

Teacher Mentor Programs—Reflections on a First-Year Implementation Process

Melissa Moultroup, EdD

New England College

For questions or comments for the author, contact Melissa Moultroup at

moultroupm@gmail.com

Abstract

High teacher attrition rates may contribute to educational inequity for students, primarily for those who are members of marginalized communities. Currently, teacher retention rates are lowest in low-income, high-minority schools and districts. As one way to level the playing field, educational leaders may be able to use teacher mentor programs to increase teacher retention. When implemented correctly, those who run these programs have the potential to not only support newly hired teachers but to also empower veteran staff. In this article, I highlight my school district's conscious decision to revitalize our teacher mentor program through purposeful planning, meaningful data collection, and consistent reflection and revision. As the mentor program coordinator, I worked with my district curriculum coordinator, teacher mentors, and newly hired staff in all phases of the process to ensure successful implementation. Although we found great success in several areas of our revitalized program, after data analysis and careful reflection, we learned there were still improvements to be made. We then used those lessons to make conscientious and data-driven decisions to continue the growth of our teacher mentor program.

Keywords: data-driven decisions, job satisfaction, teacher empowerment, teacher job satisfaction, teacher mentoring

Although teacher retention has been a significant issue in the United States for the past decade, in recent years, more and more teachers are leaving their positions and the field entirely (Kaufman & Diliberti, 2021). For example, at the start of the 2024–2025 school year, workforce reports and state agency documents revealed that in 30 states and the District of Columbia, close to 42,000 teaching positions were unfilled. Also, in 49 states, approximately 365,000 teaching positions were held by non-certified teachers. In total, this means one out of eight teaching positions were either unfilled or filled by uncertified, underqualified teachers (Tan et al., 2024), and this only accounts for the states whose representatives reported this data. Although the number of vacant positions is down from 100,000 when compared to school year 2017–2018 (Darling-Hammond, 2022), in 2023, more than three-quarters of the country was still in a teacher shortage (Jones, 2023). One year later, 86% of public schools still found it difficult to hire teachers and fill all positions for the upcoming school year (Peck, 2025). While some states have better teacher retention rates than others, it is clear the teacher shortage is maintaining its status as a national crisis because of the costs to teaching, learning, and school morale (Ronfeldt et al., 2013; Sorensen & Ladd, 2020).

Using Teacher Mentor Programs to Increase Teacher Job Satisfaction and Retention

One way to approach the issue of retaining teachers is to ensure that school districts implement and maintain research-based teacher mentor programs. In doing so, they not only support new teachers, but they also empower veteran teachers who are willing to be mentors. Newly hired teachers clearly need systematic support (Radford, 2016) as they take on the intimidating challenge of a new teaching role. Otherwise, they may never build the self-efficacy they need to stay in the profession for an extended period of time (Bandura, 1997; Han, 2023; Ingersoll & Strong, 2011). Teacher mentors also feel benefits when they take on the extra role of

being a leader in their school. This is because they often feel empowered when they serve as a mentor and as if they can use the program as a way to improve their own practice (Guha et al., 2016). Johnson and Birkeland (2003) also determined that both parties benefit from the mentoring process; the mentee feels supported and even inspired, while the mentor is reinvigorated about teaching and learning. Furthermore, Bowman (2014) discovered that mentoring had a positive effect on teacher collaboration, emotional resilience, and a sense of belonging for both the mentor and the mentee. Essentially, school principals and district leaders will find that when they use a teacher mentor program that supports new teachers while empowering teacher experts, teacher job satisfaction will increase and therefore, teacher retention rates should increase as well (Ingersoll et al., 2018; Ingersoll & Strong, 2011; Maready et al., 2021; National Institute for Excellence in Teaching, 2021).

One District's Revitalization Process

Using the research regarding the importance of teacher mentor programs, at the end of the school year 2023–2024, my district curriculum coordinator and I decided to collaborate to revamp our teacher mentor program in our rural New Hampshire school district. Using research-based strategies and data collected from a 2023 end-of-school-year survey, we decided to move forward with implementing a mentor-designed program that focused on providing support for newly hired teachers and finding ways to empower veteran staff. Our primary focus for this program was to supply differentiated experiences for all new staff, since they come into our district with varying levels of experience and competence, and to give shared decision-making opportunities to mentors.

