

CHAPTER 2

TEACHER INDUCTION POLICY AND PRACTICE AMONG APEC MEMBERS: RESULTS OF THE EXPLORATORY SURVEY

Maria Stephens and Jay Moskowitz

Policies and practices promoting effective teacher induction are of growing importance to APEC members. Effective programs have a positive impact on new teachers, the schools where they work, and the students they teach.¹ Nearly all APEC members employ multipurposed and multifaceted practices to help beginning teachers in their transition into their chosen profession and to their new schools.

Eleven members responded to an exploratory survey (see Appendix B) on teacher induction practices: Australia, Brunei Darussalam, Canada, Indonesia, Japan, the Republic of Korea, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Singapore, Chinese Taipei, and the United States. Ten of the 11 responding members indicated the existence of a teacher induction program. Indonesia currently does not have a teacher induction program; its system of preservice and in-service education is designed to improve the quality of the teaching force as a whole, with no programs aimed specifically at beginning teachers.

While the depth of response varied from member to member, the information provided helps us to understand the basic practice of teacher induction in different APEC members. The first part of this chapter discusses the prominent features of and influences on teacher induction; the second part briefly summarizes teacher induction policy and practice in individual APEC members.

Features and Influences of Teacher Induction

This section summarizes the available information, noting trends, similarities, and differences among the teacher induction programs of participating APEC members. In

¹Conclusions about the current state of policy and practice in teacher induction programs among APEC members are based on members' responses to a survey administered between June and August 1995. The survey (see Appendix B) addressed general strategies, programs and practices, government policies, financing, and future plans regarding teacher induction.

particular, we address: (1) general strategies (i.e., when and why implemented); (2) authority and financing; (3) types of programs and basic features; (4) participation; and (5) perceived outcomes and future plans for teacher induction.

General Strategies

Teacher induction programs take many forms in APEC members. Some members employ a single, member-level program, whereas those members with a federal or decentralized structure may employ programs at the provincial level where even the presence of a program varies from province to province. In still others, there may be informal practices variably employed among individual schools and jurisdictions. Two main differences across all teacher induction programs are the level of formality of the programs and the types of strategies they employ to assist beginning teachers.

First, the variance in the level of formality of teacher induction both among and within APEC members' programs is striking, with each program differing in the extent or depth to which it is practiced and in the amount of structure and regulation. Programs range from a formal, preservice orientation, networking, mentoring, and in-service at the provincial and school levels to an informal "welcome" arranged by school principals.

Second, both among and within APEC members, there are many different strategies implemented for teacher induction. Strategies employed, singly or in combination include: workshops, orientations, teacher meetings, observations of model classrooms, mentoring, distribution of handbooks, internships, peer probation, training, and evaluation. Program variation is illustrated in Exhibit 1, which displays preliminary information about the level of implementation, the level of formality, and the prominent strategies of teacher induction. (Discussion of specific program features follows in the section "Types of Programs and Basic Features.")

EXHIBIT 1

Teacher Induction Programs in APEC Members

Member	Where Implemented	Formal or Informal	Feature
Australia	Nearly all schools in nearly all provinces	Both	Orientation, mentoring, in-service training, and probation
Brunei Darussalam	All schools	Informal	Orientation
Canada	Some schools in some provinces	Both	Probation and mentoring
Japan	All schools	Formal	Mentoring and training
Indonesia	None	None	N/A
Republic of Korea	All schools	Formal	Pre-appointment orientation
New Zealand	All schools	Formal	Probation and program of advice and guidance (mentoring)
Papua New Guinea	All schools	Both	Mentoring, meetings, and "inspection"
Singapore	All schools	Both	Mentoring, seminars, and national handbooks
Chinese Taipei	All schools	Formal	Internship
United States	Most schools in half of the provinces	Formal	Mentoring and assessment

Timeframe

There is little available information on the history of teacher induction in APEC members. Since teacher induction programs often evolved gradually or were implemented at the local level, without mandate, little documentation or even formal recognition of such efforts exists. From the information available, formal, systematic teacher induction programs are a relatively recent development. For instance, Japan instituted a member-mandated teacher induction program in 1988, with implementation occurring gradually between 1989 and 1992. The first state-level teacher induction program in the United States was established by Florida in 1980, with several states following in that decade. Finally, Chinese Taipei revamped and intensified its teacher induction program as part of its 1994 reforms.

Goals

APEC members identify several goals for implementing teacher induction programs. Although not all APEC members share all goals, the five listed below represent the most common reasons for establishing teacher induction programs:

- Familiarize the inductees with the responsibilities of teaching and the culture of the schools where they will teach;
- Increase the competency of the inductees, by improving their professional skills;
- Screen or assess the inductees to ensure they can perform the duties of teaching and that they are an effective "match" for their particular school;
- Provide support and guidance to help smooth the inductees' transition from beginners to professionals (often a component of achieving the other goals cited above); and
- Increase retention of teachers in a particular geographic location or in a particular subject area.

Nearly all APEC members describe multiple goals for teacher induction programs, encompassed by the five above. The two most common goals cited are familiarizing the inductee with the culture and expectations of the school and increasing competency (in five and four members' programs, respectively). However, only Japan and Papua New Guinea describe goals that fall into both categories; more often, members focus almost entirely on either the school environment *or* general professional skills. Those APEC members that offer teacher induction primarily directed to integrate teachers into their school and role include Brunei Darussalam, Korea, and Canada. Those whose programs tend toward general professional development include Indonesia² and Chinese Taipei.

Four members cite screening and assessment as a main goal of teacher induction. In Chinese Taipei, a primary reason for the teaching internship is to "weed-out unqualified participants."³ Further, screening or "matching" is a main component of regional programs in Québec, Canada, and the Catholic Sector in Australia. Finally, assessment is a major, and sometimes the sole, function of more than half of the teacher induction programs implemented in the United States.

²Although Indonesia has no teacher induction program, its general professional development strategies and ideals will serve as the basis of any response described here for Indonesia.

³All quotes attributed to members are taken from the documents submitted by APEC members in response to the survey. We reference the responding agencies and persons, by member, at the end.

Four members name provision of support and guidance as a goal of their programs. Although support and guidance are often necessary for increasing competency or familiarizing beginning teachers with their school (corollary goals), they also stand alone as both an ideal and a function of four members' teacher induction programs, namely, those in Australia, Singapore, Japan, and the United States.

Finally, in Australia and Papua New Guinea, teacher induction also serves the purpose of increasing retention of teachers (e.g., in Australia's isolated areas and in Papua New Guinea, where math and science teachers are in short supply).

Authority and Financing

Most APEC members have government policies regarding teacher induction. These policies are important to understanding the aspects of authority and financing in teacher induction programs. The two elements are discussed below.

Authority

The level of authority involved in the programs varies from member to member and can affect the level of implementation of teacher induction. For instance, where there is member involvement, teacher induction probably is more formal, with less variability in programs implemented and strategies employed. However, if schools are responsible for teacher induction, the practices likely are tailored to the varying needs of individual teachers and schools.

Because teacher induction is a complex endeavor involving several levels of governance, the issue of who has authority often is a nebulous one. At its most basic, authority may be viewed as decision-making power. In that case, the teacher induction programs of Japan, the Republic of Korea, and Chinese Taipei are primarily under *member-level authority*. By that same criterion, the programs of Australia, Canada, and the United States are under *provincial authority*; and those of Brunei Darussalam, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, and Singapore are under *school authority*. However, examining the roles that each level of governance plays in the varied efforts related to teacher induction allows a fuller understanding of the organization and authority of teacher induction in practice.

