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Abstract

The school district being studied is one of the most highly populated in the country located in the southeastern United States. The metropolitan area encompasses the entire county including the urban center, suburban, and rural perimeter. Since 2010, the district has been operating a teacher induction program supporting both beginning teachers and experienced teachers new to the district. This study focuses on experienced teachers new to the district. In six years, no formal evaluation or feedback had been gathered from their teacher induction program with site based support revealing what led to the study’s problem of practice. Once this was identified, a program evaluation was designed to gather information from program architects and current supervisors to inform the creation of a logic model identifying resources, activities, outputs, and outcomes. These intended outputs and outcomes led to the gathering of feedback from past and present inductees and site based administrators through data collection methods consisting of an online survey, two focus groups, and several interviews. Data was analyzed against expected outputs and outcomes of the logic model resulting in findings including the increasing of teacher effectiveness by providing a common level of support, improving communication by all stakeholders, and providing a differentiated adult learning experience for inductees by offering more choice in completing induction requirements. Discussion of the findings was conducted through the theoretical lens of the adult learning theory and applicable literature previously reviewed. The evaluation concludes with recommendations to improve induction effectiveness, explain research limitations and offer suggestions to other districts in position to design, implement, evaluate, or revise their own teacher induction program.
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Chapter I: Introduction

Conducting a program evaluation of this county-based district’s teacher induction program with site based support will allow the researcher to identify the overall effectiveness of the six year old program as well as review the required components to determine what best supports teachers and instructional support staff in their role within the classroom. The study will offer suggestions from various stakeholders as to how the program can continue to be beneficial toward meeting program goals and outcomes as analyzed through several data collection methods over the period of this research. These consist of an online survey administered to current and previous inductees, follow-up focus groups with a subset of those surveyed, interviews with program designers and supervisors as well as current site based administration that monitor inductees’ progress. Informed by a logic model designed with data gathered throughout this study, the research should clearly evaluate how the program has progressed over the years and if intended outputs and outcomes have been met based on the input and activities that were created and implemented by program designers and supervisors. In order to reach that conclusion in this study, it is necessary to first introduce the problem of practice and delve deeper into the purpose and goals of the program evaluation of this county-based district’s teacher induction program with site based support.

Statement of the Problem

In the state this county-based district is located, it is mandated that individual school districts develop and implement an induction program for beginning teachers. With the purpose to bridge the gap between that formal academic training teachers receive, and how it can be applied in their first years in the classroom. Additionally, district designed induction gives the program designers an opportunity to not only build upon previously learned pedagogical
strategies and subject specific content, but tailor those learning opportunities to the goals and philosophies of the district. However, programs like this are fiscally challenging and based on the size of the district, could impact thousands of teachers during its time being administered which in turn would affect even more students if operated unsuccessfully.

The teacher induction program in this county-based district has operated in its current form for just over six school years (beginning in school year 2010-2011) at the time this research was conducted. It is important to understand the background as to why the current program exists before elaborating on specifics as to what the study will be evaluating. For over a decade, this county-based district previously inducted beginning teachers through their Preparing New Educators (PNE) program. This was designed as per historic program documentation to assist and support new educators to work toward becoming more effective. Components of this program consisted of the following requirements as acquired from a collection of archived school district documentation and through discussions with program supervisors:

- Each teacher new to the district is in the PNE program.
- Each teacher is assigned a Support Team of veteran educators at their school site.
  The members of the Support Team observe, provide feedback, assist and mentor the teacher as s/he begins a career in the district.
- Teachers must complete cycles of successful demonstration of effective teaching.
  For each cycle, an action plan is created. This action plan becomes an outline for the professional growth of the teacher.
- At the school site, a portfolio is created which holds all documentation collected during the teacher’s time in PNE.
• The school administrator signs the teacher out of PNE upon successful completion of the required cycles and successful demonstration of effective teaching.

Although the Preparing New Educators met state guidelines at the time, program supervisors “saw a lot of gaps as to how the teachers were being supported at their sites as part of this program”. Incidentally, at the time of this realization, the professional development department was also undergoing a complete overhaul of the entire induction program and how teachers are supported. This was thanks to the district being awarded the $100 million “Intensive Partnerships for Effective Teaching” grant by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation in the winter of 2009, which would drastically change professional development, how teachers are supported, and ultimately induction within this county-based district.

The Intensive Partnerships for Effective Teaching grant designed to fund the district over seven years served several purposes at the time most of which directly funded a new teacher evaluation system adding the layer of peer observation to the formula in which each teacher would be evaluated. Additionally, this money introduced the opportunity to provide full-time mentors, released from the classroom, to work solely with 1st and 2nd year teachers in the district as a support during their induction. However, it was decided at that time experienced teachers new to the county would not be given mentors, but would have a new induction system to follow. The convergence of the timing of this grant with the overhaul of the evaluation system and professional development department created the conditions necessary to design a new induction system.

After six years of operation, the induction program and professional development within the district have undergone subtle changes, but until now, only the mentor component of the induction program has formally been monitored for progress on an on-going basis. The need to
examine the teacher induction program with site based support, which has affected and will continue to affect thousands of educators in the district, was made evident when discussing opportunities related to the researcher’s position as a mentor. Knowing that a program of this magnitude had existed for several years without any formal evaluation, introduced a significant problem of practice that provided direction for the program evaluation that follows.

Significance of the Problem

With an annual budget of over $2.8 billion, this county-based district operates in a southeastern United States metropolitan area as something much bigger than a school system. It provides nearly a hundred thousand jobs for the area, it spans the entire county and impacts nearly 200,000 students every year. Within this budget are annual expenditures in the tens of millions for professional development course materials, trainers, and administrators needed to operate the teacher induction program, including the portion that is the focus of this research. Although this amount may seem to be insignificant when compared to the budget as a whole, the fiscal need allocate any public funding efficiently and effectively always remains significant in the public school system, making this program evaluation even more needed and valuable.

As previously mentioned, this county-based district splits any teacher newly hired within the district into two categories, those with less six months of teaching experience, and others with more than one. The group having less than six months experience teaching is provided a mentor while the other group, in which this research will focus on, complete up to their first two years in the district through the teacher induction program with site based support. The decision to focus on this population was developed from several conversations with program designers and supervisors after inquiries were made regarding current district needs. From these conversations, emerged the idea of the induction program and the need for a proper evaluation.
It was discovered that formal feedback from participants or other stakeholders had not been collected previously, increasing the desire of the researcher to implement a program evaluation in order to provide necessary feedback to program supervisors.

Because this significant portion of the district’s budget focuses on professional development of beginning teachers and their supports, such as mentors and other district administration and personnel to manage these departments, evaluating the current program and its impact on those new to the district became a logical and opportunistic area to research. Additionally, it is relevant to goals of this department and district to support and put the most effective teachers in front of students. In addition to financial considerations, turnover in a district this size requires new teachers to be hired each school year. Given this fact, the number of teachers participating in the teacher induction program with site based support is constantly growing. With each of these teachers required to complete coursework designated by the district, this presents a financially significant cost, many hours spent in professional learning, and a follow-up expected to be performed by each participant. There has been no monitoring in this process, clearly identifying the need to provide a program evaluation.

After nearly six years of this program’s operation it would benefit the district and program supervisors to have a clear picture as to the results of the program as viewed by participants, site based administrators and other program stakeholders. Once given this feedback, program administrators can address next steps in the program’s evolution and make changes if needed to provide for future success of the participants.

Discussion of Practical and Intellectual Goals

Practical Goal. Through a program evaluation of the this county-based district’s teacher induction program with site based support and its impact on instructional effectiveness, program
administrators will be provided with data and recommendations to revise or retain various components of the program in order to ensure future success toward meeting the needs of the district’s vision and the program’s goals. Additionally, utilizing a logic model designed during this study to identify what inputs and activities led to intended outputs and outcomes discussed in forthcoming sections and chapters will give the program a framework in to continue evaluating the program over time.

**Intellectual Goal.** It is the purpose and intent of this program evaluation to look deeper at this particular model of a teacher induction program and its impact on teachers new to a district. In addition to the impact on this district, most other districts within the state are implementing similar programs and due to this county-based district’s size, budget, and historical credibility, this could open up opportunities for this evaluation to be a model for other districts in the state when adopting new programs or systems. Induction programs in the state as well as throughout the nation have similar goals containing components such as coaching, mentoring and professional development delivered both face-to-face and virtually. Finding the most effective induction program for a particular district will require input from several stakeholders within their system and a program evaluation like this one could benefit districts in various stages of development including planning, implementation, evaluating, and revising. How this program evaluation is conducted and shared will be considered to better assist other school districts, inside and outside of the state, in the evaluation of their own induction program implementation.
Research Questions

The following research questions will guide the direction of the program evaluation, development of the necessary logic model, preparation of data collection instruments, and the analysis and discussion of data collected:

1. How effective is this county-based district’s teacher induction program with site based support in supporting teachers to be successful and effective as perceived by teachers, administrators, and program designers and supervisors?

2. Which components of this county-based district’s teacher induction program with site based support are most valuable to teachers new to the district in support of their success, as perceived by them?

3. In what ways can this county-based district’s teacher induction program with site based support be improved to better support the success of teachers new to the district, as perceived by participants themselves, administrators, and program designers and supervisors?

