

**GOING FROM GOOD TO GREAT: A STUDY OF TEACHER INDUCTION
PROGRAMS IN SOUTHWESTERN PENNSYLVANIA SCHOOL DISTRICTS**

By

Johannah Mischelle Vanatta

Bachelor of Arts, West Virginia University, 1999

Master of Education, West Virginia University, 2000

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of

The School of Education in partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education

University of Pittsburgh

2012

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

This dissertation was presented

by

Johannah M. Vanatta

It was defended on

November 27th 2012

and approved by

Charlene Trovato PhD, Associate Chairperson, Administrative and Policy Studies

Diane Kirk EdD, Associate Professor, Administrative and Policy Studies

Joseph Werlinich MEd, Emeritus Assistant/Associate Professor, Administrative and Policy
Studies

Dissertation Advisor: William Bickel PhD, Professor, Administrative and Policy Studies

Copyright © by Johannah Vanatta

2012

GOING FROM GOOD TO GREAT: A STUDY OF TEACHER INDUCTION PROGRAMS IN SOUTHWESTERN PENNSYLVANIA SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Johannah M. Vanatta, EdD

University of Pittsburgh 2012

The purpose of this study was to focus on how school districts are incorporating effective teacher induction programs in their school districts. The goal of the study was to identify effective research based characteristics of teacher induction programs and investigate how these characteristics are or are not utilized in the school district's teacher induction programs.

The research questions assessed how public school districts located in Western Pennsylvania are utilizing research based strategies in their teacher induction programs. After an initial survey of 107 school districts in Allegheny, Westmoreland, and Butler counties, final participants were selected based on the number of new teacher hires in the 2012-2011 school year and the per capita student expenditures. Methods of final data collection were semi-structured interviews with district administrators responsible for the teacher induction program, and the administration of an electronic teacher survey consisting of open and closed ended questions. The interviews were recorded and transcribed to allow for content analysis.

Key findings of the study indicate that time is an essential factor when administering and participating in teacher induction programs; teachers and administrators frequently have different perceptions of the content of teacher induction programs; and research based models are not utilized to the fullest extent within teacher induction programs.

Contents

1.0 CHAPTER ONE.....	10
1.1 INTRODUCTION	10
1.2 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM.....	12
1.3 PURPOSE OF THE STUDY	13
1.4 RESEARCH QUESTIONS	14
2.0 CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	15
2.1 INTRODUCTION	15
2.2 METHODS FOR SELECTING LITERATURE	16
2.3 THE HISTORY OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	16
2.3.1 No Child Left Behind.....	23
2.4 COMPONENTS OF INDUCTION PROGRAMS	25
2.4.1 Thomas Guskey's Standards of Professional Learning	29
2.4.2 Barry Sweeny's Levels of Induction Programs	33
2.4.3 Setting the Standards: The Rise of INTASC.....	38
2.5 CONCLUDING REMARKS	41
3.0 CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY.....	42
3.1 RATIONALE	42
3.2 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM.....	42
3.3 RESEARCH QUESTIONS	43
3.4 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.....	44
3.5 METHODOLOGY	46

3.6 SELECTION PROTOCOL.....	47
3.6.1 Sample School Selection	51
3.7 RESEARCH PROCEDURES.....	54
3.7.1 Data Collection Instruments.....	55
3.7.2 Data Collection Methods.....	56
3.8 DATA ANALYSIS.....	58
3.8.1 Qualitative Analysis	62
3.8.2 Quantitative Analysis	66
3.9 PROFILES.....	69
3.10 CONCLUSION.....	70
4.0 CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS.....	71
4.1 PROFILES FOR SELECTED SCHOOLS	72
4.2 ADDRESSING THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS	74
4.2.1 What are the Espoused Characteristics of the Induction Programs Offered by the Selected School Districts?	75
4.2.2 How Do These Districts Monitor the Quality and Assess the Outcomes of Their Programs? ..87	87
4.2.3 What Do the Selected School Districts Actually Do as Their Teacher Induction Programs from the Perspective of the Teachers?	93
4.2.4 To What Extent do the Selected District's Programs Align with what the Research Tells Us Regarding the Characteristics of Teacher Induction Programs?.....	109
4.3 CONCLUSIONS.....	117
5.0 CHAPTER FIVE CONCLUSIONS, PERSONAL REFLECTIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS .	120
5.1 SUMMARY OF STUDY	120
5.1.1 Restatement and Brief Review of the Problem.....	121

5.2 DISCUSSION OF INTERPRETATIONS AND FINDINGS.....	123
5.2.1 Perceived Disconnect between Administrator and Teacher.....	123
5.2.2 Research Models Utilized.....	127
5.2.3 Time Factor for Administrators and Teachers.....	129
5.3 SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH	131
5.4 LIMITATIONS.....	133
5.5 CONCLUSIONS	134
APPENDIX A: Pennsylvania State Evaluation Form 426	137
APPENDIX B: Superintendent Letter	142
APPENDIX C: Administrator Letter	143
APPENDIX D: Teacher Letter	144
APPENDIX E: Administrator Interview Questions	145
APPENDIX F: Teacher Survey	146
APPENDIX G: Research Questions/Framework Analysis.....	148
APPENDIX H Works Consulted	149
REFERENCES	156

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2-1: <i>Guskey's Five Elements of Professional Development</i>	30
Table 2-2: <i>Guskey's Standards for Professional Learning</i>	32
Table 2-3: <i>Sweeny's Induction Models</i>	37
Table 2-4: <i>InTASC Standards as Presented in CCSSO (n.d.)</i>	39
Table 3-1: <i>Sweeny's Induction Models</i>	45
Table 3-2: <i>School Districts Hiring at Least Seven Teachers during the 2011-2012 School Year</i>	52
Table 3-3: <i>Selected School Districts</i>	53
Table 3-4: <i>Research Questions as Related to Interview and Teacher Survey Questions</i>	60
Table 3-5: <i>Sweeny's Induction Models</i>	63
Table 3-6: <i>Research Questions and Framework Analysis</i>	68
Table 3-7: <i>District Profile Components</i>	69
Table 4-1: <i>District Administrator Components</i>	72
Table 4-2: <i>District Profile Components</i>	73
Table 4-3: <i>Emergent Themes for Research Question One</i>	86
Table 4-4: <i>Identified Themes for Monitoring and Evaluation of Teacher Induction Programs</i>	93
Table 4-5: <i>School District A Electronic Survey Results</i>	95
Table 4-6: <i>School District B Electronic Survey Results</i>	98
Table 4-7: <i>School District C Electronic Survey Results</i>	100
Table 4-8: <i>School District D Electronic Survey Results</i>	103
Table 4-9: <i>District D Open-Ended Responses Regarding Improving the District's Induction Program</i>	104
Table 4-10: <i>School District E Electronic Survey Results</i>	106

Table 4-11: <i>Emergent Themes in Open-Ended Responses to the Electronic Survey</i> * indicates total responses from electronic survey.....	108
Table 4-12: <i>District Classification According To Sweeny's Model</i>	117

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My deepest appreciation and gratitude is extended to a number of people who supported and encouraged me throughout the process of this dissertation. To my committee, Mr. Joseph Werlinich, Dr. William Bickel, Dr. Diane Kirk, and Dr. Charlene Trovato, I thank you for your genuine interest, time, and input in this study.

To my husband, Aaron Vanatta, for his constant support, reassurance, and encouragement throughout this dissertation and doctoral process. I am truly blessed to have you by my side. For my daughters, Julia and Grace Vanatta, who have been extremely patient and giving of their time. It is to the three of you for whom I dedicate this work.

To my incredible mother, who instilled a passion for education and a desire for learning beyond any I have acquired in an institution or textbook. Thank you for all you sacrificed in order for your children to prosper.

To my mentors and colleagues within North Hills School District and surrounding school districts who provided guidance and affirmation. Thank you!

1.0 CHAPTER ONE

“We misrepresent the process of learning to teach when we consider new teachers as finished products, when we assume that they mostly need to refine existing skills, or when we treat their learning needs as signs of deficiency in their preparation” (Feiman-Nesmer, 2003, p. 26).

1.1 INTRODUCTION

In 1981, United States Secretary of Education Terrel H. Bell announced that something is seriously remiss in our educational system. After funding more than 40 studies, analyzing the most current data, and conferring with administrators, educational experts, teachers, and students, the National Center on Education and the Economy (NCEE) produced a 1983 report entitled *A Nation at Risk* (Edmondson, 2007). The report stated how America was “mediocre” in educational performance.

Thirty-one years have passed since this report was made public, and America is still battling the same global battle. Out of 34 countries in the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), the United States was recently ranked 14th for reading skills, 17th for science, and 25th for mathematics (United States Department of Education, 2008). Pennsylvania students are feeling the pressure of these rankings through various standardized assessments such as the Pennsylvania System of School Assessment (PSSA), 4-Sight, Terra-Nova, and Keystone exams. The demands placed upon schools to make Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) have deterred many new teachers from remaining in the profession (United States Department of Education, 2008).

The United States Department of Education, school administrators, educators, and researchers have argued that the answer lies in addressing these shocking statistics (Guskey, 2000). The overwhelming response has been professional development, specifically for new teachers (Guskey, 2000). This demand for teacher professional development¹ has sparked discussion among teachers, administrators, and policy-makers as to what the appropriate content and delivery of such programs. Many teachers and administrators have questioned the characteristics of ideal professional development programs and, even more specifically, teacher induction programs.

In order to address some of these quandaries, one can turn to the business literature, specifically the literature of Collins (2001). Business owners, large and small, concern themselves with the issues of profitability, considering many facets as they weigh cost-benefit risks. They may reflect upon their product output/input, retention of employees, gross product, and annual fiscal gains, amongst many other areas of business operation. Ultimately, businesses want to see growth and financial gains. In Collins's (2001) book, *Good to Great: Why Some Companies Make the Leap...and Others Don't*, the Starbucks Corporation is cited among many "great" companies. Starbucks managed to transform from a 'good' to a 'great' company by focusing on employee induction and professional development to shape workers into an 'employee mold' that aligned with the company's vision (Collins, 2001). As such intense employee induction and professional development involves both time and financial commitment, a large portion of the Starbucks Corporation's budget and training were directed toward its employees; however, the gains mustered from this investment have far outweighed the costs

¹ For purposes of this research, *teacher professional development* will refer to the ongoing, intentional, systemic educational training opportunities available to educators in their schools and districts, as based off of the definitions and descriptions provided by Guskey (2000).

(Collins, 2001). By consistent training, the company was able to move its corporate identification from ‘good to great.’

If equating the ‘Starbucks scenario’ with public education, one could expect to find that the more investment put into teacher professional development, the more ‘greatness’ we would see in those teachers. How can we develop ‘good’ teachers into ‘great’ teachers? What programs are in place to assist new teachers in the development of successful educational strategies, community resources, and building supportive relationships in their schools? Can schools somehow mirror the philosophy of the Starbucks Corporation by investing in the growth and development of new hires and put into place teacher induction programs with effective characteristics grounded in research-supported strategies and theory?

In this introductory chapter, a rationale for this study will be presented, followed by a statement of the problem, purpose of the study, and specific research questions. This study will aim to examine the extent to which selected school districts effectively employ the characteristics of research-based teacher induction programs.

1.2 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

American students compete globally in the academic sector. American schools prepare students for the global market and post-secondary education upon graduation from public education institutions. Teachers and administrators are essential to this purpose, and, as stated by Edmondson (2007), “we must be able to give teachers needed skill set to prepare our students” (p. 3). In fact, researchers state that a well-prepared teacher can have a greater impact on student achievement than poverty, language background, and minority status (Davis, Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, & Meyerson, 2005).

After teacher pre-service training, teacher professional development is the next major step towards improving teachers' practices (Wong, 2004). High quality intensive professional development programs are crucial to train, support, and retain quality teachers (Wong, 2004). These induction programs improve teachers' classroom management patterns and instructional strategies, provide opportunities for new teachers to observe master teachers in demonstration lessons, and acculturate new teachers to the district (Wong, 2004).

If teacher induction programs are thought to reap benefits for schools, then it is important to evaluate the quality of teacher induction programs in which teachers participate (Wong, 2004). In Pennsylvania, the Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE) teacher induction programs are a requirement for permanent certification and ultimately tenure. The induction programs must address the needs of the schools, the teachers, and the community, as well as contain mechanisms for program evaluation grounded in research and aligned with standards (Wong, 2004). However, in many school districts, teacher induction programs do not embody the characteristics of effective, researched models (Wong, 2004). If we are to begin investigating what practices impact public education, we must first look at the characteristics and practices of our teacher induction programs.

1.3 PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

This study aims to examine reliable research that addresses issues related to professional development, specifically teacher induction programs within public schools. The advantages and shortcomings of various induction programs, effects of federal mandates on induction programs, and the characteristics of induction programs will be viewed through the lens of various researchers and then applied to five selected school districts in Southwestern Pennsylvania.

Through an examination of induction programs in these school districts, this study intends to assemble and discuss the empirical evidence that contributes to answering the burgeoning question: *To what extent do selected school districts use effective characteristics within their teacher induction programs?*

1.4 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Several sub-questions underscore this main line of inquiry that relate to the development, implementation, and monitoring of teaching induction programs. In the following literature review, the author will determine the components of teachers induction programs as indicated by reputable research (i.e., What does the research state are components of teacher induction programs?). The subsequent study will address the following questions as they related to the five selected districts in Southwestern Pennsylvania:

1. What are the espoused characteristics of the induction programs offered by the selected school districts?
2. How do these districts monitor the quality and assess the outcomes of their induction programs?
3. What do the chosen school districts actually do as their teacher induction programs from the perspective of the teachers?
4. To what extent do the induction programs in the selected school districts align with what the research tells us regarding the characteristics of high quality teacher induction programs?

2.0 CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

“Never before in the history of education has there been greater recognition of the importance of professional development. Every modern proposal to reform, restructure, or transform schools emphasizes professional development as a primary vehicle in efforts to bring about needed change. With this increased recognition, however, has come increased scrutiny. Questions are being raised about the effectiveness of all forms of professional development in education. And with these questions have come increased demands for demonstrable results. Legislators, policy makers, funding agencies, and the general public all want to know if professional development programs really make a difference” (Guskey, 1995, p. 42).

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The intent of this literature review is to describe the characteristics of successful induction programs as indicated by research. First, the methodology for selecting and evaluating the research for review concerning teacher induction programs will be explained, followed by a brief history of professional development as it pertains to induction programs. Then, this review will focus on induction programs in the public school systems of the United States, as well as the impact of No Child Left Behind on the public school induction programs. The review will describe the components of teacher induction programs and standards that have been established for induction programs as discussed by researchers in the field of professional development. By the conclusion of this review, the reader will understand the history behind and development of teacher induction programs, key components of high quality programs.

2.2 METHODS FOR SELECTING LITERATURE

Literature was selected for this review based on relevance, scholarship, empirical nature, and quality. Relevance of the selected literature was determined by evaluating whether a document provided insight to the issues regarding teacher induction programs within public education in the United States. In order to further ensure relevance, the author primarily used studies published after 2006; however, there were some seminal cases, research, and documentation that were essential to include from previous years. Because of the importance of the older research, in many instances it was paralleled to newer research to provide both comparison and contrast.

In addition to the emphasis on relevance, selected literature was restricted to sources of a scholarly nature, with primary emphasis lying on articles published in peer-reviewed journals and by reputable organizations. Hence, the articles, case studies, books, and journals included in this review were considered rigorous in quality by the author. These articles and other sources include qualitative, quantitative, and theoretical work, and were found through various keyword and database searches of library databases and educational journals. When browsing these sources, attention was devoted to the context, organization, publication, and content while emphasizing the importance of research-based materials.

The research chosen is that which is most relevant to this study's research questions and able to show what various researchers consider effective characteristics when creating a teacher induction program or reviewing a current program.

2.3 THE HISTORY OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

A prodigious amount of literature exists regarding professional development in public education, but there is a limited amount of empirical research regarding teacher induction programs in

public education. Specifically, there is a dearth in information addressing how school districts evaluate their progress in regards to research-based strategies, standards, and models. To understand current trends in induction programs, it is necessary to detail the professional development trends from the history of American education and education reform.

Teacher professional development is not a new idea. In-service trainings designed to help teachers improve their instructional practices began in the 1850s. At this time, many teachers were untrained and had little knowledge of subject matter, and in-service training programs were designed to help inexperienced teachers attain knowledge and skills. In the 19th and early 20th centuries, the general public considered teachers as being poorly educated and ‘deficient’ in teaching skills, and in-service education focused on large group instruction at teacher institutes with the purpose of correcting teacher deficiencies (Corey, 1957).

Cook (1977) reported that prior to World War I, a spirit of reform flourished and affected almost every aspect of American life. Teddy Roosevelt’s creation of the Panama Canal inspired administrative progressives to develop a blueprint for educational progress (Tyack and Cuban, 1995). From 1900 to 1950, administrative progressives shaped the agenda and implementation of school reform more powerfully than any other group in the past (Tyack and Cuban, 1995). The Progressive Education Movement was in full force during the first two decades of the century and consisted of two branches: John Dewey’s “child-centered wing” and the “mass education wing² often associated with Edward Thorndike (Levin, 1991).

A shift toward the use of workshops for teacher professional development occurred in the late 1930s (Corey, 1957). New ideas about motivation and learning led to a transition in beliefs

² While commonly referred to as the mass education wing, this branch was at times called the administrative wing.

about the main purpose of in-service programs for teachers (Corey, 1957). While the prior purpose of professional development focused on correcting individual teacher deficiencies, in-service programs evolved towards generating cooperative, problem-solving approaches to instruction (Corey, 1957). Hass (1957) described in-service education as the activities that educational professionals participate in for continuous, on-the-job improvements. In-service education was expected to assist educators as they learned the profession, to help educators eliminate deficiencies, to aid educators with understanding a rapidly expanding knowledge base, and to promote the development of common values among educators (Hass, 1957).

As part of a 1932 work relief in Education program, unemployed teachers were hired to teach other unemployed adults (Cook, 1977). In 1930, a group of educators concerned with curriculum in public schools decided to form the Society for Curriculum Study, which eventually merged with the Directors and Supervisors of Instruction of the National Education Association to form the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD), which still remains a powerful force in the professional development of teachers (Tyler, 1987). Perhaps the most significant reform stemming from 1930s was the Progressive Education Association's eight-year study conducted between 1933 and 1941, which focused on reform to secondary education that benefited both teachers and students (Tyack & Cuban, 1995). For the first time, teachers had the opportunity to work together, instead of in isolation. In addition, the study initiated mandatory professional development opportunities for teachers provided on-site during teachers' non-instructional time, which became commonly known as *in-service workshops* (Tyack & Cuban, 1995).

In the Post-World War II and Cold War era, new ways of looking at learning evolved. The Progressive Education Association became impractical as post-war America looked for

ways to insert more authoritarianism into its schools (Tyack & Cuban, 1995). Although in-service workshops continued in the decades following the 1930s, much of effectiveness was lost as side-to-side activities and teacher collaboration, highlighted in the study, was replaced by a top-down approach to professional development (Tyack & Cuban, 1995). Surrounded by World War II's threats to American power, schools paid less attention to teacher sharing and creative curricula and more attention to strengthening the sense of authority within the schools (Tyack & Cuban, 1995).

This shift towards authority resulted in an era of re-examination in education during the 1950s (Cohen & Barnes, 1999). Fear, memories of hard times, devaluation of the dollar, military spending, and social unrest resulted in the advent of school criticism that would spread into the rest of the century began here (Cohen & Barnes, 1999). The professional development needs of educators in the 1950s were linked to gaining subject knowledge and increasing expertise in teaching methods (Hass, 1957). Educators were expected to adapt their teaching to match the needs of individual students and to increase their own personal skills and abilities for working co-operatively with colleagues. Therefore, teacher professional development was expected to assist educators in developing skills and knowledge to address the individual needs of learners, to modify the behavior and attitudes of educators, and to address the growing social concerns of American education (Corey, 1957).

During the 1950's, many Americans could remember the devastation of the Great Depression and turned careful attention to whether or not the schools were producing educated young citizens (Scott & Hill, 1954). An overall uncertainty about the security of the nation prompted citizens to worry about the shrinking value of the dollar and the fact that the government was spending so many of those dollars. Social unrest about the publicly perceived

decline of morality inspired some to look to the schools as a source of society's problem (Scott & Hill, 1954).

Tyack and Cuban (1995) noted that educational reformers attacked the 'mediocrity' of academic performance, poor discipline, and lackadaisical teachers. Some critics argued that students were permitted to waste time in class and were becoming lazy (Tyack and Cuban, 1995). Fueled by the social frustrations and anxieties of Americans in the 1950s, schools were accused of ignoring the basics, becoming too easy in regards to content, becoming too permissive in regards to discipline, offering insignificant courses, leading the young toward socialism, failing to get students ready for college, and poorly preparing students for the job market (Scott & Hill, 1954).

Educational reform of the 1960s originated from the government and individual schools themselves (Tyack & Cuban, 1995). Government reform was derived from Lyndon B. Johnson's idea to build a great American society by declaring war on poverty. Through the war on poverty he indicated that the answer to all our national problems comes down to education (Tyack & Cuban, 1995). With the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Elementary and Secondary Education Act, 1965), Johnson hoped that schools would prevent poverty. In 1965, Lyndon B. Johnson urged the field of education to pay attention to research on teaching and learning (Tyack & Cuban, 1995). There were increased concerns about the science and mathematics curriculum and instruction, and the use of films, tape recorders, and television added a new layer of complexity to teaching and learning practices (Fenstermacher & Berliner, 1985). Teachers were faced with rapid change and how to utilize these technological innovations in their profession. Dillon (1976) reported that school districts began to push professional development to try to alleviate some of the public dissatisfaction with education and

to address emergence of technology as a teaching tool.

Some of the educational reforms from the 1970s were continuations of the reforms of the 1960s, and some reflected criticisms specific to the 1970s (Tyack & Cuban, 1995). As the public trusted the government less and less because of the Watergate Scandal, that lack of trust began to filter into other areas in the 1970s, resulting in a period of turmoil for teachers and students (Tyack & Cuban, 1995). Confidence in public schools certainly reflected the waning confidence in the government. Schools were called mediocre while teachers were blamed for letting students down, and staff development began to reflect these public criticisms and expectations of schools (Dillon, 1976). Since schools were to become a solution for social problems (as emphasized by Johnson's regime), teachers relied upon training and professional development as a potential cure. As a result, professional development was becoming more localized, and school leaders would decide for themselves what they needed to cover. Once again, staff development became more side-to-side, rather than top down: teachers and school administrators would conduct their own sessions, rather than depending on college personnel to provide professional development (Dillon, 1976).

As the nation entered the 1980's the nature of education was changing and competing with Japan became an issue. The *Nation at Risk* (1983) report listed seven recommendations for improving teacher quality:

- higher standards for teacher-preparation programs;
- teacher salaries that were professionally competitive and performance-based;
- 11-month contracts for teachers allowing more time for curriculum improvement and professional development;
- career ladders that differentiated teachers based on experience and skill;
- more resources devoted to teacher-shortage areas;

- incentives for drawing highly qualified applicants into the profession; and
- mentoring programs for novice teachers that were designed by experienced teachers.

Within a year of the *Nation at Risk* report, reform initiatives were underway in every state, and more than 275 state-level task forces were working on educational issues (United States Department of Education, 1984). Not since the National Defense Education Act of 1958 passed in response to the Soviet launching of Sputnik had the nation exhibited such determination to reform public education (Fuhrman, 2003). However, the resulting standards revolution differed from the curricular reforms that followed Sputnik, as these new reforms emphasized test-driven accountability and deregulation measures such as charter schools, vouchers, privatization, and takeovers (Fuhrman, 2003).

The new programs of the mid-1980's, commonly referred to as *mentoring programs*, took on the role of defining or shaping young educators (Harris & Goertz, 2008). These programs aimed to help new teachers successfully navigate the transition between the teacher preparation program and to the act of teaching in the classroom by pairing them with experienced teachers (Harris & Goertz, 2008). The programs later transitioned into what educators commonly refer today as induction programs (Harris & Goertz, 2008).

A maelstrom of induction programs has dominated the last two decades in American public school systems. Some of these programs were based upon a standards-based vision, which was enacted in federal law under the Clinton administration with the Improving America's Schools Act (IASA), which was the 1994 reauthorization of the ESEA. IASA required states to set challenging and rigorous content standards for all students and develop assessments that aligned with the Act's standards in order to measure student progress (Improving America's Schools Act, 1994). By holding schools accountable for meeting the standards, the government

expected teachers and those at other levels in the education system to redirect their efforts and find ways to improve student achievement. It was assumed that with sufficient motivation, teachers and other relevant school personnel would find the means to improve instruction. Unfortunately, early implementation research showed that many schools lacked an understanding of the changes that were needed and the capacity by which to make them happen (Elmore & Rothman, 1999). Many induction programs were developed with mentors as the focus, but many times, beginning teachers were not receiving the needed support and structure to become effective change agents in the classrooms (Elmore & Rothman, 1999).

2.3.1 No Child Left Behind

The standards-based vision established under President Clinton was carried forward under President George W. Bush with the most recent reauthorization of ESEA, deemed the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB). With NCLB calling for states to set standards for designating all public school teachers as highly qualified and requiring districts to notify parents if their child's teacher does not meet these standards, the Act emphasized the education of every child by a highly qualified teacher (No Child Left Behind [NCLB], 2002). The mandates of NCLB (2002) applied to all teachers of core academic subjects and to teachers who provide instruction to students with limited English proficiency (LEP) and students with disabilities.

NCLB (2002) established an accountability of schools for ensuring that all students reach proficiency on state assessments by 2014, making it vital for teachers to have the knowledge and skills needed for effective instruction; hence, the Act supported ongoing professional development for all teachers regardless of their highly qualified status. NCLB (2002) defined professional development as activities that “are high quality, sustained, intensive, and classroom-

focused in order to have a positive and lasting impact on classroom instruction and the teacher's performance in the classroom; and are not 1-day or short-term workshops or conferences" (p. 1).

