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This study attempted to discover the number and types of mentoring programs offered to first year music teachers in the Northwest states and to get new teachers' opinions about the value of the mentoring they received.

A Superintendent's Survey was mailed to the superintendent of each district in the states of Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington and Wyoming asking if mentoring was available for music teachers and requesting a description of any existing mentoring programs. A Music Teacher survey was mailed to first and second year music teachers in the state of Washington seeking the teachers' opinion of the mentoring they had received. Teachers were asked to describe the mentoring and comment on its usefulness.

Mentoring was offered in more than half the districts of only two Northwest states. The structure of these programs varied widely from the very formal to the very informal.

Only a minority of the responding teachers was assigned a mentor for their first year of teaching. Many of those not assigned to a mentor sought guidance and advice from a more experienced staff member on their own. Teachers felt most satisfied with mentors who (a) taught the same subject, (b) observed them and provided feedback, help and encouragement, (c) provided
opportunities for new teachers to see them teach, and (d) shared teaching ideas, explained procedures, and assisted with classroom management issues.

Teachers were least pleased with mentors who did not understand music, and who gave no feedback or negative feedback. They disapproved of mentoring programs that (a) did not allow meaningful activities to take place, (b) prevented frequent contact with the mentor, or (c) did not supply a mentor.

Providing a music mentor for new music teachers, offering better training for mentors, and collaborating among several districts to provide better mentoring were recommended ways to help first year music teachers succeed. Recommendations for future research were (a) comparing with mentoring programs of other states, especially where mentoring is state-mandated, (b) investigating mentor training programs, and (c) developing recommendations for effective mentoring program models.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

After just one quarter or semester of student teaching experience many education students graduate and receive certification. Once they are hired, first-year teachers may be given a perfunctory orientation, handed the key to their classroom, and left to get on with the job (Hoffman, et al, 1985, Halford, 1996). One educational writer observed that teaching is the only profession where a novice is expected to do the same duties, bear the same responsibilities, and produce the same quality of work as a veteran of fifteen or twenty years experience (Huling-Austin, 1990). Many beginning teachers feel overwhelmed by difficulties resulting from their lack of experience (Varah, Theune & Parker, 1986, Veenman, 1984). Due in large part to this circumstance, data indicate that up to 47% of new teachers leave the profession in the first seven years (Schlechty & Vance, 1981, Huffman & Leak, 1986).

Beginning in the late 1970's, school districts began to institute induction or mentoring programs, patterned after those that have been used in the business world, to reduce teacher dropout and help establish novices as effective professionals (Lawson, 1992). The programs they developed took different forms
but a common theme was to provide a mentor from the ranks of experienced teachers to assist the new employee with professional development (Varah, Theune, & Parker, 1986, Brooks, 1987).

Studies show that new teachers who received mentoring tended to continue teaching longer than did those who received none (Odell & Ferraro, 1992). The questions novices asked their mentors reflected need for teaching expertise and content-related information (Odell, 1986). Several studies indicated that music teachers needed additional subject-related guidance and direction that can only be provided by an experienced music teacher (DeLorenzo, 1992, Rose, 1997, Krueger, 1999).

**Need for the Study**

New teachers frequently find their first year to be difficult and stressful (Lortie, 1975). Leaving the somewhat sheltered life of a student, the novice teacher assumes the enormous responsibility of educating a group, or several groups, of youngsters each day. He or she must plan lessons, deliver information, and keep the students in order. He or she must also determine that each of his/her pupils is actually learning the required information. In addition to bearing teaching's burden, many teachers experience a sense of isolation by the very nature of the job, working alone in a self-contained classroom (Veenman, 1984). Consequently, it is hardly surprising that a young teacher may often feel a certain amount of panic and frustration in his/her new role (Grant & Zeichner, 1981).
Mentoring implies that a helpful teacher with from seven to fifteen years of experience is assigned to show the newcomer around the building, help him/her locate materials and supplies, and explain the procedures and policies of the school and the district (Galvez-Hjornevik, 1986). The conscientious mentor also provides a listening ear, reacting with understanding empathy to the tales of difficulty and frustration that often attend the first weeks on the job (Shulman & Colbert, 1987).

At the beginning of the year the new teacher wishes to discover where to find books and supplies, how to order supplementary materials, how to set up the room, and what are the policies of the school and the district. Gordon (1990) refers to these concerns as environmental issues. They are usually specific needs that have straightforward and relatively easy answers (Gehrke & Kay, 1984).

Another major concern for novice teachers is establishing an effective system of classroom management (Veenman, 1984, Gehrke & Kay, 1984). There may be a district policy concerning management techniques. Often a mentor teacher can offer suggestions and help the newcomer to develop strategies for management (Schulman & Colbert, 1987).

First-year teachers who have passed the hurdle of these early difficulties often feel an urgent need to investigate and improve any deficiencies in their teaching technique, share strategies for motivating students, and get ideas for more effective planning and delivery (Bova & Phillips, 1984, Odell, 1986b, Huling-Austin, 1987, Gordon, 1990). After the first few months of school have passed, the sphere of a mentor's influence and assistance needs to include
dialogue and discovery in the actual business of teaching subject matter to students (Huling-Austin, 1992, Darling-Hammond, 1998).

A new teacher needs guidance and direction in the organization and delivery of subject matter in addition to help with setting up the room, learning the district or school policies on classroom issues and establishing a consistent and effective system of classroom management (Darling-Hammond, 1998, Huling-Austin, 1986). Research recommends that the novice teacher receive mentoring from a teacher whose expertise is in the same subject field (Thompson, 1988, DeLorenzo, 1992).

Music teachers practice an extremely specialized function in the school setting. DeLorenzo (1992) found that few non-music colleagues or administrators understood what is entailed in the music teaching job. Sometimes the only mentors available for new music teachers have expertise in different subject areas (Thompson, 1988, Krueger, 1996). In such cases, mentors are unable to offer the specific subject matter support that is essential for the first year (Krueger, 1996). When first-year teachers begin to look for ways to increase their effectiveness as music teachers, research indicates they seek the help of another music teacher (De Lorenzo, 1992, Rose, 1997, Krueger, 1996, Krueger, 1999).

If new music teachers need to be mentored by experienced music teachers, school districts may need to recognize the necessity of identifying music mentors for their newly hired music employees. Music teacher mentors should provide expertise and experience specifically in music, preferably the same specific area of music teaching as the novice teacher (DeLorenzo, 1992, Rose, 1997). According to researchers, mentors benefit greatly by receiving training in
mentoring skills and observational techniques (Darling-Hammond, 1998). While many studies have investigated mentoring issues for general education, relatively few have focused specifically on music education. An analysis of existing music mentoring programs in the schools may help identify both areas of excellence and areas needing improvement. Findings can provide baseline data that can be used to develop guidelines for the formation of future programs. They may indicate ways to design an effective curriculum for mentors, provide a model for an effective training schedule, or demonstrate the need for reorganizing or expanding the budget for mentoring practices.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to determine (a) how many mentoring programs currently exist for music teachers in the six states of the Northwest Division of Music Educators National Conference, (b) whether new music teachers are mentored by experienced music teachers, and what attempts are made to match music mentors with novice teachers in their music specialty area (e.g., band, choir, orchestra or general music), (c) whether the size of a district or program is related to the existence of a mentoring program, and (d) how effective mentoring efforts are as perceived by first-year teachers who have been mentored.

An ancillary purpose of the study is to consider string program mentoring as a specific part of a school district's music program, attempting to discover (a) whether string instruction is included in the district's music program, (b) how string teachers are mentored, especially in cases where there are few string
teachers in the system, and (c) whether the mentors of new teachers in such programs have any string teaching experience.

If the music teaching profession is to increase its effectiveness in inaugurating new music teachers adequately, it will need to know and understand how they are currently being mentored. Only after discovering the strengths and weaknesses of prevailing practice can educational leaders propose any needed changes for a more competent future policy.

To gain a partial description of today's practices, this study surveyed school districts in the Northwest region of the Music Educators National Conference to determine their mentoring practices. It sought to answer the following questions:

Research Question #1

To what extent do school systems in the Northwest have formal mentoring programs for music teachers?

Research Question #2

What is the relationship between the size of the district and the existence of a formal mentoring program?

Research Question #3

Of those districts with formal mentoring programs, are the mentors either currently employed or have they previously been employed as music teachers?

Research Question #4

If mentoring is provided for music teachers, (a) who selects these mentors, and (b) what selection process and criteria are used?
Research Question #5

If a new string/orchestra teacher was hired, would his/her school district provide a mentor who had string/orchestra teaching experience?

Research Question #6

How did new teachers who have received mentoring view their mentoring experience?

Research Question #7

How do new teachers assess the success of their first year of teaching?

Definition of Mentoring

Mentoring is a nurturing process in which a more skilled and experienced person, serving as a role model, teaches, sponsors, encourages, counsels, and befriends a less skilled and experienced person for the purpose of promoting the latter's professional and/or personal development (Huling-Austin, 1990, Odell & Ferraro, 1992). Mentoring functions are especially effective when carried out within the context of an ongoing, caring relationship between the mentor and the mentee (Anderson & Shannon, 1988).

Mentors have been described variously in the literature as assuming the role of a coach, buddy, role model, developer of talent, guide, counselor, sponsor, teacher, colleague, or friend (Gordon, 1990). Bova and Phillips (1984) envisioned the mentor exhibiting risk-taking behaviors and communicating political skills for professional advancement to the mentee. Huling-Austin (1987) referred to a support teacher, while Odell (1986), emphasizing a focus on
teaching issues, called the position a clinical support teacher. Zey (1984) stated that a mentor will oversee the career development of his or her mentee through teaching, counseling, providing psychological support, protecting, promoting and sponsoring. Anderson and Shannon (1988) viewed the mentor as a nurturer, role model, care giver, and teacher, who will support, encourage, counsel and befriend the mentee. Daloz (1983) described a guide who could point the way, offering support and challenging the mentee to higher levels of professional development.

The Formal Mentoring Program

For the purposes of this study, a formal mentoring program is defined as one established by a state or school district where a particular mentor teacher is officially assigned to a new employee. The assignment may be made through a rigorous system of selection and matching by the superintendent of the district or at the building level from the personnel available. The structure of the mentoring program may be defined in detail or left up to the individuals involved. If the mentor is chosen and assigned to the new teacher by a school official, rather than sought out by the new teacher alone, the program will be considered a formal mentoring program.

Administrators generally make a mentoring assignment to acquaint the new employee with solutions for the many difficulties he/she will face during the first year of teaching (Odell, 1986). The mentor and mentee may receive training or attend meetings to prepare them. One or both may receive a stipend to compensate for extra time they spend during the course of the mentoring
process. The mentor may have resources of personnel and literature to define and structure interaction with the mentee. The program may include an established schedule of visits, observations and opportunities for feedback (Huffman & Leak, 1986, Varah, Theune & Parker, 1986).

The Mentor's Role

The guidance a mentor may offer includes helping the inexperienced teacher understand and cope with various issues in the teaching profession. Procedural demands of the school, classroom management, unit planning, curriculum development methods and the development of new teaching strategies comprise issues that all may be addressed (Huling-Austin, 1990, Odell, 1990, Ganser, 1995). The mentor may model effective teaching strategies and provide opportunities for the novice to observe and reflect on existing educational practices (Daloz, 1983, Bova & Phillips, 1984, and Shulman & Colbert, 1987, Gay, 1995).

Applied Mentoring

The education profession regards mentoring as such an important component of establishing a new teacher successfully that some states have mandated a mentoring experience for all first-year teachers (Defino & Hoffman, 1984, Huling-Austin, 1990, Furtwengler, 1995). Other states have recommended that mentoring programs be instituted by individual school districts with support from state monies and state guidelines (Furtwengler, 1995).
Established mentoring programs are usually quite adequate for handling the issues of:

- classroom management
- classroom routines
- communication with parents
- location of educational resources
- district policies and procedures (Little, 1990, Gordon, 1990).

According to research, following the first months of the school year, if the new teacher is dealing successfully with environmental issues, most mentors need to shift the focus of their guidance to teaching expertise and subject-centered knowledge (Gordon, 1990). For example, in a 1986 study, Odell found that first-year teachers asked more questions about teaching strategies and subject content than about any other category of mentor support. The novices continued to ask many teaching related questions after the first months of school. This category remained the largest area of concern for virtually every new teacher throughout the first teaching year (Odell, 1986). Mentors who can be the most help in this regard are expert teachers whose subject or grade level is most closely matched to that of their mentees (Darling-Hammond, 1998).

New music teachers experience a number of unique needs to the music education field (Krueger, 1996, DeLorenzo, 1992). These include:

- guidance in choices and purchase of music and materials
- subject-specific support and advice
- assistance with program and concert planning and preparation
• help with curriculum development and long-range planning for the music program
• modeling examples for effective strategies and delivery
• help in establishing and maintaining budgets and procedures for instrument inventory, repair, libraries, uniforms, and trips or other extra-curricular activities specific to a performing group.

Limitations

Music Educators National Conference (MENC) is a professional organization representing all phases of music education in the United States. Its membership includes music teachers and others involved in music education at all levels (MENC, 1987). The national organization is comprised of five major divisions, Eastern, North Central, Southern, Southwestern and Northwest. One division, the Northwest, was selected for the present study. The states of Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington and Wyoming constitute the Northwest division. This study is limited to that region. The Northwest states provided a manageable sample of school districts for the study. The results of the study, therefore, may have implications unique to the Northwest division.
CHAPTER 2

RELATED LITERATURE

The discussion of related literature is separated into the following categories: (a) literature on the dilemma facing beginning teachers, (b) literature on mentoring roles (c) literature on mentor teacher characteristics (d) literature on mentor teacher selection, (e) literature on the first established mentoring programs, (f) literature on differences in mentoring models, (g) literature on mentor teacher training, and (h) literature on the unique needs of beginning music teachers.

The Dilemma of the Beginning Teacher

The education community has been forced to face issues that have been driving able young teachers from the profession. Studies by Dropkin & Taylor (1963), Ryan, et al (1980), Grant & Zeichner (1981), Veenman (1984), and Varah, Theune & Parker (1986) have identified various problems that beset inexperienced teachers. A 1981 North Carolina study by Schlechty & Vance (1981) revealed that 47% of new teachers left the profession within the first seven years. More teachers actually left after the first year than after any other.
from representing the weak or incompetent, the more academically accomplished individuals were actually the most likely to leave the profession. Other studies have corroborated these findings. A survey by Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction Task Force on Teaching and Teacher Education (1984) showed 50% of beginning teachers leaving within five years.

One of the first concerns the beginning teacher faces is becoming familiar with the day-to-day organizational details of his or her specific school building and the policies and procedures of the school district (Odell, 1986). The beginning teacher may encounter difficulties learning exactly what is expected of him/her as these details are often not explained adequately (Dropkin & Taylor, 1963). Sometimes it is only after the novice has done something incorrectly or omitted an important procedure that he or she learns about various policies and regulations (Deal & Chatman, 1989).

Concerns of first-year teachers most frequently mentioned by researchers (Veenman, 1984, Dropkin & Taylor, 1963, Varah, Theune, & Parker, 1986, Gordon, 1990) are:

- classroom management
- inadequacy of instructional materials, resources and supplies
- lack of familiarity with school procedures and operational policies
- feelings of isolation
- inappropriate and/or undesirable teaching assignments
- role conflict between the emerging adult personality and the responsibility of teaching
• reality shock - the contrast between expectations of the new teacher and the reality of the classroom situation
• principal/supervisor observation and evaluation
• establishing communication with administrators, other teachers and parents
• motivating students
• evaluating students
• meeting students' individual needs
• building an adequate repertoire of teaching strategies
• suitable delivery and pacing of lessons
• lesson planning and curriculum building skills
• organization of content and instructional goals

Mentoring Roles

Beginning in the late 1970's, educators began to advocate comprehensive programs of induction to help new members of the profession develop the skills and knowledge necessary for success. Induction for new teachers meant a systematic program to orient, inform, and assist the newcomer in his/her role. A key component of many induction programs was the assignment of an experienced teacher to mentor the new employee and assist with his/her professional development (Varah, Theune & Parker, 1986). The mentoring idea was borrowed from the business community where it had long been a successful strategy for establishing new leaders (Brooks, 1987).
Because beginning teacher induction programs so frequently included mentoring, they were often called mentoring programs. The two terms, induction and mentoring, are used interchangeably throughout the literature.

In the earliest stages of teacher induction, a mentor was intended to assist and support the novice teacher through the first seven of the difficulties previously listed for beginning teachers (Huling-Austin, 1987). A teacher with from seven to fifteen years of experience was deemed the ideal person to help the new employee. The mentor could show the newcomer around the building, help him/her locate materials and supplies, explain the procedures and the policies of the school and the district, and listen sympathetically to accounts of the troubles and triumphs that occurred during the first few weeks on the job. (Shulman & Colbert, 1987).

For those mentoring pairs who established a strong working relationship, the sphere of influence and assistance could soon extend to include dialogue and discovery in the actual business of teaching subject matter to students (Odell, 1986, Huling-Austin, 1987). Gordon (1990) describes the first seven topics from the previous list as environmental concerns. Many writers observed that once the first-year teachers passed the hurdle of the environmental difficulties of the job, they were often ready to investigate and improve deficiencies in their teaching technique, including strategies for motivating students and more effective planning and delivery. (Bova & Phillips, 1984, Odell, 1986, Huling-Austin, 1987, Gordon, 1990). Researchers suggested that appropriate mentors could help novices understand and cope with the procedural demands of the school, classroom management, unit planning, curriculum development methods.
and the development of new teaching strategies. For this purpose, researchers felt the ideal mentoring experience ought to feature modeling by the mentor and provide opportunities for the novice to observe and to reflect on existing educational practice. (Daloz, 1983, Bova & Phillips, 1984, and Shulman & Colbert, 1987).

Characteristics of Mentor Teachers

Mentors' roles have been depicted in the literature as that of coach, buddy, role model, developer of talent, guide, counselor, sponsor, teacher, colleague, or friend. Bova & Phillips (1984), envisioned the mentor exhibiting risk-taking behaviors and communicating political skills for professional advancement to the mentee. Huling-Austin (1987), referred to a support teacher, while Odell (1986), called the position a clinical support teacher, both of them making an effort to get away from the buddy idea and to place the mentor in a more formal role for promoting academic improvement. Zey (1984), stated that a mentor oversees the career development of his/her mentee through teaching, counseling, providing psychological support, protecting, promoting, and sponsoring. Anderson & Shannon (1988), saw the mentor as a nurturer, role model, care giver, and teacher, who would support, encourage, counsel and befriend the mentee. Daloz (1983), described a guide who could point the way, offering support and challenging the mentee to higher levels of professional development.
Mentor Teacher Selection

Proponents of mentor-style induction programs described various essential mentor selection criteria according to their conception of the mentors' role. Galvez-Hjornevik (1986) stressed that his/her peers must view the teaching mentor as an expert. Borko (1986) emphasized that the mentor must take a reflective and analytic approach to his/her own teaching. The prospective mentor must desire to help, be dedicated to teaching, and be willing to take on the added responsibility of mentoring according to Varah, Theune & Parker (1986). A successful mentor should be experienced and ideally about a half a generation or more older than the person who is to receive the mentoring in the opinion of Gordon (1990), Ryan (1986), and Levinson (1978). Although opposite-gender relationships can work, many researchers recommended the mentor and mentee be of the same gender.