The first question will allow the researcher to gain insight from stakeholders within this county-based district’s teacher induction program with site based support regarding the purpose and activities of the program through a combination of an online survey, focus groups, and individual interviews to gain perspective on the overall effectiveness of the program. With the second question, the researcher wishes to dig deeper into feelings toward individual components of this county-based district’s teacher induction program with site based support such as the required coursework and the time it takes for completion. The final question will guide the researcher’s analysis of the current state of the program and how stakeholders propose
improvements could enhance success of those teachers required to participate in the induction process.

**Theoretical Framework**

Because this county-based district’s teacher induction program with site based support focuses on acclimating experienced teachers to the district through a series of requirements involving coursework and professional development activities, the theoretical lens which will be used to view this problem of practice focuses on adult learning theory. This theory was chosen because career and lifelong learning is at the core of what teachers are expected and encouraged to do in order to stay current with shifts in pedagogy and content to continue their success in teaching others. If the goals of the induction program are to prepare teachers to be successful and effective in the district, a strong understanding of how adults learn and in what ways they learn efficiently and effectively is essential to the program’s success. Because this is such a large district, much of the professional development and course design are created within an in-house professional development department. Whether the course is face-to-face or through an online platform, the design and delivery must take into consideration the heart of this theory and the research behind it. Through a program evaluation, it is the goal of this researcher that the learning needs of the adults who participate in the induction program will surface and the current state of the program can be evaluated against those needs to determine if they have been met.

Adult learning, or andragogy, is a theory that holds a set of assumptions as to how adults learn. This includes valuing the process of learning, problem-based and collaborative approaches to learning, and an emphasis on more equality between the teacher and learner (Queensland, 2005). Although adult learning as a study had its roots in 1950’s Europe, American theorist, Malcolm Knowles, dedicated his work to this field, ultimately developing it
from theory, into a model of adult learning by the 1970’s. His definition of andragogy is “the art and science of helping adults learn” (Knowles, 1980, p. 43), and from this foundation he developed six principles of adult learning and the characteristics of an adult learner. This foundational understanding of adult learning will be one lens in which the researcher will evaluate the data collected and analyzed to determine whether adult learning is taking place with fidelity in this county-based district’s teacher induction program with site based support.

Being able to fully understand andragogy it is important to view varying perspectives as to the value and scholarly viewpoints of this concept. There has been some debate following his work in this area, as to whether or not andragogy is an actual theory, or just a set of principles of adult learners. Knowles responds by stating that “andragogy is less a theory of adult learning than a model of assumptions about learning or a conceptual framework that serves as a basis for an emergent theory” (Knowles, 1989, p. 112). In addition, Cyril Houle, Knowles’ mentor and andragogy contributor stated that “andragogy has alerted educators to the fact that they should involve learners in as many aspects of their education as possible and in the creation of a climate in which they can most fruitfully learn” (Houle, 1996, p. 30). In one contrary opinion to Knowles and Houle, Pratt (1993) states that “andragogy has been adopted by legions of adult educators around the world. . . . very likely, it will continue to be the window through which adult educators take their first look into the world of adult education.” However, “while andragogy may have contributed to our understanding of adults as learners, it has done little to expand or clarify our understanding of the process of learning,” nor has it achieved the status of “a theory of adult learning” (Pratt, 1993, p. 21). Viewing this opinion gives a more rounded analysis of the theory although the researcher will continue to operate under the assumption siding with the supporters of adult learning as an actual theory.
Knowles et. al., (2005) define the six principles of andragogy as it relates to the learner as the following: (1) the learner’s need to know, (2) self-concept of the learner, (3) prior experience of the learner, (4) readiness to learn, (5) orientation to learning, and (6) motivation to learn. In an adult classroom, Knowles suggests that the classroom climate should be one of “adultness” both physically and psychologically. Adults should “feel accepted, respected, and supported” and there should exist “a spirit of mutuality between teachers and students as joint inquirers” (Knowles, 1980, p. 47). Furthermore, “because adults manage other aspects of their lives, they are capable of directing, or at least assisting in planning, their own learning” (Merriam, 2001, p. 5).

As stated within the problem of practice, the most time-consuming component of this county-based district’s teacher induction program with site based support is the required face-to-face and online professional development coursework that is required consisting of classes related to content taught, classroom management, and pedagogy among other topics. In looking at these principles of adult learning and by analyzing teacher’s responses to the survey and focus groups, the researcher hopes to clarify the necessity of each course, the mode in which the courses are transmitted and the value to which the coursework add to the teacher as an adult learner in order to be effective as new editions to this county-based district.
Chapter II: Literature Review

The literature reviewed here will focus on what has been learned from the implementation of teacher induction programs throughout the United States. The researcher will focus on implementation of programs designed for beginning teachers, the more traditional participants of induction programs, knowing that most research does not decipher between this population and that of teachers with previous experience but new to a district – the focus of this study. The researcher believes it is important to have a firm understanding of induction programs in general in order to complete this program evaluation with integrity.

In order to better understand induction, the researcher will provide a thorough analysis of several bodies of literature relating to teacher induction programs. These will primarily consist of: current views on the purpose and value of teacher induction programs, components or strategies that induction programs contain, and mentoring’s role in the teacher induction process. These bodies of literature were selected from sources by authors that have researched teacher induction programs and specific components over the past three decades including those that are still at the forefront of modern research in this area.

In order to narrow down the body of literature chosen for this review, the following questions were generated to guide the literature selection and research direction:

- What characteristics do common models for teacher induction programs have both historically and presently?
- What is mentoring’s role in induction?
- What do successful mentoring programs look like?
- Why do induction programs exist and for what purpose?
- Do teacher induction programs vary depending on teaching experience?
• How do teachers view induction programs?
• What stakeholders are involved in teacher induction design?
• In what ways does induction raise student achievement?

An Overview of Teacher Induction Programs

In order to better understand the research and literature surrounding teacher induction programs, a first look at a broad overview of what teacher induction is gives this review of literature some direction. An early look at the meaning of formal induction programs for beginning teachers found a definition by Huling-Austin (1990) who described it as “a planned program intended to provide some systematic and sustained assistance to beginning teachers for at least one year” (Huling-Austin, 1990, p. 536). In addition to this definition, Huling-Austin (1990) cited five goals that are important to any new teacher induction program: improving teacher performance, increasing retention of promising beginning teachers during the induction years, promoting personal and professional well-being of beginning teachers by improving their attitudes toward themselves and the profession, satisfying mandated requirements related to induction and certification, and transmitting the culture of the system to beginning teachers (Huling-Austin, 1990). More recently, a description by Feiman-Nemser (2010) states that induction is “a phase of learning to teach, a process for enculturation, and a program of support and development” (p. 16). This will be the basis for literature chosen to review and as the working definition moving forward in this research, with a focus of this particular study on the “program of support and development” component of induction (Feiman-Nemser, 2010). In looking at the types of formal, comprehensive programs for teacher induction, most consist of a foundation laden with professional learning opportunities and professional development
requirements, as well as a component including some type of support by school personnel or a mentor.

Glazerman, Senesky, Seftor, and Johnson, (2006) state that there is “no ‘one-size-fits-all’ model of teacher induction either in theory or in practice: different programs emphasize different goals. However they conclude that programs can “stress to a greater or lesser extent components such as orientation, assessment, professional development workshops, mentoring, peer coaching, small group activities, and classroom observations” (Glazerman et. al., 2006). In addition to these components, Wong (2002) says the design of a truly comprehensive induction program should be focused on teacher training, support and retention. Furthermore, he adds that all successful induction programs help new teachers establish effective classroom management procedures, routines, and instructional practices and develop teachers' sensitivity to and understanding of the community, as well as their passion for lifelong learning and professional growth (Wong, 2002).

Regardless of individual program components or requirements, the literature appears to be clear on the purpose for induction programs. Lopez, Lash, Schaffner, Shields, and Wagner (2004) believe that “induction programs share a simple logic: because new teachers tend to be less effective and are more likely to leave the profession than their more experienced peers, targeted support should be provided to orient them to the profession and to assist them to learn their craft. The goals are to make new teachers more effective earlier in their careers and to keep them in the profession” (Lopez et. al., 2004, p.3). Glazerman et. al. (2006) indicate three goals of induction programs: to strengthen beginning teachers’ attachment to the profession, to improve their teaching skills, and the ultimate goal, is to improve students’ academic outcomes (Glazerman et. al., 2006).
Like most careers, on-the-job training is critical in the field of education. Feiman-Nemser (2001) sees induction within the professional learning continuum indicating its role as a bridge between pre-service education training and professional development. Successful induction programs, according to Moir (2009), require involvement of stakeholders across the district and policymakers across the country in order to act as a “lever for school change that builds leadership and encourages collaboration.” These successful induction programs “incorporate both the passion of new teachers and the expertise of experienced teachers to ensure all students in America receive the best education” (Moir, 2009, p. 19).

**Mentoring within Teacher Induction Programs**

It is important to include an overview of the mentoring practice within induction programs as it has increasingly become a central component of many programs for beginning teachers. According to Moir (2009), more than thirty states require some sort of mentored induction experience for new teachers. Although this is a step in the right direction as far as requiring this important component of induction, she cautions that “unfunded mandates where districts assign teachers as mentors without regard to program quality won’t improve teaching practice or student learning” (Moir, 2009, p. 18).

