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ABSTRACT

This research study examines the perceived impact of teacher induction programs on public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers. This study seeks to explore the differences in perceptions of public high school novice teachers versus public high school beginning career-change teachers in regards to the efficacy of induction programs.

Through a case study design that utilized qualitative questionnaires, individualized interviews, and document analysis, the researcher uncovered data, which highlighted the importance of addressing the individual needs of public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers in district induction.

The conclusions that follow summarize the utilization of Allan A. Glatthorn’s Differentiated Supervision model to provide differentiated induction for public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers during their first year of teaching in order to meet their individual needs. Additionally, the summary highlights the importance of the building principal taking an active role in the induction of all new teachers to their building. It is the hope of the researcher that these conclusions can be incorporated in other instructional leaders’ school induction programs to better support new teachers in their first year of teaching.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Professionals in education comprise 3.8 million available jobs in the United States (Andrew, 2009). The education profession attracts men and women with a “clear passion... for teaching” (Peter D. Heart Research Associates, Inc., 2010, p. 11). Individuals enter the profession of education for a variety of reasons. The motivation to enter the field of education is a “desire to make a difference, give back to others, or an interest in working with children” (p. 2). Professionals enter the field of education to foster change through working with children. Unfortunately, there are common reasons why teachers decide to leave the profession. Teachers cite “low salaries, inadequate support from the school administration, student discipline problems, and limited faculty input into school decision-making” (Ingersoll, 2001, p. 5). The purpose of this study was to examine the perceived impact of teacher induction programs on public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers in education. This study examined the differences in perceptions of public high school novice teachers versus beginning career-change teachers in regards to the efficacy of induction programs.

This study examined instructional leaders’ current perceptions of the development needs of public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers in the educational field. The study also explored public high school
principals’ perceptions of the commonalities in public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers’ needs while addressing the vast differences in age, gender, education, skill sets, and family status and life experiences. The principal in charge of creating, facilitating, and reviewing the induction program in their building has a wide variety of options and factors to consider. The choices they make and the sources of information they choose to use to develop their programs profoundly impacts school/district culture, teacher longevity, and most importantly, student achievement.

Motivation

Thomas Sergiovanni’s (1992) theory on motivation offered guidance for the reasons why an individual chooses a career in education. He believes motivation directly connects to rewards. Rewards link to three factors: extrinsic rewards, intrinsic rewards, and/or one’s duty/obligation.

Sergiovanni’s (1992) first motivational reward is extrinsic. Extrinsic rewards motivate according to the idea that “what gets rewarded gets done” (p. 27). Individuals pursued a career in education because they liked “working with young people” (Manuel & Hughes, 2006, p. 11). Through working with young people, an adult has the opportunity to be an influential role model for students. The teacher/role model has the ability to inspire students to achieve beyond the students’ expectations. Assisting students in actualizing their dreams or being the catalyst to formulate a dream culminates the teacher’s impact on students and their future. This does not happen overnight. Throughout the course of a school year a teacher
watches their students grow socially, emotionally, and academically. As Stephen Covey (2008) states, “teachers want to enjoy a sense of dignity and pride in their profession” (p. 36). Daily contact, assessment, reflection, and conferences all offer teachers a privileged lens to see a student grow-up in their classroom. Helping a student grow can shape a teacher’s outcomes while motivating the heart of his or her extrinsic desire to enter the field of education. Teachers gain a sense of pride and dignity when they know their students have the skills, knowledge, and confidence to tackle the challenges in their lives.

Sergiovanni’s (1992) second motivational reward is intrinsic. Sergiovanni’s polarizing point of intrinsic rewards is the suggestion “what is rewarding gets done” (p. 27). Individuals enter teaching because they enjoy the content, as well as the personal fulfillment education has to offer, but “what underlies and truly fuels that interest is teachers’ genuine desire to make a difference” (Covey, 2008, p. 34). Individuals elicit this desire by reflecting on their own experiences: “Many look back to their own schooling and remember a teacher who had a significant, if not life-changing, influence on them. Their chief desire is to be that same type of influence for good on individual students, if only in a small way” (p. 34).

The final motivational idea Sergiovanni (1992) suggests is duty or obligation. Educators motivated by a sense of duty or obligation believe “what is good gets done” (p. 27). Many educators enter the field to help others find their place in the world, in essence, a “calling” (Palmer, 2000, p. 4). “Teachers do not want to teach just for the sake of teaching. They want what they teach to be relevant” (Covey,
Relevancy “is about preparing them [students] to handle any situation they may encounter and giving them confidence to do so” (Clark, 2003, p. xxi). When teaching directly relates to students, it relates to their lives, environment, and future life goals. Ron Clark summarizes duty/obligation as “preparing kids for what awaits them after they leave my classroom” (Clark, 2003, p. xxi).

Motivation to enter education can occur at various points in an individual’s life. Some individuals enter education as their first career, while others change careers to become educators. Simon (2005) stated that approximately 70,000 career-change teachers have turned to teaching in the last two years, from 2003 to 2005. As novice teachers exit the field, new teachers with prior non-educational work experience routinely fill these positions.

**Issues Unique to Career-Change Teachers**

Medford and Knorr (2006) state the benefits for career-change teachers in the classroom:

Career changers bring a wealth of real-life experience to the classroom. Often they are very strong in their content areas and may easily provide concrete answers to questions such as “Why do we need to know this?” or “How can I use this information?” (p. 6).

Career-change teachers offer benefits to the classroom, but also present challenges: “Some career-change teachers have not been in schools in a long time, so they may suffer culture shock when they enter the classroom” (Medford & Knorr, 2006, p. 6). In addition to culture shock, career-change teachers may not be accustomed to bringing work home. Such work entails grading and lesson planning, in addition to the worries and personal issues teachers often bring home regarding their students.
Whether these issues are academic or social/emotional, concern for a student can weigh heavily on one’s conscience. Additionally, a career-change teacher may not understand the nuances of a school budget. Most career-change teachers come from the private sector and therefore are not aware that 80% of a school’s budget goes to salaries, not supplies, maintenance, or technology (Fritts, 2008, p. 91).

Furthermore, classroom management may be an issue for a career-change teacher. Capturing and maintaining the attention of adolescents can be a challenge to individuals accustomed to only working with adults. Finally, the jargon of high stakes testing presents a challenge for career-change teachers. As the nation moves to Common Core State Standards, a career-change teacher may be unfamiliar with the strands, standards, and scaffolding associated with Common Core State Standards. The Common Core State Standards are not the College Readiness Standards of yesterday. These challenges require a high learning curve and fast implementation.

**First-Year Teacher Experience**

Novice and career-change teachers have a shared experience: the first year of teaching. Kevin Ryan and James Cooper (1998) describe the first year of teaching:

The first year of teaching has been described as an emotional rollercoaster, filled with peaks of exhilaration and dips of discouragement. The first year is intense because of the unexpected demands and because of the surprises that reside in what was thought to be a familiar world – the classroom. (p. 467)

Teacher preparation programs and certification programs provide prospective educators necessary pedagogical preparation; and course assignments,
school observations, and practicum teaching experiences introduce teachers to the classroom. However, these skill-teaching experiences do not fully prepare individuals for the needed adaptable skills of the first year of teaching. “A person’s first year of teaching is too unusual, too filled with extremes and emotional highs and lows” (Ryan & Cooper, 1998, p. 491) for one to be completely prepared.

Popular culture offers resources that seek to understand and prepare first year teachers for the classroom. These resources are tailored to future teachers or individuals curious about the profession. Amazon.com devotes a page of its website to a section titled “Books for First Year Teachers” (Amazon.com, 2012). This section provides a reading list for first year teachers. Examples include Abby Goodnough’s *Ms. Moffett’s First Year: Becoming a Teacher in America*, a novel about a career-change teacher with no prior teaching experience who enters a New York City first grade classroom; Dan Brown’s *The Great Expectations School: A Rookie Year in the New Blackboard Jungle*, a non-fiction account of a new teacher who enters a Bronx fourth grade classroom; *My First Year as a Teacher*, is a collection of recollections from teachers who share their first year experiences; and *Inside Mrs. B’s Classroom: Courage, Hope and Learning on Chicago’s South Side*, by Leslie Baldacci, a former *Chicago Sun-Times* journalist. In this last book, Baldacci, who made a career change from educational reporter to inner-city educator, discusses the trials of classroom management, overpopulated classroom, fatigue, and lack of administrative support, as well as her triumphs in the classroom and the inspiration she drew from students.
The Public Broadcast System (PBS) has run several specials about education. The three part series *Only a Teacher* traces the role and changes of the American teacher from the 1830s to the present. *SCHOOL* is a four-part documentary series that chronicles the American public school system from the 1770s to the 21st Century. In 2001, PBS broadcast a documentary entitled *The First Year*, which follows five teachers over the course of the 180 days of their first year of teaching in Los Angeles.

The first year teaching experience overflows with rewards, as well as challenges for novice and career-change teachers. The resources listed above, as well as teacher preparation programs provide clinical insight into the first year of teaching, but there is no panacea for understanding and preparing for the emotional rollercoaster of that challenging year.

**First-Year Teacher Challenges**

The personal experience of the first year of teaching is unique to the individual; yet there are some common challenges that all new teachers face. In the article, “New Teachers Face Three Common Challenges,” Bryan Goodwin (2012) highlights common struggles all new teachers face in their first year: classroom management; lack of guidance and support when writing curriculum; and the concern of being in a non-supportive environment (p. 84).

Classroom management is a developed skill in education. Few professions expect an individual to steward a large group confined to assigned seats for an extended period of time while also expecting increased results of skills or content
for the group. In a 2004 Public Agenda survey, 85 teachers agreed “new teachers are particularly unprepared for dealing with behavior problems in their classrooms” (p. 3). Additionally, teachers face the challenge of “teaching children and adolescents with higher needs” (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2005). Both novice and career-change first-year teachers, typically find themselves in emotionally and physically taxing classrooms that require finding a personal balance and solutions that work best for them and their students.

Goodwin (2012) further revealed that “a lack of guidance and resources for lesson and unit planning” (p. 84) burdens new teachers. Due to new teachers’ lack of experience in the areas of lesson creation, planning, differentiation, delivery, resiliency, and knowledge of what works in their classrooms, many new teachers struggle with a lack of guidance. Fry (2007) observed that new teachers spend ten to twelve hours a day managing lesson planning, grading, and other time consuming aspects of the job (p. 223). In 2005, the Alliance for Excellent Education found that “most new teachers are given little professional support, feedback or demonstration of what it takes to help their students succeed” (p. 2).

The final struggle that Goodwin (2012) highlighted for new teachers was the sentiment toward an unsupportive environment. New teachers felt as though administrators ignored them and there was a lack of cooperation from veteran teachers in the building. The main area of frustration stemmed from new teachers’ lack of meaningful feedback on the craft of teaching from administrators, mentors, department chairs, peers, and other members of the school community. They felt
their colleagues and administrators did not provide appropriate guidance. Research by the Alliance for Excellent Education (2005) supported this claim: “most new teachers are given little professional support, feedback or demonstration of what it takes to help their students succeed” (p. 2).

The Illinois School Code has attempted to address the lack of support for first year teachers by requiring induction programs for new teachers in all public schools. Illinois School Code (105 ILCS 5/21A-10) required public schools in the 2003-2004 school year to create programs that “assist new teachers in developing the skills and strategies necessary for instructional excellence” (P.A. 93-955, eff. 1-1-04). The program requirements set out in 105 ILCS 5/21A-10 are as follows:

(1) Assigns a mentor teacher to each new teacher for a period of at least 2 school years.

(2) Aligns with the Illinois Professional Teaching Standards, content area standards, and applicable local school improvement and professional development plans, if any.

(3) Addresses all of the following elements and how they will be provided:

   (A) Mentoring and support of the new teacher.

   (B) Professional development specifically designed to ensure the growth of the new teacher’s knowledge and skills.

   (C) Formative assessment designed to ensure feedback and reflection, which must not be used in any evaluation of the new teacher.

(4) Describes the role of mentor teachers, the criteria and process for their selection, and how they will be trained, provided that each mentor teacher shall demonstrate the best practices in teaching his or her respective field of practice. A mentor teacher may not directly or indirectly participate in the evaluation of a new teacher pursuant to Article 24A of this Code or the evaluation procedure of the public school. (P.A. 93-355, eff. 1-1-04)
The law stipulates the following important clause: “provided that funding is made available by the State Board of Education from an appropriation made for this purpose” (P.A. 93-355, eff. 1-1-04). The absence of secure funding creates hard choices for principals regarding allocating resources for new teachers. When funding is unavailable from the State Board of Education, principals must decide the degree of support for the mentor program and become creative in finding a solution or forgo other programming. Lack of funding creates the dilemma of choosing between supporting the needs of new teachers and supporting other needs within the school. When funding is not available, principals must prioritize allocation mechanisms that may impact the overall funding of induction programs.

The importance of this research study was to explore the perceptions of teachers and principals regarding the needs of new teachers, whether public high school novice or beginning career-change teachers and the appropriate induction program that the faculty believes is needed. The degree to which an induction program addresses these needs, as well as provides support to new teachers, both public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers, directly impacts their longevity in education (Ingersoll, 2001).

**Teacher Turnover**

The U.S. Department of Education commissioned a study in 2010 to investigate the condition of American education. The findings indicated that of the 3.5 million teachers in the United States, 255,700 move to another building, and 269,800 leave the profession each year. Over the past 20 years, the number of
beginning (new) teachers increased, but so too has workforce turnover (Washington, DC, 2010). The study found teacher attrition results in a significant drop in educators’ experience (Ingersoll & Strong, 2011). Research in the area of teacher attrition estimates that 30 to 50 percent of new teachers leave the profession within five years from the start of their career (Ingersoll & Strong, 2011). What is more startling is that over the last two decades, first-year teacher turnover has increased by 40 percent (Fulton, Yoon & Lee, 2005; Ingersoll & Merrill 2010). The turnover rate often can result in an unstable learning environment. In 2009 the attrition rate was significant enough that the rate of turnover could be represented as “1000 teachers per day who quit teaching” (Andrew, 2009). Such attrition negatively impacts the profession, student achievement, school culture, and instructional leadership.

Principals in Illinois face a quandary regarding teacher attrition. Teacher turnover has a profound effect on school performance and student achievement (Grissmer & Kirby, 1987; 1997; Ingersoll, 2001) in addition to district finances. The Illinois Education Research Council reviewed teacher turnover data over a 35 year time period and found that “roughly one in four individuals who enter public school teaching in Illinois leaves the profession of teaching during the first five years and does not return to Illinois public schools” (Colleen, DeAngelis & Presley, 2007). When nearly a third of teachers in their first three years of teaching and roughly half of teachers by their fifth year leave the profession, school districts must undergo
time-consuming and expensive measures to maintain high performance in classrooms (Andrew, 2009).

The National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future estimated that in 2003 school districts spent at least $7.2 billion a year on teacher turnover. This staggering statistic is devastating to school districts within the current state of the economy; these turnovers directly impact district budgeting. Yet despite the turnover statistics, individuals are still entering the field of teaching.

Lack of educator experience negatively impacts student learning in a profound way. Several researchers note that student achievement significantly declines in the classrooms of first year teachers (Rivkin, Hanushek & Kain, 2002). In the 2005 brief on teacher attrition titled “Teacher Attrition: Costly Loss to the Nation and to the States,” The Alliance for Excellent Education indicated that beginning teachers “are more likely than their more experienced colleagues to be assigned low-performing students” (p. 2). This trend of placing novice teachers with the lowest performers in a school, with the knowledge that first-year teachers’ classrooms have notably lower achievement, does not foster a stable, equitable, and viable learning community for teacher and student (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2005; Ingersoll, 2001).

With the pressure to manage a classroom, motivate and educate students, and handle a myriad of responsibilities such as grading, lesson planning, materials creation, being evaluated, long hours, and pressures from parents and administration, many first year teachers feel overwhelmed and leave the profession
Ingersoll (2001) listed reasons for teacher dissatisfaction that eventually leads to turnover: “Inadequate Administrative Support, Poor Salary, Student Discipline Problems, Lack of Faculty Influence, Lack of Student Motivation, Class Sizes Too Large, Inadequate Time to Prepare, Unsafe Environment, Poor Opportunity for Professional Advancement, Lack of Community Support, Interference in Teaching, Lack of Professional Competence of Colleagues, and Intrusion on Teaching Time” (p. 21). Ingersoll’s findings stressed that “retirement accounts for the least number of departures” and “the largest proportion of departures had to do with job dissatisfaction and desire to seek better jobs” (p. 23).

**Purpose of Study**

The purpose of this study was to examine the perceived impact of public high school teacher induction on public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers in education. This study examined the differences in perceptions of public high school novice versus beginning career-change teachers in regards to the efficacy of induction programs.

This study also examined principals’ current perceptions of the development needs of public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers in the educational field. The study explored public high school principals’ perceptions of the commonalities in public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers’ needs, while addressing the vast differences in spectrums of age, gender, education, skill sets, family status and life experience. Principals in charge of
creating, facilitating, and reviewing the induction program must consider a wide variety of options and factors. The choices they make and the sources of information they choose to use to decide how to induct new teachers profoundly impacts school/district culture, teacher job longevity and most importantly student achievement.

**Research Questions**

The following are the research questions for this case study:

1) According to the perceptions of first year public high school teachers with no prior work experience:
   a. What were the needs of public high school novice teachers during their first year?
   b. How did their districts’ induction programs meet these needs?
   c. What specific recommendations would they make to improve their districts’ induction programs?

2) According to the perceptions of beginning public high school career-change teachers entering the teaching profession:
   a. What are the beginning public high school career-change teachers’ needs during their first year of teaching?
   b. How did their districts’ induction programs meet their needs?
   c. What recommendations would they make to improve their districts’ induction programs?

3) According to the perceptions of the public high school principals:
a. What are the needs of a public high school novice teacher versus a beginning public high school career-change teacher during his or her first year of teaching?

b. How do the induction programs in their school districts meet the needs of public high school novice teachers and beginning career-change teachers?

c. How do public high school principals believe the intentions of their induction programs are met by their school district for public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers?

d. What recommendations would they make to improve their school districts’ induction programs?

Conceptual Framework

After analyzing the responses by public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers and principals to the survey designed for this study and the interview questions, the researcher coded the qualitative data gathered. The conceptual framework for this coding employed Allan A. Glatthorn's (1997) model of Differentiated Supervision. Construction for understanding the developmentally different needs of public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers and the ways in which school districts address these needs was analyzed through the three categories of Differentiated Supervision.

identified Differentiated Supervision as a method of supervision that supports all new teachers. “Differentiated supervision is an approach to supervision that provides teachers with options about the kinds of supervisory and evaluative services they receive” (p. 3). Differentiated Supervision centers on the premise that providing teachers with supports can foster their professional development. The three areas of Differentiated Supervision are:

1) Intensive Development;
2) Cooperative Development; and,
3) Self-Directed Development.

**Intensive Development**

“Intensive development is another term for clinical supervision” (Glatthorn, 1997, p. 179). Clinical supervision is a developmental approach with emphasis on teacher growth (p. 179). Glatthorn outlined a six-stage model of Intensive Development commonly used in teacher evaluation and acknowledged variations to the model. The first stage clarifies the supervisory relationship, purpose, and goal of the foci of each observation. The second stage is the pre-observation conference.

During the pre-observation conference, the supervisor and the teacher examine the following issues: when the observation will be made; nature of the class to be observed; specific purpose of the observation; what material has already been taught; the teacher’s objectives for the lesson; the activities the teacher plans to use; and the methods the teacher will use to assess learning. (p. 156)

The third stage is the observation of the teacher in the classroom in order to collect data. The fourth stage analyzes data collected in the observation. The fifth stage is the post-observation conference. In this stage, the supervisor provides feedback to
the teacher from data collected in the observation. The final stage is assessment. Supervisor and teacher evaluate the stages completed and generate focus for the next cycle of Clinical Supervision.

**Cooperative Development**

“Cooperative development is also a developmental process in which small teams of teachers work together in a variety of ways to facilitate their own professional growth” (Glatthorn, 1997, p. 179). Glatthorn noted Cooperative Development takes many forms such as observing each other’s classes, holding professional dialogs, producing curricular and instructional materials, exchanging classes and carrying out action research projects (p. 179). The supervisor supports teachers, while teachers manage their own developmental programs.

**Self-Directed Development**

“Self-directed development is a third developmental process in which a teacher directs his or her own growth, for the most part working independently” (Glatthorn, 1997, p. 179). Self-Directed Development focuses on attention towards independent and goal-orientated facilitation by the supervisor.

The researcher used the conceptual framework to identify key concepts and relationships within the data collected. The three Differentiated Supervision categories outlined by Glatthorn (1997) were used to generate the public high school teacher survey and the public high school principal interview questions, as well as classify induction models into one of the three categories. Through this analysis, the researcher drew conclusions and comparisons that addressed the
public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers’ perceptions, as well as the high school principals’ perceptions in the research questions.

**Significance of Study**

The significance of this study was to increase awareness of the needs of public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers through their own voices. Also included were the building principals’ perceptions of public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers’ needs in induction programs. The study explored possible comparisons and discontinuity amongst the two groups as perceived by these individuals and their immediate supervisors, building principals. The number of public elementary and secondary school teachers is “projected to increase an additional 13 percent between 2002 and 2014” (Hussar, 2005, p. 17). Future public high school educators will be a mix of novice and career-change teachers. “Due to the results of the economic downturn these past few years or other factors, many professionals have rethought their career paths and turned to the field of education” (Monsenson & Monsenson, 2012, p. 8). As new teachers enter the field of education from a variety of backgrounds, induction programs will be required for teachers new to a particular school, teachers with previous teaching experience, individuals entering their first career, or individuals making a career change.

The research and findings of this study provided significant insight into identification of commonalities and differences in public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers’ induction needs. This study uncovered the
perceptions of current induction programs for teachers who entered teaching as either a public high school novice or beginning career-change teacher and how induction programs may or may not have addressed and supported their needs. The information in this study will assist instructional leaders in cultivating effective and appropriate induction programs based on the needs of public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers.

**Methodology**

The methodology of this research was a case study. A case study permits the usage of both quantitative and qualitative data to solve complex and intricate problems. Three public high school unit school districts with high teacher attrition were utilized for a case study of public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers in the beginning of their teaching careers, along with insight from building principals. Since the case study utilized three public high school unit school districts, a multi-site case study design was employed.

The research measured the perceptions of public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers and their building principals. This study set out to discover the needs of public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers in their first year of teaching. In addition this multi-site case study sought to understand the perceived effectiveness of how the induction program appropriately met the needs of first year public high school teachers by both the teachers and principals. The multi-site case study data was compared to qualitative
data gathered from historic district hiring data, state hiring and attrition data, and end of the year hiring data for each case study district participating in the research.

Districts were selected based on the Illinois Interactive Report Card’s (IIRC) datum. Selection was based on similar per pupil spending and demographic data to determine schools with similar student populations. In addition, the medium district average years of teaching experience the researcher looked for was fourteen years. The Teacher Service Record was utilized to ensure the districts selected had teachers with zero to three years teaching experience.

After districts were selected, a cooperation letter was sent to the superintendent outlining the research study and requesting permission to conduct research in the district. A request was also made to the districts human resources department for historical data regarding personal (hire data, years of experience, exit data, level of education, certification, gender, age, etc.). Once permission was received from the superintendent, a letter of cooperation outlining the research and case study was sent to building principals. This letter requested high school participants in the building to have zero to three years teaching experience and at least one career-change teacher with zero to three years teaching experience. Teachers with zero to three years teaching experience should have been recent recipients of the induction program and were therefore selected based on their recent entrance to the field of education. Building principals were informed that the case study would include a survey of public high school novice and beginning
career-change teachers, as well as interviews with the building principals themselves.

**Limitations of Study**

While this study sought to gain an understanding of the current needs of first year public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers, and contribute to the research on induction programs, there were limitations.

Each site for the multi-site case study had similar per-pupil-spending and demographic data to attain corresponding student populations, but school climate and culture were not always comparable. Although only three suburban high school districts were selected for this study to provide insight for teacher induction, the depth of data collection and analysis assisted in exploring induction programs ability to address the perceived needs of public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers. Therefore, the issue of generalizability may impact how the research results will be transferable in different educational settings (Merriam, 2009, p. 51).

Multi-site case studies typically present the challenge of management. Managing various data collected at multiple sites can become confusing (Merriam, 2009, p. 50). As such, the researcher conducted these data gathering efforts one site at a time. This was done during each principal interview. When the researcher was onsite to conduct the principal interview, surveys were left in the main office. These were then distributed to the public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers at each site that met the research requirement.
This study required access to the three districts’ historic data, specifically on their hiring practices, retention, and attrition. These areas of data are not publicly shared and require strict confidentiality. Therefore, the accuracy for which districts did or did not track this information may have had an impact on the reliability and validity of data available. The researcher utilized district data that was congruent for all three districts studied.

The participants in this study were asked questions that examined the perceived needs of both supervisors and subordinates. Public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers may have had reservations responding to such questions, thus impacting the reliability and validity of data collected. In order to control this limitation, confidential questionnaires were used to gain insight into the research questions pertaining to the teachers’ perceived needs. Principal interviews were conducted one-on-one with the researcher to diminish this limitation as well. Questionnaires allowed the teachers to choose between confidentiality and partial anonymity. Since teacher questionnaires were delivered to each site and coded by site, partial anonymity was assured. After each survey, the questionnaires were stored away and locked.

The professional experience of the researcher himself, in relation to this study, was controlled for biases through a reflective journal. The biases of the researcher that relate to this study are:

1. The researcher was a career-change teacher to education.
2. The researcher experienced new teacher induction in four different school settings.

3. As a leader in education, the researcher's own experiences and thoughts on new teachers and induction may have influenced objectivity.

4. The researcher's involvement in professional development and new teacher induction may have influenced objectivity.

5. The researcher works as an assistant principal in a charter school.

To control for the biases mentioned above, the researcher strove to maintain his objectivity by keeping a reflective journal. The reflective journal was used by the researcher to reflect on items and issues that may cause loss of objectivity in the research process. Since the researcher's daily life required him to be part of a school with new teachers and an induction program, the researcher needed to remain fully cognizant of his own biases through the process.

**Definition of Terms**

- **Novice Teacher** - First year teachers with no prior career experience.

- **Career-change Teacher** – First year teachers with previous career experience in a field other than education.

- **Administrator** – Instructional leader in a school. Interchangeable with principal.

- **Principal** – Instructional leader in a school. Interchangeable with administrator.
• **New Teacher** – First year teachers with no prior career experience and first year teachers with previous career experience in a field other than education.

• **Induction** – “A process used by districts to train, support, and retain new teachers” (Wong, 2004, p. 107).

• **Differentiated Supervision** – “An approach to supervision that provides teachers with options about the kinds of supervisory and evaluative services they receive” (Glatthorn, 1997, p. 3).

• **Supervision** – “The set of activities designed to improve the teaching-learning process” (Hoy & Forsyth, 1986, p. 3) and provide teachers with information guidance in navigating school culture and climate.

• **Multi-site Case Study** – A type of qualitative case study in which the researcher collects and analyzes data from several cases at multiple locations (Merriam, 2009, p. 49).

**Summary**

Despite limitations from the outset, this research addressed a significant matter in public education. What the researcher learned from this study can help to inform and improve induction programs to differentiate between the needs of public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers. Also, the results of this study may influence instructional leaders working with public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers in order to create improved induction programs that meet specific needs of these teachers. Finally, this study may inform
how instructional leaders directly address new teacher attrition. Teacher
preparation programs, principal development programs, and district/building
induction coordinators may all gain valuable insight from this study to help address
the needed support structures for public high school novice and beginning career-
change teachers in their first years of teaching.
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

As with any field, researchers gain knowledge from individuals who have preceded them. Through a vigorous review of previous literature, a researcher acquires the ability to comprehend the concept examined. New teacher induction programs comprise a myriad of components, regardless of state, district, and school, which contributes to teacher development. Due to the lack of uniformity in implementation of new teacher induction program, research was reviewed to provide examples of effective models of induction.

Exploring factors that have impacted the American teacher supply, longevity, and quality in the field were vital to this research study in order to explore the factors that assisted in answering the research questions. Below are the research questions used to conduct the literature review:

1) According to the perceptions of first year public high school teachers with no prior work experience:
   a. What were the needs of public high school novice teachers during their first year?
   b. How did their districts’ induction programs meet these needs?
   c. What specific recommendations would they make to improve their districts’ induction programs?
2) According to the perceptions of beginning public high school career-change teachers entering the teaching profession:
   a. What are the beginning public high school career-change teachers’ needs during their first year of teaching?
   b. How did their districts’ induction programs meet their needs?
   c. What recommendations would they make to improve their districts’ induction programs?

3) According to the perceptions of the public high school principals:
   a. What are the needs of a public high school novice teacher versus a beginning public high school career-change teacher during his or her first year of teaching?
   b. How do the induction programs in their school districts meet the needs of public high school novice teachers and beginning career-change teachers?
   c. How do public high school principals believe the intentions of their induction programs are met by their school district for public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers?
   d. What recommendations would they make to improve their school districts’ induction programs?

Teacher longevity can be impacted in the initial years. Bartell (2005) opens her book, *Cultivating high-quality teaching through induction and mentoring*, with the following passage:
The initial years of teaching are the most challenging for new teachers. Typically, new teachers are struggling to survive day-to-day. It is during these entry years that teachers are most likely to become disillusioned and leave their initial teaching positions or even the profession. For those who stay, the early years are ones in which teachers establish patterns and practices that often last throughout their career. (p. xv)

The first years of teaching are pivotal in determining a teacher’s potential longevity or early exit from the field. Principals play a key role in how they structure and support induction programs for public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers in their buildings and districts. Principals must be aware of the similarities and differences public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers bring to the profession and determine ways to support them. In addition to supporting new teachers in the school, principals need to be aware of the challenges facing American schools and how these challenges impact the profession.

In recent years, student enrollment has increased and created the demand for more teachers. Johnson, Berg and Johnson (2005) found that “teacher supply has not kept pace with demand in all schools, districts, and subject areas” (p. 5). At the same time, teacher supply does not meet demands that federal, state, and local mandates have put into place to increase teacher and administrator accountability (Barrera, Bradley, & Slate, 2010). The MetLife Teacher Survey (2012) found that new and veteran teachers’ job satisfaction has decreased 23 percentage points in schools since 2008. The survey attributed the decrease in job satisfaction to the inability to maintain an adequate supply of teachers and sustain a rigorous academic learning environment, thus creating a cyclical affect in education that attributes to teacher attrition (Humphrey, Wechsler, Bosetti, Park, & Tiffany-
Morales, 2008; Ingersoll, 2001). Therefore, it is important for stakeholders to acknowledge the need to create effective systems for new teachers to address both supply shortages and increased accountability in education. Comprehensive and effective induction are programs that can provide new teachers with the supports to become “successful, contributing members of the profession” (Bartell, 2005, p. xv). This can be achieved when district administrators and building principals consider the “needs of beginning teachers in contexts in order to identify ways to provide them better support” (Fry & Anderson, 2011, p. 2). Exploring the needs of professionals new to the field of education, as well as the induction programs in place to provide supports for them in the first years of their education careers, can break the cycle of teacher attrition and create a more stable and rewarding field for adults and students. Consequently, the literature was reviewed as it related to the concepts below:

1) Historic Trends in Teacher Attrition in the United States and Illinois
2) Characteristics of Novice Teachers
3) Characteristics of Career-Change Teachers
4) The Need for Induction
5) Defining Quality Induction
6) Models of Induction
7) Conceptual Framework: Glatthorn’s Differentiated Supervision
Through the review of literature, the researcher showed a connection between attrition, novice and career-change teachers, induction models, and Differentiated Supervision.

**Historic Trends in Teacher Attrition in the United States and Illinois**

Ingersoll (2001) wrote, “Contemporary educational theory holds that one of the pivotal causes of inadequate school performance is the inability of schools to adequately staff classrooms with qualified teachers” (p. 3). New teachers are entering the field and classrooms, but the supply of teachers is not keeping up with pace of demand. A study commissioned by the Harvard Graduate School of Education, *Who stays in teaching and why: A review of the literature on teacher retention*, indicated that 450,000 of American teachers (one-sixth of the teacher workforce) left schools and did not return to the classroom. The study indicated that the teaching force today is the largest in American history, with 150,000 new teachers graduating from teacher preparation programs annually (Johnson et al., 2005, p. 5). Demand for teachers has increased with the growing enrollment of students. Enrollment and teacher retirement contribute to the issue of staffing, but teacher dissatisfaction and attrition are also key contributors to the current demand for teachers. “Decreased supply is also due to turnover and, more specifically, to attrition and mobility” (p. 6). The issue of supply and demand impacts the perception of the field, as well as students that rely on teachers for preparation for their own futures. Studies suggest that teacher supply is “not evenly distributed across schools, districts, regions and subject or grade assignments” (p. 6). This
uneven distribution has created an inconsistent and unbalanced issue of teacher supply and demand across suburban, urban, and rural school districts.

The issue of teacher staffing does little to deter the old impression that education is a profession with a revolving door. Teachers continue to leave the profession at an alarming rate. According to the U.S. Department of Education’s Teacher Attrition and Mobility results from the 2008-2009 Teacher Follow-Up Survey, at the end of the 1988/1989 school year, 132,300 teachers left the profession, and at the end of the 2008/2009 school year 269,800 teachers left the profession (Keigher, 2010). The majority of teachers leaving the profession in the 2008/2009 school year were retirees, but the second largest group was teachers with only one to three years of service (Keigher, 2010). The National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future (2003) indicated a major concern in educational research and policy due to the increased need for replacement teachers to sustain the rise in teacher turnover. The high attrition of teachers especially new to the profession has had a wide and negative impact on education.

When effective teachers leave schools, less effective teachers are left to “build instructional capacity” (Donaldson & Johnson, 2011, p. 48) for the individuals that they replace. Less effective and less experienced teachers are responsible for “writing curriculum and coordinating its implementation, tracking and communicating important educational information regarding students as they move grade to grade and maintain productive relations with parents and the larger school community” (p. 48). These replacement teachers are taxed with impacting student
achievement and achieving their own proficient instructional capacity at the same time. The Alliance for Excellent Education (2011) stated, “The size of the teaching force, coupled with the high annual turnover rates, seriously compromises the nation’s capacity to ensure that all students have access to skilled teaching” (p. 2). Research has found that effective teachers make a massive difference in student achievement on test score gains as compared to less effective teachers (Nye, Konstantopoulos & Hedges, 2004).

Effective teaching is directly related to the time and experience educators acquire from being in a classroom and the supports they received in their first years of teaching. Novice teachers are less effective because of their overall lack of experience teaching students. Barrera et al. (2010) reviewed several studies and concluded that beginning teachers need three to seven years of experience in order to become proficient teachers. Completing just three years of teaching contributes only to enhancing a teachers’ competency, not their proficiency in becoming effective classroom teachers (Ingersoll & Smith, 2004; Porrter, 2008; Stanulis & Floden, 2009). Any teacher’s professional growth occurs over time. Time spent exploring and learning the craft of teaching contributes to a teacher’s effectiveness in the classroom. The first four years of teaching focuses on building instructional capacity and impacting student growth, a process that often becomes frustrating for new teachers. This frustration can produce job dissatisfaction in less experienced teachers, and job dissatisfaction is the key reason for non-retirees to exit the field of education.
Education is not immune to attrition. Ingersoll (2001) identified the following as contributors to high teacher turnover rates: “low salaries, inadequate support from the school administration, student discipline problems, and limited faculty input into school decision-making” (p. 5). Humphrey et al.’s (2008) study of Teacher Induction in Illinois and Ohio discovered additional reasons in their research, including “school environment, availability of instructional materials and supplies, induction support for instructional preparation and planning, induction program support for working with special population, mentor support for instructional preparation and planning, and mentor support for working with special student populations” (p. 6). These contributors are key levers in identifying reasons new teachers exit the profession within their first five years.

Illinois

The Illinois Education Research Council’s (2007) report on teacher attrition provides the following information on teacher attrition and hiring in the state of Illinois:

- New teachers leave their initial schools at significantly higher rates.
- Two out of five (44%) new entrants leave their initial school within the first two years.
- 67% of new entrants leave their initial school within five years
- Average net loss of new teachers is 27%.

The report indicates new teacher attrition is at a high and alarming rate in Illinois. No school type is immune to attrition. School types range from urban, rural,
high and low performing, as well as student characteristics. The research found attrition is similar across school types. Although the report indicates that teachers being recruited are stronger academically than their peers who are leaving the profession, conditions for teachers and supports have not yet improved. The survey found “that between 25 and 30 percent of new teachers leave and do not return to teaching in Illinois Public Schools, regardless of the locale of the school or the characteristics of the students in the school” (Colleen et al., 2007, p. 3).

Additionally, the report found that “roughly one in four individuals who enter public school teaching in Illinois leaves the profession of teaching during the first five years and does not return to Illinois public schools” (Colleen et al., 2007, p. 3). This trend of new teachers exiting the profession within their first five years is not unique to Illinois. Research indicates that many teachers leave within their early years in education no matter where they live, due to the levers Ingersoll (2001) identified.

The report further found “those who enter teaching between the ages of 26-34 are the most likely to leave during their first five years (43%), even compared to those who enter at a younger age” (Colleen et al., 2007, p. 22). The study stated, “Teachers who enter at age 35 or older register the lowest five-year attrition rate (35%)” (p. 22). This statistic indicates that novice teachers exit the field at a higher rate than career-change teachers in Illinois.
**Performance Evaluation Reform Act (PERA)**

The passing of Performance Evaluation Reform Act (PERA) and Senate Bill 7 in Illinois requires the “design and implementation of performance evaluation systems that assess teachers’ and principals’ professional skills, as well as incorporate measures of student growth” (Illinois State Board of Education, Performance Evaluation Advisory Council homepage). PERA requires teacher performance evaluation to consist of an evaluation of a teacher’s professional practice, student data and indicators of student growth (ISBE Non-Regulatory Guidance on PERA & SB 7, 2011). Prior to the implementation of the PERA system, teacher evaluations centered solely on a teacher’s performance in the classroom through a “snapshot” observational approach. Now, however, professional practice is measured through a formal classroom observation, where the evaluator collects data on the teacher’s instructional practice, pedagogy, classroom environment, classroom management, and assessment of students. PERA now requires the inclusion of data that indicates the teacher’s impact on student growth and achievement. The implementation of PERA in Illinois has just begun to shape district evaluation systems. The paradigm shift now requires that each formal observation “must be preceded by a conference between the qualified evaluator and the teacher” (Illinois State Board of Education, 2011, p. 25). During the post-conference, the evaluator must discuss with the teacher the evidence collected regarding professional practice. This conversation is required by PERA and may not
have occurred as part of the formal evaluation process for many Illinois school districts and schools in the past.

**Characteristics of Novice Teachers**

“Few other professions have the expectation that initial training adequately prepares them to take on a full-time load of work – newly qualified lawyers and doctors continue their training as they work alongside their more experienced and qualified colleagues” (Oliver, 2009, p. 6). New teachers are trusted with a classroom, required to plan, and expected to manage and increase student achievement. Most new teachers are isolated in a room with a variety of students on the first day of school. New teachers are asked to assimilate into a school culture they have yet to fully understand.

It is important to note that novice teachers provide a unique asset to the profession of education. They are enthusiastic and optimistic. They come from a variety of teacher preparation programs that have provided them with educational research and practicum experience that helps to foster their potential and understanding of the day-to-day rigors of being a teacher. Novice teachers can be molded for success. As students look toward their teacher for guidance, novice teachers look towards administrators, mentors, and others in the building for guidance in order to attain the knowledge and skills to become proficient educators (Roberson & Roberson, 2008).

Novice teachers need time to become proficient in their first careers. Roberson and Roberson (2008) identify this issue: “It makes little sense to expect a
novice to perform as well as a person of experience in any setting” (p. 113). Unfortunately, they point out “the reality facing district officials and campus administrators is that we are consistently presented with novice first-year teachers at the beginning of each new school year” (p. 113). Principals must foster the novice teacher’s ability to demonstrate effective classroom practice. Principals can promote effective classroom practice that emphasizes high expectations for all students while meeting individual student needs through the systems they put into place at the school (Gallagher, 2012). The systems principals put into place to support novice teachers must address the challenges new teachers bring to schools.

A major challenge that novice teachers face is “encountering a world of unknowns” (Roberson & Roberson, 2008, p. 114). Novice teachers have no prior educational work experience to reference. The responsibility of being in charge of students and a classroom, loom large. Planning and implementing daily lessons that are engaging, rigorous, and rooted in educational standards for 182 days is daunting for any educator. The role of a teacher comes with great responsibility. An administrator can address this challenge by creating a healthy school climate.

Bickmore and Bickmore (2010) identified a healthy school climate as “characterized by alignment of actions with goals, collegiality, and positive work conditions (e.g., administrative support, resources for teaching, and input into decision making)” (p. 448). Creating an environment that assists novice teachers in uncovering the unknowns begins with the supports a principal puts into action to create a healthy school climate. “Principals can support teachers by developing
organizational structures that enhance collegial work, by involving teachers in school operations, by efficiently providing resources for teachers, and by enhancing teachers’ work environments” (p. 449). The components of a healthy school climate contribute to uncovering the challenges of being a novice classroom teacher. A principal can involve novice teachers in creating a healthy school climate by including them in decision-making, fostering collegiality, and resource alignment. By including novice teachers in creating and maintaining a healthy school climate, new teachers gain references and resources that can assist in uncovering the mystery of being a teacher.

Roberson and Roberson (2008) identify five major areas of concern regarding novice teachers. The five major areas of concern are 1) workload, 2) time management, 3) knowledge of curriculum, 4) evaluation and grading, and 5) issues of autonomy and control (p. 114). An example of a teacher’s workload is the management of paperwork for over a 120 students. An example of time management is using class time effectively for each class eight hours a day, as well as using their preparation time to plan, grade, contact parents, or being involved in a variety of meetings. Knowledge of curriculum centers on how well the individual knows the subject matter they are teaching. Evaluation and grading requires a teacher to create assessments that accurately assess skills and content covered in their class. The issue of autonomy and control focuses on the freedom a teacher has every day in their classroom. Management does not check on them daily and therefore teachers are solely responsible for the control of the classroom. These five
areas of concern create anxiety, doubt, confusion, and frustration for novice teachers based on their lack of teaching experience and no prior career knowledge.

Principals can address these five areas of concern by creating a sense of belonging for novice teachers. Bickmore and Bickmore (2010) found that principals are at the core of creating a sense of belonging in the school community to address the previous five areas of concern. “Principals’ influence in developing multifaceted induction programs, structures of collaboration, and positive personal interactions with novice teachers seemed to induce novice teachers overwhelmingly positive perceptions of their teaching and work environments” (p. 463). Odden (2011) supports the idea that professional development strategies require administrative support. Through personal interaction and guidance by a school administrator, novice teachers gain a positive self-perception, as well as confidence as a teacher. Through positive personal interactions the principals provides novice teachers with resources that can assist them in understanding how to manage workload and time management. Through collaboration, novice teachers obtain knowledge of the curriculum they are to teach by having access to others who teach the same course. This collaboration can also assist them in understanding evaluation and grading, as well as learn systems and structures to eliminate the issues of autonomy and control.

Principals can be held accountable in this process. Measuring the outcomes of collaboration and participation can be used to gauge effectiveness of an induction program and principals participation. Schools and districts can implement levers of
accountability that measure if “teaching practice is changing and improving toward higher levels of performance in the district view of effective instructional practice and if students learning is rising and achievement gaps are falling” (Odden, 2011, p. 102).

Novice teachers present unique challenges and concerns because of their lack of previous work experience in another field or education. However, principals play an important role in addressing these challenges and concerns. Career-change teachers have relevant experience to assist them in the early stages of a career change, but also bring to the profession of education their own advantages and disadvantages.

**Characteristics of Career-Change Teachers**

An increasing number of new teachers entering the profession of education already have experience working in a previous occupation. *The MetLife Survey of the American teacher: Collaborating for student success* (2009) indicated that most principals (69%) and teachers (77%) have colleagues in their schoolhouses that entered education from other careers. The report stated that more than one-third of all teachers (35%) report that they themselves entered education following another career (45% of high school teachers and 31% of elementary school teachers referencing entering education as a second career).

These career-change teachers enter education as a second career for a myriad of reasons. Vivienne Griffiths (2011) provided several common reasons individuals decided to change careers to become an educator. These reasons
included: dissatisfaction with current career paths, positive motivation to teach, and the perceived family-friendless of teaching; that is, a mixture of intrinsic motivation and pragmatic reasons. For individuals who are looking for a change in career, education can provide a wide spectrum of intrinsic and extrinsic rewards. Yet the rewards of becoming a career-change teacher coincide with advantages and disadvantages they offer the profession of education.

Wilson and Deaney (2010) discuss the advantages career-change teachers bring to education. Based on their research, advantages includes “direct experience in the workplace,” and they “bring different but important life skills and experiences to teaching, confidence in their role as an authority figure, and experience of supervisory responsibilities and working in teams” (p. 170). In addition, “Many career-changers also bring specialized subject-related knowledge, skills and experiences gained in real world enterprises” (p. 170). Career-change teachers have real-world working experience and therefore can assist students in seeing the application of skills learned in the classroom. Furthermore, confidence and experience gained from a previous career provides career-change teachers the maturity and self-knowledge that comes with prior work experience.

Although career-change teachers come to education with a variety of skills and reasons, the nuances of education provide specific challenges for them. Career-change teachers require induction that is both supportive and relevant because they have acquired a specialized skill set in a different career.
One disadvantage career-change teachers bring to education is the experience of having "been away from schools for varying amount of time" (Wilson & Deaney, 2010, p. 170). Alexandra Moses (2010) indicated the same concern: “Career-changers, unlike undergraduate education students, require more exposure to modern teaching methods because much has changed since many of them were students’ (p. 1). Education is ever changing. For instance, the standards for which student success is measured against is shifting from College Readiness Standards to the Common Core State Standards. This requires teachers to learn an all-new set of standards to utilize in their teaching. Teachers must change how they present content and measure student mastery of skills as they prepare students for college and career readiness. All the changes since a career-change teacher was in school present a host of challenges.

The MetLife Survey of the American teacher: Challenges for school leadership (2012) states, “While 85% of middle and high school teachers believe that graduating each and every student from high school ready for college and a career is a priority in education today, far fewer teachers report that all students are reaching this goal” (p. 53). High school standards for students strongly emphasize college and career readiness. In Illinois, this is measured by EPAS testing and student growth each year. The tests that make up the EPAS in Illinois are the EXPLORE test for freshmen, PLAN for sophomore, and the ACT for junior year students. Junior students take the ACT as a way to measure their academic growth in high school as well as manage the college application process, via their scores. Student
achievement on the ACT is used to gauge future success for college readiness and career preparation. A career-change teacher comes to education with a perspective of knowing what skills a student needs to be successful in a career, but they may lack knowledge on how to prepare students for college success.

The MetLife (2012) survey asserts that current successful implementation of the Common Core State Standards depends on teachers being knowledgeable and confident in teaching new standards. The survey indicates that teachers with zero to five years of experience are seven percent less able to assist students in attaining performance at or above grade level in English/Languages Art and Math than their colleagues with six to ten years of teaching experience. Darrell Lee’s research, “Changing Course: Reflections of Second-Career Teachers” (2011), found that many career-change teachers come to education with strong content knowledge, but as one participant reflected, he had a minimal understanding of “some basic structure of lessons” (p. 10). The ability, confidence, and knowledge of a teacher to create and deliver lessons is the first and most important step in assisting students to transition from at or below grade level to meet or exceed standards.

Another respondent in Lee’s (2011) research stated that career-change teachers enter education for a myriad of reasons, but “don’t really have a good idea of what they are getting themselves into” (p. 10). Career-change teachers bring a wealth of real life experience in schools, but lack clarity as to how to assist students in growing academically. One respondent indicated this might be because they are “intimidated by getting up in the front of a classroom” (p. 10).
These deficiencies may contribute to a lack of successful implementation of standards and the inability to deliver instruction that permits a student to raise their EPAS score to attain college and career readiness, as measured by the current College Readiness Standards and (eventually, upon implementation) the Common Core State Standards. One respondent summed this up by stating that the “previous career may have had no crossover value in terms of skills” (Lee, 2011, p. 14).

Another characteristic that impacts career-change teachers in education is the change of economic structures in American society, and how schools reflect those changes. This change impacts career-change teachers’ success in the classroom as well. The MetLife Survey of the American teacher: Challenges for school leadership (2012) stated, “Over one-half of principals say that their school budgets have decreased within the past year” (p. 16). The survey indicated “schools with budget cuts also see providing guidance and opportunities for building their (teacher) competence and skills as a greater challenge for school leaders” (p. 18). Allocating resources to support new teachers is important but often overlooked to facilitate the budget for student activities, building projects, or supporting new curriculum.

When allocating resources to support career-change teachers, they often are viewed as mature and experienced and therefore do not need “new teacher induction.” Sawchuk (2008) warns against this thought process: “It’s clear that midcareer entrants potentially have real strengths and assets to bring to teaching that could enrich a school. But it’s a mistake to assume that people can immediately
move into teaching positions and know what to do, just based on the fact that they are more mature” (p. 2). Principals should not hesitate to provide a career-change teacher with a mentor that might be younger but a more experienced teacher. Age is not an indicator of professional maturity.

“Upon entering their first school, career changers report that the quality of support they received was high, however, many teachers are not receiving critical support including orientation by their principal or mentoring” (Peter D. Hart Research Associates, Inc., 2010, p. 25). The Peter D. Hart Research Associates, Inc. research found that mentoring, when used as an induction tool, was inconsistent and shorter than the mentoring received by novice peers. Fry and Anderson (2011) provide a rationale for this. Their research indicated a perception that career-change teachers do not need a constant support from a new peer because of their “overall greater maturity and their various non-educational careers had enhanced their initial entry into their new profession” (p. 11). Fry and Anderson found cases where this perception was the reason career-change teachers received a lack of support and/or no mentor in their first years of teaching, thus causing them to struggle professionally and personally during this time.

Career-change teachers who received mentors felt “the mentoring relationship was meaningful while it lasted, but unfortunately for most it did not continue past the first year” (Peter D. Hart Research Associates, Inc., 2010, p. 25). Individuals who met with a mentor did so at varying times. The Peter D. Hart Research Associates, Inc. (2010) found that of the individuals who had a mentor,
28% met with their mentors once a week, 27% met with their mentor once or twice a month in the first year, 9% met less frequently than that and 2% said they never met their mentor (p. 25). The findings indicated that 33% of all career-change teachers who received mentoring had a valuable experience, while two in three career-change teachers (67%) did not.