After school principals hired teacher mentors who were in good professional standing and consistently demonstrated effectiveness as instructional leaders, we provided a summer training

program for all mentors. The first focus of the training was to review how adults best learn, because we felt that for the mentor program to have success, we needed to adhere to practices that would play directly into the way in which adults learn (Knowles, 1984). Not only did we want our newly hired staff to feel supported, we also wanted to ensure our mentors provided opportunities for them to learn about and perfect their practice, since the primary focus of such a program is to help newly hired teachers provide quality instruction for students. Once this review of adult learning theory was complete, we used the rest of our training session to create our vision and our mission statement. From there, we embedded these components into the design of all remaining aspects of the program (see Appendix A for an overview of the entire program).

Once these pieces were complete, we decided to move forward in designing the nuts and bolts of the program itself. As the facilitator of the training session, I knew we first needed to review what we already had in place and then decide what to keep, what to discard, and what to revise. In the end, the mentors decided to retain the basic structure of the program, with the district curriculum coordinator and myself as the individuals to oversee the entirety of the program, a lead mentor in each building to facilitate building cohort meetings and provide additional support to both first and second-year mentees, and an assigned mentor for each individual mentee. The mentors and facilitators believed this structure would not only allow for ample support regarding all school-related issues, but also would ensure that if, for some reason, there would be a problem between their mentor and mentee, both the mentor and mentee would have other professionals on which to rely. The mentor program facilitators understood that a tiered and profound support system would be crucial to the success of our teacher mentor program.

We also decided to keep the meeting schedule we had used in the past, with a few tweaks. First, we agreed that mentors needed to continue meeting with their mentees one-on-one on a monthly basis. However, we also came to the consensus that mentors should have autonomy over the way in which these meetings are scheduled and what should be included on the agenda. This helped to ensure mentors felt empowered to differentiate these meetings to fit the needs of their mentees. We also felt it was necessary to hold building and district cohort meetings, which, altogether, would give mentors and mentees another way to connect with each other about once per month. We viewed these meetings as integral to the overall support system for both mentees and mentors as they navigated their way through the program. We decided that four of the eight district cohort meetings would be revised into choice workshops for mentees in which mentors would design and host workshops on a variety of topics. We made this decision based on solicited feedback from past mentors and mentees through informal conversations and a yearly end-of-year survey that asked all program participants to rate their experience in the mentor program. It was clear that due to the structure and topics of the past district cohort meetings, these meetings, at times, were not viewed as useful or necessary. By providing options for four of these meetings, we hoped to be better able to differentiate and meet the needs of our new teachers (see Appendix A for some examples of the choice workshops we provided).

In addition to the regularly scheduled meetings, the program facilitators chose to incorporate peer observation cycles. In previous years, this was an unsuccessful component of our mentor program, so we knew we needed to further exam its implementation. In the end, mentors decided they wanted to do two rounds of peer observations for their mentees, since they knew they were seen as instructional leaders and could truly help to improve their mentee's practice. Although the lead mentors at each school coordinated this in a slightly different way, all

mentors agreed to use the same peer observation protocol so we could maintain consistency and compare notes regarding the way the observation process went (see Appendix A for a description of this process).

One interesting discussion revolved around the role of building administrators in our mentor program. In the end, all mentors agreed the school principal's involvement should be minimal, since we wanted the mentor program to be a place in which mentees and mentors feel safe to express concerns without risking the chance that administrators may view them poorly or reprimand them for any mistakes they made. Building principals, however, were asked to take on two responsibilities for the mentor program. First, the mentors decided it should be part of the building principal's job to actively recruit and hire competent teacher mentors. During this summer meeting, lead mentors expressed frustration with past hiring practices, concerned that principals were hiring mentor teachers who did not keep up with the responsibilities of the job and in fact, imposed negative attitudes on newly hired staff (Moultroup, 2024). To try to curb this situation, the mentors decided, with the district coordinator's consent, that building principals must consult the lead mentor in each school when hiring teacher mentors. Although this may be a difficult conversation to have, lead mentors were willing to take on these discussions to ensure that only teachers who are committed to the program and can be effective mentors are hired. In addition, if there are very few teachers interested in being mentors or if too few people apply for the position, mentors decided the school principal must collaborate with the lead mentor to actively recruit applicants who would make competent mentors.