Ingersoll and Smith (2004) describe mentoring within the education field as “personal guidance provided, usually by seasoned veterans, to beginning teachers in schools” (Ingersoll and Smith, 2004, p. 29). In addition, this mentor, sometimes referred to as a “reflective coach,” may also offer emotional support, establish trust and respect, and have strong interpersonal skills. They need to develop relationships with the beginning teacher and have an understanding of new teacher development in order to provide “tailored” assistance to beginnings teachers’ needs (Smith & Evans, 2008). Wang and Odell (2002) more specifically identified three approaches to
mentoring including the humanistic perspective (emotional support), situated apprentice (practical knowledge of the profession), and critical constructivist (co-construction of knowledge through collaborative inquiry) (Wang and Odell, 2002).

One type of mentoring program may take place in what Glazerman et al. (2008) describe as “informal or low-intensity teacher induction” which may include pairing each new teacher with another full-time teacher without providing training, supplemental materials, or release time for the induction and mentoring to occur (Glazerman et al., 2008). However, in a more comprehensive beginning teacher induction program, mentors take on a formal role in which they are provided some type of formal training that may include reflecting on instructional practices, communicating effectively, developing their coaching language and analyzing student work. One particular group of beginning teachers, those from alternative certification paths who typically bypass student teaching for a full-time teaching position, find mentoring to be particularly crucial in their development and induction into teaching (Nakai & Turley, 2003; Simmons, 2005). Ingersoll and Smith (2004) state that during the past twenty years “several studies seem to provide support for the hypothesis that well-conceived and well-implemented teacher mentoring and induction programs are successful in increasing the job satisfaction, efficacy, and retention of new teachers.” However, they also go on to critique these empirical studies for lack of control groups (or the “non-mentored”) focusing only on attitudinal outcomes such as teacher’s feelings of the benefits of induction programs without data on more tangible outcomes such as teacher retention or effectiveness (Ingersoll & Smith, 2004, p. 30-31).

Mentoring program selection process. An important component of comprehensive mentoring programs is the selection process for choosing who will be a mentor. Wood and Stanulis (2009) believe that “helping adults develop involves a distinct skill set from helping K-
12 students learn” so quality induction programs seek mentors with “indicators of excellence in multiple areas” (Wood and Stanulis, 2009, p. 6). They have compiled mentor selection criteria from several researchers in the area of induction to narrow down the process and they include:

- A quality instruction practice of three or more years (Moir & Gless, 2001);
- A reflective approach to one’s own teaching (Stanulis, Ames, Stanulis, Burrill, & Ames, 2007);
- Content knowledge and subject-based pedagogy (Moir, 2003);
- Commitment to ongoing personal and professional growth (Norman & Feiman-Nemser, 2005);
- Excellent interpersonal and communication skills (Costa & Garmston, 2002);
- Experience in teaching adult learners effectively (Arends & Rigazio-DiGilio, 2000);
- Empathy toward the needs of novice teachers (Gold, 1996);
- Commitment to the functions and processes of mentoring (Feiman-Nemser, 2001).

In addition to sharing this criteria, mentors need to undergo specific training before working with beginning teachers. Schwille and Dynak (2000) believe that this preparation takes place before meeting mentees but also continues throughout the mentor’s practice focusing on (a) understanding new teachers’ needs and development, (b) studying one’s own teaching and mentoring practices, (c) participating in simulations of mentoring situations, and (d) working with other mentors to share and learn (Schwille and Dynak, 2000).

Much work over the past two decades by the New Teacher Center in Santa Cruz, California has revolved around mentoring and designing coherent induction programs for schools and districts. Ellen Moir, founder of the New Teacher Center, believes that the “heart of our (induction) model is regular, one-on-one mentoring in which new teachers are matched with
exemplary teachers who analyze their practice and, using classroom data, offer constructive suggestions for improvement” (Moir, 2009, p. 16). She also feels that mentoring can positively affect school culture in addition to beginning teachers’ instructional practices, provided that schools and districts have “sufficient resources, empowered educators, and the time and professional development to work closely with colleagues” (Moir, 2009, p. 18).

Critics of mentoring within induction programs look at how these programs can often fall short of intended goals because of lack of resources, program focus and structure, and a “well-conceptualized curricula to develop new mentors to guide new teachers” (Athanathes et. al, 2008, p. 745). There is also little evidence of studies in which “mentoring of new teachers has had a direct impact on student learning” or if “new teachers participating in induction programs do not receive different or more regular feedback from mentors or administrators than any other teachers,” calling into question whether induction and mentoring programs in their current form are “maximizing their impact on improving teacher and student learning” (Smith & Evans, 2008, p. 365).

**Components of Teacher Induction Programs**

Wong (2004) suggests that induction programs should provide: a continuum of professional development through systematic training over a period of two to three years; study groups in which new teachers can network and build support, commitment and leadership in a learning community; a strong sense of administrative support integrating a mentoring component within the induction program; a structure for modeling effective teaching during in-services and mentoring; and opportunities for inductees to visit demonstration classrooms (Wong, 2004). Similarly, Wood and Stanulis (2009) summarize the components of the modern “wave” of induction programs by including the following nine components in the order of prominence:
• Educative mentors’ preparation and mentoring of novice teachers
• Reflective inquiry and teaching practices
• Systematic and structured observations
• Developmentally appropriate professional development
• Formative teacher assessment
• Administrators’ involvement in induction
• A school culture supportive of novice teachers
• Program evaluation and/or research on induction
• A shared vision of knowledge, teaching and learning

(Wood and Stanulis, 2009, p. 5)

Although the first two points are highlighted in the previous section regarding mentoring, as it is generally the most common component of teacher induction programs, these other components deserve a deeper dive into their merits for a better understanding of what any one induction program could include.

**Developing appropriate professional development.** As compiled by Wood and Stanulis (2009), “quality induction programs deliver professional development in multiple ways including novices’ observations of peers and experienced teachers, seminars, workshops, joint mentor-novice teacher observations; college courses; and district or state-sponsored online courses specifically targeted to novice teacher learning needs, including an emphasis on deepening content knowledge, classroom management skills, and the ability to establish and maintain good relationships with students and their families” (Alliance for Excellent Education (AEE), 2004; Ingersoll & Smith, 2004).
**Formative teacher assessment.** In order to improve beginning teacher practice, observations as part of a structured cycle of coaching are a necessary component. Two formal programs, the Pathwise system of formative assessment designed by Education Testing Service and the Formative Assessment System designed by the New Teacher Center at the University of California, Santa Cruz are widely used nationwide among formal teacher induction programs. Regardless of the program, they are designed for novice teachers to participate in a series of structured formative assessment activities in conjunction with a mentor teacher and for them to ultimately learn how to self-assess their “professional competence through organized and reflective discussions” (Wood and Stanulis, 2009, p. 10).

**Administrators’ involvement in induction.** Although most teachers believe their mentor to be the most important in their development early in their career, many cite having a supportive principal as the “most critical factor in their professional development” (Wood and Stanulis, 2009; Wood, 2005; Bartell, 2005; Brock & Grady, 1997). Having administrative support as a beginning teacher is crucial as they are the instructional leaders of the school, most likely responsible for recruiting and hiring of the beginning teacher, responsible for facilitating mentors and mentor selection, builder and designer of the school culture, and advocate for the beginning teacher (Wood, 2005). Moir (2009) also believes that when principals work together with mentors, they can “create environments where teacher learning is supported and students benefit” (Moir, 2009, p. 19).

**A school culture supportive of novice teachers.** According to Wood and Stanulis (2009), “quality induction programs prosper in contexts that provide novice teachers substantive orientation activities specific to their teaching context, sanctioned time for novice teachers and mentors to reflect and collaborate, and opportunities for collegial interactions among novices” (p.
For some induction programs, orientation activities could be the bulk of the formal program consisting of overviews in which the district or school operates. Discussion of the school mission/vision, district-specific curriculum, and professional development offerings could be the core components of such overviews. A quality district environment and culture allocates time needed for a beginning teacher in order to plan, reflect, and develop instructional strategies with their mentors (Wood and Stanulis, 2009). Without this necessary, sanctioned time, these components or strategies for beginning teachers would not be feasible or possible and therefore negate the purposes of the induction program. In addition to a culture that provides time and orients a beginning teacher to their teaching environment, a high-quality culture offers opportunities for beginning teachers to interact with their peers and other experienced teachers in addition to their mentors. This could be both through formal sessions, such as professional learning communities and mentor sessions with other beginning teachers, or informally through online communities or grade-level partnerships. Moir (2009) encourages learning communities because they “build capacity and provide a structure for student learning” by working as a team to “collaborate to design powerful lessons, observe each other teaching when possible, and analyze student data to ensure that students are learning” (Moir, 2009, p. 17).

Program evaluation and induction. As is the purpose of this researcher’s program evaluation, other researchers agree that evaluation and research are critical components essential to a quality teacher induction program. “A thoughtful, collaboratively designed program evaluation or research study: (a) keeps the program grounded in novice teachers’ needs, (b) produces information on how well the program is functioning, and (c) identifies areas for program improvement” (Wood & Stanulis, 2009, p. 14). Although this component seems obvious and important to a successful induction program, many induction programs do not have
a mandated research or evaluation component. Instead, some high quality programs voluntarily conduct research and evaluation to provide program feedback (Wood, 2001; Fideler & Haselkorn, 1999; Resta, Huling, White, & Matscheck, 1997).