To establish and implement a teacher induction program, there are three main areas of effort. First, there must be an impetus—a mandate, recommendation, certification requirement, or system of guidance—establishing the teacher induction program (or at least the need for one). Second, organization and administration of the program must

be established. Finally, implementation (the undertaking of the actual work and strategies of teacher induction) must be set in motion. For each of these efforts, different levels of governance are involved and have authority; and knowledge of that involvement is necessary to understand the practice of teacher induction as a whole.

Impetus. For six members, the impetus for teacher induction is member-level: Korea, Japan, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Singapore, and Chinese Taipei.⁴ Specifically, the first three members have a member-level mandate that requires establishing teacher induction programs. In Australia, Canada, and the United States, the impetus comes primarily from the province. The remaining members' programs spring solely from the school or school system.

Organization. Most APEC members' programs are organized at the level of either the school or province—only Japan and Chinese Taipei have member-level involvement in the administration and organization of teacher induction. Of the four members that are organized, at least in part, at the provincial level, only Korea is exclusively administered by provincial authorities; the programs of Australia, Canada, and the United States devolve some of the responsibility to the schools or jurisdictions. The remainder are organized at the school level.

Implementation. All members implement their teacher induction programs at the school or jurisdictional level, oftentimes in the classroom. However, in several members, there are additional activities implemented by other levels of governance. Japan is the sole economy whose member government plays a role in implementing an actual training session. Further, Australia, Canada, the Republic of Korea, Papua New Guinea, and the United States have activity at the provincial level. For example, Korea has in-services at the regional level before the school year begins.

⁴The six members were not all included in the general rubric of "member-level authority" above, principally because not all of these member governments exert control over teacher induction, despite their level of involvement in this initial aspect.

Financing

Teacher induction programs are financed through a variety of means, and the financing is generally related to the level of authority involved in teacher induction. In other words, a member-level mandated program may include member financial support, whereas school-initiated programs are usually self-funded.

Most APEC members' teacher induction programs are funded by a combination of provinces and schools—although in Korea, programs are fully funded by the provinces, and, in Singapore, programs are funded only by the schools. In New Zealand, teacher induction—support services, salaries, and registration—is funded by the member government. In Japan and Papua New Guinea, the member government financially supports some or all aspects of teacher induction programs (e.g., "on-board training" in Japan and "inspection" in Papua New Guinea). In Brunei Darussalam, there is no allocation of funds specifically for teacher induction. Exhibit 2 provides information about the authority and financing of teacher induction in APEC members.

EXHIBIT 2

Authority and Financing in APEC Teacher Induction Programs

Member	Highest Level of Authority Involved in Teacher Induction	Financing
Australia	Provincial	Member, provincial and school ⁵
Brunei Darussalam	School	None
Canada	Provincial	Provincial and school
Japan	Member	Member and provincial
Republic of Korea	Member	Provincial
New Zealand	Member	Member
Papua New Guinea	Member or school ⁶	Member and school
Singapore	School	School
Chinese Taipei	Member	Not available
United States	Provincial	Provincial and jurisdiction

Information on funding levels for teacher induction is scarce. In general, however, APEC members spend less than 1 percent of an education budget per inductee. APEC

⁵In Australia, schools receive funding from the member government (for teacher salaries) and provincial governments (for their teacher induction activities). In the Independent and Catholic sectors, teacher induction programs may be funded at the school level.

⁶In Papua New Guinea, teacher induction is decided and carried out mainly at the school level. However, there is an Inspection Program that undergirds teacher induction and that is organized and financed at the member level.

members commonly spend teacher induction funds on fees and training for mentors and guidance teachers; on workshops and training sessions for inductees; and on relief- or release-days for beginning teachers during induction activities.

Types of Programs and Basic Features

Although no two teacher induction programs are alike, there are similarities in some of their basic features. The following paragraphs examine the methods, focus, and links to higher education in different teacher induction programs.

Methods of Teacher Induction

The strategies used most often in teacher induction across APEC members are mentoring and some type of workshops, in-services, or trainings. At least seven members' teacher induction programs use one or both of these strategies. Other program strategies include internships, model-classroom observations, evaluations and observations, informal guidance, and handbooks and orientation.

Mentoring. Mentoring consists of pairing veteran teachers with beginning teachers to offer guidance and support. Mentoring is one of the most widely used strategies for helping new teachers become competent professionals. Australia, Canada, Japan, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Singapore, and the United States use mentoring as a primary teacher induction strategy, whereas the idea of mentoring is just beginning to emerge in Brunei Darussalam, Republic of Korea, or Chinese Taipei.

A typical mentoring program lasts throughout the beginning teacher's first year (the general duration of induction programs as a whole). Mentors are largely senior teachers with several years' experience and respected reputations, although principals and department heads may also be mentors. Over half of the members who use mentoring provide limited training for some mentor teachers. These members (Australia, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Singapore, and the United States) offer guidance through workshops and handbooks. In some cases, the provision of training for mentors is a program mandate; in others, it is either necessitated by challenging work environments or implemented at the discretion of the individual jurisdictions financing the program.

Few programs provide direct incentives for experienced or excellent teachers to become mentors. Some programs in Australia and the United States offer a financial bonus or stipend for teachers who take on the responsibility of mentoring. Also, mentor teachers in Australia, New Zealand, and Papua New Guinea are more likely to

receive promotions resulting from their mentorship. In a few instances, mentoring is viewed simply as an expectation of the career structure of teaching and an opportunity for the mentor's own professional development.

Workshops, In-Services, and Trainings. Instructional sessions comprise a second, widely used strategy for inducting beginning teachers into their profession. Although different members use different terminology to describe such instructional sessions, they encompass any activities intended to inform and professionally develop teachers, such as workshops, seminars, in-service training, meetings, and external training activities. Seven members use these activities to instruct new teachers: Australia, Japan, the Republic of Korea, Papua New Guinea, Singapore, Chinese Taipei, and the United States.

These instructional sessions occur several times both before and throughout a new teacher's tenure. The subject matter, structure, and personnel involved differ from program to program. University professors, teachers, department heads, principals, and local, regional, or national administrators conduct these activities, with subjects including curriculum design, school policy, teaching strategies, and innovative education practices.

Several APEC members employ a multi-tiered approach to such informative and practical trainings. For instance, in Papua New Guinea, there is a "National In-Service Week," during which schools and individual departments devote several days to in-services for beginning teachers. In Korea and Chinese Taipei, local government and tertiary faculty conduct workshops to inform teachers on local school policies and practice. Korea uses "teacher meetings" as a forum for beginning teachers to discuss the recent literature in their field. Finally, Japan uses an extensive outside training program, with all teachers attending four- to five-day training excursions and weekly seminars, and a select number attending a member-organized and –funded "on-board training," which offers advanced workshops to specially recommended teachers.

Focus of Teacher Induction

An earlier section described the broad goals of teacher induction in APEC members. These goals are reflected, as well, in the focus of the teacher induction programs. APEC members' teacher induction programs most commonly focus on some combination of the following topics (in order of commonality):

- teaching methods,
- curriculum content,
- classroom management,
- advice to students, and
- school policies.

Other, less frequent topics include working with parents, handling administrative tasks, screening, integrating teachers, retaining teachers, and developing ethical and professional standards.