In addition to these changes, the mentors decided to add a few components to the program. Those who had served as lead mentors in previous years wanted a way to hold mentors and mentees accountable for attending and participating in regularly scheduled meetings. As a

way to do so, the mentors created a simple online monthly log for their individual mentor-mentee meetings that chronicles how often they have met and what the major focus was of their meetings. In addition, for each building cohort meeting, district cohort meeting, and choice workshop, the mentors created an exit ticket that doubles as our data collection tool. Not only does this exit ticket hold mentors and mentees accountable for attending meetings, I also analyzed the data to share with mentors so we can consistently reflect on our practice and make changes as necessary. Lastly, mentors decided that if a mentee does not attend and participate in at least 70% of the meetings, the district curriculum coordinator can ask them to complete year one of the mentor program again in their following year of employment. If a mentor does not attend at least 70% of the meetings, the lead mentor communicates this issue to the district coordinator, and then the coordinator may address the issue as they see fit. It is important to note that these accountability measures were created by the mentors themselves, and not those who would need to impose them on others.

As the facilitator of this program, I knew that for a mentor program to be successful, mentors needed to feel supported and empowered just as much as the mentees. So, we decided to add three mentors-only meetings within the school year—one in the fall and two in the spring. During these meetings, we took time to check in with one another, design additional aspects of the program we did not address in the summer training (for example, we used the fall meeting to design the peer observation cycles), review the exit ticket data, make decisions based on this data, and air any concerns or issues regarding mentees and the overall mentor program. It was understood and confirmed that these meetings were established as a safe zone in which all concerns could be addressed without retaliation or reprimand from administrators, since administration was not present at these meetings.

Data Analysis

At the end of the school year, I compiled and analyzed exit ticket data. To assess whether mentors and the structure of the program were meeting the needs of mentees, the program facilitators asked mentees to rate their experience in the program on a scale from one to five according to the key concepts of our program vision: opportunities for meaningful collaboration with colleagues, an overall feeling of positivity, supportive interactions, time to reflect on instructional practices, the promotion of high quality work with students, and the empowerment of teachers. Mentees completed this exit ticket every time they met with building cohorts and participated in a choice workshop, which resulted in collecting data a total of eight times, or approximately once per month (exit tickets were not administered in February due to cancelled meetings on snow days, and we did not have any mentor meetings in the month of June). Please see Table 1 for compiled data from the mentee and mentor exit tickets.

Table 1

Compiled Exit Ticket Data

Program component	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
Self-Reflection					
Mentees	52 (62%)	20 (24%)	9 (11%)	1 (1%)	2 (2%)
Mentors*	24 (32%)	37 (50%)	8 (11%)	4 (5%)	1 (1%)
Collaboration					
Mentees	62 (74%)	13 (15%)	5 (6%)	1 (1%)	3 (4%)
Mentors*	43 (59%)	24 (33%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	4 (6%)
Support					
Mentees	53 (63%)	18 (21%)	5 (6%)	2 (2%)	6 (7%)
Mentors*	32 (43%)	30 (41%)	7 (10%)	1 (1%)	4 (5%)

		Empowerment			
Mentees	38 (45%)	34 (41%)	6 (7%)	2 (2%)	4 (4%)
Mentors*	34 (46%)	24 (32%)	11 (15%)	5 (7%)	0 (0%)
		Quality Work			
Mentees	41 (49%)	30 (36%)	8 (10%)	1 (1%)	4 (5%)
Mentors*	26 (35%)	34 (46%)	10 (14%)	4 (5%)	0 (0%)
		Positive Experience			
Mentees	60 (71%)	16 (19%)	3 (4%)	2 (2%)	3 (4%)
Mentors*	35 (47%)	28 (38%)	6 (8%)	2 (3%)	3 (4%)

Note: Mentees $n = 84$; Mentors* $n = 74$; Mentors** $n = 73$

On a monthly basis I compiled all responses and analyzed the exit data at the end of the school year. Because I completed monthly analyses and shared that data with mentors during our mentors-only meetings, the mentors and program facilitators used this meeting time to reflect on the program and our practice. Together, we used the data to decide what needed to continue happening in the program and what needed to be added or changed. At the end of the school year, the mentee responses indicated that 90% agreed or strongly agreed that the mentor program was a positive experience, and 89% of mentees agreed or strongly agreed the program encouraged and allowed for mentees to collaborate with colleagues. In addition, 86% of mentee responses showed the mentees agreed the program promoted self-reflection and empowered teachers. According to the data analysis, 85% of mentee responses indicated the mentor program challenged mentees to provide quality curriculum, instruction, and assessment for students. Also, 84% of mentee responses indicated they agreed the program and mentors provided a supportive environment for newly hired teachers. As a result, mentors, lead mentors, and program

facilitators identified two primary focus areas as we continue to revise both years one and two of the program: promoting quality work and providing a supportive space for mentees and mentors.