**Shared vision of knowledge, teaching, and learning.** A final and important component of induction includes the notion of a shared vision between designers and induction program supervisors and the fact that it is imbedded throughout each component of the program. Arends and Rigazio-DiGilio (2000) recommend that induction programs “provide a clear definition of teaching in order to develop assessment tools to give feedback on novice teachers’ instruction, establish a knowledge base on which rubrics and formative assessments can be developed, and provide a common language with which new teachers and mentors can discuss teaching” (p. 12). In agreement, Wood and Stanulis (2009) believe that high quality induction programs must unite program goals with each of the program components, and Schwille and Dynak (2000) even go as far as to point out that this collaboration should even take place among pre-service programs at universities in conjunction with the districts but highlight that it must be developed together in order for success. Moir (2009) echoes this sentiment by stating that “induction programs are most effective when all stakeholder groups are represented in the program design and when new teacher induction is part of a districtwide initiative to improve teaching and learning” (Moir, 2009, p 16).

**Summary.** By digging deeper into the bodies of literature focusing on current induction programs, components and strategies that embody these programs, and mentoring’s role in induction, the researcher has developed an understanding of the current state of induction in schools. This review of literature has prepared the researcher to conduct this program evaluation
with this background information and knowledge acting as a base understanding of induction programs and the impact they can have on teacher effectiveness and student learning.
Chapter III: Research Methodology

In order to begin to answer the proposed research questions, the design of this study will consist of a program evaluation of this county-based district’s teacher induction program with site based support. The evaluation will be based upon a newly designed logic model of this program created to clearly identify components integral to its existence that ultimately lead to intended outputs and outcomes. Using data compiled from interviews with program designers and supervisors, an online survey of past and current program participants, follow-up focus groups, and interviews with site based administration, the researcher hopes to address areas of strength and focus in order to continually operate the program as it stands now or refine programmatic components for future success.

Research Questions

The three research questions guiding this study are as follows:

1. How effective is this county-based district’s teacher induction program with site based support in supporting teachers to be successful and effective as perceived by teachers, administrators, and program designers and supervisors?

2. Which components of this county-based district’s teacher induction program with site based support are most valuable to teachers new to the district in support of their success, as perceived by them?

3. In what ways can this county-based district’s teacher induction program with site based support be improved to better support the success of teachers new to the district, as perceived by participants themselves, administrators, and program designers and supervisors?
Each of these three questions guided both the design of the data collection tools such as online survey and interview questions, and focus group discussion points. Additionally, it provided the framework in which the analysis of data and the discussion of that data is laid out in future chapters. These established guiding questions will allow the research to maintain a focused structure and provide a point of reference as the evaluation unfolds.

**Rationale for a Qualitative Program Evaluation**

A program evaluation gives researchers and evaluators an opportunity to collect data about a program or system in order to provide feedback as to its success as intended by designers or supervisors. Every day, programs are designed and operated in the private and public sector, including the world of education. Oftentimes this process occurs without feedback, analysis, or evaluation allowing for the system to operate under the assumption that activities and resources are successfully having the impact necessary to lead to intended outcomes. Program evaluations can uncover the truth that intended goals and results may not have been met, and assumptions can be dispelled. To offer the district this opportunity and to allow supervisors to see the value in evaluation, the course of this study and research was selected.

Through a program evaluation of this county-based district’s teacher induction program with site based support, the researcher collected data to address the proposed questions of inquiry in order to provide current supervisors with an analysis that reflected attitudes toward the current state of the program and identified any suggestions for future improvement. To accomplish this, it was necessary to begin the data collection process by interviewing induction program architects and current supervisors to develop a working and complete logic model for this county-based district’s teacher induction program with site based support. According to the Kellogg Foundation, “the most basic logic model is a picture of how you believe your program
will work” and it is meant to “describe the sequence of activities thought to bring about change and how these activities are linked to the results the program is expected to achieve” (Kellogg Foundation, 2004, p. 1). To better understand the intended results of this program, clarifying how the program was designed and how it should function, became a necessary first step in creating the logic model and thus, conducting the program evaluation.

**Participants and Recruitment**

In addition to including program designers and supervisors within the research, the population primarily studied consisted of teachers and instructional support personnel with more than six months of experience that are currently enrolled or previously completed this county-based district’s teacher induction program with site based support. Each of these participants were invited via their school district email to participate in an online survey that was used to gather information as to their experience with the induction program. Those invited, regardless of their decision to take part in the survey, were also asked via a follow-up email to participate in one of two focus groups consisting of elementary, middle and high school teachers or instructional support personnel who completed or are currently enrolled in the induction program. Additionally, it was valuable to conclude by inviting site based administrators to provide feedback on their experience as site supervisors of induction participants to gain insight from their perspective.

**Data Collection**

To properly complete this program evaluation, it was necessary to acquire data from designers, supervisors, participants, and administrators through a variety of methods to support the intentions to be portrayed in the logic model. In order to proceed, this county-based district required the completion of an application process and approval to conduct research within the
school district. This required sharing thesis proposal information and answering questions as to what participants would be contacted and how data would be collected. After several months, the application was approved and data was allowed to be collected between the dates of August 19, 2015 and December 1, 2015. Throughout the approved data collection window several means in which to obtain perceptions, feelings, and opinions toward the induction program transpired. Data collection employed included an online survey, interviews, and focus groups.

**Interviews.** An interview with program designers and supervisors launched the data collection process to gain crucial background information on programmatic design and philosophical viewpoints. This data was the cornerstone of what would eventually be used to create the logic model. To conclude the data collection process, interviews were conducted with three site based administrators to understand their perspective and feelings toward the induction program.

**Online survey.** The online survey was designed and delivered through an emailed invitation to all program participants that were enrolled or recently completed the teacher induction program with site based support. The first section of the survey consisted of several demographic and experience gathering questions designed to give the researcher perspective as to the population of the study. The next section focused on the ranking of individual required components of the induction program and allowed participants to rate the impact of specific courses using a Likert scale. The remaining sections asked participants the value and impact of other stakeholders on their induction as well as frequency in which they communicate with stakeholders.

**Focus groups.** As participants completed the online survey, they were given an opportunity to indicate their interest in a follow-up focus group to further discuss topics
addressed in the online survey. Others were invited through a mass email reminder sent to the potential survey participants, regardless of completing the survey. Based on the interest of the participants, two separate focus groups were conducted with three teachers who attended each session. Participants varied between elementary, middle, and high school teachers. These were held at a district professional development building geographically convenient for all teachers involved. The researcher facilitated the line of questioning and discussion and recorded the encounter for purposes of transcribing at a later stage of the study. Based on data collected from the online survey, questions posed expanded on widespread themes involving communication, program components, relationship with administration, and areas the induction program could be improved. Additionally, each of the questions and ways in which the researcher directed conversation points were informed by both the three research questions and components of the logic model.

**Data Analysis**

Analysis of the data collected began once surveys were closed and both focus groups and interviews were completed. This aligned with the requested completion time required by this county-based district. The entire process of analyzing what had been collected could not have been possible without the understanding of what program designers had intended for induction which had been memorialized in the completed logic model. Informed by outputs and outcomes identified in the logic model, the data collected from the completed SurveyMonkey.com responses had to be subsequently analyzed and coded to develop themes and direction for the remaining analysis. Transcripts created from focus group recordings and interviews were then coded using similar words, phrases, and themes from the survey analysis.
To accomplish this, the researcher employed a variation of in vivo coding, also known as “literal coding” and “verbatim coding.” The very nature of the word “vivo” meaning “in which is alive,” means that the coding itself will come from the actual words spoken by the participants through the interview process as notated in their transcripts (Strauss, 1987, p. 33). According to Saldana (2012), in vivo coding is an appropriate choice for nearly all qualitative studies, especially those led by a beginning researcher, which made it an intelligent choice for this particular study. A second cycle of coding included pattern coding. Pattern coding allowed the researcher to break-down initial results from the in vivo coding in order to see “emergent themes, configurations or an explanation” (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 69). The culmination of this process resulted in a summary analysis of coded data against articulated outputs and outcomes developed within the logic model to clarify what was necessary to complete the program evaluation.

**Protection of Human Subjects and Ethical Considerations**

Before this stage of research began at Northeastern University, the researcher passed the National Institute of Health’s online course, “Protecting Human Research Subjects” as part of the requirements for the doctoral program. As with any research involving human subjects, the researcher applied for approval by Northeastern University’s Institutional Review Board following the submission of the doctoral proposal and before starting any research or collection of data. Because the researcher was employed with this county-based district in a position as a fully released mentor to beginning teachers, which is a component of the professional development department of the district studied here, ethical considerations and the importance of maintaining standards throughout the study were of great importance. The teacher induction program supervisors were the immediate contacts throughout the entire thesis process, although
management within the district’s Assessment, Accountability, and Evaluation department ultimately held the authority to grant approval for the program evaluation to be conducted.