The research by Smith and Ingersoll (2004) indicated that career-change teachers require better support in the classroom. The Peter D. Hart Research Associates, Inc. (2010) found that career-change teachers are receiving inconsistent induction: 53% of their respondents had worked with a mentor, 39% were oriented to their new school by their principal, and 64% benefitted from informal support from other teachers and staff (p. 25).

Both novice and career-change teachers require supports to permit them to attain confidence in their craft, as well as themselves in order to meet and overcome the challenges they face on a daily bases. Therefore, there is a strong need for effective teacher induction programs.

American High School

The first American high school was founded in 1635. The purpose of the Boston Latin Grammar School was to “prepare young men for college at Harvard” (Department of Education, p. 1). These young men were made up of Boston’s elite families and the school was not accessible to all residents of Boston. It was not until two hundred years later that the first public school opened, also in Boston, in 1821: the English Classical School. Public education in America was not publicly funded in
any widespread way until 1874 when a Michigan State Supreme Court ruled, “taxes could be levied to support public high schools as well as elementary schools” (Department of Education, p. 1). The ruling occurred as the Industrial Revolution and subsequent urbanization increased the size of cities. These large cities began to build high schools. The focus of the 19th century high school was not on college preparation but rather on “manual” or vocational training schools. This training was viewed “as a shortcut to the new skilled jobs in the burgeoning factories and agricultural enterprises” (Department of Education, p. 1). Academic courses were supplemental portions of the curriculum, whereas manual training was the foci of the American high school core curriculum.

Curriculum for the American high school dramatically shifted in 1892 when the first National Council of Education convened. University presidents from the nation’s most prestigious colleges sought to address the “uneven quality of high school education” (Department of Education, p. 2). The meeting concluded with the mapping of the core academic subjects that were deemed necessary for college preparation. The Department of Education’s From There to Here: The Road to Reform in American High Schools described the impact of the results of the National Council of Education’s meeting:

In addition to Latin, Greek and mathematics, the Committee added modern subjects that, in altered form, are still considered the core of the academic curriculum: English, foreign language, natural history, physical science, geography, history, civil government, and political economy. (p. 2)
The rationale for the shift in curriculum was “that a liberal education arts education, which trained the mind, was suitable for all students regardless of their future life path” (Department of Education, p. 2). Liberal arts education is still the predominant curriculum of American high schools, but the Space Race and the Civil Rights movement later changed the structure of American high schools.

Another major shift in American high schools occurred during the Cold War: “It was a shock to the public when in the 1950’s and 1960’s the United States found itself falling behind other countries, especially the Soviet Union” (Department of Education, p. 3). With the launch of Sputnik by the Soviet Union in 1957, the American curriculum in math and science was criticized throughout the nation. “Policymakers and educators responded by adding more courses and ever-larger facilities with all of the modern trappings –science labs, football fields and band rooms” (Department of Education, p. 3). The byproduct of this educational shift was:

What the policymakers did not do was re-examine assumptions about the capabilities of most young Americans. Schools continued to believe that students should be sorted among various tracks –academic, vocational and general. (Department of Education, p. 3)

As the nation reacted to Sputnik in public education, two landmark decisions impacted education for minorities and students with disabilities and their access to an equal education. The Supreme Court ruling on Brown v. the Board of Education of Topeka (1954) ended legal segregation and the Education of all Handicapped Children Act of 1975 mandated all children with disabilities must have access to full educational opportunities. Civil rights legislation, special education advocacy, and
the focus on math and science shifted the course of American high school education once again.

In the years leading up to 1983, it became evident that the American public education system was not keeping up with the Post-Cold War world. A commission was appointed to address public education. The findings of the commission became the report known as *A Nation at Risk*. “In issuing the report, the Commission expressed alarm that the rise of global trade and the United States as the leading world power, and the dawn of the information age, were not being accompanied by complementary changes in the schools” (Department of Education, p. 4). The results prompted a renewal to a commitment that all students must have access to a rigorous academic curriculum. Consequently, the lack of clarity and equity of the quality of the curriculum led to the 21st century standards based movement of *No Child Left Behind* in 2001. Measuring achievement through standards-based testing, *No Child Left Behind* sought to increase the standards of education as a way to improve every individual student’s educational achievement.

**Modern American High School**

The current American high school is structured to “ensure that all adolescents graduate from high school prepared for postsecondary schooling and training” (Balfanz, 2009, p. 17). American high schools can be found in urban, rural, and suburban locations throughout the United States. Adolescent students attend high school in “ninth grade and concludes in the twelfth grade” (p. 18). The academic structure varies state to state, but the following is an average of earned
credits American high students would accumulate over four years: 4.3 credits in English, 3.9 credits in social studies, 3.6 credits in mathematics, 3.3 credits in science, 2.0 credits in fine arts, and 2.0 credits in foreign language (Balfanz, 2009).

The preparation for postsecondary education or further specialized training possesses significant demands on administrators and teachers. These demands do not just encompass budgeting, human resources, and instructional capacity but also the education of a diverse student population with a diverse set of needs in every classroom. Balfanz (2009) identified that students in American high schools bring a wide variety of needs and demands to schools based on their own individual diversity. He stated:

In many high schools, the movement of special education students into the least restrictive environment, the increase in the number of students learning English as the result of immigration, and the formal dismantling of a rigid tracking system have led to much more diverse and heterogeneous classrooms. In urban and increasingly in older suburban communities, as well as low-wealth rural districts, the growing concentration of poverty has further changed the composition of classrooms-bringing in more students who face a host of environmental and individual challenges associated with living in high-poverty neighborhoods and often, single parent household. (p. 29)

The current accountability movement in American high schools requires student academic mastery be aligned to a set of standards. The current unification of standards based instruction is being done through the Common Core State Standards Initiative. These standards are designed to provide “consistent, clear understanding of what students are expected to learn, so teachers and parents know what they need to do to help them” (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2012, Mission Statement section, para. 1). This is achieved through a variety of school and
district actions such as “high-stakes testing, district-wide curricula, pacing guides and instructional coaches” (Balfanz, 2009, p. 29). The American high school responsibility is to prepare adolescents for either a career and/or college readiness through homogenous standards in heterogeneous classes. This is a challenge for a seasoned high school teacher as well as a new teacher.

The Need for Induction

Ingersoll and Strong (2011) provide a clear rationale for induction:

There is a necessary role for schools in providing an environment where novices are able to learn the craft and survive and succeed as teachers. The goal of these support programs is to improve the performance and retention of beginning teachers, that is, to both enhance and prevent the loss of teachers’ human capital, with the ultimate aim of improving the growth and learning of students. (p. 203)

The need for induction is multilayered. Often new entrants to the profession are left to their own devices to survive in their own classrooms, calling to mind the Draconian ideology of sink or swim. Another need for induction is the traditional view characterizing education as an occupation with high levels of attrition. “A number of studies seem to provide support for the hypothesis that well-conceived and well-implemented teacher induction programs are successful in increasing the job satisfaction, efficacy, and retention of new teachers” (Smith & Ingersoll, 2004, p. 682). The final need for induction is the impact teachers have on student achievement. Rice (2010) stated, “on average, brand new teachers are less effective than those with some experience under their belt” (p. 1). New teacher induction can assist in retaining quality teachers, decrease the cost of attrition, and positively
impact student achievement. The need for induction is explored through three key elements: 1) inadequate induction, 2) teacher turnover, and 3) student achievement.

**Inadequate Induction**

Recent trends in education have indicated that new student enrollment has grown and therefore, so too has the workforce. Ingersoll (2012) acknowledged, “In 1988, there were about 65,000 first-year teachers; by 2008, this number had grown to over 200,000.” As new teacher entrance into the profession has grown, so too has induction. In the same article, Ingersoll identified that in 1990 about 50% of new teachers received induction where in 2008 about 91% of new teachers received induction.

The quality of induction is at the epicenter of effectiveness of new teacher induction programs. Ingersoll’s research found that individuals who received two components of induction, either working with a mentor or having regular interactions with an administrator, had a better retention rate than teachers who did not receive any induction. Yet Ingersoll (2012) concluded “the difference was small” (p. 5). He indicated that individuals who received a more comprehensive induction package, “such as participation in a seminar for beginning teachers, common planning time with other teachers in the same subject, a reduced course load, and assistance from a classroom aide” (p. 5), had a very large impact on teacher retention after the first year of teaching, compared to those who received no induction at all. Ingersoll also referenced the inconsistencies of the content and
duration of induction programs. These inconsistencies create disparate induction programs from state to state and district to district.

Fry and Anderson (2011) identified two common components of inadequate induction: “poor use of time and resources for the individual” (p. 2). Useem (2003) found that individuals cited lack of resources as a reason to not return to the field of education. When a new teacher’s time is squandered and these teachers are provided with inadequate resources, districts and principals are not assisting in the professional growth of the new teacher, but instead fostering a feeling of being “overwhelmed and busy” (Fry & Anderson, 2011, p. 7). Not using an individual’s time wisely and providing inadequate resources can nurture frustration and anxiety.

Another reason for inadequate induction programs is cost, as Ingersoll (2012) pointed out:

Induction programs also vary in their financial costs, and beyond the question of which kinds and amounts of assistance are most effective lies the question of which kinds and amounts of assistance are most cost-effective. Especially in periods of budget shortfalls, the “bang for buck” of such programs is, of course, crucial information for policy makers faced with deciding which programs to fund. (p. 51)

The economic situation in the United States today has had a direct impact on new teacher induction. The Illinois New Teacher Center Fall 2012 report discussed the impact of reduced funding for the state of Illinois. Respondents to the survey identified limitations and reductions in their induction programs. As a result, one respondent stated, “We have been using districts funds, but I anticipate that after this round of new teachers complete the program, the program will be discontinued
due to funding issues” (Illinois New Teacher Center, 2012, p. 4). Another respondent reported one school’s transition from full day sessions to half-day sessions, but warned, “Without funding, we may find that the program may not be sustainable” (p. 4). Some respondents indicated diverting other funds or cutting compensations to offset the loss in state funding, but the survey indicated this is not a suitable or sustainable methodology. The study indicated that moving forward, “Induction programs could benefit from training that includes strategies for finding alternative funding, how to maximize professional development sessions, and tips for self-sustainability” (p. 5). Administrators need to be proactive and thoughtful in how they budget and utilize their resources in order to provide quality induction programs for new teachers.

**Teacher Turnover**

Effective and non-effective systems of induction both directly impact an individual’s longevity in the field of education. Ingersoll and Strong (2011) wrote that “teaching has relatively high turnover compared to many other occupations and professions, such as lawyers, engineers, architects, professors, pharmacists, and nurses” (p. 202). They indicated that this is especially true for teachers in their first years. Ingersoll and Strong continue, “Several studies have calculated that between 40% and 50% of new teachers leave within the first 5 years of entry into teaching” (p. 202). Humphrey et al. (2008) study of Teacher Induction in Illinois and Ohio found that from their sample, “more than one in four beginning teachers who were teaching in spring 2007 did not return to the same school in fall 2007 – and the
rates were even higher in some school districts” (p. 4). The research of Marable and Raimondi (2007) found that educators leave the field within the first five years of teaching for a variety of reasons. They found that dissatisfaction with administrators, low quality of training and lack of materials were all reasons individuals left the profession. Teachers also cited “low salaries, burned out colleagues, and uncaring principals” (p. 28) as reasons for leaving the profession. Humphrey et al.’s (2008) found six other areas for attrition: “school environment, availability of instructional materials and supplies, induction support for instructional preparation and planning, induction program support for working with special population, mentor support for instructional preparation and planning, and mentor support for working with special student populations” (p. 6). Research indicates there is no single reason why teachers leave the profession of education, but one can infer that several factors can foster job dissatisfaction as a key driver in attrition.

Barnes et al. (2012) found evidence that attrition costs are significant at both district and school levels. In their study, they indicated that one North Carolina school district spent $10,000 on recruiting, hiring and training to replace a teacher. They indicated that a small rural district in New Mexico spent $4,336 per teacher who left the district, and in the Chicago Public Schools district it costs $17,872 to replace a teacher. Furthermore, they indicated it costs the Chicago Public Schools district $86 million per year in average turnover costs. In their study they found that teachers left high minority and low performing schools at significantly higher rates.
The Illinois State Board of Education’s report, *Educator Supply and Demand in Illinois 2011 Annual Report* indicated that in the school year 2009, only 7% (2,239) of the 34,009 high school teachers in the state did not return to the profession the following year. With the cost of replacing teachers, schools are unable to invest in filling vacant jobs, improve teacher effectiveness, and/or impact student achievement growth. This research informs readers that leaving the profession impacts school budgets and student achievement.

**Student Achievement**

Teacher attrition profoundly impacts student achievement. Too many students are likely to have inexperienced teachers helming their education. Statically, students in high poverty and low performing schools have the highest teacher attrition rates. Donaldson and Johnson (2011) indicate, “21% of teachers at high-poverty schools leave their schools annually, compared to 14% of their counterparts in low-poverty settings” (p. 48). This suggests that our students with the highest needs have the least experienced teachers.

Ronfeldt, Loeb and Wycoff (2013) indicated “in grade levels with higher turnover score lower in both English language arts and math and that these effects are particularly strong in schools with more low-performing and Black students” (p. 4). Ronfeldt et al. found that schools with higher turnover also have lower achievement. Their study found that teacher turnover has a “harmful effect on student achievement” (p. 31).
A report by the Alliance for Excellent Education (2011) suggests that an uncertain workforce complicates student achievement:

Almost all states have responded to the urgency to increase educational outcomes by adopting the common core state standards, which are internationally benchmarked against the highest-performing nations. Long-standing concerns remain, however, about whether states have an educator workforce or the capacity to produce one with the training and skills needed to deliver high-quality content to all students. If the dominant teacher workforce policies and practices remain unchanged, then the aspirations of the common core standards will simply continue a legacy of unfulfilled reforms. (p. 1)

Inadequate teacher induction negatively impacts the field of education and students achievement. To combat teacher turnover and positively impact student achievement growth, administrators and school districts need to provide novice and career-change teachers with effective induction programs. Before administrators and district personal can provide effective induction programs, they must have an understanding of what induction is.

**Defining Quality Induction**

Nearly every career has a form of induction for new employees. New employees typically are provided practical answers to questions about their specific job responsibilities, organizational structure, and benefits. For a high school teacher, induction aims to address the above. In addition the following should be addressed: navigating school culture, departmentalization of content, working environment in and outside of their classroom, familiarity with established curriculum or the requirement to write a new curriculum, learning how to manage a classroom of teenagers, learning how to interact with parents, learning who is responsible for
different building tasks, and individual responsibilities required by the school and/or district. Yet, there is no uniformity across states and districts as to how they define and implement new teacher induction. Therefore the definition of induction is vague; seldom does it encompass everything required to induct an individual to their new working environment.

Harry Wong (2004) defined induction as “a process used by districts to train, support, and retain new teachers” (p. 107). Wong (2002) acknowledged that induction state-to-state and district-to-district has similar tenants in place as supports for teachers. He states, “All successful induction programs help new teachers establish effective classroom management procedures, routines, and instructional practices” (p. 52). Wong subtly insinuated that an unsuccessful program provides no form of induction whatsoever.

The definition of induction by Smith and Ingersoll (2004) includes aspects of Wong’s definition and elements of the process: “Teacher induction can also involve a variety of elements—workshops, collaborations, support systems, orientation seminars, and especially, mentoring” (p. 683). Smith and Ingersoll referenced mentoring as the current focus of most induction programs today. The majority of new teacher induction programs reviewed in their study utilized mentoring. They add, “Mentorship programs, collaboration and planning time with other teachers, seminars for new teachers, and regular communication with administrators or department chairs were the major components used to integrate teachers into a
new school” (p. 706). Since there are a variety of activities new teachers are given in their induction programs, these programs are seldom similar to one other.

Fulton et al. (2005) defined induction more extensively by stating, “A system of induction should include a network of supports, people, and processes that are all focused on assuring that novices become effective in their work. An induction system is both a phase – a set period of time – and a network of relationships and supports with well-defined roles, activities, and outcomes” (p. 4). The complex components required to assist new teachers are addressed, as well as how to assist new teachers to become effective teachers. Fulton et al. identified that there is a need for structure and support that includes other individuals in the induction process. Key elements of induction that Fulton et al. identified are clear structure, use of time, activities, and outcomes. Odden (2011) furthered this by referencing key elements of induction as form, duration, collective participation, content focus, active learning, and coherence in professional growth (p. 100). Odden’s elements are very similar to creating a lesson plan. One must plan the appropriate activities (form), while acknowledging class time (duration), as well as the specific individuals the lesson is focused on (collective participation), materials needed (content focus), and the outcomes as they are aligned with curriculum goals (active learning and coherence in professional development). Fulton et al. (2005) and Odden (2011) both acknowledged that a major aspect of induction is to identify people as human capital. Human interaction creates relationships the new teacher can rely on and
utilize in a variety of forms throughout their induction and professional career as an educator.

The Illinois State Board of Education created nine standards for effective teacher induction. They can be found in the Illinois Induction Guide (2013). These standards reflect the ideas of induction promoted by Harry Wong (2004), Smith and Ingersoll (2004), Fulton et al. (2005), and Odden (2011). The Illinois Induction Program Standards provides districts with an induction system that has structure with clear goals and outcomes. The nine standards are:

**Standard 1: Induction Program Leadership:** The induction program has an administrative structure with specified leaders who plan, implement, evaluate and refine the program through data analysis, program evaluation, and stakeholder communication linked to relevant standards.

**Standard 2: Program Goals and Design:** Local program design is focused on beginning teacher development, support, retention and improved student learning. The goals are guided by current induction research, effective practices, Illinois Induction Program Standards, the district/school improvement plan and local concerns/context.

**Standard 3: Resources:** Program leadership allocates and monitors sufficient resources to meet all goals and deliver program components to all participants.

**Standard 4: Site Administrators Roles and Responsibilities:** Site administrators lead efforts to create a positive climate for the delivery of all essential program components. Site administrators and program leadership collaborate to ensure that they are well prepared to assume their responsibilities for supporting beginning teachers in the induction program.

**Standard 5: Mentor Selection and Assignment:** Mentors are recruited, selected and assigned using a comprehensive strategy that includes a clearly articulated, open process and specific criteria that are developed by and communicated to all stakeholder groups.

**Standard 6: Mentor Professional Development:** Mentor professional development provides a formal orientation and foundational mentor training
before they begin their work with beginning teachers and should continue over the course of the mentor’s work with beginning teachers. Mentors have time, supported by the program, to engage in this mentor learning community and are consistently supported in their efforts to assist beginning teachers in their development, with a focus on student learning.

**Standard 7: Development of Beginning Teacher Practice:** Beginning teachers have regularly scheduled time, provided during the two year program, to participate in ongoing professional development that is focused on their professional growth to support student learning.

**Standard 8: Formative Assessment:** Beginning teachers and mentors participate in formative assessment experiences, collaboratively collecting and analyzing measures of teaching progress, including appropriate documentation, mentor observations and student work, to improve classroom practices and increase student achievement.

**Standard 9: Program Evaluation:** Programs operate a comprehensive, ongoing system of program development and evaluation that involves all program participants and other stakeholders. (Illinois State Board of Education, 2013).

The Illinois State Board of Education also offers a definition of induction through the Illinois Induction Guide (2013). The Illinois Induction Guide website defines new teacher induction as “structured support across a new teacher’s formative first years in the classroom and is designed to increase retention, help teachers be more effective more quickly, and improve student outcomes” (Welcome section, para. 1). This definition encapsulates the ideas and definitions of Wong (2004), Smith and Ingersoll (2004), Fulton et al. (2005), and Odden (2011) in a concise, coherent manner. The definition addresses Wong’s focus on becoming a competent teacher, Smith and Ingersoll’s emphasis on structured supports, and Fulton et al.’s acknowledgment of timing of the program. The standards created to support the Illinois Induction Guide definition encompass elements of Harry Wong
Smith and Ingersoll (2004), Fulton et al. (2005), and Odden (2011), and are highlighted later in the examination of models of induction. The idea of human capital development that Fulton et al. (2005) and Odden (2011) highlighted is explored in models of induction, through the concept of mentoring and comprehensive induction.

**Models of Induction**

Induction models, like the definition of induction, vary. Fletcher and Strong (2009) support this by stating, “Variation across new teacher induction programs is likely to be found not only in the degree of their comprehensiveness, but also the nature of the program elements” (p. 330). The variation is based on a myriad of reasons, state regulations, the number of new teachers, and school and district specific mission statements and visions.

Smith and Ingersoll (2004) acknowledge the variation in induction programs. Programs vary according to the numbers of new teachers they serve; some include anyone new to a particular school, even those with previous teaching experience; others focus solely on candidates who are new to teaching. Programs vary according to their purpose. Some, for instance, are primarily developmental and designed to foster growth on the part of newcomers; others are also designed to assess, and perhaps weed out, those deemed ill-suited to the job. Finally, mentoring programs themselves differ along the same dimensions. For example, they vary as to whether they include training for the mentors; how much attention they devote to the match between mentor and mentee; the degree to which mentor are compensated for their efforts, either with a salary supplement or a reduction in other duties; and whether an effort is made to provide mentors who have experience in teaching the same subjects as their mentees. (p. 683)
Referencing variation in induction programs, two models will be reviewed that encompass the paradigms of induction programs. Those programs are Comprehensive Induction and Mentoring.

**Effective Induction**

Ronald W. Rebore (2007) defined an effective induction program as having “well-defined objectives that reflect the needs of new employees and the specific philosophy of the school system” (p. 156). The U.S. Department of Education study, “Impact of Comprehensive Teacher Induction: Final Results from a Randomized Controlled Study” (2010), identified the following as the components of an effective induction model used in their research.

- The components include carefully selected and trained full-time mentors; a curriculum of intensive and structured support for beginning teachers, including orientation, professional development opportunities, and weekly meetings with mentors; a focus on instruction, with opportunities for novice teachers to observe experienced teachers; formative assessment tools that permit evaluation of practice on an ongoing basis and require observations and constructive feedback; and outreach to district- and school-based administrators to educate them about program goals and to garner their systemic support for the program. (p. 37)

As previously mentioned, the Illinois State Board of Education in recent years created a set of induction standards for the state of Illinois. These standards are aligned with the components of an effective induction program, as laid out by the U.S. Department of Education. The Illinois State Board of Education created the Illinois Induction Program Standards to create alignment in the state's induction program of new teachers. The continuum developed the criteria over three years.
The vision and strategic plan of this program are comprised of the following elements:

- Supporting teachers in their professional development, including teacher preparation, beginning teacher induction, and ongoing development
- Providing high quality professional development for principals, program coordinators, teacher leaders, and mentors to effectively support beginning teachers
- Supporting the inception of beginning teacher induction programs where they don’t exist and helping existing induction programs move toward excellence
- Integrating high quality professional development, technical assistance, networking, evaluation, and research related to induction and mentoring
- Focusing on beginning teacher development, including formative assessment
- Differentiating induction support for beginning teachers—a single induction model will not fit all schools and districts in Illinois
- Cultivating support from multiple stakeholders, including teachers themselves, as well as unions and associations, principals, district administrators, professional development providers, higher education, ISBE, and legislators
- Developing a shared definition and common understanding of excellent teacher induction, then tracking and reporting progress toward excellence locally and statewide. (Illinois State Board of Education, 2010, p. 1)

The goal of the Illinois Induction Program Standards are “intended to set forth a clear framework to assist in the development of research-based programs that meet local needs and are responsive to local contexts” (Illinois State Board of Education, 2010, p. 3). The standards assist in fostering a comprehensive induction model and an effective mentoring program for new teachers.
Comprehensive Induction

Smith and Ingersoll’s (2004) definition of comprehensive induction was the first model reviewed. They believe comprehensive induction is the sum of several aspects of what induction programs have offered in the past. The components of a comprehensive induction program are basic induction, mentoring, collaboration, participation in an external network of teachers, having reduced number of preparations, and being assigned a teacher’s aide (Smith & Ingersoll, 2004). Smith and Ingersoll found that less than one percent of beginning teachers received comprehensive induction. For those who did, there was a 50% reduced likelihood of turnover. The purpose of a comprehensive induction program is to provide new teachers with a comprehensive and supportive environment that covers all the basic needs of any teachers’ first years in the profession.

The comprehensive induction model provides new teachers with a complete array of supports. Basic induction includes orientation to the school, district, and new teacher orientations that can occur through the school and district. **Standard 7: Development of Beginning Teacher Practice** of the Illinois Induction Program addresses basic induction. According to the standard, ”Program leadership provides beginning teachers with a one-time orientation event at the beginning of the school year which focuses primarily on district/school curriculum, policies, and procedures including a brief overview of the induction program” (Illinois State Board of Education, 2010, p. 30). Basic induction is structured to provide clarification on district and school programs.
Collaboration is a teacher’s time to work with peers within content and grade levels. This is often curriculum work or student centered conversations concerning social, emotional, or academic growth of students. Collaboration allows new teachers to work with staff directly to understand students and content. **Standard 4: Site Administrators Roles and Responsibilities** of the Illinois Induction Program supports collaboration. According to the standard, “Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders collaborate with site administrators to foster the development of collaborative learning communities to promote a program of support for all staff” (Illinois State Board of Education, 2010, p. 20). Collaboration introduces new teachers to a collaborative learning community. This community supports one another by helping new teachers with curriculum development to “explain such things as discipline procedures, evaluation processes, and/or provide a school handbook” (Illinois State Board of Education, 2010, p. 20).

The external network of teachers relates specifically to district wide orientations and meetings. This occurs either as a specific orientation for new teachers or a professional development. This permits new teachers to access others outside of their schoolhouse. **Standard 3: Resources** of Illinois Induction Program supports providing an external network of supports for new teachers. According to the standard, “Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders access and coordinate existing professional development resources to effectively align and coordinate with the induction program” (Illinois State Board of Education, 2010, p.
15). The standard requires the allocation of “sufficient, sanctioned protected time” (Illinois State Board of Education, 2010, p. 16) for resources, such as a mentor.

The reduction in the number of courses a new teacher is assigned to teach gives them additional time to work on their craft. Teacher work ranges from curriculum planning and grading, to day-to-day paperwork, and operational requirements that can become overwhelming. In addition, a reduced class load permits new teachers time to meet with mentors, other staff or administrators, as well as observe other teachers’ instruction. This provides new teachers with the ability to inform and strengthen their own teaching. The addition of a teacher’s aide provides new teachers with additional in-class support in the form of another adult. While the Illinois Induction Program standards do not directly address this in class support, principals could utilize **Standard 3: Resources** to provide new teacher fewer preparations and provide them with an instructional aide. The standard calls for the regular monitoring of resource allocations and the option to make necessary changes. If a district has adequate funding, they could pursue this aspect of comprehensive induction.

**Mentoring**

Mentoring is an aspect of comprehensive induction, as well as the second induction method reviewed. Mentoring is “when a senior person (the mentor in terms of age and experience) provides information, advice and emotional support to a junior person (i.e., the mentee) in a relationship lasting over an extended period of time” (Barrera et al., 2010, p. 62). Mentoring is a main aspect of induction programs
and has become a key element of the induction process for new teachers. Mentoring is required in the state of Illinois as part of new teacher induction program.

Barrera et al. (2010) outlined the program components of mentoring. Mentoring consists of two individuals: a new teacher and a veteran teacher with the same certification as the new teacher. The veteran teacher and the mentee should work within a close proximity to one another. The veteran teacher and the mentee’s schedules should allow for common planning time and opportunity for classroom observations. It is also suggested that the mentee have a reduction in workload.

Sharon Schwille (2008) highlighted the important role of the mentor. Schwille said that the “mentor teachers can help novices get inside the intellectual and practical tasks of teaching. Ideally they can also help novices develop the skills and dispositions to continue learning in and from their practice” (p. 139). Mentoring of novice teachers has become a prevalent component of induction programs that help beginning teachers. She states that the model of mentoring is “aimed at helping novices learn to teach is a professional practice with a repertoire of skill sets that must be learned over time” (p. 139).

**State of Illinois.** The Illinois School Code 5/21A-10 requires new teachers to be part of an induction and mentoring program. The law outlines the following new responsibilities required of schools:

1. Assigns a mentor teacher to each new teacher for a period of at least 2 school years.

2. Aligns with the Illinois Professional Teaching Standards, content area standards, and applicable local school improvement and professional development plans, if any.
(3) Addresses all of the following elements and how they will be provided:

(a) Mentoring and support of the new teacher.

(b) Professional development specifically designed to ensure the growth of the new teacher’s knowledge and skills.

(c) Formative assessment designed to ensure feedback and reflection, which must not be used in any evaluation of the new teacher.

(d) Describes the role of mentor teachers, the criteria and process for their selection, and how they will be trained, provided that each mentor teacher shall demonstrate the best practices in teaching his or her respective field of practice. A mentor teacher may not directly or indirectly participate in the evaluation of a new teacher pursuant to Article 24A of this Code or the evaluation procedure of the public school. (P.A. 93-355, eff. 1-1-04)

In addition, the State of Illinois induction program standards require mentors to do the following:

(1) Participate in foundational training;
(2) Participate in an ongoing professional learning community that supports their reflective practice and their use of mentoring tools, protocols, and formative assessment; and
(3) Engage in self-assessment to reflect on their own development as teachers and mentors. (New Teacher Center, 2012, p. 24)

Although the law indicates the requirement of induction programs for all new teachers, there are no levers of accountability for districts to maintain a quality or research based induction model. Furthermore, the law states, “provided that funding is made available by the State Board of Education from an appropriation made for this purpose” (P.A. 93-355, eff. 1-1-04). The law is restricted based on budget and school funding issues. Selecting a mentor, training the mentor, and classroom release time to create and follow development all take time and money.
Often, building principals must decide between funding a mentoring program or a different program they perceive may offer students a greater value. These factors contribute to the cycle of attrition and the negative repercussions associated with teacher turnover.

**Conceptual Framework**

The conceptual framework for this study employed Allan A. Glatthorn’s (1997) model of Differentiated Supervision. This model assisted with constructing an understanding of the developmentally different needs of public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers and the ways in which school districts address these needs in relation to three categories of supervision. Teacher induction models were explored through research samples, comprehensive induction, and mentoring. Each sample was then placed in one of the three Differentiated Supervision categories based on Glatthorn’s work.

Allan Glatthorn (1997) identifies “Differentiated Supervision” as a method of supervision that supports new teachers. Differentiated Supervision is defined as “an approach to supervision that provides teachers with options about the kinds of supervisory and evaluative services they receive” (p. 3). Differentiated Supervision centers on the premise that providing teachers with supports can foster their professional development. The three areas of Differentiated Supervision are:

- Intensive Development;
- Cooperative Development; and,
- Self-Directed Development
Intensive Development

Intensive Development is a special approach to clinical supervision. The general focus of clinical supervision is on the teaching method and the correlation to learning outcomes. It “relies on one type of observation, followed by analysis and conference” (Glatthorn, 1997, p. 38). At a minimum it is administered twice a year and has “superficial impact” (p. 38) because it is offered to the entire faculty. Intensive Development “typically involves five or more cycles of the supervisory process, with multiple observations, because only a small group of teachers is involved” (p. 38).

Intensive Development does not revolve around teacher evaluation (like clinical supervision), but it is structured to focus solely on teacher growth. This allows for Intensive Development to be delivered by a non-evaluator, such as an administrator and/or department chair that is not part of the evaluation process, central office administrator, team leader, mentor, or colleague. This permits a relationship of collaboration and inquiry, not supervisor and subordinate.

Intensive Development is comprised of eight components. The first component requires a Taking-stock Conference (Glatthorn, 1997, p. 39). This conference is to be done at the beginning of the school year and is informal in nature. The discussion centers on building a trusting relationship between the teacher and supervisor. These discussions are focused on each observation, the number of observations, types and frequency of observations, and the process for supervisory conferences. A review and discussion of other resources that can assist
in the teacher's growth are also discussed at this time, as well as a conversation of how to share information and maintain records.

The second component is Pre-Observation Conferences. In Intensive Development, Pre-Observation Conferences center around four key areas. These areas are intended learning outcomes, student work, means of assessment, and overall nature of the lesson. The style and tone of the Pre-Observation Conferences should be flexible and not direct. A flexible approach provides the teacher with a problem-solving environment in which they will feel comfortable thinking through their teaching and reflecting on student learning.

The next components of Intensive Development are Diagnostic Observations and the analysis of the data collected during the observations. Diagnostic Observation is the data collection component of the supervisor's observation of the teacher's classroom. Glatthorn (1997) generated four questions for the supervisor to think about when collecting data: “1) What is the learning outcome and how significant is it? 2) How many students seem to have achieved the outcomes? 3) What work are the students engaged in and what is the quality? 4) How is learning being assessed?” (p. 44). The analysis of data varies based on what the teacher and supervisor have decided to focus on for that particular observation.

The fifth component is the Diagnostic Debriefing Conference. Glatthorn (1997) discussed that the debriefing conference must be data-rich and objective. The flow of the conference must be cooperative and mutual. Both individuals' perspectives and knowledge are respected. The purpose of the conference is to
solve problems and not to critique or evaluate. Ultimately the Diagnostic Debriefing Conference needs to be productive. The purpose is to assist in fostering teacher strengths and identifying areas for growth, and the outcome is focused on finding workable solutions for the teacher.

The sixth component is Coaching. Coaching sessions should be focused on developing a teacher’s skills, knowledge, and content. The coach should demonstrate skills and "facilitate guided practice of the skill" (Glatthorn, 1997, p. 52). Finally, coaching sessions should be used to review the skill after the teacher has had time to practice the skill in his or her classroom.

The seventh component of Intensive Development is Focused Observations. These observations follow coaching sessions. The Focused Observation seeks to be a time for the supervisor to observe a single aspect of teaching or learning. The teacher and supervisor generate the focus collaboratively.

The final component is the Focused Debriefing Conference. These conferences are a review of the data collected during the Focused Observation. The supervisor and the teacher work together to generate understanding of the data and patterns of behaviors from the Focused Observation notes. By the conclusion of the meeting they should be able to generate the next steps in the teacher’s development.

**Cooperative Development**

The second aspect of Glatthorn’s (1997) Differentiated Supervision is Cooperative Development. Cooperative Development is “collaborative work that capitalizes on teachers’ skills” (p. 57). A benefit of Cooperative Development is that
it “enables the supervisor to affect a larger number of teachers, rather than working with one teacher at a time” (p. 57) and it allows staff to work with one another in a variety of cooperative situations.

The first form of Cooperative Development is Peer Coaching. Peer Coaching is a group of two teachers who have met and identified professional areas they wish to grow in. They observe each other’s classrooms and then meet to discuss the observations and provide each other with feedback, suggestions, and advice for informing practice.

The next form of Cooperative Development is Professional Dialogues. “Professional dialogues are structured discussions of professional issues designed to raise the level of teacher’s cognition” (Glatthorn, 1997, p. 59). The Professional Dialogues must be structured or else they can degenerate and lack focus. Groups meet initially to schedule when to meet, generate possible discussion topics, and appoint a leader for each topic. Glatthorn states that the topics should meet the following criteria: “the topic is important to them professionally, the issues are ones about which inform them professionally, the issues are ones about which informed professionals differ, and materials are available relating to the topic” (p. 59).

Curriculum Development is the next aspect of Cooperative Development. Teachers work together to review, revise, or create curriculum for their school or district.

The last component of Cooperative Development is Action Research. Action Research is a “systematic inquiry by practitioners into issues of educational practice,
designed to deepen understanding and lead to interventions” (Glatthorn, 1997, p. 62). The process of Action Research focuses on a “general problem-solving model” (p. 63). Glatthorn laid out the steps as follows:

1. Become aware of the mess, an ill-defined deficiency.
2. Study the mess to understand it better.
3. As a result of the study, define the problem.
4. Build the knowledge base with respect to the problem: Synthesize previous research and expert recommendations.
5. Generate creative solutions, drawing from both experiential and empirical knowledge.
6. Evaluate the solutions and design the intervention.
7. Implement the intervention and evaluate its effectiveness. (p. 63)

**Self-Directed Development**

The third and final component of Differentiated Supervision is Self-Directed Development. Self-Directed Development “places teachers on their own” (Glatthorn, 1997, p. 71). Staff will occasionally interact with administrators, supervisors and/or other teachers, but “their professional development comes mainly through their individual initiatives” (p. 71). Therefore, Self-Directed Development is “a professional development process in which teachers work independently to foster their own growth” (p. 70).
Differentiated Supervision as a Conceptual Framework

The figure below illustrates how Differentiated Supervision was used as a conceptual framework for this study. The use of Differentiated Supervision as a conceptual framework permitted the researcher to create meaning between the perceived needs of public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers along with building principals’ perceptions of public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers’ needs and the induction programs used to address those needs. For each district, interview and survey results were separated by public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers’ needs and supports received, by data source. The needs and supports were then compared to induction models, comprehensive induction, and mentoring. After each district induction model was described, the needs of public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers, and induction components identified in the research were categorized into the three areas of Differentiated Supervision.

The use of Differentiated Supervision allowed the researcher the ability to quantify supports received by public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers in their first years of teaching. Differentiated Supervision also permitted a way to categorize the perceived needs of public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers, by principal and teachers, into different elements of supervision. The researcher utilized the induction models and Differentiated Supervision to compare the needs of public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers with the induction program received. This was done to
understand how the perceived individual needs were met and supported, as well as what perceived needs were not addressed. The conceptual framework of Differentiated Supervision allowed the researcher the ability to create an understanding for how to differentiate induction programs for both public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers.

Figure 1. Applied Framework

Supply and demand for teachers in the United States and Illinois is unbalanced, with demand outweighing supply (MetLife, 2012; Humphrey et al., 2008). New measures of accountability for educators and administrators focus more on test scores, and school funding remains a perennial concern. Quality and
the longevity of new teachers entering the field have an impact on student achievement. Public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers are entering the field, but both experience inequity in how they are supported in the profession of education. However, effective induction models exist and provide the support necessary to assist public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers to impact student growth and foster job satisfaction. The three components of Glatthorn's Differentiated Supervision provided a framework for exploring the similarities and differences of the perceptions of public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers’ needs in their first year of teaching, juxtaposed with administrators’ perceptions of public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers’ needs in their first year of teaching. The use of the components of Differentiated Supervision provided a method for exploring the elements of induction programs that public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers received and investigated which components best addressed the perceived needs of public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers.

**Summary of Literature Review**

The literature reviewed in this chapter provided evidence that teacher attrition is of serious concern in education. Effective induction programs may be able to provide some of the supports necessary to combat the reasons educators choose to leave the profession. Additionally, public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers provide unique challenges and benefits to the profession,
but require supports in order to foster their professional success and improve student outcomes.

By studying the factors that may have an impact on the American teacher supply, longevity, and quality in the field of education, the researcher provided the reader with insight into the perceived needs of public high school novice and beginning teachers along with the perceptions of high school principals. This research is useful in understanding how induction programs can address the perceived needs of public high school novice and career-change teachers in their first year of teaching.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to examine the impact of teacher induction for public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers. Through a case study methodology, a rich narrative description of public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers and their principals’ responses to the research questions, the complex needs of public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers were explored.

This research study used a qualitative case design to collect data to answer the research questions. This case study explored public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers’ perceptions of their needs in their first years of teaching. It also explored public high school principals’ perception of the needs of these new teachers, and how induction programs addressed those needs. In order to appositely address the research questions for this study, a multi-site case study utilizing a qualitative questionnaire and interview design was used for data collection. The research aimed to answer the following questions:

1) According to the perceptions of first year public high school teachers with no prior work experience:

   a. What were the needs of public high school novice teachers during their first year?
b. How did their districts’ induction programs meet these needs?

c. What specific recommendations would they make to improve their districts’ induction programs?

2) According to the perceptions of beginning public high school career-change teachers entering the teaching profession:

a. What are the beginning public high school career-change teachers’ needs during their first year of teaching?

b. How did their districts’ induction programs meet their needs?

c. What recommendations would they make to improve their districts’ induction programs?

3) According to the perceptions of the public high school principals:

a. What are the needs of a public high school novice teacher versus a beginning public high school career-change teacher during his or her first year of teaching?

b. How do the induction programs in their school districts meet the needs of public high school novice teachers and beginning career-change teachers?

c. How do public high school principals believe the intentions of their induction programs are met by their school district for public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers?

d. What recommendations would they make to improve their school districts’ induction programs?
The focus of qualitative research is to attain meaning from research. Stake (1995) indicated that qualitative research explanation is not geared towards cause and effect, but “toward personal interpretation” (p. 43). Creswell (2007) emphasizes this fundamental difference between qualitative and quantitative research.

In the entire qualitative research process, the researchers keep a focus on learning the meaning that the participants hold about the problem or issue, not the meaning that the researchers bring to the research or writers from literature. (p. 39)

Quantitative research relies on the data to make meaning. Qualitative research, on the other hand, relies on the researcher to make meaning from the participants’ experiences and collected data. Looking at perception of needs from a variety of individuals and systems used to address those needs, qualitative research was selected to allow participants’ voices to be heard in the data.

Sharan B. Merriam (2009) provides rationale for using a qualitative research design. She writes that qualitative research interests lies in “understanding the meaning people have constructed” (p. 13). Social phenomena are multifaceted and complex and encompass “how people make sense of their world and the experiences they have in the world” (p. 13). Studying perceived needs from a variety of viewpoints requires a research design that emphasizes “focus is on process, understanding, and meaning” (Creswell, 2007, p. 14) from personal experiences. Therefore, a qualitative research design was selected to explore public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers’ and principals’ perceived needs of new teachers and systems used to address those needs.

Creswell (2007) defines qualitative research as a “study of research
problems inquiring into the meaning individuals or groups ascribe to a social or human problem.” When exploring the perceived needs of public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers from the teachers’ point of view and from the principals’ point of view, as well as the systems in place to support them, one person’s perceptions will differ based on his or her individual experience. Therefore, the use of a qualitative research design permits the collection of data that “empower individuals to share their stories” (p. 40) and add their voices to the data.

Wills (2007) recommends using a case study research design when investigating perceptions from different groups because case studies have the ability to investigate multiple perspectives within a social phenomenon. A case study is “an in-depth description and analysis of a bounded system” (Merriam, 2009, p. 40). A bounded system is "a phenomenon of some sort occurring in a bounded context” (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 25). A bounded system requires individuals to be part of some social phenomenon that can be “fenced in” (Merriam, 2009, p. 40) and focused to study. In this particular case study, the bounded system is the process of induction in each of the buildings being studied. What can be “fenced in” in the building includes the principals’ and public high school novice and career-change teachers’ own perceptions of new teacher needs and induction used to address those needs.

A case study was selected to examine public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers’ and principals’ perceptions of new teacher needs and the induction that addressed those needs, because it “allows you to gather rich,
detailed data in an authentic setting” (Willis, 2007, p. 240). Gathering rich and detailed data was done through the utilization of multiple case study sites and the differentiation of data collection methods for both groups studied. This created an understanding of the subject studied from multiple perspectives. Each data collection tool was designed to gather full, rich, and detailed information through open ended and probing questions from the respondents: interview questions for principals and a questionnaire for teachers. The addition of multiple sites for a case study was done “to show different perspectives on the issue” (Creswell, 2007, p. 74). Within this multi-site case studies bounded system, two data collection tools were utilized at three different sites. “Qualitative researchers typically gather multiple data, such as interviews, observations and documents, rather than rely on a single data source” (p. 38). Principals were interviewed on site and interviews were taped and transcribed. Teachers were given a questionnaire and data was collected through a running record of responses. Rich and detailed data went far beyond quantitative datum and gave the participants a voice that contributed to the findings and the construction of meaning from findings.

Using a multi-site case study to explore a bounded system permitted the researcher the opportunity to collect data from public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers and principals bound by the induction process in their building. Furthermore, the data collection method was done at each school site to allow, “The collection of data in a natural setting sensitive to the people and places under study” (Creswell, 2007, p. 37). Each data collection tool initially began
in each building. Teachers completed their questionnaires in the building or elsewhere, but all surveys were distributed in their schoolhouses.

A qualitative questionnaire design was selected as one tool for this study to respond to the specific research questions. A questionnaire collects information to “describe, compare, and explain knowledge, attitudes, perceptions or behaviors” (Bernhardt, 2004, p. 57). The qualitative questionnaire was designed to understand one “fenced-in” component of the bounded system, the perceptions of public high school novice and beginning career-change high school teachers. All teachers who were identified by building principals as public high school novice and/or beginning career-change teachers in their first, second, or third years in education were given the questionnaire. The questionnaire (see Appendix E) was delivered to the main office of each public high school participating in the case study. The office manager distributed the questionnaires to the participant’s in school mailboxes. The questionnaires contained a letter of informed consent for teachers (see Appendix D). Every teacher who agreed to complete the survey later returned the completed survey in an included self-addressed stamped envelope to the P.O. Box that the researcher had sole access to.

The use of a questionnaire provided a variety of perspectives from teachers and the opportunity for thick description from responses. Questionnaires “are an excellent way to assess perceptions because they can be completed anonymously” (Bernhardt, 2004, p. 57). Since the nature of the research explored both supervisors’ and subordinates’ perceptions, the questionnaire was designed for
public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers to provide their insight into the research questions anonymously.

An additional tool for this study was the use of purposeful interviews. Patton (2002) presents the rationale of using interviews in this research study: “The purpose of interviewing is to allow us to enter into the other person’s perspective” (pp. 340-341). Gaining insight into principals’ perceptions directly correlated with the research questions. Interviewing permitted the researcher to enter into a “conversation with a purpose” (Dexter, 1970, p. 136) in order “to aggregate perceptions over multiple respondents” (Stake, 1995, p. 65). The purpose of the interviews conducted in this study were to explore principals’ perceptions as to the needs of public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers and the systems in place at each building to address those needs. Principals were contacted through a letter of informed consent (see Appendix B) after the district superintendent had agreed to give consent (see Appendix A) for the study to occur in their district. Upon the receipt of the signed consent form, the researchers set up and then conducted the scheduled interviews. The researcher taped the interviews and sent the audio to be transcribed by a third party (see Appendix F). Once the interviews were transcribed, the researcher submitted a copy of the transcription to each interviewed principal. The principal were given the opportunity to review the transcription and provide the researcher with his or her feedback. This process was used to member check the data collected by the researcher.

In addition, “interviewing is also the best technique to use when conducting
intensive case studies for a few selected individuals” (Merriam, 2009, p. 88).

Interviewing was selected as a qualitative data collection tool for the multi-site case study based on the sample size that comprised of six principals in six separate buildings. An interview was the best way to get a “description of an episode, a linkage, an explanation” (Stake, 1995, p. 65) from six principals regarding their perceptions of the needs of new teachers.

Historic hiring and retention data was also collected through district documents. This information was requested from the district office from each district. The link between perception of needs and induction tools with historic district data was investigated. Where applicable, the use of district data documentation served “as substitutes for records of activity that the researcher could not observe directly” (Stake, 1995, p. 68).

**Site Selection**

This research explored the perceived needs of public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers in their first years of teaching and induction used to address those needs from the perception of teachers and principals. Since induction models vary throughout high school districts, multiple sites in Illinois were chosen for this study. Six distinct public high schools in three distinct districts were selected based on the following data:

- all are public high schools in Illinois;
- all exhibit similar student demographics and per pupil spending;
- all have an average teacher experience of less than 11 years on the Illinois
Interactive Report Card;

- all have teachers with 0 – 3 years teaching experience on the Teacher Service Record (TSR);
- all received permission from the superintendent to conduct the study within the district;
- all are located within a reasonable geographic area for on-site interviews; and
- all have a minimum of one beginning career-change teacher in their first, second, or third year of teaching.

The Illinois Interactive Report Data from 100 public high school districts and 389 unit districts in Illinois were reviewed to obtain a section to sample for public high schools with an average teacher experience of less than 14 years and similar student demographics and per pupil spending. The Teacher Service Record (TSR) was reviewed to identify years of experience for teachers in that school and whether or not a building had teachers with one, two, or three years of teaching experience. Chicago Public Schools was omitted from the study based on IRB. The researcher was also employed within the school district.

Once the three districts had been identified using the above criteria, the researcher contacted the Superintendents (see Appendix A) to introduce and explain the research process and request permission to conduct research in each district’s high school. Once consents were received, the researcher contacted building principals (see Appendix B) to explain the research process. Permission
was requested to set up interview times and gather information as to how many public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers were in their schools with zero to three years teaching experience, along with the Interview Schedule (see Appendix C). High schools were required to have at least one beginning career-change teacher within their first to third year of teaching. When the researcher was on site for the interview, questionnaires were delivered to the main office to be placed in identified teachers’ mailboxes with a return self-addressed envelope to the researcher (see Appendices D and E). At the same time, the researcher collected data from the central office regarding historic district information on hiring, attrition, and retention.

**Sample Selection**

Six large, public, distinct, suburban public high schools from three distinct school districts were selected. These three districts were chosen because of their size (more than 1,000 students per district), their diverse student population, and their consistent hiring of new faculty each year. The sample size at each school consisted of one principal who was interviewed, with teacher size varying at each building. The Teacher Questionnaire (see Appendix E) was provided to all teachers in their first, second, or third year of teaching within the six chosen high schools. Teacher sample size varied but each building was required to have a minimum of one beginning career-change teacher with 0-3 years teaching experience. Since the research questions explored public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers’ and principals’ perceptions, both populations needed to be sampled. The
focus of this study was on the perceived needs of public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers and the induction used to address those needs from both the teachers and their principals’ point of view. Therefore, sampling required representation from each group studied.

A Letter of Cooperation to Participate in Research (see Appendix A) was mailed to superintendents identified from the site selection process. The Letter of Cooperation to Participate in Research requested permission to conduct research in the school district. When the researcher received the superintendent consent at the researcher’s P.O. Box, the Letter of Informed Consent for Principals (see Appendix B) was mailed to district principals. The Letter of Informed Consent for Principals contained a self-addressed stamped envelope for the signed consent portion to be returned to the researcher’s P.O. Box. When the researcher received each principal’s consent, the researcher telephoned the principal and set up a time for the interview. At this time, the researcher also attained the number of teachers who fit the research requirement. After each interview, the researcher provided the principal with the questionnaires for the teachers in the building who met the research requirements, as laid out in the Letter of Informed Consent for Principals (see Appendix B). The research required public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers to be in their first, second, or third years of teaching in the field of education. The questionnaires were collated in sealed labeled envelopes for the identified public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers to be placed in their in-school mailboxes. The envelopes contained the Letter of Informed
Consent for Teachers (see Appendix D), Questionnaire for Teachers (see Appendix E), and a self-addressed stamped envelope for completed questionnaires to be returned to the researcher's P.O. Box. All questionnaires were sent to a rented P.O. Box that only the researcher had access to. The researcher recorded and sent the interview to a third party to transcribe. All data collected was stored in a locked cabinet that only the researcher had access to.