Because the program facilitators and mentors felt the first year of the mentor program was best used to help mentees master the district and school procedures and policies, we decided to focus on the quality of work during the second year of the mentor program. We felt that once the first-year foundation is laid, mentors can provide more opportunities to dive further into providing quality instruction during the program's second year. Lead mentors also chose to review the hiring process as a way to address the support issue, since mentees who had rated the program as not providing enough support were employed in roles other than classroom teaching positions, such as school counselors, special educators, nurses, and social workers. In fact, out of seven total disagree or strongly disagree responses regarding the level of support over the course of the entire year, 88% (seven out of eight) of these responders were employed in non-classroom teaching positions. This means that only 12% of disagree responses came from one other mentee, who was a classroom teacher. Due to these results, the lead mentors made some suggestions for providing more support to those who are hired in unique positions, as indicated below in the next section under "Lessons Learned."

In addition to this data, mentors also completed exit tickets at the end of building cohort and mentors-only meetings (please see Table 1). These exit tickets asked mentors to also rate the six major components of the mentor program, and were phrased in the exact same way they were posed to mentees. In total, mentors completed exit tickets five times (at the end of building cohort meetings and mentors-only meetings). Over the course of the year, 92% of mentor responses indicated that mentors agreed or strongly agreed that the mentor program provided opportunities for meaningful collaboration. In fact, collaboration was the only component on

which mentors agreed at a higher rate than mentees did. For every other program component, mentors agreed at a lower percentage. For example, while 90% of mentee responses indicated mentees felt the program was a positive experience, while 85% of mentor responses indicated the same. There were similar discrepancies when it came to self-reflection, quality work, and empowerment, with empowerment showing the largest gap (86% of mentee responses showed mentees felt the program empowered teachers, while 77% of mentor responses indicated the same). Only one program component seemed to have been viewed quite similarly, with 84% of mentee and mentor responses indicating the program participants felt the program was supportive of newly hired teachers.

When lead mentors examined the data analysis, it felt unclear as to why, on four out of six components, mentors agreed at lower rates than mentees, but some individuals offered up assumptions to explain the results. First, some lead mentors felt their own experience in the mentor program when they were first hired may have altered the way they view the new and revised program, especially if they felt their own experience was unmeaningful. They also felt it was possible that professionals who had served in the role as mentors for several years were holding on to the negative experiences their mentees had had in the past, and they had yet to come around to the idea that the program had changed and may now provide a more positive experience. Regardless, the lead mentors saw these discrepancies in the data as a problem to be addressed, and they brainstormed some possible solutions, which will be described in the next section.

Lessons Learned

There were many lessons to be learned throughout this process. Some lessons were small and were resolved with easy solutions, while others required some critical thinking skills in order

to identify the cause of the problem and then find a solution that worked best for everyone. First, one small lesson involved the scheduling of mentor training and the application process. Because we did our initial training in August before the school year officially started, many teachers who were hired as mentors were not able to attend the training. The easy solution to this problem was to include the summer training date in the job description and application process. That way, when teachers apply to be mentors, they are aware of the training date and can make sure to add it to their calendars so they can attend the training.

We also ran into an additional issue regarding hiring mentors. At the start of the school year, we had several unfilled teaching positions and luckily, we were able to hire for those positions mid-year. However, this created a situation in which newly hired staff members needed mentors and unfortunately, we did not train enough mentors during the summer because we had only trained enough for the new staff we had hired at that time. As a result, I found myself scheduling more training sessions throughout the school year so that not only did we have enough mentors to go around, but I could also make sure the new mentors understood each aspect of our program. After consulting with the district administrator, we decided that in the future, we will hold a training session for all staff who are interested in being mentors, even if we end up with more trained mentors than actual mentees. That way, we can eliminate the need to train new mentors mid-year, and we end up with a larger pool of mentors from the very beginning.

One last simple problem was that mentors often had scheduling conflicts when it came to our building cohort, district cohort, and choice workshop meetings. This is because most mentors also serve their schools as team leaders or department heads, and those meetings were often scheduled on the same days as our mentor meetings. This was an unintended oversight on the

part of the school and district administrators, but it required a very simple fix. In the future, district and school administrators will ensure that department and team leader meetings are not scheduled on the day of the week on which mentor meetings are scheduled. This way, mentors can continue to serve in both roles and participate in all necessary meetings.