According to the Act, professional development must include activities that improve and increase teacher knowledge of the academic subjects they teach. They should enable teachers to become highly qualified and advance teacher understanding of effective instructional strategies and activities that are an integral part of broad school-wide and district-wide educational improvement (NCLB, 2002). NCLB (2002) acknowledged and supported professional development as a key strategy for improving knowledge and skills for all teachers, regardless of their highly qualified status. The quality of the professional development that teachers receive is critically important if professional development is to have the intended effects of improving instruction and student learning (Birman et al., 2009). Therefore, a significant component to this improvement movement was the development of induction programs.

One of the main policy responses to the problems of turnover and inadequate preparation among beginning teachers was to support them with a formal, comprehensive induction program (O'Donnell, Reeve, & Smith, 2009). The practice of teacher induction is common in many public schools, but a program that is intensive, comprehensive, and structured in response to teacher's specific needs was not (O'Donnell et al., 2009).

Congressional interest in formal, comprehensive teacher induction programs has grown in recent years. NCLB (2002) emphasized the importance of teacher quality in student improvement. The *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants* program provides nearly 3 billion dollars per year to states to train, recruit, and prepare highly qualified teachers (IES). In addition, the Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2008 authorized grants that included teacher induction or mentoring programs for new teachers.

In the 21st century, education is becoming a more competitive business enterprise. Like all other investments, schools spend money, effort, and time in education and expect quality returns, making education an institution to be rated based on its cost effectiveness. The outcomes, calculated in terms of economic, social, and political gains, are what motivate people to invest heavily in education (O'Donnell et al., 2009). According to Darling-Hammond (1999), each dollar spent on improving teachers' qualifications nets greater gains in student learning than any other use of educational funds. However, these gains are dependent on the quality of the teachers, and realistically, it takes time for one to become an effective teacher (Darling-Hammond, 1999). At whatever cost, it is notable that good instruction derives from the effective professional development of teachers (O'Donnell et al., 2009).

In 2012, educators are quite clear that professional development is an essential aspect of teacher growth, and it begins with providing a strong foundation for novice teachers upon entry in to the public school systems. Yet, the question still remains as to *how* schools use this research as they choose and incorporate induction programs and attempt to measure the efficacy of these programs.

2.4 COMPONENTS OF INDUCTION PROGRAMS

Research suggests that quality induction programs can make a difference in relation to teaching practices (Breaux & Wong, 2003). Hence, schools must offer the support and consistency to enable beginning teachers to teach effectively and to continue their own educational development (Breaux & Wong, 2003). In fact, Breaux and Wong (2003) indicated that beginning teachers should be a part of a strong induction program that goes beyond an orientation or assignment of a mentor and helps to develop and cultivate an "attitude of lifelong

learning.”

Traditionally, induction programs did not provide professional development for beginning teachers. Rather, the programs simply oriented the teachers to the day-to-day operations of the school. Ingersoll and Smith (2004) analyzed the NCES Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) for 1999-2000 and the Teacher Follow-Up survey for 2000-2001 to determine the impact of teacher participation in a formal induction program on their teaching practice. Results indicated that there are significant discrepancies between existing programs (Ingersoll & Smith, 2004), thereby determining the need for further investigation into the necessary requirements for highly effective teacher induction programming.

Empirical evidence states that ideal induction programs are comprehensive, with some programs following the beginning teacher for three years or more. The National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future (NCTAF) noted that the most important influence on what students learn in school is what teachers know and what teachers do (NCTAF, 1996). Of the five recommendations for change in the educational system proposed by NCTAF, one recommendation addressed the development of higher quality teacher professional development that begins within the teachers first year (Edmondson, 2007).

Reportedly, more than 80% of beginning teachers report participating in an induction program (Ingersoll & Smith, 2004). These programs, however, vary in content, and often, “there is a mismatch between the needs of these new teachers and the supports they received” (Johnson, Kardos, Kauffman, Liu, & Donaldson, 2004, p. 12). In many districts, induction programs consist of a “one-year program that assists the beginning teacher to become acclimated with the district and to transition through the first year of teaching” (Partlow, 2006, p. 33).

However, comprehensive new teacher induction programs are crucial to train, support,

and retain quality teachers (Wong, 2003). Induction programs may contain a mentoring component, but an effective induction program will go far beyond pairing a novice teacher with a veteran teacher or mentor. These programs will help new teachers develop “effective classroom management patterns and instructional strategies, provide opportunities for new teachers to observe master teachers in demonstration lessons, and acculturate new teachers to the district” (Wong, 2003, p. 49).

As the demands grow for teacher development and retention, demand for induction programs grow as well. Induction programs have become a way to provide emotional support to newly hired teachers (Feiman-Nemser, 2003). Newly hired teachers account for a large portion of teacher exodus, with many of these new teachers reporting that they frequently feel overwhelmed within their first year (Ingersoll, 2003). In fact, data from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) and Teacher Follow-up Survey indicate that between 40-50% of teachers leave the profession within the first five years (Ingersoll, 2003). Of those beginning teachers 19% stated they left due to staffing such as layoffs, cutbacks, or other termination, and another 42% stated they left for personal reasons. The remaining 39% left to pursue better jobs, and 29% cited dissatisfaction with their jobs (Ingersoll, 2003).

The constant scramble by school administrators to find new, qualified teachers to replace those leaving for other jobs constitutes an increasing drain on the educational system’s human and financial resources. Providing better teacher training and professional development (by means of induction programs) may be one solution to the teacher attrition crisis (Edmondson, 2007). Through induction programs, teachers may find the needed support to continue in the teaching profession and not suffer from teacher a premature departure from the field due to

emotional burnout.

Furthermore, researchers also have examined the perceptions of beginning teachers and their principals regarding the problems new teachers face, role expectations, and assistance they receive (Partlow, 2006). Beginning teachers indicated that classroom management and discipline were their biggest concerns, followed by “instructing mainstreamed students, determining appropriate expectations for students, dealing with stress, and handling angry parents” (Partlow, 2006, p. 36). .

Ideal induction programs not only address these concerns of emotional and professional support, but they address other concerns so as to transform ‘good’ teachers into ‘great’ teachers. Feiman-Nemser (2003) stated that “we must treat the first years of teaching as a phase in learning to teach and surround new teachers with a professional culture that supports teacher learning” (p. 25). An induction program is very much like a professional development program where the prime purpose is to help teachers “articulate their voices” as a way of constructing and reconstructing the purposes and the priorities in the work, both individually and collectively (Partlow, 2006). Hence, induction programs must be personalized to meet the needs of teachers, with teachers working collaboratively in structuring the program and ask questions specific to their needs. As the needs of teachers change with the statutes of the current times and with the needs of the specific schools, so to must the school’s induction programs.

Because post-NCLB induction programs were developed in a historical time period ridden with assessment and accountability mandates and increasingly diverse K-12 student populations, these programs place distinct emphasis on several categories that are indicative of the time (Wood & Stanulis, 2009). Post-NCLB induction programs focus on (a) ensuring teacher quality, (b) developing a teaching practice for diverse learners, and (c) increasing student

achievement through improving teacher performance (Arends & Rigazio-DiGilio, 2000; Alliance for Excellent Education (AEE), 2004; Fletcher, Strong, & Villar, 2008). These modern-day induction programs reflect the current needs of new teachers. New teachers need supportive programs based upon researched methods and practices in order to survive the profession in today's educational setting (Wong, 2004).

Several researchers and organizations have investigated the qualities that lead to highly effective induction programs that meet the needs of modern-day beginning teacher. Specifically, specific characteristics inherent to successful induction programs have been provided in three seminal works: Thomas Guskey's Five Elements of Professional Development and Standards for Staff Development, Barry Sweeny's three Induction Models, and the InTASC Standards for Professional Development.³ In the following sections, each of these works will be reviewed, highlighting the essential elements of successful teacher induction programs.

2.4.1 Thomas Guskey's Standards of Professional Learning

In 2000, Thomas Guskey, a prominent researcher in the field of education, outlined a five-step process for evaluating professional development in education and its connection to professional development planning. Guskey based his five-step model on the work of Donald Kirkpatrick, the developer of a model for the evaluation of training programs in business and industry.

Guskey states:

“My thinking was influenced by the work of Donald Kirkpatrick, who developed a model for evaluating training programs in business and industry. Kirkpatrick described four levels of evaluation that he found necessary in determining the value and worth of

³ These works will later form the basis for a series of evaluative tools to utilize in this study of the characteristics of induction programs in Western Pennsylvania.

training programs.” (Guskey, 2000, p. 1)

By utilizing the “levels” of Kirkpatrick, Guskey was able to further his work on the categories of professional development regarding teacher development.

Guskey (2000) established five elements (listed in Figure 2-1) that describe teacher professional development. Guskey’s first element is the participants’ reactions to the training,

Table 2-1: Guskey’s Five Elements of Professional Development

-
- Participants reactions to the training
 - Influence of the training
 - Knowledge gained from the training
 - Effects on productivity attributable to the training
 - Organizational support and change for the training
-

determining whether the reaction was positive or negative (Guskey, 2000). Guskey’s second element was related how the training influenced the teachers and what carried over into their job, and his third element addressed what new knowledge and/or skills participants gained from the training (Guskey, 2000). Guskey’s forth element relates to teacher productively (i.e., did this training make the teacher more productive in the classroom)? Lastly, the fifth element involved the role of organizational support and change: when the teachers return to the classrooms and/or their schools, are they receiving the support from their administrators and colleagues to continue the training they have received?

The initial “Guskey Model,” as it has become known, further advanced into a model entitled *The Five Elements of Professional Development and Standards*, which the National Staff Development Council (NSDC) adopted. These five elements quickly became essential components to teacher induction programs and also teacher professional development. Additionally, Guskey (2000) recognized that it is imperative that the teachers receive the support and structure to continue to nurture successes in their classes, as clearly stated in the fifth

element:

Experts suggest that when educators engage in professional development endeavors, results might not be evident for two or three years. But when teachers are experimenting with a new approach to instruction or new curriculum they need to gain evidence rapidly to show that it's making a difference. They need support and evidence. If they don't see such evidence, they quite naturally revert back to the tried and true things they have done in the past. (Gusky, as quoted in Kreider & Bouffard, p. 2, 2005).

Hence, in planning professional development and induction programs, Guskey suggested that there must be some mechanism whereby those responsible for implementation can gain evidence of student success rather quickly.

After publishing *The Five Elements of Professional Development and Standards*, Guskey took his research even further and developed the *Standards for Professional Learning*, which NCDC also adopted. Prior to Guskey's research and development of the *Five Elements...* and *Standards for Professional Learning...* school professional development (including teacher induction programs) had very little with which to gauge their programs (Learning Forward, 2011).

Table 2-2: Guskey's Standards for Professional Learning

Context Standards	Process Standards	Content Standards
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organizes adults into learning communities whose goals are aligned with those of the school and district. (Learning Communities) Requires skillful school and district leaders who guide continuous instructional improvement. (Leadership) Requires resources to support adult learning and collaboration. (Resources) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uses disaggregated student data to determine adult learning priorities, monitor progress, and help sustain continuous improvement. (Data-Driven) Uses multiple sources of information to guide improvement and demonstrate its impact. (Evaluation) Prepares educators to apply research to decision making. (Research-Based) Uses learning strategies appropriate to the intended goal. (Design) Applies knowledge about human learning and change. (Learning) Provides educators with the knowledge and skills to collaborate. (Collaboration) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prepares educators to understand and appreciate all students, create safe, orderly and supportive learning environments, and hold high expectations for their academic achievement. (Equity) Deepens educators' content knowledge, provides them with research-based instructional strategies to assist students in meeting rigorous academic standards, and prepares them to use various types of classroom assessments appropriately. (Quality Teaching) Provides educators with knowledge and skills to involve families and other stakeholders appropriately. (Family Involvement)

As can be seen in Table 2-2, these standards are organized into three overarching categories (i.e., context standards, process standards, and content standards) that incorporate learning communities, leadership, data, design, research-based strategies, quality teaching, and family involvement with the overarching goal to improve the learning of all students (Learning Forward, 2011). These standards have set a precedent in the world of professional development,

making Guskey a reputable name in the professional development world.

2.4.2 Barry Sweeny's Levels of Induction Programs

As can be seen, Guskey is one of many who have developed research-based models that have been applied in the educational setting within professional development and teacher induction programs. Other prominent researchers in this arena, Kendyll Stansbury and Joy Zimmerman, have also composed a series of research and models outlining the qualities or characteristics of teacher induction programs.

Echoing Guskey's sentiments, Stansbury and Zimmerman (2002) also noted that support for beginning teachers is a continuous process, starting with personal and emotional support. As the teacher gains experience, the support should then lead into task- or problem-related support, expanding to the point where the teacher is self-reflective of their teaching practice (Stansbury & Zimmerman, 2002). Much like Guskey, Stansbury and Zimmerman (2000) identified five common goals of teacher induction programs:

- Improving teaching performance;
- Increasing the retention of promising beginning teachers;
- Promoting the personal and professional well-being of beginning teachers;
- Satisfying mandated requirements for induction and/or licensure; and
- Transmitting the culture of the system to beginning teachers.

These common goals, when utilized in induction programs set the groundwork for effective programs (Stansbury & Zimmerman, 2002).

However, the fact remained that most induction programs identify new teachers as being directly out of teacher preparation classes or who have taught only one to two years (Stansbury

& Zimmerman, 2002). Hence, the research from Stansbury and Zimmerman (2000, 2002), along with other researcher Barry Sweeny, was incorporated into a three-year study conducted by the National Education Association (NEA-FIE, 2002). The study took into account Stansbury and Zimmerman's five goals, but gained momentum by implementing Sweeny's research models.

Following the NEA study, Sweeny elaborated on his models for developing, implementing, evaluating, and sustaining an induction and mentoring program, eventually incorporating these models into the *Leading the Teacher Induction and Mentoring Program* (Sweeny, 2008). Sweeny was able to apply the research of his colleagues and predecessors to create three categories, which he refers to as models, of teacher induction programs. These models classified induction programs as Basic Orientation Model, Instructional Practice Model, and School Transformational Model (Sweeny, 2008).

The Basic Orientation Model

Sweeny's *Basic Orientation Model* focused on acclimating new teachers and teachers new to the school district to the school's culture and procedures (Sweeny, 2008). The purpose of this model was to help novice teachers settle into their environment and understand their responsibilities (Sweeny, 2008). The content of these programs typically included topics such as classroom management, district policies, and school procedures, which were addressed mostly during workshops prior to the beginning of the school year (InSites, 2001). Additionally, teachers were appointed a mentor for the first academic year during these initial sessions. The focus during the workshops could be, but were not limited to, how to address parent conferences, holidays, report cards (Sweeny, 2008); however, little attention was given to a teacher's instructional skills or professional development plan. As the mentoring process in the Basic

Orientation Model was quite informal, the mentor within this model served more as a point of contact for problematic issues rather than any instructional mentoring (InSites, 2001).

The Instructional Practice Model

Similar to the Basic Orientation Model, the *Instructional Practice Model*, sometimes referred to as the *beginning teacher development model*, helped the new teacher get acculturated to their new profession and working environment (InSites, 2001). However, the primary purpose of the Instructional Practice Model was to increase teacher effectiveness by helping beginning teacher's bridge their knowledge of theory and practice (Sweeny, 2008). In order to achieve this purpose, the Instructional Practice Model included mentors who convey the school's approach to effective instruction in addition to assisting the new teacher with first-year orientation (InSites, 2001). In this model, the mentor worked with the beginning teacher to reflect upon his or her experiences and compare his or her own practice to the district or state teaching standards (InSites, 2001). These programs organized incoming teachers into cohorts that move through the induction process over a period of three to five years: "The cohort model is founded on the idea that teachers learn best by studying, doing, collaborating, and reflecting together with other teachers" (InSites, 2001, p. 10).

The School Transformational Model

Separate from the orientation processes of the Basic Orientation and Instructional Practice Models, the *School Transformational Model* used induction as an agent for transformation of the school (InSites, 2001). This type of model helped new teachers become part of a school culture that is actively engaged in school reform efforts, connecting quality professional development growth to improved student learning (InSites, 2001). This model acknowledged that teachers need not only knowledge and skills, but also the ability to influence

the conditions in which they can teach (InSites, 2001). The School Transformation Model highlighted the need for the following characteristics and skills: effective collaboration, data-driven decision-making, research, authentic assessment, and community participation (InSites, 2001). Within this model, teachers were expected to be leaders and a community of learners, as it aimed to “transform the school into a site for state-of-the-art practice and continuous teacher learning among all faculty members, not just new teachers” (InSites, 2001 p. 15).

According to Barry Sweeny and the NEA’s study, the most successful teacher induction programs went beyond the elements of the Basic Orientation and Instructional Practice Models to emphasize the community of learners inherent to the School Transformational model (NEA-FIE, 2002; Sweeny, 2008). This model emphasized the community of learning, and it considered various forms of data collection (e.g., program satisfaction, teacher retention, job satisfaction, teacher learning, and student impact) to assess this community (NEA-FIE, 2002). These data were used to continuously evaluate and modify the program according the specific needs the school, teachers, and community. Table 2-3 provides a summary of the aforementioned models as outlined by Sweeny (2008).

Table 2-3: Sweeny's Induction Models

Model	Description	Characteristics	Effectiveness
Basic Orientation Model	This simple model is quite common for school districts. It is the basic orientation model, which introduces new teachers to school procedures and to district policies, enabling the teacher to learn his or her responsibilities. These programs usually assign a mentor teacher and other developmental activities. The mentor's services are usually an informal practice.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction to district Procedures and Policies • Mentor serves as an informal practice 	Least effective
Instructional Practice Model	This model covers such topics as classroom management issues, policies, and procedures. The instructional practices model links the induction model to the state and local standards for high quality teaching with well trained and skilled mentors, helping to bridge the gap using research based instruction. This program usually lasts 2-3 years.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improving Teaching Performance • Classroom Management Issues • Introduction to district Policies and Procedures • Alignment with State Standards for Instructional Practices • Trained Skilled Mentors • Research Based Instruction 	Moderately effective
School Transformational Model	This model incorporates both induction attributes (policies and procedures) and instructional practice models. The school transformation model connects the two aforementioned models to systematic school-wide renewal efforts that promote continuous learning for new teachers. Within this model, teachers are asked to select professional development that meets their needs for professional growth. The focus is the teacher as a part of a "community of learning." It enables all faculty members to work together to meet the needs of the students in the building.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning Communities • Data Driven • Equity • Leadership (mentors and administrators) • Evaluation (peer and administration) • Quality Teaching • Family Involvement • Collaboration • Resources • Research Based • Reflective 	Most effective

2.4.3 Setting the Standards: The Rise of INTASC

With the rise of NCLB (2002), induction programs have received funding and national notoriety. Many school systems, whether they are district, county, or state educational systems have developed their own models of programs. A consortium that is gaining ground in 35 states and territories is the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC).

InTASC developed core standards and objectives regarding teacher induction that have been used by many colleges and universities to prepare students in the education field (Council of Chief State School Officers [CCSSO], n.d.). The InTASC model consists of a set of core teaching standards outlining what teachers should know and be able to do to ensure every K-12 student reaches the goal of college or work (CCSSO, n.d.). Furthermore, these standards set forth common principles and foundations of teaching practice that cut across all subject areas and grade levels and are necessary to improve student achievement (CCSSO, n.d.).

InTASC is a program of the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), a non-profit organization that represents education officers responsible for setting education policy in the states and territories. Within the CCSSO, InTASC collaborates with the state education agencies responsible for teacher licensing, professional development and program approval promoting standards based learning and educational reform (CCSSO, n.d.).

According to the CCSSO (n.d.), InTASC's mission is to provide a forum to learn about and collaborate in the following areas:

- Compatible education policy on teaching among the states;

- New accountability requirements for teacher preparation programs;
- New techniques to assess the teacher performance for licensing and evaluation; and
- New programs to enhance the professional development of teachers.

Furthermore, InTASC has accomplished the following objectives relating to teacher induction:

- Developed core standards for what all beginning teachers should know and be able to practice responsibly, regardless of the subject matter or grade level being taught;
- Initiated development of a new licensing examination in the *Test for Teaching Knowledge*, which will measure a beginning teacher's knowledge of the core standards; and
- Developed and validated a model performance assessment in the form of a candidate portfolio in math, English/language arts, and science linked to InTASC standards (CCSSO, n.d.).

By outlining these common objectives, induction programs can align themselves with clear-cut national standards. The InTASC standards reflect the professional consensus of what beginning teachers should know and be able to do. These ten standards (presented in Table 2-4) are essential pieces of effective induction programs.

Table 2-4: InTASC Standards as Presented in CCSSO (n.d.)

Standards	Standard description
Standard 1: Content Pedagogy	The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline he or she teaches and can create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for students.
Standard 2: Student Development	The teacher understands how children learn and develop and can provide learning opportunities that support a child's intellectual, social, and personal development.

Standard 3: Diverse Learners	The teacher understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners.
Standard 4: Multiple Instructional Strategies	The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage student development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.
Standard 5: Motivation and Management	The teacher uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.
Standard 6: Communication and Technology	The teacher uses knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.
Standard 7: Planning	The teacher plans instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.
Standard 8: Assessment	The teacher understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of the learner.
Standard 9: Reflective Practice Professional Development	The teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of his or her choices and actions on others and who actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally.
Standard 10: School and Community Involvement	The teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students' learning and well-being.

Although the research informs us about the many characteristics of teacher induction programs the criteria and standards set aside by Guskey 2005, Stansbury and Zimmerman (2000, 2002), Barry Sweeny (2008), and the INTASC standards have set a precedent in the realm of modern day teacher induction programs. Previously there was not a research based induction program standard school districts could utilize as a means to evaluate their teacher induction programs but thanks to these researchers and many others educators now have a tool of measurement which to model the characteristics of their new teacher induction programs.

2.5 CONCLUDING REMARKS

This literature review has outlined effective aspects to professional development and teacher induction programs (summarized in Table 5). Guskey established a criterion with which schools could effectively gauge their induction programs, Sweeny and the NEA gave way to evaluating the “levels” of teacher induction programs, and InTASC contributed standards that put perimeters on colligate preparation for new teachers entering the workforce. These three areas of research all point to similar concepts for establishing, maintaining, and measuring the effective characteristics of teacher induction programs.

3.0 CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

3.1 RATIONALE

The purpose of this study was to use semi-structured interviews, surveys, and artifacts to assess the characteristics of teacher induction programs in five selected Southwestern Pennsylvania school districts. The data was categorized according to established research based criteria. This chapter describes the statement of the problem, research study questions, theoretical framework, research methodology, research settings and selection process, research procedures, instrumentation, and data collection and analysis procedures.

3.2 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

American students compete globally in the academic sector. American schools prepare students for the global market and post-secondary education upon graduation from public education institutions. Teachers and administrators are essential to this purpose. In fact, researchers state that a well-prepared teacher can have a greater impact on student achievement than poverty, language background, and minority status (Davis, Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, & Meyerson, 2005). Edmondson (2007) emphasizes the importance of teacher preparation, stating “we must be able to give teachers needed skill set to prepare our students” (p.3).

After teacher pre-service training, teacher professional development is the next major step towards improving teachers’ practices (Wong, 2004). High quality intensive professional development programs are crucial to train, support, and retain quality teachers (Wong, 2004). These induction programs improve teachers’ classroom management patterns and instructional

strategies, provide opportunities for new teachers to observe master teachers in demonstration lessons, and acculturate new teachers to the district (Wong, 2004).

If teacher induction programs are thought to reap benefits for schools then it is important to evaluate the quality teacher induction programs in which teachers participate (Wong, 2004). In Pennsylvania, the Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE) teacher induction programs are a requirement for permanent certification and ultimately tenure. The induction programs must address the needs of the schools, the teachers, and the community, as well as contain mechanisms for program evaluation grounded in research and aligned with standards (Wong, 2004). However, in many school districts, teacher induction programs do not embody the characteristics of effective researched models (Wong, 2004). If we are to begin truly looking at what practices impact public education, we must first look at the characteristics and practices of our teacher induction programs.

3.3 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The research questions were chosen to guide the study and provide essential information regarding the teacher induction programs of the selected school districts. These four questions focused on the characterization of the teacher induction programs within this research study:

2. What are the espoused characteristics of the induction programs offered by the selected school districts?
2. How do these districts monitor the quality and assess the outcomes of their induction programs?
3. What do the chosen school districts actually do as their teacher induction programs from the perspective of the teachers?

4. To what extent do the induction programs in the selected school districts align with what the research tells us regarding the characteristics of high quality teacher induction programs?

3.4 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

To understand the characteristics and attributes of teacher induction programs, a review of the literature provided relevant models for evaluation of teacher induction programs. Stansbury and Zimmerman (2002) stated that support for beginning teachers should be looked at as a continuum, starting with personal and emotional support. This support should then lead into task-or problem-related support, expanding to the point where the teacher is self-reflective of his/her teaching practices (Stansbury & Zimmerman, 2002). Within this study, teacher induction programs in the selected school districts were viewed through the lens of Sweeny's three levels of induction models (Sweeny, 2008) as adopted by the National Education Association (NEA). The three models (i.e., the Basic Orientation Model, Instructional Practice Model, and School Transformational Model) were then used as a tool to categorize or "group" teacher induction programs. While Sweeny's induction models were explained in detail in section 2.3.2, Table 3-1 has been reproduced here to as a means for review and quick reference for the reader.