**Data Collection**

**Questionnaire Question Design**

The design of the Teacher Questionnaire (see Appendix E) was to gather responses from teachers in their first through third year teaching in a public high school in Illinois. The first, second, or third year teachers represented public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers from three distinct public schools in three distinct districts. The questionnaire was designed to address the research questions regarding public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers’ perceptions of their needs in the first year of teaching and the supports they received.

The first portion of the questionnaire collected data on the respondents (public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers) education, path to certification, and highest level of education. The possibility of further understanding the public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers based on other factors (age, gender, level of education, certification type, etc.) was also explored.
The first portion of the questionnaire searched for similarities and differences between the respondents.

Question 1: Do you consider yourself a career changer?

Question 1 gathered data on whether or not the public high school teacher entered education as a first career or from another career. If the teacher respondent indicated they were a career changer, a space was provided to list their previous career.

Question 2: Please describe what you believe is the purpose of a teacher induction program.

Question 3: Please describe what you think the ideal induction program would consist of.

Questions 2 and 3 gathered data on public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers’ perceptions on what they believed to be the purpose and ideal components of an induction program. The researcher was interested in teachers’ perceptions of the components and purpose of induction programs. These questions were designed based on Ingersoll and Strong’s (2011) discussion of the theory of induction. Their description of the theory is that “there is a necessary role for schools in providing an environment where novices are able to learn the craft and survive and succeed as teachers” (Ingersoll & Strong, 2011, p. 203).

Question 4: Does your school have an induction program for new teachers? ___Yes ___No
Question 5: Were you a part of an induction program in your school district in your first year of teaching? ___Yes ___No

Question 6: Currently, does the induction program go beyond the first year of teaching? ___Yes ___No

Question 7: Please describe the program of support for teachers beyond their first year of teaching.

Questions 4 through 7 addressed Smith and Ingersoll's (2004) discussion on the variation of duration and time of induction programs. The variation can range from a single meeting at the beginning of a school year to involving several activities throughout the course of a school year. Variation on duration and time in induction can extend from the first year of teaching into the second and third year of teaching.

Question 8: Allan Glatthorn believes that supervision for teachers should be differentiated into three categories: Intensive Development, Cooperative Development and Self-Directed Development. Please select all the development options you received during your first year induction.

Question 9: Who formally facilitates induction in your school?

Question 10: Please describe your professional need(s) during your first year of teaching.

Question 11: Did your school address those needs?

   Strongly Disagree---1---2---3---4---5---6---7---Strongly Agree

Question 12: Please describe what professional needs were not met?
Question 13: Why do you think your professional needs were not met? Please select all that apply.

Question 14: Please describe in a few sentences aspects of your first year of teaching you would want to change.

Question 8 focused on the conceptual framework and the work of Glatthorn (1997). The use of Coaching/Mentoring was utilized based on how induction models define mentoring and the relationship it has to Glatthorn’s definition to Coaching. Collaborative Teams was used instead of Glatthorn’s Cooperative Teams because some schools use this term when referencing grade level or content area teams. Question 9 focused on the eighth aspect of Schlechty’s (1985) indicators of an effective induction program. The eighth part of an effective induction program addresses the responsibility of a supervisor to equitably provide induction in an “organized, consistent, and continuous” (Boggan, Bifuh-Ambe, Harper & Smith, 2010, p. 2) manner. Questions 10 through 12 and 14 directly addressed the research questions. Question 13 directly addressed Ingersoll’s reasons for teacher attrition as referenced in the previous chapter’s Literature Review.

**Questionnaire Informal Focus Group.** A draft of the Teacher Questionnaire (see Appendix E) was presented to an informal focus group. The informal focus group was a cohort of new teachers at a public charter high school at the end of their first year of induction to the school. This particular group was used because they were considered new teachers and had completed one year of induction at a high school. No one in the focus group was included in the actual
study. This group was able to provide useful feedback to the researcher on the structure of the questionnaire and the wording of individual questions.

**Interview Schedule Design**

The design of the Administrative Interview Schedule (see Appendix C) was to link one administrator to each distinct public high school in Illinois. The administrators represented public high school principals with novice and beginning career-change teachers from six distinct public high schools in three distinct districts. These principals also received the Teacher Questionnaire. The interview questions reflected the research questions regarding administrator perceptions of the needs of public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers in their first years of teaching, as well as the supports they received.

The design of the interview schedule was semi-structured. A semi-structured interview is:

> Guided by a list of questions or issues to be explored, and neither the exact wording nor the order of the questions is determined ahead of time. This format allows the researcher to respond to the situation at hand, to the emerging worldview of the respondent, and to new ideas on the topic. (Merriam, 2009, p. 90)

A semi-structured interview schedule was selected for data collection in order for the researcher to respond to the interviewee as the interview was conducted. Probing questions were used to reply to principals’ responses. Probing or follow-up questions seek to gather, “more information or clarity about what the person has just said” (Merriam, 2009, p. 101). In addition, a semi-structured interview schedule was selected to be respectful to the time frame granted by
principals for the interview. The interview schedule was designed to take forty-five minutes.

The first portion of the Administrator Interview Schedule collected data on the respondent’s years in education as an administrator and educator, their path to certification, their highest level of education, as well as if education was his or her first career. The possibility to further understand administrators based on other factors (age, gender, level of education, certification type, etc.) was explored. The first portion of the questionnaire searched for similarities and differences among the respondents.

Question 1: Suppose I was a first year teacher in your building. What would my induction be like?

Question 1 was a hypothetical question designed to gather data on administrators’ perceptions on what they perceived were the components of the induction programs in their buildings. Hypothetical question “responses are usually descriptions of the person’s actual experience” (Merriam, 2009, p. 97). This question was used to gain data on the principals’ perceptions of an ideal induction program and the actual induction components teachers received during induction in their buildings.

Question 2: How do new teachers respond to induction in your building?

Question 2 was a devil’s advocate question. Devil’s advocate questions are intended to elicit a respondent’s opinions and feelings. The wording of a devil’s advocate question depersonalizes the question and allows for the respondent to
freely answer the question without feeling embarrassment or antagonized (Merriam, 2009, p. 97). Question 2 asked the principal to think about his or her response from Question 1 and compare it to actual teachers in his or her building.

Question 3: Would you please describe what you think the ideal induction program would be like?

Question 3 was an ideal position question. Ideal position questions gather both information and opinion. This type of question reveals the benefits, drawbacks, or shortcomings of a program. The researcher was interested in administrators’ perceptions of the components of induction programs. This question was designed to align with the Teacher Questionnaire’s question 3 based on Ingersoll and Strong’s (2011) discussion of the theory of induction. Their description of the theory is that “there is a necessary role for schools in providing an environment where novices are able to learn the craft and survive and succeed as teachers” (p. 203). Probing questions of retention and leadership roles were explored if not explicitly stated by administrators during the interview.

Question 4: Please tell me what the induction need(s) of a first year teacher with no prior work experience are.

Question 5: Please provide me an example of how you address those needs.

Question 6: Please tell me what the induction need(s) of a career-changer to education are.

Question 7: Please provide an example of how you address those needs.

Question 8: Are any new teachers’ needs not met? What are those?
Question 9: Please tell me what the process of induction is for someone not hired at the start of the school year.

Question 10: Who informs new teachers (both novice and career-changers) regarding the day-to-day needs of a teacher (keys, who to go to for questions, for concerns) and who was this person(s)?

Question 11: Is that person part of your formal induction program?

Question 12: Is there anything we did not discuss you would like to address at this time?

Questions 4 through 8 directly addressed the research questions. Probing questions were utilized to clarify each respondent’s answers. Questions 9-11 addressed the nuances and program specifics of the first year of teaching and the school that are often not referenced in induction programs. These questions were only utilized if time permitted. The 12th question was designed to discuss any topic related to the research questions that was not addressed in the previous eleven questions.

**Interview Informal Focus Group**

A draft of the Administrative Interview Schedule (see Appendix C) was presented to an informal focus group. The informal focus group consisted of administrators at a public charter high school. This particular group was used because these administrators were familiar with new teachers and induction. No one in the focus group was included in the study. This group was able to provide
useful feedback to the researcher on the structure of the interview questions and the wording of individual questions.

**Data Analysis**

Stake (1995) wrote, “Analysis essentially means taking something apart” (p. 71). A third party transcribed interview data in order to attain accuracy of the principals’ responses. Questionnaire data was coded in spreadsheets utilizing questions as column headings and responses in the corresponding rows. Common themes, phrases, and ideas were looked for and color-coded in both data collection methods. Analyzing a multi-site case study required the researcher to look at all three district sites as individual case studies prior to looking at these data in a holistic way. Therefore, these data were taken apart in two stages.

A third party transcribed verbatim the Principal Interview Schedule responses. This was done to maintain validity through member checking and assist in accuracy of response coding. The utilization of line numbering on the left side of each page was used to reference a particular part of the interview. In addition, the interview questions were in italics as another referencing tool. Margins on the right-hand side of the transcriptions were left for the researcher to use to write notes and identify trends. This process permitted the researcher to code themes and reference aspects of interviews in an efficient manner. Common themes from each interview question were put in a spreadsheet in order to sort by the emerging themes. This allowed the researcher to access, code, and identify themes from a variety of aspects from the research study.
The researcher transferred all teacher questionnaire responses into a spreadsheet. The questionnaire questions were placed in rows and columns were used to record verbatim questionnaire responses. Color-coding was utilized to identify between novice and beginning career-change teachers’ responses. Three tabs in the spreadsheet identified the three participating school districts. The spreadsheet data was used to review trends at each school and district. Data was merged to look for data trends at all six high schools. Utilizing spreadsheets for data sources allowed the researcher to look for common themes and differences amongst the groups studied in a uniformed format.

Each of the data analysis stages used thick description. Clifford Geertz’s theory of thick description is defined by Willis (2007) as “an approach that emphasizes seeking multiple perspectives, interpretative rather than positivist explanations and purposes, open-minded methods, and the situatedness of knowing” (p. 153). Thick description represents perspectives, interpretations, and meanings throughout the paradigm of social relationships. Through the use of thick description in the analysis of data, the researcher aimed to represent the perceptions that public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers and high school principals have regarding the needs of new teachers and the induction programs used to address those needs.

Merriam (2009) identifies these two stages as within-case and cross-case analysis. The first step of data analysis in this study was the within-case analysis. Within-case analysis means, “each case is first treated as a comprehensive case in
and of itself” (p. 204). This was done to study each individual district in a comprehensive and thorough manner. Each district and building was given its own code for data analysis. Building codes for the first district were A1 for the first building and A2 for the second building. Building codes for the second district were B1 for the first building and B2 for the second building. Building codes for the third district were C1 for the first building and C2 for the second building. Principals were coded as Building A1 Principal, Building A2 Principal, Building B1 Principal, Building B2 Principal, Building C1 Principal, and Building C2 Principal. Teacher questionnaires were coded by building code and sequentially for the number of participants at each site. This permitted the collection and easy organization of data by site.

In the within-case analysis, data was coded into themes through pattern matching. Pattern matching utilized themes that were coded into categories related to the conceptual framework, as well as emergent categories from each individual site. Data coding permitted the researcher to provide comprehensive evidence of collected data. Words and phrases assisted in formulating links between data, themes, and categories. Pattern matching strengthened internal validity (Yin, 2009, p. 136) and triangulation for the second phase of analysis.

The triangulation of patterns from each case study was done through data source triangulation. Stake defines data source triangulation as “an effort to see if what we are observing and reporting carries the same meaning when found under different circumstance” (Stake, 1995, p. 112). Once all three district sites’ datum
were collected and coded, themes that emerged at all three district sites were utilized in the second phase of data analysis.

The second phase of data collection was cross-case analysis. Cross-case analysis permitted each of the cases to be synthesized. This allowed for multi-cases to explore constructs of themes across cases. The details of each case were unique to their individual bounded systems, yet generalizability was formed by the researcher's explanation that fit each individual case and the whole of the study.

Elliot Eisner's connoisseurship approach to data analysis was utilized during the cross-case analysis phase. Connoisseurship "does not emphasize breaking things down as much as it promotes developing a contextual, holistic understanding of the research context" (Willis, 2007, p. 300). Observing all case studies together constructed understanding from an emergent perspective. The emergent perspective made possible the interpretation of knowledge that was generalizable and transferable to other induction programs. Figure 2 outlines the process for the collection of data.
The limitations of using a qualitative case study research design in this study are noted below.

The first limitation in case study research is that it may focus “on a single unit, a single instance, the issue of generalizability looms larger here than with other types of qualitative research” (Merriam, 2009, p. 51). A single case may offer an isolated instance and limit generalizability. Although only three suburban public high school districts were selected for this study to provide insight for teacher induction programs, the depth of data collection and analysis assisted in exploring the ability of induction programs to address the perceived needs of public high
school novice and beginning career-change teachers. Therefore, the use of a multi-site case study design was used to address this limitation. The use of multiple sites allowed for triangulation prior to synthesizing all three districts. This allowed for the transfer of meaning to similar situations and scenarios. However, the results may not be generalizable because other situations and scenarios are not exactly the same as the one that produced the results in this study.

Another limitation was the lack of clarity as to the purpose of why both data collection methods were being utilized. This impacted the clarity as to why the data were collected and thus impacted the relevance of collected data. This speaks directly to the various inherent limitations of using a qualitative research method. The use of interviews, questionnaire, and historical district data as sources of data allowed the researcher to collect data that was relevant to the research questions.

The issue of “the right time to collect data” was the next potential limitation. Research is often grounded in the idea that the opportunity to gather the data at the most opportune time may have passed. While focusing on one data source, the researcher may have missed the opportunity to gather data via another source. Since the data collection tools were questionnaires and interviews, the right time to collect data was not missed. All teachers surveyed were within their first three years of teaching, and therefore the recent supports they desired and received could be recalled fairly easily, as opposed to a teacher with four to eleven years’ experience. Principals, moreover, were engaged in a yearly cycle of induction and therefore, were constantly involved in the system studied.
Finally, the “intent of qualitative research to promote a subjective research paradigm is a given” (Stake, 1995, p. 45). There is no uniform subjective test that qualitative researchers utilize to minimize personal misinterpretation by researcher and audience. Therefore, the use of triangulation within case analysis can “put subjective misunderstandings to a stiff enough test” (p. 45). Through the process of pattern matching in the first phase of data collection the researcher was able to address common themes in findings prior to cross-case analysis. This prevented personal misinterpretation by the researcher and audience.

The professional experiences of the researcher in relation to this study were controlled for biases through a reflective journal. The biases of the researcher that relate to this study were:

1. The researcher was a career-change teacher.

2. The researcher had experienced new teacher induction in four different school settings.

3. As a leader in education, the researcher’s own experiences and thoughts on new teachers and induction may have influenced objectivity.

4. The researcher’s involvement in professional development and new teacher induction may have influenced objectivity.

5. At the time of research, the researcher worked as an assistant principal in a charter school.

To control for the biases mentioned above, the researcher maintained his objectivity by keeping a reflective journal. The reflective journal was used for the researcher to
reflect on items and issues that may cause a loss of objectivity in the research process. Since the researcher’s daily life required him to be part of a school with new teachers and an induction program, the researcher needed to be cognizant of his own biases.

**Summary of Methodology**

For the intention of this study, a qualitative case study approach was used to gather information about the perceptions of public high school principals and public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers regarding the needs of new teachers in induction programs and the systems used to address those needs. Qualitative questionnaires were distributed to public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers in six selected public high schools in Illinois. Interviews were conducted with building principals from the six selected high schools in Illinois as well. In addition, historical hiring, attrition, and retention data were collected from each participating school. These data were used to gain knowledge on the perception of new teachers needs in induction programs (both public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers) and the systems used to address those needs. The questionnaire and interview schedule were comprised of questions designed to answer the following research questions:

1) According to the perceptions of first year public high school teachers with no prior work experience:

   a. What were the needs of public high school novice teachers during their first year?
b. How did their districts’ induction programs meet these needs?

c. What specific recommendations would they make to improve their districts’ induction programs?

2) According to the perceptions of beginning public high school career-change teachers entering the teaching profession:

a. What are the beginning public high school career-change teachers’ needs during their first year of teaching?

b. How did their districts’ induction programs meet their needs?

c. What recommendations would they make to improve their districts’ induction programs?

3) According to the perceptions of the public high school principals:

a. What are the needs of a public high school novice teacher versus a beginning public high school career-change teacher during his or her first year of teaching?

b. How do the induction programs in their school districts meet the needs of public high school novice teachers and beginning career-change teachers?

c. How do public high school principals believe the intentions of their induction programs are met by their school district for public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers?

d. What recommendations would they make to improve their school districts’ induction programs?
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF DATA

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine the perceived impact of teacher induction programs on public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers. This study examined the differences in perceptions pertaining to public high school novice teachers and beginning career-change teachers in regards to the efficacy of induction programs.

Research Questions

The following were the research questions for this case study:

1) According to the perceptions of first year public high school teachers with no prior work experience:
   a. What were the needs of public high school novice teachers during their first year?
   b. How did their districts’ induction programs meet these needs?
   c. What specific recommendations would they make to improve their districts’ induction programs?

2) According to the perceptions of beginning public high school career-change teachers entering the teaching profession:
a. What are the beginning public high school career-change teachers’ needs during their first year of teaching?

b. How did their districts’ induction programs meet their needs?

c. What recommendations would they make to improve their districts’ induction programs?

3) According to the perceptions of the public high school principals:

a. What are the needs of a public high school novice teacher versus a beginning public high school career-change teacher during his or her first year of teaching?

b. How do the induction programs in their school districts meet the needs of public high school novice teachers and beginning career-change teachers?

c. How do public high school principals believe the intentions of their induction programs are met by their school district for public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers?

d. What recommendations would they make to improve their school districts’ induction programs?

This research utilized a qualitative case design. Figure 3 shows the sequence of the study. The qualitative interview data was collected using the Administrative Interview Schedule (see Appendix C). The quantitative data was collected from teachers using the Questionnaire for Teachers (see Appendix E). The goal of the research was to explore public high school principal, novice, and beginning career-
change teachers and their perceptions as to the needs of those classes of teachers, as well as the systems in place at each building and district to address those needs. After each district site’s data was collected, the data was analyzed within each site case. After all three district sites’ data were collected, a cross-site analysis occurred. This allowed for the synthesis of each site’s data into the conceptual framework to evaluate which categories of Differentiated Supervision were predominately used in induction.

Six large, public, distinct, suburban public high schools from three distinct school districts were selected. These three districts were chosen because of their size (more than 1000 students per district), their diverse student population, their consistent hiring of new faculty each year, and having multiple high schools within the school district. Data was collected and analyzed as depicted in Figure 3 below.

**Site A: Demographics**

The first case study is located southwest of the city of Chicago. The two high schools utilized in the research are part of a community unit-district consisting of fourteen elementary schools, five junior high schools, and two high schools. The majority student populations in the district as of school year 2013 were as follows: White (64.94%), Asian (14.84%), Hispanic or Latino (10.51%), and Black or African American (6.01%). Enrollment for the first high school consisted of 2,907 students for the school year 2013-2014. Enrollment for the second high school consisted of 3,038 students for the school year 2013-2014. The district’s percent of low-income
was 13.4%, the state of Illinois for FY2013 was 49.9%. The percent of low-income students for the first site is 8.9% and the second site was 16.3%.

*Figure 3. Data Collection*

Data were collected at this first site in this district on April 9, 2014. The principal interview took place in the principal’s office at 9:00 am. The interview was recorded. At the conclusion of the interview, the principal requested thirty teacher questionnaires for new teachers in the building who fit the research requirements. The questionnaires were handed to the principal’s secretary prior to the researcher exiting the building. These questionnaires were coded as Building A1 in the top right header. Data for the second site in this district was collected on April 16, 2014. The principal interview took place in the principal’s office at 3:00 pm. The interview
was recorded. At the conclusion of the interview, the principal requested 30 teacher questionnaires for new teachers in the building who fit the research requirements. The questionnaires were handed to the principal prior to the researcher exiting the building. The questionnaires were coded as Building A2 in the top right header.

**Site A: Principal Interview**

**Gender, Age and Experience**

The respondents were both males. The age span ranged from 51 years of age to 59 years of age. The mean age of the responding principals was 54.5 years of age. Both of the principal respondents have been administrators for 15 years. One of the principals had been a teacher for 10 years and the other had been a teacher for 20 years.

Table 1

**Gender Representation of Respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Present</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

**Age Range and Mean Age of Respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

*Range and Mean Number of Years as an Administrator*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4

*Range and Mean Number of Years as a Teacher*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were asked about their attainment of teaching credentials. One respondent indicated that he received his certification through conventional means of attaining certification. The other respondent indicated the receipt of teaching credentials through the last year of the state's college transcript evaluation program. This respondent indicated taking three additional courses in order to receive his teaching certification. Both respondents hold Type 75 Administration Certification and Type 9 certifications in content related fields. One respondent is endorsed to teach history and the other respondent is endorsed in business education and mathematics. Respondents were also asked to indicate their highest level of education attained. The respondents both hold a master's degree, while one has a second master's degree.
Table 5

*How Teacher Certification was Attained*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent 1</th>
<th>Conventional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 2</td>
<td>I was in the last year that they did this in Illinois, that they allowed us if you had a college degree but no teaching, no education courses, to get certified by transcript evaluation and taking three courses. I had my undergraduate transcript evaluated. I took three courses, and I was given a teacher’s certificate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6

*Teacher Certifications Respondents Currently Possess*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent 1</th>
<th>Type 9 certification: Business Education and Mathematics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 2</td>
<td>Type 9 certification: History</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7

*Highest Level of Education*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent 1</th>
<th>Master’s Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 2</td>
<td>Two Master’s Degrees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were asked if education was a second career. Of the two interviewees, only one indicated education as a second career. This respondent indicated that his previous career was working for the United Nations right out of college for three-years in economic development. This respondent also acknowledged that he left education in the 1990’s to work as a lobbyist, only to return to education.
Table 8

List of Previous Careers

| Respondent 2 | Worked for the UN right out of college for 3 years in economic development. Also took a 2-year period off and worked as a lobbyist for 2 years in the 90’s. |

Induction Programming at District and School Levels

Both respondents were asked questions about the induction process into the school and district, as well as their perceptions of the purpose and components of new teacher induction. The respondents indicated that induction in the school and district consisted of the following components. First, new teachers participate in a one and a half day unit wide district orientation. This is done with 22 other schools in the unit district. After that orientation, new teachers report to their individual buildings for two full days of a building induction program. It is at this time new teachers are assigned to their mentors. Mentors have a basic curriculum that they are to follow, one that focuses on acculturation to the building and the district. Mentors meet weekly with their mentees. One respondent indicated that receipt of a building mentor or network mentor depends on teaching experience. The majority of induction is done at the building level, unless the teacher has never taught before. Additionally, the buildings induction includes monthly meetings for teachers. One respondent indicated that these nine monthly meetings run for about two hours after the school day.
Table 9

Suppose I was a first year teacher in your building. What would my induction be like?

| Respondent 1 | It would include a 1 1/2 day district orientation where you and every other first year teacher in the district were a unit district. We have 22 schools. All the first year teachers are gathered together and there is a district orientation. Then it would also include 2 full days of building orientation for first year teachers. Then you would be assigned a mentor teacher who would meet with you regularly throughout your first two years. It would include monthly gatherings after school with your first year teacher colleagues, led by a building administrator. |
| Respondent 2 | If you were a first-year teacher, you would receive a mentor in the building. The mentor has a basic curriculum that they are supposed to take you through in terms of acculturation to the building and the district. That involves a weekly meeting with the mentor. That is at the building level. That is not a district program. That is a building program. The district, depending on what your background was as a new teacher ... If you are a brand new teacher, you had never taught before, I think the district provides a mentor in this district. If you taught somewhere else and now you are coming new to this district, you wouldn’t necessarily get a district level mentor. Hope that matches what respondent 1 said. Then we run a once a month after school coaching program for about 2 hours once a month in different topics through the year for first-year and second-year teachers. There are 9 sessions during the year of these 2-hour seminars, essentially. |

Respondents were asked how new teachers respond to the induction program. One respondent said that new teachers respond favorably. He acknowledged that no formal measure is used, but that “it appears that they respond favorably.” Through attending meetings and having a positive attitude new teachers behave favorably to the induction they receive. The other interviewee indicated that new teachers respond through compliance. The respondent described compliance:
“They usually want to have a second year or third year or fourth year.” This is due to not having earned tenure in the district yet. The second respondent indicated that “we don’t know for a fact but our general impression is they feel like the time they spend in the seminar sessions is worthwhile and the time they spend with their mentor is worthwhile.”

Table 10

*How do new teachers respond to induction in your building?*

| Respondent 1 | I think they respond favorably. They show up consistently. My assistant principal has the responsibility of the monthly meetings. I don’t believe that she has ever formally surveyed the teachers and said, "Tell me how you feel about the new teacher induction program." If she has, it wouldn’t shock me if she has, and I just don’t know about it, but otherwise, my answer to that question is it appears that they respond favorably. They show up, they seem to have a positive attitude. |
| Respondent 2 | With compliance... Because they usually want to have a second year or third year or fourth year. I don’t know how positively they really feel about the seminars that take place and the mentoring from their mentor. They also get mentored by their department chair and an administrator because we evaluate them and we view our evaluation as primarily professional development opportunities as opposed to do we want to keep this person or not. That is another aspect. We do seek feedback from them. It’s generally positive. There is always a lot of trepidation on the part of teachers who are new to a school to be too candid in the feedback that they give about anything. I think the best answer would be, we don’t know for a fact but our general impression is they feel like the time they spend in the seminar sessions is worthwhile and the time they spend with their mentor is worthwhile. |

The interviewees were asked what they thought is the ideal induction program. The first respondent stated that it would be an extension of the current
program. The extension would consist of basic concerns. In his view, examples of these basic concerns centered on where to park cars, what to do in case of emergency, and work attire, to name a few. Additionally, the interviewee acknowledged that more induction time could be given to the topic of classroom instruction. This would consist of new teachers watching classroom examples and discussing those examples. Peer observations and a debriefing of the observations could then facilitate a dialogue about what the new teacher and mentor each saw in that lesson. The second respondent described the ideal induction program as an extension of student teaching. In this model, the new teacher would teach three courses instead of five. Their time would be spent observing colleagues, being observed by colleagues, and receiving formal feedback from colleagues. This cycle would occur for a teacher’s first year.

Table 11

Would you please describe what you think the ideal induction program would be like?

| Respondent 1 | I think the ideal program would include much of what we already have in place, which is addressing basic concerns like "How do I get keys, how do I find my way around this large building? Where do I park my car? What if I need to leave because of an emergency? What kind of clothes am I expected to wear? What do I do during my lunch period?" The basics, and I think a mentor is a good idea. We already do that. The one piece that we don’t spend much time on that I think should be an ideal program is more time around classroom instruction with the new teachers watching classroom examples, maybe a combination of video clips and then afterwards, let’s have some discussion and hear from an evaluator, what their evaluation of what they just saw, is. Then also some observations in classrooms of other teachers. The observation, I think ideally, would be the new teacher sitting alongside of either a mentor or an evaluator, so that |
Principals were asked what the induction needs of a first year teacher with no prior work experience are. The first respondent indicated that novice teachers require basic needs to be addressed, as well as school culture and feedback on their classroom teaching. The second respondent indicated that most of their novice teachers have had a similar experience in this type of building and therefore know the expectations and general culture of the building. However, they do need orientation in the structures and operations of the building. The examples given included how the school conducts parent-teacher conferences, as well as participant expectations in meetings. The second respondent discussed the novice teachers’ challenges in classroom management and the relationship to classroom instruction.

| **Respondent 2** | The ideal induction program would be an extension to some extent of student teaching. They would come in and not teach a full schedule. They would be paid a full salary, but they would not teach a full schedule. They would teach 3 courses instead of 5, for example. They would spend a lot of time observing colleagues. They would be scheduled to be observed by colleagues and to get formal feedback from colleagues. It’s not evaluative, it’s just coaching feedback, coaching feedback, coaching feedback. I think they would do that for an entire year where they were working less than a full schedule so that they could primarily receive coaching and do observations during the year.

I think that would be how I would change the first year. It would be a much more intensive coaching year and a less intensive teaching year. Then I would run a 4-year mentoring relationship for which the mentors were paid substantially. There would be a very fairly specific curriculum of what they were supposed to work on with the new teacher. All of that would be firewalled off from any kind of evaluation. |

afterwards, there can be dialogue back and forth about what they just saw.
and engagement. The respondent indicated that the root of this challenge is that “it takes them (teachers) awhile to adjust to the fact that large portions of their clientele is not like them.” This respondent indicated that students in classrooms are not like the students the teachers were themselves. Therefore, the teacher initially struggles with finding the activities that “truly cause kids to construct genuine understanding at a fairly deep level of something are very challenging to create,” because this requires both time and experience.

Table 12

*Please tell me what the induction need(s) of a first teacher with no prior work experience are*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent 1</th>
<th>I think the needs are mostly what's being addressed here, the basic needs. I think the needs also include an acclimation to the culture of the place; how do people behave, what are some traditions in this new place. I also think that first year teachers, as I just mentioned in the previous question, should have feedback on some samples of classroom instruction.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 2</td>
<td>Typically, our teachers have gone to a high school that is very similar to this. Oddly enough, we get a lot of teachers who came from some large comprehensive suburban high school that is relatively high performing. They kind of get how the building works. There are some teachers who would, if they came from a smaller school or they had gone to a private high school or a different part of the country, they might need to be enculturated to this particular community, county kind of building expectations. For the most part, they are relatively familiar with what a large suburban high school is like. They typically don't need a lot of orientation to the general culture of this kind of building. They need some orientation to the logistics. Okay, parent-teacher conferences are coming up. This is how we do them here. Grade reports home are coming up. This is how we do them here. What is expected from you in terms of your participation in meetings, whether they are instructional team meetings or they are department meetings or any other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


kind of meeting? Those kind of this is how we do this here kinds of things, which can be done sort of just in time. You do it right before it’s going to happen and give them some orientation.

Typically, new teachers are most challenged by classroom management. Classroom management is really a subset of engaging instruction. If your instruction is engaging, classroom management for the most part, 80% of the time, all sort of takes care of itself. The real big one is engaging appropriately paced instruction. That falls into what do you think will be the most relevant way to kids to present a particular concept or skill or chunk of content. Usually, first-, second-, third-year teachers are not very constructivist in the way that they do things. They are more inclined to talk a lot and be very teacher centered and share their wisdom. To believe that kids will behave as they did in school, which is to listen raptly and take careful notes and to not be thinking about other things or to be bummmed out or to consider things irrelevant or to struggle.

It takes them a while to adjust to the fact that large portions of their clientele are not like them. It takes them a while to figure out activities that they can do with students that are genuinely constructivist. That something really is being created. Some understanding is really being created on the part of the student in the classroom. Those are very difficult things to come up with. It is easy to come up with gimmicky kinds of things to do. You can get them out of a book. You can get them in teacher school. Activities that truly cause kids to construct genuine understanding at a fairly deep level of something are very challenging to create. That is one of the reasons that I think the first year should be spent doing more observation and being observed than teaching because that is your opportunity to see what genuinely effective teachers are doing and to consider how you would personalize that for your own instruction.

Respondents were asked to provide examples of how they address new teacher needs. The first respondent indicated that the mentor addresses the needs of novice teachers through regular conversations. The second respondent indicated
that their practice is to address those needs on a person-by-person basis. This is
done through the department chair’s time with new teachers early in the year, as
well as checking in with teachers on the various teams with the novice teachers.
Finally, the respondent indicated the mentors have a prescribed curriculum that has
specific items to cover during particular months of the school year, but the
responsibility is chiefly on the department chair to try and figure out what the needs
of that teacher are.

Table 13

Please provide me with an example of how you address those needs

| Respondent 1 | Yes, we address those needs with a mentor, the assignment of a mentor to regularly have conversations with the first year teacher that include opportunities for the first year teacher to ask questions. We also meet those ... well, you just asked for one example, so I guess the mentor would be an example of how we meet some of those needs. |
| Respondent 2 | We try to do it on a person-by-person basis. The department chair tries to see the new teacher teaching several times early in the year to get a feel for what their strengths are. They have a couple of conversations with the teacher early in the year along the lines of what needs do you feel you have. They check in with the other teachers on that teacher’s team. Instructional level team, course team to see what they think they are seeing. They drop into the classroom Extemporizing initially a few times to see what they are ... They try to suss out what the teacher’s needs are and then to tailor whatever kind of coaching they are going to do for that particular teacher. |

In the seminar curriculum that I described to you, we have a notion of what will be a good thing to cover in September, what will be a good thing to cover in October, what will be a good thing to cover in November. It’s to the extent that we are effective in this at all, it’s the department chair chiefly trying to figure out what the needs of that teacher are. Will they articulate those needs? Can we see what their needs are? Then to provide that kind of push in.
Principals were asked what the induction needs of a beginning public high school career-changer to education are. The first respondent indicated the needs of a beginning public high school career-change teacher are not too different from someone who is a novice teacher. The differences he indicated are that the career-change teacher is “going to experience some new feelings and some experiences that might be surprising, some feelings that might be unusual,” as they navigate their first year as a teacher. The need to share those feelings with others who might be able to empathize would be beneficial to the career-change teacher. The second respondent indicated that career-changers’ needs are focused on “not being used to dealing with teenagers and having an exaggerated notion of how interesting they will be to teenagers and how interesting their thoughts and the things that fascinate them are going to be to teenagers.” Career-change teachers often face disappointment in themselves and students because it is a shock to deal with teenagers. He said, “The shock of dealing with real-life teenagers day in and day out is often the biggest thing, which isn't terribly characteristic of first-year teachers who come right out of teacher school because they usually are still somewhat teenagers themselves and they recognize the species. It’s different if you come back to it in your 30’s or 40’s. It just looks different.” The second need of beginning public high school career-change teachers, as indicated by principal respondents, is the transition from a strict work environment and system with a clear reward structures to the school environment. “Schools are typically not as regimented and well organized as people come out of a corporate environment expected. We have a
number of people here who came out of Lucent or engineering firms. Most of our
career-changers tend to be in science or math. They have often worked in
organizations that were more organized than we are and wonder why we don’t have
things more tightly buttoned down. It takes a while to adjust to the fact that we are
not colleges, but there is a lot more freedom about how you do things than they have
typically experienced.”

Table 14

*Please tell me what the induction need(s) of a career-changer to education are*

| Respondent 1 | I don’t believe that they’re significantly different from someone who’s not a career-changer. With the one difference that I think would be there is, someone who’s not been in education before and switching from another career, is going to experience some new feelings and some experiences that might be surprising, some feelings that might be unusual. I think that having some form of a support system, whether it’s other people experiencing those same feelings ... if, in a building like this, that opportunity would exist where first year teachers could share their feelings - or career-changers could share those feelings with other career-changers, or veteran teachers who were a career-changer 10 years ago, or just somebody as a support system. |
| Respondent 2 | Usually career changes to education, and I have had more successful career-changers than I have had unsuccessful career-changers, usually if they face a challenge, it is not being used to dealing with teenagers and having an exaggerated notion of how interesting they will be to teenagers and how interesting their thoughts and the things that fascinate them are going to be to teenagers. Frequently, there is a period of disappointment in the kids feeling sometimes like, “Well, I must just not be doing this right or they would be more fascinated and they would respond with more genuine interest.” Sometimes, that is a disappointment in the kids; sometimes it is a disappointment in self. “I must just not be doing this right.” |
The number one thing that I see with career-changers is an assumption that they will walk into something that looks like a TV set or a movie set and that is what school will look like when in fact teenagers don’t typically behave the way they do in movies and on TV. The shock of dealing with real-life teenagers day in and day out is often the biggest thing, which isn’t terribly characteristic of first-year teachers who come right out of teacher school because they usually are still somewhat teenagers themselves and they recognize the species. It’s different if you come back to it in your 30’s or 40’s. It just looks different.

The other thing is that they usually have been working in an environment where there is more regimentation and more of a clear reward structure. Schools are typically not as regimented and well organized as people come out of a corporate environment expect. We have a number of people here who came out of Lucent or engineering firms. Most of our career-changers tend to be in science or math. They have often worked in organizations that were more organized than we are and wonder why we don’t have things more tightly buttoned down. It takes a while to adjust to the fact that we are not colleges, but there is a lot more freedom about how you do things than they have typically experienced.

The respondents were asked how they address the needs of a career-changer. The first respondent indicated that the school “really does not address those needs.” The second respondent indicated it is the same method as novice teachers, in that it is up to individual department chairs to figure out what those needs are.
Please provide an example of how you address those needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent 1</th>
<th>We really don’t address those needs here.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 2</td>
<td>We don’t specifically go, “Aha. We have a career-changer. We need a different approach to this person.” If we go back to the idea of the department chair studying you over the first several weeks to month that you are here to try to figure out what your needs are and then be hanging around to hear things from you. I think that gives them an opportunity to respond to whatever they think they are seeing. Often, the initial reaction after a month or two of a career-changer is sort of disappointment, the thought about, “Did I do the right thing here?” There are some who instantly love it, feel like they found their spot. It’s a (teacher) moment. They think this is where they should have been forever. They get the kind of reaction from kids that they expected. A lot of times, they don’t and they have to persist through to find the pony in the pile of poop. Sometimes, it’s the second half of the year when career-changers start to really say, “Okay, I get it now. It didn’t feel good to me in the fall, but this is starting to feel better to me.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Principals were asked if they believed any new teachers’ needs were not being met and what those needs might be. The first respondent indicated that there “probably are” needs not met, but does not know what they might be. The respondent indicated that time management is an ongoing challenge for teachers, juggling the balance of time spent in the building and at home around grading and lesson planning. The second respondent indicated that “almost all” teachers have unmet needs, but indicated that both public high school novice and beginning career-changers have difficulty “developing genuine relationships with kids.”
### Are any new teacher needs not met? What are they?

| Respondent 1 | My answer is probably there are, but I don’t really know what they are. I would guess that they might be around one of the common themes, would be around time management. I think that’s a significant challenge for new teachers and it's a concern that I have after informal conversations with new teachers about the sometimes overwhelming amount of time that they're spending in the school building and at home, around grading and preparing lessons. |
| Respondent 2 | I’m sure almost all of them have unmet needs. I would say that the hardest part of being a new teacher whether you are a career-changer or not a career-changer is developing genuine relationships with kids. One of the things that almost all of our new teachers, and I don’t think it’s more career-changers than not, they think they are coming in to teach a class or to teach classes as opposed to coming in to teach individuals. When you try to teach a class, you miss with a lot of kids because the kids are peculiar and unique in the challenges they face and the interests that they have. Typically the people who are coming in to teach have not dreamed that way. They have dreamed of standing in front of a class or managing a class and they have thought about the class and how I would do that. They haven’t thought deeply about or developed ... I don’t know how you develop these skills prior to doing it. They haven’t prioritized the development of skills working one on one with a kid and getting to some depth. “I really have to find out quite a bit about you in order to really be able to teach you effectively.” That part doesn’t dawn on most people right away. Usually takes a little bit of time for them to realize that teaching a class works for maybe half the kids in the room, but for the other half of the kids in the room, it doesn’t work. There is going to have to be a one-on-one relationship. That is something that needs to be stressed from the very beginning because it is not necessarily self-evident. When kids start not performing, but you are doing this great job of planning and presenting and choreographing and you still got a third to half of the kids in the classroom not doing what you really hoped would come from them, initially you could blame yourself, “I must not be doing this right” or you could blame those kids. It really isn’t either one. It’s about relationships. |
Respondents were asked about the process of induction for someone not hired at the start of the school year. The first respondent indicated these hires are assigned a mentor and expected to attend the monthly sessions. The second respondent indicated the same process as a teacher who starts at the beginning of the school year.

Table 17

*Please tell me what the process of induction is for someone not hired at the start of the school year*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent 1</th>
<th>They’re assigned a mentor, but they missed all of the orientation programs that took place prior to the start of the school year. In this building, if they get hired midstream, they are expected and invited to attend monthly sessions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 2</td>
<td>(Laughs) Whenever they’re hired, we schlep them into at whatever that point in time. November, February, we schlep them into the new teacher process. We join this program in progress, that kind of thing. We don’t do anything special for them at all. It’s a bad idea the way we do it, but now that you’ve mentioned it. (Laughing)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were asked who informs new teachers about the day-to-day needs of a teacher. The first respondent indicated these individuals are primarily teachers and mentors who are part of the formal mentoring program. The second respondent indicated that while both mentors and department chairs are involved, it is primarily the responsibility of the department chairs. The second respondent indicated that the department chair is not part of the formal mentoring program.
Table 18

Who informs new teachers (both novice and career-change teachers) regarding the day-to-day needs of a teacher and who is this person(s)?

| Respondent 1 | Those people are primarily teachers in the building. The mentor would address some of those things, and then our orientation program in the summer is primarily led by teachers, where we set up an agenda that mirrors our bell schedule. We have an 8 period day. 1 period might be a new teacher who talks to them about social events that take place in our building. The next period, they might travel to a classroom where a teacher orients them to how to use our electronic grade book. The next period might be a tour of the building led by a teacher here. So those needs are met primarily through teachers. |
| Respondent 2 | It’s primarily their department chair, primarily their department chair, secondarily a mentor. It’s primarily their department chair is responsible for all the logistics and the very surfacing culture issue things. |

Table 19

Is that person part of your formal induction program?

| Respondent 1 | Yes |
| Respondent 2 | No, only in the sense that it is the responsibility of the department chair to do that. (laughs) In that sense of the department chair is part of the formal induction program, they are the primary coach of that teacher. Their primary responsibility is for that teacher to be successful. I don’t know whether you call it “part of the induction program” or not, but it is the responsibility of their department chair to make sure they know those things. |

Respondents were asked if they wanted to discuss anything additionally. The first respondent indicated no. The second respondent discussed his ideal induction program. The implications of having new teachers teaching in multiple classrooms and having additional preparations were also discussed.
Table 20

*Is there anything we did not discuss that you would like to address at this time?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent 1</th>
<th>I don’t think so.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 2</td>
<td>I do think getting back to what I talked about earlier about, “What would be an ideal system in my mind?” I do think that having new teachers teach a full load, typically they get more separate preparations that a veteran teacher. If anybody is going to have three preparations rather than two, three class courses to teach rather than two, it’ll be a newer teacher. We try to discourage that but it often plays out that way. Typically, if somebody is going to move from class into classroom, it’s a newer teacher. Also bad idea!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site A: Teacher Questionnaire**

**Gender, Age and Experience**

The administration distributed the Teacher Questionnaires to teachers after the researcher left the school site. Principals indicated a process of communicating to the teachers who fit the research requirement via email and then placed the Teacher Questionnaire in staff school mailboxes. The majority of respondents were females. Males represented 40% of the respondents while females represented 60%. The age span ranged from 30 years of age to 38 years of age. The mean age of the responding teachers was 31 years of age.

**Table 21**

*Gender Representation of Respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Present</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 22

*Age Range and Mean Age of Respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of years of experience, the respondents ranged from one year of experience to three years of experience. The average experience for a responding teacher was two years of teaching experience. Two responding teachers had one year of teaching experience at the time of the questionnaire. One responding teacher had three years of teaching experience and the remaining two responding teachers had two years of teaching experience.

Table 23

*Range and Mean Number of Years as a Teacher*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were asked about their attainment of teaching credentials. The vast majority of respondents indicated they received their teaching certification through a bachelor’s degree program. One respondent indicated receiving their teaching credentials through a two-year certification program. Four teachers indicated they possess Type 9 certifications in content related fields and one teacher referenced the possession of a Type 73, a school service personnel certification, and a Type 29, a transitional bilingual teaching certification. Respondents also indicated
their highest level of education attained. Three of the teaching respondents have a bachelor’s degree and two have master’s degree. Three respondents indicated they have additional educational credits, but not a confirmed degree. Respondents indicated entry into the school district at different times.

Table 24

*How Teacher Certification was Attained*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent 1</th>
<th>Bachelor’s Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 2</td>
<td>2 year certification program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 3</td>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 4</td>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 5</td>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25

*Teacher Certifications Respondents Currently Possess*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent 1</th>
<th>Type 9 certification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 2</td>
<td>Secondary Science, MS Art, endorsed in earth/space, chemistry and physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 3</td>
<td>Initial Certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 4</td>
<td>Secondary Math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 5</td>
<td>Type 73 and Type 29 certification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 26

*Highest Level of Education*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent 1</th>
<th>Bachelor’s Degree and currently pursuing master’s degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 2</td>
<td>MS in Earth and Planetary Science. ABD PHD (all but dissertation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 3</td>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree, with some graduate school credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 4</td>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 5</td>
<td>Master’s Degree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 27

*When was the respondent hired by the school district in which they currently work?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent 1</th>
<th>September 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 2</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 3</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 4</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 5</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were asked if education was a second career. Two teaching respondents indicated that education was their only career. Three respondents indicated that education was a career-change for them. One respondent indicated a previous career held as a college lecturer and lab instructor. The second respondent who entered education from an alternative field referenced several previous careers: naval cryptologist, office manager, and work with lobbying and law firms. The third career-change teacher referenced a past career as a benefits operations analyst.

Table 28

*Respondents’ Career*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Present</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Novice</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career-changer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 29

List of Previous Careers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent 2</th>
<th>College Lecture and Lab instructor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 4</td>
<td>Naval cryptologist, office manager at community college, worked on specific projects for lobbying firms &amp; law firms (tax divisions)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Induction Programming at District and School Levels

All the respondents were given a questionnaire asking them about their induction program. Respondents indicated that the purpose of teacher induction was to help them gain understanding of their new school, covering a spectrum of topics ranging from school culture, communication, community, and school standards, as well as how they would transition into all of the above. Teachers were asked to describe their ideal induction program. The five respondents indicated a variety of ideas. Respondents strongly indicated the importance of addressing teacher evaluation and feedback on teaching; this was the highest need expressed. Also, respondents indicated the need for more familiarity with systems and supports in the building for their practice and students. Four respondents referenced the need for integration with other staff members in the building. Respondents suggested mentoring and interactions with administration as ways to integrate with other staff members.
Table 30

Please describe what you believe is the purpose of a teacher induction program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent 1</th>
<th>To help new teachers learn school standards and goals and how to work to achieve them.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 2</td>
<td>To help new teachers to become part of the school community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 3</td>
<td>To help teachers get a feel for the culture of the school and learn what is expected of them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 4</td>
<td>To help new teachers become better acclimated to the school climate, programs, expectations, and other faculty. To establish a more direct line of contact and relationship between faculty and administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 5</td>
<td>To help new teachers transition to their new school.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 31

Please describe what you think would be the ideal induction program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent 1</th>
<th>Mentors, periodic meetings and consistent feedback.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 3</td>
<td>Spotting/recognizing substance abuse in students, mentoring senior staff mentors new staff, what a good observation looks like for the specific school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 4</td>
<td>Meet and greet with administration, primary support staff, etc. Q&amp;A about any issues or curiosities. Sample practice with evaluation system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 5</td>
<td>Equal parts of real classroom examples and lectures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were given three yes-or-no questions focused on their induction program. All respondents indicated that their district has a new teacher induction program in the first year of a new teacher’s employment in a district and that they were involved in the program. When asked whether the program of
induction went beyond the first year of teaching, three respondents said it did and
two said that it did not.

Table 32

Does the District Have a Program for New Teachers During the 1st Years of Teaching?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 33

Were You A Part of An Induction Program During Your 1st Year of Teaching?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 34

Does the Program Go Beyond the 1st Year of Teaching?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher respondents were asked about the program of support beyond the
first year of teaching. Only one respondent indicated that there is none. Four
respondents indicated additional support that centered on meetings. One
respondent indicated that mentor observations continue beyond the first year.
Table 35

*Please describe the program of support for teachers beyond their first year of teaching*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent 1</th>
<th>District mentor who observes with no evaluative assessment. Monthly 1st year teacher meetings. Observations (formal and informal) with feedback.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 2</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 3</td>
<td>Regular meetings with/a specific topic, assigned readings, &quot;homework,&quot; discussions during meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 4</td>
<td>Once per month meeting (sometimes cancelled), pre-planned topics-&gt;evaluation, community contact, &quot;mindsets&quot; (fixed vs. growth), responses to recent school occurrences (clarifying, reassuring, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 5</td>
<td>Meeting once a quarter but it's mostly lecturing and not for (counselors, nurses, deans) only geared for teachers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Differentiated Supervision**

Teacher respondents were provided a chart outlining Allan A. Glatthorn’s (1997) Differentiated Supervision. The chart provided examples and explanations of the three categories: Intensive Development, Cooperative Development, and Self-Directed Development. Teacher respondents were asked to select aspects of each category they had experienced in their induction program. In the category of Intensive Development, all teacher respondents indicated they had coaching and mentoring as well as clinical observations. One respondent indicated no experience with Focused Observations during the induction. In the category of Cooperative Development, all respondents indicated some participation on a Collaborative Team, Curriculum Development, and Professional Dialogues. None of the respondents participated in Action Research. Also, two respondents indicated their participation in Peer Observation. In the category of Self-Directed Development, all five
respondents indicated some experience in goal-setting based on generic-skills of teaching and professional role. Four respondents indicated goal-setting based on mixed resources. Also, four respondents indicated goal-setting based on subject-specific skills.

**Figure 4.** Glatthorn Intensive Development (N=5)

**Figure 5.** Glatthorn Cooperative Development (N=5)
Figure 6. Glatthorn Self-Directed Development (N=5)

**Induction Facilitation at District and School Levels**

Respondents were asked to indicate who in the district facilitated their induction program at the school. One respondent indicated "other" in the form of district mentors. Another respondent indicated a district administrator as a facilitator of new teacher induction. A respondent indicated the building principal, and another respondent indicated the department chair as a facilitator of the induction program. All five respondents indicated that the assistant principal formally facilitated the induction program. No respondents indicated that a fellow teacher in their building had facilitated the induction program.
Respondents were asked to answer what their professional needs were during their first year of teaching. Four respondents referenced classroom management. Two respondents indicated classroom observations specifically. One respondent indicated meetings. One respondent mentioned their mentor as support for addressing their first year needs. Respondents were asked to complete a Likert Scale addressing how the school addressed their needs. Three respondents gave the school a 6 out of 7. One respondent gave the school a 7 out of 7. One respondent gave the school a 2 out of 7.