The mentoring relationship appeared more successful between individuals who taught the same subject or grade level, according to Borko (1986) and Galvez-Hjornevik (1986). Those teachers and mentors who worked in the same building or district also seemed to be successful, perhaps because of their opportunities for better and more frequent communication (Huffman & Leak, 1986, Lewis, 1979, Ward, 1986). Galvez-Hjornevik (1986) suggested first-year teachers should share philosophies about teaching and classroom management with their mentors. She also stated first-year teachers must recognize the need for the support teacher arrangement if the relationship was to be successful.
Several investigators reflected on the highly personal and affective dimensions of mentor selection (Zimpher & Reiger, 1988). However, Gordon (1990) notes that a school setting, with a limited time frame for setting up the program and a finite number of available mentors, limits the opportunity for a novice to choose for him/herself. He states that a mentor-mentee relationship established by an institutional induction program, though it may seem artificial and contrived, can function well provided most of the other selection considerations are in place (Gordon, 1990).

Selecting an outstanding mentor teacher is of extreme importance to the ultimate success of the induction process (Huling-Austin, 1986). Often, according to Rauth & Bowers (1986), local school district administrators assumed selection responsibility. While they may be supposed to know their own employees best, administrators may exercise subjective judgement that could be unreliable in identifying effective mentors (Rauth & Bowers, 1986). According to Odell, (1987) another potential difficulty is that mentor teachers chosen in this manner may not be accepted by their peers as the ones most uniquely suitable to help newcomers. Other experienced teachers may question the qualifications of the administration's choice. Odell opined that teachers recognized and viewed by their peers as excellent educators would also enjoy the support of those peers. Moreover, involving the teachers in the process of choosing mentors would tend to enhance the professional status of teachers as decision-makers (Odell, 1987).

A potential mentor should desire to be a help to young teachers and should show dedication to the teaching profession according to Varah, Theune & Parker (1986). He or she must be an empathetic, caring individual who
understands the principles of adult learning, can accept young teachers as colleagues and establish open communication with them, stated Anderson & Shannon (1988). Above all, suggest Huling-Austin (1986), Varah, Theune & Parker (1986), and Wagner (1985), the mentor should be an excellent as well as an experienced teacher.

**First Established Mentoring Programs**

Some of the first programs that utilized mentor teachers to help ease beginning teachers' transitions into the profession appeared in the late 1970's and early 1980's. The University of Alabama at Birmingham set up the First-Year Teacher Pilot Program, a partnership between the teacher training institution, local educational agency and the State Department of Education (Applegate, 1977). The University formed a support team of six clinical professors who worked with a coordinator in each county. Together with experienced cooperating teachers, these professors assisted a random sample of first-year teachers through a series of team meetings, individual conferences that occurred after actual classroom observation, and meetings with both the first-year teacher and mentor at the University teacher center. At the end of the first year, researchers found no significant difference between the student achievement in classes of teachers who had been assisted and the control group. However, they did find the principal ratings and teacher attitudes of beginning teachers who had been mentored were significantly higher than those of teachers who had not received assistance. (Applegate, 1977).
The University of Texas at Austin investigated the induction of beginning teachers in the United States (Defino & Hoffman, 1984). Questionnaires were sent to each of the 50 states and the District of Columbia to determine the amount and type of new teacher induction in the nation. Their report from 1984 indicated fifteen states with some induction of beginning teachers already in place. Florida, Georgia, Oklahoma, and South Carolina reported having state-mandated induction programs operational during the 1983-84 academic year. Arizona, Oregon and North Carolina reported that they were piloting induction programs. Other states indicated their programs were in the planning stages. In all, twenty-two states showed at least some level of new teacher induction, with different structured models and with varying amounts of general involvement. (Defino & Hoffman, 1984).

The University of Texas at Austin also conducted an experimental program of teacher induction in their Model Teacher Induction Project (MTIP) where first-year teachers were paired with support teachers chosen by their school principal (Huling-Austin, 1985). The mentoring teams addressed the common needs and concerns of new teachers, adapting the type of assistance to the changing needs of the novices as the year progressed. The findings of the study affirmed the value of including a mentor or peer teacher as part of an induction program. The study also supported claims by earlier educational supervisors that a productive relationship appeared more likely to develop between the new teacher and the mentor when they taught similar content or grade levels and when their classrooms were located in the same area of the building. The MTIP project recommended that induction programs include the

Odell and Ferraro (1992) studied two cohort groups of teachers for four years from their entry into the profession to determine whether mentoring made a difference in the attrition of novice teachers. They found that mentoring definitely helped new teachers decide to continue in teaching. Respondents indicated their intention of remaining in the teaching field, some even mentioning that they aspired to the area of administration. The teachers contacted through the study expressed their appreciation of the support mentors gave them for instructional procedures and resources. The most highly rated area, however, was that of emotional support during the critical first year.

Mentoring Models and Types of Assistance

As different mentoring programs were being developed across the country during the early 1980's, teacher induction was accomplished in various ways. In time, several distinct approaches developed. Each of the early programs reflected a slightly different view of the mentor's role and responsibility.

The California State Education Department developed the California Teacher Mentor Project at the instigation of the state legislature in 1983. This program employed an experienced teacher to befriend the novice and familiarize him/her with the culture of the school. The mentor's responsibilities included assistance with curriculum, guidance in classroom management, and modeling exemplary teaching. The mentor observed and provided suggestions, guidance
and feedback, but did not evaluate the new teacher. While there were few specific guidelines for identifying, training and evaluating teacher mentors, the California statute clearly emphasized the advisory role of the mentor (Wagner, 1985).

The entry year program in Oklahoma began by state mandate in the 1982-83 school year. All Oklahoma first-year teachers were assigned an advisory committee consisting of three people. The committee, comprised of a school administrator, a teacher consultant, and a higher education representative, provided guidance and assistance, reviewed the teaching performance of the novice, and made certification recommendations to the state board of education (Friske & Combs, 1986). All committee members made independent observations, provided progress reports to the beginner, and made recommendations for future staff development. Teacher consultants spent a minimum of 72 hours with the entry year teacher, providing a variety of mentoring services — helping, providing feedback for formative purposes, and gathering data to make summative judgments. (Godley, Wilson & Klug, 1986).

Florida initiated a statewide beginning teacher program in 1982. It designated each beginning teacher as a member of a four-person team, including a peer teacher, a building-level administrator, and another professional educator who could be another district officer or university faculty member. A professional development plan outlined the education each teacher should receive and the competencies each beginner needed to demonstrate to complete the program. Novices developed a variety of materials and lesson plans. Tests and observations measured their performance. Mentors reviewed anecdotal
records during conferences with mentees to identify specific teaching behaviors with which the new teachers needed assistance and proposed suggestions for improvement. Summative evaluation formed the central feature of the assistance program. The program aimed to determine the new teacher's level of competency. Those who demonstrated the desired competence were approved to discontinue assistance (Stroble & Cooper, 1988).

Virginia instituted its Beginning Teacher Assistance Program (BTAP) in 1985. This program's assessment and assistance goals meant to assure that certified teachers demonstrated specified competencies and that beginning teachers received help in achieving those competencies. Three experienced educators observed beginning teachers' classrooms on three separate occasions to make an initial assessment. Teachers who had not successfully demonstrated the specified competencies received assistance from trained instructors. This cycle of assessment and assistance was repeated to allow beginning teachers two more opportunities to demonstrate the needed competencies. New teacher certification depended on the successful completion of the BTAP requirements. (Beginning Teacher Assistance Program, 1986). In 1991, the Virginia legislature rescinded this program for financial reasons (Furtwengler, 1995). However, Virginia school districts continued local efforts to mentor beginning teachers. In 1999, the General Assembly again enacted legislation mandating mentor teacher programs for all new teachers (Virginia Department of Education, 2000).

Reports on the 1981 program in Toledo, Ohio indicated it used mentors judged to be excellent and experienced teachers to train and evaluate beginning teachers. There was also a component of the program designed to help
experienced teachers whose skills were deemed critically weak (Waters & Wyatt, 1985). The peer evaluation program gave experienced teachers a role in screening new entrants into the profession. Experienced teacher consultants were matched with beginning teacher interns according to their subject area. Interns entered a two-year probationary period where they were evaluated at the end of each year. Their teacher consultant did the first year evaluation while the principal was responsible for the evaluation in the second year. Goals set by the intern and consultant were assessed, information was gathered through detailed observations, and conferences were held that focused on teaching techniques, classroom management skills, and content area knowledge. A panel composed of teachers' association members and appointees of the district personnel office then reviewed the consultants' recommendations. The superintendent and the school board authorized action to renew or not renew each intern's contract. Although this program provided assistance in teaching methods and demonstrated sample lessons for beginning teachers, it also emphasized the consultant's assessment role. (Stroble & Cooper, 1988).

Structure as Determined by Function

Odell (1987) found that the educational agency responsible for initiating an individual mentoring program largely determined its structure. She noted that legislatures and/or state departments or boards of education often mandate programs to be implemented throughout the state. Other mentoring programs are founded by local school districts and are administered at the district level. Colleges of education sometimes establish and execute still others for their
surrounding communities. The program characteristics for each model correlate highly with the initiating agency.

State departments of education, who are responsible for assuring that teachers licensed in their state are competent, tend to create induction programs with a strong component of performance assessment that serve as probationary periods for the new teacher. These programs emphasize evaluation of new teacher competence and often serve to screen out those who show the least skill and promise of professional development. (Hoffman, et al, 1986).

Local school districts look for teacher competence, but they also seek to provide orientation to specific district procedures and to facilitate adjustment to the school community (Odell, 1987). They tend to initiate programs that rely on the informal involvement of veteran teachers within each individual building. These veterans have the potential for offering structured instructional support to new teachers, but the degree of involvement and the structure varies widely among mentoring programs. Formal evaluation does not usually form a large component of local district programs. The amount of control the administration exercises also varies. (Johnston, 1985).

Teacher induction programs inaugurated by colleges of education are not as concerned with licensure or employment orientation and tend not to emphasize summative evaluation. Rather, they focus on mastering the subject matter, planning effective strategies, and developing the novice's teaching proficiency. Most of the evaluation that takes place in these programs is formative and its outcome rarely determines or affects the new teachers' employment (Odell, 1986).
Training of Mentor Teachers

Once identified, the prospective mentor teacher needs to receive training for the role he or she is to assume according to Gordon (1990). Decisions about that role, whether a primarily evaluative, a primarily supportive role or a combination, will help to determine what training is needed. Whether assuming a supportive or evaluative role, the mentor teacher needs to become informed about professional teacher development, new teacher needs and concerns, effective teaching principles, supervision, induction, and adult learning principles (Odell, 1987). Huffman & Leak (1986) also suggest that mentors receive training in observation techniques and strategies for providing feedback and conducting conferences with their mentees. Opportunities to share ideas and pool resources with other mentors, problem solve, use a case study approach, and evaluate their own work would make the training program more meaningful and worthwhile according to Odell (1987).

Recently, several university supervisors have criticized some of the early attempts to mentor new teachers for failing to address lack of expertise in teaching, which was the central issue in their opinion (Halford, 1996, Darling-Hammond, 1998). They claimed that too many early programs only informed new teachers what the district policies were and made the novices "feel good" (Darling Hammond, 1998). Darling-Hammond (1998) advocated that first year teachers follow an intensive program of supervised internship combined with graduate-level, school-based courses. She felt the novices should study teaching methods and strategies, do rigorous work in curriculum planning and
demonstrate strong pedagogical and content knowledge. Huling-Austin (1992) recommended that results of research on teacher induction and research on learning to teach be combined with teacher induction practices to make improvements that would ultimately benefit the entire profession.

Thies-Sprinthall (1986) and Halford (1996) also suggested improvements to the teacher mentoring models generally in place. They suggested that mentors and administrators should regard the beginning teacher as a learner who is still in the process of discovering how to work with students, deliver content, and motivate and assess student learning. Several researchers advocate thorough, research-based training of the mentor teacher and a significant component of involvement from the university teacher training faculty as valuable features to implement in addition to field experience during the induction process (Huling-Austin, 1992, Darling-Hammond, 1998).

Unique Needs of Beginning Music Teachers

According to Mortenson (1991), Krueger (1996), and Warrick (1988), in addition to the issues common to all first-year teachers, beginning music teachers have another set of concerns that are specifically music-related. These include:

1. selecting and ordering music and music teaching materials
2. preparing and implementing a specialized budget
3. recruiting students
4. establishing an ongoing relationship with students and parents
5. fulfilling contest and competition obligations
6. performing in public
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7. planning, scheduling and supervising concerts, trips, and other events intrinsic to music
8. developing a comprehensive curriculum plan for retaining the same students in the program over a number of years
9. following a successful, popular previous music teacher
10. teaching at more than one level and in more than one building
11. maintaining, storing and keeping records on instruments and equipment
12. organizing and maintaining a music library
13. teaching multiple ability and experience levels in a single group

Because the music teacher's situation is so different from his or her colleagues who teach other academic subjects, and because there are usually only one or two music teachers in a building, the novice music teacher sometimes feels an intensified sense of isolation (Krueger, 1999). Also, DeLorenzo (1992) points out that many teachers of performing groups, such as choir, band or orchestra, instruct individual students over a number of years. This particular teaching circumstance makes it important that he/she establish strong working relationships with those students and their parents (DeLorenzo, 1992). Students will often develop a special affinity and loyalty to a specific music teacher. If there is a teacher change, students may show a wary or even hostile attitude to the newcomer (Krueger, 1996). The first-year music teacher may also face criticism or opposition from students and parents who complain that the new teacher does not do things the same way or have the same requirements and expectations as his/her predecessor. (Warrick, 1988, De Lorenzo, 1992).
Preparing a group for public performance is often a daunting responsibility for new music teachers as well (Krueger, 1996). First-year music teachers may encounter difficulty handling the complexity of concert planning and preparation. Observations and entries from the journals of first-year teachers about their initial teaching experiences served to enumerate some of the concerns of beginning music teachers (Krueger, 1996). Novice music teachers frequently claimed their administrator did not understand or appreciate the demands of the job and failed to give them adequate help and support (Krueger, 1996). In a series of personal interviews, first-year music teachers expressed a need for the subject-specific guidance and counsel that could only be provided by a mentor with experience in their subject field (Krueger, 1999).

Thompson (1988) found that beginning music teachers relied primarily on other music teachers or district music supervisors for help with first-year questions. The music teachers in Thompson’s study viewed district inservice programs, professional journals, and clinics or workshops in the field as their greatest source of professional growth. This finding is in direct contrast to the studies in general education. According to Deal and Chatman’s study (1989), 75% of new teachers in a large metropolitan school district reported trial and error as their primary adjustment strategy to the school routine. They claimed to receive minimal help from principals and supervisors. Myton (1984) also found that new teachers in general did not view district-sponsored clinics or workshops as particularly helpful. Other educational studies revealed concerns of neophytes about getting basic information about the school, its operating
procedures, and the demands and responsibilities placed on beginning teachers (Odell, 1986, and Griffin, 1983).

A study by DeLorenzo (1992) undertook to identify the perceived problems of beginning music teachers and the perceived usefulness of any professional assistance offered during the first year of teaching. Noting that music teachers' jobs involve specialized knowledge and skill, and that music teachers' responsibilities are somewhat different from the general teaching population, DeLorenzo theorized that these teachers would require different kinds of assistance in an induction program.

To inquire further, DeLorenzo developed a questionnaire that asked beginning music teachers to answer questions about the degree of help they had received from various sources such as administrators and inservice programs during their initial teaching year. They were further asked to state the degree of usefulness of specific forms of assistance such as observations, discussions with other teachers and music conferences. Most of the questionnaire asked for responses on a 5-point Likert scale, but several open-ended questions called for a narrative response. When the results were analyzed, the music teachers indicated on the Likert scale response items that the areas of greatest concern for the first year were budget preparation and finding time for continued musical growth. The skills and responsibilities creating the least concern were developing effective working relationships with colleagues and with administrators.

DeLorenzo's findings about the difficulties of first year music teachers correspond with findings of other studies in education (Odell, 1986, Griffin,
1983). A large number of young teachers shared concerns about the need for basic information about the school, its operating procedures, and the burden of responsibilities placed on beginning teachers. The indications that beginning music teachers have relatively few problems relating to school personnel, however, run counter to findings for the general classroom teacher (Deal & Chatman, 1989, Ryan, et al. 1980, Shelley, 1978).

When asked how helpful they found various forms of assistance, the music teachers in DeLorenzo's study identified mentor teachers and colleagues in the field as most helpful and general school district inservice programs as least helpful. When asked about assistance modes, beginning teachers reported that discussions with other teachers and music conferences were most helpful. Asked to describe any special assistance programs that the school district provided during the first year, they responded with descriptions of programs that varied from a single orientation meeting for first-year teachers in one instance, to elaborate mentor programs with on-going meetings throughout the year in another. Predictably, the perceived value of these programs was as varied as the programs themselves. One comment that was repeated many times was the need for information or training specific to music teaching and the limited value of generic or specifically academic training. This concern as well as the findings about the variability of experiences from one district setting to another was corroborated by Krueger's 1999 study. (DeLorenzo, 1992, Krueger, 1999)

In response to the open-ended questions, DeLorenzo's novice teachers made overwhelmingly clear their need for specific experience and information about the music-related issues of starting out in teaching. They expressed a
strong need for workshops and inservice programs that provide practical, hands-on strategies for the music classroom. They indicated awareness of their teaching limitations and asked for release time to observe experienced music teachers. Their concerns about classroom management centered on ways to adapt techniques specifically to the music classroom. They seemed to value contact with other music teachers most highly and expressed discipline-specific concerns with their teaching. (DeLorenzo, 1992). Again, the teachers in Krueger's study affirmed these findings. (Krueger, 1999).

Research indicates that first year music teachers desire support and assistance on music-specific teaching issues. Krueger (1997, 1999), Thompson (1988), and DeLorenzo (1992) offer insight into the difficulties of beginning music teachers and identify the need to provide support for them. Their studies reveal that beginning teachers want more programs offering a one-to-one relationship of an experienced and excellent music teacher, providing help, support and counsel to a novice in the field of music teaching. The ideal form for such support and assistance, however, is yet to be established. Unfortunately, few studies address this need.

Smith (1994) and Rose (1997) describe mentoring programs that focus on pairing music teacher mentors with beginning music teachers. The mentoring program in Smith's study paired experienced music teachers with one first-year and one second-year music teachers to form triad relationships. New teachers and mentors were chosen carefully with regard to their teaching areas and the levels of students they taught. The teachers attended periodic meetings that addressed various teaching issues and also included an informal time for sharing
of experiences among the teams. The members of each team negotiated individual meetings, school visits and other support themselves. Each team worked together for two years. At the end of the mentoring period, novices expressed a preference for the collaborative style of mentoring. They rated the help they received in classroom management, knowledge of teaching materials, class planning and other school issues as the most effective assistance from the mentoring program. They appreciated the mentoring triads and the efforts at matching subjects and grade level between their mentors and themselves (Smith, 1994).

The subjects in Rose’s study kept journals and engaged in dialogue with their peers in an effort to help them develop reflective insight into their own teaching. As they became increasingly aware of their own philosophies and styles, the novice teachers became more independent and felt freer to be creative in their teaching. They struggled with their identity as a music specialist in the school environment. They questioned whether music teachers could command respect in a community of teachers of academic subjects. They also strove to reconcile their roles as musicians and teachers. In the university setting, most of their work centered on performance, while in teaching, they saw themselves differently. At first the teaching role seemed to fit poorly with their own self-concept as musicians. By the end of the program, most acknowledged that a music teacher must place a higher priority on the progress of their students than their own performance (Rose, 1997).
Summary

Research indicates new teachers often feel a sense of isolation and inadequacy in their first teaching assignment (Veenman, 1984, Dropkin & Taylor, 1963, Varah, Theune, & Parker, 1986, Gordon, 1990). It is such a serious problem that a significant number of able teachers leave the profession after only five years (Varah, Theune, & Parker, 1986). The difficulties presented by this situation have attracted the attention of university teacher trainers and school district officials throughout the country.