Table 3-1: Sweeny's Induction Models

Model	Description	Characteristics	Effectiveness
Basic Orientation Model	<p>This simple model is quite common for school districts. It is the basic orientation model, which introduces new teachers to school procedures and to district policies, enabling the teacher to learn his or her responsibilities.</p> <p>These programs usually assign a mentor teacher and other developmental activities.</p> <p>The mentor's services are usually an informal practice.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction to district Procedures and Policies • Mentor serves as an informal practice 	Least effective
Instructional Practice Model	<p>This model covers such topics as classroom management issues, policies, and procedures.</p> <p>The instructional practices model links the induction model to the state and local standards for high quality teaching with well trained and skilled mentors, helping to bridge the gap using research based instruction. This program usually lasts 2-3 years.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improving Teaching Performance • Classroom Management Issues • Introduction to district Policies and Procedures • Alignment with State Standards for Instructional Practices • Trained Skilled Mentors • Research Based Instruction • Learning Communities • Data Driven • Equity • Leadership (mentors and administrators) • Evaluation (peer and administration) • Quality Teaching • Family Involvement • Collaboration • Resources • Research Based • Reflective 	Moderately effective
School Transformational Model	<p>This model incorporates both induction attributes (policies and procedures) and instructional practice models. The school transformation model connects the two aforementioned models to systematic school-wide renewal efforts that promote continuous learning for new teachers. Within this model, teachers are asked to select professional development that meets their needs for professional growth. The focus is the teacher as a part of a "community of learning." It enables all faculty members to work together to meet the needs of the students in the building.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership (mentors and administrators) • Evaluation (peer and administration) • Quality Teaching • Family Involvement • Collaboration • Resources • Research Based • Reflective 	Most effective

3.5 METHODOLOGY

The descriptive case study method allowed for a comprehensive understanding of the subject(s) under review (Merriam, 1998). Additionally, Yin (2009) states that “the strength of the case study method is its ability to examine, in-depth, a ‘case’ within its ‘real-life’ context” (p. 111) and that case studies are most effective when “one’s research addresses either a descriptive question (what happened) or an explanatory question (how or why did something happen)” (p. 111). Furthermore, the use of the descriptive case study approach allowed for direct observations and collection of data in natural settings can occur (Yin, 2009), adding an element of authenticity to the research. The authenticity and generalizability of descriptive case studies is enhanced when using a multiple case approach (Yin, 2009).

When considering Yin (2009) and Merriam’s (1998) comments about descriptive case studies, one can see that this method lends itself to this project’s central research task of analyzing and describing teacher induction programs. I aimed to identify *what* the characteristics of teacher induction programs are at five school districts in Southwestern Pennsylvania and *how* these selected school districts monitor the quality and assess the outcomes of their programs. Additionally, the multiple cases analyzed in this project add to the strength of this study. With this study containing five districts, the author examined the selected school districts vertically for in-depth analysis of each district’s program and horizontally to provide comparisons across the districts within the study. By using a descriptive method blended with a multi-case design study method, the central research theme was explored: *To what extent do selected school districts use the school transformational model within their teacher induction programs?*

3.6 SELECTION PROTOCOL

Five school districts in Southwestern Pennsylvania served as the research setting for this study.

In order to fully understand the selection process for choosing these school districts, one must first understand the state induction policy for Level I teachers in Pennsylvania. A Level I teacher is one who is within his/her first 3 years of teaching and has not received teaching tenure in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (PDE, 2002). In order for teachers to apply and receive Level II teaching certification, they must complete a series of requirements, including successful completion of the district's induction plan and satisfactory marks on their semi-annual and annual evaluations (PDE, 2002).

Because the progression between Level I and Level II certification relies partially upon the incoming teacher's transgression through an induction program, the Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE) requires school districts to submit an outline of their induction program for formal review (PDE, 2002). The *Induction Plan Guidelines*, as articulated by the PDE in May of 2002, provide the following requirements for school district induction plans:

- First-year teachers and educational specialists are required to participate in the program;
- An induction coordinator and a description of the individuals who developed the plan and how they were selected;
- A list of goals and competencies for the induction program;
- A description of how the needs of inductees will be assessed;
- A description of how the mentors were selected;
- A timeline of activities/topics, including the Code of Conduct, to be addressed;
- A description of the procedures for monitoring and evaluating the induction program;

and

- A description of how records of participation and program completion will be kept.

(PDE, 2002, p.8)

Interestingly, Pennsylvania state induction program requirements have not been modified since 2002; however, there have been additional criteria that Level I teachers must complete in order to receive Level II teaching certification.

In 2004, PDE mandated the statewide use of the “Semi-Annual Employee Evaluation Form for Instructional I Teachers”, otherwise known as the 426 form (Appendix A) as a teaching evaluative form⁴ within all Pennsylvania school districts. The 426 semi-annual employee evaluation form for Instructional I teachers is used to determine the professional needs of the employee (PDE, 2002). The 426 semi-annual employee evaluation form for Instructional I form may also be used to gauge whether an employee demonstrates the competencies necessary for retention by the school district (Pennsylvania Department of Education, n.d.). When determining competency, the 426 semi-annual employee evaluation form for Instructional I form relies upon the work of Charlotte Danielson. In 1996, Danielson outlined a research-based set of components of instruction grounded in a constructivist view of learning and teaching. Danielson (1996) sorted these components into four domains, which are directly reflected in the four categories of the 426 evaluation. The 426 semi-annual employee evaluation form for Instructional I form assesses teacher competency by evaluating the teacher in four categories: planning and preparation, classroom environment, instructional delivery, and professionalism (Danielson, 1996).

⁴ The 426 and 427 forms are evaluative forms that occur semi-annually and annually. These forms, based upon Charlotte Danielson’s research (Danielson, 1996; Danielson & McGreal, 2000), replaced the PDE 5501 evaluation form. See Appendix A for the 426 form.

While the 426 semi-annual employee evaluation form for Instructional I evaluation was a new requirement for Level I teachers in 2004, PDE continued to require all Level I teachers to participate in at least a one-year, state-approved induction program in order to progress to Level II certification (PDE, 2002). Although PDE does provide broad criteria for what constitutes acceptable district induction programs, Pennsylvania does not have a fully specified state or countywide induction program. Hence, Pennsylvania's 500 independent school districts have their own independently operating induction programs.

While these programs all meet the state's broad framework, there are many variations in the content and implementation across each district. For example, some districts appoint a central office administrator as responsible for the district's induction program, while other districts place this task in the hands of building level administrator(s). Furthermore, some school districts have chosen to implement a portfolio requirement as evidence of completing the districts induction program. These portfolio requirements are in addition to the requirements of the 426 semi-annual employee evaluation form for Instructional I evaluation, meaning they are not state-mandated. With no state mandate, portfolio criteria and evaluation falls in the hands of a district administrator; therefore, the 'induction portfolios' are at the complete discretion of the school district. A system that does not align itself horizontally with other school districts leads to induction programs that vary based upon individual district visions, budgets, and objectives.

Since the introduction of the *Induction Plan Guidelines* in 2002, PDE has made no modifications or proposed modifications to the Commonwealth's school district induction plan requirements. However, in the spring of 2012, PDE proposed to remove induction plan

requirements from the inclusion of the Comprehensive Plan⁵ and house the induction guidelines in Chapter 49 PDE regulations.

A summation of timely events and state mandates regarding new teachers is as follows:

- 2002: Commonwealth of Pennsylvania mandates new teacher hires complete an approved teacher induction program. The induction program must be part of the school districts strategic plan and be revisited every 6 years, along with the district strategic plan.
- 2004: Commonwealth of Pennsylvania institutes the evaluative forms 426, 427, and 428.
 - The PDE 426 (Semi-Annual Employee Evaluation Form For Instructional I Teachers) has been prepared by the Department to rate temporary professional employees, or those who possess an Instructional I certificate. The PDE 426 has been designed to permit completion of the PDE 427 (see below).
 - The PDE 427 (Instructional I to Instructional II Assessment), a mandatory form, to be used by all school districts to rate the services of a temporary professional employee for the purpose of recommending movement to an Instructional II. The PDE 427 can only be used after six successful semi-annual evaluations have been achieved from the PDE 426, or locally developed/state approved evaluation, or PDE 5501 have been completed. Regardless of which option being used to evaluate temporary employees, information collected during the six semi-annual evaluations must permit the evaluator to complete the required content in the PDE 427.

⁵ The Comprehensive Plan is a continuous process used to ensure that all students are achieving at high levels. All districts can create better environments so that more students are successful. Continuous Comprehensive planning of Local Educational Agencies is essential to providing increased student performance and quality results. Innovative, exemplary, and research-based programs, coupled with staff development, focused and aligned resources, and public participation in planning, are critical factors in districts that demonstrate continuous growth.

- 2012: Commonwealth of Pennsylvania proposes to eliminate the induction plan as a component of the district's Comprehensive Plan; however, the induction plan will remain a district mandate as part of other Chapter 49 regulations through PDE. (Pennsylvania Department of Education, n.d.).

For this study, it was important to note the guidelines and importance the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania places on teacher induction programs. Although this section added relevant and essential reader information regarding the recent history of teaching induction programs and requirements for level I teachers in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the protocol did not have an immediate impact on the specific sample school selection.

3.6.1 Sample School Selection

For this study, the school districts were selected based upon the number of new teacher hires in the 2011-2012 school year and the district's per capita student expenditure. To qualify for the sample, school districts needed at least seven new hires participating in their first-year teacher induction program in the school year 2011-2012. In order to find this information, 102 school districts in Southwestern Pennsylvania were contacted by the director of the Tri-State Area School Study Council.⁶ The information collected by the Tri-State Area School Study Council showed that eleven school districts hired seven or more teachers for the 2011-2012 school year (see Table 3-2).

⁶ The Tri-State Area School Study Council is one of the oldest and largest study councils in the nation. Its membership includes over 100 school districts, intermediate units, vocational-technical schools, dioceses, colleges, and private schools. The council is supported largely by fees from member districts and by a subsidy from the University of Pittsburgh, where it is headquartered.

Table 3-2: School Districts Hiring at Least Seven Teachers during the 2011-2012 School Year

School District	County	Student Per Capita Expenditure	Number of Teacher Inductees 2011-2012
	Allegheny	9,679	13
	Allegheny	10,995	31
	Allegheny	10,324	7
	Allegheny	14,940	7
	Allegheny	12,369	7
	Allegheny	14,422	7
	Allegheny	11,139	9
	Allegheny	11,682	7.5
	Butler	10,092	7
	Westmorland	8,020	7
	Allegheny	9,752	7

Note. Information based on PDE (n.d.).

In addition to the number of newly hired teachers, student per capita expenditure was also set as a criterion for the sample. The student per capita expenditure was included as a criterion in order to reduce the chance of budgetary constraints impacting the teacher induction program. I was concerned that schools with lower per capita student expenditures and, theoretically, smaller budgets, would attempt to reduce costs in all areas that were not mandated by the state. For example, a financially restricted district may only include the minimum state teacher induction mandate of a one-year program, rather than attempt to develop a stronger, research-based model (e.g., Sweeny's School Transformational Model, which is a three-year minimum program). The student per capita expenditure of the eleven schools with seven or more teacher inductees is provided in Table 6.

In order to determine the final selection for this study's sample, the per capita student expenditures of the eleven districts that hired seven or more teachers for the 2011-2012 school year were averaged; resulting in an average per capita expenditure of \$10,781 per student. Five

of the eleven school districts that had a student per capita expenditure of \$10,781 or more, and these five districts became the selected districts for the study. Table 3-3 lists the five selected school districts.

For anonymity each district has a designated letter A through E. Table 3-3 also identified the county of each district, the per capita student expenditure, and the number of new teacher hires. District A may appear to be an outlier because they have hired 31 teachers this past school year; however, through semi-structured interviews and data collection I will be able to verify or provide explanation for the significant hires compared to the other districts and make a further determination.

Table 3-3: Selected School Districts

School District	County	Student Per Capita Expenditure	Number of Teacher Hires or Inductees 2011-2012
A	Allegheny	10,995	31
B	Allegheny	10,824	7
C	Allegheny	14,940	7
D	Allegheny	12,369	7
E	Allegheny	14,422	8

By narrowing the initial eleven school districts and focusing on five of those districts based upon a pre-selected criterion, the methodology of this study became even more refined. Criterion sampling, as defined by Patton (2002), is “choosing cases that meet some criterion” (p. 243). Within this study, the criterion limited the sample to districts who hired seven or more new teachers and who had established per capita student expenditure minimum of \$10,781. Characteristics of the districts’ teacher induction programs were identified by examining data collected via semi-structured interviews with administrators, surveys, and artifact collection.

3.7 RESEARCH PROCEDURES

This study relied upon both qualitative and quantitative approaches to data collection. Methods included semi-structured recorded interviews of the administrator(s) responsible for the teacher induction programs, electronic surveys of teachers currently or recently (within the past year) participated in the district's teacher induction program, and the review of documents or artifacts used in the district's teacher induction program (e.g., "opening day" agendas, portfolio requirements, mentoring information). The procedures of data collection and procedures included the following:

1. Each of the five school district superintendents was contacted by email for permission to conduct the study in their school district. Additionally, the email requested that the superintendent identify the lead administrator for their district's teacher induction program (see Appendix B or correspondence letter).
2. A follow-up email was sent to the superintendent after 10 days from the initial email if a response was not received. If a response to that email was not received within 5 days, the superintendent was be contacted via phone and relayed the information provided in Appendix B.
3. Following the obtainment of the person responsible for the district's induction program, that administrator was then contacted (see Appendix C for correspondence letter).
4. A follow-up email was sent to the administrator conducting the induction program after 10 days from the initial email if a response was not received. If a response to that email was not received within 5 days, the administrator was contacted via phone and relayed the information provided in Appendix C.

5. A meeting time to conduct the interview was arranged with the appropriate administrator in charge of induction during which the teacher letter (Appendix D) was also provided to establish teacher correspondence.
6. The interview was the focus on the questions provided in Appendix E, which was provided to the interviewee in advance. While the interview primarily addressed these focus questions, the interviewer conducted appropriate probes to acquire more insight to the program. During the interview, questions also were asked regarding various documents, such as teacher portfolio requirements, “opening day” agendas, mentoring information, literature which may be of focus, and/or other materials relating to the induction program. Finally, at the conclusion of the interview, a request was made for contact information for new teachers so that a request to complete an electronic survey could be made (see Appendix F). Participants were then thanked for their time, and permission was requested for future contact in the case that further questions pertaining their program/district arise.

3.7.1 Data Collection Instruments

Three instruments were used to gather both quantitative and qualitative data for this study. Together, these collection instruments offered a thorough approach to provide rich and thoughtful data and included the following:

- Semi-structured interviews. Interviews were conducted with the administrator in charge the district’s teacher induction program (see Appendix C for interview script).

- Electronic Survey using Surveymonkey, an Internet-based tool for completing surveys on-line. Due to the setting of the schools, the timing of the study, and the availability of participants, I felt a direct method, such as the on-line instrument, was most beneficial in gaining participant response. Within this survey, teachers currently participating, or who have recently participated in the selected district's teacher induction program were invited to complete a 14-question electronic survey through Surveymonkey (Appendix F).
- Collection of the selected district's teacher induction program artifacts. These artifacts included, but were not limited to opening day agendas; portfolio requirements, literature or pedagogy related to the specific induction program, and district induction program requirements.

3.7.2 Data Collection Methods

Throughout the study, responses were gathered through the use of semi-structured interviews. Questions for the semi-structured interviews were crafted from this study's initial four research questions and include questions that address essential components or characteristics of teacher induction programs as indicated by the literature. These interviews, which were recorded and transcribed, included open-ended and probing questions, which were intended to obtain information about the districts induction program in order to identify emergent themes within data. As the open-ended questions were crafted with research-supported models in mind, they were intended to highlight the characteristics of the districts' induction programs in order to categorize them within an analytical framework (see Appendix G). Patton (2002) explains, "the

purpose of gathering responses to open-ended questions is to enable the researcher to understand and capture the points of view of other people without predetermining those points of view through prior selection of questionnaire categories" (p. 453). Open-ended questions were used to assist in gathering descriptive data from the respondent's perspective.

In addition to semi-structured interviewing, the use of the electronic survey data as garnered through Surveymonkey was utilized. These 14-question surveys, completed by teacher inductees currently or recently (within the past year) participating in their district's induction program, contain both open- and closed-ended questions. These survey questions aligned with several of the semi-structured administrative interview questions to permit I to examine patterns. Additionally, the survey questions corresponded with specific references and contained closed-ended questions utilizing a Likert scale. Specifically, the quantitative survey questions addressed whether or not teachers believed the induction program promoted the following topics: continual striving for instructional improvement, resources that support adult learning, collaboration, assessment of teacher needs, progress monitoring, content knowledge, instructional strategies, and classroom assessments. The electronic survey was formatted by utilizing Surveymonkey. As previously mentioned, Surveymonkey is an Internet based tool for completing surveys on-line. Due to the setting of the schools, the timing of the study, and the availability of participants a direct method, such as the on-line instrument, was the most beneficial in increasing the response rate. Additionally, for the protection of subjects who may not want to participate in the study, it allowed the respondents to opt out of the survey. Surveymonkey ensured anonymity of the respondents, and the specific data collected, as it may only be accessed through a password that is unique to I (See Appendix F for Teacher Survey).

Finally, the use of artifact collection added to the comprehensive data analysis for this study. The artifact collection included any documents, agendas, literature, that was components of the districts induction program. These documents provided additional information about the districts induction program and enabled further analysis of the program.

Ideally, the interview, survey, and artifact collection indicated the model of the district's teacher induction in according to the three models or "lenses" referenced in the theoretical framework. Table 8 illustrates the alignment of each specific research question to the semi-structured administrative interview questions, teacher electronic survey questions, and possible artifacts collected throughout the study. The data collection instruments employing qualitative and quantitative research methods enabled the data to be organized in a fashion that complemented the analytical procedure and allowed the results of data analysis to be displayed and clearly outlined.

3.8 DATA ANALYSIS

The processes of data analysis for this study were a mixture of both qualitative and quantitative data. Qualitative data analysis is the process of taking the collected data and interpreting the information investigated. "While working inductively, the analyst is looking for emergent patterns in the data" (Patton, 2002, p. 468). Inductive analysis involves discovering patterns, themes, and categories through the analyst's interactions with the data. Deductive analysis is where the data are analyzed according to an existing framework (Patton, 2002). This type of data collection can also be referred to as directed content analysis; here initial coding begins with a theory or relevant research findings. "Then, during analysis, is immerse themselves in the data and allow themes to emerge from the data" (Zhang & Wildemuth, 2009, p. 310). Within this

study, deductive and inductive analysis methods were used. Data was analyzed for patterns and themes based upon Sweeny's Basic, Instructional Practices, and School Transformational Models.

The research also incorporated quantitative research methods. According to Patton (2002), qualitative findings may be presented alone or in combination with quantitative data. Quantitative research generally involves numerical data or subject to statistical review. "Research and evaluation studies employing multiple methods, including combinations of qualitative and quantitative data, are common" (p. 5). Through an electronic teacher survey presented via the Surveymonkey platform, teacher inductees answered Likert scale responses to 14 questions. Table 3-4 provides a visual representation and structure to the data collection procedures regarding questions asked through the semi-structured administrative interviews and the teacher electronic survey.

Table 3-4: Research Questions as Related to Interview and Teacher Survey Questions

Research Questions	Interview Questions	Teacher Survey Questions	Document
What are the espoused characteristics of the inductions programs within the sample school districts?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the most important aspects of your induction program? Why? • What has been the most challenging part of your induction program? Why? • How has the program developed? • Who developed your program? • What literature or theories/pedagogy do you base your program? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the most useful aspects of your induction program? • What has been the most challenging part of your induction program? Why? • Who monitors and evaluates the program? • How would you strengthen the program? 	What documents/materials can be collected to further identify the characteristics of the districts induction program? Such as agendas, portfolios, literature, etc.
How do these districts monitor the quality and assess the outcomes of their programs?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do you monitor and evaluate your induction program? • Who monitors and evaluates your program? • What criteria are utilized? • How are these criteria assessed? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do you monitor and evaluate your induction program? • Who monitors and evaluates the program? • What criteria are utilized? 	What evaluation tools do the selected school districts use to monitor the quality and assess the outcomes of their programs? For example, teacher evaluation forms, portfolio completion, etc.

Research Questions	Interview Questions	Teacher Survey Questions	Document
What do the chosen school districts actually do as their teacher induction programs from the perspective of the teachers?		<p>Your induction program:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • is guided by district leaders who continuously strive for instructional improvement. • requires resources that support adult learning. • requires resources that support collaboration. • utilizes data to determine adult learning priorities. • utilizes data to monitor progress. • utilizes data to help sustain continuous improvement. • applies knowledge about human learning and change. • deepens educator's content knowledge. • provides you with research based instructional strategies to assist students in meeting rigorous academic standards. • prepares teachers to use various types of classroom assessments. 	Data from teacher electronic survey.
To what extent do the selected districts programs align with what the research tells us regarding the characteristics of teacher induction programs?	<p>If you had unlimited resources how would you change the program and why?</p> <p>What research model/pedagogy do you utilize?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How would you strengthen the program? • How do you monitor and evaluate your induction program? • Who monitors and evaluates the program? • What criteria are utilized? 	What approaches are described in the documents/ that are representative of characteristics of the various types of induction programs?

3.8.1 Qualitative Analysis

The qualitative data was assessed through the analytical framework of Sweeny's three induction models Induction Models (the reproduction of Table 3-5 is included below for the purposes of quick reference). Patton (2002) asserts that qualitative interviewing is used to depict a respondent's perceptions and experiences about a phenomenon to better understand his or her viewpoint. Participant responses were coded and organized into themes based upon the perceptions, roles, and experiences of the district administrators responsible for the induction program and the teachers participating in the program.

Table 3-5: Sweeny's Induction Models

Model	Description	Characteristics	Effectiveness
Basic Orientation Model	This simple model is quite common for school districts. It is the basic orientation model, which introduces new teachers to school procedures and to district policies, enabling the teacher to learn his or her responsibilities. These programs usually assign a mentor teacher and other developmental activities. The mentor's services are usually an informal practice.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction to district Procedures and Policies • Mentor serves as an informal practice 	Least effective
Instructional Practice Model	This model covers such topics as classroom management issues, policies, and procedures. The instructional practices model links the induction model to the state and local standards for high quality teaching with well trained and skilled mentors, helping to bridge the gap using research based instruction. This program usually lasts 2-3 years.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improving Teaching Performance • Classroom Management Issues • Introduction to district Policies and Procedures • Alignment with State Standards for Instructional Practices • Trained Skilled Mentors • Research Based Instruction 	Moderately effective
School Transformational Model	This model incorporates both induction attributes (policies and procedures) and instructional practice models. The school transformation model connects the two aforementioned models to systematic school-wide renewal efforts that promote continuous learning for new teachers. Within this model, teachers are asked to select professional development that meets their needs for professional growth. The focus is the teacher as a part of a "community of learning." It enables all faculty members to work together to meet the needs of the students in the building.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning Communities • Data Driven • Equity • Leadership (mentors and administrators) • Evaluation (peer and administration) • Quality Teaching • Family Involvement • Collaboration • Resources • Research Based • Reflective 	Most effective

Within this study themes were first identified through the semi-structured interviews and electronic survey by their frequency. The themes were then categorized according to Guba and Lincoln's three-theme classification (see below) and finally aligned with researcher Sweeny's induction model. As research states, data analysis begins with the identification of themes emerging from raw data, a process sometimes referred to as "open coding" by Strauss and Corbin (1990). According to Creswell (2002), coding is the process of labeling text and segmenting it to form broad descriptive themes. Themes are then "aggregated codes" and are merged "to form a major idea in the database" (p. 267). Within this specific study, the characteristics of referenced by Sweeny's Basic induction models served as the basis of the selected districts induction categorization.

The semi-structured interviews in this study will utilize open-ended questions and probing questions to gather data. During coding of the administrative interviews, emergent themes from the transcribed interviews will be identified. The research found themes surrounding school culture, "life-long" or continuous learning, and improving teacher performance. Each theme gathered from the administrative semi-structured interviews was classified based on the three types of themes identified by Lincoln and Guba (1985). Lincoln and Guba's (1985) three theme classifications include:

- Consensus themes (the theme emerges in a majority of the sample, 60% or greater);
- Supported themes (the theme emerges in approximately half of the sample; 30%-59%); and
- Individual themes (the theme emerges in only one, individual sample member; 1%-29%).

Consensus, supported, and individual themes were identified in the administrative interviews and in the electronic teacher survey. These theme types were coded with the following system: 1 = consensus themes, 2 = supported themes, and 3 = individual themes. Due to only five administrators interviewed in selected districts the emergent themes had a much smaller number of respondents than the electronic teacher survey, which had a larger pool of respondents. Because of this variation in respondents I found it necessary to identify the themes according to percentages.

As in the administrative interviews, re-emerging themes within the collected artifacts and documents (e.g., opening-day agendas, portfolio requirements, literature or pedagogy) were identified. I anticipated finding the same themes in these documents as found in the administrative interview (i.e., school culture, “life-long” or continuous learning, and improving teacher performance). The themes were then aligned with the characteristics of Sweeny’s Induction Models. Each artifact theme was categorized as collected from the school districts as one of the aforementioned theme categories as set forth by Lincoln and Guba (1985). Themes within the artifacts and documents will be coded in alignment with the emergent themes and identified by the letter “A”: A = consensus themes (i.e., the theme appears in the majority of districts’ artifacts, 60% or greater), A = supported themes (i.e., the theme appears in approximately half of the districts’ artifacts 30%-59%), and A = individual themes (i.e., the theme appears in a minority of district’s artifacts 1%-29%).

The final aspect of the qualitative research analysis pertains to data from the electronic surveys. Although the electronic survey consists primarily of quantitative data, a small portion consists of qualitative data, as the survey includes two open-ended questions. These survey responses were analyzed and coded much like the semi-structured interviews and artifact review,

looking for re-emerging themes of school culture, “life-long” learning or continuous learning, and improving teacher performance.⁶ Again, the emergent themes were aligned with the characteristics of Sweeny’s three induction models and will be coded according to Lincoln and Guba’s (1985) three classifications. For the qualitative data obtained from the electronic surveys, consensus themes (i.e., the theme is present in the majority of teacher responses 60% or more); supported themes (i.e., the theme is present in approximately half of the teacher responses 30%-59%); and individual themes (i.e., the theme is present in a minority of teacher responses 1%-29%) were categorized by their frequency.