Figure 7. Facilitator(s) of School Induction

**Professional Needs during the First Year of Teaching**

- Four respondents referenced classroom management.
- Two respondents indicated classroom observations specifically.
- One respondent indicated meetings.
- One respondent mentioned their mentor as support for addressing their first year needs.
- Respondents were asked to complete a Likert Scale addressing how the school addressed their needs.
- Three respondents gave the school a 6 out of 7.
- One respondent gave the school a 7 out of 7.
- One respondent gave the school a 2 out of 7.
Table 36

Please describe your professional need(s) during your first year of teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent 1</th>
<th>Curriculum and professional help with classroom content and management.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 2</td>
<td>Mostly advice for specific situations in classroom/HR questions/etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 3</td>
<td>It would’ve been helpful to learn about discipline policies regarding student drug abuse as I had 3 students with severe issues and there was no plan in place. The observation system was really stressful and made me quite nervous. Something to fix this would’ve been helpful. It would’ve been nice to have a building mentor who was specifically trained and attended meetings with me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 4</td>
<td>Semi-regular observations (formal and informal) to provide feedback on instruction and classroom management. Periodic scheduled meeting w/evaluator to touch base with ideas, concerns, etc. Both instructional and professional.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 5</td>
<td>Mentor to show me what to expect in the coming year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8. Did your school address those needs?
Teacher respondents were asked to identify professional needs that were not met by the school. Two respondents indicated that all needs were met. One respondent indicated an uncertainty of any needs not being met, but indicated a desire for more time to get to know the administrators to establish a clearer understanding of what was expected of them and a better working knowledge of each other. One respondent indicated a desire for more understanding of the evaluation system and specific student needs. One respondent indicated a desire for more personalized professional development in their specific field.

Table 37

Please describe what professional needs were not met

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent 1</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 2</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 3</td>
<td>Observation are 4 a year the first 2 and extremely stressful, better building mentor program, more training on student substance abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 4</td>
<td>Not sure there are any - perhaps more time with administration to establish a better knowledge of each other (how each operates in/out of class) - may help evaluation be better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 5</td>
<td>Professional Development in specific field</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher respondents were asked to select a variety of reasons from Ingersoll’s research as to why teachers leave the field of teaching in order to indicate why their own professional needs were not met. Two respondents selected none of the reasons. One respondent indicated three reasons: lack of faculty influence/support, inadequate preparation of the program, and program interfered with their teaching and individual preparation time. One respondent selected “other” and
wrote that time was an issue. One respondent indicated the lack of district funds impacted why the needs were not met.

Table 38

*Why do you think your professional needs were not met?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent 1</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 2</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 3</td>
<td>Lack of faculty influence/support, Inadequate preparation of the program, Program interfered with your teaching and individual preparation time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 4</td>
<td>Other- not just my time-everyone is swamped 100% of the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 5</td>
<td>Lack of district funds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher respondents were given a free-response section to write a few sentences about what they would change about their first year of teaching. Two respondents indicated none, with one respondent reflecting the choices they made. One respondent indicated more knowledge of professional learning and state requirements. One respondent briefly referenced a situation that impacted their start to the school year. One respondent indicated the need to support non-teaching staff.
Table 39

Please describe in a few sentences the aspects of your first year of teaching you would want to change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent 1</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 2</td>
<td>More info on professional learning requirements/report to IL state licensure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 3</td>
<td>Parents at this school are very ‘intense’ and there was an explosive situation that I was completely unprepared for. As a result, my self-confidence was shaky that first semester and my observations did not go well. This is a great school but there is a lot of performance pressure. I’ve learned to adjust but having a mentor that understood this, was trained for it would’ve been helpful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 4</td>
<td>None related to this topic - mine are related to choices I made in planning, club sponsorship, etc. (entirely on me, not the schools structure).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 5</td>
<td>Have a program for non-teaching staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site A: Data Documents

Documents from District A were received on October 31, 2014. The documents received came from the New Teacher Center and consisted of a binder titled: Formative Assessment System. The binder consisted of the following sections: Using Collaborative Assessment Log, Exploring School and Community Resources, Assembling a Class Profile, Setting Professional Goals, Analyzing Student Work, Communicating with Parents, Planning Lessons, Conducting Classroom Observations, Reviewing Process at Mid-Year, Reflecting on Professional Growth and Resources.
Using Collaborative Assessment Log

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section: Why use the Collaborative Assessment Log?</th>
<th>Your mentoring conversations are important opportunities for beginning teachers to talk through their successes and challenges, and then prioritize and address their challenges in a constructive, collaborative manner. By using the CAL routinely, you help new teachers establish the productive professional habits of reflection and self-assessment.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How do I use the Collaborative Assessment Log?</td>
<td>Your mentoring might include co-developing lessons, problem-solving together, teaching new strategies, asking reflective questions, offering suggestions, or providing information and resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2: Identify, Prioritize and Discuss Current Focus, Challenges, and Concerns</td>
<td>At other times, the beginning teacher's Individual Learning Plan will provide a focal point for discussion and exploration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3: Specify Next Steps</td>
<td>This helps encourage teachers to focus on what is possible. Developing a few achievable, short-term objectives helps create a feeling of control and increases the likelihood of success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4: Code According to The Framework for Teaching</td>
<td>The Collaborative Assessment Log helps us connect our work with our beginning teachers to professional standards. Over the course of your regular conversations, incorporate The Framework for Teaching into your discussions with new teachers by indicating the appropriate Framework code next to each of the successes, issues, and next steps recorded on the CAL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 5: Bring Closure</td>
<td>Ensuring beginning teachers have a specified focus for their development, a set of clearly articulated and manageable next steps and offering support in accomplishing them will help build trust, mutual accountability, and increase the likelihood of implementation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the documents under the heading Collaborative Assessment Log, the following areas relate to the conceptual framework of this research study. The first area referenced is Intensive Development. The materials in this document were to be used by the mentor to support the beginning teacher. The mentor also supports new teachers in understanding the Framework for Teaching, which is the evaluative methodology utilized by the school district. Additionally, Cooperative Development with the mentor is referenced as “developing lessons, problem-solving together, teaching new strategies, asking reflective questions, offering suggestions, or providing information and resources,” as well as goal-setting by setting objectives and steps to support and achieve those objectives. Finally, Self-Directed Development was mentioned in the beginning teacher’s Individual Learning Plan.

Table 41

*Exploring School and Community Resources*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section: Why Explore School and Community Resources?</th>
<th>Taking the time to introduce them to the community, the school, and the available resources can help them begin to feel at home in their new school and overcome some of the anxieties that accompany this first year of teaching.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exploring School and Community Resources encourages beginning teachers to think about their classrooms in the context of the school as a whole and to become aware of the support available to them and their students. This information will help them take full advantage of critical programs and resources while setting the stage for future collaboration with colleagues, parents, and other support agencies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Step 1: Identify School Resources
Take some time together to review the school staff roster and district directory to help identify key resource personnel and programs.

Step 2: Discuss School Designations
For example, some programs will affect the staff development-taking place at the school site during the year, the nature of staff meetings, the allocations of staff and other resources, or the focus for a teacher’s personal professional growth.

School and Community Resources (worksheet)
What resource personnel, programs, and/or facilities do you want to access? Whom to Contact For What Purpose By When

In the documents under the heading Exploring School and Community Resources, the following areas relate to the conceptual framework of this research study. The first area referenced is Cooperative Development. This section focuses on identifying peer groups in the school and beyond to support the beginning teacher. Specifically the Worksheet School and Community Resources requires the beginning teacher to identify resource personnel, programs, and facilities they want to access. The second component identified is Self-Directed Development through “the focus for a teacher’s personal professional growth.”

Table 42
Assembling a Class Profile

Step 3: Select a Case Study-Student (optional)
At some time during the FAS process, you will want to help your beginning teachers choose a Case Study Student. Point out that by focusing on just one student they can use that single example as an opportunity to learn about the effect of instructional practice upon student learning.
In the documents under the heading Assembling a Class Profile, Cooperative Development is the area referenced in this section. This section requires beginning teachers to select a student for a case study and use the information gathered to “learn about the effect of instructional practice upon student learning.” This relates to the Action Research component of Cooperative Development.

Table 43

*Setting Professional Goals*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Through Setting Professional Goals beginning teachers will develop a yearlong focus for professional growth based upon teaching and content standards.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why Set Professional Goals?</td>
<td>Setting Professional Goals is a process that helps beginning teachers establish goals aligned with The Framework for Teaching by Charlotte Danielson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do I Set Professional Goals?</td>
<td>With your guidance and expertise, your new teachers have the opportunity to approach thoughtfully the process of self-assessment and goal-setting. As a result, they will not only be better prepared for the first evaluation conferences with the site administrator, but can also be strong, articulate advocates for their professional development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3: Self-Assess on the Levels of Performance Rubric</td>
<td>The beginning teachers are now ready to self-assess their practice using the Continuum of Teacher Performance that is aligned with The Framework for Teaching. You might point out that, just as we use assessments in the classroom to design appropriate instruction, we are going to use a self-assessment instrument to ensure the design of meaningful professional goals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Step 4: Develop an Individual Learning Plan

Your beginning teachers are now ready to move to goal-setting.

Subsections:
- **Content Area Focus and Impact on Student Learning**

- **Overarching Professional Goal**

- **Supporting Goals**
  Helping your beginning teacher identify more specific objectives or Supporting Goals will help make next steps seem more do-able and less overwhelming.

**Plan**
These next steps might include working with you and other resource personnel, preparing demonstration lessons, planning lessons together, observing veteran teachers, attending workshops, analyzing student work, or employing specific instructional strategies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Self-Assessment Summary (worksheet)</strong></th>
<th>Three areas of the worksheet are Strengths, Domain (The Framework for Teaching) and Areas of Growth.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual Learning Plan (worksheet)</strong></td>
<td>Center: Content Area Focus, Overarching Professional Goal and Impact on Student Learning. Four corners of the worksheet are the same with Framework Domain/Component, Supporting Goal, Plan and Evidence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the documents under the heading Setting Professional Goals, the following conceptual framework categories are referenced in the section. Self-Directed Development is referenced through the process of setting professional goals so that “new teachers have the opportunity to approach thoughtfully the process of self-assessment and goal-setting.” The section references the beginning teachers self-
assessment in order to create goals. This is done on the Self-Assessment Summary worksheet and then transferred to the Individual Learning Plan worksheet.

Additionally, Intensive Development is referenced in the sub-section “How do I Set Professional Goals?” The sub-section references formal observation preparation. “As a result, they will not only be better prepared for the first evaluation conferences with the site administrator, but can also be strong, articulate advocates for their professional development.” Finally, Cooperative Development is referenced in this section beyond the mentor’s role in assisting the goal setting process and specifically in the sub-section titled “Plan.” “These next steps might include working with you and other resource personnel, preparing demonstration lessons, planning lessons together, observing veteran teachers, attending workshops, analyzing student work, or employing specific instructional strategies.”

In the documents under the headings Communicating with Parents and Planning Lessons, no data were coded to the conceptual framework of this research study. Communicating with Parents contains the following areas: “Review Student Information,” “Analyze Academic Progress,” “Plan the Conversation,” “Role Play the Conversation,” “Bring Closure” and “Follow-up Reflection.” “Role Play the Conversation” is only utilized if the beginning teacher is not comfortable with parent communication. Since it is not a mandatory piece of the section, it was not coded. The culmination of this section requires the usage of the Collaborative Assessment Log, in both the “Bring Closure” and “Follow-up Reflection” sections.
The Collaborative Assessment Log had already been coded utilizing the conceptual framework in an earlier section of the district document review.

The section Planning Lessons was not coded based on the section’s utilization of mentoring/coaching on lesson plans with the beginning teacher. Since the entire document provided by the district centers on the role of the mentor, and already coded as such, this section was not coded here.

Table 44

*Conducting Classroom Observations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How Do I Conduct Classroom Observations?</th>
<th>The FAS Conducting Classroom Observations is a formal observation process that involves three basic components: Pre-Observation Planning Conversation Data Collection Post-Observation Reflecting Conversation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

In the documents under the heading *Conducting Classroom Observations* the conceptual framework category Intensive Development is apparent. The section *Conducting Classroom Observations* outlines the process and possible protocols to conduct a formal observation of a beginning teacher by their mentor. This section reviews the pre-observation planning conversation, data collection tools, and protocols and procedures for the post-observation reflecting conversation.
Table 45

Reviewing Progress at Mid-Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Through Reviewing Progress at Mid-Year, beginning teachers will be able to articulate their professional growth to date using relevant data from classroom practice and refine their professional growth.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why Review Progress at Mid-Year?</td>
<td>Reflection upon one’s progress can be rewarding and empowering. The process encourages beginning teachers to re-examine their Individual Learning Plan, thereby keeping their professional goals current and relevant as they continue to reflect on and refine their teaching practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Year Review (worksheet)</td>
<td>Center: Content Area Focus, Overarching Professional Goal and Impact on Student Learning. Four corners of the worksheet are the same with Framework Domain/Component, Supporting Goal, Plan and Evidence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the documents under the heading Reviewing Progress at Mid-Year, the conceptual framework category of Self-Directed Development is referenced. The section Reviewing Progress at Mid-Year outlines the process and benefits of having beginning teachers reflect on their professional growth midway through the school year. “Through Reviewing Progress at Mid-Year, beginning teachers will be able to articulate their professional growth to date using relevant data from classroom practice and refine their professional growth.”
Table 46

*Reflecting on Professional Growth*

| Why Reflect on Professional Growth? | As teachers and schools begin to make plans in the spring for the start of the next school year, beginning teachers are naturally thinking back to the start of the current school year and considering how far they have come and how they know what to do differently the next time. The *Reflecting on Professional Growth* conversation helps teachers begin to create a vision for next year as they identify new areas for growth and foster a disposition for life-long learning and development. |

The section Reflecting on Professional Growth focused on goal-setting at the end of the teachers’ first year. This allows for teachers to reflect on their first year as well as “helps teachers begin to create a vision for next year as they identify new areas for growth and foster a disposition for life-long learning and development.” Each sub-section of Reflecting on Professional Growth requires the mentor to guide the beginning teacher through the process of reassessing their performance, review their Individual Learning Plan Goals and Mid-Year Review worksheets, use evidence, and plan the next steps prior to creating their goals for their next year of teaching. This section was coded as goal-setting based on professional role.

**Site A: Summary of Differentiated Supervision**

The researcher coded the qualitative data gathered to the conceptual framework of Differentiated Supervision by Allan A. Glatthorn’s (1997). Allan Glatthorn identified Differentiated Supervision as a method of supervision that
supports all new teachers. “Differentiated supervision is an approach to supervision that provides teachers with options about the kinds of supervisory and evaluative services they receive” (p. 3). Differentiated Supervision centers on the premise that providing teachers with supports can foster their professional development. The three areas of Differentiated Supervision are:

1) Intensive Development;

2) Cooperative Development; and

3) Self-Directed Development.

The Site A data were reviewed from the principal interview, teacher questionnaire, and district documents in relationship to the three categories of Differentiated Supervision. In the category of Intensive Development, all teacher respondents indicated they had experienced Clinical Supervision/Formal Evaluations. One principal indicated that department chairs and administrators participate in Formal Evaluations of new teachers. In the documents, under the section Setting Professional Goals, the sub-section “How do I Set Professional Goals,” indicated, “As a result, they will not only be better prepared for the first evaluation conferences with the site administrator, but can also be strong, articulate advocates for their professional development.” All new teachers indicated that they received coaching and mentoring during their first year of teaching. Both principals indicated that all new teachers receive a mentor, and one referenced the curriculum provided to mentors to follow in every new teacher’s first year. The binder of documents reviewed is the same binder provided to mentors as their coaching resource and
therefore, coded as mentoring. Only one teacher respondent indicated that he/she did not have a Focused Observation during their induction program. One principal referenced Focused Observations in the ideal induction program, but neither principal respondent acknowledged Focused Observations as part of the formal induction program. In the documents, the section Conducting Classroom Observations is devoted to instructing the mentor on how to conduct a classroom evaluation. Additionally, the document indicated that conducting mentor observations is a formal process and therefore also coded under Clinical Supervision/Formal Evaluation.

Note: 5 teachers, 2 principals, 1 mentor binder.

Figure 9. Glatthorn Intensive Development (N=8)

In the category of Cooperative Development, no respondent participated in Action Research, and neither principal indicated Action Research as part of induction. In the documents, under the section Assembling a Class Profile, the sub-
section Step 3: Select a Case Study-Student (optional) outlined the process for conducting a case study on one student. All teacher respondents indicated participation in a Collaborative Team. All teacher respondents also indicated participation in Curriculum Development. The two teams the principal indicated new teachers being involved in were course level teams and instructional teams. One principal respondent indicated that department chairs observed new teachers participation on teams, as well as building’s expectations for membership on particular teams; since the nature of course level teams and instructional teams is to create curriculum and support instructional practices through strategies and lesson planning. The two principal responses were coded as Collaborative Team and Curriculum Development. In the documents, under the section Exploring School and Community Resources, the sub-sections provided information alluding to collaboration with members of the school community. In the section Why Explore School and Community Resources, the document indicated, “This information will help them take full advantage of critical programs and resources while setting the stage for future collaboration with colleagues, parents, and other support agencies.”

Also, under Step 1: Identify School Resources, the document stated, “Take some time together to review the school staff roster and district directory to help identify key resource personnel and programs.” These two areas were coded for both Collaborative Teams and Curriculum Development. Monthly meetings for new teachers were coded as Professional Dialogues based on the structure, organization, topics discussed, and teacher interaction in these meetings. All teacher and
principal respondents indicated new teacher participation in Professional Dialogues. In the section Why Explore School and Community Resources, two sections were coded for Professional Dialogues, Step 2: Discuss School Designations, and School and Community Resources worksheets. These were coded as such because under Step 2: Discuss School Designations staff meetings are referenced. The School and Community Resources worksheet requires beginning teachers to articulate who to contact and for what purpose, thus creating a structured discussion of professional issues. Two teacher respondents indicated their participation in a Peer Observation, and one principal referenced Peer Observations in their ideal induction program that is not part of the current induction program. In the documents, the section Conducting Classroom Observations is devoted to instructing the mentor on how to conduct a classroom evaluation.

Note: 5 teachers, 2 principals, 1 mentor binder.

*Figure 10. Glatthorn Cooperative Development (N=8)*
In the category of Self-Directed Development, all five respondents indicated experience in goal-setting based on generic-skills of teaching and professional role. Four respondents indicated goal-setting based on mixed resources. Four respondents indicated goal-setting based on subject-specific skills. Principal respondents made no reference or indication of Self-Directed Development in the school and district induction program. However, throughout the documents, goal setting was referenced. Goal-setting based on generic skills of teaching were coded as such based on the individualized nature of the process and different needs of new teachers. Therefore, when objectives or goals were mentioned without specifics, they were coded as generic. Goals centered on Charlotte Danielson’s Framework for Teaching, were coded as related to professional role. In the documents, under the section Setting Professional Goals, in sub-section Step 4: Development of Individual Learning Plan, one heading referenced the topic of Content Area Focus and Impact on Student Learning. This was coded as a Goal based on subject-specific skills. The section Reflecting on Professional Growth focused on the beginning teacher’s focus on professional goals and was coded as professional role.
Note: 5 teachers, 2 principals, 1 mentor binder.

Figure 11. Glatthorn Self-Directed Development (N=8)

Based on the research findings, Site A utilized three differentiated categories in their current induction program. Intensive Development is utilized in the form of Mentoring and Clinical Supervision. Cooperative Development is utilized at the school and district level through Professional Dialogues in the new teacher monthly meetings, Curriculum Development, and Collaborative Teams. Self-Directed Development is utilized through the work of the mentor to support the beginning teacher's goal-setting and professional growth by creating an Individual Learning Plan, setting professional goals and revisiting those goals, at the mid and end of their first year of teaching.

Site B: Demographics

The second case-study site was located just northwest of the city of Chicago. The two high schools utilized in the research are part of a high school district
consisting of nine high schools. The majority student populations in the district from school year 2013 were as follows: White (62.5%), Asian (7.2%), Hispanic or Latino (25.4%), and Black or African American (2.4%). Enrollment for the first high school consisted of 2,061 students for the school year 2013-2014. Enrollment for the second high school consisted of 1,835 students for the school year 2013-2014. The district's percentage of low-income students was 25.4%, whereas the state of Illinois' percentage for FY2013 was 49.9%. The percent of low-income students for the first site was 36.1% and the second site was 42.4%.

Data were collected at this first site in this district on April 17, 2014. The principal interview took place in the principal’s office at 9:00 am. The interview was recorded. At the conclusion of the interview, 20 teacher questionnaires for new teachers were provided to the principal. The 20 teachers were generated from a list of early career licensed staff provided by the Director of Professional Learning and Instructional Technology. The questionnaires were handed to the principal prior to the researcher exiting the building. The questionnaires were coded as Building B1 in the top right header. Data for the second site in this district was collected on April 17, 2014. The principal interview took place in the principal’s office at 1:00 pm. The interview was recorded. At the conclusion of the interview, thirty-four teacher questionnaires for new teachers were provided to the principal. The thirty-four teachers were generated from a list of early career licensed staff provided by the Director of Professional Learning and Instructional Technology. The questionnaires
were handed to the principal prior to the researcher exiting the building. The questionnaires were coded as Building B2 in the top right header.

Site B: Principal Interview

Gender, Age and Experience

The respondents were one male and one female. The age span ranged from 38 years of age to 39 years of age. The mean age of the responding principals was 38.5 years of age. The number of years the respondents has been administrators ranged from 9 years to 12 years. The mean average years of being an administrator in Site B was 10.5 years. One respondent had been a teacher for 5 years and the other had been a teacher for 9 years. The mean average years of teaching experience in Site B for administrators was 7 years.

Table 47

Gender Representation of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Present</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 48

Age Range and Mean Age of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 49

Range and Mean Number of Years as an Administrator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 50

Range and Mean Number of Years as a Teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were asked about their attainment of teaching credentials. Both respondents indicated receiving their teaching certification through a conventional university program. Both respondents hold Type 9 certifications in content related fields. One respondent is endorsed to teach social studies, history, U.S. history, world history, sociology, and English and the other respondent is endorsed in Spanish, French, and mathematics. Respondents were also asked to indicate their highest level of education attained. The respondents both hold a master’s degree and indicated they also possess a Type 75 Administrators certification. Respondents were asked if education had been their only field of employment. Both respondents indicated that education had been their only field of employment.

Table 51

How Teacher Certification was Attained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent 1</th>
<th>University of Illinois Conventional Program.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 2</td>
<td>My undergraduate, from University of Illinois</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 52

*Teacher Certifications Respondents Currently Possess*

| Respondent 1 | I had a Type 9 as a teacher. I have a Type 75 now as an administrator. In Social Studies, History, U.S. History, World History, Sociology and then English. |
| Respondent 2 | Type 9 certification: Teaching of Spanish, teaching of French, and mathematics. |

Table 53

*Highest Level of Education*

| Respondent 1 | Master’s Degree |
| Respondent 2 | I have a master’s degree, and then I went on to my Type 75 certification. |

Table 54

*List of Previous Careers*

| Respondent 1 | None |
| Respondent 2 | None |

**Induction Programming at District and School Levels**

Both respondents were asked questions about the induction process into the school and district, as well as their perceptions of the purpose and components of new teacher induction programs. Respondent one indicated that the induction program is divided into district and building components. The district level component consisted of logistics. Logistics includes benefits, getting a substitute teacher, and “practical concerns that are standard to the whole district.” At the school level, respondent one indicated that building induction included new teachers receiving their mentors and working with them, “lunch and learn”
professional development led by a teacher expert, informal peer evaluations, and participation in professional learning communities (PLC). Respondent two referenced only an in-building induction program comprised of working with mentors, building tours, monthly “lunch and learn” events, and school specialists working with new teachers to review aspects of the specialists supporting role in the building.

Table 55

*Suppose I was a first year teacher in your building. What would my induction be like?*

| Respondent 1 | At the district level there is a series of workshops that teachers go through that involve things like the logistics of things like benefits, but then in addition what do you do when you need to get a substitute, what do you do, like sort of the practical concerns that are standard to the whole district. For example, that’s a good one, when you’re not going to be school, what do you do? Things like that. In addition to that, safety trainings, required ... mandated reporter trainings, things like that are pretty want to play legal requirements, ADHD, blood borne pathogens, that stuff is standardized through an online system that is done through the district. Everybody does the same thing every year.

In building, there is a teacher coordinator of the First-Year Teacher Mentor program; each teachers given a mentor. There is a process by which they’d be observed by their mentor, and observe their mentor, get feedback from each other, take that feedback into periodic ... I think there are about four or five per year what they’ll take at a lunching learns, where the teachers, mentor and mentee are together, all of them in a ... what are we learning from each other, what instructional strategies are you encountering, what are the things that you’re noticing as challenges, what do you need to get better at.

Informally there is a Peer Observation group system. That’s not mandatory. I’d consider it as part of an induction program, because many of our first-year teachers are encouraged by most of their peers and their administrators to join it. It’s not governed by the administration. It is purely teacher-led and teacher-driven. It is a very high functioning productive group that consists of over a third of our teachers in the building who choose to engage in a process that’s organized by instructional coach to observe each other and
interact with each other in specifically instruction strategies.

Then at the least induction-like, but yet it is an induction, the professional learning community structure in which any course or team you're on, there is a professional learning team on every Thursday, or in a later time like today, it is meeting and working together on assessment and student performance and also making instructional changes based upon the data, etcetera. Although that's not formal induction process, it is something that we ... It does become induction into the way that we operate here because every teacher isn't using that same process. Those are the major components standing around that have been currently in place.

Respondent 2

In August, there would be a meeting run by a couple of our teachers. A teacher, I believe, runs it along with another teacher. You meet before school starts.

This year it was in the library. I don't know if that's always where it is held. It consists of meeting with your mentors. I went there to say a few words. Of course I was new this year as well so I've also attended some of the meetings throughout the year.

You get a tour of the building; just get acclimated to the history of the district and the community. After that, you have a mentor in your division.

Once a month there are lunches that are run by the (teacher) who I mentioned earlier and (teacher), and they bring in specialists. For example, a couple of them have been run by also a special education teacher just going over IP meetings, and then another special education teacher came in. She does the special education math classes. She talks about the courses that she teaches and how she applies services to the students.

The social workers or counselors will go in talk about the different programs, counseling services for the students, so once a month, if the teachers go it is optional if they go. It's held at two of the three lunch periods typically every month, depending on when teachers have their lunches.

Respondents were asked how new teachers responded to the induction program. One respondent said that new teachers respond favorably. The respondent stated, “my take on it is that they respond favorably to the opportunities
that are there.” Respondent one indicated that there are aspects that could be done better. The respondent referenced a recent lockdown drill and learned that many teachers do not know what to do in this situation. Another reference was made pertaining to the need to do a better job, “clarifying some of the things that new teachers just don’t know.” The other principal indicated that new teachers respond positively to an induction program. This information is based on attendance at new teacher meetings. Respondent two discussed that the content of the new teacher meeting prior to the open house consisted of “what you should expect and how to handle parents that might want to focus on grades.”

Table 56

*How do new teachers respond to induction in your building?*

| Respondent 1 | From what I’ve seen, it’s my first year as the principal of the school. My take on it is that they respond favorably to the opportunities that are there. I believe in my own analysis of things there are things that we need to do better job of communicating. It’s far more instructional-focused. There are operational things that I’m seeing that the first-year teachers do not know. For example, we had a lockdown drill yesterday. There are many teachers who do not know really what they’re supposed to do. If there is a soft lockdown, you grab … there is kid in the hallway, whoever it is, you say, come in here and you shut the door. You continue to use soft lockdown. That’s not your student. It doesn’t matter, because you don’t want them in the hall.

They respond well to those things. I think we need to do a better job of clarifying some of the things that new teachers just don’t know. It’s easy to forget how little they know when they enter the profession, not to be offensive to them. We go through year-after-year and saw it’s easy to forget it. New teachers don’t have a clear sense of that. |

| Respondent 2 | It’s been positive. I try to go to as many lunches as I can. In the beginning of the year it was better attended. This last
month I went and I was the only one that went, but I think it had something to do with the invitation. It was through Gmail, through the Google calendar and it didn’t pop into your calendar during the period. It sat at the top of the day, and I think people could have missed it.

First semester was well attended. The one right before open house was very well attended because it was information on open house and what you should expect and how to handle parents that might want to focus on grades. Then of course teachers get very busy and around finals I’m sure they really don’t want to go.

The respondents were asked what they thought the ideal induction program looked like. The first respondent stated that it would consist of “must-knows.” These must-knows center around a “clear sense of what are the must-knows; don’t ever mess this up things, like that, like the crisis plan, like things where you can’t have a second chance or things like that.” The respondent indicated that this could be achieved through indoctrinating new teachers to the school’s instructional practical and philosophical practices. The principal stated this could be achieved through explaining how and why the school and district do certain things. The principal gave the example of the district’s reassessment program and thinks it could be better explained. Respondent two indicated an emphasis on a four-year program that staggers the time commitments of a new teacher. Additionally, respondent two wanted to include a social emotional learning component for teachers to be aware of what students are experiencing, how to plan lessons for a 45 and 90 minute blocks, more administrative involvement with new teachers, and how to handle unique
situations that occur in the first years of teaching. Examples of unique situations include handling difficult parents and difficult teachers.

Table 57

*Please describe what you think the ideal induction program would be like*

| Respondent 1 | I think an ideal induction program would consist of the ... like I just mentioned, a clear sense of what are the must-knows; don't ever mess this up things, like that, like the crisis plan, like things where you can't have a second chance or things like that. You got to know what that is. More importantly, and I think this is something that the school has attempted to do here, and our district has attempted to do is induction program has to ... I don't know how to say this, but indoctrinate ... in the positive sense, indoctrinate new teachers into the instructional approach and the philosophy of our school.

For example, our school believes strongly that students should have opportunities for reassessment and opportunities to develop mastery as opposed to only being assessed. Then that assessment is over now. Here is your D and we're moving on. Our induction program needs to include its explanation of that philosophy. Why do we believe that's the case? Then training in how does that ... how do I do that as a teacher? Do I have not coming at your school? Is there a place that I give a reassessment? Then the student is supposed to go. I'll take that on their own time, what would I do when a student is getting incomplete? It's now the end of the third quarter and there are semester incomplete still on the books.

The biggest thing about an induction program in my opinion is that the philosophy of how we operate in the biggest picture has to be communicated and has to be reinforced in a way that we currently do things. It's very loose. There is teacher who runs it, the mentor readings that may not even share with the philosophy of our school. I don't know she is the person that was identified. In this my first-year, I have not ... we haven't moved somebody from our enrollment, like that until I really know what I'm doing. I think an ideal induction program must be justice-focused as the instructional program that you have for students, because otherwise teachers just don't know what
we really are at the school that they work at. They know they're going to do the thing. They don't know who we are as a building. It's a high priority for me moving forward.

| Respondent 2 | I think it would definitely be longer than one year. Probably a four-year program to match the four-year, ten-year cycle. Obviously less and less time commitment, but the first year I would like to see it involve some readings that go with the highs and lows that the teachers might be experiencing. Also some very exclusive education on social emotional learning for the students, and the different stresses that our students might be facing. (Site B) is a different school. It is a full title school. It's a majority-minority school, so 50% of our students are Hispanic. There’s 43% low income, and so really educating the parents on how to help the families. I think there could be a little more focus on that, as well as how to plan lessons, a 90-minute block, how to best plan for a 90 minute block.

There should be multiple changes in pace, changes in structure, not just two, not just three versus a 45-minute block. For teachers who are going between the two, that could be a difficult balance to go in to 45 minutes and say ‘this is my last’ and then going to a 90 and then change it.

I would like it to be a little more involved the first year, then the second year a little less, maybe every other month. Have meetings, and talk about how’s the second year going, what supports do the teachers need, what changes have there been in the community, in the school and then just tapered off so that the fourth year maybe it’s just one time each semester just checking in.

Because the retention rate for teachers could be better and a lot of it probably has to do with support that they’re afforded and how you handle difficult parents? How do you handle difficult teachers? In a big school district, there’s so much more that goes into it.|

Principals were asked what the induction needs of a first year teacher with no prior work experience are. Respondent one indicated that novice teachers require immediate comforts to be addressed. The respondent defined the
immediate comforts as: “The most immediate things are the ones that you got somebody who is 23 years old and they literally don't know what it's like to have a full-time job. Some of that stuff is absolutely essential.” Additionally, the respondent referenced a sense of urgency: “You’re actually directly responsible for the safety of the students that you’re around. You may go home to your mother and father’s home tonight; would they take care of you? You’re the mother or the father of these kids in your room while they’re in our building, and so you have got to recognize the significance of that responsibility.” The respondent expounded further by stating that novice teachers need to understand that “you’re the one” with the responsibility of educating the students before them. Respondent two indicated that new teachers with no prior work experience require a strong mentor who is willing to meet with them weekly. The mentors should support new teachers on how to plan their lessons, how to work with students, and how to balance their work. Additionally, “having someone weekly to sit down with you and say ‘How are you doing? Let’s look at your lesson plans for the week,’ and then maybe even at the end of the week, ‘what did you modify, or what would you do next year?’ and talking through it, because having that the first year would be a lot.” Respondent two indicated that the benefit of this would be in the second year the work is done and lessons would only need to be modified instead of fully created. Additionally, the respondent indicated the importance of discussing how to hold limits on students, since the age gap is minimal between a novice teacher and a high school student.
Finally, respondent two indicated how to handle difficult students and parents as a common need of a novice teacher.

Table 58

Please tell me what the induction need(s) of a first teacher with no prior work experience are

| Respondent 1 | I alluded to some of them there. I think some of them will include immediate comfort ... I need to know where do I get my keys, where do I get my ... does my ID open the door 24 hours a day, does my ID open the door only certain times? The most immediate things are the ones that you got somebody who is 23 years old and they literally don't know what it's like to have a full-time job. Some of that stuff is absolutely essential.

The second is in a school the urgency of ... you're actually directly responsible for the safety of the students that you're around. You may go home to your mother and father's home tonight; would they take care of you? You're the mother or the father of these kids in your room while they're in our building, and so you have got to recognize the significance of that responsibility. I believe that most importantly is the sort of ... I feel little bit of the tough love ... you got to make sure right now fast. You're the one. That to me is an urgent message to the first-year teacher with no work experience. |
| Respondent 2 | Yes, that was me. I think it was definitely having a strong mentor who's willing to meet with you at least weekly. For me it was lesson planning. I majored in Spanish and French and then I minored in mathematics. I remember my education courses, but no one ever really sat down with you and said this is how you do your lesson plan. This is how you know what to do with the students and what to provide them and how much homework to give and the balance. I think having someone weekly to sit down with you and say ‘How are you doing? Let's look at your lesson plans for the week,’ and then maybe even at the end of the week ‘what did you modify or what would you do next year?’ and talking through it because having that the first year would be a lot. But then the second year when you open your files and see we met twice every week and I already modified my lessons for the next year, so I think that is definitely necessary. |
I think for a first year teacher if they're young there probably can be some conversation about how to hold limits to the students. How to have them not view you as a friend because you could be 22 or 23 years old. That could be very difficult for people who were just in college and were very friendly with classmates who were 18 when they were 21. Now you’re 22 and they’re 18 year olds and it’s a different dynamic. That’s why I think there could probably be some structure or just tips for that. What do you do when kids make inappropriate comments to you? How do you hold that those boundaries?

Where if you’re a second career you're probably in the late 20s or early 30s they look like kids to you. It’s a completely different outlook in my opinion. I think it will be probably a little more just about how do you handle kids who want to view you as a friend.

Then also how do you handle parents who view you like their child. Because there’s also that age where they look at you, ‘Well, you’re just too young. You don’t understand,’ but I’m still a professional. I still went through all the education and I am your child’s teacher. I think there would probably more of that for a new teacher versus I would think for a second career person.

Respondents were asked to provide examples of how they address new teacher needs. Respondent one stated the school has done a “poor job of it.” The respondent referenced the lockdown drill as an area for additional “intermediate training” and that communication is paramount in order not to overlook individual needs. Communicating directly about procedures and instructional parts are extremely important and should be done before the school year begins. Respondent two indicated, “I don’t know how well they’re addressed. I think the teachers do a great job that run it.” Respondent two elaborated by stating, “I think that we could probably meet with the teachers more often during the school year and provide
more services and even divide those teachers up into first-year teachers and then career-changers.” Additionally, the respondent indicated that young teachers might be too embarrassed to ask for assistance, and this reluctance can be addressed by providing supports to them at the building level.

Table 59

*Please provide me with an example of how you address those needs*

| Respondent 1 | Yeah, well, part of it is we've done I'd say need from our first-year people here, poor job of it. We need to have ... One thing we analyzed yesterday with our lockdown drill is we need intermediate training in those areas, for the whole building. Then I'd say separately in the new teacher induction process when they may meet with different people from different administration of the building the day where they were here before school starts. That's got to be something that's communicated very directly in terms of how serious need that is. I think that out-of-the-gate giving information to them about these procedures before school even begins. The instructional parts, those are extremely important. Again, like I said before, this is the ... These are things we can't mess up, components right out-of-the-gate. |
| Respondent 2 | Here, I don't know how well they're addressed. I think the teachers do great job that run it. They definitely bring in the specialists that they need to bring in. I think that we could probably meet with the teachers more often during the school year and provide more services and even divide those teachers up into first-year teachers and then career-changers. There are some things that they all need. Like I said there are some things that a young teacher might need a little support might be embarrassed to ask for it, but to say 'this is some support that we're going to provide you. When you walk through the hall and you're asked for a pass it's not an insult; you look young. It's a compliment.' There're just different struggles that they might have. |

Principals were asked what the induction needs of a career-change teacher to education were. The first respondent stated that career-change teachers often “find
the world of education shockingly freeing and shockingly autonomous.” As an example, the respondent reported that a career-change teacher informed him “if I said that to my [old] boss, I’d get fired. In the public school system, people are relatively free to say what they wish.” The respondent continued that an induction program need for a career-change teacher to education is “to empower them to lead.” Career-change teachers have been leaders in another field and have experiences that novice teachers do not. The respondent continued by stating that a career-change teacher would need to know how “to step up as a leader in a professional learning community, which is unique to a career-changer’s thought process, particularly one who is ten years older than a newbie who just got here. That person may need to know when not to say certain things. The career-changer may need to know you have wisdom that someone else doesn’t. Don’t hesitate. You don’t need to hesitate. You don’t have to fear for your livelihood in a situation like this.” Respondent two indicated that career-change teachers experience “a whirlwind of emotions” because it has been several years since they graduated high school. Therefore, a career-change teacher may not recall the high school experience as vividly as a novice teacher. Respondent two emphasized the importance of “helping them learn to address those types of needs that the students are still high-schoolers and there are different expectations for them than there were in the workplace.” Also, noted was guidance for the career-change teacher on how to interact with difficult parents.
Table 60

*Please tell me what the induction need(s) of a career-changer to education are*

| Respondent 1 | Some of that ... Nothing you can take it for granted. Most likely I think that my experience for career-changers through education is that they already ... They find some that ... They find the world of education shockingly freeing and shockingly autonomous.

There is a sense of ... I can’t say how many I’ve heard from a career-changer a statement like, "Well, if I said that to my boss, I’d get fired." In the public school system, their people are relatively free to say what they wish. I think for career-changers, the most important induction need for them is to empower them to lead. Sometimes there are people who have been ... They’ve not been a boss in a company; they’ve been less perhaps empowered as an employee, which is one of the reasons they left that position. They didn’t feel all things are under control or satisfaction.

People who come into teaching in my opinion from another career, they feel all of a sudden a passion about this is worthwhile, what I’m doing is really worthwhile, I feel most special when I did I was at a bank or whatever else. They may not feel as empowered to lead as the current climate of teaching. What I feel like one of those ... How to step up as a leader in a professional learning community is unique to a career-changer thought process, particularly one who is ten years older than a newbie who just got here. That person may need to know when not to say certain things. The career-changer may need to know you have wisdom that someone else doesn’t. Don’t hesitate. You don’t need to hesitate. You don’t have to fear for your livelihood in a situation like this.

| Respondent 2 | Yes. I think a career-changer they’re used to working with adults. Then you go into a school with kids and it can be just a whirlwind of emotions. Kids are experiencing so much in their life and especially, at least here, so much outside of the school that you have no control over.

That can be far different than the teacher who’s always known they wanted to be a teacher, who just left high school and went to college and is back. They’re still in touch with what it was like to be in high school. Often career-changers
might be 10 years out of college, which means they’re 14 or 15 out of high school and they don’t remember that as well. I think helping them learn to address those types of needs that they are still high schoolers and there are different expectations for them than there were in the work place. I’d never worked in the corporate world, but I have friends that have. I know that it can be a distinctly different place.

Also I think similar to new teachers, first-year out of college teachers, some education on how deal with difficult parents. You have to really monitor and edit what you’re saying to them. Sometimes emotions can get the best of you, so it’s really just talking through situations before they occur.

The principal respondents were asked how they address the needs of a career-change teacher. The first respondent indicated that the school and district “does not have a differentiated plan for career-changers versus first-year teachers.”

The second respondent indicated, “I don’t think we do them differently currently for career-changer versus new teachers, our first-year teachers.”

Table 61

Please provide an example of how you address those needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent 1</th>
<th>We don’t have a differentiated plan for career-changers versus first-year teachers.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 2</td>
<td>Again, I don’t think we do them differently currently for career-changer versus new teachers, our first-year teachers. I think we do provide some training. I think we can be better or more explicit in certain areas of need that our students have and our community has and just preparing our teachers for it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Principals were asked if they believed that any new teachers’ needs were not met and if so, what those needs might be. The first respondent indicated that there evidently are needs not meet, based on not retaining all new teachers for a second
year. The respondent did not reference a specific new teacher need; rather the respondent referenced the new teacher’s desire to find job security. The respondent clarified this by stating, “There is a need for, I don’t want to say job security, a need for ... maybe just that ... Some teachers feel like they’re nervous about am I going to make it? I don’t know how to meet that need without being disingenuous, because we do have to hold people to a standard where they know nothing is for granted. Don’t be scared, but we ... bring your A game to the position. I think if there is any need, it’s not how to teach, it’s not training in some of the logistical things, we do okay with those things. I think to some degree maybe it’s a sense of security.” The second respondent acknowledged, “I can't imagine that we're perfect. I don’t know.” The second respondent then referred to walk-through observations of all new teachers. “Then I also did a walk-through to ask them what they need and what support we could give them. Of course no one really said to me I need this.” This respondent indicated that some new teachers requested more walk-throughs in their classes so students could get to know the principal. Additionally, both respondents assumed that more time and guidance from the mentors is a need not met for all new teachers.
| Respondent 1 | The fact that we didn't retain every single new teacher that we hired signifies to me that there could be a gap in what we provide and what is needed. Sometimes you don't ... you want to look and evaluate are we doing all that we need to do to put people in the best position? At the same time you want to think they just didn't have it so they can't stay. I'd like to think that we do a good job of making our teachers feel welcomed and secured, and feeling like they're in a good position.

I do feel that there are some who ... There is a need for, I don't want to say job security, a need for ... maybe just that ... Some teachers feel like they're nervous about am I going to make it? I don't know how to meet that need without being disingenuous, because we do have to hold people to a standard where they know nothing is for granted. Don't be scared, but we ... bring your A game to the position. I think if there is any need it's not how to teach, it's not training in some of the logistical things, we do okay with those things. I think to some degree maybe it's a sense of security. |
| Respondent 2 | Let me think about that ... I would have to guess yes. I can't imagine that we're perfect. I don't know. As a first year principal, I did a walk-through with all my teachers this year just to get to know them. Then I did meet with all my first and second-year teachers individually in a meeting. Then I also did a walk-through on them to ask them what they need and what support. Of course no one really said to me I need this.

A couple of teachers said to me "Would you walk through the classes more and let students get to know you," and as they gave me that advice that's what I did. I can imagine that there are some teachers who wished that their mentor maybe have more time.

Everyone gets busy. Being a teacher is an extremely demanding job and so everyone gets busy. Often I can imagine that there are teachers whose mentor maybe had a lot of time at the beginning of the year and then it tapered off to where they barely know they had a mentor at this point.

I would say that they probably could use a little more guidance, through no one's fault. Everyone just gets busy, and when you're mentor, you're taking on helping someone else but you still have all your preps, all your other work that you have to do and then help support another person. |
Respondents were asked about the induction program for someone not hired at the start of the school year. The first respondent indicated they have not experienced this situation, but they did hire a district retiree during the school year. The respondent stated, “We don’t have an established process for somebody who comes in. They're falling into the new teacher pool. Whatever that new teacher group is with regard to their meetings they’re just now in it, like a kid who transferred in and we should look after one.” Respondent two stated, “I don’t know because we did have maternity leave people come in, but we didn't hire anybody mid-year so I don’t have enough information to answer that.”

Table 63

*Please tell me what the process of induction is for someone not hired at the start of the school year*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent 1</th>
<th>We didn’t have to do that this year. When we ... We had one person going, we evenly had somebody come in, that was a retiree. They know the process here. We don’t have an established process for somebody who comes in. They're falling into the new teacher pool. Whatever that new teacher group is with regard to their meetings they’re just now in it, like a kid who transferred in and we should look after one.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 2</td>
<td>I don’t know because we did have maternity leave people come in, but we didn't hire anybody mid-year so I don’t have enough information to answer that. I’m sorry.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were asked who informed new teachers about the day-to-day needs of a teacher. The first respondent indicated those individuals are primarily mentors and the division assistants. The second respondent indicated those individuals are mentors and teachers who run the induction program. Respondent two indicated that “the formal mentor, yes; division assistance, no; division heads,
not really.” When asked if those people are part of the formal mentor program, the second respondent stated that the teachers who lead new teacher induction and the individual mentors are both part of the formal induction program.

Table 64

*Who informs new teachers (both novice and career-changer teachers) regarding the day-to-day needs of a teacher and who is this person(s)?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent 1</th>
<th>It’s a bunch of people. We have … Every new teacher does have a mentor in their department. Every new teacher has nearby them a division assistant who is a sort of the research person for the whole division.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 2</td>
<td>That would be the new teacher induction program, so at the beginning of the year it was run by (teacher) and (teacher). When they meet in September that’s what they go over with everybody. They hand out the keys and they go over the roles of this is who you need to go for this. They are also introduced to their mentors and the mentors went down to meet with them during lunch and for the second half of the day I believe. Their mentors are also there to explain it to them, but on that first day meeting the nuts and bolts are pretty much given to them. Who you go to for this, who you go to for that, if you need technology help this is the person that you go to.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 65

*Is that person part of your formal induction program?*

| Respondent 1 | The formal mentor, yes, that person is. The division heads interestingly are not formal part of the induction program. At the beginning of the ... One thing I neglected to mention earlier that ... I'll sort of later answer that, the day before ... new teachers are coming earlier than everybody else, the day before ... Everybody else joins us for two days. There is a partial day where new teachers are in our building meeting our student services staff, meeting our assistant principals in those areas, sometimes division heads are there, but sometimes division heads are not there. It kind of depends. The formal mentor, yes; division assistance, no; division heads, not really. |
| Respondent 2 | Yes. |

Respondents were asked to discuss anything additionally. The first respondent continued to discuss how induction should be focused mostly on instruction. This respondent self-reflected as to whether or not that would be more effective than what is currently occurring in their building. The second respondent indicated nothing additional to discuss.
Table 66

*Is there anything we did not discuss you would like to address at this time?*

| Respondent 1 | I don't think so. I think these are it. They’re the questions that ... over the top I’d been in other environments with significantly more involved induction processes, and I’ve been in the district for the four-year induction process. It was almost complete instructionally focused. Each year was a different type of instructional thing. One was understanding by design; backward design structuring, one year was cooperative learning for that year. One year was assessment literacy, something like that. That was it. I don’t know that was any more effective than what we have. I’m not sure if that’s a product of who is doing it because that seemed like a pretty darn good plan to me. It seemed like sort of get a feel for what the building was like. |
| Respondent 2 | I don’t think so. |

**Site B: Teacher Questionnaire**

The original protocol for sampling teachers required that teachers taking the questionnaire at each site would have zero to three years’ teaching experience. One respondent returned the Teacher Questionnaire fulfilling the research requirement, as well as being a career-changer. Three additional respondents with 4 years teaching experience returned the Teacher Questionnaire. Therefore, the sample criterion was changed to 4 years for this site. The usage of these respondents’ responses provided the necessary sample to study the research questions in this district and, therefore, changed the original sampling plan.

**Gender, Age and Experience**

The administration distributed copies of the Teacher Questionnaire to teachers after the researcher left the school site. Principals indicated office
managers would place copies of the Teacher Questionnaire in staff school mailboxes from the list provided by the Director of Professional Learning and Instructional Technology. The respondents were equally male and female. Males represented 50% of the respondents and females represented 50%. The age span ranged from 25 years of age to 33 years of age. The mean age of the responding teachers was 31 years of age.

Table 67

*Gender Representation of Respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Present</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 68

*Age Range and Mean Age of Respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of years of experience, one respondent had three years of experience and three had four years of experience. The average experience for a responding teacher was 3.75 years of teaching experience.

Table 69

*Range and Mean Number of Years as a Teacher*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents were asked about their attainment of teaching credentials. The majority of respondents indicated they received their teaching certification through a master’s degree program. One respondent indicated receipt of teaching credentials through a bachelor’s degree program. Four teachers indicated they possess Type 9 certifications in content related fields. Respondents also indicated their highest level of education attained. Three of the teaching respondents have master’s degrees and one respondent holds a bachelor’s degree. One respondent indicated they have additional educational credits, but not a confirmed degree. Respondents indicated entry into the school district at different times.

Table 70

*How Teacher Certification was Attained*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent 1</th>
<th>Master’s Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 2</td>
<td>Master’s Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 3</td>
<td>Master’s Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 4</td>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 71

*Teacher Certifications Respondents Currently Possess*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent 1</th>
<th>Type 9 certification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 2</td>
<td>Type 9 certification in Physics, Math, Business, Computer Science and Tech Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 3</td>
<td>Math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 4</td>
<td>Type 9 Math and Physical Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 72

*Highest Level of Education*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Master's Degree plus 30 additional graduate hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Master's Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Master's Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bachelor's Degree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 73

*When was respondent hired by the school district in which they currently work?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>May 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>June 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>May 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were asked if education was a second career. Two teaching respondents indicated that education was their only career. Two respondents indicated that education was a career change for them. One respondent indicated a previous career as a mechanical engineer. The second respondent entered education after a career as a market analyst working in real estate.