Links to Higher Education

Many APEC members agree that there is a need for a greater connection between preservice and in-service education (i.e., for building a learning continuum of which teacher induction is but a step). For the most part, the existing connections between teacher induction programs and the institutes of higher education where teachers receive their preservice training are few. There is little or no connection of teacher induction to higher education in Brunei Darussalam, the Republic of Korea, and the United States.⁷ Most members use the university as a resource. New Zealand funds teacher training institutes through the member government and requires them to provide services to schools for their induction programs. Other members have faculty provide workshops or guidance to beginning teachers. This is the case in Chinese Taipei, where recent reforms augmented the amount of time beginning teachers are able to spend with professors for guidance and evaluation by reducing the number of students professors oversee and increasing beginning teacher release-time. Time will test the strength of these links as the reforms take full shape and the system is further developed. In Australia and the United States, the interaction is in the use of the university's research regarding teacher induction or in the programs serving as the basis of further research. Despite the relative paucity of tertiary links, many members

⁷Information on this topic was not provided for Canada and Japan.

cite this area as ripe for reform and are striving for a greater connection among the various stages of teacher education (see the section "Perceived Outcomes and Future Plans").

Participation

Another major aspect of teacher induction that differs among APEC members is participation—how many new teachers participate and why. Nearly half of APEC members mandate participation for all beginning teachers. These members—Japan, Korea, Papua New Guinea, and Chinese Taipei—often have the most formal and least variable induction programs, with a generally higher level of member involvement than other economies. In Brunei Darussalam and New Zealand, all beginning teachers participate to varying extents in teacher induction, although it is not required.

Several other members whose programs are provincially administered and implemented mandate the participation of all teachers in that province. For instance, Québec mandates a two-year probationary period for all beginning teachers; and the Northern Territory and Capitol Territory of Australia, as well as such U.S. states as Connecticut, Florida, and Indiana, require that all beginning teachers participate in induction activities. (In Australia, overall, 75 to 100 percent of beginning teachers in most provinces participate in an induction program.) In Singapore, although no level of jurisdiction mandates a teacher induction program, most teachers are involved in such activities.

Additionally, Australia, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, and the United States note that participation in teacher induction programs includes not only teachers who are new to the profession (in their first year of teaching), but also teachers new to a grade level, school, or system, or those returning after extensive sabbaticals.

Links to Licensure

One way participation may be mandated is through links to licensure and accreditation. Many APEC members require participation in teacher induction programs for teachers to become fully certified or appointed to permanent positions in their systems. The requirements of participation necessary for accreditation vary according to the individual program. In the United States, beginning teachers undergo evaluations in many teacher induction programs, which determine their continued teaching eligibility. In Chinese Taipei, teacher preparation graduates must

successfully complete a one-year internship to become fully licensed and eligible for continued employment.

Duration and Timing

Teacher induction programs vary in their length, although most last one to two years, with activity concentrated in the earliest days and weeks on the job. Nearly all members' programs and activities occur periodically, even weekly, throughout the induction year. Only two members confine activities mainly to the initial period: Republic of Korea, where the program is highly centralized and specialized, and Singapore, where induction focuses on integration and transition to the school environment.

APEC members find commonality in the timing of teacher induction activities, with nearly all members conducting their programs during school hours, or during and after school hours. When induction activities occur during school hours, many programs offer release-time⁸ to beginning teachers who participate.

Effects of Participation

Participation in such teacher induction activities, for the most part, does not affect other responsibilities. Where workloads for beginning teachers differ from those of veteran teachers, the variance is mainly manifest in a lighter administrative load for the new teachers. In rare cases, beginning teachers receive lighter teaching loads or are placed in classes viewed as less critical or less challenging. Japan and New Zealand particularly use reduced teaching loads to accommodate beginning teachers' participation in a wide range of induction activities. It seems that such supports are found only in the more developed and extensive teacher induction programs. The one exception is Chinese Taipei, where the teacher induction program was recently reformed to create a first-year internship where beginning teachers receive substantial release time to meet with professors and guidance teachers and participate in workshops and observations.

Perceived Outcomes and Future Plans

Teacher induction is in the formative stages in nearly all APEC members, and members have not focused on formally evaluating their programs. Three members

⁸Release-time excuses teachers from class, without losing pay, to attend teacher induction activities (and is the main support given to beginning teachers across APEC members).

collect data or follow a review procedure. Only the Republic of Korea, however, does so uniformly across all of its programs, by soliciting feedback of inductees through questionnaires and review sessions. In Australia, individual states and territories evaluate their own, individual programs. For instance, every year the Northern Territory obtains feedback from teachers on their induction experiences during the orientation and "recall session," and in one case, New South Wales undertook a member-wide program evaluation. New Zealand is the only other member that conducts evaluations, and these are performed at the individual school level (although the Advisory service does collect data from all programs for a report to the Ministry of Education).

Perceived Outcomes

Despite the lack of formal evaluation procedures, APEC members are explicit in their desired outcomes and the process of attaining those outcomes. Among the desired program outcomes are: increasing the competency and effectiveness of teachers, meeting the needs of new teachers through assistance, and retaining or increasing the supply of teachers. Further, respondents from all members feel that teacher induction programs achieve the outcomes.

Future Plans

Nearly all APEC members are discussing or planning reforms in their teacher induction programs and practices.⁹ The range of reforms from one member to the next is great. Some members are in the early stages of discussion and are beginning to address how to put in place a more systematic teacher induction program. Other members have formed member-level task forces that are in varying stages of recommending changes and "next steps." Still others have particular procedures in mind for achieving the goals. The reforms being considered include competency frameworks, internship programs, master teacher systems, centralization (or devolution), and improved research.

Australia, Canada, Indonesia, the Republic of Korea, Papua New Guinea, and Chinese Taipei have planned or begun reforms in teacher induction programs. In particular, Papua New Guinea, in an effort to upgrade teacher competency levels, plans to do the following: formalize its mentor program; extend induction activities to elementary and multi-grade teachers; and involve the member-level government in the direction,

⁹Although Japan, New Zealand, and Singapore have no changes planned for the immediate future, the former two have highly regarded programs currently in place.

funding, and identification of master teachers. Another member seeking to foster the ideals of mentoring is the Republic of Korea, whose main reform is to establish a master teacher system. Reforms in Australia may include internship options for preservice education and the integration of induction and the achievement of basic competencies.

Summary

The variation in all aspects of teacher induction across APEC members is apparent. If any points of summary or conclusion are to be made, they are that teacher induction among APEC members is:

- Multipurposed and multifaceted;
- A relatively recently developed education policy;
- Funded from a combination of sources, and is a small percentage of education budgets;
- Most often "run" by multiple authorities;
- Marked by the wide use of mentoring, instructional workshops and in-services, or both;
- Mandated, in varying degrees, for all teachers, in about half the members;
- Widely perceived to have a positive impact, but not generally the subject of rigorous evaluation; and
- Still in the formative stages, with reforms expected for many in the near future.

Teacher Induction in Individual Members

The following synopses discuss the prominent features of the individual programs and the aspects of the structure or historical-cultural factors that influence the practice of teacher induction by APEC members.

Australia

Under Australia's federal system of government, all aspects of education, including teacher induction, are the domain of the state or territory ministers of education. Further, much of the management and implementation of teacher induction has been devolved to the region, district, and school level. Therefore, teacher induction in Australia is widely varied, both from state to state, as well as within states, to accommodate more localized needs and demands.

There is no one method or member-level framework for teacher induction in Australia. However, the Australian Education Union has set forth the following recommendations:

- a teacher induction period of one year,
- placement in a supportive school with senior teachers,
- a reduced teaching load to 80 percent of full-time load with a period for reflection, and
- appraisal linked to further professional development.

Generally, the purpose of teacher induction in Australia is to provide support and guidance for the beginning teacher and to facilitate his or her transition into professional teaching. Some states or sectors have more specific purposes. For instance, in the Northern Territory, teacher induction is intended to increase the retention of teachers in order to address teacher shortages in predominantly isolated schools with largely Aboriginal populations. In the Catholic sector, induction is viewed as a way to ensure a "positive fit" between the new teacher and the school.