Research reveals that beginning as early as the 1970's, some schools have attempted to solve the problem by borrowing the idea of mentoring from the business community (Varah, Theune, & Parker, 1986, Brooks, 1987). Different districts or states have suggested diverse mentoring designs in an attempt to address the problem. There have been varying amounts of success with these programs. None has solved the problem, but most educators agree that some form of mentoring is valuable to new teachers. Many states have mandated that mentoring programs be instituted. Others have piloted programs and left the choice of design up to individual districts. There are varying amounts of money committed in different states to support mentoring efforts. The different program designs have seen varying amounts of success. In the end, there is no one model that all agree is the best.

According to research, first-year music teachers have additional needs over other novices because of the specialized nature of their jobs (Krueger, 1997, 1999, Thompson, 1988, DeLorenzo, 1992). Frequently these unique concerns are not addressed by the usual state or district sponsored mentoring program.
School districts often fail to meet individuals' needs by offering only a series of general inservice meetings or by assigning mentors to their new staff without regard to the subject or grade level taught by either individual (Krueger, 1999). Studies have shown that beginning music teachers often feel even more isolated and less supported than their colleagues who teach the traditional academic subjects (Thompson, 1988, DeLorenzo, 1992). Subject matter counts in the training and induction of new teachers if they are to fulfill their potential and become masters of their craft (Odell, 1986, Griffin, 1983). Music teachers have special, subject-centered questions that can best be answered and needs that are best met by other music teachers (DeLorenzo, 1992, Krueger, 1999).
CHAPTER 3

PROCEDURES

This study sought to determine the number of mentoring programs for music teachers offered in the Northwest, the structure and implementation of those programs, and the attitude of the music teachers in the state of Washington towards mentoring they received. To obtain this information, the study surveyed: (a) district administrators to gather data about existing music teacher mentoring programs, and (b) music teachers, either new to the profession or new to a district, to get their impressions of the relative success or failure of mentoring they had received.

Two surveys were administered to gather data. The first was administered to the superintendent of every school district in the six Northwest states. The district superintendent was asked to complete the questionnaire or see to its completion by a designee.

The second survey was limited to the teachers in the state of Washington. Washington was chosen because it is the state with the largest total number of districts offering music instruction. It represents the largest number of music teachers available in any one state in the Northwest.
This chapter will describe the two surveys and the procedures that were used in their implementation. It will: (a) explain the subjects chosen for each survey, (b) describe the questionnaires, (c) outline the process followed in administering the questionnaires, and (d) report the rate of returns and the school systems and geographical areas they represent.

The Superintendents Survey

The first survey was distributed to each district in the Northwest division of the Music Educators National Conference (MENC): Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming. The questionnaire for this survey was mailed to the superintendent's office of every school district in each state. A total of 902 school districts were identified for the six states: 55 in Alaska, 108 in Idaho, 198 in Montana, 197 in Oregon, 296 in Washington, and 48 in Wyoming.

The Directory of Public Elementary and Secondary Education Agencies (1998), a publication of the National Center for Education Statistics of the United States Department of Education, yielded a list of school districts in each state. The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) is the primary federal entity for collecting, analyzing, and reporting data related to education in the United States. Each school district, its central office address and phone number, the grade range of students, its total student enrollment, the number of teachers, and the number of schools are included. The listings in the publication were from the 1995-96 academic year. To verify and update the NCES publication, a list was taken from the State Superintendent's website of each state. The state lists confirmed the validity of information from the NCES publication, and included
superintendents' names for each of the districts. A set of mailing labels was made from these verified lists for each state. The questionnaires were mailed to each superintendent at the district office address.

**Questionnaire for the Superintendents Survey**

A survey questionnaire was prepared to administer to each district Superintendent. The purpose of the survey was to ask each superintendent to describe any mentoring program currently offered to music teachers new to his/her district. The survey consisted of fourteen questions. It appears in appendix A. The following is a description of the content and purpose of each question.

Question one asked how many students the district served. It provided a blank where the superintendent supplied the official number of students enrolled. This information was used to separate the districts into groups by size. Its purpose was to compare mentoring program offerings among different sized districts.

Question two asked if the district had a formal mentoring program for its teachers. The respondent was asked to indicate yes or no. If the district did not offer a formal mentoring program, the subject was asked to return the questionnaire after this question. The purpose of this question was to identify districts that offered mentoring programs.

Question three asked if the district employed certified music teachers, asking the respondent to check yes or no. Question four asked how many music teachers the district employed. It supplied a blank for the respondent to write in
the number. Question three was designed to identify the districts with music programs, while question four was to determine the size of the programs. Information regarding the size of music programs sought to discover if there was a relationship between the size of the music programs and the existence of music teacher mentors.

Question five asked if mentoring was available for music teachers in the district. The respondent was asked to check yes or no. This question was designed to reveal whether or not music teachers and their mentoring needs were specifically addressed in the district's total mentoring efforts.

Question six asked if the music teachers' mentors were experienced music teachers. Respondents were asked to choose among the following responses: "all," "some," or "none." If the answer was "some," the respondent was requested to circle the percentage of the total that were experienced music teachers: 1-25%, 26-50%, 51-75%, or 75-99%. This was designed to avoid confusion in case a district had a music mentor for some but not all mentored music teachers.

Question seven asked whether there was a strings/orchestra program. The respondent was to indicate yes or no. If the respondent marked yes, the respondent was instructed to continue with question eight. If the answer was no, he/she was asked to skip to question eleven. Since not all districts offer string instruction, question seven was designed to determine the number and frequency of strings/orchestra programs among the whole set of responding districts.

Question eight asked for the respondent to give the number of individuals teaching strings/orchestra classes. The respondent was asked to write the
number in a blank. This question was designed to reveal the extent of
strings/orchestra offerings within those districts that offer strings. It endeavored
to determine if programs with a larger number of strings/orchestra teachers
were more likely to offer mentoring to orchestra teachers as compared to those
with fewer teachers.

Question nine asked a hypothetical question. If a district chose to start a
strings/orchestra program this question undertook to establish whether or not
the person they hired for the job would receive mentoring from a music teacher.

Question ten carried the query a step further by asking if the music
teacher mentoring the newly-hired strings/orchestra teacher would have
strings/orchestra teaching experience as well. The respondent was asked to
choose an answer among "yes," "probably," or "probably not." This question was
created to ascertain if the music mentoring offered would specifically relate to
strings/orchestra teaching.

Question eleven sought to discover if mentoring efforts were specific to
each music subject area. It asked if new music teachers would receive mentoring
from teachers practicing within their respective teaching areas (e.g., band, choir,
general music, and orchestra). Respondents were asked to choose an answer
among Likert scale responses of: "always," "up to 25%," "26-50%," "51-75%," "76-
99%," or "not at all,"

Related literature indicates that some districts offer mentoring for first-
year teachers only, some for teachers new to the district or program, and some
for teachers who are identified as "at risk," meaning experienced teachers who
are not meeting district or state standards of effectiveness. Question twelve
asked which categories of teachers received mentoring in the district. The respondents were asked to check all that applied among responses: "first-year teachers only," "teachers new to the district or program," and "teachers identified as at risk." The directions asked the respondent to check all that applied in case the district served more than one category.

Question thirteen asked who selected the mentors in the district. A blank was provided for the subject to respond. Related literature indicates that different districts have various policies on the selection issue. This question was designed to determine the proportion of those who assigned mentors at the building level according to proximity and those with a different selection process. This question further attempted to ascertain under what circumstances mentor and mentee tended to be matched by their teaching area.

Question fourteen asked the respondent to describe the process for selecting mentors and list the criteria by which they were chosen. This question utilized an open-ended format to permit districts with highly structured programs to describe the selection process. The open-ended format allowed those programs that were more flexible to characterize the different ways their mentors were chosen and assigned, without asking them to choose between a set of standard solutions.

The Pilot Study

Once the initial superintendent survey questionnaire was written, it was shared with three Ohio State University professors for comments and
suggestions. Several wording changes to the questions were made as a result of their review.

Two educators from Ohio, one from Maryland, and three retired from Washington then reviewed the questionnaire. These individuals generally approved its content, but suggested several additional minor wording changes to increase clarity.

The reviewers stated that they thought, after the suggested changes had been implemented, the questionnaire would elicit the desired information. They further affirmed that a busy superintendent would be able to complete the form in a short time without encountering much difficulty. They agreed that this would improve the chance of securing a high return rate.

Administering the District Superintendent Questionnaire

The District Superintendent's questionnaires were mailed to the superintendent's office in each of the 902 districts of the Northwest in November of 1999. These included 55 in Alaska, 108 in Idaho, 198 in Montana, 197 in Oregon, 296 in Washington and 49 in Wyoming. A reminder letter was sent two weeks after the first mailing, and a second mailing of the questionnaire was sent in December of 1999.

The Music Teacher Survey

The Music Teacher survey canvassed music teachers from Washington who were eligible to receive mentoring. These were teachers who were either new to the district or new to the teaching profession. The survey was designed
to discover how effective mentoring efforts by school or district appeared from
the perspective of teachers who had been mentored.

The teachers who were included in the survey were selected as follows. Washington Music Educators Association (WMEA) publishes a directory every
two years listing the music teachers for each district in the state. It was assumed
that any teacher whose name was included in the latest directory (1999-2000) but
not the previous one (1997-98) would be a first or second year music teacher in
Washington.

The questionnaire asked for information about any mentoring received
during the respondent's first year of teaching. Whether the responding teacher
was new to the profession or simply new to Washington, the questionnaire
specifically asked him/her to refer to the first year of teaching in Washington to
supply the answers. The questionnaire asked the respondents to describe any
mentoring they received and rate its effectiveness for their teaching and
professional development.

The two hundred ninety-one names and addresses collected from the
WMEA directory were compared for verification with those on a list from MDT
Marketing, Inc. MDT Marketing, Inc. conducts a phone survey of every school
each year to inquire the names of the current music teachers and verify
addresses. Their database is updated each time they receive current information.
The names and addresses on the MDT list were used to confirm the WMEA list.
Music Teacher Questionnaire

The questionnaire for the music teacher survey consisted of thirty-five questions. It appears in Appendix D. It sought information about teacher mentoring programs from the point of view of the teachers. It asked teachers to describe the mentoring they received, if any, and rate its effectiveness on their teaching and professional development.

Question one asked the teachers if they had been formally assigned to a mentor for their first year of teaching. Respondents were asked to check either yes or no. If they indicated they had, they were to skip to the third question. Those who had not been assigned to a mentor were asked in question two if they had found another teacher or an administrator to help with their orientation and development in the first year. Respondents again were to indicate yes or no. Those who answered yes to this question were instructed to answer the rest of the questions referring to the self-selected person as their mentor. Since mentoring opportunities and programs differ widely, input from both formal and informal mentoring then would be gathered.

Question three gathered data about the respondents' specific subject areas in music. Responses of: "band," "strings/orchestra," "choir," "general music," and "other," were listed. A blank was provided for open-ended responses. Subjects were asked to check as many as applied to their specific music teaching area. Districts usually employ more general music, choir, and band teachers than string teachers. This question could help determine if teachers in one subject area had received mentoring more frequently than those in other areas.
Question four asked what subject the mentor taught. The respondent was instructed to write the subject in a blank. The question sought to determine if their mentors taught the same subject, a related music subject, or an unrelated subject.

Question five asked how many years the mentor had taught. The respondent was asked to check the appropriate range from a Likert scale, choosing among: "1-5 years," "6-10 years," "11-15 years," "16-20 years," and "more than 20 years." This question was designed to compare the most frequent and least frequent experience levels of those chosen to mentor.

Question six asked whether the subject's mentor had received any special training for the role. The respondent was asked to check yes or no. This question was designed to demonstrate differences in how well the mentors were prepared for their tasks. Participants were asked to respond to an open-ended question by describing any special schooling mentors received. This question was designed to determine how thoroughly the mentors were trained for their assignment.

Questions seven, eight, and nine attempted to reveal the structure of the mentoring program. Question seven asked for a number of times the mentor met with the beginning teacher. The respondent was asked to check the appropriate answer from a Likert scale ranging from 1-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-15 years, 16-20 years, to more than 20 years.

Question eight asked what form the mentoring meetings took. Respondents were to indicate their answer from a list of choices: “formal observations,” “discussions,” “questions and answer,” “a combination of these,”
or "other." A blank for an open-ended response offered the respondent a chance to explain the responses of "combination" or "other." The open-ended section also requested the respondent to describe any meetings that did not fit into the categories listed.

In question nine, the respondent was asked to report if meetings with their mentors took place during the school day. Respondents were instructed to check what applied from a list of responses: "all during the school day," "all outside the school day," and "a combination." If the answer was a combination, the respondent was asked to indicate the number or proportion of meetings during or outside the school day.

Question ten inquired if the mentor observed the respondent's teaching. Respondents were asked to check yes or no. If the answer was yes, the respondent was asked to give the number of times observation took place: "1-5," "6-10," "11-15," "16-20," or "more than 20."

Question eleven asked if the teacher was able to observe the mentor teaching. As in Question ten, the respondent was asked to check yes or no and to indicate the number of times observation took place.

Question twelve asked the respondent to describe the type of feedback received from the mentor. Subjects were asked to check all that applied from a list that included: "sympathetic listening," "supportive remarks," "constructive criticism or suggestions," "written evaluations," or "other." Those who indicated "other" were asked to explain. An open-ended format was supplied for the explanation.
Question thirteen asked whether the mentored teacher felt comfortable expressing his/her own teaching ideas in discussions with the mentor. The respondent was to choose a response among: "very comfortable," "moderately comfortable," "somewhat uncomfortable," and "no." Those responding "no" were asked to explain why not. An open-ended format was supplied for the explanation. This question sought to establish if suitable rapport for meaningful dialogue existed between teacher and mentor.

Question fourteen, closely related to the previous question, asked if the mentor helped the mentee find his/her own solution to teaching problems. Respondents were asked to check yes or no. The question was designed to determine if the mentee was encouraged to think for him/herself and come up with creative solutions to teaching problems.

Questions fifteen and sixteen attempted to determine the amount of record keeping involved in the mentoring program. They also served to help indicate if the mentor's role in the mentored teacher's development was to offer suggestions and guidance for growth and improvement (formative) or to evaluate, rate, or judge the novice (summative). Related literature suggests that in a summative program the mentor frequently serves in an evaluative capacity (Odell, 1987, Godley, Wilson & Klug, 1987, Stroble & Cooper, 1988). Question fifteen asked if mentor feedback was entered on a written form and saved as part of a permanent record. Respondents were asked to check yes or no. Question sixteen inquired where the forms were kept, directing the respondent to check responses: "at the building level," "in a district office," or "other," providing an open-ended response blank for the respondent to describe "other."
Questions seventeen, eighteen and nineteen were open-ended, requesting the mentored teachers to express what they felt was the most valuable and least valuable aspects of their mentoring and how the mentoring experience could have been improved.

Question twenty asked if any administrator observed the teacher informally (not for evaluation) during the first year. The respondent was asked to check all that applied from a list of: "principal," "supervisor," and "other administrator." A blank was provided for the respondent to specify if a different administrator was involved. The question was designed to ascertain whether or not the teacher received feedback about teaching other than the annual evaluation from his/her building principal, supervisor, or other administrator during the first year.

Question twenty-one sought to determine if the mentor's role was primarily formative or summative. It asked whether or not the mentor was responsible for the teacher's evaluation. The respondent was requested to check yes or no. Related literature indicates several differing roles for mentors depending on the type of mentoring program. This question was designed to identify programs with mentors whose role was to evaluate.

Beginning with question twenty-two the teachers were asked to describe the process by which they were evaluated and how they felt about its effectiveness. The purpose of this line of inquiry was to determine if mentoring helped a teacher feel more confident about being evaluated. Question twenty-two asked who evaluated them: "principal," "supervisor," or "other
administrator," with an open-ended response format for the respondent to specify which other administrator was involved.

Question twenty-three asked the respondent to indicate the number of times the evaluator observed his/her teaching for the purposes of evaluation. A blank was provided for the respondent to supply the number.

Question twenty-four asked if the evaluator provided constructive feedback prior to the evaluation process. The respondent was asked to check yes or no.

Question twenty-five asked whether the novice felt the evaluation was a fair assessment of his/her teaching. The respondent was asked to choose a response: "yes," "no," or "I don't know."

Question twenty-six was an open-ended question. It asked the respondent to list what improvements he/she felt could have been incorporated into the evaluation process.

Question twenty-seven asked if the evaluation included suggestions for improvement that the teacher could implement. Respondents were asked to check yes or no.

Questions twenty-eight through thirty asked how teachers perceived their evaluators. In question twenty-eight teachers were asked to indicate whether their evaluator appeared primarily helpful, primarily judgmental, or a little of each.

Question twenty-nine asked if the teacher was satisfied with the observation and input of his/her evaluator. Respondents were asked to choose among yes, no, or somewhat.
Question thirty inquired if the teacher was intimidated by the evaluator’s presence in the classroom. Respondents were asked to indicate yes, no, or somewhat. These questions were designed to determine if the teacher felt greatly stressed or anxious about his/her evaluation process, or viewed it as a helpful tool for professional growth.

Question thirty-one asked the respondent to indicate how satisfied he/she was with the first year of teaching. The answers were expressed on a Likert scale ranging from "generally positive," "mostly positive with a few negatives," "equally positive and negative," to "mostly negative with a few positives," or "generally negative." This question was designed to elicit the teacher’s perception about the success of his/her first year of teaching.

Question thirty-two asked the respondent to specify positive factors that had encouraged him/her to continue teaching. Question thirty-three requested him/her to list the three most difficult problems faced during the first year of teaching. Both questions required open-ended responses.

Question thirty-four asked the teacher to list all the resources he/she consulted during the first year of teaching for professional growth. Nine sources were given: "mentor," "other teachers in your subject," "other teachers in a different subject," "principal," "arts coordinator or supervisor," "previous college coursework," "district level meetings," "professional journals," "music conferences or workshops," and "other." Respondents were instructed to check all that applied and were given another chance to include anything not listed by answering with an open-ended response.
Question thirty-five asked the respondent to suggest anything else he/she thought would help a first-year teacher's adjustment to teaching be more successful. It also called for an open-ended response to avoid directing the person's thoughts.

The Pilot Study

The teacher questionnaire was pilot-tested with a group of teachers who attended the Midwest String Teacher Conference at Ohio State University in July 1998. These teachers were practicing strings/orchestra teachers from around the country who had enrolled in a workshop for string teachers. It is one of the largest string teacher workshops in the United States and draws participants from many regions of the country. These teachers' backgrounds and the programs in which they teach vary widely.

Seventy-two questionnaires were distributed to members of the workshop. They were asked to complete the questionnaire and to offer suggestions that might improve the survey questions. The teachers were instructed to respond to the questions as if it were their first year of teaching.

Returns from the pilot study revealed that several questions required wording changes to improve their clarity. The changes indicated were made.