In addition to these smaller issues, we experienced some bigger problems that needed more time and reflection to correct. First, it became clear quite early on, based on the exit ticket data, that we were struggling with supporting newly hired staff who did not serve in classroom teacher positions, such as school nurses and social workers (as indicated in the Data Analysis section). The major issue was the lack of an immediately available support system for these new staff members. After much reflection, the mentors and I figured this was likely due to the uniqueness of these positions. Unlike other positions in our small school district, people who are hired for these jobs often are the only ones to serve their school in that position. For example, there is only one elementary school nurse, rather than a group of nurses who work together. To mitigate this issue, we initially tried to pair them with a mentor who was in a similar position in another school (i.e., the elementary school nurse's mentor was the middle school nurse). However, these new staff members still reported feeling less supported when compared to classroom teachers. The mentors and I figured this was created by an issue with proximity, or the ability to easily talk to someone nearby who may be able to provide support or help solve problems. We decided that in the future, these staff members will be assigned a mentor within their building, regardless of whether the mentor is in a similar position. That way, the mentor can provide support for district and building procedures and protocols or any other issue that pertains directly to the school. It will be this mentor's responsibility, however, to connect their mentee to other staff members who play similar roles in other buildings and help them build collegial

relationships with these important colleagues. That way, the mentee has a support system readily available to them but will also have a connection with other staff members who may be able to provide guidance on issues particular to their job responsibilities. It is our hope that through this tiered process, these staff members will feel more supported overall.

In addition, the lead mentors in each building expressed concern regarding accountability for mentors and whether they were performing their job duties. It was clear that many mentors adhered to the monthly meeting schedule and worked hard to support their mentees. However, some mentors failed to do so. Even though lead mentors wanted to place trust in all mentors, it became clear that due to a lack of job fulfillment, some mentees did not feel supported throughout the school year. As a result, lead mentors added a new item to their job description, which is to check on monthly meeting logs at the end of every month and follow up with mentors regarding these meetings, if necessary. We also revised the monthly meeting log form to include a “notes” section that we hope will encourage mentors to provide more information about each meeting so that lead mentors know they are fulfilling their job duties.

Lastly, when designing the choice workshop aspect of the mentor program, the district curriculum coordinator and I assumed all mentors would be willing to put on a professional development session on a topic of their choice for their peers, with the intent of trying to empower them. However, at our first mentors-only meeting, one mentor expressed concern with this aspect of the program, as they felt they did not have enough time to design a workshop and, quite frankly, did not feel comfortable doing so. As she started this discussion, it was clear many of the other mentors felt the same way, especially because the design and presentation of a workshop was not included in the mentor job description. Clearly, we needed a way to fix the situation so we could keep our highly competent mentors.

After the meeting, I sent an email to the entire mentoring staff asking them to let me know if they no longer wanted to design a professional development session for newly hired staff. As a result, several mentors expressed their disinterest, which I was grateful for, since I knew I was no longer requiring them to do something they were not interested in and was also not a part of their job description. This did create an issue, however, because I then no longer had enough workshop facilitators to cover the entirety of the four choice workshop meetings. I decided to reach out to the lead mentors in each building for suggestions on what to do, and they felt it would be a great idea to elicit help from other staff who were not mentors. After reaching out to staff in each building, we received interest from enough staff members to be able to offer a wide variety of workshops to our newly hired staff. In the end, I believe this process allowed for more differentiation in the workshop session topics and the empowerment of more teachers, since so many of the workshop facilitators are also competent teachers who were not hired as mentors.

Next Steps

As with all new endeavors, it is important to find ways to maintain successful work and effective programs, such as our mentor program. Our first step to continue the success of this program will be to carry on the effective components and make the necessary changes based on the problems we encountered this school year. Mentors and program facilitators will continue to revise the program as needed, based on research and data analysis from the program's exit tickets and informal mentor and mentee feedback.

One primary focus moving forward will be the development and refinement of the second year of our mentor program. Due to the time dedicated to the implementation of our new first-year program, we are still finding the need to revitalize year two. Currently, the second year of

the program entails guidance and support from the lead mentor in each building, three building cohort meetings, and three district cohort meetings. As part of the next mentor training session, we will once again seek the advice and wisdom of those being trained as mentors in how this phase of the program should look. That way, they continue to have decision-making power over the program they will be working hard to implement.

Lastly, and mostly due to the success of the program and the lessons we learned in the implementation process, we plan to promote our mentor program at future conferences and workshops. As of right now, the state of New Hampshire does not require that each district implements a teacher mentor program. However, after collecting data and interviewing educators, the state's 2023 Committee to Study New Hampshire Teacher Shortages and Recruitment Incentives suggested ten recommendations for each district to consider to recruit and retain great teachers (Reaching Higher N. H., 2025). As a way to promote some of the committee's recommendations, our program will be a shareable document that any district or school leader can use and modify as it best suits their needs. Ideally, through the sharing of our program, we will acquire new connections with leaders from other districts who can share their successes and issues with their own mentor program, helping to make ours even better. And of course, the goal in this borrowing process is to create and implement effective teacher mentor programs in as many districts as possible, with the idea that as a result, we can only positively impact teacher job satisfaction and teacher retention rates, which may help level the educational playing field for students who are members of marginalized communities. As long as we keep the students as our main focus, I know we will meet great success with this mentor program.