Basic Features

Because teacher induction in Australia is the responsibility of the individual states and territories, devolved to the schools within some states, there is considerable variation in the programs implemented. States, territories, and schools rely on a variety of methods to support the new teacher and facilitate his or her transition into the profession. Mentoring and in-services are the most developed and most widely implemented strategies, although induction activities such as orientations, cooperative teaching, professional networking, guidebooks, seminars, and observations of model classrooms also have a place in several induction programs.

Mentoring. Mentoring is a main feature in all fairly well-developed or formal teacher induction programs, and a highly regarded practice. Mentors may be experienced teachers, deputy principals, or principals. When possible, advanced skills teachers, or those teachers with at least eight years of experience, serve as mentors. Generally, the role of the mentor includes many responsibilities, such as: advising and supporting the new teacher; observing and assessing the new teacher; attending education courses and in-services with the new teacher; and allowing the new teacher to observe the mentor's class. Also, some mentors are expected to "team teach" with the beginning teachers.

Several territories use a mentoring team approach. In both the Northern Territory and the Australian Capital Territory, where teacher induction is centrally funded and mandated, teams comprising advisors, teachers, and administrators guide and assess the inductee over time. For experienced teachers, participation as a mentor is seen as both a responsibility and an opportunity given them by their chosen profession. Participation often aids in promotion, and, in some cases, teachers receive a small stipend for their mentoring duties. There is no formal training for mentors, except in the Northern Territory for those teachers who work primarily with new Aboriginal teachers.

In-Service Training. Many states and territories use in-service and other instructional sessions as a way to further train and guide beginning teachers. These in-services, and indeed all induction activities, focus mainly on teaching methods, curriculum development, classroom management, and school policies. Additional topics may include ethics, dealing with families, cross-culturalism, values, professionalism, and professional growth.

An in-service may be as simple as an orientation or as elaborate as a series of sessions implemented on multiple government levels. In the Northern Territory, teachers participate in in-service training at the territory, regional, and school level, as well as in a mid-service session to discuss the new teacher's needs and curriculum ("recall orientation"). In Queensland independent schools, beginning teachers have the opportunity to participate in the Beginning Teacher Seminar, which allows several days of learning and interaction with experienced teachers.

In some cases, especially in the independent sector, beginning teachers receive reduced teaching loads to accommodate their professional development. Another common support is relief-time. For instance, Queensland teachers have up to three student-free days to participate in induction activities. In some rarer cases, teachers

may be reimbursed for outside expenses (e.g., travel) for courses taken as part of induction.

Participation

The Department of Employment, Education, Training, and Youth Affairs estimates that 75 to 100 percent of teachers in most systems participate in some form of teacher induction, depending on whether the program is mandated. Participation lasts for about one year, although the most frequent activity occurs during the first six months of the program. Some state or territory programs have mandated initial participation, with activities occurring periodically and to a lesser extent throughout the remainder of the year.

Financing

The financing of teacher induction programs, again, is a responsibility of the states and territories. The Australian Capital Territory, which has a mandated teacher induction program, centrally funds its programs. Other states or territories may provide funds to schools for training and development. However, in general, there is no allocation specifically for teacher induction; use of the money for induction is at the discretion of the school.

Future Directions in Teacher Induction

Most teacher induction programs are evaluated *within* the particular program itself, if at all. Of those territories mandating and implementing a central teacher induction program, the Northern Territory gathers feedback from teachers following teacher orientation and recall sessions. While the process is rather informal at the present, there are plans to be more systematic in gathering and using the information provided by teachers.

Within some states, reviews are underway to improve teacher induction. In South Australia, researchers examined the use of a competency framework for beginning teachers. A special advisory board in New South Wales has developed a *Strategic Policy Framework for Teacher Education* that addresses, in part, teacher induction. There also are approaches at the member level that involve exploring the use of teacher competencies to improve induction and investigating the use of internships in preservice education.

Brunei Darussalam

Teacher induction in Brunei Darussalam focuses mainly on informal practice comprising activities that are solely school-initiated and variable in the attention and support provided to new teachers. Although there are no policies governing teacher induction at the member or local level, all schools, to some extent, provide teacher induction to teachers during their first weeks on the job. The purpose of teacher induction is mainly to help beginning teachers " . . . become familiar with the school ethos and their expected responsibilities." However, because teacher induction varies from one location to another, the perception of the extent to which assistance or support exists at all also varies.

Basic Features of Teacher Induction

After completing a four-year degree in an approved educational program from the Universiti Brunei Darussalam, beginning teachers are posted to schools for a three-year probationary period (Darling-Hammond and Cobb, 1995). Although some beginning teachers may carry slightly less time-consuming or less difficult administrative duties, they assume essentially the same responsibilities as fully fledged teachers and receive a uniform salary appropriate to their probationary stature.

Teacher induction activities are generally confined to the first days and weeks of the beginning teacher's tenure and consist mainly of orientations, observations, and informal advice from principals and senior teachers or department heads. Beginning teachers often note the non-existence of and lack of support for a system such as model classrooms, team teaching, or mentoring, where they would have an opportunity to observe and directly learn from veteran teachers. The involvement of experienced teachers is limited to observing beginning teachers and subsequently offering advice on such topics as curriculum requirements, teaching performance, and classroom management.

Since these teacher induction practices are informal and unspecified, they occur during school hours. In terms of attention, support, or evaluation of new teachers, teacher induction generally does not exceed one month and has no formal conclusion.

An Innovative Program. Staff of the Sultan Hassanal Bolkieh Institute of Education (SHBIE) recently collaborated with the Ministry of Education in a project that aims to attend to the needs of primary school teachers in improving science and math teaching. The project—Collaborative Action Research in Science and Math

Education (CARISME)—is the first link between higher education and fledgling teacher induction activities.

Future Directions of Teacher Induction

The main, positive outcome of the current practice of teacher induction in Brunei Darussalam is thought to be increased familiarity with the school and teaching responsibilities. It is difficult to further judge teacher induction (on criteria beyond the above outcome) as teacher induction is not yet developed or systematic, and there are as yet no systematic evaluations in place to determine the effectiveness of the activities that do take place.

Recently, the Director General of Education of Brunei Darussalam expressed interest in exploring a more systematic program of teacher induction. As a step in this direction, a National Task Force, comprising members of the Ministry of Education and of Higher Education, was established in 1996. In highlighting teacher induction as one of the most important areas in need of attention, the Task Force stated: "The first few years of teaching may well be a critical period in the making or breaking of a professional and, hence, require special attention." Arising from a recommendation from the Task Force, a three-day Teacher Induction Programme will take place in mid-June 1996 for newly graduated teachers. Besides briefings by senior officers of the Ministry, the beginning teachers would participate in a series of simulation exercises developed jointly by school principals, headteachers, and university lecturers. School-based follow-up activities will then be encouraged and monitored. Future plans will therefore more than likely develop the notion of teacher induction as a tool for assisting teachers to become competent and effective professionals in the classroom.

Canada

In Canada, teacher induction is the responsibility of individual provinces and territories. Consequently, there is much variance in the practice of teacher induction in Canada, although induction programs have been implemented at the school and provincial level, with varying degrees of rigor and success. As information was not provided on teacher induction initiatives across Canada, we will confine discussion to Québec, one of the large provinces.

Basic Features

Québec employs a probation system for beginner teachers as part of teacher certification. Following completion of preservice education, teachers are issued a five-year provisional certificate. The system's official manual states:

This probation will certainly make it possible to evaluate the teacher, but, even more importantly, it will give him an opportunity to serve a kind of internship, to acquire practical training and theoretical knowledge, either in education or in specialized subjects.