3.8.2 Quantitative Analysis

In addition to the qualitative analysis, this study analyzed quantitative data as gained from the brief, 14-question electronic survey. The survey questions addressed teacher’s perceptions regarding their districts induction program by asking the teachers to respond to questions using a five-variable Likert scale. A basic Likert scale is used, with available responses including the following: strongly agree, agree, neither agree or disagree, disagree, and strongly disagree. The quantitative survey results will be analyzed using frequencies and percentages as calculated by the Surveymonkey analytical platform. These frequencies and percentages informed the study as to the horizontal and vertical responses within the specific district and how the responses compare to other districts within the study.

Following the categorization and analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data, the frequency of themes from the semi-structured administrator interviews, electronic teacher surveys, and artifacts/document review was examined. The theme(s) was then compared to the components of Sweeny’s three induction models. Table 3-6 illustrates the alignment of the collected data and Sweeny’s induction model characteristics with this study’s primary research

questions. With the study's research questions closely aligning with possible patterns and themes and a simple coding system I was able to develop profiles for each of the five districts in the sample.

Table 3-6: Research Questions and Framework Analysis

Research Question	Data Source	Data Collection Method	Analysis Used	Framework Model
What are the expressed characteristics of the inductions programs within the sample school districts?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Documents • Administrative interviews • Teacher surveys 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews • Electronic survey • Document collection 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emergent themes (consensus, emergent, and individual) • Identification of Patterns (Words, phrases, documents, events that appear to be similar will be grouped into the same category) 	
How do these districts monitor the quality and assess the outcomes of their programs?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative interviews 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emergent themes (consensus, emergent, and individual) • Identification of Patterns (Words, phrases, documents, events that appear to be similar will be grouped into the same category) 	
What do the chosen school districts actually do as their teacher induction programs according to the teachers?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Documents • Administrative interviews • Teacher surveys 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews • Electronic survey • Document collection 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emergent themes (consensus, emergent, and individual) • Identification of Patterns (Words, phrases, documents, events that appear to be similar will be grouped into the same category) 	
What extent do the districts align with what the research tells us regarding the characteristics of successful teacher induction programs?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research from literature review • District Documents • Administrative interviews • Teacher surveys 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research (electronic/traditional) • Survey • Interview 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emergent themes (consensus, emergent, and individual) • Identification of Patterns (Words, phrases, documents, events that appear to be similar will be grouped into the same category) 	

“Framework Model” refers to NEA’s three models of induction programs (i.e., Basic Orientation, Instructional Practice, and School Transformational Models) the selected districts are identified in coordination with the Framework and Research Questions.

3.9 PROFILES

A district profile was prepared for each of the sites, which was useful when later presenting results. The profile consisted of the seven components outlined in Table 3-7. The collected data consisted of coded responses from the semi-structured interviews, electronic surveys, and artifact review, which all aided in creating comprehensive profiles for each district's induction program.

Each district was assigned a "classification" using the 3-model typology (with a rationale for the classification). The profile will include the responses to the four research questions based upon the research of that specific district.

By organizing the district profiles in such a manner, it structured the findings chapter in a capacity that each district's data was clearly displayed and organized according to research framework and according to the data collected from each district.

Table 3-7: District Profile Components

Components	Districts				
	A	B	C	D	E
Approximate student enrollment					
Approximate number of faculty members					
Number of new hires in the 2011-2012 school year					
Percent of free and reduced lunch students					
Approximate district revenues for the 2011-2012 budget (in millions)					
Number of research participants (administrative and teacher)					
Documents reviewed					

3.10 CONCLUSION

This study sought to explore the characteristics of the teacher induction programs within five selected Southwestern Pennsylvania school districts. Additionally, I was able to use data from semi-structured interviews, electronic surveys, and document review to align these programs with research-supported induction model frameworks as presented by Sweeny (2008) and adopted by the NEA. The semi-structured interviews were audio recorded, and the data was coded to provide for thematic data analysis. In Appendix F a research prototype has been provided, which further illustrates the analytical framework.

4.0 CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS

This study focused on analyzing the characteristics of new teacher induction programs in selected school districts in Southwestern Pennsylvania, aiming to characterize these programs as one of three types of teacher induction programs (as defined by Sweeny, 2008). Within this study, the criterion limited the sample to districts who hired seven or more new teachers and who had a minimum per capita student expenditure of \$10,781. In order to establish the study's sample, I, through Tri-State Area Council,⁷ first polled 107 schools districts in Allegheny, Westmoreland, and Butler County's regarding the number of teacher hires during the 2010-2011 public school year. From the districts polled, 11 school districts met the established hiring criteria of seven or more new teacher hires per district. The remaining pre-selected criterion (i.e., per capita student expenditure) allowed I to further narrow the sample to five public school districts.

In these five school districts semi-structured interviews of the administrator in charge of the district's teacher induction program at a location selected by the participant were conducted. Each interview was later recorded and transcribed for accuracy. Additionally, any existing documents relevant to the district's induction program were collected. During this time the administrator was provided a survey for the electronic teacher survey. The link led to an electronic survey to be completed by the teachers participating in the districts induction program.

This chapter contains the findings of the study, including a profile of the selected school districts, followed by a discussion of the qualitative and quantitative findings regarding each

⁷ The Tri-State Area School Study Council is one of the oldest and largest study councils in the nation. Its membership includes over 100 school districts, intermediate units, vocational-technical schools, dioceses, colleges, and private schools. The council is supported largely by fees from member districts and by a subsidy from the University of Pittsburgh, where it is headquartered

research question. Upon the conclusion of the findings from each research question a summary of the individual district's consensus, supported, and individual themes discovered through the qualitative interview process and through the electronic teacher survey are discussed and formatted. Finally, the selected district findings are summarized, discussed, and categorized using a research based model.

4.1 PROFILES FOR SELECTED SCHOOLS

Five school districts were eligible for inclusion within this study based upon the aforementioned pre-selected criterion. Five administrators, one from each district, agreed to partake in the semi-structured interview phase of the study. Three of the administrators held central office positions of assistant superintendent; one administrator held a building level position of principal; and one administrator was maintaining a building level principal position and a director title. The administrators ranged in their tenure with their current position in the district from 2-15+ years.

See Table 4-1 for profiles of administrators participating in semi-structured interviews.

Table 4-1: *District Administrator Components*

District	Administrative position	Length of time within the position
A	Principal/Director	2 yrs.
B	Assistant Superintendent	15+ yrs.
C	Assistant Superintendent	3 yrs.
D	Assistant Superintendent	3 yrs.
E	Principal	15+ yrs.

All school districts within the study used teacher induction programs developed within the district, rarely contracting outside agencies assistance with these programs. Student populations for the participant districts ranged from approximately 1900 to 4100 students with teacher populations ranging from 160 faculty members to 350 faculty members. When

examining the number of new hires in these teacher populations, most districts had 7-9 new hires within the 2011-2012 school year; however, one school district hired a significantly higher amount of teachers in the past year compared to the other schools. This district (District A) had an aging faculty population, a contract negotiation and renewal, and a significant retirement incentive, which resulted in the hiring of 31 new teachers within the 2011-2012 school year.

Table 4-2 illustrates disaggregated demographic data of the schools represented in this phase of the study. In an attempt to protect the identity of the respondents and the school districts in this phase, I rounded to the nearest hundred for student enrollment; to the nearest ten for faculty member populations, percentage of students receiving free and reduced lunch, and number of new hires; and to the nearest million for district revenue dollars. While most figures are rounded, the reported number of administrator and teacher respondents is exact.

“Documents reviewed,” reflects whether induction documents were provided during the semi-structured interviews. Originally I anticipated the document review or artifact review to be a larger part of the study; however, within the study the document search yielded little results. I found only one district, which had documents readily available to discuss during the semi-structured interview. The majority of districts briefly referenced induction documents or referred to changing documents. I found this second data source to be unhelpful in addressing the research questions.

Table 4-2: District Profile Components

Component	District A	District B	District C	District D	District E
Student Enrollment	3705	4251	4089	1951	2879
Faculty Population	293	336	296	155	263
Number of 2011-2012 New Hires	31	7	7	7	8
Percentage of Students Receiving Free or Reduced Lunch	12	17	3	10	7

District Revenues (in millions)	58	68	62	38	41
Number of Actual/Possible Research Participants (Administrative and Teacher)	19/32*	7/8*	7/8*	8/8*	9/9*
Documents Reviewed?	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes

Note: 2011-2012 Data (Pennsylvania Department of Education-Division of Food and Nutrition 2012)

** Indicates total possible number of respondents*

The demographic data showed an array of unique characteristics for the districts in this study. Districts are comprised of a variety of sizes (relating to student population), spanning from 2000 to 4000 and from middle socioeconomic to an upper socioeconomic community populations. The socioeconomic status is based on student free and reduced lunch data as well as district operating budgets for the 2011-2012 fiscal year. Additionally, subjects in this study have a variety of experience levels in terms of offering induction opportunities for teachers.

4.2 ADDRESSING THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS

In this section, the author will present participant responses from the semi-structured interviews and electronic survey responses relevant to a specific research question. With five school district administrators participating in semi-structured interviews and teachers participating through an electronic survey, I used a theme analysis of the collected data and categorized themes according to the frequency. The themes are classified as follows:

- Consensus themes, defined by the majority (60% or more) of respondents stating the same theme;
- Supported themes, defined by approximately half (30%-59%) of the respondents stating a theme; and
- Individual themes, defined by a minority (1%-29%) stating a theme.

The following sections address each of the four primary research questions and the semi-structured interview items used to investigate these questions. In order to provide an in-depth report of the participant's perspectives on their district's teacher induction programs, each section is then organized in a sequential manner by school district. At various points direct quotations and excerpts from the participants are used throughout this section for full understanding of the context.

4.2.1 What are the Espoused Characteristics of the Induction Programs Offered by the Selected School Districts?

In order to acquire the data to answer this first research question, the following questions were developed and asked of the administrators:

- What are the most important aspects of your induction program? Why?
- What has been the most challenging part of your induction program? Why?
- How has the program developed?
- Who developed your program? and,
- What literature/pedagogy do you base your induction program on?

The following sections present each administrator's responses to the aforementioned questions along with the data collected from the teacher survey and any documents collected from each district. The espoused view(s) will be "tested" against the teachers' perspectives on the enacted view within research questions 3.

District A. Over the past five years, District A underwent a significant shift in their teaching population. Once a seasoned faculty, veteran teachers had recently retired due to retirement incentives and contract renewal, leaving District A with a much younger and much

less experienced teaching faculty. In addition, District A's administrator has been a building-level principal for the past 5 years; however, the administrator only recently undertook a director position in conjunction with the building principal responsibilities and the responsibilities of teacher induction. Upon the semi-structured interview, the administrator frequently mentioned the difficulty balancing district responsibilities and ensuring faculty members are receiving the attention needed, stating that "time is a huge factor."

When speaking of District A's induction program, the administrator stated that the most important aspect of the program was to give teachers what they need to be successful in the classroom. Currently, District A's teacher induction program is a three-year model and is reflective of Danielson's (1996) Four Domain Model, which is "quite useful since the state is incorporating that model in their teacher evaluative forms," as reported by the administrator. The first year of District A's program focuses on district familiarity of procedures, policies, and time with a trained mentor; the second year focuses on understanding the Four Domain Model; and the third year focuses on reflection and growth. While the administrator was unsure when the district's current induction program began and how it has evolved, District A's administrator reports that "the program changes as the needs of the teachers change." The awareness of specific teacher needs lie with what District Administrator A feels the teachers need in today's public education atmosphere.

In addition to staying current with public education trends, District A's administrator reported strong support for mentoring programs. The administrator trains these mentors and provides training updates when needed. Furthermore, District A's administrator meets with mentors throughout the school year as a group to assess and discuss the progress of their mentees and their mentoring. During the interview, District A's administrator paused in reflections, and

then stated “I have not done that [mentor training] for a couple of years. I may need to revisit them [the mentors].”

With the District A’s administrator advocating for mentorship programs, it was not surprising that the administrator also found observations of new teachers essential. District A’s administrator meets with all new teachers regularly and conferences with them regarding their teaching practices, lessons, and procedures after the observation. This observation is in addition to building level principal observations, and the post-observation conference is usually focused around Danielson’s (1996) Four Domains.

Reflections are also a key component of District A’s induction program. As stated by the administrator, “Reflections are essential to the program. Teachers must consider their practices and have open and honest reflections.” Portfolios are not required in District A, but they are encouraged as means of organizing and collecting materials, observations, reflections, and various artifacts.

Throughout the semi-structured interview, District A’s administrator reviewed and referenced materials used during the district’s teacher induction program, including an opening day agenda. District A’s opening day agenda listed the dates, times, and locations of various components of the induction program. While the particular agenda listed specific trainings included in the program, District A’s administrator clarified that the trainings vary with the needs of the inductees. District A’s administrator reported that the teacher induction programs for the past two years include a large focus on Danielson’s (1996) Four Domains, which coincides with the inclusion of this framework on Pennsylvania’s state evaluative form (Form 426). Another artifact used at times in District A is the portfolio, but as District A’s administrator explained, “the portfolio is not a requirement; however, the inductees are encouraged to utilize the portfolio

as a means of collecting and organizing materials, observations, reflections, and other relevant instructional artifacts.”

District B. Although sometimes receiving input and direction from other central office administrators, the District B’s assistant superintendent is the administrator largely responsible for the district’s teacher induction program. District B’s administrator has been with the district for 15 + years and been maintaining the induction program for many of those years. Reflecting on these years, District B’s administrator reported that the program has evolved greatly in the past reported years: “A program that was once meetings and workshops has transformed into an almost completely online induction program.”

District B’s induction program is a three-year program with the first year focusing on procedure, policy, and mentoring. The second year emphasizes on differentiated instruction, along with reading and writing across the curriculum, while the third year concentrates on understanding student data and implementation of data in the classrooms. Currently, the focus of District B’s program revolves around instructional practices and the data-driven instruction. District B’s administrator stated the program is not ultimately based upon theory, rather placing emphasis on what the administrator detects teachers currently need. According to District B’s administrator, the most important aspects of the program include “providing the teachers the needed skill set for 21st century learning and finding the time to ensure the skills are meaningful and understood.”

When asked about the online component to the induction program, District B’s administrator stated that various administrators collaborated to create the program:

We all have different areas of expertise, some in data, some in writing, and some in literacy. By utilizing our resources we were able to build a program to meet the needs of our teachers and in a model that is effective and time saving (hopefully) for everyone. Time is always going to be factor; there is simply too much to cover in education today

for it not to be. But, if we can save time in some areas we can fit other items in

The incorporation of the online component was a consideration that District B's administrator believed would assist with the challenge that accompanies any professional development endeavor: finding time. District B's administrator stated:

Many times, teachers have obligations after school and cannot attend meetings. Also, over the summer many teachers are on vacation. The online component ensures that the teachers can get to the program whenever they need to.

Even though time has been maximized through the online learning component, District B's administrator stated that if anything could be changed about the existing program it would be increasing the amount of time devoted to it, as there still seems to be pieces missing in regards to mentors, collaboration, and reflection.

While these induction programs are set to occur over the first three years of employment, "professional development does not end once a teacher completes this program," states District B administrator. District B administrator wanted I to be clear of the induction and professional develop Teachers in District B are contractually obligated to complete 50 hours of Professional development each school year. Some of these hours consist of administratively driven tasks, such as faculty meetings; however, the teachers for their own individual or group professional development selects the majority of the time. District B's administrator reported that this is intended to create a culture of learning and sense of community.

Although District B's administrator shared an opening day agenda, the remaining artifacts were electronic. Any resources, reflective formats, and itineraries were all in an online format using the Blackboard platform. These resources, I was told, are modified annually. I was able to view the online class via District B administrator's computer; however, due to the format of the online course and response of District B administrator to viewing the course I did not

request additional copies of the resources. Permission was not granted to obtain the online resources. Modules were created for each induction topic, which for the current year included reading, writing, and differentiated instruction. District B's administrator reported that the topics for inductees are modified as needed based upon the administrator's perception of teacher needs and from electronic survey feedback, which is provided from the inductees upon their conclusion of the program annually.

District C. District C has had limited turn over in their building level administrators in the past years, but their central office administration has been less stable. With the administrative movement in central office it is not surprising that primarily their building level administrators guide the main aspects of the districts induction programs. District C administrator stated that program is developed by central office, but the district relies strongly on the building level administrators to monitor and assess the needs of the new teachers. District C's administrator expressed great pride in the district's teacher induction program and emphasized the importance of such programs:

It is essential to understand the culture and the community upon entering the district, no matter what position you may enter into. The most important aspects of the program are understanding those things [culture and community]. The teachers hired are competent and instructionally sound teachers. Many times, they do not need teaching strategies to be part of the program; however, they do need to understand the community, and the learning communities established within the school district buildings. They need to be reflective in their teaching and know that they have support when needed from their mentors, building level administrators, and central office administrators.

District C's administrator stated the program was developed in the district many years ago and has since evolved into a teacher induction program that is very family-oriented.

While focused on the positive qualities of teacher induction programs, District C's administrator also acknowledged a major challenge to implementing such programs: time. District C's administrator illustrated the importance of taking the time to implement these

programs correctly by identifying that there are many mandates from the state that teachers need to be aware of and able to understand and stating that “a first year teacher is not forgiven of that understanding just because they are first year.”

In regards to artifacts, District C’s administrator shared the district observation template used for new teacher evaluations, a template reflective of Danielson’s (1996) framework. As explained by District C’s administrator, “the teachers are expected to be familiar with the framework and be able to reference the framework in their observation post-conferences.” District C’s teacher induction program did not include an opening day agenda; however, the administrator stated that new teachers receive a welcome back letter towards the end of summer that includes dates, times, and a brief itinerary for the first days of teacher must report to the school.

District D. Within District D a central office administrator is responsible for the district’s induction program. This administrator has been with the district for quite sometime and has moved from building level administrator to central office administrator. District D administrator emphasized a culture of learning, celebrating, and understanding the community. District D’s administrator also expressed pride in the district’s teacher induction program, starting that the investment is in teachers and that remains to be the focus. When asked what the most important aspect of District D’s induction, the administrator responded:

Reflection, re-reflection, and relationships matter most; I sometimes struggle too with the reflections. It is also very important to communicate the culture by board members, former students, and even bus tours. We must have respect for the culture. I also try to create panels that bring new teachers and veteran teachers together.

One of the most important aspects to teacher induction it to make the program meaningful to all teachers, which can be difficult to do in a prescribed “one size fits all program,” states District C administrator.

According to District D’s administrator, the teacher induction program is constantly evolving, but consistently highlights culture and the celebration of learning. At the time of the interview, District D’s induction program placed emphasis on Danielson’s (1996) model; however, the program also focused on brain-based research and ways to better educate students. Additionally, mentorship is a large part of District D’s three-year induction program. This mentor will meet with the inductee and observe the inductee’s instruction. In addition, inductees observe ‘expert’ teachers.

In order to aid with reflection, District D’s induction program requires teachers to send a survey to their student’s parents at the end of each year. Depending on the grade level, teachers also may be required to have their students take surveys. These surveys ask the parents and students to provide feedback about the teacher’s instruction throughout the school year. While this survey is not required beyond the induction program, District D’s administrator expressed hope that such reflective practices would continue throughout the teacher’s tenure, emphasizing that “feedback is a wonderful tool to reflect upon our instructional practices.”

Throughout District D’s induction program, teachers are required to maintain a portfolio, which is submitted upon the conclusion of their third year within the program. The contents of the portfolio include reflections, unit plans, lesson plans, and teacher observations, responses from parent/student surveys, and professional memberships and/or recognitions. The teachers, their mentors, and administrators attend a portfolio celebration where the teachers share their portfolios, their experiences, and lessons learned throughout the program. It is at the conclusion of this celebration that the teachers complete the induction program.

District administrator D focused on how the district could best prepare new teachers. District D’s administrator mentioned that in an ideal world, the district would “hire the best and

brightest" recently retired teachers to mentor the new teachers. Throughout the semi-structured interview, the administrator's passion that District Administrator D had for the districts' teachers and the induction program was evident.

Although no artifacts were brought to the semi-structured interview, District D's administrator mentioned several in the discussion. District D provides an opening agenda, which includes an itinerary for the teachers return (prior to student return) for the teacher's role in the induction program. Furthermore, inductees occasionally receive relevant or useful pieces of literature during the induction program. In the past, these pieces of literature have included inspirational books or subscriptions to educational magazines, such as *Educational Leadership*. These pieces of literature were not brought to the semi-structured interview. They were discussed generically throughout the conversation. I began to realize that in the majority of semi-structured interviews the administrator's spoke of resources utilized in their induction program, but have not to this point provided tangible evidence of those resources. It is difficult to interpret the "lack of tangible resources." I would like to think that the administrator is constantly reviewing data and evolving resources annually, therefore, did not have any tangible resources on hand; however, I also consider the possibility of resources not being fully utilized.

District E. District administrator E spoke clearly and elaborately regarding the district's induction program. District administrator E was relatively new to the position (less than 3 years); however, the administrator has previously served the district in a building level capacity. District administrator E strongly emphasized working as team and building on the strengths of all district employees to best meet the needs of the new teachers. The administrator from District E stated that the most important aspect of the induction program is the clear communication of the district's mission, vision, and beliefs. In order to help communicate these elements and develop

a unique culture, the district has developed various symbols, which have associations relevant to the teachers (e.g., the schoolhouse represents the district mission, while the school bus represents the team).

District E's administrator asserted the importance of developing a culture of support and teamwork within the district:

We very much so want our teachers to feel that they are supported and belong to a family within the district. It is hard enough being an educator in today's society, even harder being a lonely educator.

In the same light, District E's administrator felt that it is essential in the program for the teachers to see all employees (e.g., faculty, administrators, maintenance, other teachers, etc.) practicing the values outlined in the district's mission and vision, or as the administrator state it, "walking the talk." As such, District E's induction program emphasizes reflection, or when put into the district's symbolic terms, the tunnel. District E's administrator stressed that educators must have honest and open reflections about not meeting the needs of our students.

The two-year induction program within District E has been an evolving program. The administrators work as a team to take on specific roles within the program:

We choose to separate year one from year two. Two central office administrators teach year one with a focus on culture and Understanding by Design (Wiggins and Mctighe). Year two is taught by another administrator and utilizes various aspects of Differentiated Instruction and Understanding by Design (Wiggins and Mctighe)⁸. Some literature for Carol Tomlinson's books are utilized as well.

With organizational culture playing a large role in District E, this culture is the primary focus of the first year of the induction program. After culture is established, the second year of the induction highlights unit design:

⁸ *Understanding by Design*, an instructional resources utilized for curriculum design and assessment written by Grant Wiggins and Jay Mctighe in 2005.

We believe all of our teachers need to have an understanding of Understanding by Design and Differentiated Instruction⁹, so we focus intensely on the philosophy and practice of developing instruction in these areas. We require teachers to bring and share work, complete projects, and we visit to be sure the learning is embedded.

A final important aspect of District E's induction program is the implementation and understanding of Danielson's (1996) framework. District E's administrator explained that because teachers are evaluated based upon this framework, it is essential they understand clear expectations and how they will be evaluated.

Within District E's two-year induction program teachers are required to maintain a portfolio, which is reviewed upon the completion of the program (Portfolio Review Conference). Included within the portfolio are items such as but not limited to self-reflections, teacher observations, and formal and walk through evaluations. Time continues to be a struggle within District E's induction program. When asked "if you had unlimited resources how would you change your program and why" District administrator E stated "time, time, and more time."

The challenges within District E have been related to modeling differentiation practices amongst the teachers. District E's administrator articulated that it is difficult to know where inductees are in the learning process when they are only taking an active part in the program for three hours a month. As such, District E's administrator stated that the district tries to avoid a prescribed or "one size fits all" program by meeting with teachers individually, observing practice, providing timely feedback, and other forms of communication. While acknowledging that this individual feedback is time consuming, District E's administrator considered them necessary because they allow for a better understanding of the progress of each individual teacher.

⁹A curricular and instructional resource, *Integrating Differentiated Instruction and Understanding by Design* written by Carol Tomlinson and Jay McTighe in 2006, can be utilized by classroom teachers and administrators as to classroom instructional strategies.

Finally, District E's administrator E shared artifacts during the semi-structured interview, including administratively created presentations for their inductees, pieces of literature focused around a specific theme (currently Danielson's framework), and handouts provided to reinforce the culture of the district. These artifacts ranged from power-point presentations, rubrics, and opening day handouts.

Emergent themes. By analyzing the collected data, I found several reoccurring themes in the administrator responses from the five districts (See Table 4.3). Primary, consensus themes included: time, reflection, mentoring, and understanding of the district's culture and community. The role of creating a culture and community in school districts was an essential theme in District A. Mentoring was also large component according to District A administrator, however, only 44 % of the teachers had the same perception. The most prominent theme that emerged is finding creative methods to incorporate time. The time to work with the teachers and the time to develop the induction program both emerged as themes for District A administrator. District A is illustrative of the majority of the district findings. In each district, administrators were attempting to find methods to save time or make more out of existing time. As educators are constantly attempting to implement more standards, assessments, instruction, anchors, and best practices, administrators identified the need to be creative when provide training for new teachers whose time is limited. Other themes can be found in Table 4-3, including themes seen in collected artifacts.

Table 4-3: Emergent Themes for Research Question One

Consensus Themes (Frequency of 60% or more)	Supported Themes (Frequency of 30%-59%)	Individual Themes (Frequency of 1%-29%)
--	--	--

-
- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reflective practices from new teachers • Understanding the districts culture and community • Mentoring of expert teachers is a need for new teachers • Need for more time • Induction agenda #A | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of best teaching practices • Data use and understanding data in the classroom • Implementation of Danielson's Framework along with understanding the role of the framework in instruction • Observations completed by the inductee of experienced teachers in the classroom • Understanding the needs of the inductees • Portfolios #A • Literature provided for focus of program #A | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Celebration of learning • Instructional challenges (such as classroom management) • Use of online resources #A |
|---|--|--|

Note: #A indicates the themes emerged in artifacts.