The largest change to the questionnaire as a result of the pilot test was the inclusion of several more open-ended questions. The object of this was to allow the teachers to express their own opinions without the limitations imposed by suggested answers. The teachers in the pilot study, lacking this opportunity, wrote all over the questionnaires, adding a considerable amount of explanation.
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and further information to their answers. Most teachers were able to complete the questionnaire in fifteen minutes or less.

Administering the Music Teacher Questionnaire

Teacher questionnaires were mailed to the 291 music teachers identified in Washington. The first mailing took place in April 2000. A reminder letter was mailed one month later to those who had not responded.
CHAPTER 4

PRESENTATION OF DATA

This study attempted to gather information about the mentoring practices in the six states of the Northwest region of Music Educators National Conference (MENC). It endeavored to provide answers to the following questions:

1. To what extent do school systems in the Northwest have a formal mentoring program for teachers?

2. What is the relationship between the size of the district and the existence of a formal mentoring program?

3. Of those districts with programs, are the mentors either currently employed or have they previously been employed as music teachers?

4. If mentoring is provided for music teachers, (a) who selects these mentors, and (b) what selection process and criteria are used?

5. If a new strings/orchestra teacher was hired, would his/her district provide a mentor who had string/orchestra teaching experience?

6. How did new teachers who have received mentoring view their mentoring experience?

7. How do new teachers assess the success of their first year of teaching?
This chapter is organized into two sections that present data from the following sources: 1.) the District Superintendent Questionnaire and 2.) the Music Teacher Questionnaire.

The District Superintendent Questionnaire

The District Superintendent Questionnaire was mailed to total of 902 district superintendents in November of 1999. The return rate for the first mailing was 69%. A reminder letter two weeks after the first mailing and a second mailing of the questionnaire in December of 1999 produced a final return rate of 86% for the six states. Table 1 shows the returns for each state and the total.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Total districts</th>
<th>First return %</th>
<th>Final return %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Return rate by state

Results of the Survey Questions

Question one asked how many students the district served. Answers were expressed in whole numbers representing the total student enrollment.
The school systems in each of the Northwest states included many of small size and exhibited a very wide range between the largest and the smallest. The range of district sizes for all six states was between a minimum of 7 to a maximum of 50,000 students. The mean district size was 2,343 students, but the standard deviation was 4,872. The median size district served 700 students. The mean did not provide a meaningful measure of average size in this instance because of the large standard deviation. Therefore, the median was used rather than the mean as a division between small and large sized districts.

The districts were divided into four size categories, two below and two above the median size. The categories were defined as: Very small (7-350 students), Small (351 - 700 students), Medium (701 - 2343 students), and Large (2344 or more students). Table two shows the divisions, frequency and percentages for this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Very small</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Small</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Size of districts by number of students, Question 1.

Forty-two percent of the district superintendents responding to the questionnaire reported that their districts provided formal mentoring programs.
for teachers. The frequency of mentoring programs varied from state to state with Idaho reporting the largest percentage (81%) of the districts offering mentoring, and Montana (16%) the smallest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>774</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Teacher mentoring districts by state, Question 2.

The states of Montana and Oregon reported mentoring programs in less than one third of the districts that returned questionnaires. Idaho and Washington noted more than half the responding districts included mentoring programs for their teachers. The remaining two states, Alaska and Wyoming, provided mentoring in more than one third but less than half of the districts replying to the questionnaire.

Related literature suggests that smaller districts, with their limited personnel resources, sometimes encounter difficulty offering a mentoring program. The Northwest states reported many small and very small districts. They also showed a wide range between the largest and the smallest districts in each state. The largest range of district sizes was reported in Oregon, the state from which the smallest (7 students) and the largest (50,000 students) district of
the entire set of respondents was also reported. The state reporting the smallest range was Wyoming whose minimum sized district (100 students) was the largest reported for any of the six states, and correspondingly, whose maximum sized district (13,367) was the smallest. Even in Wyoming, however, the district sizes skewed to the smaller end of the scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>15,940</td>
<td>1518</td>
<td>2851.3</td>
<td>496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>26,980</td>
<td>2208</td>
<td>3878.0</td>
<td>1045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15,822</td>
<td>15,787</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>1790.0</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>49,993</td>
<td>3031</td>
<td>6178.0</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>46,757</td>
<td>46,747</td>
<td>3338</td>
<td>5922.0</td>
<td>1008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>13,367</td>
<td>13,267</td>
<td>1701</td>
<td>2388.0</td>
<td>875</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. School district size statistics.

The number of mentoring programs in districts smaller than the state median was compared to that of larger ones. In general, those districts whose size ranged at or below the median tended to have fewer mentoring programs than the group of larger districts. In addition, very large districts, especially those with numbers of students equal to or greater than the mean for the state, showed a proportionately larger number of mentoring programs.

Table 5 shows the percentage of total mentoring programs for the state according to district size. The districts in the category above the mean size are
those with the largest number of students. In all states except Idaho, the largest districts indicated an increased percentage of mentoring programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Below Median Size</th>
<th>Above Median Size</th>
<th>Above Mean Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Mentoring programs by size of school district.

Question three asked if the district employed certified music teachers. Not all the districts reporting a mentoring program offered music instruction by a music specialist to their students. In eleven districts (3% of the districts reporting mentoring) there was no music teacher. The non-music districts ranged in size from 77 to 600 students.

Question four inquired about the number of music teachers employed by the district. The music teachers employed in any one district varied from .5 to 75 Full Time Equivalents (FTE). Most of the districts employed a small music staff. The largest numbers of teachers occurred in only a few districts.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Music Teacher FTE</th>
<th>% of Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 8</td>
<td>73.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - 15</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 22</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 - 30</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 37</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 - 45</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 - 52</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 - 60</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 - 67</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 - 75</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Number of music teachers employed by district, Question 4.

Question five asked if mentoring was available specifically for music teachers in the district. Those districts with mentoring programs already in place reported a much higher percentage of music teacher mentoring. However, no state was able to supply music teachers with mentors in all districts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Frequency of Total districts responding</th>
<th>% Districts with teacher mentoring</th>
<th>Frequency Districts with music mentors</th>
<th>% Districts with music mentors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Districts providing mentoring for music teachers, Question 5
Question six inquired if the music teachers' mentors were experienced music teachers. Districts were divided on their response to this issue. Most districts stated that they would prefer to provide mentors with music teaching experience for their music teachers. More than half were able to provide at least some musically experienced mentors. However, many (21%) could not do this at all.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proportion of mentors with music teaching experience</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 75%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 50% but less than 75%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 35% but less than 50%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 35%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8. Mentors with music teaching experience, Question 6.

Question seven asked which districts offered string/orchestra instruction. Ninety-one districts, 33% of those with mentoring programs, reported string/orchestra offerings.

Question eight asked the number of teachers in the district teaching string/orchestra classes. The responses, grouped into four categories according to the number of teachers teaching strings/orchestra, are shown in Table 9.
Question nine asked if a novice string/orchestra teacher would receive mentoring from an experienced music teacher. Eighty districts (88% of the districts with string teachers) reported that they would supply music teachers for mentors of new string teachers.

Question ten asked if the mentor would have string/orchestra experience. Respondents were less certain that such a mentor would have string/orchestra teaching experience. The data from question 10 is shown in Table 10. Percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percent, so the total does not add up to 100.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentors with string teaching experience</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably not</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10. Mentors with string teaching experience, Question 10.

Question eleven asked if new music teachers received mentoring from teachers practicing within their respective teaching areas (e.g., band, choir, vocal, instrumental). The data from question 11 is shown in Table 11. Percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percent, so the total does not add up to 100.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentors with within area teaching experience</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably not</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11. Mentors with within area teaching experience, Question 11.
general music, orchestra). The response to this question was divided. The results are shown in Table 11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentors from same teaching area as novice</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76 - 99%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 - 75%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 50%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% or less</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depends on availability</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11. Mentors from the same teaching area as novice, Question 11.

Question 12 asked who received mentoring in each district. Respondents checked all that applied of three categories. The largest single group receiving mentoring was first-year teachers only. Table 12 shows the detailed response to the question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers who received mentoring</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First-year teachers only</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers new to district or program</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Risk Teachers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-year, New, and At-Risk Teachers</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-year and At Risk teachers</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-year and new teachers</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New and At-risk teachers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12. Who receives mentoring, Question 12.
First-year teachers receive the majority of mentoring effort. When all the categories containing first year teachers are combined, they are included in the mentoring efforts of 91% of the school districts that report mentoring.

Question 13 asked who is responsible for the selection of mentor teachers in the district. A few mentoring districts have a well-established and rigorous procedure for the selection of mentor teachers. Many others follow a more informal process for selecting and assigning mentors. Table 13 shows the distribution for the responses to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual/group making selection</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent or designee</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Supervisor</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Mentoring</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Principal</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal &amp; Music Supervisor</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal &amp; Union Representative</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13. Mentor teacher selection, Question 13.

When all the categories that include the Building Principal are combined (Building Principal, Committee, Principal & Music Supervisor, Principal & Union Representative), the total frequency is 208 with a percentage of 64%. Several superintendents who stated that their districts did not have a formal mentoring program reported that a building principal would still select and assign someone
to help a novice (first-year) teacher in his/her building. Many respondents stated that the principals chose someone who was willing and happened to be available.

Question 14 was an open-ended question that gave the respondents an opportunity to describe the process and the criteria that determined mentor selection. Respondents described widely disparate structures and criteria ranging from the very simplest assignment choices to several with very elaborate and formal organization. The ten selection structures cited the most frequently by respondents are listed in order of frequency of response in Table 14. The number of respondents giving the answer is included after each statement. Respondents frequently gave more than one answer in this open-ended question, so the percentages of responses were not included.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Structure reported</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The prospective mentor teacher demonstrates interest and willingness to help new teachers by asking or applying to be a mentor</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The superintendent and/or a committee in consultation with the Music Supervisor screen the applications.</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The building principal selects the best person available.</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>An application process is required to become a mentor.</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Volunteers from the teaching force are accepted as mentors</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Training is either available or required for the mentor candidate.</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Input or requests from the first-year teacher are accepted or considered.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mentor candidates are interviewed for selection.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mentor teachers receive either released time or a stipend or both in return for performing mentoring.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>A schedule of meetings and observations is either encouraged or required for mentors and novices.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14. Most frequently reported structure for selecting a music mentor, Question 14.

Respondents indicated much more agreement about some of the categories of criteria to be sought in an ideal mentor than they did about the structure of an ideal mentoring program. The ten most frequently listed mentor criteria are shown in Table 15. The number of respondents giving the answer is 65.
included after each statement. As in Question 13, many of the respondents gave more than one answer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Criteria reported</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>The mentor candidate shows evidence of successful teaching experience or longevity of successful teaching career.</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>&quot;Master&quot; teachers are chosen for the excellence of their teaching.</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mentors teach the same subject matter/specialization area as their novice teachers.</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mentors are available at appropriate times and willing to spend time helping the novice teacher.</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mentors are compatible with the new teacher.</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mentors have proximity to the novice, teaching in the same area or building.</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mentors demonstrate leadership qualities</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mentors have had favorable evaluations.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mentors show good listening skills, are empathetic, nurturing, and encouraging.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mentors are able to work with others and meet the needs of the novice teacher.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15. Most frequently reported criteria for selecting a music mentor, Question 14.

Although some respondents were unable to demonstrate an organized structure for selection in their district, most acknowledged that mentor selection is too important to leave to chance. Several administrators affirmed the value
they placed on both music teachers and mentoring for music teachers. Some wrote comments about this issue on the forms. Their remarks included the following quotations:

"Perhaps small districts could band together to find music mentors to help the new teacher and do observations. If several districts joined for a common goal, maybe they could pay someone from the outside to come."

"We've had the same music teacher for nine years. She's terrific! If we hired another one, we'd look for a mentor."

"This is a small district and we can't provide specialized mentoring, but everyone does something to help the new teacher."

"Music teachers are very difficult to find in Northeastern Montana. I treat mine with love and respect and value her highly."

The Music Teacher Questionnaire

The Music Teacher Questionnaire was sent to 291 first- and second-year music teachers identified in Washington. The questionnaires were mailed to the teachers' school addresses. Questionnaires were first mailed in April of 2000. The initial return rate was 25%. After a reminder letter was mailed to the non-respondents in May, 2000, this figure was increased to 38%.

The second questionnaire mailing was delayed until September of 2000, when school started again. The second mailing was timed to arrive in the first week of school to ensure that the teachers surveyed still had about the same amount of teaching experience as their colleagues had who returned their
questionnaires in the spring. This mailing increased the rate to 51%. After a final reminder letter, following two weeks after the questionnaire, the final total return rate was 53%.

To ensure that the data gathered from that percentage of respondents would adequately represent experiences from all areas of the state, comparisons were made in each region between the percent of returns and the percent of teachers in that area. Washington is divided into nine Educational Service Districts (ESD’s) to serve districts in all parts of the state. The percentages of Music Teacher returns in each ESD were compared to the percentages of identified teachers for the survey and to the percentages of Washington students served by each ESD. A map indicating the location of each ESD appears in Appendix J. Results of this comparison are shown in Table 16.
Table 16. Comparison of Percentages of students, identified teachers and returns by ESD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESD #</th>
<th>% of students</th>
<th>% of identified teachers</th>
<th>% of returns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESD 189</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESD 114</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESD 121</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESD 113</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESD 112</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESD 171</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESD 105</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESD 101</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESD 123</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first item asked if the respondent was formally assigned to a mentor for the first year of teaching. If the answer was yes, the respondent was directed to Question 3. For those who answered no, Question 2 asked if they found another teacher or administrator to help with their questions. Those who had found such a person were instructed to answer the subsequent items referring to that person as their mentor.

First year teachers are apt to seek more experienced colleagues for help, support, or advice according to the related literature. The teachers in this survey affirmed this tendency. Table 17 shows the response to Question 1, Table 18 indicates the first-year teachers not assigned to a mentor who sought out other support.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assigned to a mentor</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17. Assigned to a mentor, Question 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Found other help</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18. Found other person to help with questions, Question 2.

Although only 31% of the responding music teachers were formally assigned to a mentor, the total number of teachers who replied that they had found someone to help them with their questions for the first year was 95, or 74% of the respondents. One respondent checked both that he/she had been formally assigned to a mentor and had also found other help, resulting in a discrepancy between the frequencies.

Questions three and four were designed to ascertain how closely the mentoring pairs of music teacher and mentor were matched by subject area. The music teacher respondents represented a wide range of subject area assignments. The results of Question 3 appear in Table 19. Percentages are rounded and thus do not equal 100%.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching area</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Band only</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strings/Orchestra only</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choir only</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General music only</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band and General music</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choir, band and general</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band and strings</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choir and general</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strings, choir and general</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine arts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band, strings and general</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19. Specific music teaching area, Question 3.

Table 20 lists the number of respondents who were paired exactly or the same in at least part of the assignment with the mentor's teaching area. A complete match means the teacher and the mentor have exactly the same teaching area assignment. The partial match categories are subsets of the category "both music teachers." Percentages do not equal 100%.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentor/novice match</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete match</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both music teachers</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial match - band</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial match - choir</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial match - general music</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial match - strings/orchestra</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not matched</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20. Mentor-novice match by teaching areas.

Non-music mentors taught a variety of other subjects. Subjects cited most frequently were:

1. elementary classroom (9)
2. English (6)
3. principal or other administrator (5)
4. math (3)
5. art (3)
6. Special Education, physical education, science, drama, and counselor (2 each)
7. business education, history, home economics, library, math and science, social studies, shop, Spanish and supervisor (1 each)

One respondent reported that various other teachers had helped over the course of the year.

Fewer than half of the forty music teachers who were formally assigned to a mentor reported that their mentors were matched by subject area. Seventeen teachers indicated at least a partial match by subject area while twenty-three
were not matched at all. The results for subject area matching between music teachers and assigned mentors appear in Table 21.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject area match</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least partial match</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not matched</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21. Assigned mentors and music teachers subject area match.

Question five asked about the experience level of the mentor teacher. Table 22 illustrates the results for this question. Percentages are rounded and thus do not equal 100%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentor Experience level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10 years</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15 years</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20 years</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20 years</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22. Mentor teacher experience, Question 5.

Question six asked if the mentor received any special training for his/her role. Seventeen of the respondents (18%) indicated that they did, while seventy-one (75%) replied that they did not. Seven (7%) teachers did not respond to this question. The eighteen percent who answered yes to this question were also given an opportunity, in an open-ended question, to describe the training. Four respondents weren't sure what type of training it was. Five cited workshops;
three that were given by the Educational Service District in which the school district was located, and two that were run by the individual school district. Two mentors attended half-day seminars; two went to orientation meetings. One respondent reported that although both the mentor and music teacher were supposed to attend such a meeting, they didn't go.

Question seven asked how many times the mentor met with the music teacher during the year. One respondent said they didn't meet. The rest responded by checking the appropriate box on a list of answers. The answers are in Table 23. Percentages are rounded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of meetings</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not meet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5 meetings</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10 meetings</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15 meetings</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20 meetings</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20 meetings</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23. Number of mentor-novice meetings, Question 7.

Question eight asked how mentoring meetings were structured. Table 24 shows the data on meeting structure.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure of meetings</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal observations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions &amp; Answers</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A combination of these</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24. Structure of mentoring meetings, Question 8.

The respondents who checked "a combination" or "other" were given an opportunity to describe or explain their experience in an open-ended question response. Respondents indicated two clear models of mentoring meeting structure, one formal and the other informal, in their answers to the open-ended part of Question eight. Forty-nine teachers responded to this part of the question. The list in Table 25 gives the number and percentage of each answer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Respondent's answer</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Teachers whose meetings with their mentors were informal and not regularly scheduled</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Those with frequent teacher/mentor meetings</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Teachers with formal, scheduled meetings</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Those with infrequent teacher/mentor meetings</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Formal meetings that included teaching observations</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Teachers whose observations included feedback from their mentors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25. Mentor meeting structure open-ended response, Question 8.
Several quotations from the respondents to Question 8 reflect the variations of teachers' experiences caused by different mentoring structures.

"There were classroom observations, after-school meetings, informal dinner meetings, and ESD mentoring sessions."

"She taught a class and I observed. I taught and she observed. Each time we met for a few minutes afterward and discussed."

"Very informal — meeting as we could during the day/week."

"I would come to her room after school to talk about questions I had or discuss issues/problems/procedures. I never saw her teach."

"Talking in the hallway."

"We met one day before school started."

Question nine asked when the mentor meetings took place, whether during or outside the school day or a combination of times. Table 26 shows the response to this question. Several teachers simply wrote in the numbers during and outside the school day, thus the numbers in Table 26 do not add up to 95, nor do the percentages equal 100%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When met</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All during the day</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All outside the day</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 26. When mentors and teachers met, Question 9.

The respondents who gave a proportion indicated that 65% of their meetings occurred during the day and 35% occurred outside the school day.
Question ten asked if the mentors observed the music teachers' teaching.

The data for this question is shown in Table 27. Percentages are rounded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentor observes teacher</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, 1 - 5 times</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, 6 - 10 times</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, 11 - 15 times</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, 16 - 20 times</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, more than 20 times</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27. Opportunities for mentors to observe teacher, Question 10.

Question eleven asked if the teachers were able to observe their mentors.

Data for this question is shown in Table 28. Percentages are rounded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher observes mentor</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, 1 - 5 times</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, 6 - 10 times</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, 11 - 15 times</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, 16 - 20 times</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, more than 20 times</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 28. Opportunities for teachers to observe mentors, Question 11.