This is evidence of the dual purpose of Québec's program: (1) enabling new teachers to prove their competence and (2) helping new teachers integrate into the profession.

The first component, screening, is met as teachers are routinely observed and reviewed by the principal. The principal uses a provincially designed form to evaluate the new teacher, and to submit a report at the end of the year. To assist him or her in this responsibility, the principal may call on department heads, educational consultants, and probation committee members (the committee includes a member of the school administration, who has main responsibility for the inductee, and a senior teacher, whose role is to advise and guide the inductee). At the end of two years, the principal may recommend the probationer for permanent certification, and all personnel involved in the probation sign their agreement.

During this probationary period, beginning teachers are provided assistance in their work toward permanent certification. They are assigned a mutually agreed-upon overseeing teacher who serves as a mentor. The overseeing teacher is responsible for welcoming new teachers and advising them throughout the probationary period. Activities of mentors include: helping new teachers with planning; encouraging new teachers to become increasingly autonomous over time; offering their own classroom for observation by new teachers; and observing and consequently advising new teachers relating to teaching methods.

A noted feature of the probationary system is that beginning teachers have several roles. They are expected to take initiative and progress toward fuller responsibility and autonomy throughout the probationary period. Also, they perform self-evaluations based on the provincial review criteria for the purpose of discussion, comparison, and self-development. Beginning teachers may also help choose the criteria upon which to be evaluated. Finally, new teachers may appeal a rejection for permanent certificate to the Review Committee.

This system is not without its difficulties, notably the occasional refusal by a mentor to evaluate a teacher who is a peer.

Future Directions in Québec's Teacher Induction

The Ministry of Education began reviewing its policies on teacher training in 1991. Since 1994, new four-year programs require a minimum of 700 hours of practice. These programs lead directly to permanent certification. For teachers who complete programs that are being phased out, the Ministry plans to replace the current probationary system with a one-year practical training for teachers at the beginning of their career, "to enable them to integrate more harmoniously into their profession."

Indonesia

There is no formal teacher induction program in Indonesia. However, there is an effort in teacher education and training to provide all teachers and teacher trainees with more professional development growth opportunities. These efforts, undertaken for the improvement of the teaching force, are directed to two main areas: preservice education and in-service education.

Preservice education and the attainment of a *D-2* diploma require coursework in general education, foundation of education, the teaching-learning process, and a specialization area as well as a semester-long practicum. The academic requirements of preservice education have been strengthened and enhanced to ensure that graduates of teacher preparation:

- Possess the personal characteristics of an educated Indonesian citizen;
- Have mastered educational concepts, especially those concerned with teaching in primary school;
- Have mastered primary school subjects;
- Are able to develop and implement a program of instruction for the primary school; and
- Are able to evaluate the process and results of learning and teaching.

The implications for teacher induction are that teachers will be better prepared to enter a classroom and less in need of basic teacher training. There also are practices that offer opportunities for professional growth to teachers once they have assumed their

teaching roles. At both the primary (KKG) and secondary (PKG) levels, teachers participate in activities such as study groups.

First-year teachers in Indonesia, for the most part, are treated like experienced teachers, with the same expectations and duties. The only difference is that first-year teachers are not placed in early grades, where basic teaching skills are deemed essential, or in the sixth grade, which is viewed as a critical level of education.

Japan

Based on reports issued in May 1988 by the National Council on Educational Reform and in accordance with the revision of the Law on Special Regulations for Educational Public Service Employees, Japan has instituted an extensive teacher induction training program. The program was begun in the 1989 academic year, and has been implemented gradually since then. The training program has now been in operation in all primary schools, lower- and upper-secondary schools, and schools for students who are deaf, blind, and who have other disabilities, since 1992. The programs are geared toward newly hired teachers in member-level and public schools (i.e., schools run by the member-level and prefectural governments, respectively).

Basic Features

The Ministry of Education, which established teacher training and employment guidelines, dictates that the legal authorities appointing teachers must provide on-the-job training and support and that first-year teachers undergo induction for one year from the date of hire. This period of teacher induction is viewed as the first step in continuing professional development, and its purpose is to "foster practical leading ability and a sense of mission, while simultaneously equipping new teachers with a broad range of understanding" (Ministry of Education, Science, Sports, and Culture, Japan, 1995).

Beginning teachers receive a variety of training and support throughout the induction year. Induction activities focus on areas essential to fulfilling professional duties: basic academic requirements, course instruction, ethics, special activities, and student guidance. Teachers participate in induction activities both in and out of school.

Training In School. Beginning teachers receive training and advice from guidance teachers and others at the school 2 days per week, or 60 days per year. The guidance teacher is not only involved in directly mentoring the beginning teacher, but also is responsible for garnering the assistance of other school personnel to support and

encourage the new teacher. The program ensures that beginning teachers carry a lighter teaching load that can accommodate the training schedule and provides release-time for the guidance and new teacher during the periods when they are involved in induction. To achieve that, the program provides one part-time teacher for every one new teacher, or one full-time teacher for every two new teachers, who assumes the duties of the otherwise-involved new and guidance teachers.

Training Out of School. Training outside the school occurs in several ways: weekly training sessions; four- to five-day training excursions; and "On-board Training." First, beginning teachers spend 1 day per week, or 30 days per year, on outside training. This includes education courses, lectures, practica, and observational tours of other schools, social education facilities, child welfare facilities, and private corporations. Some beginning teachers may even have the opportunity to gain experience with volunteer or outdoor educational activities during the training sessions. Another outside training experience in which all beginning teachers participate is four- to five-day excursions developed and run by the prefectural boards. A final type of outside training is "On-board Training." Specially recommended teachers (approximately 2,400 of 18,000 new teachers) participate in member-run trainings on ships and in harbor locales.

Financing

The Ministry of Education spent 22.6 billion yen (roughly US\$220 million) on teacher induction programs in academic year 1995. The member treasury funds one-half the cost of personnel hired to support beginner teachers in school and one-half the expenses for prefectural trainings. Prefectural boards responsible for the hiring of such personnel and for the execution of such training supply the other half of the necessary funds. "On-board Trainings" are exclusively funded by the member treasury.

Evaluation

Although there are no formal evaluations in place, the teacher induction training program enjoys a respected reputation in many quarters. Hence, no reforms are currently planned for the program whose positive outcomes are perceived as the following:

- Newly appointed teachers undertake their training with autonomy and dedication, and demonstrate an extremely high level of growth in their abilities;

- Guidance teachers also develop a high sense of responsibility as leaders and show improved leadership abilities, in particular, achieving a greater breadth of vision; and
- The program fosters the development of a school environment dedicated to the mission of training the new teacher, and stimulates the other teachers' sense of mission and desire for training as well, thus breathing new life into the school.

Republic of Korea

The Republic of Korea employs a teacher induction program focused on a mandated, pre-appointment training session offered at the provincial level. Following the pre-appointment program, beginning teachers continue to participate in less formal provincial- and school-level induction activities. The main purpose of teacher induction in the Republic of Korea is inspiring and informing teachers on the responsibilities of teaching and the culture of the school and the profession.

Basic Features

The *pre-appointment program* is the central feature in the Republic of Korea's teacher induction program. The member-level government requires that all beginning teachers who have received their teaching certificate and passed the employment examination participate in these activities. Provincial institutes for the in-service training of teachers provide 60 hours of training and induction that are intended to inspire the new teacher's sense of commitment, foster the basic knowledge required for teaching, and establish an awareness of the ethics of the teaching profession. Although the design of the pre-appointment program is at the discretion of the provinces, there are no significant differences among programs.