4.2.2 How Do These Districts Monitor the Quality and Assess the Outcomes of Their Programs?

The following questions were developed and asked to acquire the data from the semi-structured administrative interview to answer this study's second primary research question:

- How do you monitor and evaluate your induction program?
- Who monitors and evaluates your program?
- What criteria are utilized? and
- How are these criteria assessed?

The following sections present each administrator's responses to the aforementioned questions along with the data collected from the teacher survey and any documents collected from each district.

District A. District A's administrator has the challenging role of building-level administrator and director, as well as the task of implementing and maintaining the district's induction program. Part of the administrator's responsibility regarding the district's induction program involves assessing and monitoring the needs of the teachers throughout their participation in the program. District A's administrator is the only individual monitoring the program by meeting with teachers throughout the year to provide feedback from observations. While these meeting and observations are a part of District A's plan, there is not a set requirement for how often these meetings and/or observations were completed. District A's administrator A stated:

The induction program has previously been a part of the district's strategic plan and therefore required state approval and updates every six years; however, with the new state mandates (and name change from the "strategic plan" to the comprehensive plan") excluding the teacher induction program from this plan I wonder how the state will monitor the plan?

Other than the state's role in monitoring the districts induction program, which it will continue to do so as part of Pennsylvania Department of Education Chapter 49 regulations, the responsibility continues to lie with the district and in District A's administrator the program monitoring will lie with them.

The criteria used to monitor and assess District A's program are based upon Danielson's (1996) framework, which is also reflected in Pennsylvania's state teacher evaluation (Form 426). In order to evaluate teachers and assess the utility of the induction program, District A's administrator employs Form 426 as well as optional portfolios. By reviewing the portfolios the

administrator can then make a more educated determination of the “meaningfulness” of the induction program for the teachers and the gains each teacher has made throughout the program.

District B. The administrator in District B monitors and evaluates their induction program by participating in the program with the teachers. As an induction program that focuses on different aspects each year, District B’s administrator can easily follow the teachers as they progress through the required induction program. While other building-level or central office administrators contribute to the assessment and monitoring of the induction model, the monitoring and evaluation of District B’s teacher induction program is largely left to the district’s administrator.

As previously discussed, District B’s three-year induction program focuses on a specific element each year, with the first year covering procedure, policy, and mentoring. According to District B’s administrator:

The first year involves meeting for three days prior to the start of school and meeting with their mentor, human resources, and the teachers union. It’s about getting to know your school. The first year is getting their feet under them.

The second and third years in District B’s induction program are primarily online. District B’s administrator explained that the online component makes it much easier to confer with teachers and monitor their progress. District B’s administrator reported the following regarding the online program as it relates to ongoing monitoring and assessment:

A nice feature of the online program is that not only are the teachers monitored, but I am monitored as well. I need to refresh myself with the course and the content annually and even throughout the school year. If I don’t, then the teachers know it, and I lose credibility. It is important to note that teachers need support and not extended criticism throughout their first years. I monitor to make sure the teachers are doing what they are supposed to do, but the real induction is when I see those teachers applying what they have learned in the classroom and students are learning.

Furthermore, the administrator claimed that the use of an online program takes the subjectivity

out of whether or not the teachers are actively participating, as the program tracks the teachers' progress. Within the course, there are discussion boards, blogs, and assignments that are due at the end of the units and lessons. At times, completion meets the criteria for participation (e.g., in the case of a blog or discussion board); however, the administrator evaluated other assignments (e.g., the development of a tiered lesson plan). At times a rubric is used and other times the assessment is based upon the description of the assignment.

District C. According to District C's administrator, the monitoring and evaluation of the induction program are very closely connected. The teachers are monitored and evaluated usually in the same occurrence. District administrator C strongly relies on the states development of Charlotte Danielson's Framework into the formal observation 426 form. Additionally, District C's administrator reported, "other than the state having to approve the induction program, as per PDE regulations Chapter 49, administrators work together to monitor the program." With newly hired teachers going to various buildings throughout the district, there is no central location or person responsible for monitoring and evaluation. Rather, the mentoring process and a great deal of evaluation comes from the building principals. Because some of the monitoring and evaluation component extends beyond District C's administrator in charge of the induction program, principals must be familiar with the basic components of the program. Because each principal may identify a different set of needs in their teacher population, principals have an active voice in implementing various components to the program.

In regards to progress reporting, principals and mentors have a responsibility to communicate with one another as to the progress of the new teachers. District C's administrator stated that through state evaluation forms (e.g., Form 426), teachers become familiar with their evaluative criteria (e.g., Danielson's (1996) framework). According to District C's

administrator, “the framework not only encouraged good teaching practices, but provides administrators with a solid observational tool. In the past observations could be quite subjective, and that was not good.”

District D. District D has strong focus on community and celebratory learning, which is reflected the monitoring and evaluation of the district’s induction. District D’s administrator asserted the importance of active monitoring during the induction program:

It is imperative that I know immediately if a teacher is struggling. I need to know so the supports can be put in place for that teacher and they can get the assistance or help where they are struggling. Sometimes teachers look at this ‘help’ as threatening, but it is far from it. We want our teachers to do their best and we want our students to learn at their best.

Whereas District D’s administrator has a firm hand on the direction of the induction program, many times the building level administrators conduct observations and mentors meet with the new teachers, practices reflective of the district’s community approach.

In order to provide the new teachers with a “toolbox” they can use throughout their career, District D requires that inductees complete portfolios. The portfolio is a tool for monitoring and a source for evaluation during the teachers induction program. As the inductee completes the program, they are learning, observing, and reflecting, and the artifacts associated with these tasks end up in the inductee’s portfolio. At times, District D’s administrator asks to see the progress of a teacher’s portfolio, as the administrator believes this progress is a very good indicator of the understanding the program.

As mentioned previously, once the teacher has completed the third year of District D’s induction program a celebration occurs. During this celebration, the inductees bring their portfolio and their mentor to a causal event where the portfolio is a shared and the teacher has the opportunity to openly reflection on his or her experiences and successes. Yet again, these

practices mirror District D's emphasis on community and celebrating learning.

District E. In order to assess new teachers, District E examines three criterions: (1) self-assessment, (2) teacher observations, and (3) portfolio review. Scores on different rubrics measure these criterions. As District Administrator E states “rubrics provided within *Understanding by Design* for self-assessing align with various stages of teacher growth. In addition to the *Understanding by Design* rubrics, District E also uses differentiated instruction rubrics, which are more of a self-assessment of the teachers. Both of these rubrics are shared with central office administrators. Finally, the Pennsylvania Department of Education's evaluative form (i.e., Form 426, as based on Danielson's (1996) framework) is also utilized as monitoring and evaluative tool.

District E's administrator reported that the district tries “to use rubrics with the inductees as much as possible to they can self-assess and determine their next steps.” These rubrics are consistently used in order to provide substantive evaluations, not subjective evaluations. District E's administrator also reported that principals and central office staff frequently complete teacher observations together so that they can see the same lesson and have the opportunity to discuss feedback to the teacher. District E's administrator asserted that this method assures the teacher is not getting mixed messaging from observers.

At the conclusion of the induction program, teachers have a portfolio review conference with the building principal and District E's induction administrator. Echoing Pennsylvania's Form 426, the portfolio is a collection of artifacts from each section of the induction program. Additionally, self-reflections are required for each article within the portfolio. The district also provides portfolios with presentations from former inductees to provide clear expectations for their portfolio and to compare their work.

Emergent themes. Through analyzing the collected data, I identified several reoccurring themes regarding the monitoring and evaluation of teacher induction programs. The administrator's responses to this question provided additional distinction amongst the districts' programs, as each district's focus and methods for their teacher induction programs become more defined. Table 4-4 presents all themes identified by the research, classifying them as consensus, supported, or individual themes.

Table 4-4: Identified Themes for Monitoring and Evaluation of Teacher Induction Programs

Consensus Themes (Frequency of 60% or more)	Supported Themes (Frequency of 30%-59%)	Individual Themes (Frequency of 1%-29%)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Portfolio creation as utilization of a tool for program evaluation • Form 426 observation as means of evaluation • Utilization of Danielson's framework • Time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-reflection • Mentor feedback • Development of best teaching practices 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Online programs • <i>Understanding by Design</i> rubrics • Differentiated instruction Rubrics

Note: #A indicates the theme emerged in artifacts.

As can be seen, evaluation was the most frequent form of program monitoring in the five districts, and Pennsylvania Department of Education's Chapter 49 teacher induction mandates were the most frequent criterion with the programs are evaluated against. Additionally, time emerged as an important factor in monitoring induction programs. Often, the monitoring of new teachers falls upon the building level principal, whose time is frequently cut short due to other responsibilities.

4.2.3 What Do the Selected School Districts Actually Do as Their Teacher Induction Programs from the Perspective of the Teachers?

For the first two research questions addressed in this study, I relied upon responses from the five

administrators responsible for their district's induction program. However, not only did I feel it was important to explore administrators' perceptions and theories of their specific districts induction program, but it was also essential to examine teachers' perceptions and theories of the program(s) in which they were partaking. Using Survey Monkey and its distribution feature, I created a survey and emailed a survey link to the five selected school districts, which in turn was then emailed to teachers partaking the district's induction program by the district administrator in charge of the induction program.

The electronic survey consisted of 14 items, 10 of which relied upon a Likert scale with responses that included strongly agree, somewhat agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, and strongly disagree. Likert items on the electronic survey addressed teacher perceptions regarding topics such as leadership, resources, monitoring, content, and usefulness. (See Appendix F for a full copy of the electronic survey.) The survey also included two fixed-response items and two open-ended items. Fixed-response items asked about the most important elements of the induction program, with the choices of mentoring, modeling of instructional practices, or culture of continuous learning, as well as the teachers' perception as to who monitored the induction program (i.e., self-monitoring/self-reflection, building principal, or central office administrator). The open-ended items inquired about the challenges of the current induction program and potential areas for program improvement. Exact wording of scaled items can be found in Appendix F.

A total of 45 teachers responded to the electronic survey out of a possible number of inductees of 60, giving a response rate of 75%. The quantitative and qualitative data from the respondents is grouped according to specific district (A, B, C, D, or E).

Through the collection and review of the quantitative and some qualitative data I will

again look for emergent themes and key words. The themes, as in the semi-structured interviews, will also be identified as consensus (60% or greater), supported (30%-59%), or individual themes (1%-29%) as indicated by frequency. Differences and similarities with and to administrator perceptions of selected items will be noted further in the chapter four and discussed in chapter five.

District A. Within District A, 18 out of 31 teachers responded to the electronic survey. Data indicated that 100% of District A's new hires agreed, to some degree (i.e., 77.8% strongly agreed; 22.2% somewhat agreed) that the induction program is guided by leaders who continuously strive for instructional improvement. Additionally, all District A newly hired teachers agreed to some degree (i.e., 88.9% strongly agreed; 11.1% somewhat agreed) that District A's induction program provided them with research based instructional strategies. However, while all teachers reported that they agreed to some degree that the program requires resources that support collaboration, only 55.6% of inductees reported that they strongly agreed with the statement. Similarly, only 55.6% strongly agreed that the program utilized data to determine adult learning priorities, with 33.3% somewhat agreeing and 11.1% neither agreeing nor disagreeing. Interestingly, within question 5 22.2% of respondents stated they're essentially not sure if data is used in monitoring and in question 8 11.1% reported they don't think they learned anything from the program. Table 4-5 displays the survey results.

Table 4-5: School District A Electronic Survey Results

Survey Item	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. Induction program is guided by district leaders continuously striving for instructional improvement.	77.8	22.2	0.0	0.0	0.0

2. Induction program requires resources supporting adult learning.	66.7	22.2	11.1	0.0	0.0
3. Induction program requires resources that support collaboration.	55.6	44.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
4. Induction program utilizes data to determine adult learning priorities.	55.6	33.3	11.1	0.0	0.0
5. Induction program utilizes data to monitor progress.	77.8	0.0	22.2	0.0	0.0
6. Induction program utilizes data to help sustain improvement.	77.8	11.1	11.1	0.0	0.0
7. Induction program applies knowledge about human learning and change.	55.6	44.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
8. Induction program deepens educator's content knowledge.	77.8	11.1	0.0	11.1	0.0
9. Induction program provided you with research based instructional strategies.	88.9	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
10. Induction program prepared teachers to use various types of classroom assessments.	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0

In addition to the Likert responses, participants were asked two fixed-response questions relating to the elements of the induction program that they found important and the person they felt monitored the induction program. Specifically, the participants were asked whether they found mentoring, modeling of instructional practices, or culture of continuous learning to be the most useful aspects of their induction programs. Within District A, teachers reported a tie between mentoring and modeling instructional practices, both receiving 44.4% of responses. Only 11.1% believed creating a culture of lifelong learning to be the most important factor. In regards to program monitoring, participants were asked whether the program was self-monitored/self-reflective or whether a building principal or central office administrator monitored the program. Out of the respondents from District A, 44.4% reported the program was self-monitored/self-reflective, 33.3% reported that a central office administrator monitored

the program, and 22.2% reported their building principal monitored the program.

Participants responded to two open-response survey items addressing the challenging elements of the program and possible changes that might improve the program. When asked about the challenging aspects of the induction program, 90% of the respondents replied that time as their primary challenge. Some teachers reported that they found it difficult to complete the programs requirements while maintaining their classes, while others stated that the induction materials and requirements were time-consuming. When asked about possible changes or improvements to the induction program, the majority of respondents stated they would prefer more hands-on activities that directly applied to their instruction, asking for less reading and more situational applications. One respondent even suggested an exclusively mentor/mentee program.

The reader will see that the broad themes within the teacher responses and the administrator responses share similarities but also share differences. According to administrator A mentoring is a large component of the districts program, as is reflection. By the data from the teacher respondents only half, or 44.4 %, of the teachers agreed mentoring was a large component and only half, or 44.4% believed the program was self-reflective. A strikingly overwhelming similarity was the time factor. According to both parties the issue of finding the “time” to either produce or complete the program was concerning factor.

District B. Six out of seven newly hired teachers from District B responded to the electronic survey. Much like District A, all respondents from District B indicated that they agreed to some degree (83.3% strongly agree; 16.7% agree) that people who strive for instructional improvement lead the induction program. Interestingly, this was the only item in which the majority of respondents reported that they strongly agreed. While 100% of

respondents reported that they agreed, to some degree, that District B's induction program requires resources that support adult learning, only 16.7% strongly agreed with this statement (83.3% somewhat agreed). Sixty-six point seven percent somewhat agreed that the program provided them with research based instructional strategies. However, only 55.6% somewhat agreed the program required resources which supported collaboration and 50.0% somewhat agreed the program provided research based instructional strategies. Within questions 5 the majority, 50%, disagreed that the program utilizes data to monitor progress. One third of the respondents (33.3%) stated that they disagreed that data was utilized to determine adult learning.

Table 4-6 presents District B's Likert responses to the electronic survey.

Table 4-6: School District B Electronic Survey Results

Survey Item	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. Induction program is guided by district leaders continuously striving for instructional improvement.	83.3	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
2. Induction program requires resources supporting adult learning.	16.7	83.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
3. Induction program requires resources that support collaboration.	16.7	50.0	33.3	0.0	0.0
4. Induction program utilizes data to determine adult learning priorities.	16.7	16.7	33.3	33.3	0.0
5. Induction program utilizes data to monitor progress.	16.7	16.7	16.7	50.0	0.0
6. Induction program utilizes data to help sustain improvement.	16.7	33.3	33.3	16.7	0.0
7. Induction program applies knowledge about human learning and change.	33.3	50.0	16.7	0.0	0.0
8. Induction program deepens educator's content knowledge.	16.7	66.7	0.0	16.7	0.0

9. Induction program provided you with research based instructional strategies.	33.3	50.0	16.7	0.0	0.0
10. Induction program prepared teachers to use various types of classroom assessments.	33.3	50.0	16.7	0.0	0.0

District B's participants also responded to the two fixed-response items addressing their perception of the most important factor within the program and the administrator responsible for monitoring the program. Between the options of mentoring, modeling of instructional practices, and culture of continuous learning, 50% of the respondents believed that modeling instructional practices was the most useful aspect of their induction program, followed by creating a culture of continuous learning (33.3%) and mentoring (16.7%). When asked about the monitoring of the program, 40% of District B's participants stated the building principal monitored the program, while 60% stated a central office administrator monitored the program. No respondents from District B reported that the induction program was self-monitored or self-reflective.

Finally, District B's participants provided responses to the open-ended items addressing the challenges of and possible changes to the existing induction program. Participants provided a variety of responses when asked about the challenges of the program, including difficulty with applying the program to individual needs, the use of technology programs, preparing for level II certification, and time. When asked about the changes they would make to the program, 50% of District B's respondents stated they would prefer more individualization in the program, 25% stated they wanted more resources included in the program, and 15% stated they would like more time to complete tasks.

The reader will see that the broad themes within the teacher responses and the administrator responses share similarities but also share differences. According to administrator B meeting the needs of the teachers and saving time by providing an online component were

both driving focuses within the program. By the data from the teacher respondents half, or 50.0 %, of the teachers felt as it the program was applicable to individual need and 15% stated that more time to complete task would be preferable.

District C. In District C, six out of seven teachers engaging in the district's induction program responded to the electronic survey. All District C participants (100%) indicated that they strongly agreed with the statement the induction program is led by individuals who continuously strive for instructional improvement. Additionally, all respondents agreed, to some degree, that the induction program requires resources supporting adult learning (83.3% strongly agreed; 16.7% somewhat agreed), that the induction program applies knowledge about human learning and change (83.3% strongly agreed; 16.7% somewhat agreed), and that the induction program provided the respondent with research-based instructional strategies (66.7% strongly agreed; 33.3% agreed).

While most responses were positive, District C's respondents reported more responses indicating that they neither agree nor disagree or somewhat/strongly disagree with the survey questions. In fact, questions 5, 6, and 8 had 16.7% of respondents, strongly disagreed to the questions. Meaning, a portion of the teacher's perceptions is that the district is not utilizing data within the induction program nor is the district deepening the educator's content knowledge. Statements that I suggests District C administrator would strongly argue against.

Table 4-7 reports all Likert responses from District C respondents.

Table 4-7: School District C Electronic Survey Results

Survey Item	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------	----------------	----------------	---------------------------	----------	-------------------

1. Induction program is guided by district leaders continuously striving for instructional improvement.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2. Induction program requires resources supporting adult learning.	83.3	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
3. Induction program requires resources that support collaboration.	50.0	33.3	0.0	16.7	0.0
4. Induction program utilizes data to determine adult learning priorities.	20.0	80.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
5. Induction program utilizes data to monitor progress.	16.7	0.0	33.3	33.3	16.7
6. Induction program utilizes data to help sustain improvement.	16.7	16.7	33.3	16.7	16.7
7. Induction program applies knowledge about human learning and change.	83.3	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
8. Induction program deepens educator's content knowledge.	16.7	66.7	0.0	0.0	16.7
9. Induction program provided you with research based instructional strategies.	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
10. Induction program prepared teachers to use various types of classroom assessments.	66.7	16.7	0.0	16.7	0.0

In addition to the Likert response items, the fixed-response items (i.e., the items regarding the important elements of the induction program and perception of who monitors the program) from District C's respondents provided more information about the district's induction program. An overwhelming 83.3% of District C's respondents reported that mentoring was the most important aspect of the induction program, with the remaining 16.7% perceiving creating a culture of lifelong learning as the most useful aspect of their induction program. Interestingly, no respondents considered modeling instructional practices as the most important aspect of the induction program. When reporting their perceptions on who monitors the induction program, District C's respondents either reported that program was self-monitored or monitored by a central office administrator. With 50% of the respondents selecting one of these two options, the

building principals in District C are not perceived as being part of the monitoring process.

Finally, participants from District C provided open-ended responses to questions asking about the current challenges and potential improvements to the existing teacher induction program. Respondents reported challenges such as “ensuring induction days are relevant to teachers of multiple levels” and “time for planning, reflections, and completion of the program.” Furthermore, if the newly hired teachers of District C could make a change to the existing induction program, they reported they would like to have more administrative feedback regarding classroom instruction in the form of frequent teacher observation. Respondents also stated that they would prefer to have more collaboration time with other teachers, especially expert teachers. Finally, District C’s inductees suggested putting various aspects of the induction into an online format in order to cut down on time spent out of the classroom and promote a more efficient use of time.

The reader will see that the broad themes within the teacher responses and the administrator responses share similarities but also share differences. According to administrator C understanding the culture of the district and understanding Charlotte Danielson’s Framework are large components within the program. Within district C 100% of teacher respondents perceived that the program strives for instructional improvement. However, teacher respondents noted that more administrative feedback regarding instruction would be helpful. Respondents also mentioned that more time would be an effective measure. Time did not seem to be a concern for administrator C.

District D. Seven out of seven teachers participating in District D’s induction program responded to the electronic survey. As with the other districts, all of District D’s respondents

reported that they agreed, to some degree, that the induction program is guided by leaders who continuously strive for improvement (81.8% strongly agreed; 12.2% somewhat agreed). In fact, all respondents agreed, to some degree, with items 1, 2, 3, and 7. However, only 63.6% indicated they somewhat agree that the program fostered collaboration and 27.3% disagreed that the program utilized data to guide the program's learning priorities. Table 4-8 includes the electronic survey results to Likert items for District D's respondents.

Table 4-8: School District D Electronic Survey Results

Survey Item	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. Induction program is guided by district leaders continuously striving for instructional improvement.	81.8	18.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
2. Induction program requires resources supporting adult learning.	54.5	36.4	0.0	9.1	0.0
3. Induction program requires resources that support collaboration.	36.4	63.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
4. Induction program utilizes data to determine adult learning priorities.	9.1	54.5	9.1	27.3	0.0
5. Induction program utilizes data to monitor progress.	27.3	18.2	27.3	27.3	0.0
6. Induction program utilizes data to help sustain improvement.	36.4	27.3	27.3	9.1	0.0
7. Induction program applies knowledge about human learning and change.	81.8	18.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
8. Induction program deepens educator's content knowledge.	36.4	18.2	9.1	36.4	0.0
9. Induction program provided you with research based instructional strategies.	50.0	40.0	10.0	0.0	0.0
10. Induction program prepared teachers to use various types of classroom assessments.	36.4	27.3	27.3	9.1	0.0

In addition to the Likert responses, participants completed two fixed-response questions relating

to the elements of the induction program that they found important and the person they felt monitored the induction program. For District D, 45.5% of the respondents believed creating a culture of continuous learning to be the most important factor of the induction program, with the remaining 54.6% of respondents split between selecting mentoring or modeling instructional practices to be of greatest import (i.e. 27.3% of respondents selected each option). When responding to the item about program monitoring, 75% of respondents from District D reported that a central office administrator monitored their program, while the remaining 25% stated the program was self-monitored through reflections. Much like District C, no respondents from District D identified the building principal as the individual monitoring the induction program.

Finally, participants responded to two open-response survey items addressing the challenging elements of the program and possible changes that might improve the program. The vast majority (90%) of respondents from District D stated that time were the most challenging factor of the induction program. The remaining 10% responded that providing a program that met the needs of various learners was a challenge. In responding to the second open-ended question, respondents from District D provided a wide variety of responses, many of which were more detailed than those provided from other districts. In order to fully represent these viewpoints, these responses are included in Table 4-9.

Table 4-9: District D Open-Ended Responses Regarding Improving the District's Induction Program

“I would occasionally divide the group up so that 7-12 teachers could focus on areas that are more pertinent to the secondary teacher.”

“I would like to hear more question and answer sessions from the teachers. It was very powerful to hear what teachers have been through and how they handled different situations.”

“Make part of it online; address more “first year/new teacher” needs; not ask us to have a written reflection on each session.”

“The individual observations and one on one feedback has been invaluable.”

“I would like to hear more about potential changes our schools may make (common core standards, universal assessments)”

“Allow new teachers the opportunity to shadow teachers in their grade to see instruction strategies in place.”

“More administrative feedback regarding classroom instruction.”

The reader will see that the broad themes within the teacher responses and the administrator responses share similarities but also share differences. According to administrator D mentoring large components of the districts program are reflection, mentoring, and creating a culture of learning. By the data from the teacher respondents there are many similarities in the administrators and the teachers responses. According to the teacher responses 45.5% found the program to create a culture of learning and 54.6% perceived mentoring and modeling instructional practices to be the most useful aspects of the program. The most striking differences was the lack of “time” concern on the part of the administrator and the emphasis (90%) on time being the most challenging part of the program according to the teachers.

District E. In District E, eight out of eight teacher inductees participated in the electronic survey. Just as in all other districts, 100% of District E’s respondents reported that they agree, to some degree that the induction program was guided by district leaders who strive for constant improvement (87.5% strongly agreed; 12.5% somewhat agreed). However, this statement was the only item that only included responses that expressed agreement. While no items garnered responses of ‘strongly disagree,’ all other items included some participants responding with either the ‘neither agree nor disagree’ and ‘disagree’ responses.

While Table 4-10 displays all Likert data for District E, some responses were surprising. For example, 50% disagreed that the induction program uses data to monitor progress, yet 50%

agree, to some degree, that the program uses data to determine what the learning needs are. (So why do teachers feel that data is being used for one thing but not the other?) Also, 75% agree to some degree that the program provides research based instructional strategies, but 37.5% neither agree/disagree and 37.5% disagree that that the program deepens content knowledge.