Question 12 asked the respondents to describe the type of feedback they received from their mentors. The questionnaire suggested several forms of
feedback. An additional blank was provided to allow the respondent to describe any feedback that did not conform to a prescribed category. Table 29 indicates the data for this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forms of feedback</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sympathetic listening</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructive criticism</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive remarks</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written evaluation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination of above</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of above</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 29. Forms of feedback, Question 12.

The responses to the open-ended section Question 12 were divided into four categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Category of response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>The mentor offered suggestions, advice and answered questions</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>The mentor offered help with learning the system, doing the clerical details, and learning to know the administrations and the community</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The mentor was unable to help much because he/she did not teach or understand music</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>The mentor served as a sympathetic ear to listen to the teacher</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 30. Open-ended responses to Question 12.
One mentor had attended teacher/mentor meetings sponsored by the Educational Service District and then met to discuss the ideas from the meeting with the teacher. One respondent complained, "She asked me for advice!"

Question thirteen attempted to discern whether strong rapport had been established between the teacher and mentor. Each respondent checked a response indicating his/her degree of comfort expressing teaching ideas with the mentor. If someone replied that he/she was not comfortable, an open-ended response section of the question allowed him/her to explain why not. Table 31 presents the response to this question. Percentages were rounded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comfort expressing ideas</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very comfortable</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately comfortable</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat uncomfortable</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 31. Comfort expressing teaching ideas with the mentor, Question 13.

Of the five respondents who replied that they were not comfortable expressing their ideas, two said they felt that the mentor was unsympathetic to their teaching style while three argued that the mentor would not understand musical ideas because he/she was not a music teacher.
Question fourteen asked if the mentor helped the teacher find his/her own solutions to teaching problems. Sixty-seven of the respondents (75%) replied that their mentors did so while 22 (25%) answered that they did not.

Question fifteen asked if the mentor's feedback was entered on a form and saved as part of a permanent record in the building or district. Question sixteen asked where such forms were kept. Eight of the ninety-five mentored teachers (8%) reported that their mentor's feedback was kept as part of a permanent record. Five of them said the forms were kept at the district office, two reported that the forms were kept in the office of the individual building and one was unsure where the forms were kept. The remaining eighty-seven teachers (92%) responded that feedback was not recorded or saved.

Question 17 provided an opportunity for the respondents to make an open-ended response describing the most valuable aspects of the mentoring they had received. The responses divided themselves into five broad categories; those concerning the mentoring structure and process, mentoring activities and elements of mentoring, the training and nature of the mentor, the novice's state of mind and psychological aspects, and some of the issues or areas of help the novice found most valuable. The percentages do not equal 100% because some respondents mentioned more than one area.

Most frequently mentioned (62%) were the activities of mentoring. Their comments are listed in order of frequency, from the most often mentioned to the least. Mentored teachers revealed how much they appreciated the feeling of support and encouragement their mentors gave them. They valued the positive feedback they received from their mentors. They were pleased to have someone
who would listen to them. They benefited from the guidance or counseling they received. They accepted gratefully the advice their mentors gave them. The qualities of empathy and friendship, acceptance and respect as a peer from their mentors were praised highly. Finally, one person referred to a chance to gain insight into "professional practice" as an advantage of associating with his/her mentor.

Second highest (31%) on the scale of frequently mentioned values for mentoring was the nature of the mentor him/herself. The teachers respected and appreciated receiving the benefit of their mentors' years of experience and skill. They were most pleased with mentors who were expert musicians, taught in their specific subject area and displayed a large amount of musical expertise in general. They were particularly happy in instances where the mentor was a congenial personality, where their philosophies harmonized with those of the mentor, and where the mentor was conscientious about doing a good and thorough job.

Novice respondents cited the feelings of collegial association, help in dealing with frustration and putting things in perspective, support for self esteem, and help with development, all of which helped improve their state of mind, as another valuable part of their mentoring. One teacher remarked that his mentor gave him a "feeling of personal validation." Several observed that they especially prized feeling comfortable with their mentor.

The third (15%) most frequently designated valuable aspect of mentoring was the structure. Teachers appreciated the observation process, especially having the chance to observe their mentor's teaching. They approved of frequent
meetings, open discussions of the teaching their mentor had observed without
the pressure of evaluation, and the feedback and suggestions they received.
Several teachers especially valued weekend seminars they had attended. Two
others gained insight into the teaching process by having a chance to observe
other teachers. Getting a chance to meet and share experiences with group of
other new teachers was another aspect of the mentoring seminars some
respondents cited as particularly rewarding.

Some of the issues or areas of most valuable help mentioned by the
respondents were:

1. Sharing teaching strategies, processes and materials (41%)
2. Insight into building or district procedures and paperwork (26%)
3. Help and suggestions for classroom management (18%)
4. Assistance and advice about music-specific issues such as uniforms,
   repair, library, budget and others (12%)
5. Offering suggestions about grading and assessment procedures
   (8%)
6. Introducing the novice to new materials or technology or offering
   insight into the materials or technology on hand (8%)
7. Curriculum advice and guidance (3%)

In addition to the mentor, five respondents listed other valuable sources of
help. They consulted and conferred with other first-year teachers, other
experienced teachers, a district supervisor, their principal, and one even
mentioned learning from the students.
In question 18, respondents were given the same open-ended format to describe the least valuable aspects of their mentoring. Answers to this item divided themselves into two major categories; the personality of the mentor, and the faults of the mentoring program.

Forty-seven percent of the respondents named mentors who had limited or no knowledge of music as least valuable. Teachers concurred in their lack of appreciation for mentors who could only help with classroom management. Music teaching is so complex and full of abstruse detail that a non-musician is not very helpful at all, they declared. The second most frequently mentioned issue (15%) was the mentor's lack of initiative. Respondents complained that they had to do all the contacting and set up any visits that took place. In addition, eleven percent declared that either their mentor's input was not useful or their mentor did not give any. One felt that the mentor was not interested, one that the mentor himself had poor classroom management skills, and another that the mentor had not updated materials or strategies for 30 years. One stated that the mentor "spent too much time praising his own work" while another thought the mentor's input was "negative and critical". One novice teacher remarked that the mentor was "so good, I was discouraged."

For those rating the least valuable aspect of mentoring as the system (39%), the most frequently mentioned problems were that access to the mentor was difficult or infrequent (22%), or the system was not structured or organized in such a way that meaningful activities could take place (18%). The next most common complaints were:

1. The mentor did not observe the novice teach (8%)
2. The mentor did not offer feedback. (7%)

3. There was no organized mentoring structure (7%)

4. There was structure, but too much time was wasted with excessive forms and paperwork (7%)

5. The novice did not get to observe the mentor (7%)

6. The program began too late in the year to help (6%)

7. Scheduling times to meet was difficult or there was no provision for times to meet. (4%)

8. There was no follow-up on observations or meetings (4%)

9. The subject area was regarded as unimportant (4%)

One novice teacher admitted, "I wasted time adjusting to the program and failed to take advantage of help."

Another stated, "I became too dependent on my mentor."

In the category of least helpful advice received from mentors, novice teachers provided the following quotations:

"It will get better in a few years."

"Yep, some teachers go to smaller districts."

"Make 'em do pushups!"

Question 19 asked respondents to suggest how their mentoring could have been improved. The responses for this question divided themselves into four categories.

1. A music specialist as a mentor was needed (33%)

2. More structure and guidance were needed (31%)

3. Assigning a mentor was needed (18%)
4. More feedback/time was needed (13%)

Respondents advocating experienced musically trained mentors were the most frequent (33%). They felt it would have been valuable for them to have had another music teacher to consult with, observe, be observed, or provide feedback. They stated that regular classroom teachers had a very indistinct idea of what music teachers do and no understanding of most of the issues with which music teachers must deal. One articulate respondent said,

"Music teachers need to relate to other music teachers. MENC provides more support than [did] our mentoring program. I am able to talk to other music teachers and get ideas for my teaching at the MENC meetings."

Twenty-two respondents went on to specify that having the mentor teach the same subject area would have been helpful. Some comments were:

"Having someone who knew the schedule and was [also] a band teacher would have helped"

"I would have enjoyed a mentor in my own field."

The second largest category (31%) of respondents suggested improvement for the mentoring experience by stating they could have used more structure and guidance. Most frequently mentioned specific suggestions were that mentees would have liked their mentors to observe their teaching, and that they would have liked the opportunity to observe the mentor or other experienced teachers. One respondent put it,

"I would have liked my mentor to observe my teaching and supply me with a formal written evaluation. I would also have enjoyed observing my mentor teach."
Third most numerous (13%) were the suggestions that teachers receive more feedback and participate in more discussions. Several felt more regular contact between the mentor and the teacher was needed. Those who had been observed felt that more observations a year would be desirable. Additional issues mentioned included:

1. Training for the mentor (6%)
2. Regularly scheduled meeting times (5%)
3. Released time for observation (4%)
4. Pre-and post-discussion for observations (4%)
5. More attendance at workshops together (4%)
6. Longer than one year (3%)

One teacher wrote,

"[I would like to have seen] more stepping in and taking over when I got frustrated with an aspect of teaching. When she did that, I was able to go 'OK, cool; I see now.' So more of that would have been great."

Ten respondents replied that they would have appreciated just having a mentor. Two mentioned that their mentors ought to have received payment for their efforts.

Nine respondents felt their mentoring experience was good and did not need any improvement. Their written comments were:

"I actually had a very good formal mentor."

"I received lots of info and I was very satisfied with my mentoring experience."
"I was blessed with a terrific mentor. The most critical components are matching philosophies and compatible personalities."

Question 20 attempted to determine the extent of informal observation given to the teacher before evaluation time. It directed the respondent to indicate who had observed him/her informally during the year. As the respondent checked all that applied, the percentages do not equal 100%. Table 32 shows the results of this inquiry.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observer</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other administrator (Assistant Principal)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal and Supervisor together</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 32. Informal observations before evaluation, Question 20.

Question 21 asked if the mentor was responsible for the respondent's annual teaching evaluation. Seven respondents (5%) indicated that their mentors were responsible for their evaluations. Eighty-eight (74%) replied that they weren't. Twenty-seven (21%) did not reply to the question.

Question 22 asked who evaluated the teacher. Respondents were to indicate whether it was the principal, supervisor or other administrator. Those who responded with "other administrator" were supplied with a blank to specify which one. Results for question 22 appear in Table 33.
Who evaluated & Frequency & Percentage \\
--- & --- & --- \\
Principal & 100 & 78 \\
Supervisor & 8 & 6 \\
Other administrator (Assistant Principal) & 9 & 7 \\
Principal and Supervisor together & 6 & 4.5 \\
No response & 6 & 4.5 \\

Table 33. Who evaluated, Question 22.

Question 23 asked the number of times the administrator in question had observed the teacher for evaluation purposes. Respondents wrote the number in a blank. Table 34 displays the data for this question. Percentages were rounded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Times Observed</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three times</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four times</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six times</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 34. Number of observations for evaluation, Question 23.

Question 24 asked if the evaluator provided constructive feedback about their teaching prior to beginning the evaluation process. Eighty-three of the respondents (65%) reported that they did, while forty-five (35%) said they did not. One did not respond to this question.
Question 25 asked if the teacher felt the evaluation was fair and representative of his/her best work. Ninety-six of the respondents (74%) replied that they felt it was fair. Seventeen (13%) did not feel the evaluation was fair and representative of their best work. Ten (8%) weren't sure whether it was or not. Six (5%) did not respond to this question.

Question 26 called for an open-ended response to give the teachers a chance to suggest what could have improved their evaluation process. Thirty-three teachers responded to this question. The largest number of respondents (10) indicated that the music teachers felt an evaluator with knowledge or experience in music would be in a better position to understand and evaluate what they do. Nine of the respondents were happy with the structure and content of their evaluations and felt it was a positive experience.

Eight teachers felt the process would be improved by better structure. They suggested such specific improvements as; pre-and post-conferences, more clarity about what the observer was evaluating, sooner follow-up meetings, and a chance to receive feedback. Three teachers took issue with the evaluator's attitude. One felt his/her evaluator did not understand the importance of the subject. One stated the evaluator ought to weigh the teaching and learning more heavily than the end performance. The third criticized the evaluator for simply judging instead of trying to guide the teacher or helping to develop his/her skills.

Two respondents mentioned they would have liked to know ahead of time when they were going to be observed for evaluation, and one wished the
evaluator could have observed a different class. One teacher admitted, "I just
didn't have it together for my first year."

Question 27 inquired whether the evaluation included suggestions the
teacher could implement to improve his/her performance. Eighty respondents
(62%) felt it did contain such suggestions, while thirty-eight (29%) replied that it
did not. Eleven (9%) did not respond to this question.

Question 28 asked if the teacher felt the evaluator's attitude was primarily
helpful, primarily judgmental, or a little of each. The results for this question
appear in Table 35.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluator's attitude</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primarily helpful</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primarily judgmental</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little of each</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 35. Evaluator's attitude, Question 28.

Question 29 asked if the teacher was satisfied with the evaluator's
observation and input. The results for this question appear in Table 36.
Percentages are rounded.
Did you feel satisfied? | Frequency | Percentage
--- | --- | ---
Yes | 75 | 58
No | 13 | 10
Somewhat | 34 | 26
No response | 7 | 5

Table 36. Teacher's satisfaction with observation and input, Question 29.

Question 30 asked if the respondent felt intimidated by the evaluator's presence in his/her classroom. Results for this question appear in Table 37.

| Were you intimidated? | Frequency | Percentage |
--- | --- | ---
Yes | 12 | 9
No | 74 | 57
Somewhat | 37 | 29
No response | 6 | 5

Table 37. Teacher's response to evaluator's presence, Question 30.

Question 31 asked the respondents to rate their degree of satisfaction with the first year of teaching. Results for this question appear in Table 38.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent’s satisfaction with first year of teaching</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generally positive</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly positive with a few negatives</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equally positive and negative</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly negative with a few positives</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally negative</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 38. Respondent’s satisfaction with the first year of teaching, Question 31.

Question 32 provided respondents with an opening to list some of the positive factors that encouraged them to continue to their second year of teaching. Sixty-eight teachers responded to this question. Their answers, in order of frequency, included the reasons listed in Table 39. Many teachers answered in more than one category, so the percentages do not equal 100%.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Category of response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Receiving the support of the staff and administration</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Observing the students' improvement and growth</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Earning the respect of the students</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Receiving parental and community support</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Experiencing the students' excitement about music</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Love of teaching and music</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Building up the program</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Achieving good performance results</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Commitment to or liking for the students</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Experiencing the satisfaction of succeeding or personal growth as a teacher</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Need the money</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Like specific job or school</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Freedom to develop own program/employ creativity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Get a better position for the second year</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Receiving good funding for the music program</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Persistence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Figured the second year would be better</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Enjoyed meeting the challenge</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Could handle the classroom management</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 39. Positive factors that encouraged novices to return for a second year of teaching, Question 32.
Some individual comments reflected varying amounts of success, but lots of determination to stick it out. Quotations from their responses include:

"I loved the kids and enjoyed my subject matter. I knew I was supposed to teach."

"The fact that I didn't want to go crawling back to my parents saying, 'Take me in... I should have been a business major all along.'"

"I know that I am a good teacher and turn on most all of my students to music."

"There were few positives. The only reason my contract was renewed was because I screwed up less than the other elementary music teacher."

"The 'light bulb' when a student finally got it and the light went on. My students' joy of music, especially elementary students."

"I love teaching. I have visions. I have goals and objectives. I am not a quitter. I am strong."

"I don't think there was anything that could have dissuaded me from continuing. I was in a very positive position that supported arts in education."

In Question 33, respondents were asked to list the three most difficult problems they faced during the first year of teaching. Sixty-four teachers responded to this question. Their concerns, in order of frequency, are shown in Table 40.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Category of response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Classroom management/discipline</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Administration did not value music or did not support the teacher</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Teaching assignment was out of teacher's area of expertise or unusually heavy or difficult</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Difficulties with amount of paperwork or understanding and following district policies</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Inadequate funding or budget</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Heavy time commitment or lack of time management</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Lack of parental support or difficulty relating to parents</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Concerns about relating to students and/or meeting student needs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Student attitudes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Community or district politics or cultural adjustment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Problems living up to former teacher or overcoming problems left by former teacher</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Difficulties relating to other teachers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Selection of music or instructional materials</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Lack of published curriculum or standards</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Difficulties with scheduling</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Inadequate preparation time or having to substitute during preparation time</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Lack of adequate facilities, classroom space, or equipment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Inexperience in planning and execution of instruction</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 40. Most difficult problems of the first year of teaching, Question 33.

Continued
Table 40. continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Category of response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>No mentor or problems with mentor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Heavy performance schedule or necessity of planning big productions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Feeling exhausted or burned out</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Lack or organizational skills and record-keeping</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Learning names or physical and learning problems of students</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Lack of confidence or feelings of stress</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Feelings of isolation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Coordinating and maintaining an extracurricular schedule of performances</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 40. Most difficult problems of the first year of teaching, Question 33.

One respondent mentioned lack of expertise in technology; one cited low pay and one admitted a difficulty accepting compliments. Several mentioned personal challenges with their particular situation. Quotations from their responses include:

"I was faced with rebuilding a music program -- changing students' negative thoughts about music, promoting student participation -- against a lack of administrative support."

"No musical standards or benchmarks were in place. [I taught] sixty beginning instruments all at once for 90 minutes without prior musical knowledge. There was a non-musical attitude among the administration. I felt as though my program was already set up to fail."

"Some teachers tried to destroy my program. Unfair funding practices -- the band programs were funded but strings were not."
"Personal insecurities about my teaching ability"
"Teaching outside my specialty and therefore not knowing curriculum or literature for what I was teaching"
"Prior loyalties of students to previous teacher and the behavioral problems that can happen."
"The pace of the year – getting used to the schedule"

Question 34 asked what resources respondents consulted to get teaching ideas during the first year. The teachers were asked to check all that applied, so the results are not expressed as percentages. One answer, "other", gave respondents freedom to list any sources not listed in the responses. Table 41 displays the data from Question 34.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources consulted</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentor</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other teachers in your subject</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other teachers in a different subject</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts coordinator or Supervisor</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous college coursework</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District level meetings</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional journals</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music conferences or workshops</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 41. Resources for teaching ideas in the first year, Question 34.

Eighteen teachers gave open-ended responses for Question 34. They found help from various other sources.
1. Seven respondents observed, conferred or consulted other music teachers (39%)
2. Six consulted books, recordings or other materials (33%)
3. Four took inservice courses or relied on previous personal experience (22%)
4. One person listed God as an additional resource.

Question 35 asked the respondents to list suggestions for making a first year teacher's experience more successful. Fifty-six teachers responded to this question. Their suggestions are listed in order of frequency in Table 42.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Respondents' suggestions</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Observe other music teachers, both experienced and other first-year teachers, and network with them about teaching ideas and techniques</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Have a mentor, especially one who is a music teacher, to guide and critique the novice</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Keep enthusiasm, caring, and zest for the job throughout the year</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Be yourself – do not try to assume another's personality or system</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Get acquainted with your administrator(s) and consult them for help and support</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Lengthen the student teaching time or begin with an intern program giving longer guided practice time before assuming the total responsibility</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 42. Suggestions to help a first year teacher's adjustment, Question 35. continued
Table 42. continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Respondents’ suggestions</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Attend inservice meetings especially designed to address first-year issues</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Expect some difficulties, especially following another successful, popular teacher, and persevere</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Keep regular hours, get enough sleep and guard health</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Improve teacher training to include more curriculum planning, student contact and classroom experience, classroom management techniques, and successful literature to choose for each grade level</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Take some classroom management instruction or training and develop an organized plan for your classroom</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Plan your lessons and your concerts carefully</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 42. Suggestions to help a first year teacher’s adjustment, Question 35.