Teacher induction often continues after completion of the pre-appointment activities. Both provincial offices of education and individual schools provide orientation to beginning teachers. The orientation offered at the provincial level focuses on informing new teachers about the status of schools within the jurisdiction and further enhancing their sense of commitment and responsibility as teachers. The orientation at the school level, on the other hand, concerns itself with issues of the particular school, such as status, goals, direction, and management. Other induction activities include workshops, peer supervision, and clinical supervision. Workshops may be seminars on curriculum content or teaching methods, or teacher meetings for reading papers and articles. Although the idea of formal mentoring is not yet established in

the Republic of Korea, principals often provide advice on teaching methods, and experienced teachers invite their younger colleagues to observe exemplary classrooms.

All the in-service induction activities occur periodically for the first year of teaching, with no formal conclusion. Generally, teachers spend a few hours per week—before, during, or after school—in teacher induction. Currently, there are no supports such as release-time in place for teachers who participate in induction. Beginning teachers carry a lighter administrative load, but spend the same amount of time on classroom activities as experienced teachers.

Financing

Provinces in the Republic of Korea have the responsibility of choosing and funding teacher induction programs. In 1994, the cost of teacher induction per inductee in the Kyongbuk Province was 377,000 won. This is 0.37 percent of the total education budget and is representative of the cost of teacher induction in most provinces.

Future Directions in Teacher Induction

The Republic of Korea currently uses a review process and questionnaire (directed toward the inductees) to evaluate teacher induction programs. These elements are used to judge the program as successful or not in helping beginning teachers adapt to the classroom. The next step for teacher induction programs in the Republic of Korea is to introduce a Master Teacher System, to develop a sense of commitment to the teaching profession.

New Zealand

New Zealand has a well-established system of teacher induction. All schools in New Zealand are required to provide advice and guidance to beginning teachers. However, these programs of teacher induction are locally developed and may vary in intensity from location to location and from individual to individual.

Upon graduation from teacher training, teachers are provisionally licensed by the national Teacher Registration Board (TRB). The TRB strongly urges that, during a two-year period, schools and early childhood centers provide and teachers participate in a program of advice and guidance. Teachers also must comply with additional

criteria specified by the TRB and teach the full two years, at which time provisional registration may be converted to full registration.

Basic Features

The TRB publishes a booklet, entitled *Advice and Guidance Programmes for Teachers (1994)*, which offers examples of successful induction programs in place around New Zealand. The TRB further specifies the necessary attributes for an acceptable Advice and Guidance Program. In short, the school and early childhood center must provide new teachers with:

- Resource and personal support from colleagues working in the same curriculum area, school, or center;
- Classroom visits and written lesson appraisals on progress toward meeting the criteria for registration;
- An opportunity to visit and observe other teachers;
- An opportunity to meet with senior staff and other teachers to clarify the wider aspects of the beginning teacher's work and responsibilities, including professional development; and
- A written record of the program, containing the advice and guidance received and the extent of participation in planning the corporate life of the school or center.

Because these guidelines are broad and because programs are implemented on a school-to-school, person-to-person basis, programs vary, although overall patterns are similar.

In all programs, new teachers are assigned an experienced tutor who then serves as a mentor. During the two-year period, the new teacher and tutor teacher meet, regularly at first and then tapering as time progresses, to review and document the new teacher's progress and to set new goals for their program of advice and guidance. The principal receives the reports compiled by the new and tutor teachers, through which he or she monitors the new teacher's achievement of the registration criteria.

The close involvement of new teachers with their tutor teachers is the main activity of teacher induction. However, new teachers receive further support and training during their induction period. Generally, new teachers in schools, though not in early childhood centers, carry a lighter teaching load with smaller, carefully selected classes and reduced time. They are expected to spend 80 percent of their time (the equivalent of four days per week) on full-time teaching responsibilities and 20 percent of their

time (the equivalent of one day per week) on induction activities—although schools vary in the extent to which they "formally" use the induction hours. The induction time may be spent in or out of school for activities such as in-services, lectures, or classroom observations (at the teacher's own or other schools). Programs provide release-time for when induction activities take new teachers away from the classroom. In some cases, tutor teachers may also receive release-time for their supervisory role.

Financing

The member government funds teacher induction—new teacher salaries, the "point 2" release-time for induction, and support services. The support services are provided by teacher support centers at the teacher training institutions, which receive funding, as above, from the Ministry of Education and also offer special programs for boards of trustees and supervising teachers who may be involved in teacher induction activities in their school.

Evaluation

Those new and tutor teachers in the advice and guidance programs who have participated in formal evaluations support the program and state that it meets their needs. The TRB is currently conducting a member-wide survey of all Year 1 and Year 2 teachers to determine the quality of induction programs. The results of this should be available by mid-1996. Also, the Advisory Service collects both qualitative and quantitative data for quarterly reports to the Ministry of Education. Furthermore, individual schools review their own programs, and may amend or adapt them as necessary. The TRB is at present negotiating with the Education Review Office for that agency to provide information to the Teacher Registration Board on the quality of programs being delivered in individual schools. This and the results of the member-level survey may result in changes to the guidelines set down by the TRB.

Papua New Guinea

In Papua New Guinea, there are both formal and informal structures that help new teachers to adapt to the school and classroom environment during the first few years of teaching. The main structure is the Inspection Program, the member-run system that licenses teachers. Other induction activities vary among schools but may include various in-services, consultations, and visitations. Teacher induction programs are implemented in Papua New Guinea for several reasons: to increase the supply of teachers at a particular level; to increase the retention rate of teachers by reducing their

first-year frustrations and displaying the incentives of teaching; and to open avenues for professional development.

Basic Features

Beginning teachers are inducted and evaluated in a variety of ways during the first year of teaching. First, the beginning teacher works under a *subject master*, who monitors the new teacher's progress by reviewing lesson plans, observing the classroom, and offering general assistance in the areas of planning, curriculum content, teaching strategies, and professional conduct. These senior teaching masters who serve as mentors help determine the needs of the particular new teacher, and, therefore, they adapt their advice, emphasis, and monitoring to the teacher's requirements. Second, the beginning teacher works in association with senior teachers and staff in extracurricular activities, such as sports and special events. Third, the beginning teacher attends in-service training at the school, department, and provincial levels. There also is a member-level "Provincial In-Service Week," during which schools and provincial-level education authorities offer special classes for new teachers.

These induction activities are closely linked to the inspection system. All new teachers must participate in induction activities to: (1) be inducted into their new areas of responsibility and (2) meet the requirements of the inspection system. As the year progresses, senior staff and mentors compile an inspection report based on their interaction with and observation of the new teacher. The Inspector (a national figure) also observes the new teacher and writes a report recommending the teacher for full registration into the teaching force. The induction period is terminated when, at the end of the first year of teaching, the individual is fully registered—although regular professional development continues to take place.

Induction activities occur mostly after school hours and during term breaks. Beginning teachers do not receive release-time or lighter workloads for induction activities. However, the senior staff involved in induction receive several benefits or incentives: training for involvement in the inspection system and points toward promotion and consequent salary increase.

In Papua New Guinea, the National Department of Education funds teachers' salaries and also finances the inspection program. Schools and provinces, however, bear the costs of the induction activities.

Future Directions in Teacher Induction

Teacher induction is viewed as successful for its purposes. Teachers become licensed and secure permanent employment, senior teachers earn promotions, and the supply of in-demand high school teachers increases. However, administrators and policy makers in Papua New Guinea are exploring ways to expand their teacher induction program. One reform under consideration is increasing the involvement of the National Department of Education in funding, selecting, and directing a "master teacher" program. Other reforms include up-grading teacher levels, introducing induction to all levels of teachers, and generally improving the effectiveness of those already being served.