Table 74

*Respondents Career*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Present</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Novice</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career-changer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of Previous Careers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent 2</th>
<th>Mechanical Engineer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 3</td>
<td>Market Analyst for real estate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Induction Programming at District and School Levels

All the respondents were given a questionnaire asking them about their induction into the school and district, as well as their perceptions of the purpose and components of new teacher induction. Respondents indicated that the purposes of teacher induction program are to help them gain understanding of their role which includes: teaching skills, resource exposure, policies and regulations, the mentoring program, and opportunities within the school and district. Teachers were asked to describe their ideal induction program. All four respondents indicated a variety of ideas. Respondents indicated the importance of addressing deficiencies in teaching practice through application in the classroom with a variety of learners. Also, respondents indicated more assistance from mentors and more feedback on their instruction were ways to improve their practice.

Table 76

Please describe what you believe is the purpose of a teacher induction program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent 1</th>
<th>Prepare teachers with the skills need to be successful in the ever changing teaching environment.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 2</td>
<td>Expose teachers to resources, district/school regulations and policies, mentoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 3</td>
<td>Guide teachers as they become accustomed to new job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 4</td>
<td>To highlight opportunities around the school and district; to provide support for the first year(s) of the profession; to gain feedback from novice + experienced teachers; to grow professionally</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 77

Please describe what you think would be the ideal induction program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent 1</th>
<th>Less theory, more hands on experience. Fieldwork and student teaching are the most important aspects. More time should be spent on technology, ESL, special populations, adapting to changes, relevancy, lesson planning and best practices.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 2</td>
<td>Mentoring, observations and feedback, school/district knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 3</td>
<td>Mentoring by experienced teachers; lunch and learns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 4</td>
<td>All of the above, but separate between new to the district and new to the profession... I think there are valuable teaching/information to share with both groups that could differ slightly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were given three yes-or-no questions focused on their induction program. All respondents indicated that their district has a new teacher induction program in the first year of a new teacher’s employment in a district, and that they were part of the program. When asked whether the program of induction went beyond the first year of teaching, three respondents said it did and one said that it did not. This respondent indicated receiving induction at a different building during their first year of teaching and not receiving induction their second year of teaching in the district.

Table 78

Does the District Have a Program for New Teachers During the 1st Years of Teaching?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 79

Were You A Part of an Induction Program during Your 1st Year of Teaching?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 80

Does the Program go Beyond the 1st Year of Teaching?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher respondents were asked about the program of support beyond the first year of teaching. Only one respondent indicated that there was none. Three respondents indicated additional support that centered on mentoring. One participant indicated that the additional supports focused on groups that met four times a year. These groups worked via online and required additional readings and responsibilities of the teacher.
Please describe the program of support for teachers beyond their first year of teaching

| Respondent 1 | We have a group that meets four times a year. Everything is mostly email/Moodle based. There is required reading and responses. Most of the readings are out of date and not relevant. The program is more of a race to complete because you have to. No relevant learning has come from it. It is more of an extra thing to tack on. They try to encourage you to visit other classes one day as a group, but it is difficult to leave for a day. The most beneficial program was year 1 in the building called, 'lunch and learn'. Lunch was provided it was during all lunch periods. It was in our building and was extremely relevant to us specifically. |
| Respondent 2 | Induction/mentor program lasts two years |
| Respondent 3 | Year two mentor program |
| Respondent 4 | I believe there is. The 2nd year program headed by the mentors. It is more professional development: reading articles and discussing them with mentors; writing papers/ |

Teacher respondents were provided with a chart outlining Glatthorn’s (1997) Differentiated Supervision. The chart provided examples and explanations of the three categories: Intensive Development, Cooperative Development, and Self-Directed Development. Teacher respondents selected aspects of each category they have experienced in their induction program. In the category of Intensive Development, four teacher respondents indicated they had Coaching/Mentoring, Clinical Observations, and Focused Observations. In the category of Cooperative Development, all respondents indicated participation in a Peer Observation, Professional Dialogues, and Collaborative Teams. No respondent participated in Action Research. Also three respondents indicated their participation in Curriculum
Development. In the category of Self-Directed Development, all four respondents indicated experience in goal-setting based on professional role, generic-skills of teaching, and subject-specific skills. Three respondents indicated goal-setting based on mixed resources.

*Figure 12. Glatthorn Intensive Development (N=4)*

*Figure 13. Glatthorn Cooperative Development (N=4)*
Respondents were asked to indicate who in the district facilitated their induction program into the school. Three respondents indicated “other” in the form of district mentors. Two respondents indicated a district administrator as a facilitator of new teacher induction. One respondent indicated the building principal and two respondents indicated their department chair as a facilitator of induction in their building. Two respondents indicated that the assistant principal formally facilitated induction in their building. All four respondents indicated a teacher in their building as the facilitator of the induction program.

Figure 14. Glatthorn Self-Directed Development (N=4)
Respondents were asked what their professional needs were during their first year of teaching. Two respondents referenced their need for policies and procedures in the building. Two respondents indicated their need for collaboration with department or professional learning communities. One respondent indicated their need for graduate programs. One respondent mentioned their need for an explanation of the evaluation system. Respondents were asked to complete a Likert Scale addressing how the school addressed their needs. Two respondents gave the school a 5 out of 7. One respondent gave the school 6 out of 7. One respondent gave the school 7 out of 7.
Please describe your professional need(s) during your first year of teaching

| Respondent 1 | Learning the procedures of the building, discipline procedures, school procedures/culture, learning the staff/departments, school operating systems |
| Respondent 2 | Knowledge of policies/procedures and evaluation process, district academic goals |
| Respondent 3 | PLC time, guidance of creation of curriculum, weekly team meetings, monthly new teacher meetings |
| Respondent 4 | Graduate Programs |

Figure 16. Did your school address those needs?

Teacher respondents were asked to identify professional needs that were not met by their school. Two respondents indicated that all needs were met. One respondent indicated, “Everything was eventually learned in the lunch and learns, but some of these things were seven months after schools started.” One respondent highlighted the lack of “clarity of going about meeting requirements for the district. Taking classes at a school on quarters and getting reimbursed on semesters.”
Table 83

Please describe what professional needs were not met

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent 1</th>
<th>Everything was eventually learned in the lunch and learns, but some of these things were 7 months after schools started.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 4</td>
<td>The clarity of going about meeting requirements for the district. Taking classes at a school on quarters and getting reimbursed on semesters.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher respondents selected a variety of reasons from Ingersoll’s research as to why teachers leave the field of teaching to indicate why their professional needs were not met. Two respondents selected none of the reasons. One respondent indicated five reasons: inadequate administrative support, lack of district funds, lack of faculty influence/support, inadequate preparation of the program, and program interfered with your teaching and individual preparation time. One respondent selected “other” and wrote in “lack of awareness/flexibility to allow teachers to go through the program quarters and get reimbursed as if it were on semesters.”

Table 84

Why do you think your professional needs were not met?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent 1</th>
<th>Inadequate administrative support, lack of district funds, lack of faculty influence/support, inadequate preparation of the program, and program interfered with your teaching and individual preparation time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 2</td>
<td>Blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 3</td>
<td>Blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 4</td>
<td>Other: lack of awareness/flexibility to allow teachers to go through the program quarters and get reimbursed as if it were on semesters.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teacher respondents had the opportunity to write a few sentences about what they would change about their first year of teaching. One respondent indicated none by leaving the cell blank. One respondent indicated that she/he would have preferred broader knowledge other than covering basic questions. One respondent indicated the need for clearer objectives for teaching and professional learning communities. One respondent indicated the desire to have more informal observation feedback.

Table 85

*Please describe in a few sentences the aspects of your first year of teaching you would want to change*

| Respondent 1 | Less stressful/hectic A lot of time was spent asking basic questions that should have been provided. It felt like you were on your own the first year. The independence was great! But there were basic information/needs that would have helped. |
| Respondent 2 | Clearer goals, clearer objectives for teaching or PLC agreed to goals |
| Respondent 3 | Blank |
| Respondent 4 | My very 1st year of teaching I would want more informal observations to get feedback on. |

**Site B: Data Documents**

Documents from District B were received on September 15, 2014. The following documents were received: Mentoring New Teachers document, the district’s mission, vision, goals and parameters, certified staff individual professional development and evaluation program, a copy of the College Readiness Standards, and a double-sided document entitled, What Works? Instructional practices that increase student achievement.
The Mentoring New Teachers document consisted of the following sections:

Mentor Responsibilities, Needs of New Teachers, Tools for Mentors, Related Reading, and Notes and Articles.

Table 86

*Mentor Responsibilities*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section: Key Elements in Any Mentor Program</th>
<th>Purpose and Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To have the best effect, the leadership in a school district should provide standard training that aligns with the research about common concerns among beginning teachers and emphasizes a coaching model for the work mentors will do with protégés. For most mentors, the opportunity for observations are useful sometimes difficult to schedule. The observations prove useful for both the protégés and the mentors. Regular meetings between protégés and mentors are very helpful, and are at the core of the relationship.</td>
<td>Observe Each Other: Following a planning conference, and observer can collect data in a Focused Observation and share the data to facilitate reflection on growth towards goals and about a lesson’s efficacy. Focus on Instructional Decisions: A mentor can help the protégé to explore specific ideas and provide support about topics such as planning instruction, managing the classroom, varying teaching methods and activity structures, planning and managing groups, grading and evaluation, and communicating with parents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is a *mentor*? Individual Mentor Reflection

In the documents under the heading Mentor Responsibilities, the following areas directly related to the conceptual framework of this research study. The area of Cooperative Development was referenced in coaching and mentoring, mentor and
protégé observations, as well as collaboration on instructional planning, pedagogy, instruction, and assessing student work.

Table 87

*Needs of New Teachers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>On Being a New Teacher</th>
<th>Individual Mentor Reflection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major Concerns of Beginning Teachers</td>
<td>Chart of Novice Teacher Issues and Reflective Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Patterns: Those Who Stay; Those Who Leave</td>
<td>List of what novice teachers talk about in relationship to Those Who Stay and Those Who Leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrast: New Teacher/Veteran Teacher</td>
<td>List of Areas of Concern and lists examples of new teacher characteristics of those areas. The veteran teacher is blank and used for mentor reflection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chart Your Emotional State</td>
<td>Chart of the school year for the mentor to chart their emotional state throughout the school year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the documents under the heading Needs of New Teacher, no data was coded to the conceptual framework of this research study. The items within this section were focused on the mentor creating empathy for the novice teacher. The items in this section are geared towards having the mentor reflect on when they entered teaching. The items are open-ended questions that prompt reflection from the mentor. “Major Concerns of Beginning Teachers” and “Contrast: New Teacher/Veteran Teacher” are divided into new teacher and veteran sections with generalizations on how the new teacher may handle a concern and a blank area for the mentor to reflect on their experience. This area was not coded because of the
The focus of the material required the mentor to reflect on their own teaching practice and there was no clarity on how these activities transfer to mentoring a new teacher. Additionally, Cooperative Development has already been coded for the entire document Mentoring New Teachers.

Table 88

*Tools for Mentors*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developing and Maintaining Trust</th>
<th>Individual Mentor Reflection and Action Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>Basic Beliefs: Coaches serve their partners well if they help them to (1) be aware of resources and possibilities, (2) have choices for planning and problem solving, (3) derive a well-articulated vision of their teaching mission, (4) anticipate reactions and pitfalls in order to be proactive and flexible, and (5) develop a sense of confidence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coaching a Colleague: Basic Steps #3 **Provide a Positive Inquiry Frame.** Begin a coaching session with an inquiry frame that presumes that the protégé has positive goals in mind and intends to work toward accomplishing those goals.

Coaching a Colleague: Basic Steps #8 **Work Toward Commitment to a Plan of Action.** If one is ultimately committed to supporting a protégé in his or her professional development, the initial exploration conversations will lead toward a goals conversation when the protégé commits to a plan of action. The reflection on the attempts will be the substance of review conversations later in the school year.

Types of Conversations. **A) Exploratory Conversations.** Exploratory conversations reveal possibilities for identifying goals for professional growth.

**B) Goals Conversations.** Goal Conversations are conversations that support the planning of activities and lead to a commitment to pursue specific goals.
When a Goals Conversation is connected to an observation, the coach will inquire about the focus of the observation and encourage the Teacher to identify the kind of data that the observer will collect to support reflection on the progress toward the stated goals.

Elements of a Goals Conversation:
Description of strategic plans that offer the reasonable potential for attaining the goals.
Observable indicators that will allow for tracking progress and measuring attainment.

The Teacher will express a goal related to a lesson, a unit of study, other performance of duties, or professional growth.

C) Review Conversations. An assessment of the progress toward achieving stated goals.

Basic Communication Tools.
Lesson Observation Questions.
Lesson Goals
Analyzing Student Work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pitfalls</th>
<th>Novice Teacher’s Self-Help</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationships with Colleagues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graciously accept whatever instructional materials colleagues care to share with you, without feeling compelled to use them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognize the potential for using everyone for mentoring and support: from first-year teacher to forty-year veteran.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Relationships with Supervisors |
| Share with your supervisor your professional and instructional goals, and solicit support. |

| Workload |
| Rely on the help of colleagues who will share materials and will show you managerial systems and shortcuts. |

| Evaluation and Grading |
| Confer with your supervisor and your colleagues to say with certainty what students should know and be able to do as a result of your instruction. |
In the documents under the heading Tools for Mentors, the following areas related to the conceptual framework of this research study. In the sub-section “Coaching”, the document referenced five attributes of a coach. Coaching relates to the component of Intensive Development. This sub-section, under the heading of “Coaching a Colleague”, also relates to the area of Self-Directed Development and the focus on individual growth via goal-setting. The first area is “Basic Steps number 3, Provide a Positive Inquiry Frame”. The document indicated, “Begin a coaching session with an inquiry frame that presumes that the protégé has positive goals in mind and intends to work toward accomplishing those goals.” In “Basic Steps number 8, Work Toward Commitment to a Plan of Action”, the document stated, “If one is ultimately committed to supporting a protégé in his or her professional development, the initial exploration conversations will lead toward a goals conversation when the protégé commits to a plan of action. The reflection on the attempts will be the substance of review conversations later in the school year.” Additionally, under sub-section “Coaching”, the document outlined types of conversations a mentor would have with his or her protégé. Three sub-categories of “Coaching” relate to goal-setting. The first sub-category is titled: “Exploratory Conversations”. The document stated that: “Exploratory conversations reveal possibilities for identifying goals for professional growth.” These documents relate to the component of Self-Directed Development with the focus on individual growth by setting specific goals.
“Goals Conversations” related to the component of Self-Directed Development in creating professional goals with the protégé teacher. “Goals Conversations” may be defined as “conversations that support the planning of activities and lead to a commitment to pursue specific goals.” This section provided detail on how to use the “Goal Conversations”. “When a Goals Conversation is connected to an observation, the coach will inquire about the focus of the observation and encourage the Teacher to identify the kind of data that the observer will collect to support reflection on the progress toward the stated goals.” The document provided information regarding “Elements of a Goals Conversation”. Two of these elements relate to the component: “Description of strategic plans that offer the reasonable potential for attaining the goals” and “Observable indicators that will allow for tracking progress and measuring attainment.” Through these conversations, “the Teacher will express a goal related to a lesson, a unit of study, other performance of duties, or professional growth.” The final section covered “Review Conversations”. These conversations relate to Self-Directed Development: “an assessment of the progress toward achieving stated goals.” This sub-section provided the mentor with the basic communication tools of “Lesson Observation Questions”; and, “Lesson Goals” and “Analyzing Student Work.”

The final sub-category in Tools for Mentors related to the conceptual framework component of Cooperative Development is the “Novice Teacher’s Self-Help.” Regarding relationships with colleagues, the document suggested, novice teachers “graciously accept whatever instructional materials colleagues care to
share with you, without feeling compelled to use them.” The document asks new teachers to “recognize the potential for using everyone for mentoring and support: from first-year teacher to forty-year veteran.” As for relationships with supervisors, the document indicated that novice teachers should “share with your supervisor your professional and instructional goals, and solicit support.” Regarding the area of workload, the document suggested that new teachers “rely on the help of colleagues who will share materials and will show you managerial systems and shortcuts.” Finally, for evaluation and grading, the document recommended that novice teachers “confer with your supervisor and your colleagues to say with certainty what students should know and be able to do as a result of your instruction.”

Table 89

_Certified Staff Individual Professional Development and Evaluation Program_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>(Site B) Certified Staff Individual Professional Development and Evaluation Program is based on a coaching model designed to enhance performance of all certified staff members. A coaching model supports staff members who have different growth needs and learning styles, which may require different methods of supervision. .... to promote the professional growth of the staff member.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appendix C1 – Full-Time Non-Tenured Professional Development Evaluation Timeline</td>
<td>1st Year: August: Department Chair – Goals October: Department Chair – Observation December: Principal – Observation January: Department Chair – Observation, Teacher – Self-Assess Goals, Teacher – Mentor – Observation March: Teacher – Observe Mentor April: Department Chair – Observation May: Department Chair – Next cycle goal conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix G – Goal One Development Form</td>
<td>Reflection form requiring data from previous evaluation, self-assessment, administrator input, division, and school and district goals to set focused goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Goal – Goal One</td>
<td>To be completed by Evaluator and Teacher Collaboratively</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the documents under the heading Certified Staff Individual Professional Development and Evaluation Program, the following areas directly related to the conceptual framework of this research study. In the sub-section Introduction, the document suggested that the evaluation system should be designed around a coaching model, as well as support the professional growth of staff members. In the sub-section “Appendix C1 – Full-Time Non-Tenured Professional Development Evaluation Timeline”, a first year teacher’s full year of observation is outlined. The first year teacher creates goals in August with his or her department chair, followed by observations by the principal and department chair. After observations, the first year teacher then reevaluates their goals and then they are observed by the mentor. In March, the first year teacher observes the mentor teaching. In April, the department chair again observes the first year teacher in the classroom. This sub-section related to the component of Intensive Development. Finally, in May the department chair and first year teacher participate in goal-setting for the next year. In the sub-section “Appendix G – Goal One Development Form”, the teacher sets focused goals based on data from previous evaluation, self-assessment, and administrator input, as well as from division, school, and district goals. This document relates to the component of Self-Directed Development. In the sub-section “Professional Goal – Goal One”, the teacher and the evaluator create goals around the applicable Charlotte Danielson elements requiring goal-setting.
Site B: Summary of Differentiated Supervision

The researcher coded the qualitative data gathered to the conceptual framework of Differentiated Supervision by Allan A. Glatthorn's (1997). Allan Glatthorn identified Differentiated Supervision as a method of supervision that supports all new teachers. "Differentiated supervision is an approach to supervision that provides teachers with options about the kinds of supervisory and evaluative services they receive" (p. 3). Differentiated Supervision centers on the premise that providing teachers with supports can foster their professional development. The three areas of Differentiated Supervision are:

1) Intensive Development,
2) Cooperative Development, and
3) Self-Directed Development.

The Site B data were reviewed from the principal interview, teacher questionnaire, and district documents in relationship to the three categories of Differentiated Supervision. In the category of Intensive Development, the teacher respondents indicated they had experienced Clinical Supervision/Formal Evaluations. Only one principal indicated participating in evaluation. This principal conducted walk-thru observations of all her first and second year teachers. After the walk-thru observation she asked these teachers what their needs were. The second respondent indicated walk-through evaluations for all new teachers at their building. In the documents, Clinical Supervision was referenced in the Mentoring New Teachers documents and the certified staff individual professional
development and evaluation program. Teachers indicated receiving coaching and mentoring during the first year of teaching. Both principals indicated that all new teachers received a mentor. One principal respondent referenced divisional assistance as another pathway for a new teacher to receive mentoring in their first year. The Mentoring New Teachers documents utilized by the mentor were coded as Coaching/Mentoring. The teacher respondents indicated having a Focused Observation during their induction program. One principal respondent referenced Focused Observations in the induction program through mentor and mentee evaluations with periodic feedback. In the document Mentoring New Teachers, under the Mentor Responsibilities, the sub-section “Purpose and Responsibilities” has a heading titled, “Observe Each Other”, thus this document was coded as Focused Observation.

![Graph showing the distribution of Coaching/Mentoring, Focused Observation, and Clinical Supervision/Formal Evaluation among principals and teachers.]

*Note:* 2 principal, 4 teachers, 2 documents.

*Figure 17. Glatthorn Intensive Development (N=8)*
In the category of Cooperative Development, no respondents indicated participation in Action Research as part of their induction program. The teacher respondents indicated participation in a Collaborative Team and Curriculum Development. Through the document Mentoring New Teachers, collaboration between the mentor and protégé is referenced as goal setting, as well as “planning instruction, managing the classroom, varying teaching methods and activity structures, planning and managing groups, grading and evaluation, and communicating with parents.” One principal respondent referenced Professional Learning Communities as either a course or team that a new teacher would be a part of that is not directly related to the induction program. This principal respondent indicated that this is a function of the school and not part of the formal induction program. Common topics of the PLC indicated by respondents included assessment and student performance, as well as instructional changes based on data. Principal respondents also referenced that a team a new teacher would be part of the content division team, as well. The teacher respondents indicated participation in Professional Dialogues that included monthly meetings (lunch and learns). The teacher respondents indicated their participation in a Peer Observation and one principal referenced Peer Observations as a part of induction.
Note: 2 principal, 4 teachers, 2 documents.

Figure 18. Glatthorn Cooperative Development (N=8)

In the category of Self-Directed Development, the teacher respondents indicated experience in goal-setting based on generic-skills of teaching, professional role, mixed resources, and subject-specific skills. Principal respondents made no reference or indication of Self-Directed Development in the school and district induction program. In the document Mentoring New Teachers, mentor and protégé goal setting is referenced in several sections and therefore coded as generic skills of teaching. “Appendix G – Goal One Development Form” was coded as subject-specific skills and “Professional Goal – Goal One” was coded as professional role goal-setting.
Note: 2 principal, 4 teachers, 2 documents.

Figure 19. Glatthorn Self-Directed Development (N=8)

Based on the research findings, Site B utilized all three Differentiated Supervision categories as defined by Glatthorn in their current induction program. Intensive Development is utilized in the form of mentoring. Cooperative Development is used at Site B through PLCs, Peer Observations, lunch and learns, and within divisional time. Self-Directed Development is utilized in a variety of goal setting activities.

**Site C: Demographics**

The third case study district was located northwest of the city of Chicago. The two high schools utilized in the research are part of a high school district consisting of three high schools. At the time of research, the majority student populations in the district were as follows: White (60.7%), Asian (14.1%), Hispanic or Latino (20.1%), and Black or African American (2.9%). Enrollment for the first high school consisted of 2,498 students for the school year 2013–2014. Enrollment for the
second high school consisted of 2,184 students for the school year 2013-2014. The district’s percent of low-income was 27.4%, while the state of Illinois’ percentage for FY2013 was 49.9%. The percentage of low-income students for the first site was 7.3% and the second site was 34.8%.

Data were collected at the first site in this district on April 29, 2014. The principal interview took place in the principal’s office at 11:00 am. The interview was recorded. At the conclusion of the interview, five teacher questionnaires for new teachers were provided to the principal for teachers who fit the research requirements. The questionnaires were handed to the principal prior to the researcher exiting the building. The questionnaires were coded as Building C1 in the top right header. Data for the second site in this district was collected on April 30, 2014. The principal interview took place in the principal’s office at 11:00 am. The interview was recorded. At the conclusion of the interview, seven teacher questionnaires for new teachers were provided to the principal for teachers who fit the research requirements. The questionnaires were handed to the principal prior to the researcher exiting the building. The questionnaires were coded as Building C2 in the top right header.

Site C: Principal Interview

Gender, Age and Experience

The respondents included one male and one female. The age span ranged from 42 years of age to 50 years of age. The mean age of the responding principals was 46 years of age. The number of years the respondents has been administrators
ranged from 9 years to 22 years. The mean average years of being an administrator in Site C is 15.5 years. The number of years respondents had been a teacher ranged from 5 years to 15 years. The mean average years of teaching experience in Site C for administrators is 10 years.

Table 90

*Gender Representation of Respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Present</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 91

*Age Range and Mean Age of Respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 92

*Range and Mean Number of Years as an Administrator*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 93

*Range and Mean Number of Years as a Teacher*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents were asked about their attainment of teaching credentials. Both respondents indicated receiving their teaching certification through a conventional university program. Both respondents hold Type 9 certifications in content related fields. One respondent is endorsed to teach English, ESL, and Journalism and the other respondent is endorsed in social science. Respondents were also asked to indicate their highest level of education attained. One respondent indicated her highest level of education as a doctoral degree. The other respondent holds a master's degree, plus thirty additional credit hours. Respondents were asked if education had been the only field of their employment. One respondent indicated education had been her only field of employment and the other indicated he spent a year working in advertising prior to becoming an educator.

Table 94

*How Teacher Certification was Attained*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent 1</th>
<th>State University Bachelor of Science in English Education.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 2</td>
<td>Through a certification program in Saint Joseph's University after I had already gained my Bachelor's in History.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 95

*Teacher Certifications Respondents Currently Possess*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent 1</th>
<th>Type 9, English Education. I’m endorsed in ESL and Journalism.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 2</td>
<td>I currently hold a Social Science Teaching certificate from Pennsylvania. I hold a Principal Certification from Pennsylvania. I hold a Superintendent License from Pennsylvania. I hold a Type 75 Administrator’s Certificate from Illinois.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 96

_Highest Level of Education_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent 1</th>
<th>Doctorate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 2</td>
<td>Master’s plus 30 hours.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 97

_List of Previous Careers_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent 1</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 2</td>
<td>I spent a year in advertising.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Induction Programming at District and School Levels**

Both respondents were asked questions about the induction process into the school and district, as well as their perceptions of the purpose and components of new teacher induction. Respondent one indicated that induction in the school consists of two days, one paid and one volunteer. The mentor coordinator who conducts all 15 meetings throughout the school year facilitates building level induction. The first full day is spent with the new teacher and his/her mentor. The other is used for a scavenger hunt through the staff handbook to gain understanding of expectations and operation of the school, to meet with department chairs to learn the department structure, and a review of the evaluation system used to evaluate teachers. Respondent two also indicated that new teachers begin two days prior to the rest of the staff returning to the building. Additionally respondent two described those days intended to “learn the building, learn my expectations, and learn some of the things we’re working on here at the building level, then they go to the district office in which they get the same treatment at the district level.” Respondent two
also referenced learning the evaluation system and monthly meetings for first year teachers as part of school based induction program. Respondent one outlined the district induction process as consisting of paperwork, learning district-wide procedures, board policies, and clarified that this was time spent without mentors.

Table 98

_Suppose I was a first year teacher in your building. What would my induction be like?_

| Respondent 1 | We have 2 institute days at the start of the school year for new teachers only. One of those days is paid, one is not. They’re technically volunteering but new teachers always come. There are actually 4. Anybody else comes back so there’s a 2 days before the 2 days that the entire school comes back. It’s only for new teachers.

They do one day here in our building and we have something called the mentor coordinator who’s paid a stipend to take them through an entire mentoring program that lasts the entire first year. Its 15 different meetings with them, including those 2 full days. We then go back to the 2 full days.

First full day is spent here. They spend some time just with that mentor coordinator and they do things like a scavenger hunt of our student handbook so they know what the rules are here. Scavenger hunt of the faculty handbooks, “What are your hours? Where do you park?” Things like that. They meet with their department chair on that first stay. We have a department chair structure so no matter what department you're in; you have an administrator who’s directly assigned to you.

There’s also the opportunity that day to meet with their mentor teacher. Every new teacher is given a mentor teacher who gets a stipend for doing that as well. They work with that person throughout their first year. Then 15 more times throughout the course of that school year, they meet after school on a different topic. I'll give you a schedule of what those topics are but they range anywhere from classroom management to teacher evaluation system, things like that. |
The 2nd day of induction is spent at the district office. They do paperwork. They learn about district procedures. They learn about board policies, where to find things on the school website. The district runs all of that. The mentors are not there with the new teachers. They are just at the district.

**Respondent 2**

What we do here is once you’re approved by the board, you’ll start two days earlier than the rest of our staff and we put you through kind of a one-day program at the building level where teachers learn the building, learn my expectations, learn some of the things we’re working on here at the building level then they go to the district office in which they get the same treatment at the district level. They then have a monthly ... there’s an induction program that’s run with monthly meetings throughout their first year. Those tail off in the second year. It’s really a two-year program.

They are all ... well, this is under SP7. There are other requirements of our non-tenured staff even if you taught elsewhere. This is something that we do overall but I think it’s especially important for new teachers in any level. We have a required coaching plan. Based upon your interest and your evaluation, teachers set goals every year and then we have a number of coaches on staff who then create a coaching plan with the teacher. They’re coached through that process of working on a goal and improving a goal over the course of a year. While that’s non-exclusive to an induction program, I think it’s a huge piece for any new teacher that they get that kind of support.

Respondents were asked how new teachers responded to the induction program. Both respondents said that new teachers respond positively. Respondent one discussed providing new teachers with a feedback form after day one and day two. “It’s been very, very positive.” Respondent two stated, “I think sometimes these monthly meetings can be like they were when I went through, which is, sometimes they’re great, many times it just feels like, ‘Oh, man. I’m so busy and now I have to go..."
sit and do this for an hour.” Respondent two indicated new teachers perceive the goal setting, coaching, and mentoring as positive pieces of the induction program. Table 99

*How do new teachers respond to induction in your building?*

| Respondent 1 | How do people respond? We give them a feedback sheet after day 1 and after day 2, and we take their feedback and make changes to the program based on that but it’s been very, very positive. They’ve been doing it for several years and have tweaked it based on input and I think it’s quite good based on what new teachers are saying. |
| Respondent 2 | I think overall it’s been positive. I mean I think sometimes these monthly meetings can be like they were when I went through, which is, sometimes they’re great, many times it just feels like, “Oh, man. I’m so busy and now I have to go sit and do this for an hour.” We don’t want it to be that way but at the same there is some value in sitting down, commiserating with the other staff who is new going through the program and trying to learn from one another. I think other than that though overall the goal setting, the coaching, the mentoring; I think we can say they are probably pretty supportive overall. |

The interviewees were asked what they thought the ideal induction program looked like. The first respondent stated that it would exceed one year and be a four-year program, and the four-year program would link to tenure. “Ideally, I would go back to that 4-year program where you’re still focusing on a lot of things that new teachers need, but then easing off by that 4th year and focusing on other things.” Respondent two indicated the current program is “pretty solid” but ideally would rethink how monthly new teacher meetings are structured. “Is that the best time to have them? Should we maybe be thinking about how do we build those into a teacher’s day or build them some of the limited staff developments days that we
have just to not make it one more thing?” Respondent two also discussed the importance of being responsive to the experiences and mindset of new teachers.

The respondent stated how important it is to express to new teachers, “here are some ideas, but what’s happening right now for you? Could enhance their program of induction.”

Table 100

*Would you please describe what you think would be the ideal induction program?*

| Respondent 1 | I think it needs to go beyond one year. Here, in our district, it’s a one-year program. It used to be a 4-year program. It took 4 years to get to tenure but they cut funding on it so there’s only funding for one mentor coordinator now. There used to be a funding for 3 and they used to spread it out over the ... 2 people did the first year and the 3rd person did years 2, 3, and 4. When they cut all these funding, they went to one mentor coordinator and he does everything and only does at first year. Ideally, I would go back to that 4-year program where you’re still focusing on a lot of things that new teachers need, but then easing off by that 4th year and focusing on other things. |
| Respondent 2 | Well, I think we have a pretty solid one here with those elements that I’ve talked about. Probably the other piece of the induction program might be what do we do with those after-school monthly meetings? Is that the best time to have them? Should we maybe be thinking about how do we build those into a teacher’s day or build them into maybe some of the unfortunately the limited staff days that we have just to not make it one more thing? As a new teacher I don’t care when you start, you’re chasing your rear end most of the time for at least a year and probably three years before you feel like, “Oh, okay. I can go home in a reasonable hour now.” Trying to be more responsive to where we place them in those things, in those offerings, more responsive to what is it that they actually want to talk about or discuss further in detail, because we have a stock way we go about it but what we probably need to think more about is, “Here are some ideas but what’s happening right now for you?” I think that’s probably how we could be more responsive from what we do. |
 Principals were asked about the induction needs of a first year teacher with no prior work experience. The first respondent indicated that novice teachers require “a lot of focus on classroom management.” Additionally, respondent one stated that more focus on the evaluation plan was needed, as well as the explanation of the Danielson rubric to new teachers by the mentors. Respondent two indicated that new teachers with no prior work experience and career-change teachers have the same needs. “I think we should assume nothing. We should assume that you’ve had training so you know your content, that’s why we hired you, and you’ve given some really good answers to those self-reflection questions we’ve asked, and you’ve at least convinced us through an interview process that you like to work with young people.” The respondent elaborated by stating, “The needs are the same. Not only do they need to know where the bathroom is, you need that constant support on what does assessment look like, what does classroom management look like, what is staying current in your content look like? I don’t really see a difference between the two and I would say they have a need in all those places.”

Table 101

*Please tell me what the induction need(s) of a first year teacher with no prior work experience are*

| Respondent 1 | What we have found is, we really need to focus a lot on classroom management. How do you approach your classroom? How do you set your classroom up? How do you do classroom expectations, rules, that kind of thing, to set the tone on the very first day. We’ve used ... Is it Harry Wong? Wong’s book. We’ve used that in the past. Now, we just use excerpts from it. Everybody used to get a copy of it. In the first several weeks, classroom management seems to be what the newest teachers need. How do you let the kids know what |
your rules are? Things like that. We also need to focus more on our evaluation plan. The Danielson Rubric. We don’t do enough with that. We just say, "Here it is. You’re going to be evaluated. Here is the evaluation system.”

We spend some time on what a pre-observation conference is going to be about and what you can expect in the observation with the post-conference is going to be about, but we don’t go through the rubric itself. That is a need of our mentoring program for sure and it’s a need for all of our teachers to better understand what it means to be an excellent teacher. I would say that should be added.

Respondent 2

Well, I know you have a number six. I think they’re both the same. I think there’s a danger in assuming that this may sound the wrong way and I don’t mean it this way. I think we should assume nothing. We should assume that you’ve had training so you know your content, that’s why we hired you, and you’ve given some really good answers to those self-reflection questions we’ve asked, and you’ve at least convinced us through an interview process that you like to work with young people. If those three things are in place, I think there are to start building from the ground up because I think the way we have it is if you are strong in an area, there’s always another place that we can be supporting you.

If classroom management is not an issue for you through some of the things I talked about with the coaching plans and the goal setting, there’s other areas that we can be responding to what your need might be. I think a person … teaching is so different than any other position or job that you’ll ever do. There may be something that is similar because they have a teaching aspect but the teaching day and what is expected and what you are responsible for I think is so different than anything else and so different from maybe even your student teaching experience that we should really assume nothing.

The needs are the same. Not only do they need to know where the bathroom is, you need that constant support on what does assessment look like, what does classroom management look like, what is staying current, your content look like. I don’t really see a difference between the two and I would say they have a need in all those places.

Respondents were asked to provide examples of how they address new teacher needs. Both respondents indicated that the needs of new teachers were
addressed in the mentor sessions. Respondent one indicated that veteran teachers and volunteer teachers assisted in classroom management plans and observations. However, most new teachers did not observe a veteran’s teachers classroom because it was not mandatory. Additionally, informal department mentors assisted new teachers regarding specific department needs. Respondent two addressed new teachers’ needs by focusing on mentors and new teacher preparation programs.

Table 102

*Please provide me an example of how you address those needs*

| Respondent 1 | In the mentoring sessions, the first several that we do with them; they go through components of Wong’s on classroom management. We bring in veteran teachers; volunteers who share their classroom management plans and these are meetings after school. They would walk through how they set up the rules, how they do their sitting charts. Just logistical things, so from teachers who are considered more accomplished in that area. Just a sharing of that. They are invited into teacher’s classrooms so that in first week or so, they can go into anyone of those veteran teachers’ classrooms and watch it. A lot of new teachers do not do it. I think it should be required but because they’re so overwhelmed and they don’t have any time and that kind of thing. They’re not sure should they really do that. That’s how they ... Just from hearing other people’s plans. There’s a mentoring website that the mentor coordinator runs and puts good ideas up there. They can go to that website as well. They also have an informal mentor within their department. If you’re a brand new teacher and I’m in your department, I might be your formal mentor but somebody else, either in your department or out of the department can also be assigned to you as a mentor. If you don’t want to ask me questions about something else, English department for example, you can go to that Math person and say, "How do you this in your Math classroom?" Just to get a different perspective. That’s also been helpful. |
| Respondent 2 | I think the mentor relationships that we have take care of the day-to-day, the day-to-day survival of what needs to be in and when, but then the coaching aspect and the required professional development piece, I think really then helps you grow your menu of how do you assess students, how do you differentiate for students, how do you teach things beyond content to your students that are so necessary for them to be successful even in your classroom but then in the future through cooperative learning and things like that.

I think that’s the way that we’ve been able to get at all of the things that you need to really get as a foundation because I don’t know your personal experience. My personal experience what I went through it and also in hiring has been that university seem to be a few steps behind where the realities of education really is. When I ask somebody who is coming out of a teacher preparation program “How familiar are you with the Danielson Framework for Teaching?” and the answer is “I’m not,” that university is way behind where everybody else is because that’s the state model for evaluation. If they haven’t taken the time to talk about that and tell you what that looks like to be successful, we have to. I just assume there’s no evidence pointing that they’ve taken care of that for us and so you come in at that level. |

Principals were asked about the particular induction needs of a career-change teacher. The first respondent stated, "I would say, they’re the same. They’re exactly the same. If you’re a career-changer, you’re still new to teaching. My philosophy would be that they need the exact same things as a new teacher, they should be the same." Respondent two initially stated that novice and career-change teachers’ needs were the same and then added, “We’ve never taken that on as an added thing that we would think about teaching people new to the profession. It’s an interesting idea, though.” |
The respondents were asked how they address the needs of a career-change teacher. The first respondent said, “The exact same way we meet the needs of our brand new teachers to the profession. I consider them career-changers as brand new to the profession, too. We addressed those needs exactly the same way.”

Respondent two referenced supports in place for novice teachers are the same supports needed by career-change teachers.
Please provide an example of how you address those needs

| Respondent 1 | The exact same way we meet the needs of our brand new teachers to the profession. I consider them career-changers as brand new to the profession, too. We addressed those needs exactly the same way. |
| Respondent 2 | Again, I don’t I think the mentor relationships that we have take care of the day-to-day, the day-to-day survival of what needs to be in and when but then the coaching aspect and the required professional development piece, I think really then helps you grow your menu of how do you assess students, how do you differentiate for students, how do you teach things beyond content to your students that are so necessary for them to be successful even in your classroom but then in the future through cooperative learning and things like that.

I think that’s the way that we’ve been able to get at all of the things that you need to really get as a foundation because I don’t know your personal experience. My personal experience what I went through it and also in hiring has been that university seem to be a few steps behind where the realities of education really is. When I ask somebody who is coming out of a teacher preparation program “How familiar are you with the Danielson Framework for Teaching?” and the answer is “I’m not,” that university is way behind where everybody else is because that’s the state model for evaluation. If they haven’t taken the time to talk about that and tell you what that looks like to be successful, we have to. I just assume there’s no evidence pointing that they’ve taken care of that for us and so you come in at that level. |

Principals were asked if they believed that any new teachers’ needs were not met, and if so, what those may be. The first respondent indicated that the greatest need for any new teacher was time to meet during the school day, to observe other classrooms, to talk with other teachers in the building, and forums to do so.
Respondent two stated, “There’s probably always something that we’re not getting to but what I’d like to think is that we’re giving you structure enough for you to manage while you can get better at it.” Additionally, respondent two indicated, “I’ve never seen any teacher come to me so fully minted that they are just knocking it out of the park every day.” However, respondent two did not provide specific teacher needs.

**Table 105**

*Are any new teacher needs not met? What are they?*

| Respondent 1 | The time to meet. Getting into each other’s classrooms, I don’t think that’s being met. Time to meet during the school day. We have all of our meetings after school, which takes some new teachers out of coaching opportunities. I mean, they can still coach but then they’re not at practice, those days. We expect them to put in a lot of time after the school day and it’s not convenient, especially some of the new teachers who have new families and things like that going on. They don’t have an opportunity to talk with a lot of other teachers besides their mentor teacher because their days are so scheduled. There’s not a lot of forums. There used to be when it was an extensive model. In the 2nd year, you meet in smaller groups of new teachers in something called the forum. We would do an analysis at the end of the first year. We say, "What do you think you still need work on? What do you want to spend more time on?" We will put them in these pods of what they said they wanted to work on. If you said classroom management, and I said teacher evaluation, I wasn’t in the classroom management pod with you. I was with people who also wanted to work on evaluation. We call them at forums and we brought in teachers who were experts in those areas and would work with you throughout the course of that 2nd year. We don’t do that anymore. Makes sense? |
Respondent 2

I think there’s always something we’re probably leaving not met because we’re not so customized as to really give you such an in depth analysis of what you’re doing as a teacher to say, “This is where you need to really focus your efforts.” We give you the general, “Here is what to do, here is how to do it, here are things to be thinking about.” There’s probably always something that we’re not getting to but what I’d like to think is that we’re giving you or it is structured enough for you to manage that while you can get better at it.

Everybody is going to have a weakness coming in. I’ve never seen any teacher come to me so fully minted that they are just knocking it out of the park every day. In fact, with the new Framework for Teaching, the conversations really have changed about what the classroom practice looks like. In this district, in this building, we’re saying maybe 25% of our teachers reach excellence. That’s on our scale. It’s an iteration of the whole thing. That means that 75% of my staff still has room to grow and there are people who have been here 20 plus years. There’s always going to be someplace where we’re working or trying to help people get better.

Respondents were asked about the process of induction for someone not hired at the start of the school year. The first respondent indicated the program of induction is no different for someone who starts after the beginning of the school year. A mentor is provided and “you jump into the mentoring program, wherever they are, and we try to catch you up on what you’ve missed. I mean, they share the calendar with you so you’ll see ... It goes in order of what might come up in the school year. Wherever that person is jumping in, they’re going to go to those sessions, and then the formal mentor is going to spend more time catching them up on what they missed.” Respondent two indicated the same induction program but discussed how those teachers make up the time they missed in the following year. “They do get plugged into induction but they get plugged in mid-year. We do not
have a way that we go back and say, ‘Okay, well you missed this stuff at the start of this year so we’re going to try and get it to you.’ What happens is you roll into the next year’s kind of cohort.”

Table 106

*Please tell me what the process of induction is for someone not hired at the start of the school year*

| Respondent 1 | Pretty similar. They're assigned a formal mentor. Our mentor teachers get paid a stipend. I think it’s $600 for the year. Even if you come after the school year starts, you get a formal mentor and you jump into the mentoring program, wherever they are, and we try to catch you up on what you've missed. I mean, they share the calendar with you so you'll see ... It goes in order of what might come up in the school year. Wherever that person is jumping in, they’re going to go to those sessions and then the formal mentor is going to spend more time catching them up on what they missed. |
| Respondent 2 | Yeah. That’s a rocky one. It always has been. They do get plugged into induction but they get plugged in mid-year. We do not have a way that we go back and say, “Okay, well you missed this stuff at the start of this year so we’re going to try and get it to you.” What happens is you roll into the next year’s kind of cohort. Even though you may have been here for six months or a semester or what have you, you’ll go back into our induction program more like a first year person. We do have people who are varying degrees going through that induction program. We even have people who and this is maybe speaks to the point. I’ve got somebody who has worked for me for six years who because of the way the hiring practice has been here only went full time two years ago. They were constantly a part time employee who got no induction. We’ve done no induction with part time employees other than a mentor. They haven’t really gotten the full induction piece who now after year 6 or being a part time who are going through the induction process. That’s a bit backwards but it’s a non-traditional. You have some of those non-traditional circumstances like that. Luckily in a district like ours, we don't have a lot of mid-year
turnover type scenarios. You’re going to hire a long-term sub for maybe half a year and that’s what they are. They’re not plugged into induction. They have someone who’s going to be their mentor that help them go through the day to day but they’re not going to be people who you turn around doing an investment in simply because you’re losing them at the end of the year which is more typically the case and probably why there’s never been a … these part-times are an odd entity but if you do have somebody who goes out and you are hiring somebody for the long haul, you end up wrapping back around it. You may have a challenge in four months to keep everything together and keep it moving without the support of somebody who has hired in August or what have you.

Respondents were asked who informed new teachers about the day-to-day needs of a teacher. The first respondent indicated this person was the formal mentor. Other individuals who supported the new teachers were the department chairs and the receptionist, but they were not part of the formal induction program. Respondent two indicated that the assistant principal, department chair, and mentor all supported the day-to-day needs of a teacher, but only the mentor was part of the formal induction program.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent 1</th>
<th>Their formal mentor as probably the key person, not key person. You get it. They are the go-to person for everything but their department chair is definitely there for them. Our new teachers tend to gravitate toward (receptionist). (Receptionist) is our receptionist right here. (Receptionist) knows everything. When you walk past her to get to the male room that tends to be a stopping point for new teachers because she’s non-threatening. If you don’t know where to park and your department chair already told you twice, you don’t really want to go to your department chair for that. You go to (receptionist) and you say, &quot;Where should I park?&quot; Or &quot;Where is the faculty bathroom?&quot; (Receptionist) is non-threatening and she’ll tell you anything. She’s an informal mentor to every new teacher, but the formal mentor and the department chair are the really the go-to people here.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 2</td>
<td>Well, the person is the (Assistant Principal) who you know. For example when you’re hired here, you’re hired at the district but you do all your paperwork at the building level. What will happen is we’ll get everybody lined up to come in and we take them through all the employment paperwork. We give them their keys and their parking passes and things like that. We have a very formalized process for getting you everything you need and then walking you to your classroom. We have a department chair structure here. Every single one of our department has a department chair. They are responsible for signing you a mentor but also they’re kind of a de facto mentors as well. They teach too and are available the rest of the day. From that standpoint, they’re there to be a support system as well. The first person you go to is the department chair and then we go up the chain from there if there’s something beyond their ability to answer or address it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 1</td>
<td>The formal mentor is. The department chair is not, and (receptionist) is not.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 2</td>
<td>Really just the mentors are part of the actual … the mentors for the most part but also the induction program is a district level program. The other people involved in the induction program are the assistant superintendent for Curriculum Instruction and then a number of trained coaches in the areas we talked about. We have people who are trained in Johnson and Johnson cooperative learning. They’ll get called in to do the workshops. There are other teachers in the district who actually are part of the induction process to the professional development side of things. We do have at the building level a mentor coordinator who then is that liaison at the district level between the building, the mentors, the mentees and district office. There’s a person who help to coordinate that, runs some of those meetings as well. The department chair really doesn’t play a huge role in that. I mean as a resource nor do the assistant principal or myself other than what I do my part at the beginning do the year and I follow-up as a principal “How are you doing? Checking in, what’s going on? “What are you involved in?” those types of things, doing that part of the induction obviously but doing evaluations and informals and stuff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were asked to discuss anything additionally. The first respondent indicated nothing to add. The second respondent responded by stating, “I know you’re talking about the induction process of career-changers to education. That’s an interesting piece of the hiring process. When you look at that, I’ve been around people who view that very differently: some people who view that as a positive and some people who view that as a negative.”
Table 109

*Is there anything we did not discuss you would like to address at this time?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent 1</th>
<th>No, I don’t think so.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 2</td>
<td>I know you’re talking about the induction process of career-changers to education. That’s an interesting piece of the hiring process. When you look at that, I’ve been around people who view that very differently: some people who view that as a positive and some people who view that as a negative.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site C: Teacher Questionnaire**

**Gender, Age and Experience**

The administration distributed copies of the Teacher Questionnaire to teachers after the researcher left the school site. Principals indicated a process of communicating to the teachers who fit the research requirement via email and then placed the Teacher Questionnaire in staff school mailboxes. The original protocol for sampling teachers required that teachers taking the questionnaire at each site would have zero to three years of teaching experience. When the three respondents returned the Teacher Questionnaire, it was revealed that all of these respondents had less than three years of teaching experience, but none of them met the minimum research requirement of being a beginning teacher who was also a career-changer. One additional respondent with five years of teaching experience who was also a career-change teacher was asked to return the Teacher Questionnaire. Therefore, the sample criteria for career-change teachers at this site were changed
to five years. The usage of these respondents’ responses provided the necessary sample to study the research questions in this district and, therefore, changes the original sampling plan.

The majority of the respondents were male. Males represented 70% of the respondents while females represented 30%. The age span ranged from 26 years of age to 40 years of age. The mean age of the responding teachers was 30.75 years of age.

Table 110

*Gender Representation of Respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Present</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 111

*Age Range and Mean Age of Respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of years of experience, the respondents ranged from one year of experience to five years of experience. The average experience for a responding teacher was two and a half years of teaching experience. Two responding teachers had two years of teaching experience at the time of the questionnaire.
Table 112

Range and Mean Number of Years as a Teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were asked about their attainment of teaching credentials. The majority of respondents indicated they received their teaching certification through a bachelor’s degree program. One respondent indicated his receipt of teaching credentials through a master’s degree certification program. All four respondents indicated they possess Type 9 certifications in content related fields and one teacher referenced the possession of a Type 73, a school service personnel certification. Respondents also indicated their highest level of education attained. Three of the teaching respondents have master’s degrees, and one referenced having eight graduate credit hours, but only holds a bachelor’s degree. Respondents indicated entry into the school district at different times.

Table 113

How Teacher Certification was Attained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent 1</th>
<th>Bachelor’s Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 2</td>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 3</td>
<td>Master’s Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 4</td>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree Elementary Education and Business, MA School Counseling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 114

Teacher Certifications Respondents Currently Possess

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent 1</th>
<th>Type 9 certification – Business and Computer Application, Physical Education and Health and Special Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 2</td>
<td>Physical Education, Health and Drivers Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 3</td>
<td>LBS1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 4</td>
<td>Primary Education certification and Type 73 School Service Personnel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 115

Highest Level of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent 1</th>
<th>Master’s Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 2</td>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree + 8 additional graduate credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 3</td>
<td>Master’s Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 4</td>
<td>Master’s Degree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 116

When was the respondent hired by the school district in which they are currently work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent 1</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 2</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 3</td>
<td>July 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 4</td>
<td>August 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were asked if education was a second career. Three teaching respondents indicated that education was their only career. One respondent indicated that education was a career-change teacher. The respondent indicated he began a career in secondary education for two years and then changed to a Marketing Director and Account Director for five years before returning to public education.
Table 117

Respondents Career

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Present</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Novice</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career-changer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 118

List of Previous Careers

| Respondent 4 | Marketing Director/Account Director for 5 years |

Induction Programming at District and School Levels

All the respondents were given a questionnaire asking them about their induction into the school and district, as well as their perceptions of the purpose and components of new teacher induction. Respondents indicated that the purpose of teacher induction is to help them gain understanding of their new school. Understanding of the school ranged from getting teachers comfortable, teaching of different techniques, answering their questions, learning procedures, school and department goals, providing them with multiple resources, and providing support and training. Teachers were asked to describe their ideal induction program. All four respondents indicated a variety of ideas. Respondents indicated utilizing veteran teachers to model teaching practices, procedures, and a forum to answer questions. Also, respondents indicated they needed more familiarity with systems and supports in the building for their practice, as well as differentiation among
individual, specific roles in the building. One respondent indicated that an ideal program would address first year teacher concerns in the first year.