Several respondents gave inspirational-sounding quotations. Their suggestions covered a wide range of teaching situations. Some selected quotations include the following:

"Love music and love teaching it; that enthusiasm will rub off"

"Observe other teachers! Take sick days if you have to, but see what other teachers are doing."

"Frequent observation of a master teacher is absolutely essential."

"I think having someone musical to lean on helps. It is a different world for a music teacher."
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"Be sure you get a music mentor, either one that the district provides or else on a voluntary basis."

"Most important of all, strive to have fun when you teach. If you're not having fun, re-examine what you are doing and ask yourself why you're teaching."
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

This study sought to determine what mentoring programs are available for music teachers in the Northwest states; Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming. It also looked for descriptions of structure and effectiveness of the existing programs. The study included a survey of 902 districts in six Northwest states to learn what programs were offered and how the programs were administered. The survey questionnaire was mailed to the superintendent's office in each district. Either the superintendent or a designee from that district completed the questionnaire to describe the program. The final return rate was 86% for the six states.

After descriptions of the current programs in responding school districts were gathered in the first survey, another questionnaire was sent to 291 first- and second-year teachers from the state of Washington. The purpose of this survey was to find out what mentoring the teachers received and how helpful they felt it had been for their professional development. This questionnaire was mailed to the teachers' school addresses. Each respondent completed his or her own questionnaire. The final return rate was 53%.
To determine whether or not this sample was representative of the entire state, returns from each of the nine Educational Service Districts (ESD) were examined to compare the percentage of return with the percentage of students served and new teachers identified in each district. In four of the ESD's the percentage of return rate was higher than that of the students served or teachers identified for the region. In three ESD's the percentages were equal or within one point. In only two ESD's the percentage of respondents was slightly lower than that of students or identified teachers. Those two were the ESD's that served the largest areas of population. This seems to indicate that the respondents in the Music Teacher Survey represented all areas of the state and all sizes of districts, constituting a fairly representative sample of the state's new music teacher population.

Summary of the District Superintendent Survey

The District Superintendent Questionnaire revealed that among the six states surveyed, the frequency of mentoring programs varied from a minimum of 16% (Montana) to a maximum of 81% (Idaho). The states of Montana (16%) and Oregon (23%) reported mentoring programs in less than one third of the districts that returned questionnaires. Alaska (34%) and Wyoming (39%) reported that mentoring was provided in more than one third, but less than one half of the responding districts. Washington (60%) and Idaho (81%) showed that more than half of the responding districts offered mentoring programs. The districts of smaller size in all six states tended not to offer mentoring as
consistently as larger districts. Some districts with mentoring programs did not include music teachers in the mentoring activities.

Only slightly more than half of the districts surveyed were able to supply mentors with music teaching experience for their new music teachers. Inability to match teaching areas was more prevalent in districts with a small music staff compared to larger programs. If a larger music staff was employed, there was a greater tendency to provide a mentor with music teaching experience.

Only 33% of districts with mentoring programs reported offering strings/orchestra instruction. Staff size of strings/orchestra programs ranged from a single string teacher to a maximum of 18 string teachers per district. By far more string programs employed the minimum number, between one and three teachers, than any other category.

Eighty-eight percent of the districts with strings/orchestra instruction reported that they would supply mentors for their new orchestra teachers, however few of the mentors would have strings/orchestra teaching experience. Twenty-four percent admitted that such mentors would probably not have orchestra experience. Most respondents acknowledged that such a pairing of teaching areas would depend largely on availability.

First-year teachers comprised the group that was most often mentored. Other groups sometimes receiving mentoring included teachers new to the district or program, regardless of years of experience, and teachers identified to be "at risk" in the district. Some districts reported a mixed category of mentoring recipients, but when all categories containing first-year teachers were combined,
91% of the responding districts reported that mentoring was offered to first-year teachers.

Districts selected mentor personnel in a variety of ways. A few districts reported a well-established, rigorous procedure for selecting mentor teachers. Most had less structured methods of mentor selection and assignment. The building principal was the most frequently cited individual either in charge of, or involved in, selecting and assigning a mentor (64%).

Responding districts also reported using a wide variety of criteria for the selection of their mentors. The two most frequently mentioned mentor selection criteria were years of experience and excellence of teaching. Other qualifications frequently mentioned by respondents included; teaching the same subject area as the novice, availability and willingness to help, compatibility with the new teacher by reason of personality or teaching philosophy, possessing leadership qualities, and ability to listen and work with others.

Although some respondents were unable to demonstrate an organized structure of mentoring in their districts, most expressed concern over the process of new teacher orientation and professional development. They affirmed that they placed a high value on both mentoring and new teacher induction.

**Summary of Music Teacher Survey**

A second survey was conducted of 291 first-and second-year music teachers in the state of Washington to obtain their perspective about their mentoring experience. The results of the Music Teacher Questionnaire revealed that 31% of new music teachers were assigned a mentor for their first year of
teaching. In addition to these formal mentoring programs, 43% of those teachers who had not been assigned to a mentor sought one out on their own. This resulted in 74% of the respondents receiving some guidance and advice during their first year of teaching from a more experienced teacher or other education professional.

Few novice music teachers were able to have a mentor who taught in a similar subject area, whether assigned or self-selected. A complete match of teaching areas was achieved for only 18% of the respondents. Thirty-five percent of the new teachers who responded were matched at least with another music teacher, but someone outside the field of music mentored 47% of the novice music teachers. For those new teachers whose district assigned a mentor, 43% were matched at least partially in subject matter, while 58% were not.

The mentor teachers' years of teaching experience ranged from one to five years (10%), to those having more than 20 years of experience (27%). Only 18% of the mentors had received any special training for the role. Seventy-five percent of the mentors either had not received training, or the respondent was not aware of any training. The training, described by open-ended responses to this question, included workshops given by the Educational Service Districts in which the individual districts were located, and meetings run by the local school district. Several respondents mentioned actual seminars of up to a half-day, some with expert leaders, but more simply attended orientation meetings.

Mentors and the novice teachers met varying numbers of times throughout the first year. Some (20%) reported more than twenty meetings, while others (39%) met from one to five times in all. In between the two were
19% who reported from six to ten meetings, 7% with eleven to fifteen meetings, and 11% with sixteen to twenty meetings for the year.

The structure of these meetings also varied widely. Two percent reported that formal observations with feedback, discussions, and questions and answers accounted for 36% of the structure. A combination of structures was reported by 43% of the responding music teachers, while 15% chose “other.” Their responses to the open-ended part of this question revealed many instances of informal chats and other brief encounters.

The meetings took place both during and outside the school day. Thirty-five percent reported that all mentoring took place during the day. Twenty-five percent said they met all outside the day, while 36% said their meetings were some combination of during and outside the school day.

Fifty-two percent of the novices reported that their mentors observed their teaching at least once, while 43% said their mentors never observed them. One teacher reported receiving only written feedback while others (32%) received only verbal comments or answers to their questions. The rest reported receiving a combination of forms of feedback.

Opportunities for the new teachers to observe their mentors teach were fewer. Thirty-five percent mentioned that they observed their mentors teaching, while 58% were not able to observe.

Mentors gave a variety of forms of feedback to the novice teachers. Respondents chose from a list of several forms of feedback and also had an opportunity to describe any feedback that did not conform to a suggested category. The most frequently mentioned category was a combination of
sympathetic listening, constructive criticism, supportive remarks, and written evaluations. Sixty percent of the respondents chose that option. Fourteen percent chose “other” and expanded on their answers by responding to the open-ended section of the question. Most common (41%) among these responses was that the mentor offered suggestions, advice, and answered the novice’s questions. Twenty-four percent reported that the mentor helped them learn the system, master the paperwork requirements, get to know the administrative policies, and become acquainted with the community. One group (18%) complained that their mentors were not much help because they did not teach or understand music.

Sixty-two percent of the respondents replied that they were very comfortable expressing teaching ideas to their mentors; 23% said they were moderately comfortable. Five percent were somewhat uncomfortable, while 5% said they did not feel at all comfortable with expressing their teaching ideas. Those responding to the open-ended part of the question wrote either that the mentor was unsympathetic to the novice’s teaching style, or that the mentor would not understand musical ideas because he/she was not a music teacher. Seventy-five percent of the respondents reported that their mentors helped them find their own solutions to teaching problems, while 25% said their mentors did not do so.

Only 8 (8%) of the mentors entered their feedback on a form to be saved as a part of the novice teacher’s permanent record. Five said the forms were saved in the district office, two reported that the forms were kept at the individual
building, while one was not sure where the form was kept. The remaining 92% reported that mentor feedback was not officially recorded or saved.

The respondents answered questions about the most valuable and least valuable aspects of the mentoring they received. These answers provided an assessment of the novice's attitudes toward mentoring and will be described in detail later in this chapter.

The new teachers also described their first annual evaluation, giving details about who evaluated them, how the observations were conducted, how they felt about the process and whether or not they felt the evaluation was fair and representative of their best work. They reported whether they felt their evaluator's attitude was primarily helpful, primarily judgmental, or a little of each. They told whether or not they felt intimidated by the observation. They indicated whether or not they had been given suggestions they could follow to improve their teaching; they also offered ideas that they felt would improve the evaluation process.

The building principal evaluated the new music teachers in most cases (78%). The evaluator observed the teacher for evaluation purposes a number of times ranging from zero up to six. Most respondents (58%) were observed twice. Sixty-five percent of the evaluators provided constructive feedback to the teacher prior to beginning the evaluation process. Seventy-four percent of the teachers reported that they felt their evaluation was fair and representative of their best work. The majority of teachers (65%) believed their evaluator's attitude was primarily helpful, 12% thought it was primarily judgmental, while 16% thought...
it was a little of each. Sixty-two percent of the teachers felt they were given constructive suggestions they could implement to improve performance.

Fifty-eight percent of the teachers were satisfied with the observation and input they experienced in the evaluation. Others were less satisfied. The majority of respondents (57%) did not report feeling intimidated by the evaluator’s presence in their classroom.

The respondents offered varying suggestions for how they felt the evaluation process could be improved. The largest number of these said they would prefer to be evaluated by someone with knowledge or experience in music because that person would be in a better position to understand and evaluate what they do.

Some teachers felt the process would be improved by better structure of the evaluation process. They suggested specific improvements, including: pre- and post-conferences, more clarity about what the observer was evaluating, sooner follow-up meetings, and a chance to receive feedback.

The final responses of the teacher survey answered questions concerning the new teachers’ feelings about their first year of teaching. They reported how satisfied or dissatisfied they felt, named some positive factors that encouraged them to continue teaching, recounted the most difficult problems they faced in their first year of teaching, and listed some resources they consulted during the first year to get teaching ideas and for professional development. They also gave suggestions, based on their own first-year experience, for other new teachers entering their first year of teaching.
The majority of respondents felt mostly positive about their first year of teaching. Some respondents reported that their first year was equally positive and negative, while a minority found their first year mostly negative.

The positive factors that encouraged many of the teachers to return for a second year of teaching reported were:

1. receiving the support of the staff and administration (31%)
2. observing the improvement or growth of their students (28%)
3. receiving parental or community support (16%)
4. experiencing their students' excitement about music (15%)
5. love of teaching and music (15%)
6. building up a program (12%)
7. achieving good performance results (8%)
8. commitment to or liking for the students (7%)
9. experiencing the satisfaction of succeeding as a teacher (6%).

The most difficult problems cited by the teachers for their first year included:

1. classroom management/discipline (45%)
2. lack of administrative support or value for music (28%)
3. unusually heavy, difficult, or inappropriate teaching assignment (23%)
4. difficulties with paperwork or understanding district policies (17%)
5. inadequate funding or budget (16%)
6. heavy time commitment or lack of time management (14%)
7. difficulty with or lack of support from parents (12%)
8. concerns about meeting students needs or relating to students (12%)
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9. students' attitudes (12%)

10. community or district politics or cultural adjustment (12%)

11. problems living up to former teacher or overcoming problems left by former teacher (11%).

These teachers consulted a number of different resources for help and ideas during their first year. The most frequently mentioned included:

1. music conferences or workshops, (34)

2. teachers in the same subject (30)

3. previous college coursework (28)

4. mentor (22)

5. professional journals, (21)

6. teachers in a different subject (17)

7. district level meetings, (13)

8. arts coordinator or supervisor, (12)

The top ten suggestions from the respondents to help a first year teacher's adjustment to the profession were:

1. observe other music teachers and network with them about teaching ideas and techniques (37%)

2. have a mentor who is a music teacher that will guide and critique the novice (36%)

3. maintain enthusiasm, caring and zest for the job throughout the year (14%)

4. be yourself and do not try to adopt another's personality or system (14%)
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5. get acquainted with administrators and consult them for help and support (12%)

6. lengthen student teaching or begin with an intern program giving longer guided practice time before assuming the total responsibility for the job (11%)

7. attend inservice meetings especially designed to address first year issues (11%)

8. expect some difficulties, especially following a successful, popular teacher, and persevere (11%)

9. keep regular hours, get enough sleep, and guard health (11%)

10. improve teacher training to include more curriculum planning, student contact and classroom experience, classroom management techniques, and successful literature to choose for each grade level (9%).

Discussion

Research Question #1

To what extent do school systems in the Northwest have formal mentoring programs for music teachers?

The six Northwest states showed a widely varying frequency of programs offering mentoring. Part of the reason for this disparity may be financial. Washington (60%) and Idaho (79%), the two states reporting that more than half
of their districts offered mentoring programs, were also the only two of the six states that supported mentoring efforts at the district level with state funding.

Washington has a program called Teacher Assistance Program (TAP) which provides funding for school districts to implement a beginning teacher induction program. These funds are used to provide; (1.) a mentor for a new employee during the first year of teaching, (2.) training for both the beginning teacher and the mentor, and (3.) release time so the mentor and beginning teacher can observe each other and other teachers. These programs may be administered at the local district level or through the Educational Service District (ESD) in which the individual district is located.

Idaho funds a Peer Assistance Program, which involves three years of provisional certification for new teachers. During the first year of teaching, the novice is provided a mentor and given a special training program in classroom management. Year two prescribes Teacher Expectations and Student Achievement training for the new teacher. During the third year, the new teacher receives instruction through the Idaho Certificated Personnel Support Program materials. The teachers are evaluated and provided with feedback twice each year during this provisional period. At the end of this program, successful teachers are recommended for continuing certification.

Mentoring services are expensive to offer, so if the state does not provide support funds for mentoring programs, some school districts may not be able to afford to offer them. Many of the district superintendents who responded to this survey expressed regret that they did not have the resources to mentor their new teachers effectively, but stated that they attempted to make up for the lack with
informal arrangements among their more experienced teachers and the newcomer. Respondents mentioned that principals or even the superintendent would keep an informal eye on the novice to try to find ways to help them adjust to their job.

**Research Question #2**

*What is the relationship between the size of the district and the existence of a formal mentoring program?*

The states surveyed in this study exhibited a very wide range between the largest and the smallest. The range of district sizes for all six states was between a minimum of 7 to a maximum of 50,000 students. The mean district size was 2,343 students, but the standard deviation was 4,872. The median size district served 700 students. The mean did not provide a meaningful measure of average size in this instance because of the large standard deviation. Therefore, the median was used rather than the mean as a division between small and large sized districts.

The districts were divided into four size categories, two below and two above the median size. The categories were defined as: Very small (7-350 students), Small (351 - 700 students), Medium (701 - 2343 students), and Large (2344 or more students). Using this measure, two states, Alaska and Wyoming, contained no large districts at all and Montana reported only six districts (.03%) in the large size category. Idaho indicated twenty-three (21%) large districts, Oregon specified fifty-four (27%), and Washington reported eighty-three (28%).

Washington and Idaho, with more than half their districts providing mentoring for new teachers, were among the states with a higher number of
larger districts. This would seem to indicate that proportion of larger districts tended to raise the number of mentoring programs.

Countering this indication was Oregon (23%), which also had a number of large districts, yet seemed not to be able to match the other states for frequency of mentoring programs. This was rather puzzling on first consideration because some of the largest districts in all six states were from Oregon. However, Oregon also had some of the smallest districts of all six states. The lack of a large percentage of mentoring programs may reflect the fact that in any given district a lack of new employees would obviate the need for a mentoring program. A study of the number of teachers being mentored rather than the number of mentoring programs in place might give a more accurate picture of the mentoring activities in this case.

Alaska (34%) and Wyoming (39%) had the largest number of medium sized districts. These states indicated the largest percentage of mentoring programs offered without the benefit of state funding. Medium-sized districts may have been better able to offer mentoring to their new teachers than those of small and very small size. With a larger number of teachers to select from, mentor candidates may have been more readily available.

Montana (16%) reported the largest number of very small districts. Sixty-one percent of Montana's school districts had fewer than 350 students. Montana also reported the fewest mentoring programs. Perhaps this preponderance of very small districts, many of which are isolated and remote, due to Montana's topography and lack of population density, makes it too difficult to provide organized mentoring efforts.
Alaska reported that districts of fewer than 350 students made up 36.5% of the total school districts in the state. Many of the districts are even more isolated and remote than Montana's. Because of Alaska's large area and sparse population density, adequate roads connecting the hamlets of the northern part of the state, especially in winter, are rare. Mentoring efforts under these conditions would have to be completely self-contained in the rural districts. The burden of such isolation may prevent the offering of many programs.

Research Question #3

Of those districts with formal mentoring programs, are the mentors either currently employed or have they previously been employed as music teachers?

Only 31% of the districts that mentored music teachers reported that those mentors had music teaching experience. Forty-eight percent tried to have music teachers for mentors in at least some of the cases, but 21% reported that none of their new music teachers would have mentors with music teaching experience. The small size of the music faculty in many of these programs may be one reason for this. Seventy-three percent of the districts responding to the survey employed a music faculty of eight or fewer music teachers. Districts with an employee pool this small may find it difficult to provide a music mentor for every new music teacher.

In all mentoring situations for music teachers, only 30% of the districts were able to provide the novice with a mentor whose teaching area exactly matched their own. Forty-five percent of the responding districts reported that mentors partially matched their novices in teaching area. Some were only matched to the extent of their both being music teachers. Five percent of the
districts declared that the subject area match would depend on availability of music mentors, but 20% said they could not attempt to match mentors and novices according to subject area. Perhaps the structure of mentoring programs or the lack of proximity of music teachers in the same district contributed to this situation.

First-year teachers received the vast majority of the mentoring efforts. This may be partly because the state money that is available to support mentoring programs is earmarked specifically for first-year teachers. If the existence of a mentoring program in a district was dependent on receiving state money, that program would naturally follow the state guidelines. Only large districts with independent funds available for a special mentoring program would be able to offer mentoring for any other group.

Research Question #4

If mentoring is provided for music teachers, (a) who selects these mentors, and (b) what selection process and criteria are used?

The building principal was the person named most frequently as one who selects the mentors of music teachers as well as any other teachers. Sometimes the principal made the selection alone (45%), sometimes in consultation with the music supervisor (5%), a union representative (3%), or as a member of a selection committee (11%). Many respondents stated that the principal chose someone who was willing to serve as mentor, or who happened to be available in the building. Since the majority of buildings, particularly elementary schools, only have one music teacher, this seems to indicate that his/her mentor would not necessarily have music teaching experience. Choosing someone in the same
building also severely limits the selection criteria that can be used. Respondents to the Superintendent's survey indicated that in 58% of the cases the prospective mentor teacher demonstrates willingness to help new teachers by asking or applying to be a mentor. Survey respondents also revealed that in 40% of the cases, the building principal selected the best person available, and that 20% of the time, volunteers from the teaching force were accepted as mentors.