Because the survey was anonymous and administered online through a web-based link, the protection of each of the participants that volunteer to contribute was secured. Following the survey, an additional email invited participants to several focus groups, which required a face-to-face session with the researcher. Identities of the individual participants will remain confidential in this study and only known to the researcher for communication and logistic purposes and their demographic information will be known in order to ensure that an equitable and appropriate quantity of elementary, middle, and high school teachers are represented in the focus groups. For purposes of confidentiality of all participants including the district, administrators, and teachers, any identifying information has been removed from the written report of this study and replaced with general terms to represent each of the participants.

**Summary**

Teacher induction programs are designed to provide beginning teachers new to teaching or the district in which they are employed the support needed to be successful in the career and in order to have a positive impact on student achievement. In this county-based district, the teacher induction program is divided into two parts, one that supports teachers with less than six months of experience and the other, the focus of this study, teachers with experience but new to the school district. This program evaluation will look to see whether the design of the teacher induction program serving teachers new to the district has indeed contributed to those outcomes as assessed through the analysis of demographic data, survey data, and focus groups. Finally, the findings will be reviewed through the lens of adult learning theory and discussed in relationship to the current literature on teacher induction programs.
Chapter IV: Report of Research Findings

This chapter will include data gathered from current and former program participants, site-based administrators, program designers, as well as current program supervisors. This was collected through the administration of an online survey of teachers and instructional support personnel that had previously completed or are currently enrolled in the teacher induction program with site based support as well as two follow-up focus groups. Additionally, information will be included from an interview of one of the initial program designers in order to develop the history, intent, and goals of the induction program for purposes of compiling what was necessary to complete the logic model and to be used to address to some extent the research questions. In order to gain a clearer picture of all facets within the induction program, a final set of interviews with site based administrators were conducted and a report of those findings will be included throughout this chapter. The first component will include a completed logic model designed at this stage of the research followed by a review of the coding procedure, giving a step-by-step account for the process. Next, the researcher reviewed the three research questions of this study and applied relevant survey, interview, and focus group data from all of the necessary stakeholders applicable to individual questions. In conclusion, findings will be summarized giving an overall depicting of the data collected.

Study Context

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the teacher induction program with site based support of this county-based district by applying knowledge gained from teacher and other educator participants, site based administrators, and program designers through a multitude of collection methods in order to determine whether logic model outputs and outcomes achieved their desired effect. In order to gain a clearer picture of the program’s history and intention, the
initial step in the collection of data consisted of a one-on-one interview with one of the program designers and program supervisor to firmly establish what would be included within the logic model. This stage in the research process guided the remainder of the data collection and analysis and informed the editing and refinement of the online survey and focus group questions administered following the interview.

**Logic model.** As introduced in Chapter 3, it was important for this researcher to develop a complete logic model as it was established that one had never been created nor had this aspect of the program been evaluated since its inception in 2009. This model served as both a tool to understand the overall flow of the teacher induction program with site based support and as a framework for which to aid the examination of collected data and to evaluate the overall program. Throughout the interview, questions were asked to help identify each component of the logic model as well as the narrative for how this program was born, unfolded and as to where it remains today. These questions (Appendix A), focused on history of the program, reasons for designing it, rationale behind individual components and requirements, personnel involved, and areas where the program has seen success or areas of concern. As a follow-up to the interview, program supervisors provided the researcher with several documents supporting the program’s history and current philosophies as to strengthen the logic model components and solidify the working model that would be used to guide the research process going forward (Figure 1).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources (Inputs)</th>
<th>Activities (Inputs)</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Short and Long Term Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In order to accomplish a set of activities we will need the following:</td>
<td>In order to address the assets we will accomplish the following activities:</td>
<td>We expect that once accomplished these activities will produce the following evidence:</td>
<td>We expect that if accomplished these activities will lead to the following changes in 1-3 then 4-6 years:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Funding from the district/Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation Grant and an annual budget</td>
<td>• Create, administer and refine district and state mandated professional development including coursework</td>
<td>• Produce effective teachers by providing a common level of support</td>
<td>• Increase effectiveness of teaching and student learning in the district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Professional Development Personnel</td>
<td>• Monitor participant progress through site-based administration</td>
<td>• Support and train teachers on the evaluation system rubric</td>
<td>• Increase support for program participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Administration</td>
<td>• Monitor participant progress through administration from a district level</td>
<td>• Provide every teacher with a clearly communicated and common message from the district and at their school site</td>
<td>• Provide choice in completion of program requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Provided Coursework</td>
<td>• Maintain a working database of site-based support program participants and those completed</td>
<td>• Communicate effectively with site-based administration and participants regarding the program and requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Content Departments</td>
<td>• Participating educators new to the district</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Site based Administration Contacts</td>
<td>• The district’s Classroom Teachers Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Participating educators new to the district</td>
<td>• The State’s Educator Accomplished Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evaluation system rubric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Logic model for this county-based district’s teacher induction program with site based support

**Logic model inputs (resources).** For an induction program to function properly in a district this large, it was not surprising that it took a multitude of human, systematic, and financial inputs in order to accomplish what was set forth during the design and creation phase.
As mentioned earlier, the awarding of the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation’s “Intensive Partnerships for Effective Teaching” grant in the fall of 2009 was the necessary catalyst that sparked the possibility of this program’s initial redesign and further funded the adjacent components of the teacher induction program as a whole until the 2015-2016 school year. Once these conditions were set, the necessary human side of the resources and inputs of the program became clearer. Initially, personnel within the district’s professional development department, including program designers and supervisors, used the months preceding implementation to prepare what would be necessary to launch the program. District administrators overseeing all departments, including professional development, played a managerial role in approving and supervising the process. Additionally, other school district administrators and departments played various roles in this initial design such as content area supervisors and personnel that developed subject area coursework. Historically, this county-based district’s has worked closely with the Classroom Teachers Association, the local teacher union, to design the evaluation system, which included an overhaul of the induction program. At each school site, administrators played an integral part in supporting teachers new to the district and were necessary resources during the implementation of the induction program. Finally, the teachers and other instructional personnel who participate or have completed the induction program complete the group of human resources or inputs that informed this logic model.

Essentially, two distinct curricular and instructional resources created the foundation from which the philosophy of the program is based. The first being, the state’s Educator Accomplished Practices, the state-mandated professional practices the state’s Department of Education believes should be mastered by an effective teacher provided the basis for all content developed within the program. Additionally, the district’s evaluation system rubric, based on
Charlotte Danielson’s A Framework for Teaching provided additional considerations and guidelines for effective teaching practices and sets the standard for what inductees needed to accomplish during their tenure in the program. Both of these crucial inputs offered the aforementioned human resources the content needed to develop this fundamental input, the induction program coursework. The remaining share of inputs consist of activities requiring a combination of resources that must be properly adjoined to maintain high levels of curricular integrity and relevancy. This allows for multiple levels of progress monitoring through clear communication to and from participants from all stakeholders within the program.

**Logic model inputs (activities).** Within the induction program, resources must work in some combination to establish a set of activities that will move the program closer to its intended outputs and short and long term outcomes. As will be discussed in detail throughout this study, one of the premier duties of the program is to create, administer, and refine district and state-mandated professional development such as the required coursework. A district this size has the resources mentioned previously to do most of this in-house through a combination of full-time professional development personnel as well as trained instructors to deliver the content to the inductees. Keeping track of what stage each participant is within the program and how much professional development has been completed involves the monitoring of progress of inductees at the site level by the administrator as well as by the professional development department throughout the year through communication with school sites. This structure is designed to minimize opportunities for participants to not complete induction while creating a checks and balances like system to assure all stakeholders are doing what they can to support induction. From the district level, an additional way to ensure this is to maintain a database of all participants past and present as to their status within the program, site of employment, and any
other pertinent information related to their placement within the district. This is housed within the professional development department and is updated on a daily basis so any stakeholders within the department can access it to provide additional support. A final activity involves the act of providing communication through channels between the district and site based administrators as well as to participants. This activity is one of importance in order to provide participants with all information as to their requirements and status within the program in order for it to operate successfully, leading toward intended outputs and outcomes set forth by program architects and supervisors.

**Logic model outputs and outcomes.** If resources have worked in collaboration to complete the designed activities, then evidence collected from this study should conclude that intended program outputs have been met. Furthermore, outcomes have potential to be satisfied in both the short and long term, provided the outputs have been met and the program, as evaluated, continues to meet expectations. The intended outputs developed from the interview with the program supervisor included 1) producing effective teachers by providing a common level of support, 2) supporting and training teachers on the evaluation system rubric, and 3) providing every teacher with a clearly communicated and common message from the district and at their school site. Ultimately, these outputs should impact the district universally creating outcomes that provide inductees with more choice in their induction, increase support of teachers to raise overall effectiveness of instruction and the level of student learning and achievement.

Once the logic model design was completed, it was advised that the researcher conduct a member check with program supervisors to ensure that the logic model accurately depicted what was originally shared with the researcher. This was conducted prior to completing this chapter.

**Analysis**
Online survey. Current and former participants in the teacher induction program with site based support were invited via email to volunteer as part of the study in September, 2015. All of the email invites were sent between September 8, 2015 and September 20, 2015. A final email to both remind program participants to either take the survey, or respond and volunteer to participate in focus groups was sent on September 27, 2015. In total, 1,414 teachers and other educators were emailed over this time period consisting of both active induction program participants as well as others who have completed the program.