Table 119

*Please describe what you believe is the purpose of a teacher induction program*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent 1</th>
<th>To get the teacher comfortable. To teach them different techniques and give them tips. To help answer their questions. To teach them the procedures.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 2</td>
<td>To walk a new teacher through the schools department goals and curriculum for year/semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 3</td>
<td>To provide new teachers with multiple resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 4</td>
<td>A teacher induction program is to provide direction, support and training for 'new' teachers both new to district and new to profession.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 120

*Please describe what you think would be the ideal induction program*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent 1</th>
<th>It would consist of other veteran teachers teaching the new teachers. Showing them all the procedures involved in their school. A place to answer all questions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 2</td>
<td>To walk a new teacher through the schools department goals and curriculum for year/semester.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 3</td>
<td>Meaningful lessons/presentations that are specific to the participants. More opportunities to discuss 1st year teacher concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 4</td>
<td>Sub Categories or Workshops for different &quot;roles&quot; within a school - classroom teaching vs. counseling social work and different for true 1st year teachers and those with work experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were given three yes-or-no questions focused on their induction program. All respondents indicated that their district has a new teacher induction program in the first year of a new teacher’s employment in a district. All of them were part of the induction program. When asked whether the program of
induction went beyond the first year of teaching, two respondents said it did and two said that it did not.

Table 121

Does the District Have a Program for New Teachers During the 1st Years of Teaching?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 122

Were you a Part of an Induction Program During your 1st Year of Teaching?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 123

Does the Program go Beyond the 1st Year of Teaching?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher respondents were asked about the program of support beyond the first year of teaching. Three respondents referenced that this time is spent with their coach. The time with coaches centered on specific supports for teachers. One respondent indicated this time was used to learn how to use the gradebook and review the evaluation system.
Please describe the program of support for teachers beyond their first year of teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent 1</th>
<th>We still meet and go over different topics. We still meet with a peer coach to talk about goals and concerns. We get observed by a principal.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 2</td>
<td>Show us how to use gradebook, Danielson model and new evaluation program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 3</td>
<td>Instructional coaching for all teachers with 3 choices of how to complete the instructional coaching program (peer, 1:1, &quot;cohort&quot;/group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 4</td>
<td>There is a coaching plan to support teachers (even beyond 1st year) where you meet as often as you/coach agree/ but a minimum of 3x/year and it's not tied to evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher respondents were provided with a chart outlining Glatthorn’s (1997) Differentiated Supervision. The chart provided examples and explanations of the three categories: Intensive Development, Cooperative Development and Self-Directed Development. Teacher respondents selected aspects of each category they have experienced in their induction program. In the category of Intensive Development, all teacher respondents indicated that they had coaching and mentoring, as well as clinical observations. All respondents indicated they had a Focused Observation during induction. In the category of Cooperative Development, all respondents indicated participation in Peer Observations. Three respondents indicated participation in Professional Dialogues and Collaborative Teams. One respondent indicated participation in Curriculum Development. No respondents participated in Action Research. In the category of Self-Directed Development, three respondents indicated goals based on the professional role. Two respondents
indicated experience in goals based on generic-skills of teaching and mixed sources.

Three respondents indicated goals based on subject specific skills.

\[\text{Figure 20. Glatthorn Intensive Development (N=4)}\]

\[\text{Figure 21. Glatthorn Cooperative Development (N=4)}\]
Respondents were asked to indicate who in the district facilitated their induction into the school. Three respondents indicated that a district administrator facilitated induction. One respondent indicated the principal as the facilitator of new teacher induction. One respondent indicated that the department chair served as a facilitator of induction in their building. All four respondents indicated that teachers in their building facilitate induction as well.
Respondents were asked to answer what their professional needs were during their first year of teaching. Two respondents referenced peer support. One respondent indicated, “It helped having a peer coach to go to answer all my questions” and another stated, “Just support from peers and the knowledge that my peers are there for me.” One respondent indicated a need for subject content resources. One respondent indicated the need for better understanding school culture and climate, better technology for them to do their job, and a better ability to identify individuals and policies and procedures in the building. Respondents were asked to complete a Likert Scale addressing how the school addressed their needs. One respondent gave the school 7 out of 7. Two respondents gave their school 5 out of 7. One respondent gave the school 5.5 out of 7.
Please describe your professional need(s) during your first year of teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 1</td>
<td>It helped having a peer coach to go to answer all my questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 2</td>
<td>Just support from peers and the knowledge that my peers are there for me helping with lesson planning activities and ideas for me to use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 3</td>
<td>Subject content resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 4</td>
<td>Understand school culture/climate, learning technology need to do the job, identifying faculty staff and building communications, understanding protocol procedures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher respondents were asked to identify professional needs that were not met by their school. One respondent indicated that no needs were left unmet. One respondent indicated confusion regarding the new evaluation system. One respondent indicated a need for more time to coordinate. One respondent indicated the need for more personalized professional development in their specific field.
Table 126

Please describe what professional needs were not met

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent 1</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 2</td>
<td>New evaluation system has everyone confused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 3</td>
<td>Time to case coordinate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 4</td>
<td>Would have liked targeted &quot;goals&quot; or &quot;initiatives&quot; geared toward the role I have in school - counseling, social work etc. - most were focused on classroom teaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher respondents selected a variety of reasons from Ingersoll’s research as to why teachers leave the field of teaching to indicate why their professional needs were not met. One respondent selected “none.” One respondent indicated inadequate preparation of the program. Two respondents selected “other.” One respondent wrote, “Way too much on our plates.” One respondent wrote, “Schools don't always have resources or man power to tailor it to meet those needs.”

Table 127

Why do you think your professional needs were not met?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent 1</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 2</td>
<td>Inadequate preparation of program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 3</td>
<td>Other: Way too much on our plates (SPED)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 4</td>
<td>Other: Schools don’t always have resources or man power to tailor it to meet those needs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher respondents had the opportunity to write a few sentences about what they would change about their first year of teaching. Two respondents indicated nothing, with one expressing enthusiasm for the next school year and the preparedness for it. One respondent indicated the long meetings after school as being sometimes effective and other times ineffective. One respondent suggested
cross-building collaboration days and personal development for non-instructional staff.

Table 128

*Please describe in a few sentences the aspects of your first year of teaching you would want to change*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent 1</th>
<th>Sometime we had very long meetings after school that interfered with other obligations like coaching. Most of the time, the meetings were great but sometimes the meetings topics weren't so great.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 2</td>
<td>Nothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 3</td>
<td>Nothing. It's just been very busy, stressful, and at times it's been overwhelming. But I will be much better prepared for next year and I am already looking forward to starting the year with a much more prepared/organized approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 4</td>
<td>Have more cross-building SPS collaboration days, protocol/process &quot;handbook&quot; available, more instruction on professional development for faculty not in the classroom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site C: Data Documents**

Documents from District C were received on November 6, 2014. The documents received included the following: New Teacher/Teacher Assistant/Student Teacher/Intern August 19th Schedule; New Teacher Induction for August 20th; Mentoring the District XXX Way; What Do I Need to Know About the District XXX Mentor Program; New Teacher Information; New Teacher Cohort Academy 2014-2015; and New Teacher District Induction Day 1 power point.

Table 129

*New Teacher/Teacher Assistant/Student Teacher/Intern August 19th Schedule*

| 8:00 – 8:15 | Welcome and Introduction – Mentor Coordinator |
| 2:30 – 3:30 | Meet with Department Chairs |
In the document New Teacher/Teacher Assistant/Student Teacher/Intern August 19th Schedule, the schedule outlined the first day of onsite induction at site C1. The schedule included introduction of the administration, deans, training on technology, and meeting COACH Tutors. Two items on the agenda related to the conceptual framework. The first item was the “Welcome and Introduction” from the site’s Mentor Coordinator. This item on the schedule indicated mentoring as part of the induction process. Mentoring was represented in the conceptual framework as Cooperative Development. The second item was an hour devoted to meet with Department Chairs. This item represented the component of Cooperative Development.

Table 130

*New Teacher Induction – August 20th, 2014 Day 2*

| 8:00 – 8:25am | Cooperative Learning Base Groups |

Within the document titled New Teacher Induction – August 20th, 2014 Day 2, Cooperative Development is coded as the twenty-five minutes of the agenda item devoted to Cooperative Learning Base Groups.
## Mentoring the (Omitted) Way

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements of Mentors:</th>
<th>Mentors must schedule peer observations with the new teacher, both where the mentor observes the new teacher and the new teacher observes the mentor. Ideally, these will be conducted prior to the new teacher’s formal observation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Help the new teacher understand the Teacher Evaluation Program and the Danielson rubrics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor Checklist</td>
<td>Offer to plan together and share some teaching materials, files, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To start the year</td>
<td>Provide professional and curriculum resources to the new teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As the year progresses</td>
<td>Review Professional Evaluation and the Danielson Rubrics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discuss Observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goal setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Artifact folder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work together to develop a peer coaching plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At grading periods</td>
<td>Schedule observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tips for Mentors</td>
<td>Final exams: Departmental and district polices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curricular Support</td>
<td>Review the curriculum with your mentee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review the core standards and course learning targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Share lessons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discuss common assessments, including time frame for administering them and using Mastery Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Talk about procedures and ‘norms’ for your PLT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Support</td>
<td>Make a coaching plan and practice how to read the Danielson rubric to be used for evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discuss classroom management and share strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model teaching procedures and ‘think aloud’ sessions with the mentee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Share resources, ideas, and activities for the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Share challenges you face in your own classroom and strategies to overcome them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trade professional articles and discuss them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Support</td>
<td>Introduce the new teacher to people in the building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the document Mentoring the District XXX Way Assembling a Class Profile, all three areas of the conceptual framework were referenced in this section. Intensive Development was referenced in the following sub-sections:

“Requirements of Mentors,” “As the year progresses,” and “Instructional Support,” when the document referenced Review Professional Evaluation and in the Danielson Rubrics. All of these sections mentioned the formal evaluation process. Cooperative Development was referenced in the sub-sections, “Requirements of Mentors,” “Mentor Checklist to start the year,” “As the year progresses,” “Tips for Mentors Curricular Support,” “Instructional Support” and “Emotional Support.” These sub-sections referenced Peer Observations, collaboratively planning lessons, curriculum review, expectations in department and professional groups, and introducing the new teacher to colleagues in the building. Self-Directed Development was
referenced in the section “As the year progresses” as goal-setting, and coded as
generic skills of teaching.

Table 132

*What do I need to know about the District XXX Mentor Program?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>1) Mentors are the key support person for new faculty members.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Induction Days are the orientation days that allow new faculty to learn about their building and the district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3) Mentor Coordinators in each building assist faculty new to the district and their mentors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4) Mentor Training presents the latest mentoring techniques in working with new teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5) New Teacher Cohort Academy is the name for the required staff development sessions for new faculty.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentor Schedule: Beginning of September</th>
<th>General discussion about beginning of year with insights into Teacher Evaluation Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early October</td>
<td>Discuss Teacher Evaluation System and plan peer classroom observations and peer coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning of January</td>
<td>Review Teacher Evaluation System – First Summative Evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the document, *What do I need to know about the District XXX Mentor Program?*, Intensive Development and Cooperative Development were referenced. Intensive Development was referenced in the introduction as the five aspects that mentors would be part of during the new teacher’s first year. Throughout this document, Intensive Development was also referenced as the three areas of formal observations as the Teacher Evaluation Program and System. Cooperative
Development was referenced in the introduction as the New Teacher Cohort Academy, “the name for the required staff development sessions for new faculty”.

Table 133

_New Teacher Information_

| New Teacher Requirements | 1) Attendance at the new teacher Induction Days  
| 2) Additional Staff Development (New Teacher Cohort Academy) for a total of 32 hours  
| 3) Complete a series of peer observations with your mentor, preferably before you begin your formal observations. You will observe and be observed by your mentor. |
| New Teacher Checklist | Weekly conference with mentor  
|  | Discuss the Danielson Rubric & Teacher Evaluation Program with mentor, including: Goal Setting, Artifacts folder, Formal Observations (pre-conference, observations, post observations)  
|  | Attend monthly New Teacher Cohort Academy within district |
| New Teacher Cohort Academy Calendar | **Fall Semester = 6 Hours**  
|  | • September 13, 3:45-5:15, Topic: Learning Targets  
|  | • October 18, 3:45-5:15, Topic: Classroom Management  
|  | • November 5, 3:45-5:15, Topic: TBA  
|  | • December 6, 3:45-5:15, 018, Topic: TBA  
|  | **Spring Semester = 11.5 Hours**  
|  | Dates TBA (assume one meeting per month)  
|  | Topics will be differentiated to address identified needs and coaching plan of the new teachers. Topics may include: assessment literacy, differentiated instruction, problem-based learning, technology, literacy strategies, and teacher rights with the district lawyer. |
In the document titled New Teacher Information, all three areas of the conceptual framework were referenced. Intensive Development was identified as the work of the mentor with the new teacher, such as the Peer Observations, weekly meetings, and discussion of the formal evaluation process. Cooperative Development was referenced as “peer observations with your mentor, preferably before you begin your formal observations. You will observe and be observed by your mentor.” Additionally, the “New Teacher Cohort Academy” was coded as Professional Dialogue in Cooperative Development. Finally, Self-Directed Development was referenced as Goal Setting in the sub-section “New Teacher Checklist.”

Table 134

New Teacher Cohort Academy 2014-2014

| 1. Wednesday 9/3 (required) | • Mentor/Mentee Social Evaluation  
|                           | • Goal Setting  
|                           | • Formal Coaching Plan  
|                           | 2. Wednesday, 9/24  
|                           | • Team Building  
|                           | • Setting Norms  
|                           | • No computers  
|                           | • On time  
|                           | • Attendance Peer Coaching  
| 3. Wednesday, 10/1, 10/8 | Deans Classroom Management  
| 4. Wednesday 10/22 | Special Education  
| 5. Wednesday, 11/5 | Counselors & SPS support  
| 6. Wednesday, 11/19 | Grading Practices (guest speaker)  
| 7. Wednesday 12/3 | Financial Planning  
<p>| 8. Wednesday, 12/17 | Cooperative Learning |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9. Wednesday, 1/28</th>
<th>Mid-year reflection Professional Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Wednesday, 2/11</td>
<td>Lawyer (guest speaker)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Wednesday, 2/25</td>
<td>RtI (Guest Speaker)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Wednesday 3/11</td>
<td>Differentiated Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Wednesday 3/25</td>
<td>PBL Questioning (guest speaker) Brain-based Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Wednesday 4/15</td>
<td>Closing Activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the document titled New Teacher Cohort Academy 2014-2015, the conceptual framework categories of Intensive Development and Cooperative Development were referenced. The session on September 3rd referenced mentors and applied to the component of Intensive Development and Mentoring. The entire New Teacher Cohort Academy 2014-2014 calendar referenced Cooperative Development as related to Professional Dialogues and working with a variety of peers within the district.

Table 135

*Reflection New Teacher District Induction Day 1 power point*

**Cooperative Base Learning Groups**

*Defined:*
- Long-term, heterogeneous cooperative learning groups with stable membership

*Responsibilities as a group member:*
- provide support, encouragement, and assistance
- hold each other accountable
- ensure others are making progress

*Forming:*
- 3-4 students, randomly assigned
- Provide a meeting place
- Assign roles (runner, explainer,
**Things you can do:**
- Non-academic team building activity
- Checking in homework
- Review progress on assignments
- Summarizing daily learning targets

| Mentor Program and New Teacher Cohort Academy | According to the Agreement between the Board and the District XXX
| - All first-year probationary teachers will be assigned a mentor during their first probationary year (page 44)
- All teachers hired by the district... will be required to work up to four additional days (32 hours) beyond the base contract year during the first year of probationary employment to receive staff development training as determined by the Administration (page 29)
- All teachers are required to create and complete an annual coaching plan (page 35)

| New Teacher Cohort Academy Schedule | Two Days of Induction = 15.5 Hours
New Teacher Cohort Academy = 16.5 Hours
Attend 11 of 14 sessions
(see schedule)

Every other Wednesday
Need to attend 11 of 14 sessions
YOU get to pick topics

In the power point document titled, Reflection New Teacher District Induction Day 1, the conceptual framework categories of Intensive Development and Cooperative Development were referenced. Intensive Development was referenced as the Mentor Program and the definition of the program is stated in the According to the Agreement between the Board and the District XXX. Cooperative Development was referenced in the power point as “Cooperative Base Learning
Groups" and "New Teacher Cohort Academy and Schedule". The power point defined the mentee’s “Cooperative Base Learning Group” responsibilities, formation, and things the group can do. Additionally, the “New Teacher Cohort Academy” and “New Teacher Cohort Academy Schedule” were reviewed.

**Site C: Summary of Differentiated Supervision**

The researcher coded the qualitative data gathered to the conceptual framework of Differentiated Supervision by Allan A. Glatthorn (1997). Allan Glatthorn identified Differentiated Supervision as a method of supervision that supports all new teachers. “Differentiated supervision is an approach to supervision that provides teachers with options about the kinds of supervisory and evaluative services they receive” (p. 3). Differentiated Supervision centers on the premise that providing teachers with supports can foster their professional development. The three areas of Differentiated Supervision are:

1) Intensive Development,

2) Cooperative Development, and

3) Self-Directed Development.

The Site C data were reviewed from the principal interviews, teacher questionnaire, and district documents in relationship to the three categories of Differentiated Supervision. In the category of Intensive Development, both principals indicated participating in a form of evaluation, whether it was preparing new teachers for the evaluation cycle or reviewing the Danielson Framework for observations. All teacher respondents indicated participating in formal
observations. Three documents referenced the Formal Evaluation process: Mentoring the District XXX Way, What do I need to know about the District XXX Mentor Program, and New Teacher Information. Both principals indicated that all new teachers receive a mentor, and both respondents referenced department chairs and other members of the school community who informally mentor or coach new teachers in their first year. All teacher respondents indicated participating in coaching and mentoring. Six of the seven documents indicated mentoring.

Regarding Focused Observations, principal respondent one discussed the option of having new teachers observe classrooms, but not all new teachers took part in this process. The other principal respondent referenced having Focused Observations that entailed the coaching plan consider teacher interests, as well as data collected from their formal evaluations. Both principal respondents referenced goal setting and working within the induction program to improve those goals over the course of the year. All teachers indicated participation in Focused Observations.
Figure 25. Glatthorn Intensive Development (N=13)

In the category of Cooperative Development, neither principal respondent indicated Action Research as part of the induction program. The principal respondents referenced support within departments as a team, but did not specifically indicate participation in a Collaborative Team or Curriculum Development. Three teacher respondents indicated participation in a Collaborative Team and Curriculum Development. One document referenced Curriculum Development with their mentor in Mentoring the (blank) Way. Three documents referenced Collaborative Teams. New Teacher Induction August 20, 2014 Day 2 and the Reflection New Teacher District Induction Day 1 power point referenced the Cooperative Learning Group. The document Mentoring the (blank) Way included the suggestion, “Talk about procedures and ‘norms’ for your PLT as well as department policies.” Respondent two referenced professional cohorts around different topics,
such as cooperative learning or assessment literacy. Principal respondents indicated the monthly meetings for new teachers that were coded as professional dialogue. Three teacher respondents indicated participation in Professional Dialogues. Four documents referenced Professional Dialogues as the "New Teacher Cohort Academy". One principal referenced Peer Observations as a part of induction, but not all teachers utilized it. All teacher respondents indicated participating in Peer Observations. Three documents indicated Peer Observations by the mentor and mentee. Those observations were indicated in these three documents: Mentoring the (blank) Way, What do I need to know about the District (blank) Mentor Program, and New Teacher Information. No document, principal or teacher respondents indicated Action Research as part of induction.

Note: 2 principals, 4 teachers, 7 documents.

Figure 26. Glatthorn Cooperative Development (N=13)
In the category of Self-Directed Development, the principal respondents indicated goal-settings through guided assistance by either mentors or department chairs and mentees, not individually. Therefore, principal data was not coded in Self-Directed Development. Three teacher respondents indicated goals based on professional role. Two respondents indicated experience in goals based on generic skills of teaching and mixed sources. Three respondents indicated goals based on subject specific skills. Two documents referenced goal setting: Mentoring the (blank) Way” and New Teacher Information. Since no specific detail was provided, these were coded as Goal based on generic skills of teaching.

![Bar chart](image)

*Note:* 2 principals, 4 teachers, 7 documents.

**Figure 27.** Glatthorn Self-Directed Development (N=3)

Based on the research findings, Site C utilized all three differentiated categories in its induction program at the time. Intensive Development was utilized in the form of mentoring and the evaluation system. Cooperative Development was
used at Site C through the "New Teacher Cohort Academy". Self-Directed Development was used through a variety of goal-setting activities.

Summary

The purpose of this case study was to examine the perceived impact of public high school teacher induction on novice and beginning career-change teachers in education. This study examined the differences in perceptions of novice public high school teachers versus beginning career-change teachers in regards to the efficacy of induction programs in three high school districts, as well as the principals supervising them. Data were displayed from principal interviews, teacher questionnaires and district induction program documents and then coded using the conceptual framework of Differentiated Supervision by Allan A. Glatthorn (1997).
CHAPTER V
DATA ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine the perceived impact of public high school teacher induction on public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers in education. This study examined the differences in perceptions of public high school novice versus beginning career-change teachers in regards to the efficacy of induction programs.

Research Questions

The following were the research questions for this case study:

1) According to the perceptions of first year public high school teachers with no prior work experience:
   a. What were the needs of public high school novice teachers during their first year?
   b. How did their districts’ induction programs meet these needs?
   c. What specific recommendations would they make to improve their districts’ induction programs?

2) According to the perceptions of beginning public high school career-change teachers entering the teaching profession:
a. What are the beginning public high school career-change teachers’ needs during their first year of teaching?

b. How did their districts’ induction programs meet their needs?

c. What recommendations would they make to improve their districts’ induction programs?

3) According to the perceptions of the public high school principals:

a. What are the needs of a public high school novice teacher versus a beginning public high school career-change teacher during his or her first year of teaching?

b. How do the induction programs in their school districts meet the needs of public high school novice teachers and beginning career-change teachers?

c. How do public high school principals believe the intentions of their induction programs are met by their school district for public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers?

d. What recommendations would they make to improve their school districts’ induction programs?

In this chapter, the researcher analyzed data and constructed conclusions based on data presented in Chapter IV. The data analyzed in this chapter were derived from three forms of data collection:

1. Building Principal Interviews

2. Questionnaire for Teachers
3. District induction document analysis

As a review, the research questions of this study examined the perceived impact of public high school teacher induction on novice and career-change teachers in education. This study examined the differences in perceptions pertaining to public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers in regards to the efficacy of induction programs.

The methodology of this research was a case study. Three public high school unit school districts were utilized for research. Within each unit school district, two high schools were used as research sites. Principals from both high schools were interviewed. High school novice and career-change teachers in the beginning of their teaching careers were provided with a questionnaire. Site A had two principals interviewed and five teacher respondents for the questionnaire. Two respondents were high school novice teachers and three were career-change teachers. Site B had two principals interviewed and four teacher respondents for the questionnaire. Two respondents were high school novice teachers and two were career-change teachers. Site C had two principals interviewed and four teacher respondents for the questionnaire. Three respondents were public high school novice teachers and one was a career-change teacher. The total principal respondents utilized in this study were six and the total teacher respondents in the study were thirteen. The total number of high school novice teachers within the thirteen teacher respondents was seven and the total number of beginning public high school career-change teachers utilized in this study was six.
**Conclusion: Public High School Novice Teachers**

**Research Question 1A**

According to the perceptions of first year public high school teachers with no prior work experience, what were the needs of public high school novice teachers during their first year?

Eight public high school novice teachers in three high school districts within six buildings identified the needs of a novice public high school teacher during their first year of teaching. One high school novice teacher wrote on the questionnaire the need during their first year of teaching: “Mentor to show me what to expect in the coming year.” The most frequent response to the question focusing on first year needs was the need for a mentor. Four of the seven high school novice teachers identified the need for a mentor as a support in their first year of teaching. The other high school novice teachers’ needs were varied but represented a myriad of challenges during their first year of teaching. Those needs were identified as subject content resources, personal inquires (school tuition reimbursement for graduate programs), and learning the procedures of the school as well as the school culture.
Table 136

*Summary of Public High School Novice Teachers Needs during the First Year of Teaching (N = 7)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High School Novice Teachers Site A (n = 2)</th>
<th>Curriculum and professional help with classroom content and management.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mentor to show me what to expect in the coming year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Novice Teachers Site B (n = 2)</td>
<td>Learning the procedures of the building, discipline procedures, school procedures/culture, learning the staff/departments, school operating systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Novice Teachers Site C (n = 3)</td>
<td>It helped having a peer coach to go to answer all my questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Just support from peers and the knowledge that my peers aware there for me helping with lesson planning activities and ideas for me to use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subject content resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals From Responses</td>
<td>Curriculum assistance N = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subject and School Related Items N = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal assistance N= 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom Management N = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mentor or Peer N = 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The idea that novice teachers need guidance and additional support in their first year is a widely held belief (Bickmore & Bickmore, 2010; Ingersoll & Strong, 2012; Ingersoll, 2004; Fry & Anderson, 2011; Roberson & Roberson 2008). As Schwille (2008) stated the benefit of a mentor is such that “mentor teachers can
help novices get inside the intellectual and practical tasks of teaching. Ideally they can also help novices develop the skills and dispositions to continue learning in and from their practice” (p. 139). The State of Illinois supports the dedication of a mentor teacher to a new teacher and provides clear expectations in the Illinois School Code 5/21A-10 and the Illinois Induction Program Standard. In regards to the other needs of new teachers, district administrators and building principals should consider the “needs of beginning teachers in contexts in order to identify ways to provide them better support” (Fry & Anderson, 2011, p. 2). Since novice teachers have no prior work experience, all aspects of the first year will be new experiences for these teachers, and their needs will require personalization and support as they encounter “a world of unknowns” (Roberson & Roberson, 2008, p. 114). The respondents in this study might vary from the respondents in the previously cited study, since each individual’s first year is unique to his or her site and situation. The research could provide similar experiences, but it would be difficult to prove any two first year teachers could have the exact same experience. Novice teachers in this study confirmed the current research that novice teachers need individuals to guide them during their first year, as there are a wide variety of unknowns that one encounters during their first year of teaching.

Relevance of Research Data to Allan A. Glatthorn’s Model of Differentiated Supervision – Question 1A. Intensive Development is relevant to this study based on the research data from public high school novice teachers’ identifying their needs during the first year of teaching. Intensive Development
does not revolve around teacher evaluation, but is structured to focus solely on teacher growth (Glatthorn, 1997). This allows for the responsibility of Intensive Development to be delivered by a non-evaluator who is not part of the evaluation process such as a central office administrator, team leader, mentor or colleague. This permits a relationship of collaboration and inquiry, instead of supervisor and subordinate (Glatthorn, 1997). The two components of Intensive Development as identified by high school novice teachers during their first year of teaching are Coaching/Mentoring and Focused Observation.

Glatthorn (1997) defines the work of a Coach/Mentor as follows: “All their work is focused solely on improving student learning; teaching methods are seen as means to an end, not an end unto themselves” (p. 7). In addition to helping novice teachers to improve their instructional practice, Schwille (2008) outlined other supports that a mentor provides to new teachers: “emotional support, occupational socialization, and pedagogical guidance” (p. 139). The coach/mentor’s work with the teacher occurs through observations, analysis of data, discussions, and coaching. One novice public high school teacher stated, “It helped having a peer coach to go to, to answer all my questions.” Respondents that recognized a mentor, peer coach, or peer who could provide assistance or guidance in their first year of teaching identified Coaching/Mentoring as a core need during their first year of teaching.

Focused Observation is time used to observe a single aspect of teaching or learning. The teacher and observer generate the focus collaboratively and work together towards mastery. Humphrey et al. (2008) identified the use of classroom
observations to assist in identifying specific teacher strengths and weaknesses, in order to “individualize support for beginning teachers” (p. 17). Respondents that identified curriculum, classroom management, lesson planning, and subject content resources as a needed support can receive these in a Focused Observation.

Respondents in this research study confirmed Glatthorn’s (1997) research by indicating public high school novice teachers could benefit from an individual dedicated to supporting them in their first year of teaching. Ingersoll and Strong (2011) highlighted the purpose of assigning new teachers a coach/mentor: “the overall objective of teacher mentoring programs is to give newcomers a local guide” (p. 203). All high school novice teachers indicated on the Teacher Questionnaire that they received a Coach/Mentor during their first year of teaching. Current research and data from this study suggested to the researcher the importance of providing individual attention to high school novice teachers in their first year of teaching. The coach or mentor offers an opportunity to develop the teacher through addressing needs in a non-evaluative way. This coach or mentor has the responsibility to provide individual advice and guidance regarding the profession of education for novice public high school teachers.

Additionally, respondents in this research study confirmed Glatthorn’s (1997) research by indicating that high school novice teachers could benefit from Focused Observations in their first year of teaching. Zimpher (1988) highlighted the importance of such observations as a way to analyze, provide feedback, and reflect on instructional practices through a collaborative process. All but one high school
novice teacher indicated on the Teacher Questionnaire that they participated in Focus Observations during their first year of teaching. Focused Observations provide novice teachers with the benefit of having their curriculum, classroom instruction, classroom management, and planning reviewed by a faculty member to inform and improve their practice. Respondents in this research study indicated that high school novice teachers wanted feedback on "specific aspects of teaching and learning" (Glatthorn, 1997, p. 52).

Another area of Differentiated Supervision highlighted by the data collected was Cooperative Development. The three components of Cooperative Development identified by high school novice teachers that were needed during their first year of teaching were Professional Dialogues, Curriculum Development, and Cooperative Teams.

Professional Dialogues are conversations that support teachers understanding of the profession. The dialogues' purpose is to incorporate knowledge teachers have developed, knowledge gained from experiences, and knowledge as to what to expect in the future (Glatthorn, 1997). One high school novice teacher listed their first year needs as follows: “learning the procedures of the building, discipline procedures, school procedures/culture, learning the staff/departments, school operating system.” Respondents that identified learning building procedures, curriculum and professional assistance, school operating systems, and peer assistance as a needed support could receive this support from Professional Dialogues.
Curriculum Development is when teachers work together to review, revise or create curriculum for their school or district. Glatthorn (1997) identified cooperative teams as the best way to achieve Curriculum Development. Smaller, Collaborative Teams can focus on the curriculum utilized in their classrooms. The researcher utilized the term Collaborative Teams on the Teacher Questionnaire to capitalize on how many school districts currently reference their use of Cooperative Teams. Therefore, the use of Cooperative Teams and Collaborative Teams are interchangeable throughout this chapter. One high school novice teacher respondent articulated a need for Curriculum Development in the first year of teaching, asking for “curriculum and professional help with classroom content and management.” Another high school novice teacher articulated the need for Cooperative Teams in the first year of teaching, asking for “support from peers and the knowledge that my peers are there for me, helping with lesson planning activities and ideas for me to use.” Respondents that identified peer support, curriculum, content resources, and lesson planning as an area of support could receive this support from Curriculum Development and Cooperative Teams.

Respondents in this research study confirmed Glatthorn’s (1997) research by indicating that public high school novice teachers could benefit from Curriculum Development and Cooperative Teams in their first year of teaching. Fulton et al. (2005) found that new teachers who have the opportunity to work collaboratively with peers “feel supported in their work” (p. 16). Three high school novice teachers indicated on the Teacher Questionnaire that they did not participate in Curriculum
Development during their first year of teaching, but they all indicated being part of Collaborative Teams. Fulton et al. (2005) illustrated how Cooperative Teams positively impact new teachers through focused work with the novice teacher on their “content area, grade level or area shared professional need” (p. 13). Current research and data from this study suggested the importance of providing teachers with an opportunity to work collaboratively and interact with a variety of individuals in a variety of settings in their first year of teaching.

All but one high school novice teacher indicated on the Teacher Questionnaire that they participated in Professional Dialogues during their first year of teaching. Current research and data from this study suggested to the researcher the benefits of providing teachers an opportunity to be part of the communication about learning building procedures, curriculum and professional assistance, school operating systems, and available peer support. Boggan et al. (2010) provided ideas on how to utilize Professional Dialogues in induction, including the suggestion that schools “instruct inductees on subjects that the administration deems important, issues that peer teachers have found essential or helpful and concerns expressed by the participating inductee” (p. 4). Professional Dialogues were coded as professional development and induction meetings. Professional Dialogues provide high school novice teachers with the opportunity to receive information while gathered together to ensure the message is clear and consistent. Additionally, the topics of these meetings can range from preparing high school novice teachers for building initiatives to informing them about upcoming school events and professional
development. This provided clarity to new teachers regarding information needed to be successful by the school and districts standards.

Principal data from this research support the needs identified by public high school novice teachers in this study. Principals in this research study recognized that public high school novice teachers require “immediate comfort” and “basic needs” to be addressed in the first year of teaching. Principal examples of novice teacher needs were identified as classroom management, lesson planning, accumulation to the school’s policies and procedures, and a mentor or coach to provide individualized support.

**Research Question 1B**

According to the perceptions of first year public high school teachers with no prior work experience, how did their districts’ induction programs meet their needs?

Seven public high school novice teachers in Illinois identified a variety of ways their districts addressed their needs during their first year of teaching, as well as needs not met by the districts. The needs not met by districts included professional development in their specific field of teaching, clarity of meeting requirements at the district, tuition reimbursement, explanation of the new evaluation system, and time to work with peers. The majority of teachers ranked their districts favorably in the Likert scale, in terms of whether or not the district addressed their professional needs in their first year.
Table 137

Summary of Public High School Novice Teachers Needs Not Met During the First Year of Teaching (N = 7)

| Teachers Site A (n = 2 novice teachers) | Likert scale 6 out of 7  
Needs Not Met = None  
Likert scale 7 out of 7  
Needs Not Met = Professional Development in specific field |
|----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| High School Novice Teachers Site B (n = 2) | Likert scale 5 out of 7  
 Needs Not Met = Everything was eventually learned in the lunch and learns, but some of these things were 7 months after school started.  
Likert scale 5 out of 7  
Needs Not Met = The clarity of going about meeting requirements for the district. Taking classes at a school on quarters and getting reimbursed on semesters. |
| High School Novice Teachers Site C (n = 3) | Likert scale 7 out of 7  
Needs Not Met = Omitted  
Likert scale 5 out of 7  
Needs Not Met = New evaluation system has everyone confused  
Likert scale 5 out of 7  
Needs Not Met = Time to case coordinate |
| Totals From Responses | Needs Not Met Professional Development N = 1  
Needs Not Met No Response N = 2  
Needs Not Met Written-In Response Focused on School Meetings N = 2  
Needs Not Met Evaluation Process N = 1  
Needs Not Met Collaboration N = 1 |
The various needs not met should not come as a total surprise when asked across three districts and six schools. One high school novice teacher in this study felt the lack of clarity on the district-wide tuition reimbursement was a need not met by the district. This respondent referenced this throughout the questionnaire. Another high school novice teacher in a different district indicated the new evaluation system created confusion and indicated that as a need not met. Finally, two high school novice teachers did not address the question at all. The research stated, “A person’s first year of teaching is too unusual, too filled with extremes and emotional highs and lows” (Ryan & Cooper, 1998, p. 491). To repeat the words of Roberson and Roberson (2008), novice teachers are “encountering a world of unknowns” (p. 114), and thus needs met and not met will be based on a variety of unknown factors that are unique to each individual’s educational experience his or her first year. The variety of unknown factors that can be unique to the respondents could stem from factors such as their district culture and climate, school culture and climate, and their personal experience during their induction.

**Relevance of Research Data to Allan A. Glatthorn’s Model of Differentiated Supervision – Question 1B.** Intensive Development is relevant to this study based on the research data from public high school novice teachers’ identifying needs not met during the first year of teaching. The component of Intensive Development identified by high school novice teachers as needs not met during their first year of teaching can be addressed through Coaching/Mentoring.
Coaching/Mentoring is “when a senior person (the mentor in terms of age and experience) provides information, advice and emotional support to a junior person (i.e., the mentee) in a relationship lasting over an extended period of time” (Barrera et al., 2010, p. 62). One high school novice teacher respondent identified needs not met as “the clarity of going about meeting requirements for the district. Taking classes at a school on quarters and getting reimbursed on semesters.” Respondents who required clarity on meeting requirements, reimbursement for courses, and clarity on the evaluation system could have acquired this information from a coach, mentor, team leader, colleague or anyone identified as a support for the teacher.

Respondents in this research study confirmed Glatthorn’s (1997) research by indicating that public high school novice teachers’ needs not meet in their first year of teaching can be addressed by an individual dedicated to them in their first year of teaching. Ingersoll and Strong (2011) found “the character and content of these programs vary widely” (p. 203). They continue to identify variances in mentor and mentee meetings, number of new teachers served by a single mentor, selection of mentor, and training as reasons for inconstancies in delivering mentor support (Ingersoll & Strong, 2011). All high school novice teachers indicated on the Teacher Questionnaire that they received a Coach/Mentor during their first year of teaching. The data from this study suggested to the researcher that high school novice teachers were receiving a coach or mentor but there was a lack of fidelity in terms of
how this support was delivered to high school novice teachers in the first year of teaching.

Another of the Differentiated Supervision areas relevant to this research, based on the previously mentioned research data, is Cooperative Development. The components of Cooperative Development identified by high school novice teachers as needs not met during their first year of teaching were Professional Dialogues. Respondents indicated specifically the need for more clarity on the evaluation process and professional development.

Respondents in this research study confirmed Glatthorn’s (1997) research by indicating public high school novice teachers’ needs not met in their first year of teaching could be addressed by discussing their concerns and gaining professional knowledge. One high school novice teacher stated that the “new evaluation system has everyone confused.” All but one high school novice teacher indicated on the Teacher Questionnaire that they participated in Professional Dialogues during their first year of teaching. The data from this study suggested to the researcher that the content of Professional Dialogues might be missing key topics and opportunities to enhance the needs of high school novice teachers in their first year of teaching. Additionally, data from this research indicated that the structure of Professional Dialogues followed a format that may not reflect the cohort of teachers for the induction year and their perceived needs.

Principal data from this research affirmed the first year needs not met for public high school novice teachers in this study. Principals in this research study
recognized the value of a mentor or other building personal to provide induction support to new teachers. However, principals in this research study addressed the fact that mentors may not “take care of the day-to-day, the day-to-day survival of what needs to be in and when.” Therefore the principals acknowledged there could be improvements in addressing the needs of high school novice teachers in their induction program.

**Research Question 1C**

According to the perceptions of first year public high school teachers with no prior work experience, what specific recommendations would they make to improve their districts’ induction programs?

Seven public high school novice teachers in Illinois acknowledged a variety of recommendations to change in their first year of teaching. The prevailing themes recommended by public high school novice teachers to add to induction programs were to reduce stress, alleviate the feeling of being alone, use time in a more meaningful way, and offer clarity on evaluation systems and professional development.
Table 138

Summary of Public High School Novice Teachers Change to Induction (N = 7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers Site A (n = 2 novice teachers)</th>
<th>None Specific Professional Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School Novice Teachers Site B (n = 2)</td>
<td>Less stressful/hectic. A lot of time was spent asking basic questions that should have been provided. It felt like you were on your own the first year. The independence was great! But there were basic information/needs that would have helped. My very 1st year of teaching I would want more informal observations to get feedback on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Novice Teachers Site C (n = 3)</td>
<td>Sometime we had very long meetings after school that interfered with other obligations like coaching. Most of the time, the meetings were great but sometimes the meetings topics weren't so great. Nothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals From Responses</td>
<td>No Response N = 3 Professional Development N = 1 Usage of Time N = 2 Feedback from Observations N = 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The variety in suggested teacher changes to district induction could be best summarized by Fletcher and Strong (2009): “Variation across new teacher induction programs is likely to be found not only in the degree of their comprehensiveness,
but also the nature of the program elements” (p. 330). Smith and Ingersoll (2004) acknowledge the variation in induction programs.

Programs vary according to the numbers of new teachers they serve; some include anyone new to a particular school, even those with previous teaching experience; others focus solely on candidates who are new to teaching. Programs vary according to their purpose. Some, for instance, are primarily developmental and designed to foster growth on the part of newcomers. (p. 683)

Fry and Anderson (2011) address the poor use of time as a common component of inadequate induction. They also acknowledge that new teachers feel “overwhelmed and busy” (p. 7). Roberson and Roberson (2008) identify five major areas of concern regarding novice teachers. The five major areas of concern include the following: workload and time management, knowledge of curriculum, evaluation, grading, and issues of autonomy and control (p. 114). This explains the various categories recommended to improve districts’ induction programs. Public high school novice teachers in this study confirmed the research regarding the implications of variation in induction programs, site by site. The public high school novice teachers in this study aligned their responses with the research on aspects of induction programs that were of concern to teachers. The concerns articulated by the respondents indicated a widely shared sense of time wasted and information not provided.

**Relevance of Research Data to Allan A. Glatthorn’s Model of Differentiated Supervision – Question 1C.** Intensive Development is relevant to this study based on the research data from public high school novice teachers that recommended changes to the induction programs in the school district. The
component of Intensive Development identified by public high school novice teachers as an aspect of induction they would change in their school districts could be addressed through Focused Observation. One public high school novice teacher respondent indicated, “I would want more informal observations to get feedback on.” Respondents that identified changes to include more informal feedback from observations recognized Focused Observations as a potential benefit to new teacher induction.

Respondents in this research study confirmed Glatthorn’s (1997) research by identifying public high school novice teachers would benefit from Focused Observations in their first year of teaching. Goodwin (2012) acknowledged, “novice teachers often appear to yearn for, yet seldom receive, meaningful feedback on their teaching from experienced colleagues and administrators” (p. 85). The inclusion of Focused Observations in an induction program can provide individual feedback on curriculum development, classroom instruction, classroom management, and planning for a public high school novice teacher. Since the purpose of Focused Observations is to work on one area, the public high school novice teacher is not confronted with a myriad of things to work on. The public high school novice teacher focuses in on one area at a time, thus providing the pathway to grow as a teacher in a more focused way. Additionally, the process of Focused Observations can be utilized as preparation for a formal evaluation and therefore directly address concerns brought up by respondents in this study.
Another of the Differentiated Supervision areas relevant to this study, based on the previously mentioned research data, is Cooperative Development. Within Cooperative Development, the specific components identified by public high school novice teachers as an area of induction they would change in their district are Professional Dialogues. One respondent stated, “A lot of time was spent asking basic questions that should have been provided. It felt like you were on your own the first year. The independence was great! But there were basic information/needs that would have helped.” Another respondent indicated he/she would add “more info on professional learning requirements.” Respondents suggested they wanted more professional support in their first year of teaching. Fulton et al. (2005) suggested that although a new teacher may receive a mentor, the school culture could foster “teaching with the door closed, and with little opportunity for interaction among peers, a new teacher’s isolation is profound” (p. 13). Data from this study indicated that Professional Dialogues were not fully utilized to address the needs of public high school novice teachers.

Respondents in this research study confirmed Glatthorn’s (1997) research by indicating that public high school novice teachers would benefit from Cooperative Development, specifically Professional Dialogues, in their first year of teaching. The inclusion of a protocol for creating effective Professional Dialogues can permit a wide array of benefits: covering teachers’ basic induction needs, maximizing time, and providing professional development expectations. Glatthorn clarified that effective Professional Dialogues need structure “or they may degenerate into
aimless talk” (p. 59). Glatthorn recommended creating a schedule of topics that
must adhere to three specific criteria:

a. The topic is important to them professionally.

b. The issues are ones about which informed professionals differ.

c. Materials are available relating to the topic.

Structuring Professional Dialogues to follow Glatthorn’s three criteria can maximize
time and create meaningful topics to address the needs of novice public high school
teachers.

Principal data from this research support the recommendations public high
school novice teachers would make to improve their districts’ induction programs.

Principals in this research study recognized the benefit of utilizing Focused
Observations in their districts’ induction program. One principal respondent
articulated the use of Focused Observations as “I think ideally, would be the new
teacher sitting along side of either a mentor or an evaluator, so that afterwards,
there can be dialogue back and forth about what they just saw.” Principals also
discussed providing new teachers with a way to learn the “must-knows” and
address basic concerns. One principal specifically identified the use of after school
meetings as an area of improvement to their districts’ induction program to deliver
important information to new teachers. He reflected “Trying to be more responsive
to where we place them in those things, in those offerings, more responsive to what
is it that they actually want to talk about or discuss further in detail, because we
have a stock way we go about it but what we probably need to think more about is
Here are some ideas but what’s happening right now for you? I think that’s probably how we could be more responsive from what we do.”

**Conclusion: Beginning Public High School Career-Change Teachers**

**Research Question 2A**

According to the perceptions of beginning public high school career-change teachers, what are beginning public high school career-change teachers’ needs during their first year?

Six beginning public high school career-change teachers identified the needs of beginning public high school career-change teachers during their first year of teaching. The most frequent response was focused around the evaluation system. Five beginning public high school career-change teachers identified advice, or guidance, as a need during their first year of teaching. This advice, or guidance, was characterized as covering the topics of policies and procedures, classroom situations, human resource concerns, curriculum guidance, and the technology to complete the job. Three beginning public high school career-change teachers referenced a lack of confidence in the evaluation process, clarity in implementation, and need for more interpersonal interaction with evaluators. The last items centered on district and school specific items. This was seen in the need for understanding school culture, meeting requirements, and district expectations.
Table 139

*Summary of Beginning Public High School Career-Change Teachers Needs during the First Year of Teaching (N = 6)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career-Change High School Teachers Site A (n = 3)</th>
<th>Mostly advice for specific situations in classroom/HR questions/etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It would have been helpful to learn about discipline policies regarding student drug abuse as I had 3 students with severe issues and there was no plan in place. The observation system was really stressful and made me quite nervous. Something to fix, this would've been helpful. It would've been nice to have a building mentor who was specifically trained and attended meetings with me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Semi-regular observations (formal and informal) to provide feedback on instruction and classroom management. Periodic scheduled meeting w/evaluator to touch base with ideas, concerns, etc. Both instructional and professional.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career-Change High School Teachers Site B (n = 2)</th>
<th>Knowledge of policies/procedures and evaluation process, district academic goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PLC time, guidance of creation of curriculum, weekly team meetings, monthly new teacher meetings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Career-Change High School Teachers Site C (n = 1) | Understand school culture/climate, learning technology need to do the job, identifying faculty staff and building communications, understanding protocol procedures |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totals From Responses</th>
<th>Evaluation system N = 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advice/Guidance N = 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observations N = 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The notion that individuals changing a career would require advice and guidance in their new teaching profession should not be a surprise to any educator.
Wilson and Delany (2010) stated that career-change teachers have “been away from schools for varying amounts of time” (p. 170). The career-change teacher may be especially challenged by the evolution in teaching practice from when the career-change teacher was a student to the current teaching practices in schools.

Additionally, as Darrell Lee’s research in (2011) indicated, career-change teachers can possess the necessary content background, but they may lack an understanding of lesson planning, thus requiring assistance from others. Yet none of the respondents indicated such support coming from a specific mentor. Past research indicates it is not uncommon for career-change teachers to either not receive a mentor or to receive a mentor who does not devote time to supporting the career-change teacher (Fry & Anderson, 2011; Peter D. Hart Research Associates, Inc., 2010; Sawchuck, 2008).

**Relevance of Research Data to Allan A. Glatthorn’s Model of Differentiated Supervision – Question 2A.** Intensive Development was relevant to this study based on the research data from beginning public high school career-change teachers identifying their needs during the first year of teaching. The two components of Intensive Development identified by beginning public high school career-change teachers as needed during their first year of teaching were Coaching/Mentoring and Focused Observation.

Respondents in this research study confirmed Glatthorn’s (1997) research by indicating that beginning public high school career-change teachers would benefit from individuals dedicated to supporting them in their first year of teaching. All
beginning public high school career-change teachers indicated on the Teacher Questionnaire that they received a Coach/Mentor during their first year of teaching. Current research and data from this study suggested to the researcher the importance of providing individual attention to a beginning public high school career-change teacher during the first year of teaching. The coach or mentor offers an opportunity to develop the teacher by addressing the teachers’ needs and focusing on the strengths they have brought from another field, in a non-evaluative way (Barrera et al., 2010; Ingersoll, 2004; Ingersoll & Strong, 2012; Schwille, 2008). This coach or mentor is given the responsibility by the school and district to provide advice and guidance regarding the profession of education for beginning public high school career-change teachers. Additionally, the coach or mentor is the career-change teachers’ guide as they navigate this new career.

Additionally, respondents in this study confirmed Glatthorn’s (1997) research by indicating that beginning public high school career-change teachers would benefit from Focused Observations in their first year of teaching. All but one beginning public high school career-change teacher indicated on the Teacher Questionnaire that they had participated in Focus Observations during their first year of teaching. One beginning public high school career-change teacher identified an unmet need during the first year of teaching as “semi-regular observations (formal and informal) to provide feedback on instruction and classroom management.” Darrell Lee’s (2011) research supports the need to provide beginning public high school career-change teachers’ with Focused Observations since they
only have a minimal understanding of “some basic structure of lessons” (p. 10). Focused Observations can provide beginning public high school career-change teachers with the experience of having their curriculum, classroom instruction, classroom management, and planning reviewed by a faculty member for feedback on their practice.

Another area of Differentiated Supervision highlighted by the research study was Cooperative Development. Within Cooperative Development, beginning public high school career-change teachers identified two components as needed during the first year of teaching: Professional Dialogues and Curriculum Development.

Respondents in this research study confirmed Glatthorn’s (1997) research by indicating that beginning public high school career-change teachers would benefit from opportunities to collaborate with other members of the faculty during their first year of teaching. Beginning public high school career-change respondents identified professional learning committees, policies and procedures, and a forum to address human resource questions, as needed supports that could be addressed via Professional Dialogues.