Table 4-10: School District E Electronic Survey Results

Survey Item	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. Induction program is guided by district leaders continuously striving for instructional improvement.	87.5	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
2. Induction program requires resources supporting adult learning.	37.5	50.0	12.5	0.0	0.0
3. Induction program requires resources that support collaboration.	37.5	50.0	12.5	0.0	0.0
4. Induction program utilizes data to determine adult learning priorities.	12.5	37.5	25.0	25.0	0.0
5. Induction program utilizes data to monitor progress.	12.5	25.0	12.5	50.0	0.0
6. Induction program utilizes data to help sustain improvement.	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	0.0
7. Induction program applies knowledge about human learning and change.	25.0	37.5	25.0	12.5	0.0
8. Induction program deepens educator's content knowledge.	25.0	0.0	37.5	37.5	0.0
9. Induction program provided you with research based instructional strategies.	37.5	37.5	12.5	12.5	0.0
10. Induction program prepared teachers to use various types of classroom assessments.	37.5	12.5	12.5	37.5	0.0

In regards to the fixed-response questions, District E's respondents 100% of respondents selected mentoring as the most useful aspect of their teacher induction program. While other districts have been split between two of the three options, District E was the only district to have

such a polarized response to this survey item. The participants' responses to the fixed-response item about responsibility for induction program monitoring were more typical, as compared to the other districts. District E's respondents most frequently identified the building principal as the one who monitored the induction program (66.7%). The remaining respondents were split in their perception of who monitors the program, with 16.7% attributing the task self-monitoring and 16.7% attributing it to a central office administrator

Finally, newly hired teachers from District E provided open-ended responses regarding the challenges and possible improvements to the district's current induction program. Nearly 80% of District E's respondents stated that time was a significant challenge to completing the induction program. One participant reflected:

The most challenging part of the program was finding time to meet with my mentor. In the situation, which I fully understand, my mentor was from a different grade-level and department. We had no common planning periods and busy after-school schedules.

Another respondent added more perspective about the challenge of time:

Finding the time to meet with my mentor - we both were coaches and struggled to find time to meet in the middle of the school year when the work load increased for us both.

In addition to reporting time hurdle, 20% of respondents identified that the level of support within the first year makes the program challenging, although this was not necessarily solely related to the induction program. These challenges were reflected in the respondent's suggestions for strengthening the induction program. District E respondents suggested an increased emphasis on classroom management strategies, increased time to meet with mentors and to complete work, increased knowledge of new assessment and state regulations, and increased opportunities for collaboration.

The reader will see that the broad themes within the teacher responses and the

administrator responses share similarities but also share differences. According to administrator E mentoring, collaboration, understanding the districts culture, and curricular design are all large components of the districts program. By the data from the teacher respondents 100% perceived mentoring to be the most important aspect of the induction program. I felt the administrator and the teachers were both in alignment on this issue; however, other perceptions differed. 80% of the teachers responded that time was a concern, and other emphasis from district E respondents encompassed classroom management strategies and increased opportunities for collaboration.

Emergent themes from open-ended survey items. By analyzing the open-ended responses from all participants from all five school districts, I found recurring themes in the responses regarding suggestions to strengthen existing induction programs. Based on the responses, the role of understanding the needs of the teachers, students, and community seemed imperative. The respondents understood that the school districts are attempting to provide exceptional educational opportunities or strive for educational excellence; however, time continued to be an emergent theme. Another emergent theme was that of meaningfulness within the induction program. At times the respondents shared that the program would be more effective if it were specific to their content level or certification level (elementary/secondary). Instructional practices and administrative observations and feedback also emerged as consensus themes. Table 4-11 presents the emergent consensus, supported, and individual themes found within the survey's open-ended item responses.

Table 4-11: Emergent Themes in Open-Ended Responses to the Electronic Survey * indicates total responses from electronic survey

Consensus Themes (Frequency of 60% or more)	Supported Themes (Frequency of 30%-59%)	Individual Themes (Frequency of 1%-29%)
--	--	--

-
- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Utilization of time (23) • Instructional focus (7) • Administrative support and feedback (8) • “Meaningfulness” in the program (8) • Focus on instructional strategies (11) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaboration (4) • Instructional support (3) • Assessment and policy updates (3) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Classroom management (2) • Online Program (1) • Technology (1) • Mentor/mentee programs (2) |
|---|---|--|
-

Throughout the data collection and analysis of research question three (RQ3) I could not help to notice some discrepancies within the perceptions of the teachers and the perceptions of the administrators. For example, in District A the administrator implied that mentoring is a component, which is quite important. The administrator within district A works with the mentors and trains the mentors on a regular basis, in contrast, less than half of the teacher respondents viewed mentoring as a useful aspect of the induction program. Also, within District B, the online medium was utilized for the sake of time. District B administrator felt as if the online format saved time for both the teacher and the administrator; however, in the teacher responses from the electronic survey the concern of time still arose as a challenge. Finally, the utilization of data was one of the largest discrepancies between teacher and administrator perceptions. According to the administrators in the selected districts data was a tool utilized to guide the program and to assess the needs of the program. In five out of five of the selected districts the majority (50% +) of teachers responding never “strongly agreed” that data was utilized for assessment, content, of needs within the program and within the open ended questions from the electronic survey data did not emerge as a theme.

4.2.4 To What Extent do the Selected District’s Programs Align with what the Research Tells Us Regarding the Characteristics of Teacher Induction Programs?

The selected school districts within this study willingly and cooperatively assisted by providing

insights and analysis of their teacher induction programs. In many instances, I was asked for feedback upon the conclusion of the study, which demonstrated that the selected school districts genuinely want to provide programs that will be meaningful to their teachers. The district administrators want to afford the best opportunities for their teachers and provide them with filled “toolboxes” of strategies, data, and collaborative techniques, in order to globally compete in the realm of education. According to research, the most effective induction programs are those with characteristics such as collaboration, data analysis, community involvement, understanding of school and community culture, leadership, evaluation, quality teaching, are research based, include self-reflection, and learning communities (Sweeny 2008).

Based on careful analysis of data collected in the semi-structured administrator interviews and the electronic teacher survey the emergent themes are compared to the characteristics of Sweeny’s research model of teacher induction programs. The “classification” assists with breaking the selected school districts into research based model or “categories” it also provides tangible data with which to align the district’s induction programs. If the districts, or even future researched districts, evaluate the characteristics of their specific induction program to a researched model, it may provide a structure and support system for the school district’s induction programs. The classification is based upon the collected qualitative and quantitative data collected within this chapter. Each district was carefully assessed and emergent themes and characteristics enabled I to align the district programs with the researched model. A summary classification for the selected districts is provided below with a detailed discussion of the classification to follow according to the district. I classified the selected school districts’ as follows:

- Districts A, B, C, and D: Instructional Practice Model

- District E: Transformational Model

These classifications as mentioned above are based upon the qualitative and quantitative data collected within this study.

The final questions from the semi-structured administrative interview and the electronic teacher survey assist with solidifying the selected school districts designation according to the research based model. The final questions within the study that assist in the program classification include: (1) If you had unlimited resources how would you change the program and why? and (2) What research model and/or pedagogy do you utilize? These questions provide data as to how I contrasts or affirms the classification and also provides information on how the districts may be able to move their specific induction program closer to a more effective research based model; such as the school transformational model. As within the previous research questions the data analysis is discussed according to the selected district, A,B,C,D, and E.

District A. As previously mentioned District A's administrator is a building-level principal, a director of curriculum within the district, and responsible for the district's induction program. With the amount of responsibility carried by District A's administrator, it was not surprising when the administrator stated that if anything could change it would be the "number of hats" he/she wears for the district.

Mentoring was a large component according to District A administrator; however, according to the teacher responses only 44% agreed with this perception. District A's teacher responses and administrative interview provided data that the district utilized mentoring, reflection, and portfolios as means of evaluation and assessment. However, there were many characteristics of an effective induction program that were missing from the district, such as

utilization of learning communities, collaboration, data analysis, community involvement, understanding of school and community culture, leadership, evaluation, and quality of teaching, to mention a few. In fact, that I pondered upon identifying the district in the most ineffective classification, of “Basic.” The utilization of portfolios within the selected district, as means of assessment and evaluation, served as the integral piece for the district’s classification of “instructional practice” model.

The identification of District A’s needs from the teacher respondents and specifically from the administrator reinforced areas of improvement within the program. District A’s administrator expressed that changing this administrative role would strengthen the program. In doing so, the administrator would have the opportunity to focus on teacher induction and teacher professional development. In addition to changing the administrator’s role, District A’s administrator wished for more data-driven decisions based upon the needs of the students, faculty, and community. In an ideal world, District A’s administrator imagined that the program focus would be on teacher reflection; these reflections would be discussed during regular discussions. District A’s Administrator also expressed the desire for more resources that could help the district focus on real growth and best practices.

In regards to a research based induction program model, District A’s administrator identified that the district’s program is reflective of Danielson’s (1996) framework. District A’s administrator pointed out Danielson’s model is ideal, with the added bonus of aligning with the current common core standards and goals from the state. However, other than utilizing Danielson’s framework within the Pennsylvania Department of Education’s mandated teacher evaluation form (426) there was little reference to Danielson’s framework from the administrator and even less data regarding a research-based model from the teacher respondents.

District B. The online component creates a unique position for District B's induction program, as this district was the only district with an induction program that was primarily online. As previously identified by District B's administrator, a huge incentive for the online component was the time factor: "Online programs can create more time when needed due to the convenience of when you can participate in them." However, when asked if they had unlimited resources what would they change, the response was regarding the amount of attention which could be given to the program and to the teachers. District B's administrator stated they would like to give more attention to the inductees.

According to District B's administrator, the program has evolved over the past few years and is content based on a variety of educational researchers, such as Danielson, Tomlinson, and even various reading and writing strategies (e.g., John Collins).

District B's administrator further explained that involving multiple administrators in the creation of the program assisted in breaking down the amount of time which the program took to create. According to District B administrator the program did include data, which the teachers were prompted to analyze and apply to a fictional classroom situation; however, from the teachers perception 50% disagreed that data was utilized to monitor the program. Monitoring and evaluation is a key characteristic of an effective induction program and District B is largely lacking that characteristic. District B's administrator claimed that reflection was a characteristic by the means of discussion boards and blogs within the online format, but the teachers perception was that the program was not self reflective. A saving grace within District B was the strong basis of instructional strategies and continual learning. Both the administrator and the teachers perceived that instructional strategies and continual learning are key characteristics within the program. The induction program boasts, researched based instructional strategies within

differentiation, and reading and writing strategies, some levels of data collection, and mentoring. If the missing characteristics of collaboration, assessment and monitoring, and data could be identified by both administrator and teacher then the model may be much more effective.

District C. District C relied upon research models that are current with state standards and are applicable to the needs of the teachers at the current moment. As such, Danielson's (1996) framework is embedded through the program and in the buildings. District C's administrator asserted that it is essential that teachers understand how they are going to be evaluated, quipping, "who likes to be assessed and not know what they are being assessed on?" As in District A, I suggest that Danielson's framework is so strongly spoken of within District C due to the Pennsylvania Department of Education's teacher evaluative form, 426. District C administrator did not address any changes or modifications to the induction program; however, the teacher's perception of lack of time, lack of administrative feedback and monitoring, and lack of data to sustain student improvement were all concerns. Strengths that identify District C's induction program with the instructional practice model are the: emphasis on mentoring, the emphasis on the continual strive for instructional improvement, the application of knowledge regarding human learning and change, development of instructional strategies, learning communities, and classroom assessment.

I was a bit disappointed in the amount of information District C administrator provided. If it were not for further prompting and the teacher responses in the electronic survey the data from District C may have been inconclusive.

District D. District D's administrator did not like to use a specific model or research for their program; rather, the administrator bases the induction program upon the needs of the teachers. District D's administrator reported working very closely with the mentors and the

teachers to provide them support. Towards the end of the induction year, teachers within the program compose a student and a separate parent survey, which provides feedback directly to the teachers. District D administrator emphasized a celebration of learning, which was unlike the other districts. The program encompassed the characteristic of celebrating learning, celebrating, teaching, and understanding the culture and community. These characteristics are essential when developing a school transformational model. The administrator and the teachers both shared the perceived characteristics of “life-long learning.” This characteristic was echoed in the portfolio assessment, the mentoring, and the collaboration amongst teachers, and the learning communities.

District D’s administrator considered what improvements would be made if given the unlimited resources, responding that the district would hire the “best and brightest recently retired teachers to mentor the inductees.” Whether it be employing recently retired teachers on a part-time basis for mentoring or making use of the teachers in the surrounding areas and community, District D’s administrator recognized that by using resources wisely, a program is limitless.

The continual striving for improvement, celebration of learning, understanding of culture and community, use of student and parent feedback, and for implementation of effective characteristics separates District D from the other districts thus far. I believe that District D is the closest to the school transformational model when compared to districts A,B, and C. However, within District D, there still are aspects with which to strive. A need within the district is to ensure that all teachers understand the focus of the induction program and perceive the program to be effective also an effective monitoring process is needed. District D did not appear to contain (other than portfolios and 426 evaluative form) an assessment and monitoring piece.

Some teacher respondents perceived that administrative feedback was an integral missing piece within the program. Due to these missing characteristics District D is classified as an instructional practice model.

District E. District E has a very demanding schedule of their new teachers. The district has a team of administrators who take on specific responsibilities within the induction program. The program, although demanding, had the strongest basis on research; citing Wiggins and Mctighe (2004), and Tomlinson (1999) specifically and providing evidence of the research in their program. The induction program was very specific in their evaluation and monitoring of teachers in their induction program. District E administrator provided a sample evaluative rubric and presentation, which is given to the inductees. Mentoring and reflection were also key characteristics within the program. Although not 100% of teachers perceived these components as the most important aspects within the program in most cases a majority did as did District E administrator. The most important characteristic within District E is the time spent on understanding the culture of the district and the community. The program took a great amount of time and energy to develop and relate the culture of the district through symbols and names, which community and students took part in developing. The teachers are made to feel as if they are becoming part of a community of teaching and learning. This characteristic was essential to a school transformational model, and missing in district's A, B, and C. District E also was sure to provide individual feedback to teachers in the induction program. The time was taken to assess, monitor, provide feedback, collaborate, develop learning communities, and instructional resources. The model developed was exciting from both the administrators and the teacher perceptions.

When reflecting upon potential changes in the program if resources were limitless,

District E's administrator reiterated the time concern, but interestingly enough stated "it is not so much changing what we do in induction, but rather when we do it." As in District D I identified key characteristics of an effective induction program in District E. District E's program contained, mentoring, reflection, assessment and monitoring, research based practices, and very importantly a strong emphasis on the understanding of the community and district's culture and is therefore classified as a school transformational model.

4.3 CONCLUSIONS

By analyzing the collected data, I identified characteristics within the five districts in relation to desired changes to the induction programs and the types of programs used. The role of understanding the needs of the teachers, students, and community was imperative. Districts were very reluctant to prescribe to a "canned" program for fear that it would not be specific enough to the district. In addition, the programs were constantly evolving to meet the growing needs and demands of new teachers. Many times, the districts made these changes to address the needs annually. This constant evolution created a strain on the time and the demands of the administrator responsible for the program (see table 4-12). Based upon the literature reviewed, data collected, and characteristics of Sweeny's Model the aforementioned school districts were classified accordingly. Table 4-12 provides an illustration of the classification according to school district, emergent established themes, and emergent needed themes, program characteristics, and classification model.

Table 4-12: District Classification According To Sweeny's Model

Selected School District	Emergent Themes	Program Characteristics	Extent of Alignment	Suggested Model Classification
A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mentoring • Reflection • Use of portfolio for assessment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building based administrator • Mentor focused • Portfolio component 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moderately Effective 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instructional Practice
B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data • Collaboration • Instructional Strategies • Mentoring 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administratively directed • Online component 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moderately Effective 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instructional Practice
C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based upon needs of teachers • Building Based Program • Mentoring 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on culture and community • Guided strongly by building principals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moderately Effective 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instructional Practice
D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Celebration of learning • Culture and Community • Instructional Strategies • Reflection • Use of portfolio as assessment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Celebrate learning and culture • Portfolio component 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moderately Effective 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instructional Practice
E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaboration • Culture and Community • Instructionally Based • Leadership • Reflective • Teamwork 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative team based on the strengths of admin • Portfolio component 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most Effective 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School Transformational Model

Data revealed that induction programs vary in regards to their characteristics, their

district focus, and their method of addressing the needs of the teacher(s). Throughout the semi-structured interviews and electronic teacher survey, I was able to gather both qualitative and quantitative data regarding each district's teacher induction program. With the primary focus of teacher induction programs to "develop" great teachers it is essential that school districts began to fully analyze their means of teacher development. Only through careful inspection of a district's induction program can schools districts begin to align their induction programs with what research states are effective practices. Only then will school districts begin to reap the benefits of their induction programs.

5.0 CHAPTER FIVE CONCLUSIONS, PERSONAL REFLECTIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 SUMMARY OF STUDY

As the demands grow for teacher development and retention, demand for high quality induction programs grow as well. New teachers need a variety of supports in order to survive the 21st century public education system (Feiman-Nemser, 2003). Clearly, many current supports are not effective: Newly hired teachers account for a large portion of teacher exodus, with many of these new teachers reporting that they frequently feel overwhelmed within their first year (Ingersoll, 2003). In fact, data from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) and Teacher Follow-up Survey indicated that between 40-50% of teachers leave the profession within the first five years (Ingersoll, 2003). Of those beginning teachers, 19% stated they left due to staffing such as layoffs, cutbacks, or other termination, and another 42% stated they left for personal reasons. The remaining 39% left to pursue better jobs, and 29% cited dissatisfaction with their jobs (Ingersoll, 2003).

Teacher induction programs have evolved as educators realized the need to provide both instructional and emotional support to incoming teachers. Some induction programs have evolved in attempts to reduce exodus within the first five years of teaching, while others have evolved to provide instructional support, to convey the culture and community of the schools, or to address all three of these issues. In this Chapter, I will restate the problem addressed by this study and review the trends in teacher induction program. Subsequent sections will summarize the results and the broad takeaways from the study, include personal reflections, provide

recommendations for future research, and contain concluding remarks.

5.1.1 Restatement and Brief Review of the Problem

As detailed in Chapter 1 of this study, American students compete globally in the academic sector. American schools prepare students for the global market and post-secondary education upon graduation from public education institutions. Teachers and administrators are essential to this purpose, and, as stated by Edmondson (2007), “we must be able to give teachers needed skill set to prepare our students” (p. 3). In fact, researchers have stated that a well-prepared teacher can have a greater impact on student achievement than poverty, language background, and minority status (Davis, Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, & Meyerson, 2005).

After teacher pre-service training, teacher professional development is the next major step towards improving teachers’ practices (Wong, 2004). High quality intensive professional development programs are crucial to train, support, and retain quality teachers (Wong, 2004). These induction programs improve teachers’ classroom management patterns and instructional strategies, provide opportunities for new teachers to observe master teachers in demonstration lessons, and acculturate new teachers to the district (Wong, 2004).

If teacher induction programs are thought to reap benefits for schools, then it is important to evaluate the quality of these programs (Wong, 2004). Currently, according to the Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE) teacher induction programs are a requirement for permanent certification and ultimately tenure. The induction programs must address the needs of the schools, the teachers, and the community, as well as contain mechanisms for program evaluation grounded in research and aligned with standards (Wong, 2004). However, in many school districts, teacher induction programs do not embody the characteristics of effective,

researched models (Wong, 2004). If we are to begin investigating what practices impact public education, we must first look at the characteristics and practices of our teacher induction programs.

The preparation colleges and universities provide to their students (i.e., future teachers) has historically been monitored by a professor, mentoring teacher, or both. I have found once the students exit the university and enter the teaching profession, they often find themselves on their own. For the first time, they are solely responsible for creating a positive learning environment within classroom of students, a building of colleagues, and a community of parents. These teachers need support in their profession and in many cases instructional development (Wong 2005).

It is from this supportive and instructional need that teacher induction programs have evolved. Today's teacher must be familiar with state mandates, various methods of assessment, how to interpret data from assessments, special education laws and regulations, not to mention specific curriculum, best teaching practices, differentiated instruction, classroom management, culture and community of their schools, and other demands which are required of teachers. A career in teaching can very quickly become overwhelming and new teachers can feel as if they can barely keep their "head above water" (Wong 2005).

Research suggests that quality induction programs can make a difference in relation to teaching practices (Breaux & Wong, 2003). Hence, schools must offer the support and consistency to enable beginning teachers to teach effectively and to continue their own educational development (Breaux & Wong, 2003). In fact, Breaux and Wong (2003) indicated that beginning teachers should be a part of a strong induction program that goes beyond an orientation or assignment of a mentor and helps to develop and cultivate an attitude of lifelong

learning.

5.2 DISCUSSION OF INTERPRETATIONS AND FINDINGS

As highlighted throughout both the literature review and the collected data for this study, induction programs can vary in their design and characteristics. According to research, the most effective induction programs are those with characteristics such as collaboration, data analysis, community involvement, understanding of school and community culture, leadership, evaluation, quality teaching, are research based, include self-reflection, and learning communities (Sweeny 2008). Within this study, characteristics of teacher induction programs were identified within the case study school districts and categorized along with other emergent themes to further classify the selected districts according to researcher Barry Sweeny's induction model. Throughout the collection of quantitative and qualitative data three major findings were yielded, a perceived disconnection between administrators and teachers regarding the teacher induction programs, the selection of specific researched based models or lack there of, and the need for time as perceived by administrators and teachers.

5.2.1 Perceived Disconnect between Administrator and Teacher

Often, the districts relied upon the use of mentors to help implement, monitor, and acculturate new teachers to the district's core values. Induction programs may contain a mentoring component, but an effective induction program will go far beyond pairing a novice teacher with a veteran teacher or mentor (Wong, 2003). Within this study, all five districts incorporated mentoring as a part of the induction program; however, the degree to which emphasis was placed on this mentoring relationship varied by district. For example, according to District administrator A their district strongly incorporated mentoring with such an emphasis that the

mentors were trained regularly on successful mentoring strategies. However, teacher responses from district A indicate only 44.4% perceived mentoring as a key factor within their program. District B administrators also stated that mentoring plays an integral role in their teacher induction program, especially within the teachers first year, but shockingly only 16.7% of the respondents perceived mentoring to be an essential part of the induction program.

In addition to mentoring, monitoring that occurred by the administrators, building principals, and mentors, indicated the districts monitored their programs as prescribed by state mandates; however, specific monitoring and assessment of the quality of the program was not frequently mentioned during the semi-structured administrative interviews, leading I to question the fidelity and quality of program monitoring within some districts. I believe that these quantitative and qualitative findings are small ripples in various other issues that create a “disconnect” or a distorted view of reality regarding the perceptions of the administrator and the teachers.

Data should be a driving impetus in assessing the needs of teachers and for monitoring/evaluation of the program. Frequently, the perception of the administrators was that data from teachers and from school assessments were utilized to guide the content of the induction program. In contrast, according to the teacher respondents in five out of five districts data was not ever identified as a majority (50% or higher) in the “strongly agree category.” If administrators perceive that data is a driving impetus for the induction program content why then do the teachers not share that same perception? Also, 75% agree that the program provides research based instructional strategies, but 37.5% neither agree/disagree and 37.5% disagree that that the program deepens content knowledge. Clearly, the perception of data incorporation was more apparent on the administrator side than the teacher.

Additionally, most district administrators reported that induction programs were assessed through self-reflection, portfolios, observations, and mentoring; however, protocols for assessment methods were not specific. For the most part the districts referred to the Pennsylvania Department of Education 426 evaluative form for the assessment method. Only District E provided other methods of assessment, such as rubrics. As evidenced in this study, assessment and monitoring of the five induction programs was minimal. In addition to mentoring, monitoring that occurred via administrators, building principals, and mentors, districts monitored their programs as prescribed by state mandates (specifically the 426 evaluative form); however, specific monitoring and assessment of the quality of the program was not frequently mentioned during the semi-structured administrative interviews, leading I to question the fidelity of program monitoring within some districts. For example, District A's administrator was not only responsible for monitoring the induction program, but also for directing curriculum along with an elementary building. I believe this lack of monitoring may be due to administrative time constraints, although alternative explanations are certainly possible. District administrator E provides many examples of monitoring within the program, such as portfolios, rubrics, observations, and structured monthly meetings. From the administrator's perspective, it seems as if district E incorporated a higher level of monitoring in their induction program than the other districts. However, I was also interested in understanding the induction programs from the viewpoint of the teacher inductee participating in the program. When the topic of monitoring and assessment was compared to the teacher respondents 25% disagreed that data was utilized in determining teacher learning priorities, and 50% disagreed the program utilized data to monitor progress within the program. Through incorporating qualitative and quantitative data I was able to gather a more accurate insights into the study.

The quantitative data collected throughout the survey indicated teachers clearly understood the direction of the school district and that the induction program was intended to strive for educational excellence; however, the teachers did not report on the presence of some of the elements that the district administrators claimed to have implemented or included in the program as evidenced above.

Induction programs are becoming a commonality in many schools, with more than 80% of beginning teachers reporting participation in an induction program (Ingersoll & Smith, 2004). In the commonwealth of Pennsylvania, they have become mandated practices for schools with mandated participation by teachers. As these programs gain more and more attention, this study showed that there can be a noted “disconnect” in what teachers and administrators perceive as integral characteristics of the programs. As programs are widely varied, there may be disparity between “the needs of these new teachers and the supports they received” (Johnson, Kardos, Kauffman, Liu, & Donaldson, 2004, p. 12). This disparity, or “mismatch,” can have damning effects on induction programs and leave teachers and administrators frustrated. A distorted view of reality occurs because an administrator creates a program and believes their concepts are implemented; however, ineffective monitoring, assessment, and the lack of data utilization are revealing that the truth behind what is actually occurring in the selected districts induction programs is not what the administrators actually intended. An effective teacher induction program ideally will have the perceptions of both parties in alignment and both parties learning.

By providing a model to frame the district’s induction program, it increases the chance that the administration and the teachers are receiving the same messages from the program. By aligning induction programs with best-practice models and research-supported effective

characteristics, the teachers and the administrators are taking strides develop, nurture, and support their new teachers.