Once participants responded to the link on the email, they were directed to SurveyMonkey.com and were provided with a digital copy of the Unsigned Consent Document for Web-Based Online Surveys to agree to before moving forward with the survey. Participants were first asked a series of demographic and teaching experience questions in order for the researcher to gain insight into the background of the respondent population. They were then asked about their experience with all components of the teacher induction program with site based support through open-ended, ranking, and Likert Scale questioning (Appendix B). As mentioned earlier, follow-up emails and a link at the end of the survey invited the same participants to a set of focus groups that would delve deeper into the initial responses gathered from the survey. To gain an additional perspective, a small number of interviews with site based administrators (assistant principals) were conducted to gain a more complete view of the program from all stakeholders and this final step completed the data collection portion of the program evaluation.

Survey participants. In reviewing the demographic data retrieved from SurveyMonkey.com, where the online survey was housed, it was recorded that 146 instructional employees agreed to the Unsigned Consent Document for Web-Based Online Surveys. Based on
initial emails sent, that constitutes slightly higher than a 10% response rate. Once past the unsigned consent, which was the only required question to answer, respondents participated in answering at least some of the remaining questions posed. Allowing the rest of the questions to be optional was purposeful as some questions could not be answered if the participant was in a different stage of the induction program, or had not taken a particular course yet. However, a majority of the questions had at least 115 respondents, which effectively brought down the response rate to about 8%.

Survey participant demographic data. The current position of participants consisted of the following: approximately 51% elementary teachers, 26% middle school teachers, 18% high school teachers, and about 6% were in other instructional fields (e.g. social work, school psychologist, pre-k), a population also required to participate in the teacher induction program with site based support (Table 1).

Table 1

**Participant Demographic Data, Online Survey**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Position</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Teachers</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School Teachers</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Teachers</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Instructional Support (psychologist, social work, etc.)</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, survey respondents were asked what type of school they worked in based on geographic location and socio-economic indicators Title I (currently 65% free and reduced lunch), and Renaissance (90%+ free and reduced lunch). Based on geography as perceived by them, approximately 30% worked in urban schools, 8% worked in rural schools, and 32%
worked in suburban schools. Additionally, about 50% were employed at Title I schools while almost 19% stated they worked at Renaissance schools (Table 2).

Table 2

*Geographic and Socio-Economic Breakdown of Participants, Online Survey*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographic Location of Employment</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suburban Schools</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Schools</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Schools</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socio-Economic Status of School</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title I Schools</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renaissance Schools</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Survey participant experience level.* When inviting survey participants to the online survey, the researcher was given access by the supervisors of the teacher induction program with site based support to utilize an electronic database of all current program participants as well as those that have graduated since the program’s existence. Because of this vast invite list, respondents of this survey had employment experience levels within the district ranging from those currently in their first year with the school district and those that have five or more years of experience with the school district (Table 3).
Table 3

*Participant Experience Level within the District, Online Survey*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience Level Within the District</th>
<th>% of Respondents (# of Respondents)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Year in the District</td>
<td>16% (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Year in the District</td>
<td>38% (53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Year in the District</td>
<td>24% (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Year in the District</td>
<td>14% (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth+ Year in the District</td>
<td>9% (12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, those surveyed have a wide range of experience in education before entering this county-based district. A majority of participants migrated from out of state (61%) while the next largest population (47%) worked outside of the county, but within the state. The smallest group of participants had experience in county, but at charter or private institutions (13%). (Table 4).
Table 4

Participant Experience Location Prior to District Employment, Online Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience Location</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Out of State</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside of the County (in the state)</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In County (Charter or Private)</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to collecting how many years of experience participants had and where that experience took place, the researcher collected total years of experience before coming to the district and participating in the teacher induction program. This data, detailed in Table 5, shows that of the participants responding to the survey, that almost three-fourths of all participants (73%) have more than three years of experience in some capacity. Conversely, slightly more than one-fourth of survey participants (27%) are newer to the profession with less than three years of experience.

Table 5

Teacher and Other Instructional Employees Years of Experience outside of the District, Online Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience outside of the District</th>
<th>% of Respondents (# of Respondents)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>8% (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 Years</td>
<td>19% (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-9 Years</td>
<td>36% (49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14 Years</td>
<td>16% (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+ Years</td>
<td>20% (27)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Focus group participants. Within the email to invite educators to the online survey, a separate request was made to gauge interest in a follow-up focus group in which more detailed questions could be asked to expand on what would be gleaned from the survey portion of the research. At one point, 17 teachers and other instructional support personnel both currently finishing the teacher induction program with site based support, as well as those that had completed it already had shown interest in a follow-up focus group. Ultimately, based on scheduling and location, the researcher was able to hold two separate focus groups with three educators at each session. Participants consisted of all classroom teachers including: two high school teachers, three middle school teachers and one elementary school teacher. Although backgrounds of individuals vary, each came into this county-based district with experience outside of the district from others states as well as in-state teachers from other county school districts.

Site based administrator participants. In order to gain a full perspective from stakeholders within this program, it was necessary to gain insight from site based administrators that are currently working in schools and are listed as the administrative contact for the teacher induction program with site based support. Due to time constraints provided by the school district, and the length of time it took to conduct the online survey and focus group, the researcher was only able to interview three elementary assistant principals, but the data collected was insightful and a usable component to the overall evaluation of this program.

Coding. The coding of the survey, focus group, and interview data was completed utilizing a variety of methods and programs. After reviewing the demographic data of the online survey, each additional question was paired with a research question that it closely applied to, starting with the Likert scale questions followed by questions that ranked components of the
program and broke-down time spent with administrators. Each of these were copied from SurveyMonkey.com into a Microsoft Excel workbook and then organized again by research question. Finally, the open ended responses contained within several of the survey questions like question #11 (What suggestions do you have that could improve the teacher induction program with site based support within this county-based district?) were transferred to the workbook as well. The importance of questions like this being that it directly aligns with the third research question (Research Question #3: In what ways can this county-based district’s teacher induction program with site based support be improved to better support the success of teachers new to the district, as perceived by participants themselves, administrators, and program supervisors?)

After reading through the responses in each of five categories: required courses (content), required courses (other), assessment review, instructional planning tool, and other, the researcher coded each response within four categories: positive, neutral, negative, or simply suggestions. These responses were read a second time to identify words or phrases that were either repeated by multiple respondents or were at least in some alignment so that various themes could be identified.

Similarly, this process was used when reading through each of the focus group transcripts, only with this data, the coding that took place during the second reading was tied to those same themes identified during the reading of the survey open-ended response data. Any additional pertinent words or phrases that could be linked to other research questions were also coded appropriately including anecdotes provided by participants that support across the board findings.

This process was slightly different with the transcript of the interview with the program designer, as much of what was captured assisted in developing the logic model. However
themes that complimented or contradicted participant viewpoints were coded for use in addressing research questions and program outcomes. This was also the process used to code the three administrator interview transcripts as well. This data will be organized and analyzed in the remaining sections of this chapter directed by the following research questions.

**Research Question #1: How effective is this county-based district’s teacher induction program with site based support in supporting teachers to be successful and effective as perceived by teachers, administrators, and program supervisors?**

The first research question was: How effective is this county-based district’s teacher induction program with site based support in supporting teachers to be successful and effective as perceived by teachers, administrators, and program supervisors? By asking how effective the overall program is in its role supporting teachers to be effective both questions and addresses the overarching goals of the program itself. Data collected from each avenue of this phase of the study included interviews, the online survey, follow-up focus groups, and analysis of program documents. Through these methods, respondents were questioned from each stakeholder level which included program designers and current supervisors of the program, administrators that monitor the program from school sites, and the participants themselves both current as well as those inductees that have completed the process.

To investigate whether the induction program supported teachers to be effective and successful, the following outputs and outcomes from the logic model were used to guide the analysis of data (Table 6).
Table 6

Logic Model Outputs and Short and Long Term Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intended Outputs</th>
<th>Intended Short and Long Term Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Produce effective teachers by providing a common level of support</td>
<td>Increase effectiveness of teaching and student learning in this county-based district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support and train teachers on the evaluation system rubric</td>
<td>Increase support for program participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide every teacher with a clearly communicated and common message from the district and at their school site</td>
<td>Provide site based support participants with more options for program completion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intended output #1: Produce effective teachers by providing a common level of support. During the initial interview with the program designer and supervisor, the phrase “common level of support” was discussed more than once in relation to induction and she alluded to the fact that the program has every intention of providing this, but each school site varies on the level of support given to inductees, especially those without a mentor. However, if this common level of support is achieved, they believe that the program will produce more effective teachers to put in front of the students in this county-based district. To examine this output, data will be shared from supervisor and administrative interviews while also reviewing comments from the online survey and follow-up focus groups.

Produce effective teachers by providing a common level of support (online survey). One of the biggest themes discovered within the online survey regarding a common level of support related specifically to the frequency of communication between program participants and their site based administrator. This will be addressed later in this chapter as it more specifically aligns to “communication,” the third output discussed here. However, several responses within
the open-ended questions that allowed respondents to share opinions regarding the program and components spoke to this particular output as did Likert scale question #10. Question #10 says: How have the following stakeholders impacted your induction in this county-based district?