All beginning public high school career-change teachers indicated on the Teacher Questionnaire that they participated in Professional Dialogues during their first year of teaching. One beginning public high school career-change teacher respondent indicated “PLC time” and “monthly new teacher meetings” as needs during the first year of teaching. The data from this study suggests the importance of providing beginning public high school career-change teachers with an opportunity
to be a part of communication that offers beginning public high school career-change teachers with an opportunity to interact with peers in their new field. Professional Dialogues were coded as professional development and induction meetings. These dialogues provided beginning public high school career-change teachers with the opportunity to receive information and share their career experiences with colleagues. Sawchuk (2008) stated, “it’s clear that midcareer entrants potentially have real strengths and assets to bring to teaching that could enrich a school. But it’s a mistake to assume that people can immediately move into teaching positions and know what to do, just based on the fact that they are more mature” (p. 2). For a beginning public high school career-change teacher, the variety of topics, and Glatthorn’s (1997) recommended protocol for Professional Dialogues, can offer concrete understanding of their role as a teacher.

Additionally, respondents in this study confirmed Glatthorn’s (1997) research by indicating that beginning public high school career-change teachers would benefit from Curriculum Development support during their first year of teaching. One beginning public high school career-change teacher indicated on the Teacher Questionnaire that she/he did not participate in Curriculum Development during the first year of teaching, but all beginning public high school beginning teachers indicated experience being part of Collaborative Teams. The data from this study suggest the importance of providing career-change teachers with ample opportunities to work with individuals covering the same content or grade level teams. Moses (2010) supports the idea of public high school career-change teachers
being part of Curriculum Development and Collaborative Teams: “career-changers, unlike undergraduate education students, require more exposure to modern teaching methods because much has changed since many of them were students” (p. 1). All six beginning public high school career-change teachers identified being part of Collaborative Teams, yet current research and data from this research study imply that there can be a discrepancy in what these teams worked towards during each beginning public high school career-change teachers’ first year of teaching.

Principal data from this research support the first year needs identified by beginning public high school career-change teachers in this study. Principals in this research study articulated that the field of education has changed since the beginning public high school career-change teacher attended high school, “it’s different if you come back to it in your 30’s or 40’s. It just looks different.” The change in education since beginning public high school career-change teachers attended high school themselves would create diversity of needs in the first year of teaching. Principals provided a variety of needs that were coded as Intensive Development and Cooperative Development specific to the individual career-change teacher’s needs.

**Research Question 2B**

According to the perceptions of beginning public high school career-change teachers, how did their districts’ induction programs meet their needs?

Six beginning public high school career-change teachers in Illinois identified a variety of ways their districts addressed their needs during their first year of
teaching, as well as specific needs not met by their districts. The average score beginning public high school career-change teachers gave to the Likert scale question “Did your school address those needs?” was a 5.5. This number lies on the “Strongly Agree” side of the scale. One respondent selected a 2, while the other five respondents selected 5.5, 6’s and a 7. Three respondents provided no response to the question asking if there were any needs not meet in their first year of teaching. Two respondents referenced clarifying observations, and single responses addressed the needs of fostering better mentors, substance abuse training, time with administration, and goal setting.

Table 140

Summary of Beginning Public High School Career-Change Teachers Needs Not Met during the First Year of Teaching (N = 6)

| Career-Change High School Teachers Site A (n = 3) | Likert scale 7 out of 7  
None  
Likert scale 2 out of 7  
Needs Not Met = Observation are 4 a year the first 2 and extremely stressful, better building mentor program, more training on student substance abuse  
Likert scale 6 out of 7  
Needs Not Met = Not sure there are any - perhaps more time with administration to establish a better knowledge of each other (how each operates in/out of class) - may help evaluation be better |
| Career-Change High School Teachers Site B (n = 2) | Likert scale 6 out of 7  
N/A  
Likert scale 6 out of 7  
N/A |
| Career-Change High School Teachers Site C (n = 1) | Likert scale 5.5 out of 7  
Needs Not Met = Would have liked targeted "goals" |
or "initiatives" geared toward the role I have in school - counseling, social work etc. - most were focused on classroom teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totals From Responses</th>
<th>No Needs Not Met N =3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observations N = 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Better Mentor Program N = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Substance Abuse Program N = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administration Time N = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goal Setting N = 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With regard to the three beginning public high school career-change teachers who suggested that no needs were unmet, Wilson and Delany (2010) referenced that career-change teachers “bring different but important life skills and experiences to teaching, confidence in their role as an authority figure, and experiences of supervisory responsibilities and working in teams” (p. 170). Previous career skills and experience in the workplace may have supported the three beginning public high school career-change teacher who stated that all their needs were met in their first year of teaching. These respondents could support principals who stated that the needs for both public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers are the same and require no differentiation in induction. The other individual needs not met by the respondents are supported by the literature. Peter D. Hart Research Inc. (2010) states, “many teachers are not receiving critical support, including orientation by their principal or mentoring” (p. 25). Orientation by an administrator or a mentor could have provided information on clarifying
observations, fostering better mentors, substance abuse training, time with administration, and goal-setting for the career-changers in this study. Principals who recognized that the changes to their induction program should address the “must-knows”, more time with evaluators to review the evaluation process, and extend the induction program duration, support the findings from beginning public high school career-change teachers regarding their needs not being met.

Relevance of Research Data to Allan A. Glatthorn's Model of Differentiated Supervision – Question 2 B. Intensive Development was relevant to this study based on the research data from beginning public high school career-change teachers identifying their needs not met during the first year of teaching. The component of Intensive Development identified by beginning public high school career-change teachers as a need not met during their first year of teaching can be addressed through Coaching/Mentoring and Focused Observations.

Respondents in this study confirmed Glatthorn’s (1997) research by indicating that beginning public high school beginning teachers’ needs not met in their first year of teaching can be addressed by having an individual dedicated to each teacher in their first year of teaching. All public high school career-change teachers indicated on the Teacher Questionnaire that they received a Coach/Mentor during their first year of teaching. One respondent acknowledged she/he could have benefited from a “better building mentor program.” The research reviewed found that career-change teachers often do not receive a similar mentoring experience as compared to their novice peers (Fry & Anderson, 2011; Peter D. Hart Research
Associates, Inc., 2010; Sawchuk, 2008). The data from this study suggested to the researcher that beginning public high school career-change teachers were receiving a coach or mentor, but there was a lack of fidelity in the program when mentors worked with career-change teachers.

Respondents in this study confirmed Glatthorn’s (1997) research by indicating beginning public high school career-change teachers’ needs not met in their first year of teaching can be addressed with the Focused Observations. All but one beginning public high school career-change teachers indicated on the Teacher Questionnaire that they participated in Focused Observations during their first year of teaching. The data from this study suggested to the researcher that beginning public high school career-change teachers want feedback on their performance. One respondent expressed a desire for “more time with administration to establish a better knowledge of each other, how each operates in/out of class.” The use of Focused Observations results can be “used to guide professional practice” (Peter D. Hart Research Associates, Inc., 2010, p. xii). Focused Observations provide the opportunity for beginning public high school career-change teachers in their first year of teaching to understand administrative instructional expectations and become more effective in the classroom.

Self-Directed Development is another of the three suggested areas of Differentiated Supervision teachers should receive during the course of the school year. Self-Directed Development is when an individual teacher works on a goal independently with occasional oversight by a supervisor. The four areas of Self-
Directed Development are (1) goals based on professional role, (2) goals based on generic skills of teaching, (3) goals based on subject-specific skills, and (4) goals based on mixed sources (Glatthorn, 1997). A respondent indicated the goals based on professional role as a need not met during her/his first year of teaching.

Respondents in this study confirmed Glatthorn's (1997) research by indicating that beginning public high school career-change teachers' needs not met in their first year of teaching can be addressed with better opportunities to create professional goals. All beginning public high school career-change teachers indicated on the Teacher Questionnaire that they participated in a form of goal-setting during their first year of teaching, but did not identify how the goals impacted their needs. One respondent stated that they “would have liked targeted ‘goals’ or ‘initiatives’ geared toward the role I have in school.” Glatthorn recognizes the benefit of goal-setting as providing teachers the opportunity to effect change in instruction through “choosing the strategies to achieve those goals, and assessing their own progress” (p. 71). The data from this study suggested to the researcher that beginning public high school career-change teachers could utilize goal-setting as a way to guide their professional growth during the first year of teaching.

Therefore, having beginning public high school career-change teachers create professional goals provides a form of structure by which they can measure their own success in the first year of teaching.

Principal data from this research support the needs not met identified by first year beginning public high school career-change teachers in this study.
Principals in this research study identified areas of Intensive Development and Cooperative Development to address the needs not met in a beginning public high school career-change teachers’ first year of teaching. However, three principal respondents indicated their district does not address the specific needs of a beginning public high school career-change teacher. One principal respondent stated, “We don’t have a differentiated plan for career changers versus first-year teachers”, therefore allowing for some needs of a beginning public high school career-change teacher to go unmet.

**Research Question 2C**

According to the perceptions of beginning public high school career-change teachers, what recommendations would they make to improve their districts’ induction programs?

Six beginning public high school career-change teachers in Illinois acknowledged a variety of recommendations to change their first year of teaching. The prevailing theme beginning public high school career-change teachers would recommend adding to induction programs centered on professional learning. Three beginning public high school career-change teachers acknowledged professional learning as an area of induction requiring additional clarity. The respondents referenced the need for more information on the topic of professional learning, better clarity on the goals of professional learning, and the option for more heterogenous learning with a variety of professionals in the school. Two respondents indicated that they had no recommendations, one respondent
suggested stronger mentor training to support the new teacher during a crisis, and one respondent requested more feedback from formal observations.

Table 141

*Summary of Beginning Public High School Career-Change teachers Change to Induction (N = 6)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career-Change High School Teachers Site A (n = 3)</th>
<th>More info on professional learning requirements/report to IL state licensure.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents at this school are very 'intense' and there was an explosive situation that I was completely unprepared for. As a result, my self-confidence was shaky that first semester and my observations did not go well. This is a great school but there is a lot of performance pressure. I've learned to adjust but having a mentor that understood this, was trained for it would've been helpful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None related to this topic - mine are related to choices I made in planning, club sponsorship, etc. (entirely on me, not the school’s structure).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career-Change High School Teachers Site B (n = 2)</td>
<td>Clearer goals, clearer objectives for teaching or PLC agreed to goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My very 1st year of teaching I would want more informal observations to get feedback on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career-Change High School Teachers Site C (n = 1)</td>
<td>Have more cross-building SPS collaboration days, protocol/process &quot;handbook&quot; available, more instruction on professional development for faculty not in the classroom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totals From Responses</th>
<th>Professional Development N = 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stronger Mentor N = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback from Observations N = 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Beginning public high school career-change teachers identified suggestions to improve their districts’ induction program with targeted professional development, stronger mentors, and better communication within the observation process, supports current research on aspects of induction programs (Smith & Ingersoll, 2004). Current research highlights that beginning public high school career-change teachers are often perceived as not requiring constant support during their entry into education, due to the presumption or perception of skills and talents from their previous work experience (Fry & Anderson, 2011; Peter D. Hart Research Associates, Inc., 2010; Sawchuck, 2008). Principal respondents that indicated that beginning public high school career-change and novice teachers’ needs do not require differentiated induction supports the research on inadequate induction for beginning public high school career-change teachers. The research from this study indicated this perception still takes place.

**Relevance of Research Data to Allan A. Glatthorn’s Model of Differentiated Supervision – Question 2C.** Intensive Development is relevant to this study based on the research data from beginning public high school career-change teachers identifying changes they would like to make to their districts’ induction programs. The components within Intensive Development that beginning public high school career-change teachers identified as potential changes to their districts' induction programs are Coaching/Mentoring and Focused Observation.

Respondents in this study confirmed Glatthorn’s (1997) research by indicating beginning public high school career-change teachers would like more
personal guidance and instructional evaluation in their first year of teaching from a coach/mentor. One respondent reflected on a situation that impacted her first year: “I've learned to adjust but having a mentor that understood this, was trained for it, would've been helpful.” Peter D. Hart Research Associates, Inc. (2010) found that career-change teachers experienced inconstancies in mentoring, but at the very least, “the mentoring relationship was meaningful while it lasted” (p. 25). Current research highlights that career-change teachers received inconsistent induction compared to their novice peers (Fry & Anderson, 2011; Peter D. Hart Research Associates, Inc., 2010; Sawchuk, 2008). Data from this study supports the research that some beginning public high school career-change teachers were not provided with the same induction support as their novice peers. The research from this study suggests that beginning public high school career-change teachers wanted and received parts of these supports, but did not receive equitable coaching/mentoring, as well as other aspects of induction.

Cooperative Development was also relevant to this research based on the research data from beginning public high school career-change teachers identifying changes they would make to their districts’ induction programs. The components in Cooperative Development beginning public high school career-change teachers would revise in their induction program is Professional Dialogues. Respondents identified professional development, cross-building collaboration, human resource inquires, and professional learning committee structures amongst the areas for improvement within the district induction program.
Respondents in this study confirmed Glatthorn’s (1997) research by indicating beginning public high school career-change teachers would benefit from Professional Dialogues in their first year of teaching. Wilson and Delany (2010) highlighted the benefits of Professional Dialogue in their research on career-change teachers in education. They found their respondents had the opportunity to utilize these opportunities to “reflect on and respond to students in her classroom,” thus “proving practical strategies which would be adopted immediately in the classrooms” (p. 177). Current research and data from this study suggests to the researcher that beginning public high school career-change teachers’ immediate needs in their new field of education differ from those of public high school novice teachers. Career-change teachers’ identified a variety of different suggestions to improve the district induction program then their novice peers. The suggestions career-change teachers’ offered included more professional development, collaboration beyond the school, access to human resources, and more structure in professional learning to be included in the districts induction program. Following Glatthorn’s (1997) structure for effective Professional Dialogues, beginning public high school career-change teachers can contribute and benefit from content, as well as provide topics that are beneficial to public high school novice teachers. These are topics that a public high school novice teacher may not have considered based on their lack of work experience.

Principal data from this research support the recommendations that beginning public high school career-change teachers would make to improve their
districts’ induction programs. Principals in this research study recognized the benefit of utilizing Focused Observations in their districts’ induction program. One principal respondent articulated the use of Focused Observations as a way to improve their current program of induction: “The one piece that we don’t spend much time on that I think should be an ideal program is more time around classroom instruction with the new teachers watching classroom examples, maybe a combination of video clips and then afterwards, let’s have some discussion and hear from an evaluator what their evaluation of what they just saw is. Then also some observations in classrooms of other teachers.” Principal respondents also indicated that beginning public high school career-change teachers would benefit from guidance on how to work with high school students, as well as have a pathway for leadership from their previous experiences. Professional Dialogues can be utilized in an induction program to provide such support to beginning public high school career-change teachers. Additionally, all principal respondents indicated the importance of a Mentor/Coach in their induction programs.

**Conclusion: Public High School Principals**

**Research Question 3A**

According to the perceptions of the public high school principals, what are the needs of a first year public high school teacher with no prior work experience versus a beginning high school career-change teacher during his or her first year of teaching?
Six Illinois public high school principals in three school districts answered the question regarding the needs of a first year public high school teacher with no prior work experience versus the needs of a beginning high school career-change teacher during their first year of teaching. According to data received, one area of need for both public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers was how to work effectively with students and parents. Principals addressed the challenges these community members may present to public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers. Two principals identified that most public high school novice teachers are close in age to their students and thus must be aware of how to hold limits on teenagers and recognize that they are not their friends. One principal referenced that public high school novice teachers need to know how to deal with parents who may perceive their age as an issue, as well as understand how to teach students near their age. Two principals identified that beginning public high school career-change teachers need to know how to deal with teenagers in a classroom environment because the classroom and students are different from when these career-change teachers attended high school. One principal identified that beginning public high school career-change teachers need to know how to work with parents and not allow their emotions to take over in the conversation. One area of commonality addressed by high school principals was that both public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers needed to learn the culture and work environment of a school setting. One principal referenced that most high school novice teachers come from a similar educational experience, but others may
not and therefore need to understand the culture and expectations of the school.
Two principals identified that beginning public high school career-change teachers’
previous work experience consisted of more structure, whereas a school permits
employees to have more freedom. Therefore beginning public high school career-
change teachers need to know how to work within an environment of greater
autonomy.

The needs of public high school novice teachers’ identified by principals
outside of the three common ones presented were as follows: four principals
indicated that novice teachers require basic needs to be addressed. These basic
needs were described as needs that address comfort and understanding of the
profession. Three principals also identified that public high school novice teachers
require strong classroom instruction support. As one principal indicated, this means
teaching public high school novice teachers how to create engaging lessons that
allow students to construct knowledge. One principal stated that public high school
novice teachers require classroom management support. One principal identified
public high school novice teachers in the first year need urgency in stewarding the
education of students. Additionally, one principal acknowledged the need for public
high school novice teachers to have a strong mentor to support them, and one
principal identified public high school novice teachers need to understand the
evaluation process better, as well as the expectations of this process. Finally, one
principal stated that he should assume nothing and allow for the coaching and goal-
setting process to uncover each public high school novice teacher’s individual needs.
Conversely, principals provided a different set of needs when asked about the needs of a beginning public high school career-change teacher to education during the first year of teaching. Three principals indicated that beginning public high school career-change teachers need assistance with understanding their feelings in the first year, as well as a place to share those feelings with others. One principal indicated beginning public high school career-change teachers need to understand that education is not what it is portrayed in the media. One principal identified the need for a beginning public high school career-change teacher to be empowered to lead in the school, based on their previous experiences gained from her/his prior career. One principal said that public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers’ needs are exactly the same, and one principal admitted to not thinking beginning public high school career-change teachers’ needs would be different.

Table 142

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Site A1 N = 1</th>
<th>Novice Teachers Needs</th>
<th>Career-Change Teacher Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I think the needs are mostly what's being addressed here, the basic needs. I think the needs also include an acclimation to the culture of the place; how do people behave, what are some traditions in this new place. I also think that first year teachers, as I just mentioned in the previous question, should have feedback on some samples of classroom instruction.</td>
<td>I don't believe that they're significantly different from someone who's not a career-changer. With the one difference that I think would be there is, someone who's not been in education before and switching from another career, is going to experience some new feelings and some experiences that might be surprising, some feelings that might be unusual. I think that having some form of a support system, whether it's other people experiencing those experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Site A2 N = 1</td>
<td>Typically, our teachers have gone to a high school that is very similar to this. Oddly enough, we get a lot of teachers who came from some large comprehensive suburban high school that is relatively high performing. They kind of get how the building works. There are some teachers who would, if they came from a smaller school or they had gone to a private high school or a different part of the country, they might need to be enculturated to this particular community, county kind of building expectations. For the most part, they are relatively familiar with what a large suburban high school is like. They typically don’t need a lot of orientation to the general culture of this kind of building. They need some orientation to the logistics. Okay, parent-teacher conferences are coming up. This is how we do them here. Grade reports home are coming up. This is how we do them here. What is expected from you in terms of your participation in meetings, whether they are instructional team meetings or they are department meetings or any other kind of meeting. Those kind of “this is how we do this here” kinds of things, which same feelings ... if, in a building like this, that opportunity would exist where first year teachers could share their feelings - or career-changers could share those feelings with other career-changers, or veteran teachers who were a career-changer 10 years ago, or just somebody as a support system. Usually career-changes to education, and I have had more successful career-changers than I have had unsuccessful career-changers, usually if they face a challenge, it is not being used to dealing with teenagers and having an exaggerated notion of how interesting they will be to teenagers and how interesting their thoughts and the things that fascinate them are going to be to teenagers. Frequently, there is a period of disappointment in the kids feeling sometimes like, “Well, I must just not be doing this right or they would be more fascinated and they would respond with more genuine interest.” Sometimes, that is a disappointment in the kids; sometimes it is a disappointment in self. “I must just not be doing this right.” The number one thing that I see with career-changers is an assumption that they will walk into something that looks like a TV set or a movie set and that is what school will look like when in fact teenagers don’t typically behave the way they do in movies and on TV. The shock of dealing with real-life teenagers day in and day out is often the biggest thing, which isn’t terribly characteristic of first-year teachers who come right out of teacher school because they usually are still somewhat teenagers themselves and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
can be done sort of just in time. You do it right before it’s going to happen and give them some orientation.

Typically, new teachers are most challenged by classroom management. Classroom management is really a subset of engaging instruction. If your instruction is engaging, classroom management for the most part, 80% of the time, all sort of takes care of itself. The real big one is engaging appropriately paced instruction. That falls into what do you think will be the most relevant way to kids to present a particular concept or skill or chunk of content. Usually, first-, second-, third-year teachers are not very constructivist in the way that they do things. They are more inclined to talk a lot and be very teacher centered and share their wisdom. To believe that kids will behave as they did in school, which is to listen raptly and take careful notes and to not be thinking about other things or to be bummed out or to consider things irrelevant or to struggle.

It takes them a while to adjust to the fact that large portions of their clientele are not like them. It takes them a while to figure out activities that they can do with students that are genuinely constructivist. That something really is being created. Some understanding is really being created on the part of the student in the classroom. Those are very difficult things to come up with. It is easy to come up

they recognize the species. It's different if you come back to it in your 30’s or 40’s. It just looks different.

The other thing is that they usually have been working in an environment where there is more regimentation and more of a clear reward structure. Schools are typically not as regimented and well organized as people come out of a corporate environment expect. We have a number of people here who came out of Lucent or engineering firms. Most of our career-changers tend to be in science or math. They have often worked in organizations that were more organized than we are and wonder why we don’t have things more tightly buttoned down. It takes a while to adjust to the fact that we are not colleges, but there is a lot more freedom about how you do things than they have typically experienced.
with gimmicky kinds of things to do. You can get them out of a book. You can get them in teacher school. Activities that truly cause kids to construct genuine understanding at a fairly deep level of something are very challenging to create. That is one of the reasons that I think the first year should be spent doing more observation and being observed than teaching because that is your opportunity to see what genuinely effective teachers are doing and to consider how you would personalize that for your own instruction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Site B1 N = 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I alluded to some of them there. I think some of them will include immediate comfort ... I need to know where do I get my keys, where do I get my ... does my ID open the door 24 hours a day, does my ID open the door only certain times? The most immediate things are the ones that you got somebody who is 23 years old and they literally don't know what it's like to have a full-time job. Some of that stuff is absolutely essential. The second is in a school the urgency of ... you're actually directly responsible for the safety of the students that you're around. You may go home to your mother and father's home tonight; would they take care of you? You're the mother or the father of these kids in your room while they're in our building, and so you have got to recognize the significance of that responsibility. I believe that</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some of that ... Nothing you can take it for granted. Most likely I think that my experience for career-changers through education is that they already ... They find some that ... They find the world of education shockingly free and shockingly autonomous. There is a sense of ... I can't say how many I've heard from a career-changer a statement like, "Well, if I said that to my boss, I'd get fired." In the public school system, the people are relatively free to say what they wish. I think for career-changers, the most important induction need for them is to empower them to lead. Sometimes there are people who have been ... They've not been a boss in a company; they've been less perhaps empowered as an employee, which is one of the reasons they left that position. They didn't feel all things are under control or satisfaction. People who come into teaching in my opinion from another career,
most importantly is the sort of ... I feel little bit of the tough love ... you got to make sure right now fast. You're the one. That to me is an urgent message to the first-year teacher with no work experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Site B2 N = 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Yes, that was me. I think it was definitely having a strong mentor who’s willing to meet with you at least weekly. For me it was lesson planning. I majored in Spanish and French and then I minored in mathematics. I remember my education courses, but no one ever really sat down with you and said this is how you do your lesson plan. This is how you know what to do with the students and what to provide them and how much homework to give and the balance.

I think having someone weekly to sit down with you and say, “How are you doing? Let’s look at your lesson plans for the week,” and then maybe even at the end of the week “what did you modify or what would you do next year?” and talking through it because having that the first year would be a lot.

they feel all of a sudden a passion about this is worthwhile, what I’m doing is really worthwhile, I feel most special when I did I was at a bank or whatever else. They may not feel as empowered to lead as the current climate of teaching. What I feel like one of those ... How to step up as a leader in a professional learning community is unique to a career-changer thought process, particularly one who is ten years older than a newbie who just got here. That person may need to know when not to say certain things. The career-changer may need to know you have wisdom that someone else doesn't. Don’t hesitate. You don’t need to hesitate. You don’t have to fear for your livelihood in a situation like this.

Yes. I think a career-changer they’re used to working with adults. Then you go into a school with kids and it can be just a whirlwind of emotions. Kids are experiencing so much in their life and especially, at least here, so much outside of the school that you have no control over.

That can be far different than the teacher who’s always known they wanted to be a teacher, who just left high school and went to college and is back. They’re still in touch with what it was like to be in high school. Often career-changers might be 10 years out of college, which means they’re 14 or 15 out of high school and they don’t remember that as well.

I think helping them learn to address those types of needs that they are still high schoolers and their different expectations for them then there were in the work place. I’d never worked in the corporate
But then the second year when you open your files and see we met twice every week and I already modified my lessons for the next year, so I think that is definitely necessary.

I think for a first year teacher if they're young, there probably can be some conversation about how to hold limits to the students. How to have them not view you as a friend because you could be 22 or 23 years old. That could be very difficult for people who were just in college and were very friendly with classmates who were 18 when they were 21. Now you're 22 and they're 18 year olds and it's a different dynamic.

That's why I think there could probably be some structure or just tips for that. What do you do when kids make inappropriate comments to you? How do you hold those boundaries?

Where if you're a second career you're probably in the late 20s or early 30s they look like kids to you. It's a completely different outlook in my opinion. I think it will be probably a little more just about how do you handle kids who want to view you as a friend. Then also how do you handle parents who view you like their child. Because there's also that age where they look at you, "Well you're just too young. You don't understand," but I'm still a professional. I still went through all the education and I world, but I have friends that have. I know that it can be a distinctly different place.

Also I think similar to new teachers, first-year out of college teachers, some education on how deal with difficult parents. You have to really monitor and edit what you're saying to them. Sometimes emotions can get the best of you, so it's really just talking through situations before they occur.
| Principal Site C1 N = 1 | What we have found is, we really need to focus a lot on classroom management. How do you approach your classroom? How do you set your classroom up? How do you do classroom expectations, rules, that kind of thing, to set the tone on the very first day. We've used ... Is it Harry Wong? Wong's book. We've used that in the past. Now, we just use excerpts from it. Everybody used to get a copy of it. In the first several weeks, classroom management seems to be what the newest teachers need. How do you let the kids know what your rules are? Things like that. We also need to focus more on our evaluation plan. The Danielson Rubric. We don't do enough with that. We just say, "Here it is. You're going to be evaluated. Here is the evaluation system." We spend some time on what a pre-observation conference is going to be about and what you can expect in the observation with the post-conference is going to be about, but we don't go through the rubric itself. That is a need of our mentoring program for sure and it's a need for all of our teachers to better understand what it means to be an excellent teacher. I would say that should be added. |
| Principal Site C2 N = 1 | Well, I know you have a number six. I think they're both the same. I think there's a danger in that's an interesting thing that we've never really addressed or thought about. You know what's |
assuming that this may sound the wrong way and I don't mean it this way. I think we should assume nothing. We should assume that you've had training so you know your content that's why we hired you and you've given some really good answers to those self-reflection questions we've asked and you've at least convinced us through an interview process that you like to work with young people. If those three things are in place, I think there are to start building from the ground up because I think the way we have it is if you are strong in an area, there's always another place that we can be supporting you.

If classroom management is not an issue for you through some of the things I talked about with the coaching plans and the goal setting, there's other areas that we can be responding to what your need might be. I think people ... teaching is so different than any other position or job that you'll ever do. There may be something that is similar because they have a teaching aspect but the teaching day and what is expected and what you are responsible for I think is so different than anything else and so different from maybe even your student teaching experience that we should really assume nothing.

The needs are the same. Not only do they need to know where the bathroom is, you need that constant support on what does assessment look like, interesting; when I talk to businesses they're expecting that to be taken care of in high school. I guess subsequently we've expected that to be taken care of in college in places like that. We've never done, although it's an interesting idea now that we're sitting here talking about it, we've never done something like a "You are now working and this is what it means to be a good employee. This is what it means to or how you can be successful on the characteristics or attributes related to that." When we hire, we do ask questions related to organizations and things like that so you're hoping you get a feel for what that might look like but we've never taken that on as an added thing that we would think about teaching people new to the profession. It's an interesting idea though.
what does classroom management look like, what is staying current, your content look like. I don't really see a difference between the two and I would say they have a need in all those places.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totals From Responses</th>
<th>Basic Needs N = 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom Instruction N = 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hold Limits on Students N = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encultured to School Community N = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom Management N = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urgency of Being a Teacher N = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strong Mentor N = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dealing with Parents N = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understanding the Evaluation Process N = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assume Nothing/What the Individual Needs N = 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| | New Feelings and Sharing those Feelings N = 3 |
| | Different Work Environment N = 2 |
| | Dealing with Teenagers N = 2 |
| | Reality of Teaching versus Media Portrayal N = 1 |
| | Empowered to Lead N = 1 |
| | Dealing with Parents N = 1 |
| | Needs are the Same as a Novice N = 1 |
| | Not thought of that in the District N = 1 |

Current research has identified the need for new teachers to be supported in classroom management and classroom instruction (Goodwin, 2012). Additionally, research supports the dedication of a mentor (Barrera et al., 2010; Illinois School Code 5/21A-10; Schwille, 2008). Research also supports the notion of assisting new teachers in understanding the school culture and environment (Bickmore & Bickmore, 2010). However, research on basic needs, learning how to hold limits on students who may be close in age with their teacher, the responsibility of being a
teacher, and dealing with parents that perceive a teacher may be too young to be effective teachers, were not uncovered in the review of literature in this study.

Research supported principal assertions that beginning public high school career-change teachers need assistance in working in schools that are different from when they attended school (Moses, 2010; Wilson & Delany, 2010). Research reviewed in this study did not address certain aspects of the beginning public high school career-change teacher’s first year of teaching. The needs identified by principals that were not represented in the research focused on assisting beginning public high school career-change teachers in acknowledging and responding to the emotions they may feel during the first year of teaching. Another need that principals discussed that was not part of the research was how to prepare beginning public high school career-change teachers for the autonomy of education when they come from a professional environment with structure. The final two areas cited by principals in this study that were not represented in the research were ways to empower beginning public high school career-change teachers to lead their colleagues in a new field with the work experience they bring to education and also supporting them when dealing with parents.

Relevance of Research Data to Allan A. Glatthorn's Model of Differentiated Supervision – Question 3A. Intensive Development was relevant to this research based on the research data from principals identifying the needs of public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers in the first year of teaching. Administrators identified two components of Intensive Development that
both public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers need during the first year of teaching: Coaching/Mentoring and Focused Observation.

One principal respondent reflected on her own need as a novice first year teacher: “I think it was definitely having a strong mentor who’s willing to meet with you at least weekly.” One principal respondent discussed the use of other individuals in the building to support a beginning public high school career-change teacher during the first year of education: “I think that having some form of a support system... or career-changers could share those feelings with other career-changers, or veteran teachers who were a career-changer 10 years ago, or just somebody as a support system.” The respondents who suggested the use of a mentor, addressing basic needs, or other supports that can be provided through an experienced teacher all identified Coaching/Mentoring as a need in the first year of teaching.

One principal respondent stated that novice and beginning public high school career-change teachers’ needs are the same. This respondent said the primary focus area for both new teachers is “on classroom management.” One principal respondent highlighted that beginning public high school career-change teachers can have a misconception of “how interesting they will be to teenagers and how interesting their thoughts and the things that fascinate them are going to be to teenagers.” Respondents also identified aspects of instruction and student interactions as an area of assistance indicated in Focused Observation as a need for
a public high school novice and the beginning career-change teacher in their first year.

Respondents in this research study confirmed Glatthorn’s (1997) research by indicating public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers would benefit from Intensive Development during the first year of teaching. The research from this study suggested the high importance principals should place in Intensive Development for new teachers. Barrera et al. (2010) emphasized the importance of a coach/mentor to a new teacher and the role a principal has in supporting that relationship. Principals must inform mentors of the expectations they have for them in “their duties and responsibilities in the mentoring” (p. 71). Current research and data from this study suggested to the researcher that a coach/mentor was nearly always assigned to new faculty members to support them in their first year of teaching, but what supports they provided may not have addressed all the first year needs of a teacher. The research from this study suggests that principals should be part of the discussion of what coaches/mentors need to provide to new teachers during their first year. This can be done by the administrator through providing “explanation of duties and responsibilities assigned to mentors” (p. 72).

Areas principals addressed as a need for public high school novice and beginning career-change high school teacher, but were not reflected in current research, revealed that the role of the mentor requires a wider scope of services to be delivered. For instance, a principal can arrange through a mentor for beginning public high school career-change teachers to create a place to share their feelings
and emotions regarding their impact and performance in the first year (Wilson & Delany, 2010). Conversely, a principal can provide the clarity of the expectations for a coach/mentor to work with a public high school novice teacher about how to set boundaries with their students and reinforce a sense of urgency that does not require the novice teacher being friends with the students. Additionally, a principal can lead or instruct coaches/mentors to conduct meetings for both groups of new teachers to address the perceptions their students and parents might have of them and create scenarios to model how to appropriately interact with their larger school community (Boggan et al., 2010). Regarding Focused Observations, Marable and Raimondi (2007) found that administrators should provide new teachers with an “informal classroom observations followed by discussions” (p. 34).

Research data from principals in this study identified Cooperative Development as a need of public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers in the first year of teaching. Principals identified Cooperative Development as a need during the first year of teaching for both public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers. These respondents identified empowerment to lead, dealing with teenagers, holding limits on students, acclimation to school culture, sharing of feelings, understanding the evaluation process, and working with families as part of Cooperative Development that is needed during the first year of teaching.

Respondents in this research study confirmed Glatthorn’s (1997) research by indicating that public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers
would benefit from Cooperative Development during the first year of teaching. A respondent in Marable and Raimondi’s (2007) research highlighted the benefit of Cooperative Development opportunities for new teachers in this way: “individual colleagues were the most immediate, beneficial support I needed” (p. 30). Marable and Raimondi’s research emphasized the benefits that Cooperative Development offers new teachers. Cooperative Development provides opportunities to learn policies and procedures, gain access to materials, seek classroom management support, and emotional support, as well as an avenue to answer new teachers’ questions.

Current research and data from this study suggested to the researcher that public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers’ needs in the field of education differ from each other, thus requires different deliveries of Cooperative Development. Three principal respondents indicated that beginning public high school career-change teachers need the opportunity to share how they feel during their first year of teaching. This can be addressed by a Professional Dialogue or a Collaborative Team comprised of beginning public high school career-change teachers designed so they can share their experiences with one another. Four principal respondents indicated that high school novice teachers required their basic needs to be addressed in the first year of teaching. Cooperative Development offers a variety of opportunities to work with peers that can assist in addressing a diversity of needs that are unique to novice and career-change high school teachers. The various opportunities Cooperative Development offers public high school
novice and beginning career-change teachers can also be used to differentiate induction programs to meet individual needs. By differentiating the process of delivering Cooperative Development, principals can address the needs of both the first year public high school novice and beginning career-change teacher.

Public high school novice and beginning career-change teacher data from this research support the first year needs identified by the principals in this study. Teacher respondents also identified Mentoring/Coaching, Focused Observations, Professional Dialogues, and Collaborative Teams as needs in their first year of teaching. However, the needs of first year teachers are not all the same. Particularly, principals and public high school novice teachers identified support from peers was needed to gain an understanding of the work expectations of being a teacher. In contrast, principals and beginning public high school career-change teachers identified support from peers was needed as a way to assist in the transition to education from their previous career.

**Research Question 3B**

According to the perceptions of the public high school principals, how do the induction programs in their school district meet the needs of a first year public high school teacher with no prior work experience and a beginning career-change teacher?

Six Illinois public high school principals in three school districts answered the question regarding how the induction program in their school district met the needs of both first year public high school teachers with no prior work experience
and beginning career-change teachers. Five total principal respondents indicated that by providing a mentor, public high school novice teachers’ first year needs were met by the school district. However, only two principal respondents indicated that by providing a mentor, beginning public high school career-change teachers’ first year needs were met by the school district. The majority of principal respondents stated that they do not differentiate their induction program to meet the needs of a beginning public high school career-change teacher. A principal respondent affirmed this: “We don’t specifically go, ‘Aha’ We have a career changer. We need a different approach to this person.” Therefore, the induction programs at the sites used for this research study were solely geared towards the needs of a public high school novice teacher.

One principal respondent indicated that other teachers in the building assisted in meeting public high school novice teachers’ needs in the first year of teaching by providing additional supports. Another principal respondent indicated that an assigned team assists in meeting public high school novice teachers’ needs during the first year of teaching. A principal respondent indicated that professional development and/or new teacher seminars assist in meeting both public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers’ needs during the first year of teaching. One principal indicated that she did a walk-thru observation of all her first and second year teachers. After these walk-thru’s she had a meeting with each teacher and asked him or her what he or she needed. This principal indicated that subsequent to this walk-thru none of the teachers informed her of their needs.
Classroom observations at the beginning of the year were also identified by principal respondents as meeting public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers’ needs during the first year of teaching.

Table 143

**Summary of how the School District met the Needs of Public High School Novice Teacher and Beginning Career-Change Teachers Needs during the First Year of Teaching (N = 6)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Site A1 N = 1</th>
<th>Novice Teachers Needs Addressed</th>
<th>Career-Change Teacher Needs Addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, we address those needs with a mentor, the assignment of a mentor to regularly have conversations with the first year teacher that include opportunities for the first year teacher to ask questions. We also meet those ... well, you just asked for one example, so I guess the mentor would be an example of how we meet some of those needs.</td>
<td>We really don't address those needs here.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Site A2 N = 1</th>
<th>Novice Teachers Needs Addressed</th>
<th>Career-Change Teacher Needs Addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We try to do it on a person-by-person basis. The department chair tries to see the new teacher teaching several times early in the year to get a feel for what their strengths are. They have a couple of conversations with the teacher early in the year along the lines of what needs do you feel you have. They check in with the other teachers on that teacher's team. Instructional level team, course team to see what they think they are seeing. They drop into the classroom Extemporizing initially a few times to see what they are ... They try to suss out what the teacher’s needs are and then to tailor whatever kind of coaching they are going to do</td>
<td>We don’t specifically go, “Aha. We have a career-changer. We need a different approach to this person.” If we go back to the idea of the department chair studying you over the first several weeks to month that you are here to try to figure out what your needs are and then be hanging around to hear things from you. I think that gives them an opportunity to respond to whatever they think they are seeing. Often, the initial reaction after a month or two of a career-changer is sort of disappointment, the thought about, “Did I do the right thing here?” There are some who instantly love it, feel like they found their spot. It’s a (teacher) moment. They think this is where they should have been</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
for that particular teacher.

In the seminar curriculum that I described to you, we have a notion of what will be a good thing to cover in September, what will be a good thing to cover in October, what will be a good thing to cover in November. It's to the extent that we are effective in this at all, it's the department chair chiefly trying to figure out what the needs of that teacher are. Will they articulate those needs? Can we see what their needs are? Then to provide that kind of push in.

forever. They get the kind of reaction from kids that they expected. A lot of times, they don’t and they have to persist through to find the pony in the pile of poop. Sometimes, it's the second half of the year when career-changers start to really say, “Okay, I get it now. It didn't feel good to me in the fall, but this is starting to feel better to me.”

Principal Site B1 N = 1

 Yeah, well, part of it is we've done I'd say need from our first-year people here, poor job of it. We need to have ... One thing we analyzed yesterday with our lockdown drill is we need intermediate training in those areas, for the whole building. Then I'd say separately in the new teacher induction process when they may meet with different people from different administration of the building the day where they were here before school starts.

That's got to be something that's communicated very directly in terms of how serious need that is. I think that out-of-the-gate giving information to them about these procedures before school even begins. The instructional parts, those are extremely important. Again, like I said before, this is the ... These are things we can't mess up, components right out-of-the-gate.

We don't have a differentiated plan for career-changers versus first-year teachers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Site</th>
<th>Here, I don’t know how well they’re addressed. I think the teachers do great job that run it. They definitely bring in the specialists that they need to bring in. I think that we could probably meet with the teachers more often during the school year and provide more services and even divide those teachers up into first-year teachers and then career-changers. There are some things that they all need. Like I said there are some things that a young teacher might need a little support might be embarrassed to ask for it, but to say, “this is some support that we’re going to provide you. When you walk through the hall and you’re asked for a pass it’s not an insult; you look young. It’s a compliment.” There are just different struggles that they might have.</th>
<th>Again, I don’t think we do them differently currently for career-changer versus new teachers, our first-year teachers. I think we do provide some training. I think we can be better or more explicit in certain areas of need that our students have and our community has and just preparing our teachers for it better.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B2 N = 1</td>
<td>In the mentoring sessions, the first several that we do with them; they go through components of Wong’s on classroom management. We bring in veteran teachers, volunteers who share their classroom management plans and these are meetings after school. They would walk through how they set up the rules, how they do their sitting charts. Just logistical things, so from teachers who are considered more accomplished in that area. Just a sharing of that. They are invited into teachers’</td>
<td>The exact same way we meet the needs of our brand new teachers to their profession. I consider them career-changers as brand new to the profession, too. We addressed those needs exactly the same way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 N = 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
classrooms so that in first week or so, they can go into anyone of those veteran teachers' classrooms and watch it. A lot of new teachers do not do it. I think it should be required but because they’re so overwhelmed and they don’t have any time and that kind of thing. They're not sure should they really do that. That's how they ... Just from hearing other people's plans. There's a mentoring website that the mentor coordinator runs and puts good ideas up there. They can go to that website as well. They also have an informal mentor within their department. If you’re a brand new teacher and I'm in your department, I might be your formal mentor but somebody else, either in your department or out of the department can also be assigned to you as a mentor. If you don’t want to ask me questions about something else, English department for example, you can go to that Math person and say, "How do you this in your Math classroom?" Just to get a different perspective. That's also been helpful.

| Principal Site C2 N = 1 | I think the mentor relationships that we have take care of the day-to-day, the day-to-day survival of what needs to be in and when but then the coaching aspect and the required professional development piece, I think really then helps you grow your menu of how do you assess students, how do you differentiate for students, how do you teach things beyond content to your students that are so necessary for them to be successful even in your | Again, I don’t think the mentor relationships that we have take care of the day-to-day, the day-to-day survival of what needs to be in and when, but then the coaching aspect and the required professional development piece, I think really that helps you grow your menu of how do you assess students, how do you differentiate for students, how do you teach things beyond content to your students that are so necessary for them to be successful even in your classroom but then in the future through cooperative |
classroom but then in the future through cooperative learning and things like that.

I think that’s the way that we’ve been able to get at all of the things that you need to really get as a foundation, because I don’t know your personal experience. My personal experience when I went through it and also in hiring has been that university seem to be a few steps behind where the realities of education really is. When I ask somebody who is coming out of a teacher preparation program “How familiar are you with the Danielson Framework for Teaching?” and the answer is “I’m not,” that university is way behind where everybody else is because that’s the state model for evaluation. If they haven’t taken the time to talk about that and tell you what that looks like to be successful, we have to. I just assume there’s no evidence pointing that they’ve taken care of that for us and so you come in at that level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totals From Responses</th>
<th>Mentor met the needs of the teacher, N = 3</th>
<th>Mentor met the needs of the teacher, N = 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Needs not addressed well N = 2</td>
<td>Needs Not Addressed N = 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coaching/Department Chair N = 1</td>
<td>Coaching/Department Chair N = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Teacher(s) N = 1</td>
<td>Other Teacher(s) N = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team N = 1</td>
<td>Team N = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Development/Seminars N = 1</td>
<td>Professional Development/Seminar N = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom Observations N = 1</td>
<td>Classroom Observations N = 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Current research supports the use of a mentor and other building personnel to support both public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers in their first year of teaching (Barrera et al., 2010; Bickmore & Bickmore, 2010; Fry & Anderson, 2011; Fulton et al., 2005; Illinois School Code 5/21A-10; Ingersoll, 2004; Ingersoll & Strong, 2012; Roberson & Roberson 2008; Schwille, 2008; Smith & Ingersoll, 2004). The use of workshops, seminars, and other support systems in induction programs are supported through the research (Fulton et al., 2005; Odden, 2011; Smith & Ingersoll, 2004). The principal responses indicating that needs were not addressed were not clear as to why, but research indicates that inadequate induction programs exist in a myriad of forms (Fry & Anderson, 2011; Illinois New Teacher Center; 2012; Ingersoll, 2004; Ingersoll 2012; Useem, 2003). Therefore, more support is needed at the building and district level to provide differentiated support and to prevent inadequate induction program. This can entail better coordination of services to meet the needs of public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers.

However, current research did not provide illustrations of induction programs that differentiated between the needs of public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers. Yet, as evidenced in this study public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers and principals do find the need for a differentiated induction program for all new teachers. For instance, the public high school novice teachers’ first year needs could be categorized as ‘survival’ needs. Principal and public high school novice teachers identified basic needs of navigating
their teaching career, instructional practices, and how to hold limits on students, as examples of the needs of a public high school novice teacher. On the other hand, the beginning public high school career-change teachers’ first year needs could be categorized as ‘adaptive’ needs. Principal and beginning public high school career-change teachers identified transitioning from working with adults to teenagers, more opportunities to interact with peers and leadership, and how to adapt their previous career experience to the work of being a teacher, as concrete examples of the needs of a beginning public high school career-change teacher.

One principal respondent affirmed that schools do not differentiate their induction by stating: “The exact same way we meet the needs of our brand new teachers to their profession. I consider career-changers as brand new to the profession too. We address those needs exactly the same way.” The research in this study highlights the need to provide induction programs that are tailored to the specific and unique needs of each new teacher.

Relevance of Research Data to Allan A. Glatthorn's Model of Differentiated Supervision – Question 3B. The majority of teacher respondents concurred with the principal respondents who addressed how their district meets the needs of public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers in their first year: “We don't have a differentiated plan for career-changers versus first-year teachers.” In the research gathered from principal respondents, Intensive Development was relevant to this study based on the data from principals identifying how districts met the needs of public high school novice and beginning
career-change teachers in the first year of teaching. Specifically, Coaching/Mentoring was the component of Intensive Development identified by principals as the way the district met those needs.

Respondents that suggested the use of a mentor or a form of coaching to provide advice or guidance in their first year of teaching identified Coaching/Mentoring as the means by which they address public high school novice and some career-change teachers' needs in the first year of teaching. One principal respondent stated, “We address those needs with a mentor, the assignment of a mentor to regularly have conversations with the first year teacher that include opportunities for the first year teacher to ask questions.” Another principal respondent addressed beginning public high school career-change teacher mentor and coaching relationships by stating, “I don’t think the mentor relationships that we have take care of the day-to-day, the day-to-day survival of what needs to be in and when, but then the coaching aspect and the required professional development piece, I think really then helps you grow your menu.”

Respondents in this research study confirmed Glatthorn’s (1997) research by indicating that both public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers need personal guidance in their first year of teaching from a dedicated coach/mentor. “School administrators should recognize that, like students, new teachers need scaffolded assistance” (Goodwin, 2012, p. 85). However, the research from this study indicated that not all needs were met in induction programs. Two principal respondents indicated that public high school novice teachers have unmet
needs, and three principal respondents indicated beginning public high school
career-change teachers have unmet needs. One respondent addressed the unmet
needs of public high school novice teachers by saying, “here, I don’t know how well
they’re addressed.” Another principal respondent provided the reason why
beginning public high school career-change teachers have unmet needs: “We don’t
specifically go, Aha. We have a career-changer. We need a different approach to this
person.” Current research and data from this study suggested to the researcher that
a coach/mentor and department chair were assigned to new faculty to support them
in their first year of teaching, however the assigned staff member may not have
provided necessary or adequate guidance.

Cooperative Development was also relevant to this research study. The data
from principals identified how districts met the needs of public high school novice
and beginning career-change teachers in the first year of teaching. Principal
respondents referenced “instructional level team, course team,” “required
professional development piece,” and “seminar curriculum” as the ways their
district addressed public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers
needs during the first year of teaching.

Through cooperative learning opportunities during their first year of
teaching respondents in this research study confirmed Glatthorn’s (1997) research
indicating that public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers’
needs were met in Cooperative Development. Research reviewed for this study
highlighted the benefit to new teachers who have the opportunity to collaborate
with other teachers (Fulton et al., 2005; Griffiths, 2011; Smith & Ingersoll, 2004). Current research and data from this study suggested to the researcher that public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers’ needs are addressed in collaborative environments, but there were still needs not met for new teachers.

The ramifications of these data are that some needs are being addressed through Intensive Development and Cooperative Development but there are still some needs that are not addressed at all. One public high school novice teacher stated that their needs were ultimately addressed but not in a timely manner: “everything was eventually learned in the lunch and learns, but some of these things were seven months after school started.” One beginning public high school career-change teacher addressed their need in the first year as a: “periodic scheduled meeting with the evaluator to touch base with ideas, concerns, etc.” Principals provided examples of new teachers’ needs and the degree to which they address them. Yet, the majority of principal respondents were clear that they do not differentiate how they address the needs of all new teachers. Principals in this research study are aware that they can do a better job of inducting public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers, but did not articulate in this research study if they plan to make any changes to their induction programs to include present unmet needs.
Research Question 3C

According to the perceptions of the public high school principals, how do public high school principals believe these intentions were met by their school district for public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers?

Six Illinois public high school principals in three school districts answered the question regarding how new teachers responded to induction in their building. All six principal respondents described teachers responding in a positive way. There were some caveats from principal respondents. One principal respondent indicated that teachers respond positively, but that they appear to do so through compliance. This was assumed because “they usually want to have a second year or third year or fourth year.” Another principal indicated that new teachers responded positively but attendance to new teacher professional development had begun to decline.