5.2.2 Research Models Utilized

When reviewing data from the selected five school districts within this study, many characteristics of Sweeny's most effective induction programs were observed or represented; however, each district's induction program had its own unique formula for what they considered an effective induction program(s). For example, some induction programs incorporated a formal methodology such as *Understanding by Design* by Wiggins and McTighe (2004). Other districts incorporated an online component as a medium to structure their program and increase efficiency, and still other districts largely relied upon building principals to structure the program based upon the perceived needs of the new teachers in their building(s). All selected districts quoted research models as a basis for their program and were able to articulate how these research strategies are employed within their programs; however, when asked to produce the documents or artifacts regarding these research methods and strategies all districts but district E were able to do so. As mentioned in chapter four perhaps the programs are so data driven that they are annually being modified to meet the needs of their current inductees, but the lack of tangible documents does indeed raise questions regarding the programs.

As the goal of this study was to classify the induction programs of these five districts by using a research-based model, I examined emergent themes found within the collected data as a basis for categorizing the programs according to Sweeny's research model. As previously mentioned there are many characteristics within the most effective model, the school transformational model. However, leadership is the characteristic that drives the framework of

the instruction program and leadership is what, in most cases, will be responsible for research model implementation.

Leadership being such an important characteristic the identification of the person(s) responsible for leading the program needed to be interviewed within this study. Throughout the collection of district induction program data it became evident that different districts have a variety of persons monitoring and leading their induction program. I; however, did not find this “variety” of administrators (whether a central office administrator or building level administrator) responsible for the district’s induction program, was any relation to the size of the districts student population or the district’s operating budget. To explain a bit further, one may believe a district with a smaller operational budget and less administrative staff may be forced to designate a variety of roles to a single administrator. What I found was the opposite. In the five selected school districts the administrator responsible for the induction program was assigned the responsibility due the administrative role within the district or to a specific expertise in professional development or in teacher induction programming.

Perhaps due to this expertise, the majority of the selected school districts did not model their induction programs from any specific research-based philosophy. The district administrator was able to identify the needs of teachers and areas of concern for their specific districts. The districts did; however, repeatedly refer to Charlotte Danielson’s research framework. I assume the emphasis on Charlotte Danielson’s research framework is due to the Pennsylvania Department of Education 426 evaluative form.

In conclusion, administrators constructed their programs based on these aspects in combination with district’s vision and mission. Accordingly, the culture of the district played a large role in the development and implementation of the programs. Administrators also

incorporated the individual strengths and resources unique to their district. For example, districts that had leadership with expertise in online development incorporated an online component, and similarly, districts that had a strong sense of “celebrating learning” incorporated that component. Essentially, a district’s induction program reflected the core values of that district.

5.2.3 Time Factor for Administrators and Teachers

The final interpretation from the data regarding school induction programs was the emergent theme of “time.” The time factor, throughout the data, was repeatedly echoed. In four of five districts both administrator and teachers, mentioned time as a major concern. As the themes for each school district emerged through either semi-structured interviews or through the electronic survey the common theme, which emerged, as a need for both sides was “time.” The amount of time that administrators had to meet with new teachers, develop induction programs, revise existing programs, observe teachers, and maintain other responsibilities was a challenge. The exception to the issue of time was occurred during the semi-structured administrative interview in District D. District administrator D had the liberty, contractually and financially, to develop an induction program and not be troubled with the “time” issue. Although I am sure time eventually would be a concerning factor for this administrator it was not on the top of the list during our discussion. According to the teacher respondents, time was a determining factor when reflecting on the program, observing master teachers, and attempting to balance the induction program against the daily duties of the teacher preparation (e.g. planning, instruction, and classroom management). In fact, the majority of teachers requested more time regarding their delivery or their take-away of their districts induction program.

In order to address the challenge of time, District administrator B attempted to alleviate

the concern by structuring a significant amount of their program in an online format. From the qualitative and quantitative data collected, the online component reduced some of the time concerns as perceived by district B administrator; however, the data from the teachers reported that time was still a concerning factor. District C teacher respondents, who did not have an online component to their induction program, felt that by incorporating an online element, their time within the program would be spent more constructively. Considering the many daily tasks already required of new teachers, the consideration of making induction programs more efficient and time sensitive emerged as a crucial element for effective models.

As you may recall district A administrator not only is responsible for the district's induction program, but also responsible for the district's curriculum, along with maintaining a building level administrative position. I can only wonder what implications "lack of time" has on the structure and authenticity of the induction program. I anticipate that due to lack of time, and perhaps "wearing too many hats" the aforementioned findings regarding District A may be explained. The fact that District A lacks many of the characteristics of an effective induction program may be the direct result of district leadership and the leadership of the induction program. The "disconnect" between what the administrator perceives is happening in the induction program become even more disjointed from what the teacher perceives is occurring in the induction program. Meaning, the administrator does not have the time to spend with the teachers, mentors, or program development and the teachers do not have the time to develop thorough reflections, assess student learning with data tools, form collaborative relationships, and implement learning communities.

Due to lack of time the administrator finds it difficult to monitor and assess the teachers moving through the program and make the proper modifications when and where needed. The

program, which originally may have had the potential to be a school transformational model, is now reduced to an instructional practice model or even worse a basic induction program model. Time, which may at one time be thought of as minor theme has emerged to be the most prominent and worrisome for the selected districts induction programs.

5.3 SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

This study represented the beginning of an exploration of teacher professional growth and development within public education, confirming existing research focusing on the need for the implementation of effective, evidence-based teacher induction programs in public education. The study delved into the characteristics of teacher induction programs in five selected school districts. To further explore and expand upon the topic of teacher induction programs, the following avenues for future research are recommended.

A study conducted in a series of selected school districts where a specific person is solely responsible for the districts induction program. This position in isolation one would assume would free up time for the development of a school transformational model induction program. Within this study the administrator was not only responsible for the induction program but for many other programs as well. I speculate that if it were the sole responsibility of an administrator to develop and lead the district's induction program then one would see more school transformational models.

A study conducted in a spectrum of school districts with low socio-economic community demographics. This specific study was conducted in school districts in predominately suburban areas with similar socio-economic status. By modifying the study to a lower socio economic community based school district may demonstrate different findings. By conducting a study on school districts with lower-socio-economic statuses I would be able to grasp an understanding on

the economic impact on teacher development, specifically new teacher development. I would be able to gather data on the correlation of funding and induction programs.

A study could be conducted regarding the impact of teacher induction programs and teacher retention. Since teacher exodus (i.e. leaving the profession) was a driving force in many states for the creation of teacher induction programs a study could be conducted solely on how induction programs have impacted (or have not impacted) teacher exodus in specific regional areas. Are the teacher induction programs in these areas accomplishing their goals or retaining teachers?

Another avenue of future research may be to conduct a study to further elaborate upon successful teacher growth and professional development and student achievement. If teacher induction programs were to develop best teaching practices then ideally one would think that these “instructionally proficient” teachers would yield proficient students. It would be interesting to conduct a study based upon the characterization of the teacher induction program and the student achievement in selected school districts.

By doing so one could further create a model for effective induction programs. For example by developing X program the district will yield Y results. I would think the research would need to evaluate induction programs in high achieving schools in a variety of settings. I would need to evaluate schools from rural, suburban, and urban backgrounds, also from high to low socio-economic means, and from a variety of student ethnic and racial backgrounds.

Teacher induction programs could also be researched on a global perspective. Teacher induction programs in high achieving countries could be researched and analyzed for their specific characteristics. It would be interesting to conduct a study based upon the teacher induction programs in various countries throughout the world. Especially to focus on high

performing countries and their teacher induction programs, looking for alignment with the student performance, teacher retention, and the induction program. Again taking into account if teachers are trained in a specific capacity (X) then (Y) specific results would be achieved. Again I would have to address cultural and ethnic differences within the study.

By conducting a study regarding the cost of teacher induction programs in comparison with the cost of teacher exodus. How much does it cost a district (or school system) to “develop” teachers annually compared to the cost of the constantly employing new teachers? I would need to assess cost factors such as student learning, health care, along with time and resources for hiring practices. The rationale of the study is to assess which is most cost efficient to school districts, constantly hiring or investing in current teachers.

Finally, by conducting an investigation of the cost variation within teacher induction programs in district, county, and state run school systems. Teacher induction programs can be quite expensive an interesting study may be to assess the cost of various programs (state, county, local, IU, etc.) and compare them to find the most efficient program along with the most cost effective including what costs what for what outcomes. This study may be quite useful in many situations, such as districts looking to consolidate or county and even statewide systems looking to delegate more authority to local governments.

5.4 LIMITATIONS

It is recognized that the data within this study revealed the perceptions of the teacher induction programs in only five school districts. The school districts that participated within this study were similar in composition and in geographical region. Future research would benefit from a larger sample with more heterogeneity amongst the districts in regards to geographic location,

socioeconomic status of the school population, and financial allocations to the school.

The issue of public education funding was not addressed in this study, nor was the fact that deteriorating school funding has had an impact on teacher professional development along with teacher induction programs. Future research would warrant an investigation into the funding of teacher induction programs in a variety of structured programs.

5.5 CONCLUSIONS

Public education is currently an area of much contention. Administrators must arm our teachers with the strategies that will assist them. They must receive the training that best prepares them to instruct students in their specific school setting. As previously mentioned up to 50% of teachers leave the profession within the first five years (Ingersoll, 2003). By providing a structured and supportive environment for beginning teachers we not only can close the gap of teacher exodus, but schools can also begin to build upon the strengths of our educators. We must too remember that new teachers need support. A new teacher's classroom structure and lessons may not be as fluid as those of a veteran teacher. It is the responsibility of the school system to provide this support to help transform the novice into the successful veteran. By providing support, companionship, and guidance, the punishingly heavy burden of a new teacher can be lightened, and some stressors can be alleviated. This is the intent of new teacher induction programs.

It was the goal of this study to assess the characteristics of teacher induction programs in selected schools in Southwestern Pennsylvania; however, I feel this study may be representative of many induction programs nationwide. As public education budgets are reduced our school systems have to do more with less, administrators take on more roles, which in turn, makes "time" (as noted within the study) a precious commodity. This study shows that induction

programs can be greatly improved on various levels.

When teachers are asked about their reasons for entering the teaching profession, a common response is that they want to have a positive impact on the lives of children. Public education needs great teachers who are lifelong learners and who are dedicated to their profession and to their students. Teachers are trusted with our children on a daily basis, and if this was not enough, teachers bear the additional weight of the responsibility for developing the minds of our future. What professional investment could be more important?

Teachers need to know they are supported, and they must be given the tools to survive in the educational setting of the 21st century. New teacher induction programs, if done correctly, can provide these supports and “toolbox of resources” so that our teachers are armed to educate all students who enter their classroom. In sum, teacher induction programs can help to ensure that good teachers learn how to be great teachers.

APPENDIX A: Pennsylvania State Evaluation Form 426

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania | DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION | 333 Market St., Harrisburg, PA 17126-0333

Category II: Classroom Environment -- Teachers establish and maintain a purposeful and equitable environment for learning, in which students feel safe, valued, and respected by initiating routines and by setting clear expectations for student behavior. Category II reviews: Teacher Interaction with Students; Establishment of a Learning Environment; Student Interaction.															
<input type="checkbox"/> SATISFACTORY		<input type="checkbox"/> UNSATISFACTORY													
<p>Teacher's performance demonstrates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Clear and moderate expectations for student achievement with reasonable value placed on the quality of student work <input type="checkbox"/> Moderate attention to equitable learning opportunities for students <input type="checkbox"/> Appropriate interactions between teacher and students and among students <input type="checkbox"/> Effective classroom routines and procedures resulting in little or no loss of instructional time <input type="checkbox"/> Clear standards of conduct and effective management of student behavior <input type="checkbox"/> Safe and adequate organization of physical space, to the extent it is under the control of the teacher, that provides accessibility to learning and to the use of resources, materials and technology 															
<p>Sources of Evidence (Check all that apply and include date, type/title, and number)</p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 25%;"><input type="checkbox"/> Classroom Observations</td> <td style="width: 25%; text-align: right;">See Attachment 426 A</td> <td style="width: 25%;"><input type="checkbox"/> Visual Technology</td> <td style="width: 25%; text-align: right;">See Attachment 426 A</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Informal Observation/Visits</td> <td style="text-align: right;">See Attachment 426 A</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Resources/Materials/Techology/ Space</td> <td style="text-align: right;">See Attachment 426 A</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Teacher Conferences/Interviews</td> <td style="text-align: right;">See Attachment 426 A</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Other</td> <td style="text-align: right;">See Attachment 426 A</td> </tr> </table>				<input type="checkbox"/> Classroom Observations	See Attachment 426 A	<input type="checkbox"/> Visual Technology	See Attachment 426 A	<input type="checkbox"/> Informal Observation/Visits	See Attachment 426 A	<input type="checkbox"/> Resources/Materials/Techology/ Space	See Attachment 426 A	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher Conferences/Interviews	See Attachment 426 A	<input type="checkbox"/> Other	See Attachment 426 A
<input type="checkbox"/> Classroom Observations	See Attachment 426 A	<input type="checkbox"/> Visual Technology	See Attachment 426 A												
<input type="checkbox"/> Informal Observation/Visits	See Attachment 426 A	<input type="checkbox"/> Resources/Materials/Techology/ Space	See Attachment 426 A												
<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher Conferences/Interviews	See Attachment 426 A	<input type="checkbox"/> Other	See Attachment 426 A												
<p>Justification for Evaluation</p> <p style="background-color: #cccccc; height: 100px; width: 100%;"></p>															

<p>Category II: Classroom Environment -- Teachers establish and maintain a purposeful and equitable environment for learning, in which students feel safe, valued, and respected by instituting routines and by setting clear expectations for student behavior. Category II reviews: Teacher Interaction with Students; Establishment of a Learning Environment; Student Interaction.</p>															
<input type="checkbox"/> SATISFACTORY		<input type="checkbox"/> UNSATISFACTORY													
<p>Teacher's performance demonstrates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Clear and moderate expectations for student achievement with reasonable value placed on the quality of student work o Moderate attention to equitable learning opportunities for students o Appropriate interactions between teacher and students and among students o Effective classroom routines and procedures resulting in little or no loss of instructional time o Clear standards of conduct and effective management of student behavior o Safe and adequate organization of physical space, to the extent it is under the control of the teacher, that provides accessibility to learning and to the use of resources, materials and technology 		<p>Teacher's performance demonstrates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Low or unclear expectations for student achievement with little or no value placed on the quality of student work o Little or no attention to equitable learning opportunities for students o Inappropriate or disrespectful interactions between teacher and students and among students o Inefficient classroom routines and procedures resulting in loss of instructional time o Absent or unclear standards of conduct, or ineffective management of student behavior o Unsafe or inadequate organization of physical space, to the extent it is under the control of the teacher, to provide accessibility to learning and to the use of resources, materials, and technology 													
<p>Sources of Evidence (Check all that apply and include date, type/title, and number)</p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 25%;"><input type="checkbox"/> Classroom Observations</td> <td style="width: 25%; text-align: right;">See Attachment 426 A</td> <td style="width: 25%;"><input type="checkbox"/> Visual Technology</td> <td style="width: 25%; text-align: right;">See Attachment 426 A</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Informal Observation/Visits</td> <td style="text-align: right;">See Attachment 426 A</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Resources/Materials/Technology/ Space</td> <td style="text-align: right;">See Attachment 426 A</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Teacher Conferences/Interviews</td> <td style="text-align: right;">See Attachment 426 A</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Other</td> <td style="text-align: right;">See Attachment 426 A</td> </tr> </table>				<input type="checkbox"/> Classroom Observations	See Attachment 426 A	<input type="checkbox"/> Visual Technology	See Attachment 426 A	<input type="checkbox"/> Informal Observation/Visits	See Attachment 426 A	<input type="checkbox"/> Resources/Materials/Technology/ Space	See Attachment 426 A	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher Conferences/Interviews	See Attachment 426 A	<input type="checkbox"/> Other	See Attachment 426 A
<input type="checkbox"/> Classroom Observations	See Attachment 426 A	<input type="checkbox"/> Visual Technology	See Attachment 426 A												
<input type="checkbox"/> Informal Observation/Visits	See Attachment 426 A	<input type="checkbox"/> Resources/Materials/Technology/ Space	See Attachment 426 A												
<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher Conferences/Interviews	See Attachment 426 A	<input type="checkbox"/> Other	See Attachment 426 A												
<p>Justification for Evaluation</p> <p> </p>															

Category III: Instructional Delivery – Teachers, through their knowledge of content and their pedagogy and skill in delivering instruction, engage students in learning by using a variety of instructional strategies. Category III reviews: Communications, Questioning and Discussion Techniques, Engaging Students in Learning, Providing Feedback, Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness.

<input type="checkbox"/> SATISFACTORY	<input type="checkbox"/> UNSATISFACTORY
<p>Teacher's performance demonstrates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Adequate communication of procedure and clear explanations of content o Adequate use of questioning and discussion strategies that encourage many students to participate o Reasonable engagement of students in learning and adequate pacing of instruction o Adequate feedback to students on their learning o Adequate use of informal and formal assessments to meet learning goals and to monitor student learning o Reasonable flexibility and responsiveness in meeting the learning needs of students 	<p>Teacher's performance demonstrates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Unclear or inappropriate communication of procedures and poor explanations of content o Ineffective use of questioning and discussion strategies and little student participation o Little or no engagement of students in learning and poor pacing of instruction o Inaccurate or inappropriate feedback to students on their learning o Little or inappropriate use of formal and informal assessments to meet learning goals and to monitor student learning o Inflexibility in meeting the learning needs of students
Sources of Evidence (Check all that apply and include date, type, title, or number)	
<input type="checkbox"/> Classroom Observations See Attachment 426 A <input type="checkbox"/> Informal Observations/Visits See Attachment 426 A <input type="checkbox"/> Assessments Materials See Attachment 426 A <input type="checkbox"/> Teacher Conferences/Interviews See Attachment 426 A	<input type="checkbox"/> Student Assignment Sheets See Attachment 426 A <input type="checkbox"/> Student Work See Attachment 426 A <input type="checkbox"/> Instructional Resources/Materials/Technology See Attachment 426 A <input type="checkbox"/> Other See Attachment 426 A
Justification for Evaluation	

Category IV: Professionalism – Professionalism is demonstrated through qualities that characterize a professional person in aspects that occur in and beyond the classroombuilding. Category IV reviews: Maintaining Clear and Accurate Records, Communication with Families and Students, Contributing to School and District, Developing Professionalism.

<input type="checkbox"/> SATISFACTORY	<input type="checkbox"/> UNSATISFACTORY																				
<p>Teacher's performance demonstrates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Adherence to school and district procedures and regulations related to attendance, punctuality and the like o Knowledge of the Professional Code of Conduct o Compliance with school or district requirements for maintaining accurate records, communicating with families o Compliance with participating in school and/or district events and school or district professional growth and development opportunities 	<p>Teacher's performance demonstrates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Failure to adhere to district procedures and regulations related to attendance, punctuality, and the like o Lack of knowledge of the Professional Code of Conduct o Lack of compliance with school or district requirements for maintaining accurate records, communicating with families o Lack of compliance in participating in school and/or district events and school or district professional growth and development opportunities 																				
<p>Sources of Evidence (Check all that apply and include dates, types/titles, and number)</p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 25%;"><input type="checkbox"/> Teacher Conferences/Interviews</td> <td style="width: 25%; text-align: right;">See Attachment 426 A</td> <td style="width: 25%;"><input type="checkbox"/> Progress Reports/Report Cards</td> <td style="width: 25%; text-align: right;">See Attachment 426 A</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Observations/Visual Technology</td> <td style="text-align: right;">See Attachment 426 A</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Parent/School/Community Feedback</td> <td style="text-align: right;">See Attachment 426 A</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Artifacts/Interaction with Family</td> <td style="text-align: right;">See Attachment 426 A</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Artifacts: Professional Development/Act 48 Documentation</td> <td style="text-align: right;">See Attachment 426 A</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Student Records/Grade Book</td> <td style="text-align: right;">See Attachment 426 A</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Perceptive Use of Teaching/Learning Reflections</td> <td style="text-align: right;">See Attachment 426 A</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Other</td> <td style="text-align: right;">See Attachment 426 A</td> </tr> </table>		<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher Conferences/Interviews	See Attachment 426 A	<input type="checkbox"/> Progress Reports/Report Cards	See Attachment 426 A	<input type="checkbox"/> Observations/Visual Technology	See Attachment 426 A	<input type="checkbox"/> Parent/School/Community Feedback	See Attachment 426 A	<input type="checkbox"/> Artifacts/Interaction with Family	See Attachment 426 A	<input type="checkbox"/> Artifacts: Professional Development/Act 48 Documentation	See Attachment 426 A	<input type="checkbox"/> Student Records/Grade Book	See Attachment 426 A	<input type="checkbox"/> Perceptive Use of Teaching/Learning Reflections	See Attachment 426 A			<input type="checkbox"/> Other	See Attachment 426 A
<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher Conferences/Interviews	See Attachment 426 A	<input type="checkbox"/> Progress Reports/Report Cards	See Attachment 426 A																		
<input type="checkbox"/> Observations/Visual Technology	See Attachment 426 A	<input type="checkbox"/> Parent/School/Community Feedback	See Attachment 426 A																		
<input type="checkbox"/> Artifacts/Interaction with Family	See Attachment 426 A	<input type="checkbox"/> Artifacts: Professional Development/Act 48 Documentation	See Attachment 426 A																		
<input type="checkbox"/> Student Records/Grade Book	See Attachment 426 A	<input type="checkbox"/> Perceptive Use of Teaching/Learning Reflections	See Attachment 426 A																		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Other	See Attachment 426 A																		
<p>Justification for Evaluation</p> <p> </p>																					

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania	DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION	333 Market St., Harrisburg, PA 17126-0333
------------------------------	-------------------------	---

I certify that the before named employee for the period beginning [redacted] (month/year) and ending [redacted] (month/year) has been evaluated with a overall level of proficiency that is: Satisfactory; Unsatisfactory

Signature of Principal/Assistant Principal
(Evaluator)

[redacted]
Date

Signature of Superintendent or I. U. Executive Director

[redacted]
Date

Overall Justification for Evaluation
[redacted]

Commendations (optional)
[redacted]

Professional Development Areas:
[redacted]

Name of Employee

Signature of Employee

[redacted]
Date

APPENDIX B: Superintendent Letter

Dear (insert superintendent's name),

,
My name is Johannah Vanatta and I am an assistant principal of North Hills Senior High School. I am also a doctoral candidate with the University of Pittsburgh in the Administrative and Policy Studies Program. The purpose of my study is to describe the characteristics of **teacher induction programs** in Southwestern Pennsylvania. I am asking for your support and assistance in this endeavor.

With your permission, I will make arrangements to interview the administrator(s) conducting the program, and implement a confidential electronic survey of a selection of teachers who are currently in the induction program or have recently gone through the program. The information gathered from these activities will provide data to better understand characteristics, commonalities, and themes within the induction program.

With your approval, I will contact those persons in charge of the implementation of your district's induction program. Being respectful of time, the administrative interview will be limited to approximately 30 minutes and structured with specific questions. I will drive to your district to conduct the interview. In addition, I will be requesting the email addresses of the teachers currently within your first year induction program. The electronic teacher survey is less than 15 questions and completion time should take about 10-15 minutes.

If you are willing to approve this research I will make sure to share the results with you at your convenience. However, in order to maintain anonymity of respondents, no individual or district will be named in the products of this research.

Your support and approval to carry out this research is much appreciated. If you have any questions about the research, please feel free to contact me at 412-779-5446 or via email vanattaj@gmail.com. You may also contact my dissertation advisor Dr. William Bickel at bickel@pitt.edu.

I thank you for your time and for your professional support.

Sincerely,
Johannah M. Vanatta
Doctoral Student
University of Pittsburgh

APPENDIX C: Administrator Letter

Dear (insert school district administrator's name),

My name is Johannah Vanatta and I am an assistant principal of North Hills Senior High School. I am also a doctoral candidate with the University of Pittsburgh in the Administrative and Policy Studies Program. The purpose of my study is to better understand the characteristics of **teacher induction programs** in Southwestern Pennsylvania.

Dr. (insert school district superintendent name) granted me permission to contact you requesting your participation and support in this research. I am requesting to speak with you briefly in person regarding your program. I am also asking that I may record our interview for transcription. I have attached some questions for your review prior to the "interview" that will focus our conversation. In order to further complete my study I am collecting key documents, resources, and/or artifacts your district utilizes within its program. Such documents may be "opening day" agendas, portfolio requirements, literature, etc. (Questions, Appendix B).

A second component of this research involves an electronic survey of a sample of teachers who are now participating in your first year induction program or completed their first year in June of 2011. I am requesting the email addresses of the teachers currently participating in your districts induction program to survey electronically following our interview.

There are no foreseeable risks associated with this project, nor are there any benefits to you. This is an entirely anonymous interview and the survey to your teachers will also be entirely anonymous, so your responses will not be identifiable in any way. All responses are confidential, and results will be kept locked in a secure place. No district names will be used in any of the products of this research.

Your participation is entirely voluntary, and you may withdraw from this project at any time. This study is being conducted by Johannah Vanatta, who can be reached at 412-779-5446, if you have any questions. Thank you for taking time out of your very busy day to support this important research topic.

Sincerely,
Johannah Vanatta
Doctoral Student
University of Pittsburgh

APPENDIX D: Teacher Letter

Dear (insert school district teachers name),

My name is Johannah Vanatta and I am an assistant principal of North Hills Senior High School. I am also a doctoral candidate with the University of Pittsburgh in the Administrative and Policy Studies Program. The purpose of my study is to better understand the characteristics of teacher induction programs in Southwestern Pennsylvania.