References

- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-Efficacy: The exercise of control*. Worth Publishers.
- Bowman, M. (2014). Teacher mentoring as a means to improve schools. *BU Journal of Graduate Studies in Education*, 6(1), 47–51. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1230726.pdf>
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2022). Breaking the legacy of teacher shortages. *Educational Leadership*, 80(2). <https://www.ascd.org/el/articles/breaking-the-legacy-of-teacher-shortages>
- Guha, R., Hyler, M.E., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2016). *The teacher residency: An innovative model for preparing teachers*. Learning Policy Institute. <https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/teacher-residency>
- Han, X. (2023). Associations between the helpfulness of teacher induction programs, teacher self-efficacy, and anticipated first-year teacher retention. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, Article 1088111. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1088111>
- Ingersoll, R. M., Merrill, E., Stuckey, D., & Collins, G. (2018). *Seven trends: The transformation of the teaching force*. Consortium for Policy Research in Education. https://repository.upenn.edu/cpre_researchreports/108/
- Ingersoll, R. M., & Strong, M. (2011). The impact of induction and mentoring programs for beginning teachers: A critical review of the research. *Review of Educational Research*, 81(2), 201-233. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654311403323>
- Johnson, S. M., & Birkeland, S. E. (2003). Pursuing a “sense of success”: New teachers explain their career decisions. *American Educational Research Journal*, 40(3), 581–617. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312040003581>

- Jones, A. (2023, February 11). Most of the U.S. is dealing with a teaching shortage, but the data isn't so simple. *ABC News*. <https://abcnews.go.com/US/map-shows-us-states-dealing-teaching-shortage-data/story?id=96752632>
- Kaufman, J., & Diliberti, M. (2021). *Teachers are not all right: How the COVID-19 pandemic is taking a toll on the nation's leaders* [Report]. The Evidence Project at CRPE. https://www.crpe.org/sites/default/files/ep_teachers_synthesis.pdf
- Knowles, M. S. (1984). *The adult learner: A neglected species* (3rd ed.). Gulf Publishing.
- Maready, B., Cheng, Q., & Bunch, D. (2021). Exploring mentoring practices contributing to new teacher retention: An analysis of the Beginning Teacher Longitudinal Study. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*, 19(2), 88–99. <https://doi.org/10.24384/rgm9-sa56>
- Moultroup, M. (2024). *Exploring the relationship between teacher-perceived administrator leadership style and teacher job satisfaction* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. New England College.
- National Institute for Excellence in Teaching. (2021, December). *2021 NIET Annual Report*. <https://www.niet.org/newsroom/show/nietinfocus/niet-now-2021>
- Peck, D. (2025). *15 teacher shortage statistics (2025)*. <https://www.devlinpeck.com/content/teacher-shortage-statistics>
- Radford, C. P. (2016). *Mentoring in action: Guiding, sharing, and reflecting with novice teachers: A month-by-month curriculum for teacher effectiveness* (2nd ed.). Corwin Teacher Essentials.

- Reaching Higher NH. (2025). *How does NH measure up in the struggle to attract and retain teachers?* Recommendations from The Committee to Study New Hampshire's Teacher Shortages and Recruitment Incentives. <https://www.reachinghighernh.org/content-item/495/teachersalary>
- Ronfeldt, M., Loeb, S., & Wyckoff, J. (2013). How teacher turnover harms student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, 50(1), 4–36.
<https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831212463813>
- Sorensen, L. C., & Ladd, H. F. (2020). The hidden costs of teacher turnover. *AERA Open*, 6(1), Article 233285842090581. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2332858420905812>
- Tan, T. S., Arellano, I., & Patrick, S. K. (2024). *State teacher shortages 2024 update: Teaching positions left vacant or filled by teachers without full certification*. Learning Policy Institute. <https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/state-teacher-shortages-vacancy-2024>

Appendix A**Teacher Mentor Program Guide****SAU #34 Mentor Program****Proudly serving the communities of****Hillsboro, Deering, Washington, and Windsor****2025-2026 Mentor Team**