Table 144

Summary of Principals Belief of Intentions were met by Public Novice Teacher and Beginning Career-Change High School \((N = 6)\)

<p>| Principal Site A1 | I think they respond favorably. They show up consistently. My assistant principal has the responsibility of the monthly meetings. I don’t believe that she has ever formally surveyed the teachers and said, “Tell me how you feel about the new teacher induction program.” If she has, it wouldn’t shock me if she has, and I just don’t know about it, but otherwise, my answer to that question is it appears that they respond favorably. They show up, they seem to have a positive attitude. |
| Principal Site A2 | With compliance... Because they usually want to have a second year or third year or fourth year. I don’t know how positively they really feel about the seminars that take place and the mentoring from their mentor. They also get mentored by their department chair and an administrator because we evaluate them and we view our evaluation as primarily professional development opportunities as opposed to do we want to keep this person or not. That is another aspect. We do seek feedback from them. It’s generally positive. There is always a lot of trepidation on the part of teachers who are new to a school to be too candid in the feedback that they give about anything. I think the |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Site</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1 N = 1</td>
<td>From what I've seen, it's my first year as the principal of the school. My take on it is that they respond favorably to the opportunities that are there. I believe in my own analysis of things there are things that we need to do better job of communicating. It's far more instructional-focused. There are operational things that I'm seeing that the first-year teachers do not know. For example, we had a lockdown drill yesterday. There are many teachers who do not know really what they're supposed to do. If there is a soft lockdown, you grab ... there is kid in the hallway, whoever it is, you say, come in here and you shut the door. You continue to use soft lockdown. That's not your student. It doesn't matter, because you don't want them in the hall. They respond well to those things. I think we need to do a better job of clarifying some of the things that new teachers just don't know. It's easy to forget how little they know when they enter the profession, not to be offensive to them. We go through year-after-year and saw it's easy to forget it. New teachers don't have a clear sense of that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 N = 1</td>
<td>It's been positive. I try to go to as many lunches as I can. In the beginning of the year it was better attended. This last month I went and I was the only one that went, but I think it had something to do with the invitation. It was through Gmail, through the Google calendar and it didn’t pop into your calendar during the period. It sat at the top of the day, and I think people could have missed it. First semester was well attended. The one right before open house was very well attended because it was information on open house and what you should expect and how to handle parents that might want to focus on grades. Then of course teachers get very busy and around finals I’m sure they really don’t want to go.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 N = 1</td>
<td>How do people respond? We give them a feedback sheet after day 1 and after day 2, and we take their feedback and make changes to the program based on that but it’s been very, very positive. They've been doing it for several years and have tweaked it based on input and I think it’s quite good based on what new teachers are saying.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 N = 1</td>
<td>I think overall it’s been positive. I mean I think sometimes these monthly meetings can be like they were when I went through which is sometimes they’re great, many times it just feels like, &quot;Oh, man. I’m so busy and now I have to go sit and do this for an hour.” We don’t want it to be that way but at the same there is some value in sitting down, commiserating with the other staff who is new going through the program and trying to learn from one another. I think other than that though overall the goal setting, the coaching, the mentoring; I think we can say they are probably pretty supportive overall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total From Responses</td>
<td>Positively Received N = 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Principals in this study acknowledged that new teacher meetings might infringe on time, since teachers are busy with other aspects of their job, and that some of these meetings might not be of value to new teachers at that time. Respondents indicated that current induction meetings’ content includes an agenda that focuses on the group of teachers, but not on their individual needs. One principal respondent indicated the content at these meeting impacts attendance, stating that the teacher meetings addressing the first semester and what to expect from open house were “well attended.” This principal respondent acknowledged the decline in attendance, because “of course teachers get very busy and around finals I’m sure they really don’t want to go.” Another principal respondent indicated that monthly meetings can sometimes cover important information, but at other times teachers may feel like, “Oh, man. I’m so busy and now I have to go sit and do this for an hour.” The principal respondents highlighted possible positives for attending these meetings but also recognized the perception of “meeting just to meet”. One principal implied that the reason why teachers may express views about their induction program favorably is because they are not tenured and therefore, must comply in order to achieve tenure. “Because they usually want to have a second year or third year or fourth year. I don’t know how positively they really feel about the seminars that take place and the mentoring from their mentor.” Research supported the notion that using a teacher’s time in a unproductive manner can have a negative perception on how their time is valued (Fry & Anderson, 2011; Ingersoll, 2011; Roberson & Roberson, 2008).
Relevance of Research Data to Allan A. Glatthorn’s Model of Differentiated Supervision – Question 3C. Principal responses to the research question indicated the intentions of addressing public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers’ needs during the first year of teaching were received favorably. However, based on principal responses in this research study it can be concluded that there is an absence of a formal evaluation program. One principal indicated receiving feedback only after the first two days of induction. The other principal who indicated that induction programs were evaluated stated that he is unsure of how accurate the data could be because: “There is always a lot of trepidation on the part of teachers who are new to a school to be too candid in the feedback that they give about anything.” The principal needs to gather feedback on the program of induction from teachers in their current program of induction and use this feedback to plan subsequent professional development around feedback. The principal is responsible for providing new teachers with: “... high quality in-service training targeted to specific job demands reflecting input from teachers” (Marable & Raimondi, 2007, p. 35). If teachers are unable to provide candid feedback then a continuous model of inadequate induction will go unnoticed by a school district. Additionally, principal respondents recognized areas they could improve about induction program when responding to this question. The researcher did not gather data on whether the principals expressed areas of improvement had been implemented in the district and, if so, whether this had impacted teachers’ perception of the induction program.
The literature reviewed for this research study cautions administrators that teachers may view induction or other supports unfavorably and thus leave the profession of education. Ingersoll (2001) identified the following contributors to why teachers may leave the field of education: “low salaries, inadequate support from the school administration, student discipline problems, and limited faculty input into school decision-making” (p. 5). Humphrey et al.’s (2008) study of Teacher Induction in Illinois and Ohio discovered additional reasons for teacher mobility in their research. The additional reasons included: “school environment, availability of instructional materials and supplies, induction support for instructional preparation and planning, induction program support for working with special population, mentor support for instructional preparation and planning, and mentor support for working with special student populations” (p. 6). The implications of the current research and the findings in this research study for administrators is that there are needs not met in induction programs for both public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers which may increase attrition in their buildings. Additionally, evaluations of these programs are not occurring. All respondents in this study presented ideas on how to change district induction programs; however, it is left to the individual principal to refine and change induction programs in their building to benefit teachers or continue to perpetuate the causes for attrition.
Research Question 3D

What recommendations would they make to improve their school districts’ induction programs?

Six Illinois public high school principals in three school districts provided recommendations for improving their school districts’ induction programs. Three principal respondents indicated that they would like to see induction programs take on a student teaching model that would last up to four years. This would allow for a gradual release into the classroom and more focus on learning instruction, curriculum and planning, as well as introduction to students, the school community, and culture. Two principals suggested adding more classroom observations and instructional support into the induction program. One principal suggested reviewing the district must-knows in order to indoctrinate teachers as to how the district operates and what it expects from teachers. Another principal respondent suggested adding in more social emotional support for teachers to support students in their classrooms. This same principal respondent also suggested more administrative involvement in the first year to support teachers in their second year. Finally, one principal respondent recommended reevaluating how after-school meetings are utilized.
| Principal Site A1 | I think the ideal program would include much of what we already have in place, which is addressing basic concerns like "How do I get keys, how do I find my way around this large building? Where do I park my car? What if I need to leave because of an emergency? What kind of clothes am I expected to wear? What do I do during my lunch period?" The basics, and I think a mentor is a good idea. We already do that. The one piece that we don't spend much time on that I think should be an ideal program is more time around classroom instruction with the new teachers watching classroom examples, maybe a combination of video clips and then afterwards, let's have some discussion and hear from an evaluator what their evaluation of what they just saw is. Then also some observations in classrooms of other teachers. The observation, I think ideally, would be the new teacher sitting along side of either a mentor or an evaluator, so that afterwards, there can be dialogue back and forth about what they just saw. |
| Principal Site A2 | The ideal induction program would be an extension to some extent of student teaching. They would come in and not teach a full schedule. They would be paid a full salary, but they would not teach a full schedule. They would teach 3 courses instead of 5, for example. They would spend a lot of time observing colleagues. They would be scheduled to be observed by colleagues and to get formal feedback from colleagues. It's not evaluative, it's just coaching feedback, coaching feedback, coaching feedback. I think they would do that for an entire year where they were working less than a full schedule so that they could primarily receive coaching and do observations during the year. I think that would be how I would change the first year. It would be a much more intensive coaching year and a less intensive teaching year. Then I would run a 4-year mentoring relationship for which the mentors were paid substantially. There would be a very fairly specific curriculum of what they were supposed to work on with the new teacher. All of that would be firewalled off from any kind of evaluation. |
### Principal Site B1

**N = 1**

I think an ideal induction program would consist of the ... like I just mentioned, a clear sense of what are the must-knows; don’t ever mess this up things, like that, like the crisis plan, like things where you can’t have a second chance or things like that. You got to know what that is. More importantly, and I think this is something that the school has attempted to do here, and our district has attempted to do is induction program has to ... I don’t know how to say this, but indoctrinate ... in the positive sense, indoctrinate new teachers into the instructional approach and the philosophy of our school.

For example, our school believes strongly that students should have opportunities for reassessment and opportunities to develop mastery as opposed to only being assessed. Then that assessment is over now. Here is your D and we’re moving on. Our induction program needs to include its explanation of that philosophy. Why do we believe that’s the case? Then training in how does that ... how do I do that as a teacher? Do I have not coming at your school? Is there a place that I give a reassessment? Then the student is supposed to go. I’ll take that on their own time, what would I do when a student is getting incomplete? It’s now the end of the third quarter and there are semester incomplete still on the books.

The biggest thing about an induction program in my opinion is that the philosophy of how we operate in the biggest picture has to be communicated and has to be reinforced in a way that we currently do things. It’s very loose. There is teacher who runs it, the mentor readings that may not even share with the philosophy of our school. I don’t know she is the person that was identified. In this my first year, I have not ... we haven’t moved somebody from our enrollment, like that until I really know what I’m doing. I think an ideal induction program must be as justice focused as the instructional program that you have for students, because otherwise teachers just don’t know what we really are at the school that they work at. They know they’re going to do the thing. They don’t know who we are as a building. It’s a high priority for me moving forward.

### Principal Site B2

**N = 1**

I think it would definitely be longer than one year. Probably a four-year program to match the four-year, ten-year cycle. Obviously less and less time commitment, but the first year I would like to see it involve some readings that go with the highs and lows that the teachers might be experiencing.

Also some very exclusive education on social emotional learning for the students, and the different stresses that our students might be facing. (Site B) is a different school. It is a full title school. It’s a majority-minority school, so 50% of our students are Hispanic. There’s 43% low income, and so really educating the parents on
how to help the families. I think there could be a little more focus on that, as well as how to plan lessons, a 90-minute block, how to best plan for a 90 minute block.

There should be multiple changes in pace, changes in structure, not just two, not just three versus a 45-minute block. For teachers who are going between the two, that could be a difficult balance to go in to 45 minutes and say “this is my last” and then going to a 90 and then change it.

I would like it to be a little more involved the first year then the second year a little less maybe every other month. Have meetings, and talk about how’s the second year going, what supports do the teachers need, what changes have there been in the community, in the school and then just tapered off so that the fourth year maybe it’s just one time each semester just checking in.

Because the retention rate for teachers could be better and a lot of it probably has to do with support that they’re afforded and how you handle difficult parents? How do you handle difficult teachers? In a big school district, there’s so much more that goes into it.

| Principal Site C1 | I think it needs to go beyond one year. Here, in our district, it’s a one-year program. It used to be a 4-year program. It took 4 years to get to tenure but they cut funding on it so there’s only funding for one mentor coordinator now. There used to be a funding for 3 and they used to spread it out over the ... 2 people did the first year and the 3rd person did years 2, 3, and 4. When they cut all these funding, they went to one mentor coordinator and he does everything and only does at first year.

Ideally, I would go back to that 4-year program where you’re still focusing on a lot of things that new teachers need, but then easing of by that 4th year and focusing on other things. |

| Principal Site C2 | Well, I think we have a pretty solid one here with those elements that I’ve talked about. Probably the other piece of the induction program might be what do we do with those after-school monthly meetings? Is that the best time to have them? Should we maybe be thinking about how do we build those into a teacher’s day or build them into maybe some of the unfortunately the limited staff days that we have just to not make it one more thing?

As a new teacher I don’t care when you start, you’re chasing your rear end most of the time for at least a year and probably three years before you feel like, “Oh, okay. I can go home at a reasonable hour now.” Trying to be more responsive to where we place them in those things, in those offerings, more responsive to what is it that they actually want to talk about or discuss further in detail, because we have a stock way we go about it but what we probably |
need to think more about is “Here are some ideas but what’s happening right now for you?” I think that’s probably how we could be more responsive from what we do.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total From Responses</th>
<th>4-year Model/Extension of Student Teaching N = 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom Instruction and Observations N = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Must-Knows (Indoctrination to District) N = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Emotional Learning N = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More Administrative Involvement N = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rethink Afterschool Meetings N = 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research does support the principal respondents’ idea of extending induction to mimic either a four-year gradual release or an extension of student teaching (Illinois State Board of Education, 2013; Odden, 2011; Smith & Ingersoll, 2004). Odden (2011) recommends: “districts and states consider having a multi-year period where all teachers new to education would be considered “teachers in residence” (p. 95). Additionally, research indicates that using a mentor in an induction program can support classroom instructions, provide a platform for classroom observations, and support the new teacher in understanding the must-knows of a school district (Barrera et al., 2010; Illinois School Code 5/21A-10; Schwille, 2008; Smith & Ingersoll, 2004; U.S. Department of Education, 2010). The research also supported more administrative presence in induction programs. Bickmore and Bickmore (2010) discussed the idea of a healthy school climate in induction programs. This is all done through administrative support and presence in induction programs. The research addressed the concept of new teacher time usage, as well as agrees with the principal respondent's suggestion to reevaluate
how and what after school meetings are used for (Fry & Anderson, 2011; Ingersoll 2011; Roberson & Roberson, 2008). Research did not discuss helping new teachers work with the social and emotional concerns of their students. A prevailing issue during the first year of teaching for one of the teacher respondents was a situation with three students who struggled with substance abuse. There was an absence of understanding how to support the teacher working with students’ social and emotional concerns, as well as a lack of clarity of school policy. Both of these negatively impacted the beginning public high school career-change teachers’ first year of teaching. Based on the research findings of this study, induction programs would benefit from a review of their content and supports for all new teachers.

**Relevance of Research Data to Allan A. Glatthorn’s Model of Differentiated Supervision – Question 3D.** Intensive Development is relevant to this study based on the research data from principals identifying changes they recommend for improving their districts’ induction programs. The components of Intensive Development identified by principals as recommendations to improve their induction programs are Coaching/Mentoring and Focused Observation.

Principal respondents acknowledged Coaching/Mentoring and Focused Observation as a model to reflect student teaching as a way to improve their induction program. One principal respondent said, “The ideal induction program would be an extension to some extent of student teaching. They would come in and not teach a full schedule.” Another principal respondent stated their induction program used to consist of a 4-year component, like the tenure track: “I think it
needs to go beyond one year. Here, in our district, it’s a one-year program. It used to be a 4-year program. It took 4 years to get to tenure...” Principal respondents who identified only classroom instruction and observations to improve induction programs suggested using Focused Observation as another way to improve their induction programs. One principal respondent referenced Focused Observations in his response: “I think an ideal induction program must be as justice focused as the instructional program that you have for students.”

Glatthorn’s (1997) research was further confirmed when principal respondents in this study suggested improvement through an extension of student teaching. A Coach/Mentor would be assigned to the teacher the same way a faculty member from a university is assigned to a student teacher. Additionally Focused Observations would be included in this model too. The creation of a student teacher model as an induction program has been proven in the research to provide a comprehensive induction program. The components of a comprehensive induction program include basic induction, mentoring, collaboration, participation in an external network of teachers, having reduced number of preparations, and being assigned a teacher’s aide (Smith & Ingersoll, 2004). By changing the current district induction program to one that is similar to a student teaching model it could provide the necessary components for a comprehensive induction program.

The data from this study suggested that Focused Observations would be utilized by the new teacher to observe or be observed by colleagues, not just their Coach/Mentor or department chair. This provides valuable feedback on instruction.
One principal respondent provide how Focused Observations would be utilized for new teacher induction, in that “they would be scheduled to be observed by colleagues and to get formal feedback from colleagues. It’s not evaluative, it’s just coaching feedback, coaching feedback, coaching feedback. I think they would do that for an entire year where they were working less than a full schedule so that they could primarily receive coaching and do observations during the year.” According to Fulton et al. (2005), in schools with collaborative observations, the culture of induction programs contain “observations of both exemplary teaching and teaching that needs improvement, candid conversations about lessons, and opportunities for reflection and discussions are the hallmarks of sustained programs that introduce novices to the valued norms of the teaching community” (p. 3). An induction program that is an extension of student teaching supports Glatthorn’s (1997) use of Focused Observations as a method to focus on a specific area or skill.

The principal data from this study and current research suggests that Intensive Development could be used in a student teacher induction program. Public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers in this research study also identified Focused Observations as an important component of induction to observe classroom management and/or instruction.

Cooperative Development is relevant to this study based on the research data from principals identifying changes they recommend for improving their districts’ induction programs. Fulton et al. (2005) stressed the importance of collaborative support for new teachers through “fostering a supportive community that helps new
teachers become good teachers—and good teachers become great teachers” (p. 1).

Principals identified Cooperative Development as a way they would enhance their induction programs. Respondents that identified an extension of student teaching, classroom observations, district must-knowns, rethinking after school meetings, focusing on social emotional learning, and encouraging more administrative involvement as improvements identified Cooperative Development as a way to improve their induction programs. One principal respondent stated, “I think there could be a little more focus on that, as well as how to plan lessons.” Another principal respondent suggested, “Also some very exclusive education on social emotional learning for the students, and the different stresses that our students might be facing.” Respondents who identified Cooperative Development as important to inductions programs confirmed Glatthorn’s (1997) research by identifying the significance of Cooperative Development in induction. Current research and data from this study suggested to the researcher that interaction with peers in collaborative environments can positively impact new teachers in a variety of ways.

Principal respondents indicated the use of Peer Observations as another potential improvement to their current induction program. Whether as an extension of student teaching model or as an addition to the current program, principals confirmed Glatthorn’s (1997) research and current research (Fulton et al., 2005; Marable & Raimondi, 2007). They identified the importance of peers observing new
teachers’ instruction and providing feedback, as well as for new teachers to observe their peers in order to gain insight into the craft of teaching.

One principal respondent suggested rethinking after-school meetings as an implementation change to their current induction program, saying, “Probably the other piece of the induction program might be what do we do with those after-school monthly meetings? Is that the best time to have them? Should we maybe be thinking about how do we build those into a teacher’s day or build them into maybe some of the unfortunately the limited staff days that we have just to not make it one more thing?” The research in this study confirmed teacher and principal concerns for these meetings. Current research on teacher mobility references teacher dissatisfaction with how their time is used (Fry & Anderson, 2011). Additionally, current research identifies ways to use time effectively in induction programs (Fulton et al., 2005; Odden, 2011). Glatthorn (1997) recommends the implementation of a protocol for Professional Dialogues to allow for organization, equity, and choice in the structure of these discussions.

One principal respondent suggested providing new teachers with the opportunity to learn how to support students’ social and emotional learning as an implementation change to their current induction program. The research in this study confirmed teachers’ and administrators’ concerns regarding how to address students’ social and emotional needs. One teacher respondent’s first year of teaching was influenced by her/his lack of mentor support while dealing with three students grappling with substance abuse and their lack of mentor support. Through
the implementation of Professional Dialogues and Collaborative Teams, teachers can share their experiences supporting students or use Collaborative Teams to work with social work and support staff to assist teachers in learning how to support students. However, current research did not indicate how to support and deliver this information in induction programs.

The principal respondent who referenced administrative involvement as an implementation change to her/his current induction program supports all three of Glatthorn's (1997) Differentiation Supervision categories. Roberson and Roberson (2008) stated the role of the administrator in induction program is to develop strategies “to meet the needs of novice teachers” (p. 113). The administrator could be part of a working group (Cooperative Development) or support the development of goal setting (Self-Directed Development). One teacher respondent identified the lack of administrative involvement in their induction program and provided a reason why this involvement could have been supportive: “perhaps more time with administration to establish a better knowledge of each other (how each operates in/out of class).” Although administrators provide formal evaluation (Intensive Development) to teachers in their buildings, current research, teacher, and principal responses in this study indicated that administrator involvement in induction programs would be a benefit to the program and individuals being inducted.

The ramifications of these data are that both principals and teachers identified Glatthorn’s (1997) three categories of Differentiated Supervision as areas to enhance induction programs; however the principal respondents were not
implementing these suggested changes to their current programs within these three districts. Additionally, formal feedback on improving induction programs and addressing the needs of all new teachers were not being identified or utilized to enact the changes principals and teachers would like to see in their district and school induction programs. Finally, the absence of the principals’ direct involvement in the induction program seemed to create an environment where needs were not met by both novice and career-change teachers and teachers did not always feel supported (Marable & Raimondi, 2007).

**Limitations of the Study**

While this study aims to gain an understanding of and add to the current research regarding public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers and principal perceptions of induction, there may be limitations. In total, six building principals and 13 teacher respondents were utilized in this study, so these respondents do not represent the population of new teachers (both novice and career-changers) and principals in other educational situations which would limit the findings of this study.

The participants in this study were culled from three suburban high school districts in Illinois. Therefore, the issue of generalizability could impact how the research results are transferable in different educational settings (Merriam, 2009, p. 51), such as rural or urban school districts. Also, this study may not be generalized to other states since each state has its own guidelines and laws of induction programs that may differ from Illinois.
Another limitation to this study is the nature of survey research. Yin (2009) stated this form of research can answer research questions by addressing the who, what, where, how many, how much it is, but not how or why. The teacher surveys, however, did not offer the opportunity for the researcher to ask how or why from public high school novice or beginning career-change teachers, which could expand the datum reported. Principal respondents were interviewed and the researcher had the opportunity to ask clarification questions during the interviews.

The next limitation is the absence of data collected from assistant principals and/or others responsible for the implementation of the site based induction program. This data could have provided information and insight about the decision-making process regarding district and school based induction programming. Including these voices may have offered knowledge as to why there were unmet needs of a first year teacher. Additionally, these voices may have also provided a deeper understanding of the role, responsibility, and dedication these individuals have to the induction program and the impact this has on the quality of induction program received by new teachers.

Another possible limitation to this study is the researcher’s biases toward the subject of induction programs. The researcher was a career-change teacher and is currently an administrator at a public charter high school. The researcher’s personal view of the perceptions of induction for new teachers and the perceptions of induction for career-change teachers in education are shaped, both positively and negatively, through personal experience. To prevent inserting the researcher’s own
biases into this study, the researcher kept a journal of thoughts, feelings, and reactions while exploring this study. As a result, the researcher was able to process his feelings in the journal to keeping his biases from entering this study.

**Further Research**

The results of this study offer opportunities for further research. The next logical step would be to interview the building leaders or teachers who are charged with delivering induction program at each district and site. Interviewing the staff members responsible for providing the school based induction program would further allow the researcher to explore the relationship between public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers’ perceived needs and the rationale of induction programs utilized to address those needs.

Additionally, the results of this study encourage future research to investigate the experience of the mentor in the process of induction. There were a number of teacher and principal respondents that indicated the use of mentors in induction programs, but the research from this study presented a disparate delivery of mentoring services. A possible area for further investigation would be to explore the mentors’ dedication to and belief in their role in the process of induction. This could shed light on why some mentoring support is not provided to new teachers.

Also, the results of this study found the role of the principal was passive in terms of the district induction programming. One of the six principal respondents in this study mentioned participating in one component of their district induction program. Another area for further research would be to investigate the role
principals’ perceive they have in participating in new teacher induction and the perceived impact their participation or absence has on the district induction program.

Another area for further research could focus on how induction programs cover the topics of school and district politics and community issues. Whether or not these concepts are covered or considered as topics for new teacher induction could be explored in further research regarding induction.

Furthermore additional research could be conducted focusing on district and school hiring practices and the link hiring has to induction. The connection between who makes the decision to hire new teachers and the program of induction for new teachers could shed insight into induction programming decisions and if such programs are considered when hiring either public high school novice or a beginning career-change teacher.

Finally, a new field of education research could evolve from this study. Current research on new teachers often utilizes the concept of a beginning teacher, but does not delineate whether the individual is a novice or career-change teacher. The results of this study indicate there are similarities and differences between public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers during their first year of teaching. While the researcher conducted a significant literature review of current and past research, differentiating between novice and career-change teachers in educational research would permit clarity in understanding their unique
experiences in education and how best to deliver induction programs and supervision.

**Significance of the Study**

The literature on teacher induction and the data obtained in this case study research suggest that school districts must differentiate aspects of their new teacher induction program in order to meet the needs of first year public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers. The data from Chapter IV reveals that all three sites intended to utilize all three Differentiated Supervision categories, yet when the research questions were answered using respondent data there was an inconsistency in the delivery of Differentiated Supervision in induction programs.

Glatthorn's (1997) premise of Differentiated Supervision focuses on providing teachers and school districts with a method to deliver a model of support to address the individual needs of a teacher. “School districts can develop their own differentiated model that responds to their needs” (p. 101). Additionally, the data collected in this study calls for stronger administrative participation in induction programs. Of the thirteen teacher respondents, only three indicated that a principal was involved in their induction during their first year of teaching. Principals in this research study had limited interactions in the induction program of new teachers. One principal respondent discussed attending new teacher meetings. One principal respondent discussed walk-thru observations of all first and second year teachers and then a discussion about teacher needs, that yielded no responses from teachers. Another principal respondent stated, “I am not directly, the first-line responsible for
new teacher induction.” Yet, Marable and Raimondi (2007) found the importance of
the interactions between a new teacher and administrator in the first year of
teaching. “Administrative support was deemed an important source of support in
terms of observation, providing written materials, planning time, and supervision”
(p. 35). It stands to reason that administrators who provide personalized supports
to new teachers are more aware of the induction program new teachers are receiving and whether the individual needs of new teachers are being met.

This research points to three major differences exist between public high
school novice and beginning career-change teachers in their first years in education.
Public high school novice teachers’ first year needs are more ‘survival’ needs then
the career-change teacher. The definition in this research study of a novice teacher
is a “first year teachers with no prior career experience”, therefore their needs focus
on attaining career experience. The three ‘survival’ needs identified in this research
study for public high school novice teachers are: (1) providing explicit information
that would satisfy their basic needs to assist in a successful first career; (2) learning
and gaining instructional practices to become an effective teacher; and, (3) learning
how to hold limits on students. These three skills sets require an induction program
that takes into consideration the needs of an individual who is entering their very
first career, as well as the unique needs of the individual.

In contrast, beginning public high school career-change teachers’ needs in
the first year of teaching are more of an ‘adaptive’ need then their novice peers.
Beginning public high school career-change teachers enter the field of education
with previous work experiences; therefore they come to the profession with expectations of what it means to be an employee, but might struggle with the transition from one career to a career in education. The three ‘adaptive’ needs identified in this research study for beginning public high school career-change teachers are: (1) assistance in transitioning from working with adults to teens; (2) providing opportunities to interact and lead their peers; and, (3) using their previous career experiences to become an effective teacher. These three differences require an induction program that takes into consideration the needs of an individual with previous work experience who is entering a new career as well as, the unique needs of the individual.

The researcher has shown that public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers have similar and different needs during their first years of teaching and the induction they receive may or may not meet those needs. Instructional leaders should consider that although public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers have similar needs, it is how the administrator addresses the differences that will allow for all new teachers’ needs to be fully met in an induction program.

The findings in this study indicated that school districts and schools are following Glatthorn’s (1997) recommendation of utilizing Differentiated Supervision while supporting teachers. Yet, data from novice and career-change high school teachers and principals warrants the utilization of all three Differentiated Supervision categories in induction programs, but additionally
considers differentiated induction to address specific needs of all new teachers. This research suggests that schools must move away from a “one size fits all” induction program.

The principals in this study shared their perceptions about their districts’ induction programs. Unfortunately, their direct interaction with the induction programs for their new teachers were absent from their responses. What these data suggest is that principals must have more presence in the process of induction for all new teachers. Glatthorn (1997) states, “All teachers need structured opportunities to meet with the principal” (p. 21). Marable and Raimondi’s (2007) research supports the findings in this study:

Administrative support was deemed an important source of support in terms of observation, providing written materials, planning time, and supervision. While teachers valued supervision and interactions with administrators, in some cases, the quality of these interactions was not helpful, and in fact, disappointing. These concerns highlight the need for increased awareness of new teachers’ needs and focuses on the important role the administrator plays. (p. 35)

The most significant finding in this study is that there is an opportunity for differentiated induction to occur with more principal oversight of the induction program through the use of Differentiated Supervision. “School administrators should recognize that, like students, new teachers need scaffolded assistance” (Goodwin, 2012, p. 85). The researcher suggests that principals need to capitalize on all aspects of Differentiated Supervision to create an induction program that addresses the individual needs of public high school novice and beginning career-
change teachers, as well as providing opportunities for the building principal to be a part of a new teacher’s first year.

Prior to implementing the components of Differentiated Supervision a principal must select mentors for new teachers. Data from this study suggest that principals should consider pairing a novice teacher with a mentor who teaches the same content area and who entered education as a novice too. Also, the principal should pair a career-change teacher with a mentor who teaches the same content area and who entered the field of education from another career.

The first step of providing differentiated induction is the use of Self-Directed Development and the goal(s) setting process. This should begin with the new teacher and his or her mentor. After goals have been set, the goals should be shared prior to the first evaluation with the department chair, mentor, new teacher, and the principal. This allows for ALL supervisors of the new teacher to be aware of the goals identified by the new teacher and mentor. During this meeting the principal can make sure that if the meeting is with a public high school novice teacher, then ‘survival’ needs are incorporated into the goals and if the meeting is for a beginning public high school career-change teacher, then ‘adaptive’ needs are incorporated into the goals. This meeting allows for the opportunity to identify staff that can effectively support a public high school novice teacher on how to interact with students as a teacher, not a peer and how to hold limits on students. Conversely, for the career-change teacher this meeting affords the principal the opportunity to identify how the school will support a beginning public high school career-change
teacher on working work with today’s teens. They can also make connections from the beginning public high school career-change teachers’ previous career that would support their instructional practice as well as the schools. Additionally, this meeting should be used to review the aspects of the formal evaluation process (Intensive Development) so that all supervisors are sending the same message to the new teacher. Finally, this meeting should conclude with the principal informing the new teacher that all data collected through this process will be used to inform their goal(s) and if need be change them. This aligns with the Illinois Induction Policy Teams (2010) resource for fostering high quality induction and mentoring practices subsection titled “Documentation and Evidence of Teacher Progress”:

As with student learning, beginning teacher learning should be data driven. To be effective, feedback to beginning teachers must be grounded in evidence about their practice, including evidence gathered through classroom observations. Tools to collect data about various components of their classroom practice and documentation of mentoring conversations ensures a structure of focusing on continuous instructional growth. (p. 1)

Prior to the conclusion of the meeting, the principal should schedule follow up meetings with the new teacher, mentor, and department chair throughout the year to review the collected data, reevaluate the goal(s), and progress towards mastery. After the goal meeting has concluded, Cooperative Development, and Intensive Development can be tailored to support the goals, as well as basic needs of both the novice and career-change teacher.

The use of Cooperative Development is supported by Roberson and Roberson (2009). “We believe that the critical factor in novice first-year teacher success is the principal and the connections to master teachers and supportive
colleagues that the principal fosters on behalf of novice teachers” (p 117). The principal must have a voice in who participates in Peer Observations, Curriculum Development, and Collaborative Teams with the new teacher, as well as participate in these meetings as often as they can. The research collected in this study can assist principals in guiding their choices of who should work with the novice or career-change high school teacher. The principal must align new teachers with veteran teachers who can support new teachers in a cooperative setting. The new teacher must be paired with individuals who provide the necessary supports to address the individual teacher’s goal(s), as well as provide effective learning on how to be successful in instruction, curriculum development, classroom management, student interactions, and instructional strategies. The new teachers’ goals are shared with all working peers. Principals should also participate in Professional Dialogues with the new teachers. Additionally, Professional Dialogues must follow Glatthorn’s (1997) structure in order to be effective and provide individual teacher voice in the selection of topics. The Action Research component of Cooperative Development that was missing from all the research sites would be the measurement of progress towards achieving the new teachers’ goal(s). The Action Research would review the impact on the professional practice of the new teacher and student achievement, through the mechanisms of support for the new teacher. The principal scheduled meetings are the time to review these data and make any adjustments in the differentiated induction of the teacher. This time is also an opportunity for the principal to identify which aspects of the new teachers’ induction program are
effective or may require refinement. The research in this study found that the current evaluation of induction programs does not allow for genuine teacher voice. Therefore along with the other systems in place to gauge the induction of new teachers, an anonymous/open survey to the principal should be utilized throughout the course of the induction year. The information gathered should be reviewed with the principal and the individual(s) charged with running the induction program to evaluate the effectiveness of the program and to make data-driven decisions about the schools’ induction program. It is during these data cycles that the principal can enact changes to the induction program for all or individual new teachers.

The utilization of Intensive Development provides an opportunity to collect further data on the goals and progress of the new teacher. Intensive Development addresses the instructional planning, delivery of instruction, classroom environment, and overall effectiveness of the teachers’ professional practice in the classroom. The results of the Clinical Supervision/Formal Observation and Focused Observations could be utilized in all goal-setting meetings, as well as each Coaching/Mentoring session. Additionally, the principal should set a consistent schedule to meet with all mentors, as well as observe an aspect of the coaching/mentoring sessions. Schwille (2008) supports the structuring of mentoring to purposely impact new teachers’ practice:

Mentors who thoughtfully and purposefully structure opportunities for their novices’ learning bring their novices further along in their learning than do mentor teachers who view their role as simply providing advice, emotional support, and technical pointers or just opening their classrooms for novices to perform teaching strategies. (p. 164)
This process would address inconsistencies found in the delivery of mentoring provided to new teachers found within the literature review and this research study. These mentor meetings are another opportunity for the principal to collect data on the effectiveness of the school based induction program and evaluate whether or not this aspect of the program is effectively addressing the needs of a new teacher.

The literature reviewed found induction programs are impacted by issues of school funding (Illinois New Teacher Collaborative, 2009; Illinois New Teacher Collaborative, 2012). This could prohibit the implementation of the principals’ suggestion to improve induction by restructuring the program to mimic student teaching or even assigning new teachers fewer courses to teach (Ingersoll, 2004). Therefore, the researcher recommends the use of Differentiated Supervision as a method to deliver differentiated induction. This would not require additional funds but does require the principal to rethink how to use time as a resource and his/her role in the induction process.

School districts and the Illinois School Board of Education have begun the implementation of the Performance Evaluation Reform Act (PERA) in Illinois. PERA requires teachers and administrators to be evaluated through the use of “multiple measures of student growth and professional practice” (Illinois State Board of Education, Performance Evaluation Advisory Council homepage). By using Differentiated Supervision as a method to deliver induction, the principal fosters new teachers to become effective teachers and supports student growth.
Differentiated Supervision also includes all the data collection, professional development, and support systems required by the PERA evaluation system.

The significance of this study is that it highlights the important role a principal must assume in addressing the individual needs of a novice or career-change high school teacher in their first year. This study must prompt principals to take an active role in inducting all new teachers and reevaluate how their school currently differentiates induction to meet the individual needs of all new teachers.

**Conclusion**

The research in this study highlights attributes of teacher attrition, inadequate induction, and the gap in supports new teachers receive in the first year of education. This research study calls upon principals and instructional leaders to take an active part in their schools’ new teacher induction program. The principal must evaluate their induction programs and make the necessary changes in order to address the individual needs of all new teachers. As one principal respondent communicated, “the fact that we did not retain every single new teacher that we hired signifies to me that there could be a gap in what we provide and what is needed.” The first year of teaching should not feel as though the new teacher is learning to swim with a piano tethered to them. Instead, the first year of teaching needs to be filled with individualized supports, to allow the new teacher to keep their head above water and learn to become an effective teacher that remains in the profession.
All principals in this study recognized and articulated new teachers have needs and that some of these needs are not being met. Yet, there appears to be a lack of urgency in evaluating the program of induction and correcting the program to meet the needs of individual teachers. At the core of supporting new teachers is the fundamental responsibility that our students rely on effective teachers to assist them in gaining the knowledge and skills to be productive members of a democratic society. If principals and instructional leaders through their inaction continue to support this vicious cycle of inadequate induction and attrition, we fail more than just these teachers. We fail every student that walks through our schoolhouse doors.

Additionally, principals need to be fully vested into the teachers that are hired for their schools. The stewardship of human capital must be viewed as an investment into the school, the individual teachers professional growth, and most importantly student achievement. Principals should consider the cost associated with attrition and their responsibility to not only fostering a teachers professional growth, longevity, and impact on student achievement but their commitment to the individuals they have chosen to be part of their school community.

This research study provides the rationale for differentiated induction for public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers with a model that utilizes Differentiated Supervision. This study posits that the principal must be a part of induction experiences in order to address individual teacher's needs, as well as evaluate its effectiveness for the individual. A high school principal cannot rely on
an assistant principal or other designee to stewarded the school based induction program without specific direction.

As principals and instructional leaders continue to hire public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers in their schools, they must consider the importance of properly and individually inducting a teacher to the field of education. Principals and instructional leaders must constantly remember that:

> Given the importance of teachers in the lives of our children, it is vital that all children have access to quality teachers. Teachers, in the beginning years of their professional lives, need support and development so that they can acquire the skills to become high-quality educators. (Barrera et al., 2010, p. 72)

There are several choices principals and instructional leaders make regarding how to address the needs of public high school novice and beginning career-change teachers. The systems of support they implement profoundly impacts continuity in induction, school/district culture, teacher longevity, teacher quality, and most importantly, student achievement. Therefore, principals and instructional leaders should utilize the components of Differentiated Supervision to create, provide, and deliver differentiated induction to all new teachers.
APPENDIX A

LETTER OF COOPERATION TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH
Dear Superintendent,

**Project Title:** The Role of Instructional Leadership on Teacher Induction and Professional Longevity: A Case Study  
**Researcher:** Jeremy E Burnham  
**Faculty Sponsor:** Dr. Marla Israel

**Introduction:**  
You are being asked to take part in a research study being conducted Jeremy Burnham for a dissertation project under the supervision of Dr. Marla Israel in the department of Educational Leadership at Loyola University of Chicago.

You are being asked to participate because your school district has a large percentage of new/novice teachers. One high school in your district will be selected from which to gather data for the research study. Teachers who have entered education as their first career and new teachers who have changed careers to become educators within the school will participate in a research questionnaire to ascertain their perceptions of the needs of novice and career-change high school teachers and the model(s) of induction used to address those needs. The principal will participate in an interview to establish their perceptions of the needs of novice and career-change high school and the model(s) of induction used to address educators’ needs. Historic attrition and retention data will be used to look at trends of teacher longevity.

Please read this form carefully and ask any questions you may have before deciding whether to participate in the study.

**Purpose:**  
The purpose of this study is to compare the perceptions of needs of novice and career-change high school teachers in their first years of teaching with those of administrators and to explore induction models used to address those needs.

**Procedures:**  
If you agree to be in the study, you will be asked to:  
• Give permission for the researcher to receive historic trends in hiring, retention and attrition from Human Resources.  
• Provide direction to direct the building principal for the researcher to have permission to distribute the questionnaire to novice and career-change teachers with 0-3 years of teaching experience in the school.  
• Provide direction to direct the building principal for the researcher to have permission to interview them.
Risks/Benefits:
There are no foreseeable risks involved in participating in this research beyond those experienced in everyday life.

There are no direct benefits to you from participation, but the results will help to better inform the field of education as to the perceived needs of novice and career-change high school teachers compared to building administrators and the models of induction used to address those needs.

Confidentiality:
Data will be coded by school building only and each building will be given a site code. This code is unique to each school building and will be used to provide anonymity to participating districts and schools. Novice and career-change teachers and principals will be coded within the site code. No other form of identification will be utilized. Access to the data will be by the researcher only.

Voluntary Participation:
Participation in this study is voluntary. If you do not want to be in this study, you do not have to participate.

Contacts and Questions:
If you have questions about this research study, please feel free to contact:
Dr. Marla Israel at misrael@luc.edu
Jeremy Burnham at burnhamjeb@mac.com
If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Loyola University Office of Research Services at (773) 508-2689.

Statement of Consent:
Your signature below indicates that you have read the information provided above, have had an opportunity to ask questions, and agree to participate in this research study. You will be given a copy of this form to keep for your records.

____________________________________________
Participant’s Signature              Date

____________________________________________
Researcher’s Signature              Date
APPENDIX B

LETTER OF INFORMED CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH (PRINCIPAL)
Dear Principal,

I am presently a doctoral student at Loyola University Chicago and my research is focused on how induction programs address the perceived needs of a first year high school novice teacher with no prior work experience and a first year high school career-change teacher with prior work experience in a field other than education. My dissertation is entitled, *The Role of Instructional Leadership on Teacher Induction and Professional Longevity: A Case Study*. The purpose of this study is to explore the perceived needs of high school novice and career-changer teachers with those of administrators and review induction programs used to address those needs.

My research method is a multi-site case study. The case study consists of an anonymous questionnaire for new teachers, both novice and career-changers, and an interview with principals. Your voluntary participation is a chance for your experience in induction to be included in this study.

**Procedures:**
If you agree to be in the study, you will be asked to provide the researcher with the access to deliver novice and career-changer teachers in your building the teacher questionnaire. Include in the questionnaire is a self-addressed stamped envelope for teachers to return questionnaires to the researcher. In addition you be asked to participate in a brief, 45-minute interview with the researcher. Interview questions will be provided ahead of time for your review and preparation. Teacher answers to the questionnaire and your interview answers will be analyzed; however they will be completely anonymous and never linked to you personally.

**Risks/Benefits:**
There are no foreseeable risks involved in participating in this research beyond those experienced in everyday life. The results of this research may uncover the perceptions concerning current induction programs for teachers who entered teaching as novice teachers or career-changers and how induction programs may or may not have addressed and supported their needs. The information in this study may assist instructional leaders in cultivating effective and appropriate induction programs based on the needs of novice and career-changers.

**Confidentiality:**
The records of this study will be kept completely confidential. Your identity will never be connected to your responses. In any report that might be published, no information will be included that would make possible identify any subject. Research records will be kept secure and only the research will have access to the data.
Voluntary Participation:
Participation in this study is voluntary. If you decide to participate, you are free not
to answer any question or to withdraw from participation at any time.

Contacts and Questions:
The researcher conducting the study is Jeremy Burnham. If you have any questions
now or in the future, you may contact the researcher at burnhamjeb@mac.com. You
may also contact the Loyola University advisor at misrael@luc.edu.

If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact
the Loyola University Office of Research Services at (773) 508-2689.

Statement of Consent:
Your signature below indicates that you have read the information provided above,
have had an opportunity to ask questions, and agree to participate in this research
study. You will be given a copy of this form to keep for your records.

Participant’s Signature  Date

Researcher’s Signature  Date
APPENDIX C

ADMINISTRATIVE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE
Demographic Data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age:________________________</th>
<th>Gender:________________________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How many school years, including this year, have you worked as an administrator?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many school years did you work as a teacher?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did you attain your teacher certification?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What teacher certifications do you hold?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your highest level of education?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has education been your only career? (If not, what was your other field and how long were you in it?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Suppose I was a first year teacher in your building. What would my induction be like?

2. How do new teachers respond to induction in your building?

3. Would you please describe what you think the ideal induction program would be like?

4. Please tell me what the induction need(s) of a first year teacher with no prior work experience are.

5. Please provide me an example of how you address those needs.

6. Please tell me what the induction need(s) of a career-changer to education are.

7. Please provide an example of how you address those needs.

8. Are any new teachers' needs not met? What are those?

9. Please tell me what the process of induction is for someone not hired at the start of the school year.
10. Who informs new teachers (both novice and career-changers) regarding the day-to-day needs of a teacher (keys, who to go to for questions, for concerns) and who was this person(s)?

11. Is that person part of your formal induction program?

12. Is there anything we did not discuss you would like to address at this time?
APPENDIX D

LETTER OF INFORMED CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH (TEACHERS)
Dear Teacher,

I am presently a doctoral student at Loyola University Chicago and my research is focused on how induction programs address the perceived needs of a first year high school novice teacher with no prior work experience and a first year high school career-change teacher with prior work experience in a field other than education. My dissertation is entitled, *The Role of Instructional Leadership on Teacher Induction and Professional Longevity: A Case Study*. The purpose of this study is to explore the perceived needs of high school novice and career-changer teachers with those of administrators and review induction programs used to address those needs.

My research method is a multi-site case study. The case study consists of an anonymous questionnaire for new teachers, both novice and career-changers, and an interview with principals. Your voluntary participation is a chance for your experience in induction to be included in this study. The data you provide through the enclosed questionnaire will help me understand how induction programs address the needs of first year teachers.

**Procedures:**
If you agree to be in the study, you will be asked to complete the attached questionnaire. The questionnaire will take approximately 8 – 10 minutes of your time. Your answers will be collected and analyzed; however, they will be completely anonymous and never linked to you personally. Included I have provided you with a self-addressed stamped envelope for you to return the questionnaire.

**Risks/Benefits:**
There are no foreseeable risks involved in participating in this research beyond those experienced in everyday life. The results of this research may uncover the perceptions concerning current induction programs for teachers who entered teaching as novice teachers or career-changers and how induction programs may or may not have addressed and supported their needs. The information in this study may assist instructional leaders in cultivating effective and appropriate induction programs based on the needs of novice and career-changers.

**Confidentiality:**
The records of this study will be kept completely confidential. Your identity will never be connected to your responses. In any report that might be published, no information will be included that would make possible identify any subject. Research records will be kept secure and only the research will have access to the data.
**Voluntary Participation:**
Participation in this study is voluntary. If you decide to participate, you are free not to answer any question or to withdraw from participation at any time.

**Contacts and Questions:**
The researcher conducting the study is Jeremy Burnham. If you have any questions now or in the future, you may contact the researcher at burnhamjeb@mac.com. You may also contact the Loyola University advisor at misrael@luc.edu.

If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Loyola University Office of Research Services at (773) 508-2689.

**Statement of Consent:**
Consent is implied with the completion of the questionnaire.
APPENDIX E

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS
Demographic Data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age:________________________</th>
<th>Gender:_____________________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How many school years, including this year, have you worked as a teacher?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did you attain your teacher certification? (Such as Bachelor’s Degree, TFA, Master’s Degree, as examples)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What teacher certifications do you hold?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your highest level of education?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When were you hired by the school district you are currently working in?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Do you consider yourself a career-changer? ____ Yes ____ No

   **If you answered yes to #1, please list previous careers:**

2. Please describe what you believe is the purpose of a teacher induction program.

3. Please describe what you think the ideal induction program would consist of.

4. Does your school have an induction program for new teachers? ____Yes ____No

   **If you answered yes to #4, please answer questions 5 through 6.**

5. Were you a part of an induction program in your school district in your first year of teaching?  
   __Yes __No
6. Currently, does the induction program go beyond the first year of teaching?
   ____Yes  ____No

7. Please describe the program of support for teachers beyond their first year of teaching.

8. Allan Glatthorn believes that supervision for teachers should be differentiated into three categories: Intensive Development, Cooperative Development and Self-Directed Development. Please select all the development options you received during your first year induction:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intensive Development:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Clinical Supervision/Formal Evaluation with a pre-conference, observation and post-conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Coaching/Mentoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Focused Observation (focus area in the classroom or teacher skill – non-evaluative)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cooperative Development: Working with peers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Peer Observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Professional Dialogues – Structured discussion of professional issues, Professional Learning Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Curriculum Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Collaborative Teams (by department or grade level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Action Research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-Directed Development: Independent individual growth centered on a specific goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Goal based on professional role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Goal based on generic skills of teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Goal based on subject-specific skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Goal based on mixed sources (e.g., organizational or administrative goals)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For question 9, please select all who apply to the following question.

9. Who formally facilitates induction in your school?
   __Teacher(s) in your building
   __Department Chair(s)
   __Assistant Principal
   __Principal
   __District Administrator
   __Other: ____________________________________________________________
10. Please describe your professional need(s) during your first year of teaching.

11. Did your school address those needs?  
   Strongly Disagree---1---2---3---4---5---6---7---Strongly Agree

12. Please describe what professional needs were not met.

13. Why do you think your professional needs were not met? Please select all that apply.
   - Inadequate administrative support
   - Lack of district funds
   - Lack of faculty influence/support
   - Inadequate preparation of the program
   - Program interfered with your teaching and individual preparation time
   - Lack of professional competence
   - Other:_______________________________________________________________________

14. Please describe in a few sentences aspects of your first year of teaching you would want to change.
APPENDIX F

CONFIDENTIALITY AGREEMENT
I,_________________________________________, have agreed to perform the duties of audiotape transcriber for a research study being conducted by Jeremy Burnham, Doctoral Candidate in the School of Education at Loyola University of Chicago.

I understand the nature of this work will involve sensitive and confidential information about the interview subjects. By signing this agreement, I agree to keep all transcript information confidential and in a secure place when in my possession. Furthermore, the information in my possession will not be shared verbally or visually with anyone expect the researcher.

Jeremy Burnham will provide the necessary equipment for me to transcribe the audiotape interviews from this study. This will include earphones, so that I may listen to the tapes confidentially. Transcriptions and audiotapes will be kept in a locked portfolio, provided by the researcher, while in my possession.

Signature of Audiotape Transcriber:_____________________________________________________

Signature of Researcher:____________________________________________________________________
REFERENCE LIST

Alliance for Excellent Education (2011). A system approach to building a world class teaching profession: The role of induction.


U.S. Department of Education, Impacts of Comprehensive Teacher Induction: Final Results from a Randomized Controlled Study. (June 2010), Executive Summary.


VITA

Jeremy E. Burnham is the son of Adele and Alan Burnham. He was born in Atlanta, Georgia on June 17, 1974. He currently resides in Chicago, Illinois with his wife, Dr. Danielle Dever, and their son, Mack.

Jeremy attended public schools in Atlanta, Georgia from K-12. He graduated from the University of Georgia in Athens, Georgia in 1996, with a Bachelor of Arts degree in Speech Communications. In 2003, Jeremy earned his Masters in Teaching from Seattle University.

Jeremy has worked in education since his graduation from Seattle University. He has taught at Tahoma Middle School and Cedar River Middle School in Tahoma, Washington. Jeremy taught in the Chicagoland area for four years in Chicago, Illinois. Currently, Jeremy is the Associate Director of Operations for Chicago International Charter School campus CICS Norftown Academy in Chicago, Illinois a position he has held for three years.
DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

The Dissertation submitted by Jeremy E. Burnham has been read and approved by the following committee:

Marla Israel, Ed.D., Director
Associate Professor, School of Education
Loyola University Chicago

Susan Sostak, Ed.D.
Clinical Assistant Professor, School of Education
Loyola University Chicago

Barbara Unikel, Ed.D.
Coach/Mentor, C.L.A.S.S. Program
Consortium for Educational Change