Singapore

The Ministry of Education (MOE) in Singapore requires that all schools plan for the arrival of new teachers. The purpose is to welcome new staff to the school, make the new teachers feel like members of the school community, introduce new teachers to the school environment, and build new teachers' confidence. In the *Principal's Handbook*, issued by the MOE as a manual of recommended practices, school principals are responsible for planning teacher induction activities. They also are expected to provide for adequate briefings, for access to relevant documents, for meetings with key personnel, and for provision of professional guidance by staff.

Basic Features

Though all schools are required to provide teacher induction, schools vary in the degree to which they fulfill that requirement. Most schools provide a half day for orientation, which may include briefings by senior teachers on student profile and curriculum and question-and-answer sessions.

Many schools follow this session with other induction activities such as mentoring, distribution of handbooks, and observations. Recently, the Ministry of Education formalized the mentoring arrangement by requiring that beginning teachers have mentors during their first year (a period of probation). Reporting officers should preferably be the mentors, although the principal may assign an experienced teacher or department head to serve as an assistant mentor. Mentors are required to meet with new teachers at least once in the first three months to find out how the teacher is coping with teaching and other assigned duties, to give feedback on performance, and to give guidance and advice accordingly. They may also share lesson plans and materials, though no observation of model classrooms or team teaching is done.

Also, nearly all schools provide new teachers with detailed handbooks containing information on the school's history and mission, the history of student performance, the curricular options, the administrative structure, and school rules. Finally, principals review the performance of new teachers during formal and informal observations. If teachers are deemed lacking in pedagogical skills, then the principal may provide feedback and guidance.

The informality of some aspects of the induction system may be attributed to the fact that, in Singapore, new teachers are viewed as capable, fully salaried teachers who have completed a rigorous and practical teacher education program. Their

responsibilities are the same as their more experienced colleagues (although sometimes they are not given examination classes).

Financing

Schools fund any induction activities undertaken, with no outside supports. Because teacher induction directly benefits the individual and the school where he or she teaches by easing the transition and increasing effectiveness or productivity, schools accept the responsibility of financing and implementing induction programs for their staff.

Chinese Taipei

Teacher induction and many other aspects of education and other domestic policy, are in transition as a result of the changing political situation in Chinese Taipei. Following the lifting of Martial Law in 1987, the nation has undergone deregulation and reform. One of these reforms is the 1994 Teacher Training Act, which restructured teacher preparation and professional development. There are implications in the new law for many features of the teacher induction program as well as the general climate in which it exists. Formally, teacher education was a five-year program, for which the government paid, and teacher induction was a mandated, full-time internship preceding graduation. Now, teacher education is a four-year program with a one-year internship following graduation. From now on, most students will fund their preservice education, with free teacher education limited to certain subject areas in which there are teacher shortages and to geographic areas where teachers are difficult to recruit. The reformed teacher induction system intends to emphasize devolving control to the localities, increasing assistance to and assessment of teachers, and establishing member-wide licensing systems.

Basic Features

Teacher induction in Chinese Taipei consists of a teaching practicum and an internship. The teaching practicum takes place during the conventional four years of pre-service education. Following pre-service education, students are then placed in schools for internships (discussed in further detail below). Formerly, the Taipei government was responsible for placing teachers; now, control of this aspect of the internship is shifting to universities. In order for the internship to function well, students must be placed in schools with good reputations, enough qualified teachers, and geographic proximity to teacher training institutions. When the internship is

completed, those students who received a government-funded education are required to serve four additional years in the school. Whereas those who paid for their own education find teaching jobs by themselves.

Formerly, all fifth-year teaching students were required to participate in the internship as a prerequisite to graduation. The interns assumed the same workload and schedule as experienced teachers. Now, students who complete preservice education and intend to become teachers are required to take part in the internship after graduation and prior to licensing. Moreover, the interns assume, at most, half of the teaching load as qualified teachers and spend the rest of their time participating in workshops and observing experienced teachers. The assistance and support in place during the internship year is threefold: workshops by the local government, involvement of university professors, and guidance of other school teachers. Each will be considered in turn.

Workshops. Before beginning the internship, inductees participate in workshops sponsored by the local government. The general purpose of the workshops is to introduce interns to the local education system, to clarify the rights and obligations of teaching, and to explain school policy.

Professors. University professors are expected to guide interns in a variety of ways: over the phone, through the mail, face-to-face, and in seminars. As a result of the reforms, the number of students professors oversee decreased from 40 or 50 to 25. The main purpose of this interaction is for the professor to see how the intern is adjusting, to provide assistance where needed, and to evaluate performance. University professors who assist with the induction of secondary school teachers receive lighter university loads in exchange for their commitment to the interns.

School Guidance Teachers. School guidance teachers are the on-site personnel designated to provide moral support and day-to-day guidance. They are especially qualified to provide advice on curriculum design, teaching methods, school policies, student work and management, and administrative tasks. Like the university professor, the guidance teacher also assesses the intern. School guidance teachers who assist secondary teachers used to receive a stipend for their participation. Now, the issue of providing stipends is still under discussion. Previously, university professors and school guidance teachers were mainly evaluators. However, they currently are expected to play a role as supporters and guides as well as evaluators. A more detailed description of the challenges and solutions to developing an effective internship programs follows.

Future Directions in Teacher Induction

Reforms in teacher induction are attempting to remedy the image that teacher induction in Chinese Taipei is a program in name only. Educational administrators and policy makers have identified five challenges and solutions to the transitioning teacher induction program, many of which are being currently implemented. Three of these are sampled below:

- ***The assistance provided by university professors and school guidance teachers was not sufficient to meet the needs of inductees.*** Because interns worked independently the entire day, and because professors were geographically inaccessible and guidance teachers were often busy, the interns often relied on "trial-and-error" to solve their difficulties with classroom management, student guidance, and selection of teaching method. Reforms will include reducing the ratio of professors to students and establishing a one-to-one mentor relationship.
- ***The internship did not currently screen candidates as effectively as expected.*** The intern failure rate was extremely low, despite the stated screening purpose. Administrators believe that this was because of the need to fill vacant positions and the lack of local discretion in hiring teachers. Reforms include a localization of control. "Without government involvement, universities and schools are expected to have freedom to screen out incompetent teachers."
- ***There was alienation between the universities and schools.*** Because there were no incentives for universities to participate in induction and there were inherent geographic difficulties of connecting universities to schools where students were placed, there were few close ties of these two important institutions. Recent reforms dictate that teacher training institutes and localities take responsibility for the placement of students in internships. The reforms are intended to foster the geographic and practical ties of schools and universities and to encourage the exchange of services between institutions.

United States

There are no member-level standards for teacher induction in the United States. Teacher induction—and all aspects of education—are the constitutional responsibility of the individual states. This responsibility is often even further devolved to the school district (or local) level. With approximately 15,000 districts in 50 states and the District of Columbia, U.S. teacher induction programs vary widely in both intensity and content.

Systematic teacher induction programs began in the United States in 1980, when Florida mandated induction programs for all its beginner teachers. Throughout that decade and into the 1990s, the number of states implementing teacher induction policies and practices has increased rapidly. Currently, 21 states have teacher induction programs, with an additional 5 states piloting or planning programs. Individual districts in the remaining states may implement their own teacher induction programs, as well.

The rise of teacher induction programs in the United States may be attributed to several factors. First, many teachers experience "reality shock" or "burn-out" during their first years of teaching. Some of the reasons that it is especially difficult for beginning teachers to transition successfully into their new careers are: the lack of interaction among practitioners during the actual workday (i.e., teachers are isolated in their classrooms), the competing professional demands placed upon practitioners from the outset, and the dearth of practical training during preservice education. Second, the first few years of teaching are seen as a time critical for developing one's teaching style and one in which, if left to "sink or swim," teachers are especially likely to leave their new profession. Attrition rates among new teachers are often five times higher than those of more experienced teachers. This, coupled with fear of teacher shortages, makes attracting and retaining new teachers especially important. Teacher induction programs are increasingly seen as a way to provide new teachers with support necessary to ease their transition, help them develop professionally, and retain them in the profession.