Shannon Adamo, ES Teacher

Rebecca Bagtaz, ES Teacher

John Bramley, HS Teacher

Jessica Granger, MS Teacher

Jeni Laliberte, Director of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment

Gregory Lefko, MS Teacher

Abigail McHugh, HS Teacher, Lead Mentor

Melissa Moultroup, MS Teacher, Mentor Program Co-Coordinator, Lead Mentor

Danielle Parenteau, ES Teacher, Lead Mentor

Jocelyn Perrin, HS Teacher

Kimberly Wesler, ES Teacher

Jeni LaLiberte, CAGS (jlaliberte@hdsd.org)

Melissa Moultroup, EdD (mmoultroup@hdsd.org)

August 2025

Table of Contents

Vision Statement	4
Mission Statement	4
Program Staff and Roles	5
Mentor Program Components - Year 1.....	7
Mentor Training and Professional Development.....	7
New Staff Orientation.....	7
Mentor/Mentee Meetings.....	7
Building Cohort Meetings.....	8
District Cohort Meetings.....	8
Mentor Accountability System and Data Collection.....	9
Peer Observation.....	10
Mentor Program Components - Year 2.....	12
Building Cohort Meetings.....	12
District Cohort Meetings.....	12
Peer Observations.....	12

Vision Statement

Through the SAU #34 Mentor Program, we hope to encourage self-reflection, develop quality instruction, and empower employees in a positive, collaborative, and supportive environment.

Mission Statement

We will achieve our vision through the following:

1. Focused and direct conversations
2. Thoughtful mentor/mentee pairings
3. Consistent and open communication
4. Needs-based differentiation
5. Meaningful professional development
6. Accountability for applicable staff

Program Staff and Roles

The mentor program is designed to provide support for every first-year staff member, including teachers, nurses, and school counselors. Several veteran staff members participate in the program in the following roles:

1. Mentor Program Coordinators - One district administrator and one mentor collaborate to:
 - a. Facilitate mentor training and ongoing professional development
 - b. Support mentors with resources and information
 - c. Provide orientation for newly hired staff
 - d. Support mentees, as needed
 - e. Coordinate monthly new staff workshops/meetings
 - f. Collect and analyze data regarding the program's effectiveness
 - g. Revise and edit the components of the mentor program, as needed
2. Lead Mentors - One lead mentor in each school works to:
 - a. Act as a liaison between mentors and administrators, mentors and mentees, and mentees and administrators (as necessary)
 - b. Plan and coordinate building cohort meetings with mentors and mentees
 - c. Ensure data collection occurs at designated meetings
 - d. Collaborate with the school principal on the selection and hiring of mentors
 - e. Support mentors, as needed
 - f. Aid in the scheduling of choice workshops for mentees, when professionals outside of the mentoring program are needed
 - g. Coordinate peer observations for first- and second-year mentees
 - h. Perform mid-year mentee check-in through a Google Form and follow-up with mentors, as needed

- i. Check monthly mentor/mentee meeting logs and follow-up with mentors, as needed
 - j. Review mentor program at the end of the school year and make suggestions using analyzed data
3. Mentors - Each mentor works to:
- a. Provide support for one newly hired staff member in a variety of ways, such as:
 - i. Monthly one-on-one meetings
 - ii. Check-ins on an as-needed basis
 - iii. Peer observations
 - iv. Providing resources and information
 - v. Acting as a liaison between mentee and administrators, if needed
 - b. Maintain and submit monthly meeting logs
 - c. Participate in ongoing training and professional development
 - d. Plan and implement at least one new staff workshop/meeting (this is optional)
 - e. Coordinate observations for mentees in other professionals' classrooms and/or environments
 - f. Participate in the data collection process and help to revise the program, as need

Mentor Program Components - Year 1

What is happening?	Who is responsible?	When does this happen?	What are the details?
Mentor Training and Professional Development	Program Coordinators Mentors (attendees)	One full-day in summer 3x per year for one hour	Focus on adult learning theory Data analysis review and constant program revision Check-ins regarding mentees and who may need additional support
New Staff Orientation	Program Coordinators Mentors	Two full days in August	One day dedicated to district overview, policies, procedures, access to technology and software programs, goal setting, etc. One day dedicated to building cohort meetings and mentor/mentee meetings
			Mentors coordinate monthly dates/times with their mentees Once these meetings are scheduled, mentors send