In only 18% of the cases did the respondent indicate that training was either available or required of the mentor. A very small number of respondents indicated, in response to an open-ended question, that mentors received either a stipend or release time to perform their mentoring tasks. Even fewer reported that the mentors and novices in their district were either required or encouraged to maintain a regular schedule of meetings.

Most of the variations in the selection process may be attributed to the relatively loose structure of most of the programs reported by the responding superintendents. These programs appeared to implement what was expedient. Perhaps the administrators felt that something was better than nothing in the matter of mentoring for the new teacher. Consequently, they did what they could with the personnel who were available rather than not offering any mentoring for fear of failing to conform to a more rigorous selection procedure.

Mentors were chosen according to criteria that varied almost as much as the processes of their selection. The vast majority of programs seemed to agree that some demonstration of teaching excellence and length of teaching experience were the major factors to be sought when selecting a mentor. After
those two, the rate of agreement on other criteria fell off sharply. Others mentioned in order of frequency include:

- mentors teaching the same subject matter/specialization area as their novice teachers
- mentors available at appropriate times and willing to spend time to help the novice teacher
- mentors are compatible with the novice teacher
- mentors have proximity to the novice, either teaching in the same area or building
- mentors demonstrate leadership qualities
- mentors have had favorable evaluations
- mentors show good listening skills, are empathetic, nurturing, and encouraging
- mentors are able to work with others and meet the needs of the novice teacher

The reason for such a lack of uniformity other than teaching experience and excellence for mentorship selection seems again to be reflected by the largely individual structure of many of the mentoring programs. When districts are trying to cover mentoring positions with their available resources, they appear to find that their choices cannot be ideal, but must simply be the best available.

Research Question #5

*If a new strings/orchestra teacher was hired, would his/her school district provide a mentor who had strings/orchestra teaching experience?*
Small faculty pool seems to be a particular issue for strings/orchestra teachers. Over half the respondents (52%) reported that their string faculty ranged from one to three teachers. The string teachers would probably not be able to see one another during the school day, as they would be assigned to different buildings. Unless they could get released time, this would greatly handicap any mentoring efforts they might attempt. Eighty-eight percent of the districts employing strings teachers said they would supply a music teacher to mentor a new strings teacher, but were not able to state that such a mentor would have strings/orchestra experience.

With such a predominant lack of rigor and structure defining many mentoring programs, the widespread disparity of mentoring application and effectiveness becomes easy to understand. With no common ideal to emulate, each district seemed to design its own structure according to the resources available in its particular situation. In some cases, the best mentoring available may not measure up to an ideal standard, but is apparently judged to be better than nothing. Some district administrators who were not able to report an organized structure for mentoring their new music teachers still acknowledged that mentoring and mentor selection was very important to them. They completed the open-ended questions with descriptions of the ways their districts attempted to nurture, instruct, and support new music teachers without the benefit of a clearly-defined mentoring structure.

The main reasons superintendents gave for failing to provide a mentoring program were lack of funding and lack of personnel. These two problems in particular seemed to beset the smaller, more isolated districts in all six states.
Several administrators mentioned that their districts tried to provide support for
the novice teacher by having each employee pitch in to help. One suggested that
several small districts should band together to find a music mentor to serve them
as a group to mentor and do observations for their new teachers.

Music Teacher Questionnaire

The music teachers who replied to the questionnaire also seemed to
subscribe to the idea that something less than ideal is better than nothing in new
teacher mentoring. Thirty-one percent of the respondents said they had been
formally assigned a mentor for their first year of teaching. An additional 43% of
the respondents reported that although a mentor had not been specifically
assigned to them, they nevertheless found someone to help them with their
questions for the first year. The total of teachers receiving some sort of
mentoring, whether officially assigned or self-selected, was 74% of the
respondents. Clearly, new teachers seem to need some guidance and moral
support through their first year. Many new teachers to whom a mentor is not
assigned will, on their own initiative, find someone to fill that role.

The subject areas of new teachers and their mentors failed to match in
quite a large number of cases. Forty-seven percent of teachers were not matched
at all with their mentors’ subject areas. Of those remaining, only 18% enjoyed a
complete match of area. Thirty-five percent were matched to the extent that both
were music teachers. Many others had mentors who taught an elementary
classroom, physical education, math, English, or Spanish. The lack of ability to
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match subject areas for mentor and teacher would seem due to the method of selection mentioned for many of the mentoring programs. Clearly, if mentors were chosen by convenience from personnel who were readily available, only the larger programs would have been able to find a mentor candidate whose subject area matched with the novice.

Reporting the number of times teachers met with their mentors during the first year, respondents described structures that varied widely. Between the one pair that did not meet at all and the 20% who specified they had more than 20 meetings with their mentors, there were those citing one to five meetings for the year (39%), six to ten meetings (19%), eleven to fifteen meetings (7%), and sixteen to twenty meetings (11%).

The structure of these meetings also varied widely, including reports of formal observations (2%), discussions (21%), questions and answers (15%), a combination of the former categories (43%), and “other” (15%). Those who checked “a combination” or “other” were given an opportunity to describe their experience. Their answers indicated several models of mentoring meeting structure. The formal structures included teachers with scheduled meetings (18%), meetings that included teaching observations (16%), and observations that included feedback from the mentors (4%). The less formal structures described teachers whose meetings with their mentors were casual and not regularly scheduled (22%). These teachers described scenarios of talking in the halls or staff rooms, seeking the mentor out to ask questions or vent personal frustrations, or meeting infrequently to touch base, discuss issues, share problems or define procedures. Both types of structures included some teachers
who described their mentor meetings as frequent (20%) and also some who described the meetings as infrequent (18%).

The reason the meeting structures, times, and styles of feedback varied so much can probably be attributed to the general lack of structure in most of the programs. Many of these mentors, with no guidelines or required structure to follow, may have done whatever was possible under the circumstances, or whatever they personally felt was needed for the teacher under their mentorship. Some mentors may have had a more highly structured plan in mind while others simply dealt with issues as they arose.

Thirty-five percent of the teachers indicated that all meetings with their mentors took place during the school day, 25% said they were all outside the school day, while 36% reported meeting in some combination of the two. Forty-two percent of the respondents said their mentors were able to observe them teach from one to five times during the year, 5% from six to ten times, 1% from eleven to fifteen times, 2% from sixteen to twenty times, 2% more than twenty times. But 43% reported that they were not observed by their mentors at all.

Twenty-five percent of the teachers reported being able to observe their mentors teach from one to five times, 3% from six to ten times, 2% from eleven to fifteen times, 2% from sixteen to twenty times, 3% more than twenty times. Fifty-eight percent were not able to observe their mentors.

One reason for the relatively large number of teachers who were not able to observe or be observed may have been due to the unstructured nature of the mentoring, particularly for those who self-selected a mentor. With no released time, a teacher and a mentor would be bound by their teaching schedule to
remain by themselves most of the day. If they were only able to meet after
school hours, no opportunity for observation would exist. Presumably, the lack
of released time would be less prevalent in more highly structured programs, as
released time was frequently mentioned as a desirable component of such
programs.

Several of the teachers mentioned, in response to an open-ended format,
that they assisted or teamed with their mentor. This probably explains the
relatively large number of respondents at the high end of the spectrum of
observations, but does not necessarily mean that the mentoring program
provided for such a high degree of observation possibilities. It seems chance
alone provided these teachers with this type of structure.

One benefit that may be attributed to the large number of teachers who
self-selected their mentors was the high degree of rapport reported between
teachers and their mentors. Sixty-two teachers reported feeling very comfortable
expressing teaching ideas with their mentors, 23% were moderately comfortable,
5% somewhat uncomfortable, and 5% not comfortable. Of the teachers reporting
that they were not comfortable discussing teaching ideas, two said they felt that
the mentor was unsympathetic to their teaching style and three claimed their
mentor would not understand musical ideas because he/she was not a music
teacher. All of these individuals had mentors assigned by some other method
than self-selection.

The complaint that some mentors lacked the understanding to advise or
support a music teacher because they were not knowledgeable in music was a
common theme developed by respondents in several open-ended questions. It
was apparently a source of dissatisfaction for many of the teachers. Presumably, this complaint would have been less common for the teacher who self-selected his/her mentor.

Research Question # 6

*How did new teachers who have received mentoring view their mentoring experience?*

The open-ended question asking respondents to describe the most valuable aspects of the mentoring they received yielded answers that divided themselves into broad categories. Some answers concerned the mentoring structure and process, some the mentoring activities and elements of mentoring, others the training and nature of the mentor, some the novice's state of mind and psychological aspects, and some the issues or areas of help the novice found most valuable.

Sixty-two percent of the respondents mentioned the activities of mentoring. Most mentored teachers expressed appreciation for the feeling of support and encouragement their mentors gave them. They valued the positive feedback they received from their mentors. They were pleased to have someone who would listen to them. They benefited from the guidance of counseling they received. They accepted gratefully the advice their mentor gave them. The qualities of empathy and friendship, acceptance and respect as a peer from their mentors were praised highly. One person expressed appreciation for the chance to gain insight into "professional practice" gained by associating with the mentor.
The nature of the mentor him/herself was the second most frequently
cited value for mentoring. The teachers respected and appreciated receiving the
benefit of their mentors' years of experience and skill. They were most pleased
with mentors who were expert musicians, taught in their specific subject area,
and displayed a large amount of music expertise in general. They were
particularly pleased in instances where the mentor had a congenial personality,
where their philosophies harmonized with those of the mentor, and where the
mentor was conscientious about doing a good and thorough job.

The third most frequently designated valuable aspect of mentoring was
the structure itself. The teachers appreciated the observation process, especially
having the chance to observe their mentors' teaching. They approved of frequent
meetings, open discussions of the teaching their mentor had observed without
the pressure of evaluation, and the feedback and suggestions they received.
Several teachers mentioned especially valuing weekend seminars they had
attended. Two others gained insight into the teaching process by getting to
observe other teachers. The ability to meet and share experiences with a group
of other new teachers was another aspect of the mentoring seminars some
respondents cited as particularly rewarding.

Teachers also described the least valuable aspects of mentoring in an
open-ended format. Their answers to this question divided themselves into two
major categories: the personality of the mentor, and the faults of the mentoring
program.

Mentors who had limited or no knowledge of music were cited as least
valuable by the respondents. Teachers concurred in their lack of appreciation for
mentors who could do little beyond helping with classroom management. Music teaching is so complex and full of abstruse detail that a non-musician is not very helpful at all, they declared.

The second most frequently mentioned characteristic was the mentor's lack of initiative. Respondents complained that they had to do all the contacting and set up any visits that took place. Eleven percent declared that either their mentor's input was not useful or their mentor did not give any. One felt that the mentor was not interested, one that the mentor himself had poor classroom management skills, and another that the mentor had not updated materials or strategies for 30 years.

For those rating the least valuable aspect of mentoring as the system, the most frequently mentioned problems were that access to the mentor was difficult or infrequent, or the system was not structured or organized in such a way that meaningful activities could take place.

Considering the wide range of experiences reported and the variety of program structures described, from the highly prescribed to the completely unstructured, many of these teachers' appraisals of strengths and weaknesses in the mentoring program are based solely on their own experience and may not be universally applicable. Enough consensus exists for some statements, however, that generalities may be made. The respondents felt their mentoring experience could have been improved in four general areas.

1. A music specialist as a mentor was needed.
2. More structure in the program and guidance from the mentor was needed.
3. Assigning a mentor was needed.

4. More feedback or time set aside for mentoring activities was needed.

Research Question #7

How do new teachers assess the success of their first year of teaching?

The teachers in this study overall seemed fairly satisfied with their initial teaching experience. Respondents listed their attitude about the first year of teaching as generally positive or mostly positive in 61% of the cases. Eighteen percent reported that their feelings were equally positive and negative about their first year. Only eighteen percent of those responding to the question listed their reaction as either mostly negative or negative. Their responses to an open-ended question about their motives in returning for another year revealed a variety of factors that inspired them to continue.

The positive factors that encouraged many of the teachers to return for a second year of teaching reported were:

10. receiving the support of the staff and administration (31%)
11. observing the improvement or growth of their students (28%)
12. receiving parental or community support (16%)
13. experiencing their students’ excitement about music (15%)
14. love of teaching and music (15%)
15. building up a program (12%)
16. achieving good performance results (8%)
17. commitment to or liking for the students (7%)
18. experiencing the satisfaction of succeeding as a teacher (6%).
The most difficult problems cited by the teachers for their first year included:

12. classroom management/discipline (45%)
13. lack of administrative support or value for music (28%)
14. unusually heavy, difficult, or inappropriate teaching assignment (23%)
15. difficulties with paperwork or understanding district policies (17%)
16. inadequate funding or budget (16%)
17. heavy time commitment or lack of time management (14%)
18. difficulty with or lack of support from parents (12%)
19. concerns about meeting students' needs or relating to students (12%)
20. students' attitudes (12%)
21. community or district politics or cultural adjustment (12%)
22. problems living up to former teacher or overcoming problems left by former teacher (11%).

Several individual comments revealed varying amounts of success, but lots of determination to stick it out through difficulties in hopes of future improvement. Quotations from their responses include:

"I loved the kids and enjoyed my subject matter. I knew I was supposed to teach."

"The fact that I didn't want to go crawling back to my parents saying, 'Take me in... I should have been a business major all along.'"

"I know that I am a good teacher and turn on most all of my students to music."

"There were few positives. The only reason my contract was renewed was because I screwed up less than the other elementary music teacher."
"The 'light bulb' when a student finally got it and the light went on. My students' joy of music, especially elementary students."

"I love teaching. I have visions. I have goals and objectives. I am not a quitter. I am strong."

"I don't think there was anything that could have dissuaded me from continuing. I was in a very positive position that supported arts in education."

The questions about the first annual evaluation were included in an attempt to discover whether or not a new teacher who had received mentoring was more comfortable with the evaluation process than one who had not. The new music teachers responding to the survey seemed to feel fairly comfortable with the idea of being evaluated. Seventy-four percent of the respondents felt their evaluation was fair and representative of their best work. Fifty-eight percent expressed themselves as satisfied with the observation and input they received from their evaluator. Fifty-seven percent of the teachers were not intimidated by the evaluators' presence. Sixty-five percent described the evaluator's attitude as being primarily helpful, and 62% felt that their evaluation included suggestions the teacher could implement to improve his/her future performance.

When asked to offer suggestions for improving the evaluation process, however, many teachers mentioned that as the evaluator knew little or nothing about music, they felt as if his/her opinion was of little value. The most frequently mentioned suggestion (30%) was that music teachers ought to have an evaluator with knowledge or experience in music; one who would be in a better position to understand and evaluate what they do. Perhaps the widespread appearance of comfort and confidence, whether or not the teachers had been
mentored, stems more from the fact that these teachers regarded their evaluators as musically ignorant and discounted their judgment than from any particular assurance resulting from mentoring activities or faith in their own teaching expertise.

The resources these novice teachers consulted for teaching ideas during the first year of teaching followed a fairly predictable pattern. The resources they cited, from the most frequently mentioned to the least, supported their contention that they needed subject-specific help. In order of frequency, they listed:

1. Music conferences or workshops
2. Other teachers in music
3. Previous college coursework
4. Mentor
5. Professional journals
6. Other teachers in a different subject
7. District level meetings
8. Arts coordinator or Supervisor
9. Principal

The widely varying circumstances of the mentoring experiences among respondents may reduce the ability to generalize these results to other groups, particularly as the frequency of responses lessens. For instance, not all districts may hold district-level meetings for the purpose of staff development, and many districts, particularly the smaller ones, do not have an Arts coordinator or Supervisor for the subject to consult.
In response to the question about suggestions to help a first year teacher's adjustment to teaching, the respondents reached consensus on two important issues. Their advice was to observe other music teachers and network with them about teaching ideas and techniques, and to have a mentor, especially one who is a music teacher, to guide and critique the novice. All other suggestions showed a frequency of fewer than ten respondents per suggestion. Many of the suggestions seem to reflect what the teacher perceived as the shortcomings of his or her own situation. This could indicate that the suggestion was based on the unique personal experience of a given respondent and may not be universally applicable.

Implications

The results of this study indicating that the majority of novice music teachers expressed the desire to have other music teachers for mentors seems to corroborate previous studies by Krueger and DeLorenzo. Music teachers occupy a unique position in the school, their teaching tasks are very specialized and their extracurricular responsibilities are extensive. Many music teachers feel that the regular classroom teacher has no idea what they do or how much work is involved. Because many are the only music teacher in their building, the feeling of isolation so many novice teachers experience could be intensified. Making contact with another individual who carries a similar load and experiences similar difficulties may be the most comfortable solution for the novice.

Many of the smaller and more isolated districts in this study seem to demonstrate the greatest difficulty in providing mentoring services to their
teachers. Perhaps a solution to this dilemma would be for several smaller
districts to combine to bring in mentors and workshop presenters for the benefit
and professional development of new teachers. Many superintendents
mentioned cost as the primary difficulty in providing such services. Costs
shared by several districts might not prove to be as prohibitive.

Some districts, especially those with smaller music faculties, also
mentioned difficulty in providing mentoring for strings/orchestra teachers. By
using the same system of sharing the cost and dividing the benefit, these districts
would be able to hire expert help, e.g., from university personnel, music
supervisors from larger programs, or clinicians to provide specific subject-related
teaching observation and feedback as well as staff development for their
strings/orchestra teachers. Such collaboration could have the effect of raising the
level of strings/orchestra instruction in the greater area without causing undue
financial hardship on any one district.

The frequency with which the novice teachers mentioned the importance
of excellent guidance from their mentors, or complained of a lack of such
excellence, seems to suggest the need for further training for mentors.
Workshops emphasizing observation techniques, principles of adult learning,
and strategies for providing feedback to new teachers might be provided to
mentors through local universities or through ESD offices. Working through a
wider pool of resources might also give more structure to the individual district
mentoring programs thus served, and allow them to be more efficient and
possibly more effective.
Responses from the music teachers affirmed the importance of top quality workshops and teacher networking. Both activities occur regularly at inservice meetings and conferences or conventions. Teachers also get a better chance to see and hear colleagues' work through participation in contests, festivals, and school group exchanges. Districts may help to improve their music teachers' effectiveness by allocating funds to support their participation in such events. Perhaps providing release time for conference attendance or contest/festival participation would be a worthwhile contribution.

Music teachers also pointed out the degree of support and the number of teaching ideas they gained from professional journals. Organizations such as MENC, ASTA, ACDA, etc., whose journals regularly publish practical articles describing ideas and strategies that work well in the music classroom provide a valuable service to teachers of all levels of experience. The music teachers in this study affirmed their confidence in such articles to provide information to aid their professional growth. Districts might consider subscribing to such journals and making them available to the music department in the same way some of them do the journals in other disciplines.

The teachers in this study found it very valuable to have opportunities to observe other teachers, either their mentor or another individual. Perhaps districts ought to consider providing more released time to allow their first and second year teachers to visit other classrooms. Districts could provide new teachers with a certain number of released-time days during the first two years for the purpose of observation. If two teachers were able to spend the entire day together for such an observation, there would be time for questions and
discussion of what had taken place. The additional cost in substitutes could be well repaid by increased effectiveness on the part of their newest and least experienced teachers.