Stakeholder impact. In addition to the coursework, it was important for the researcher to gather data on how much impact different stakeholders had on an educator’s induction into the district both inside and outside of their school site when reviewing the “common level of support” output. As was common during the data collection phase, the researcher combined percentage of respondents that chose “no impact” or “little impact” to gain a total percentage score that leans toward the negative or not a strong impact as well as on the more positive side, the “some impact” with “greatly impacted.”

Overall, as seen in Table 7, participants responded that full-time, site based stakeholders, had a greater impact on their induction than those outside of the school (district administrators) or temporarily housed at the school (mentors and peer evaluators). The most common site based administrators in the district, principals and assistant principals, had either “some” or were said to have “greatly impacted” teachers new to the district at combined rates of 66% and 67%, respectively. In addition to school leadership, the group of stakeholders in which respondents claimed had the most impact on their induction were other faculty at the school site at a combined rate of 74%.
Table 7

*Stakeholder Impact on Educator Induction, Online Survey*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Little Impact</th>
<th>Some Impact</th>
<th>Greatly Impacted</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>12% (14)</td>
<td>21% (25)</td>
<td>37% (44)</td>
<td>30% (35)</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
<td>11% (13)</td>
<td>23% (27)</td>
<td>35% (41)</td>
<td>31% (36)</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty at School Site</td>
<td>11% (13)</td>
<td>15% (17)</td>
<td>33% (38)</td>
<td>41% (48)</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School’s Mentor</td>
<td>56% (63)</td>
<td>20% (23)</td>
<td>14% (16)</td>
<td>10% (11)</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Evaluator</td>
<td>35% (41)</td>
<td>31% (36)</td>
<td>25% (29)</td>
<td>10% (12)</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Administrator</td>
<td>52% (61)</td>
<td>22% (26)</td>
<td>14% (16)</td>
<td>13% (15)</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alternatively, three groups of stakeholders held combined “no impact” or “some impact” percentage totals at equally high percentage points, the most impactful of the bottom three being peer evaluators, those experienced educators assigned to evaluate and observe inductees teaching at several times throughout the year. The peer evaluators had “no impact” or “some impact” on their induction at a total of 65%. An even less impactful group of stakeholders were the district administrators (74%) not working at the school site, but elsewhere in the district for part or most of the time. Having the least impact on induction were mentors (76%) who were assigned to work with other teachers new to the profession at the school site and not this population of respondents.

Individual comments provided during open-ended question responses varied in the level of support they feel they have received during induction in order to be effective and successful. One participant felt it would be more beneficial to hold more regular sessions to support teacher
induction program participants. Another respondent claimed the program is “seriously lacking to support new staff” and that it “feels more punitive than helpful.”

Although not necessarily tied to support from a person or group of people in the district, several participants responded to coursework tied directly to their content as “useful” and “beneficial,” even with experience coming into the district. Others felt that any coursework that contained new information or was provided to support school wide initiatives (such as CHAMPS, if applicable to the school) had the highest benefit toward their effectiveness.

One of the least time consuming requirements, the assessment review came up in comments in relation to level of support with one survey participant stating that they thought it was “effective for us to review an assessment and discuss what our next instructional steps would be, based on the results.” Further concluding that they now do this “after giving any assessment.” Another said that “my administrator was really wonderful to work with.”

A final question on the survey designed to understand teacher attrition and retention provided some information most relevant to this output as opposed to others. Survey question #12 asked the following: Are you employed at the same school as last year? If not, for what reason did you move to another school? The majority of the participants responding to this question, answered that they returned to the same school they were employed in the previous year (72%). However, of those respondents answering “no,” the reasons cited varied, most of which related to self-chosen relocation or unit changes out of their control (Table 8).
Table 8

*Teacher Attrition or Retention from 2014 to 2015, Online Survey*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did you return to the same school?</th>
<th>% of Respondents (# of Respondents)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>72% (84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No without Reason</td>
<td>4% (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No with Reason</td>
<td>24% (28)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those that responded as not returning to their school site for reasons other than relocation or unit changes had answers that gravitated toward the theme of this output, support. The four that responded regarding support cited “poor administration,” and “poor support from administration” seeking a new teaching opportunity to find “supportive administrators” and a school culture more aligned to their professional philosophy.

*Produce effective teachers by providing a common level of support (focus group).*

Similar to online survey responses, focus group participants felt supported in some ways and not in others. One participant described the professional development activities as making you “more comfortable with your teaching,” however, “an actual person supporting you [during induction,] that was a little lacking.” More than one focus group participant had to contact the district professional development department because of a lack of communication and support from site based administration. Another teacher who started mid-way through the year felt that “it was quite a challenge to get started” and “there was absolutely no support for anything.” A teacher who said it was harder because she was part of a small team of foreign language teachers and felt that getting support was much harder because she was “isolated and not extraverted.” Others felt there was a lack of support when it came to utilizing district technology resources and
completing administrative tasks like submitting report card grades or accessing other online services.

One inductee positively referred to the support she received from several stakeholders in her experience taking the required New Teacher Orientation (NTO) course in which she described the following:

My instructors for NTO were amazing, full of life. I don't know if it was the start of the year, or what. They did MVP in the classes. Our principal and assistant principal came and gave us a welcome gift and shirt. It was nice to see them supporting us in doing that.

*Produce effective teachers by providing a common level of support (interviews).* In the initial interview with the current program supervisor, she stated that one of the reasons for this being a focus when the program was devised was because of the need for all inductees to have the same level of support regardless of where they were employed. One way she had suggested this level of support increase is by giving faculty that look for leadership opportunities at a school site the chance to assist in supporting inductees in this program. Although this was not communicated when the program began, it is something that is being shared now to help provide that common level of support at each school site.

Site based administrators that volunteered to be interviewed regarding the program unanimously felt supported from the district level, but feel the program does not provide enough support for teachers new to the district like the support given to beginning teachers who are assigned a full-time mentor. Administrators all agreed that this would allow for a more consistent level of support and better serve inductees in their path to effectiveness.

*Produce effective teachers by providing a common level of support (summary).* Based on data previously shared in this section, inductees received support through both coursework
and human resources at their site and within the school district. The level of support varies depending on where the inductee is employed and with whom they are working. Some participants have benefitted from the support received through impactful experiences at their school and through their coursework while others struggle to even make contact with the administrator responsible for their induction. A majority of participants consider the frequency in which they have the opportunity to work with site based administrators to support their induction is not substantial and most feel an improvement in the frequency would benefit their overall effectiveness.

**Intended output #2: Support and train teachers on the evaluation system rubric.**

This output addresses how the evaluation system and rubric play a role in induction requirements and what survey and focus group participants felt regarding the level of support and training offered. This is important to this study and the district because every teacher employed, regardless of experience level or position is observed multiple times during the year using this rubric and possibly more crucial, it provides the basis for an end of the year evaluation that not only goes on a teachers record, but if negative, can be an indicator determining a teacher’s employment for the upcoming year.

As previously mentioned, each requirement of the induction program is connected with the state’s Educator Accomplished Practices which in turn are correlated with the evaluation system rubric. Utilizing the language from the rubric as well as the critical attributes within each of the domains and components, courses were designed were adapted annually to provide the most up to date and effective content to best support teachers new to this county-based district. One such course, although optional until recently, Teacher Rubric Overview, is the most exclusive to teaching and understanding the rubric. Additionally, the four-day New Teacher
Orientation (NTO) gives a domain and component overview of the rubric, as most teachers new to the district experience this course first and foremost in their induction, making it a logical time to introduce the rubric and the observation/evaluation process. Each of the other remaining courses address various components of the rubric and what instructional strategies can be used in the classroom to exemplify course content. For example, the Higher Order Thinking course addresses much of Domain 1’s Planning and Preparation as well as instructional strategies in Domain 3 such as component 3.2 Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques. Table 9 addresses the correlation between required coursework, the evaluation system rubric, and the state’s Educator Accomplished Practices.
Table 9

Correlation between the Evaluation System Rubric, State EAP, and the District’s Induction Program Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The State’s Educators Accomplished Practice</th>
<th>Evaluation System Rubric Correlation to State EAP</th>
<th>Requirement Correlation to State EAP/Rubric Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Domain 1f, 3</td>
<td>Assessment for Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code of Ethics</td>
<td>Domain 4e, 4f</td>
<td>Code of Ethics (course)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous Improvement</td>
<td>Domain 4</td>
<td>New Teacher Orientation, Teacher Rubric Overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Delivery and Facilitation</td>
<td>Domain 1, 2, 3</td>
<td>New Teacher Content Training (varies by level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Instruction</td>
<td>Domain 1a, 1c, 1e, 1f, 4</td>
<td>Higher Order Thinking Foundations of Differentiated Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Learning Environment</td>
<td>Domain 1b, 1e, 2, 3a, 3d, 3e</td>
<td>3-Hour Lesson Planning CHAMPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discipline in a Secondary Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Positive Behavior Support (PBS)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Support and train teachers on the evaluation system rubric (online survey). Although no specific question exclusively addressed this particular program output, various comments within open-ended responses speak to the imbedded idea and others address the evaluation system rubric at least partially. Question #7 asks: Based upon your experience with this county-based district’s teacher induction program’s required courses, please describe your thoughts on how it impacted your teaching? This question utilized a Likert scale allowing respondents to decide the level of impact each course had on their teaching. Included within the course list was the Teacher Rubric Overview course. Although 118 participants chose to answer the question,
thirteen were not required to take the course and three hadn’t taken the course at the time of the survey. This left 65% of respondents declaring this course to either greatly impact or have some impact on their teaching practice, ranking it first in required courses having the most impact on their teaching according to this survey. Following closely behind the Teacher Rubric Overview, the four day New Teacher Orientation (NTO) has similarly high responses (58%) in the greatly impact (27%) and some impact (31%) categories (Table 10).
Table 10