Mentor/Mentee Meetings	Mentors and Mentees	1x per month for one hour	meeting dates/times to the program coordinators If a meeting must be canceled for an unforeseen reason, mentors must attempt to reschedule the meeting During summer training, mentors establish pre-determined topics for meetings (see Appendix A) Mentors may include ample time for mentees to discuss any questions/concerns Mentors complete and submit an online meeting log (see Appendix B) Mentors understand the time they spend with their mentee may vary based on their mentee's needs, but monthly meetings are a required component of the program Lead mentors check monthly meeting logs on a monthly basis and follow-up with mentors, as needed
			Lead mentor creates and sends agenda to building mentors one week prior to meeting, seeking feedback

Building Cohort Meetings	Lead Mentors	4x per year for one hour	and making necessary changes prior to the meeting
	Mentors and Mentees (attendees)		Lead mentor ensures all attendees complete the Exit Ticket (see Appendix C and D)
District Cohort Meetings	Program Coordinators	First Year Cohort Meetings	District administrator plans and implements full-cohort meetings with all first-year staff
		4x per year for one hour	Mentees choose a topic to present to their cohort during one of the meetings
	Mentors	SAU Administrator and Mentees	
	Mentees (attendees)	Mentee Choice Workshops	Program Coordinators gather ideas for workshops/discussions from mentors and create a choice workshop schedule (see Appendix E)
		4x per year for one hour	Program Coordinators disseminate the choice workshop schedule to mentors and mentees, coordinate sign-ups, and gather necessary resources/materials

			Presenters design and put on the workshop Mentees attend the workshop/discussion of their choice and complete the exit ticket (see Appendix D)
		Program Review Meeting 1x per year for one hour at the end of the school year	Program Coordinators review collected and analyzed data through exit tickets Program Coordinators disseminate a program review survey for mentors and mentees to complete Program Coordinators analyze end-of-year data and share the analysis at the summer mentor training session
Mentor Program Accountability System	Program Coordinators All Mentors		Mentors complete and submit meeting logs for monthly mentor/mentee meetings (see Appendix B) Mentees and mentors must attend and participate in 70% of all meetings Mentors and mentees complete Exit Tickets for Building Cohort Meetings and Choice Workshops (see Appendix C and D)

	All Mentees		Lead mentors address concerns regarding meeting attendance (for mentors and mentees) with mentors, then seek assistance from program coordinators, if needed Lead mentors check monthly meeting logs and follow-up with mentors, if needed Lead mentors administer mid-year check with mentors, in which they ask if mentors feel their mentees need additional support
Peer Observation Cycles	Program Coordinators Lead Mentors All Mentors All Mentees	2x per year (Fall and Spring)	District administrator selects dates for observations and communicates these dates to building administrators and lead mentors Lead mentors coordinate schedules for observations and communicate these schedules to mentors and mentees within their building Mentor uses the Purposeful Observation method for each cycle (see Appendix F), which includes: 1. Fall - Mentee observes mentor a. Prior to the observation, mentors meet with mentees one-on-one to decide on a

			focus area for observation (this is mentee-driven) b. After the observation, mentor and mentee engage in a meaningful discussion regarding the focus area 2. Spring - Mentor observes mentee a. Prior to the observation, mentors meet with mentees one-on-one to decide on a focus area for observation (this is mentee-driven) b. Mentor completes observation using the Running Time Observation Record (see Appendix G) c. After the observation, mentor and mentee engage in a meaningful discussion regarding the Running Time Observation Record notes
--	--	--	---

Mentor Program Components - Year 2

What is happening?	Who is responsible?	When does this happen?	What are the details?
Building Cohort Meetings	Lead Mentors 2nd Year Mentees	3x per year for one hour	Lead mentor creates and sends agenda to mentees one week prior to meeting, seeking feedback and making necessary changes prior to the meeting Mentors and lead mentors decide on meeting topics at summer training Lead mentor ensures all attendees complete the Exit Ticket (see Appendix D)
District Cohort Meetings	Program Coordinators 2nd Year Mentees	3x per year for one hour	District administrator plans and implements full-cohort meetings with 2nd year staff Mentees complete choice book study and present information to rest of cohort
		Program Review Meeting - 1x per year for one hour	Program Coordinators disseminate a program review survey for mentors and mentees to complete Program Coordinators analyze the data and share

			the analysis at the summer mentor training session
Peer Observations	Program Coordinators Lead Mentors 2nd Year Mentees	2x per year - Fall and Spring semester	Program Coordinators coordinate observation dates with building administrators and communicate those dates to lead mentors (one in the Fall, one in the Spring) Lead mentors coordinate observations for mentees - these observations are intended to give mentees opportunities to see staff members in similar roles