Teachers who responded to this survey listed classroom management/discipline as the number one difficulty in their first year of teaching, yet seemed to place lesser value on any mentor who was not also a music teacher. This seems somewhat contradictory at first consideration. Presumably the novice teacher could learn valuable lessons about discipline and classroom management from a classroom teacher. Yet, ironically, the majority stated that a non-musician was unable to help them very much.

Upon further reflection, however, the greater issue of managing a music class does seem to set the music teacher apart from the rest of the school staff. Perhaps the type of classroom management appropriate for a music classroom is different and more specialized than that of, for instance, a math or English class. It is unlikely that a music teacher's academic colleagues would consider providing each member of the class with a sound-generating object and few would be comfortable with the typically larger class sizes of the average performance ensemble. Cooperative learning on a scale to match that of a music classroom is relatively rare in an academic setting. The music teacher may be actively involved in the learning process of the students in the ensemble for a far greater proportion of the class time than is the average academic classroom teacher. His/her leadership role and the number of value decisions he/she must make during each class probably places a greater burden of responsibility on the music teacher.
The music teacher’s role may be so different from every other teacher in the school that often virtually nobody else is able to understand what he/she does. The same may be true of the type of classroom management/discipline plans necessary for success in music classes. Perhaps to receive guidance about the unique nature of their classroom management needs is one of the reasons music teachers are so insistent upon a music mentor.

Classroom management plans, to be most effective, must begin on the first day of school. A valuable asset to a first-year teacher in establishing effective classroom management from the start might be a pre-service workshop or a conference with the mentor specifically preparing the novice in this area. Each new teacher could work with the mentor to establish a concrete plan for classroom management before the first day of school. The teacher and mentor could then develop plans for periodic observation and review as the year progresses.

The teachers replying to this survey represent such disparate experiences and unique combinations of personalities and influences that their recommendations may not generalize to the total population. As each teacher’s situation is unique, so perhaps is the perspective through which he/she views the subject of mentoring. Additional data from a larger sample of teachers and from subjects with different experiences would greatly expand the insight and understanding gained by this study.

One factor to be considered when interpreting the results of this study is that these respondents all returned for a second year of teaching. The study did not address the issue of teachers who left the field either during or after the first
year of teaching. The responses in this study, therefore, probably represent a more positive view of first year experiences that would be reflected by those who left. Perhaps tracking graduates of the colleges that trained potential teachers would be a way to locate and gather data from all first-year teachers, whether or not they completed the year or continued in the profession.

Recommendations for Future Research

The following topics suggest themselves for further research on this topic:

1. Study the mentoring programs of other states in different parts of the country. Especially investigate programs in states where there are state-mandated programs, since none of the programs in this study were mandated.

2. Examine highly structured programs to study their methods of choosing mentors, implementing programs and establishing systematic systems for delivering feedback.

3. Investigate the mentor training programs of highly effective programs to find good quality methods of preparing mentors.

4. Examine the relationship between mentoring and the evaluation process of the new teacher. Especially observe the proportion of formative and summative evaluation employed and whether feedback was provided for the person being evaluated.

5. Compare the effectiveness of mentoring programs that include university personnel to those without.
6. Compare the effectiveness of different types of mentoring so that recommended mentoring program models can be suggested.

7. Compare formal, highly structured mentoring programs with more informal situations, such as self-selected mentors or mentors chosen for the convenience of proximity, to discover the advantages and disadvantages to be found in each.

8. Compare the evaluations of teaching effectiveness of those teachers who are mentored to those of teachers who are not mentored.

9. Based on the results of the comparison in #5, investigate the questions:
   • When is mentoring needed?
   • What are the best methods to assess the effectiveness of mentoring?
   • How much mentoring is needed to be effective?
   • What type of mentoring is needed to be effective?

10. Develop a recommended mentoring program model for participants who are matched by music subject areas.

11. Develop a recommended mentoring program model for use by those who are responsible for mentoring music teachers but have no music teaching background.

12. Recommend practical mentoring program models for large and small districts so that effective strategies could be implemented in either situation
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APPENDIX A

Music Teacher Mentoring Questionnaire

This is a short survey that will take less than 10 minutes to complete. Please help our profession to assess the current practice in mentoring by answering the following questions. All answers will be kept strictly confidential and will be used only for this research study.

Please Complete & Return This Form in the Envelope Provided by December 1, 1999

1. How many students does your district serve?

2. Does your district have a formal mentoring program for teachers?
   - YES - Please continue with the next question
   - NO - Thank you for your help. Please return the survey.

3. Does your district employ certified music teachers?
   - YES - Please continue with the next question.
   - NO - Please skip to question 12

4. How many music teachers does your district employ?

5. Is mentoring available for the music teachers in your district?
   - YES - Please continue with the next question
   - NO - Please skip to question 12

6. Are the music teachers’ mentors experienced music teachers themselves?
   - ALL
   - 1 - 25%, 26 - 50%, 51 - 75%, 76 - 99% (circle)
7. Does your district have a strings/orchestra program?
   □  NONE
   □  YES - Please continue with the next question
   □  NO - Please skip to question 11

8. If yes, how many people teach strings/orchestra classes?

9. If you hired a new strings/orchestra teacher, would that person be mentored by a music teacher?
   □  YES
   □  NO

10. Would the mentor teacher in question 9 have strings/orchestra teaching experience?
    □  YES
    □  PROBABLY
    □  PROBABLY NOT

11. Do new music teachers receive mentoring from teachers practicing within their respective teaching areas? (e.g., band, choir, general music, orchestra).
    □  ALWAYS
    □  IN SOME CASES  1 - 25 %  26 - 50 %  51 - 75 %
                     76 - 99 %  (circle)
    □  NOT AT ALL

12. Is the mentoring in your district for:
    (check all that apply)
    □  NEW (FIRST-YEAR) TEACHERS
    □  TEACHERS NEW TO THE DISTRICT OR PROGRAM
    □  A TEACHER WHO IS IDENTIFIED AS “AT RISK”
13. Who selects mentor teachers in your district?

__________________________________________________________________________________

14. Please describe the process and the criteria that determine their selection.

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

(Please continue on back if necessary)

Thank you for your assistance in completing this questionnaire. Please return it in the
envelope provided.
November 5, 1999

Dear Superintendent of Schools:

I am doing a study of mentoring programs for music teachers in the Northwest Division of the Music Educators National Conference. The research is for my doctoral dissertation and is being conducted under the direct supervision of Dr. Robert Gillespie, a faculty member at the Ohio State University. I am interested in what type of mentoring is given to new Northwest music teachers and how the mentoring occurs. With the information gathered in this study, I hope to be able to provide an overview of what is being done throughout the Northwest, and then begin to develop a plan for future mentoring programs.

Each district in Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington and Wyoming will be contacted during the week of November 8 - 12, 1999, for their input. In order to be able to interpret the results accurately, it is very important that each questionnaire be completed and returned. Responding to the questionnaire should take less than ten minutes of your time, but it will be critical to the success of the research. Your participation in this study is voluntary, however, and I will know by your completing and returning the questionnaire that you consent to participate. I would urge you to take the time to complete the questionnaire and return it in the enclosed envelope by November 24, 1999.

You may be assured that your responses will remain completely confidential. The return envelope has an identification number that will enable me to check your name off the mailing list when the questionnaire is returned. The envelope will then be discarded. Your name will never be placed on the questionnaire.

Please contact me if you have questions regarding the study, or if you would like a copy of the results.

Your cooperation and timely response are greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Kristin Turner
512 North E Street
Tacoma, WA 98403
APPENDIX C

District Superintendent Follow-up Letter

January 2, 2000

Dear Superintendent of Schools:

During the month of December, each district in Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington and Wyoming was contacted to supply input on a questionnaire for my study of the type of mentoring currently being given to Northwest music teachers. With the information gathered in this study, I hope to be able to provide an overview of what is being done throughout the Northwest, and then begin to develop a plan for future mentoring programs. Each district's information is important to provide the accurate picture I hope to be able to draw. Your district has not, as yet, sent back the questionnaire with the necessary information.

In order to be able to interpret the results accurately, it is very important that each questionnaire be completed and returned. Responding to the questionnaire should take less than ten minutes of your time, but it will be critical to the success of the research. I am enclosing a copy of the original questionnaire in case yours was lost or misplaced. Won't you please take the time to complete it and return it in the enclosed envelope by January 14, 2000?

You may be assured that your responses will remain completely confidential. The return envelope has an identification number that will enable me to check your name off the mailing list when your questionnaire is returned. The envelope will then be discarded. Your name will never be placed on the questionnaire.

If this letter has crossed your returned questionnaire in the mail, please accept my thanks. Do not send a duplicate questionnaire.

Your cooperation and timely response are greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Kristin Turner
512 North E Street
Tacoma, WA 98403
APPENDIX D

Music Teacher Questionnaire

1. Were you formally assigned to a mentor for your first year of teaching?
   □ Yes (please skip to question 3)  □ No

2. If there was no formal mentor assigned, did you find another teacher or an administrator to help with your questions?
   □ Yes (please answer the next questions about that person as if he/she was assigned as your mentor)
   □ No (please skip to question 20)

3. What specific music area do you teach? (check all that apply)
   □ band  □ strings/orch.  □ choir  □ general music
   □ other____________________ (please specify)

4. What subject did your mentor teach?

5. How many years had your mentor taught?
   □ 1 – 5  □ 6 – 10  □ 11 – 15  □ 16 – 20  □ more than 20

6. Did your mentor receive any special training to be a mentor?
   □ yes  □ no  If yes, please describe

7. How many times did you and your mentor meet during the year?
   □ 1- 5  □ 6 – 10  □ 11 – 15  □ 16 – 20  □ more than 20

8. How were the meetings with your mentor structured?
   □ formal observations  □ discussions  □ questions & answers
   □ a combination of these (please describe)  □ other (please explain)
9. Did your mentor meetings take place during the school day or outside it?
   □ all during the day □ all outside the school day
   □ combination ______ number during day ______ number outside day

10. Did your mentor observe you teaching? If yes, estimate the number of times.
    □ yes □ no
    □ 1 - 5 □ 6 - 10 □ 11 - 15 □ 16 - 20 □ more than 20

11. Did you ever observe your mentor teaching? If yes, estimate the number of times.
    □ yes □ no
    □ 1 - 5 □ 6 - 10 □ 11 - 15 □ 16 - 20 □ more than 20

12. Please describe the feedback you received from your mentor
    □ sympathetic listening □ constructive criticism or suggestions
    □ supportive remarks □ written evaluation
    □ other (please explain)

13. Did you feel comfortable expressing your own teaching ideas with your mentor?
    □ Very comfortable □ Moderately comfortable □ Somewhat uncomfortable
    □ No
    If not, why not? ______________________________________________
    ___________________________________________________________
    ___________________________________________________________

14. Did your mentor help you find your own solutions to teaching problems?
    □ Yes □ No

15. Was the feedback from your mentor entered on a form and saved as a permanent record
    in the building or district?
    □ Yes □ No

16. If so, where are the forms kept?
    □ District office □ building office □ other ________________________
17. What was the most valuable aspect of the mentoring you received?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

18. What was the least valuable aspect of the mentoring you received?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

19. How could your mentoring experience have been improved? Please be specific.

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

20. Did your principal, supervisor or another administrator observe you informally (not for evaluation) during the year? (check all that apply)

☐ principal  ☐ supervisor  ☐ other administrator
(please specify)

_____________________________________________________________________

21. Was your mentor responsible for your annual teaching evaluation?

☐ yes  ☐ no
The next group of questions pertains to the annual school district performance assessment evaluation that is done for all teachers rather than mentoring:

22. Who evaluated you?

☐ principal ☐ supervisor ☐ other administrator (please specify)

23. How many times did he/she observe for purposes of the evaluation?

24. Did he/she provide constructive feedback prior to beginning the evaluation process?

☐ Yes ☐ No

25. Did you feel your evaluation was fair and representative of your best work?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ I don't know

26. What could have improved it?

27. Did your evaluation include suggestions for improvement that you could implement?

☐ Yes ☐ No

28. Was your evaluator primarily helpful or judgmental?

☐ Primarily helpful ☐ Primarily judgmental

☐ A little of each

29. Did you feel satisfied with his/her observation and input?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Somewhat
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30. Were you intimidated by his/her presence in your classroom?
   □ Yes  □ No  □ Somewhat

31. Please indicate your own degree of satisfaction with your first year of teaching.
   □ generally positive  □ mostly positive with a few negatives
   □ equally positive and negative  □ mostly negative with a few positives
   □ generally negative

32. What were some of the positive factors that encouraged you to continue with a second year of teaching?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

33. What would you say were the three most difficult problems you faced during your first year of teaching?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
34. During your first year of teaching what resources did you consult to get teaching ideas? (check all that apply)

☐ mentor
☐ other teachers in your subject
☐ other teachers in a different subject
☐ principal
☐ arts coordinator or supervisor
☐ previous college coursework
☐ district level meetings
☐ professional journals
☐ music conferences or workshops
☐ other (please explain)

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

35. Can you suggest anything else that would help a first-year teacher’s adjustment to be more successful?

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

Thank you for your cooperation in completing the questionnaire. Please return it in the envelope provided by May 29, 200
APPENDIX E

Music Teacher Cover Letter

April 25, 2000

Dear Music Teacher:

I am doing a study of the mentoring experiences music teachers have in the state of Washington. The research is for my dissertation and is being directly supervised by Dr. Robert Gillespie, a faculty member at the Ohio State University. I am interested in what types of mentoring new teachers receive and how the mentoring occurs. For the purpose of this study, mentoring is defined as the process of inducting a teacher, either new to the profession or new to the particular position, into his/her role by the efforts of a skilled or more experienced person who serves as a role model, teacher, or sponsor. A formal mentoring program is defined as one administered by the school district or building, where mentors are chosen and assigned to the new teacher by some official process. With the information gathered in this study, I hope to be able to provide a picture of what assistance Washington offers to its new music teachers in becoming acclimated to the school climate and developing their maximum effectiveness. I hope then to be able to begin to develop a plan for future mentoring programs.

Selected music teachers in the state of Washington are being contacted in May of 2000. Your participation in this research is voluntary. Your completion and return of the questionnaire will indicate your consent to be a part of the study. In order to be able to interpret the results accurately, it is very important that each questionnaire be completed and returned. Responding to the questionnaire should take less than fifteen minutes of your time, but it will be critical to the success of the study. I would urge you to take the time to complete the questionnaire and return it in the enclosed envelope by May 29, 2000.

You may be assured that your responses will remain completely confidential. Your responses will not be shared with or reported to anyone. No names will be mentioned and none of the data reported will be mentioned individually, but will be included only as a part the group data. The return envelope has an identification number that will enable me to check your name off the mailing list when the questionnaire is returned. The envelope will then be discarded. Your name will never be placed on the questionnaire.

Please contact me if you have questions regarding the study, or if you would like a copy of the results.

Your cooperation and timely response are greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Kristin Turner
2601 E McKellips Rd #2023
Mesa, AZ 85213
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APPENDIX F

Music Teacher Follow-up Letter – Spring

June 8, 2000

Dear Music Teacher:

During the month of May, selected teachers in the state of Washington were contacted to supply input on a questionnaire. The information requested is for my study of the type of mentoring currently being given to music teachers in this state. With the data gathered, I hope to be able to provide an overview of what new teachers are experiencing in their first year or in the first year in a new position or district. Each individual’s information is important to provide the accurate picture I hope to be able to draw. You have now, as yet, sent back the questionnaire with the necessary information.

In order to be able to interpret the results accurately, it is very important that each questionnaire be completed and returned. Responding to the questionnaire should take less than fifteen minutes of your time, but it will be critical to the success of the research. I am enclosing a copy of the original questionnaire in case yours was lost or misplaced. Won’t you please take the time to complete it and return it in the enclosed envelope by June 30, 2000?

You may be assured that your responses will remain completely confidential. The return envelope has an identification number that will enable me to check your name off the mailing list when your questionnaire is returned. The envelope will then be discarded. Your name will never be placed on the questionnaire.

If this letter has crossed your returned questionnaire in the mail, please accept my thanks. Do not send a duplicate questionnaire.

Your cooperation and timely response are greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Kristin Turner
2601 E McKellips Road # 2023
Mesa, AZ 85213
Dear Music Teacher:

Last spring, selected teachers in the state of Washington were contacted to supply input on a questionnaire. The information requested is for my study of the type of mentoring currently being given to music teachers in this state. With the data gathered, I hope to be able to provide an overview of what new teachers are experiencing in their first year or in the first year in a new position or district. Each individual's information is important to provide the accurate picture I hope to be able to draw. Some of the letters apparently did not reach their destinations and some individuals did not receive them. Others did not get a chance to return them. We have not, as yet, received a questionnaire from you with the necessary information.

In order to be able to interpret the results accurately, it is very important that each questionnaire be completed and returned. Responding to the questionnaire should take less than fifteen minutes of your time, but it will be critical to the success of the research. I am enclosing a copy of the original questionnaire in case yours was lost or misplaced. Won't you please take the time to complete it and return it in the enclosed envelope by November 10, 2000? Answer each question about your first year of teaching or about your first year in your present job.

You may be assured that your responses will remain completely confidential. The return envelope has an identification number that will enable me to check your name off the mailing list when your questionnaire is returned. The envelope will then be discarded. Your name will never be placed on the questionnaire.

If this letter has crossed your returned questionnaire in the mail, please accept my thanks. Do not send a duplicate questionnaire.

Your cooperation and timely response are greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Kristin Turner
3015 S Kenwood Ln
Tempe, AZ 85282

Oct. 22, 2000
APPENDIX H

Sources For Survey Frames


National Center for Education Statistics
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
U.S. Department of Education
555 New Jersey Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20208-5574

http://nces.ed.gov


MDT Marketing, Inc.
420 Alcott Court
Colorado Springs, CO 80921
APPENDIX I

State Offices of Education - Addresses and Websites

Alaska Department of Education and Early Development
Richard S. Cross, Commissioner of Education
Suite 200
801 W 10th Street
Juneau, AK 99801-1894
http://www.eed.state.ak.us/

Idaho Department of Education
Dr. Marilyn Howard, Superintendent of Public Instruction
Len B. Jordan Office Building
650 West State Street
PO Box 83720-0027
Boise, ID 83720-0027
http://www.sde.state.id.us/Dept/

Montana Office of Public Instruction
Linda McCulloch, Superintendent of Public Instruction
PO Box 202501
Helena, MT 59620-2501
http://www.metnet.state.mt.us/

Oregon Department of Education
Stan Bunn, Superintendent of Public Instruction
255 Capitol Street NE
Salem, OR 97310-0203
http://www.ode.state.or.us/

Washington Office of Public Instruction  
Dr. Terry Bergeson, Superintendent of Public Instruction  
Old Capitol Building  
600 South Washington  
PO Box 47200  
Olympia, WA 98504-7200

http://www.k12.wa.us/

Wyoming Department of Education  
Judy Catchpole, Superintendent of Education  
Hathaway Building  
Second Floor  
2300 Capitol Avenue  
Cheyenne, WY 82002

http://www.k12.wy.us/

United States Department of Education - Address and Website:

United States Department of Education  
Rod Paige, US Secretary of Education  
400 Maryland Avenue SW  
Washington, DC 20202

http://www.ed.gov/
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Educational Service Districts in the State of Washington

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESD #</th>
<th>% of students</th>
<th>% identified teachers</th>
<th>% returns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>