Dr. (insert school district induction administrator's name) granted me permission to contact you requesting support to conduct my research. The purpose of my research study is to determine the characteristics of teacher induction programs, specifically the methods and program within your school district. For that reason, I will be contacting public school teachers who are currently participating in their first year or have completed their first year as of June 2011 requesting the completion of a confidential electronic survey. If you agree to participate, the survey will ask about the induction programs strengths and challenges, as well as the supports within the program. There are no foreseeable risks associated with this project, nor are there any direct benefits to you. This is an entirely anonymous survey, so your responses will not be identifiable in any way. All responses are confidential, and results will be kept under lock and key. Your participation is voluntary, and you may withdraw from this project at any time. This study is being conducted by Johannah Vanatta, who can be reached at 412-779-5446, if you have any questions.

Please click on the link (provide the link) to access the survey in Survey Monkey.”

Thank you for taking time out of your very busy day to support this important research topic.

Sincerely,
Johannah Vanatta
Doctoral Student
University of Pittsburgh

APPENDIX E: Administrator Interview Questions

- 1.What are the most important aspects of your induction program? Why?
2. What has been the most challenging part of your induction program? Why?
3. How has the program developed?
 - 3a. Who developed your program?
 - 3b. What literature or theories/pedagogy do you base your program?
4. How do you monitor and evaluate your induction program?
 - 4a. Who monitors and evaluates the program?
 - 4.b. What criteria are utilized?
 - 4.c. How are these criteria assessed?
5. If you had unlimited resources how would you change the program and why?

APPENDIX F: Teacher Survey

Teacher Induction Survey 2012

1.

1. Your induction program is guided by district leaders who continuously strive for instructional improvement.

<input type="radio"/> strongly agree	<input type="radio"/> somewhat agree	<input type="radio"/> neither agree or disagree	<input type="radio"/> disagree	<input type="radio"/> strongly disagree
--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	---	--------------------------------	---

2. Your induction program requires resources that support adult learning.

<input type="radio"/> strongly agree	<input type="radio"/> somewhat agree	<input type="radio"/> neither agree or disagree	<input type="radio"/> disagree	<input type="radio"/> strongly disagree
--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	---	--------------------------------	---

3. Your induction program requires resources that support collaboration.

<input type="radio"/> strongly agree	<input type="radio"/> somewhat agree	<input type="radio"/> neither agree or disagree	<input type="radio"/> disagree	<input type="radio"/> strongly disagree
--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	---	--------------------------------	---

4. Your induction program utilizes data to determine adult learning priorities.

<input type="radio"/> strongly agree	<input type="radio"/> somewhat agree	<input type="radio"/> neither agree or disagree	<input type="radio"/> disagree	<input type="radio"/> strongly disagree
--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	---	--------------------------------	---

5. Your induction program utilizes data to monitor progress.

<input type="radio"/> strongly agree	<input type="radio"/> somewhat agree	<input type="radio"/> neither agree or disagree	<input type="radio"/> disagree	<input type="radio"/> strongly disagree
--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	---	--------------------------------	---

6. Your induction program utilizes data to help sustain continuous improvement.

<input type="radio"/> strongly agree	<input type="radio"/> somewhat agree	<input type="radio"/> neither agree or disagree	<input type="radio"/> disagree	<input type="radio"/> strongly disagree
--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	---	--------------------------------	---

7. Your induction program applies knowledge about human learning and change.

<input type="radio"/> strongly agree	<input type="radio"/> somewhat agree	<input type="radio"/> neither agree or disagree	<input type="radio"/> disagree	<input type="radio"/> strongly disagree
--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	---	--------------------------------	---

8. Your induction program deepens educator's content knowledge.

<input type="radio"/> strongly agree	<input type="radio"/> somewhat agree	<input type="radio"/> neither agree or disagree	<input type="radio"/> disagree	<input type="radio"/> strongly disagree
--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	---	--------------------------------	---

9. Your induction program provides you with research based instructional strategies to assist students in meeting rigorous academic standards.

<input type="radio"/> strongly agree	<input type="radio"/> somewhat agree	<input type="radio"/> neither agree or disagree	<input type="radio"/> disagree	<input type="radio"/> strongly disagree
--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	---	--------------------------------	---

Teacher Induction Survey 2012**10. Your induction program prepares teachers to use various types of classroom assessments.**

- strongly agree somewhat agree neither agree or disagree disagree strongly disagree

11. What are the most useful aspects of your induction program?

- Mentoring
 Modeling of Instructional Practices
 Culture of Continuous Learning

Other (please specify)

12. What has been the most challenging part of your induction program? Why?**13. Who monitors and evaluates the program?**

- Self-Monitoring (Reflection)
 Building Principal
 Central Office Administrator

Other (please specify)

14. If possible, how would you strengthen the induction program?

APPENDIX G: Research Questions/Framework Analysis

Research Question	Data Source	Data Collection Method	Analysis Used	Framework Model
What are the expressed characteristics of the inductions programs within the sample school districts?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Documents • Administrative interviews • Teacher surveys 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews • Electronic survey • Document collection 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emergent themes (consensus, emergent, and individual) • Identification of Patterns (Words, phrases, documents, events that appear to be similar will be grouped into the same category) 	
How do these districts monitor the quality and assess the outcomes of their programs?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative interviews 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emergent themes (consensus, emergent, and individual) • Identification of Patterns (Words, phrases, documents, events that appear to be similar will be grouped into the same category) 	
What do the chosen school districts actually do as their teacher induction programs according to the teachers?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Documents • Administrative interviews • Teacher surveys 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews • Electronic survey • Document collection 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emergent themes (consensus, emergent, and individual) • Identification of Patterns (Words, phrases, documents, events that appear to be similar will be grouped into the same category) 	
What extent do the districts align with what the research tells us regarding the characteristics of successful teacher induction programs?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research from literature review • District Documents • Administrative interviews • Teacher surveys 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research (electronic/traditional) • Survey • Interview 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emergent themes (consensus, emergent, and individual) • Identification of Patterns (Words, phrases, documents, events that appear to be similar will be grouped into the same category) 	

“Framework Model” refers to NEA’s three models of induction programs (i.e., Basic Orientation, Instructional Practice, and School Transformational Models) The selected districts are identified in coordination with the Framework and Research Questions through specific color-coding within the matrix:

School District A

School District B

School District C

School District D

School District E

APPENDIX H Works Consulted

- American Association of State Colleges and Universities. (2006, October). Teacher induction programs: Trends and opportunities. *Policy Matters*, 3(10). Retrieved from
<http://www.aascu.org/uploadedFiles/AASCU/Content/Root/PolicyAndAdvocacy/PolicyPublications/TeacherInduction.pdf>
- Barbee, B. (2009). *A qualitative study of a local district teacher induction program and its perception by young educators* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas.
- Boggan, M., Bifuh-Ambe, E., Harper, S., & Smith, I. (2009). Viva Saskatchewan! Improving school district teacher induction programs in the Katrina states by stealing ideas from our international neighbors. *Research in Higher Education Journal*, 7(1), 1-11.
- Boyer, L., & Gillespie, P. (2000). Keeping the committed: The importance of induction and support programs for new special educators. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 33(1), 10-15.
- Brewster, C., & Railsback, J. (2001). *Supporting beginning teachers: How administrators, teachers, and policymakers can help new teachers succeed*. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED455619)
- Canniff, J. G., & Shank, M. J. (2003). *If you do what you always did, you get what you always got: Portland SST transforming school cultures through a seamless continuum of teacher professional development*. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Illinois. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED478623.pdf>
- Carver, C. L., & Feiman-Nemser, S. (2009). Using policy to improve teacher induction: Critical elements and missing pieces. *Educational Policy*, 23(2), 295-328. doi: 10.1177/0895904807310036
- Cheney, C. O., Krajewski, J., & Combs, M. (1992). Understanding the first year teacher: Implications

- for induction programs. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 15(1), 18-24. doi: 10.1177/088840649201500104
- Choy, S. P., Chen, X., Bugarin, R., & Broughman, S. P. (2006). Teacher and professional development 1999-2000: What teachers, principals, and district staff report (NCES Report 2006-305). Retrieve from National Center for Education Statistics website: <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2006/2006305.pdf>
- Christy, J. (n.d.). *Professional development and the No Child Left Behind Act*. Retrieved from The McGraw-Hill Companies website: http://www.glencoe.com/sec/teachingtoday/subject/prof_development.phtml
- Clement, M. C. (2010, May 24). Helping beginning teachers succeed: Five strategies for induction. *Inside the School: Teachers' Corner*. Retrieved from <http://www.insidetheschool.com/articles/helping-beginning-teachers-succeed-five-strategies-for-induction/>
- Cochran-Smith, M. and Lytle, S. L. (1999). Relationships of knowledge and practice: Teaching learning in communities. *Review of Research in Education*, 24, 249-305.
- Components of good teacher induction programs*. (1986). Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED269407)
- Creating a learning-centered school culture and climate*. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.lead.org/resources/resources.asp?ResourceID=25>
- Cremin, L. A. (1968). *The transformation of the school: Progressivism in American Education 1876-1957* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Knopf.
- Cross, C. T., & Islas, M. R. (2011). *School reform-A nation at risk, reform in action, greater goals better teachers and more accountability*. Retrieved from <http://education.stateuniversity.com/pages/2400/School-Reform.html>
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1990). *Teacher evaluation in transition: Emerging roles*

- and evolving methods.* In J. Millman & L. Darling-Hammond, *The new handbook of teacher evaluation: Assessing elementary and secondary school teachers.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Berry, B. (2006). Highly qualified teachers for all. *Educational Leadership*, 64(3), 14-20.
- Darling-Hammond, L. & Richardson, N. (2009). Teacher learning: What matters? *Educational Leadership*, 66(5), 46-53.
- Davis, B., & Higdon, K. (2008, March 22). The effects of mentoring/support on beginning teachers' practices in early elementary classrooms (K-3). *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, 22(3), 261-274. doi: 10.1080/02568540809594626
- Edutopia Staff. (2008, March). Why is teacher development important?: Because students deserve the best. Retrieved from <http://www.edutopia.org/teacher-development-introduction>
- Elmore, R. (2000). *Building a new structure for school leadership.* Washington, DC: The Albert Shanker Institute.
- Flanagan, J., & Fowler, W. J. (2010). *Induction programs effect on beginning teachers' feelings of preparedness and plans to remain in teaching.* Paper presented at the 2010 Conference of the Society for Research on Educational Effectiveness. Retrieved from <https://www.sree.org/conferences/2010/program/abstracts/172.pdf>
- Fry, S. W. (2007). First-year teachers and induction support: Ups, downs, and in-betweens. *The Qualitative Report*, 12(2), 216-237.
- Fry, S. W. (2010). The analysis of an unsuccessful novice teacher's induction experiences: A case study presented through layered account. *The Qualitative Report*, 15(5), 1164-1190.
- Guskey, T. (1999). Apply time with wisdom. *Journal of Staff Development*, 20(2), 10-15.

Guskey, T. R., & Kwang, Y. S. (2009, March). What works in professional development? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 90(7), 495-500.

Hewitt, P. M., & Wilhelm, M. (2010). A case study of the Fort Smith public schools new teacher induction program. *International Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies*, 2(8), 105-112.

Illinois Education Research Council. (n.d.). *Completed projects*. Retrieved from
<http://ierc.siu.edu/iercprojectcomplete.htm>

Isenberg, E., Glazerman, S. Bleeker, M., Johnson, A., Lugo-Gil, J., Grider, M., . . . Ali, M. (2009). *Impacts of comprehensive teacher induction: Results from the second year of a randomized controlled study*. (NCEE 2009-4072). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.

Jackson, J. & Bogle, S. (n.d.). *Hillsborough County Public Schools Teacher Induction Program*. Retrieved from http://mentor.mysdhc.org/teacher/crothers/Class_Documents/tip.pdf

Joerger, R. M., & Bremer, C. D. (2001). *Teacher induction programs: A strategy for improving the professional experience of beginning career and technical education teachers*. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED458436)

Julius, A. K. (1976). Britain's new induction plan for first-year teachers. *The Elementary School Journal*, 76(6), 350-357.

Kahumoku, W., III., Kekahio, W., & the Kaÿü, Keaÿau, and Pähoa Complex Area Core Planning Team. (2010). The Kahua induction program: Systemically supporting new teachers through culturally relevant, place-based, and community mentor strategies. *Hülili: Multidisciplinary Research on Hawaiian Well-Being*, 6, 213-236. Retrieved from <http://www.ksbe.edu/spi/Hulili>

/Hulili_vol_6/10_The_Kahua_Induction_Program.pdf

- Kalkman, D. (2008). *INTASC standards and portfolio activities aligned by Deborah Kalkman*. Retrieved from McGraw-Hill Higher Education website: http://highered.mcgraw-hill.com/sites/0073378585/student_view0/intasc_standards.html
- Kellaher, A. (n.d.). Professional Educator Induction Program (PEIP). In *Department of Teacher Leadership and Professional Development* [Teacher induction program]. Retrieved March 22, 2009, from <http://www1.pgcps.org//.aspx?id=9376>
- Learning Point Associates. (2007). *Implementing the no child left behind act: Teacher quality improves student achievement*. Retrieved from <http://www.learningpt.org/pdfs/qkey8.pdf>
- Maciejewski, J. (2007). Supporting new teachers: Are induction programs worth the cost? *Direct Administration*, 43(9), 48-52.
- McElroy, M. (2009, August 5). Classroom observations, mentoring, and co-teaching among strategies to train new teachers. *American Association for the Advancement of Science News Archives*. Retrieved from <http://www.aaas.org/news/releases/2009/0805noyce.shtml>
- Myers, R. G. (2011). *Early childhood education: Preparation of teachers*. In J. W. Guthrie (Ed.) Encyclopedia of education. Retrieved from <http://www.answers.com/library/Education+Encyclopedia-cid-13575589>
- Nieto, S. (2009). From surviving to thriving. *Educational Leadership*, 66(5), 8-13.
- North Hills School District. (2008). *North hills school district induction packet*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Operation Public Education. (n.d.). *Support for educators: Mentoring and new teacher induction*. Retrieved from http://www.cgp.upenn.edu/ope/34_mentoring.html

- Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development (2009). *Creating effective teaching and learning environments: Results from TALIS*. Retrieved from <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/17/51/43023606.pdf>
- Potrzeba, H., & Hendrix, S. (n.d.). *Educator quality: Induction programs and mentoring* [Article]. Retrieved from Rhode Island Department of Elementary or Secondary Education website: <http://www.ride.ri.gov/EducatorQuality/mentoring.aspx>
- Raffel, J. A., & Holbert, R. R (2006). *Preliminary evaluation of the Delaware new teacher mentoring/induction program* (Research Report). Retrieved from the Institute for Public Administration, College of Human Services, Education & Public Policy website: http://www.ipa.udel.edu/publications/teacher_induction.pdf
- Schleicher, A. (2009, October). Lessons from the World. *Educational Leadership*, 67(2), 50-55.
- Sedely, R. (n.d.). [Review of the book *Teachers wanted: Attracting and retaining good teachers*, by D. A. Heller]. Retrieved from <http://www.teacherleaders.org/node/268>
- Slaybaugh, J., Evans, C., & Byrd, R. (2000). Second-year teachers' attitudes toward the teaching profession. *National Forum of Teacher Education Journal, Electronic*, 10E(3), 21-26.
- Smith, D., Wilson, B., & Corbett, D. (2009). Moving beyond talk. *Educational Leadership*, 66(5), 20-25.
- Supporting new teachers: Evaluating teacher induction models. (n.d.) Retrieved from <http://www.mathematica-mpr.com/education/teachinduc.asp>
- United States Department of Education. (n.d.). School improvement. In *Planning and evaluative service school improvement plan* [Links]. Retrieved from U. S. Department of Education website: http://www2.ed.gov///_improvement.html#subepdp1
- United States Department of Education. (1996). *Achieving the goals - Goal 4: Teacher*

- professional development.* Washington, DC: Author.
- United States Department of Education. (2005). *10 facts about K-12 education funding*. Retrieved from
<http://www2.ed.gov/about/overview/fed/10facts/10facts.pdf>
- United States Department of Education. (2007). *Connecting students to advanced courses online: Innovations in education*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Walberg, H. J., & Haertel, G. D. (1992). Educational psychology's first century. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 84*(1), 6-19.
- Wei, R. C., Andree, A., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2009). How nations invest in teachers: High-achieving nations treat their teachers as professionals. *Educational Leadership, 66*(5), 28-33.
- Wong, K., Britton, T., & Ganser, T. (2005). What the world can teach us about new teacher induction. *Phi Delta Kappan, 86*(5), 379-84.

REFERENCES

- About certification for applicants prepared outside of Pennsylvania (n.d.). Retrieved from
http://www.portal.state.pa.us/portal/server.pt/community/commonly_asked_questions/8628/about_certification_for_applicants_prepared_in_pennsylvania
- Alliance for Education. 2004. *Tapping the potential: Retaining and developing high-quality new teachers*. Washington DC. Author.
- A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform (1983). *US Department of Education. National Commission on the Excellence of Education*.
<http://teachertenure.procon.org/sourcefiles/a-nation-at-risk-tenure-april-1983.pdf>
- Arends, R.I. and A.J. Rigazio-DiGilio 2000. *Beginning Teacher Induction: Research and Examples of Contemporary Practice*.
- Approval of Induction Plans, 22, Pa. Code § 49.16 (2007).
- Birman, B. F., Boyle, A., Le Floch, K. C., Elledge, A., Holtzman, D., Song, M., . . . Yoon, K. (2009). *State and local implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act volume VIII--teacher quality under NCLB: Final report*. Washington, DC: United States Department of Education. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED504212.pdf>
- Breaux, A. L., & Wong, H. K. (2003). *New teacher induction: How to train, support, and retain new teachers*. Retrieved from <https://effectiveteaching.com/newteacher.com/oobooks/cover.html>
- Cohen, D. K., & Barnes, C. A. (1999). Research and the purposes of education. In E. C. Lagemann & L. S. Shulman (Eds.), *Issues in education research: Problems and possibilities* (pp. 17-41). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Collins, J. (2001). *Good to great: Why some companies make the leap... and others don't*. New York, NY: HarperCollins Publishers Inc.

- Cook, W. D. (1977). *Adult literacy education in the United States*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Corey, S. M. (1957). Introduction. In N. B. Henry (Ed.), *In-service education for teachers, supervisors, and administrators: The fifty-sixth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* (pp. 1-12). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Council of Chief State School Officers [CCSSO]. (n.d.). *Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) core standards*. Retrieved from <http://www.ecu.edu/cs-educ/teached/upload/INTASCStandardsIndicators.pdf>
- Creswell, J. W. (2002). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed method approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Danielson, C. (1996) Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching. Alexandria, Va: ASCD
- Danielson, C., & McGreal, T. L. (2000). *Teacher evaluation to enhance professional practice*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1999). Target time toward teachers. *Journal of Staff Development*, 20(2), 31-36.
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Baratz-Snowden, J. (Eds.). (2005). *A Good Teacher in Every Classroom: Preparing the Highly Qualified Teachers our Children Deserve*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass
- Davis, S., Darling-Hammond, L., LaPointe, M., & Meyerson, D. (2005). *School leadership study: Developing successful principals* (Review of Research). Stanford, CA: Stanford University, Stanford Educational Leadership Institute. Retrieved from http://www.srnleads.org/data/pdfs/sls/sls_rr.pdf

- Dillon, E. A. (1976). Staff development: Bright hope or empty promise? *Educational Leadership*, 34(3), 165-170.
- Edmondson, S. (2007). Investigating the effectiveness of a telepresence-enabled cognitive apprenticeship model of teacher professional development. *Proceedings of the 10th Annual Meeting of the International Society for Presence*. Retrieved from http://www.temple.edu/ispr/prev_conferences/proceedings/2007/Edmondson.pdf
- Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, 20 U.S.C. § 70 (1994).
- Elmore, R. F., & Rothman, R. (Eds.). (1999). *Testing, teaching, and learning: A guide for states and school districts*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Feiman-Nemser, S. (2003). What new teachers need to learn. *Educational Leadership*, 60(8), 25-29.
- Fenstermacher, G. D., & Berliner, D. C. (1985). Determining the value of staff development. *Elementary School Journal*, 85(3), 281-314.
- Fletcher, S., Strong, M., & Villar, A. (2008). *An Investigation of the effects of variation in mentor-based induction on the performance of students in California*. Teachers College Record, 110,2271,2289.
- Fuhrman, S. (2003). Riding waves, trading horses: The twenty-year effort to reform education. In D. T. Gordon (Ed.), *A nation reformed? American education 20 years after A Nation at Risk* (pp. 7-22). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Guskey, T. (1995) Results-oriented professional development: In search of an optimal mix of effective practices. *Journal of Staff Development*, 15(4), 42-50.
- Guskey, T. (2000). *Evaluating professional development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press

- Harris, D. N., & Goertz, M. (2008). *The potential effects of "high-quality and uniform" standards: Lessons from a synthesis of previous research and proposals for a new research agenda*. Paper prepared for the 2008 Workshop Series on State Standards, National Research Council, Washington, DC.
- Hass, C. G. (1957). In-service education today. In N. B. Henry (Ed.), *In-service education for teachers, supervisors, and administrators: The fifty-sixth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* (pp. 13-34). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2008, 122 U.S.C. § 110-315 (2008).
- Improving America's Schools Act of 1994, H.R. 6, 103d Cong. (1994).
- Ingersoll, R. M. (2003). *Is there really a teacher shortage?* (Document R-03-3). Retrieved from University of Washington's Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy website: <http://depts.washington.edu/ctpmail/PDFs/Shortage-RI-09-2003.pdf>
- Ingersoll, R. M., & Smith, T. M. (2004, March). Do teacher induction and mentoring matter? *NASSP Bulletin*, 88(638), 28-40. Retrieved from http://repository.upenn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1134&context=gse_pubs
- InSites (2001). *Creating a Teacher Induction Program*. Retrieved from <http://www.insites.org/documents/induction.pdf>
- Johnson, S. M., Kardos, S. M., Kauffman, D., Liu, E., & Donaldson, M. L. (2004). The support gap: New teachers' early experiences in high-income and low-income schools. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 12(61), 1-25.
- Kreider, H., & Bouffard, S. (2005). A conversation with Thomas R. Guskey. (2006). *The Evaluation Exchange*, 11(4). Retrieved from <http://www.hfrp.org/evaluation/the-evaluation-exchange/issue-archive/professional-development/a-conversation-with-thomas-r.-guskey>

- Learning Forward. (2011). *Standards for professional learning* (3rd ed.). Retrieved from
<http://www.nsdc.org/standards/index.cfm>
- Levin, R. A. (1991). The debate over schooling: Influences of Dewey and Thorndike. *Childhood Education*, 68(2), 71-75.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- McTighe, J., & Wiggins, G. (2004). *The Understanding by Design professional development workbook*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance*. (n.d.). Retrieved from
<http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/>
- National Commission on Teacher & America's Future [NCTAF] (1996). *What matters most: Teaching for America's future – Report of the National Commission on Teaching & America's Future*. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED395931.pdf>
- National Defense Education Act 1958, 72 U.S.C. § 85-864 (1958),
- National Education Association Foundation for the Improvement of Education [NEA-FIE] (2002). Using data to improve teacher induction programs (Issue Brief No. 4). Washington, DC. Retrieved from http://www.neafoundation.org/downloads/NEA-Using_Data_Teacher_Induction.pdf
- No Child Left Behind Act [NCLB] of 2001, 20 U.S.C. § 6301 (2002).
- O'Donnell, A., Reeve, J., & Smith, J. K. (2009). *Educational psychology: Reflection for action*. Danvers, MA: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- Partlow, M. R. (2006). *Teachers' perceived needs within a responsive induction program structured as*

a learning community (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from OhioLINK ETD Center.
(Document No. osu1154972019).

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Pennsylvania Department of Education [PDE] (2002). *Induction plan guidelines*. Retrieved from
[http://www.psea.org/uploadedFiles/TeachingandLearning/Certification/InductionGuideLines5%2003\[1\].pdf](http://www.psea.org/uploadedFiles/TeachingandLearning/Certification/InductionGuideLines5%2003[1].pdf)

Scott, C. W., & Hill, C. M. (Eds.). (1954). *Public education under criticism*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Stansbury K., & Zimmerman, J. (2000). Lifelines to the classroom: Designing support for beginning teachers. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED447104)

Stansbury, K., & Zimmerman, J. (2002). Smart induction programs become lifelines for the beginning teacher. *Journal of Staff Development*, 23(4), 10-17.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory, procedures, and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Sweeny, B. (2008). *Leading the Teacher Induction and Mentoring Program* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA. Corwin Press.

Tomlinson, C. (1999). *The differentiated classroom: Responding to the needs of all learners*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Tyack, D., & Cuban, L. (1995). *Tinkering toward utopia: A century of public school reform*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Tyler, R. W. (1987). The five most significant curriculum events in the twentieth century. *Educational Leadership*, 44(4), 36-38.

- United States Department of Education. (1984). *The nation responds: Recent efforts to improve education*. Washington, DC: Author.
- United States Department of Education. (2008). *A nation accountable: Twenty-five years after a nation at risk*. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/research/pubs/accountable/accountable.pdf>
- Wong, H. K. (2003). Induction programs that keep working. In M. Scherer, *Keeping good teachers* (pp. 42-49). Retrieved from https://effectiveteaching.com/newteacher.com/pdf/Keeping_Good_Teachers_Ch5.pdf
- Wong, H. K. (2004). Induction programs that keep new teachers teaching and improving. *NASSP Bulletin*, 68(638), 41-58. doi: 10.1177/019263650408863804
- Wood, A. L., & Stanulis, R. N. (2009). Quality teacher induction: “Fourth Wave” (1997-2006) induction programs. *The New Educator* 5, 1-23.
- Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Zhang, Y., & Wildemuth, B. M. (2009). Qualitative analysis of content. In B. W. Wildemuth (Ed.), *Applications of social research methods to questions in information and library science* (pp. 308-319). Westport, CT: Libraries Unlimited.