The main purpose of teacher induction in the United States is to help ease the transition from "student of teaching" to teacher. Other objectives include:

- Improving teacher performance;
- Increasing the retention of teachers;

- Promoting the personal and professional well-being of beginning teachers and reinforcing positive attitudes toward themselves and their new profession;
- Satisfying mandated requirements related to teacher induction and certification; and
- Transmitting the culture of the educational system to beginning teachers.

Basic Features

The practice of teacher induction varies widely in the United States. Generally, states that require teacher induction programs issue a provisional license valid from one to three years, under the condition that the individual will go through a beginner teacher program before qualifying for full certification or continued employment.

Teacher induction programs in the United States are undergirded by one or both of the following principles: assist and assess. Assistance describes guidance, feedback, and emotional or professional support provided to new teachers. Assessment is the monitoring and evaluation of beginning teachers against certain criteria, the achievement of which are necessary for licensure.

Teacher induction in the United States traditionally has focused most heavily on assessment; and assistance where it exists is strongly linked to aiding new teachers to achieve the assessment criteria. For instance, both Florida and Connecticut have teacher induction programs that require new teachers to meet with mentor teachers who help them prepare for observations by administrators and achieve the state criteria for certification. Experts criticize these models—assessment and assistance for assessment—because they discourage "reflective, context-specific" teaching and seldom address teacher-initiated professional development issues.

In more recent years, however, several states have developed induction programs with an assistance component only. Michigan, Maine, and New York have implemented programs that require a personally developed professional growth plan, attendance in 15 days of in-service training, and participation in a mentor relationship, respectively. A few other states have implemented programs that have both the assist and assess components, with the assistance provided for its own sake and the assessment conducted for the teachers' own information rather than for licensure.

States employ varied strategies to accomplish their goals. Some of the most common strategies include: observing exemplary teaching practices; participating in in-service training; attending summer training; and attending certification programs conducted

through collaboration of school districts and universities. The most commonly used strategy, which is in place in nearly all existing teacher induction programs, is mentoring.

In most states with induction programs, new teachers are matched with a more experienced teacher whose role it may be to: discuss school policy, curriculum, and discipline; evaluate and monitor the new teacher's progress; or allow the new teacher to observe his or her classroom. The dominant characteristic of all mentoring is assisting new teachers to understand the culture of their school, in addition to preparing new teachers for the assessment process.

Some states require that mentors have a minimum level of experience; other states reward mentors with a small stipend. Generally, however, the teachers who serve as mentors volunteer and receive no extra rewards. Several states (California, Connecticut, and Florida, for example) require that mentors be provided training for their roles as support providers or assessors.

Participation

It is difficult to gauge the overall participation in teacher induction. Roughly half the states have no direct involvement in teacher induction programs, and for those states that do have direct involvement, five are in the pilot or planning phase and at least two have not yet implemented their programs for all teachers. Thus, it is likely that less than 50 percent of all new teachers in the United States participate in teacher induction programs that are more than a brief school orientation.

Financing

Data are similarly sparse on the financing of teacher induction programs. A key variable in the method of funding is whether or not the program is mandated. Several states with mandated programs provide state money to the districts for program implementation, with districts supplying the rest. For instance, Indiana provides \$600 of state money for each new teacher-mentor team, and the school districts supply up to \$400 more for other induction activities. Voluntary teacher induction programs are often funded by state grants or by individual school districts. In Minnesota, districts currently apply to the state for a funding grant—which they must match—to implement a state-recommended induction program. In general, statewide teacher induction programs do not exceed the cost of \$1,000 per inductee. Programs that are implemented on a smaller scale may cost \$4,000 to \$6,000 per inductee.

The costs of teacher induction are mainly the compensation provided to mentors or administrators participating in the program. Another main cost is relief-time for new teachers and mentor teachers to participate in in-service and other professional development activities.

Future Directions in Teacher Induction

There have been few evaluations of teacher induction programs in the United States. The evaluations that have been conducted generally are confined to privately conducted studies of individual programs. For instance, one of the few studies that has been conducted concluded that a successful teacher induction program emphasized structure, careful selection of mentor teachers, and assistance, rather than the assessment of new teachers. This conclusion has important implications for U.S. programs that currently are assessment-focused.

It is difficult to discuss future plans as the system is decentralized and state programs vary widely. However, in general, in education, there is growing attention to the issue of the "professionalization of teaching" and to the idea of the school-university partnership, which aims at improving pre-service teacher training, new teacher induction, and in-service teacher education. One type of partnership receiving attention is Professional Development Schools, ". . . analogous to teaching hospitals, in which expert teachers join with university faculty to provide a structured internship for new teachers . . ." This idea was originally proposed in the mid-1980s by the Carnegie Task Force and the Holmes Group. Although there is wide support for such schools, progress in this arena is slow.

References

Darling-Hammond, Linda, and Cobb, Velma L. (1995). *Teacher Preparation and Professional Development in APEC Members, A Comparative Study*. Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Education Forum and the U.S. Department of Education.

Australia

Department of Employment, Education, and Training (1995). *Exploratory Survey of APEC Members on Teacher Induction: Teacher Induction in Australian Schools*. Canberra, Australian Capitol Territory, Australia.

Brunei Darussalam

Ministry of Education, (1995). *Responses to the Exploratory Survey of APEC Members on Teacher Induction*. Bandar Seri Begawan, Negara Brunei Darussalam.

Canada

Burghardt, Fred (1995 May). Personal communication, Comparative Study of Teacher Training and Professional Development, APEC Education Forum. Edmonton, Alberta, Canada.

Direction générale de la formation et des qualifications (1992). *Teacher Probation, The Probation System and a Procedural Guide*. Québec, Canada: Ministry of Education.

Chinese Taipei

Fwu, Bih-jen (1995). *Chinese Taipei's Teacher Induction Programs*. Taipei, Taiwan.

Indonesia

Office of Educational and Cultural Research and Development (1995). *Responses on the Exploratory Survey Concerning Teacher Induction*. Senayan, Jakarta, Indonesia: Ministry of Education and Culture.

Japan

Ministry of Education, Science, Sports, and Culture (1995). *Induction Training for Beginning Teachers*. Tokyo, Japan.

Republic of Korea

International Education and Cooperation Division (1995). *Responses to the Exploratory Survey of APEC Members on Teacher Induction*. Seoul, Korea: Ministry of Education.

New Zealand

Philips, David (1995). *Responses to the Exploratory Survey of APEC Members on Teacher Induction: New Zealand*. Wellington, New Zealand: Learning and Evaluation Policy, Ministry of Education.

Papua New Guinea

National Commission for UNESCO (1995). *Responses to the Exploratory Survey Of APEC Members on Teacher Induction*. Waigani, Papua New Guinea: Department of Education.

Staff Development and Training Division (1995). *Responses to the Exploratory Survey Of APEC Members on Teacher Induction*. Waigani, Papua New Guinea: Department of Education.

Singapore

Gopinathan, S. (1995). *Teacher Induction in Singapore: An Exploratory Account*. Singapore: Nanyang Technological University, National Institute of Education.

United States

Grinder, Elisabeth, and Gordon, Pamela (1995). *Current Teacher Induction Practices in the United States*. Washington, D.C.: Pelavin Research Institute for the U.S. Department of Education.