*Teacher Responses to the Impact of Required Courses on Their Teaching Practice, Online Survey*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Course</th>
<th>Greatly Impacted</th>
<th>Some Impact</th>
<th>Little Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Not Taken Yet</th>
<th>Not Required to Take</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Code of Ethics</td>
<td>21% (25)</td>
<td>26% (30)</td>
<td>21% (25)</td>
<td>23% (27)</td>
<td>7% (8)</td>
<td>2% (2)</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Teacher Orientation</td>
<td>27% (32)</td>
<td>31% (37)</td>
<td>14% (17)</td>
<td>12% (14)</td>
<td>3% (3)</td>
<td>13% (15)</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Rubric Overview</td>
<td>43% (51)</td>
<td>22% (26)</td>
<td>11% (13)</td>
<td>8% (9)</td>
<td>5% (6)</td>
<td>11% (13)</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAMPS</td>
<td>40% (47)</td>
<td>22% (26)</td>
<td>8% (10)</td>
<td>4% (5)</td>
<td>11% (13)</td>
<td>14% (17)</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline in Secondary Classrooms</td>
<td>9% (10)</td>
<td>11% (13)</td>
<td>5% (6)</td>
<td>8% (9)</td>
<td>14% (17)</td>
<td>53% (63)</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBS</td>
<td>12% (14)</td>
<td>12% (14)</td>
<td>7% (8)</td>
<td>10% (11)</td>
<td>15% (17)</td>
<td>44% (51)</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerful Lesson Planning</td>
<td>14% (17)</td>
<td>25% (29)</td>
<td>21% (25)</td>
<td>14% (17)</td>
<td>12% (14)</td>
<td>14% (16)</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Order Thinking</td>
<td>22% (26)</td>
<td>33% (39)</td>
<td>14% (17)</td>
<td>3% (4)</td>
<td>16% (19)</td>
<td>11% (13)</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiated Classroom (D.I)</td>
<td>28% (33)</td>
<td>28% (33)</td>
<td>14% (16)</td>
<td>3% (3)</td>
<td>15% (18)</td>
<td>12% (14)</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to coursework, survey participants felt that the use of the Instructional Planning Tool requirement assisted them in preparing for observations and the evaluation system. That being said, others felt that a suggestion to provide more support in the area of either a district wide course on the usage of the tool, or at least something for a faculty provided at the school site.

**Support and train teachers on the evaluation system rubric (focus group).** Focus group volunteers consisted of teachers both currently enrolled in the induction program and others who have finished sometime in the past four years. Most participants who shared their connections between the rubric and the induction program focused on the support provided during training or coursework follow-up requirements. One such follow-up requirement, the backward lesson plan template provided during the course, Powerful Lesson Planning, gave one participant a tool that she still uses in preparation for lessons, but especially as she prepares for any observation (or evaluation). She explains the benefits of the learning in the following way:

That was the first time I ever heard about backward design, so that was really helpful to me. They allowed you to actually bring down a lesson and build one up and put us in common groups. That helped in organizing everything I have been learning. I actually still use that template they gave you to work on, especially if I have an evaluation that is my starting point.

One participant in the focus group felt that another course, New Teacher Orientation, would have helped her with the evaluation system rubric because it really “broke it down,” however she took it late in the school year as opposed to summertime which she agrees would have helped her much earlier. Participants also stated that the veteran teachers have taken notice to how the induction program supports and trains inductees in the understanding of the rubric
and how to properly prepare for observations and evaluations. They even went so far as to say that “we definitely felt like there was some hostility from the veteran teachers because they felt the TIP program prepared us to be successful in our evaluations and they were not provided with that same support so they were very frustrated with that.” Another focus group volunteer wished there was even more support around the rubric, especially if the Teacher Rubric Overview course was not required (which has been the case over the tenure of the program for some participants). She claimed that she had to seek out an explanation of the rubric and evaluation system online through a site not corroborated by the school district, Teachers Pay Teachers, in order to understand the system in “layman’s terms.”

**Support and train teachers on the evaluation system rubric (interviews).** It was made evident in the interview with the program designer that this goal of training and supporting all teachers, especially those completing the induction program, was paramount in the design of all induction program courses once the evaluation system was established and implemented during the 2010 school year. Although the rubric has not changed in the last five years, she did make it clear that course content is reviewed and updated each year in order to meet the needs of any new changes in curriculum or district initiatives.

Administrators interviewed did not elaborate on individual coursework, but reiterated that providing more support for inductees in the form of a mentor could benefit them with a more individualized professional development plan. Additionally, one administrator suggested more shadowing of experienced, effective teachers in the district so new teachers could visually see what was considered “effective” or “successful” from the evaluation system rubric.

**Support and train teachers on the evaluation system rubric (summary).** This output addressed the desire of the program designers to include support and training on the evaluation
system rubric for induction program participants. Because of the distinct correlation between the evaluation system rubric, the state’s Educators Accomplished Practices, and the induction program coursework and requirements, it was made evident that this intended output of the program has always been a part of the foundation and design. Participants claimed that course experiences such as New Teacher Orientation, and the more explicit Teacher Rubric Overview, gave ample opportunities for the understanding of the evaluation system rubric. Others described tools and concepts learned within the required courses as helpful to their growth and understanding of accomplished teaching practices and their application in the classroom.

Although the data presented shows some level of success toward meeting the goals of this output, suggestions for improving this support and training still exist and will be shared in future sections.

**Intended output #3: Provide every teacher with a clearly communicated and common message from the district and at their school site.** If the induction program is to support and grow effective teachers as previously referenced, then it is vital, especially in a district as large in population and geographic size as this county-based district, that communicating program goals, requirements, and any changes to all stakeholders be efficient, effective, and clear.

**Clear communication (supervisor interview).** Since this program was launched, being able to communicate effectively and with fidelity has always been a necessary but challenging goal according to program supervisors. Within that interview, she continues by stating that “a common message and common level of support” should be provided to all stakeholder and participants. She also believes as the program enters its sixth year, communication with site based administrators has “gotten stronger,” but because of administrator attrition, this still has
posed a challenge. When one administrator is transferred or moved to another school, they could have a steep learning curve trying to establish what teachers they are responsible for within induction and once identified, where they are in the duration of the program.

One way in which she believes they have increased the quality and frequency of communication was by attending and speaking to whole group assistant principal and principal meetings. Additionally, supervisors recently began sharing programmatic details with up and coming administrators through the district’s Future Leader Academy in order to introduce the workings of this program earlier in their career as administrators. These are some ways communication has improved from the district personnel down to site based administration, which shows promise toward successfully meeting this program goal and output.

**Clear communication (online survey).** In order to understand the system of communication within this program, it is important to see where it begins. Communicating with teachers or other educators that will be required to complete the induction program begins from the day they are processed as employees in the district offices. For those that start in the fall, this most likely takes places over the summer following the previous school year. However, the district is constantly hiring due to unfilled vacancies or those caused by leaves of absence, so new employees can technically process anytime during the year. Currently, through the application process and processing of the new employee, it is determined internally with the Human Resources department whether they have less than a year of experience and get a mentor or they have over a year or more of experience and are placed into the teacher induction program with site based support. Once their name enter their respective computer database and managing department, both operated within the professional development offices, official folders are sent to site-based administrators identifying the new to the district teacher or educator. The
responsibility to communicate with the participant logistics, requirements, and protocols of induction falls to the site based administrator, which as the data will show, is an area where some participants believe improvements could be made.

Although understanding which components of the teacher induction program have the most impact on teaching and student learning are discussed more in detail later in this chapter, one of the components addressed in survey question #8, “meeting with your administrator“ supports this research question and will be addressed here. The question states: How would you rank each required component of this county-based district’s site-based support Teacher Induction Program? The ranking shows that “meeting with your administrator” ranked second highest in being “mostly impactful” toward student learning and teaching and ranked 4 out of 5 as the component having the “least impact” (meaning it did have at least some impact on the teacher). Because of this, the researcher considers this component to have significant value to participants in the program.

Similarly, another survey question, #9 (How often do you meet with your administrator about induction requirements?) connects to this output and will be expanded upon here. Although it appears that participants value the time meeting with their administrators regarding the induction program, the results of this question showed that over 60% met with their administrators twice a year or less as seen in Table 11. This does not even include the other 22% of respondents that chose “other” as their answer giving open-ended responses such as “never”,” I haven’t yet.,” and “one time in three years as a group to finalize paperwork.”
Table 11

*Frequency of Administrator Contact Regarding Teacher Induction Program Requirements, Online Survey*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Meetings</th>
<th># of Respondents</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi-Weekly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every 9 Weeks</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice A Year</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once A Year</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Clear communication (focus groups).* Focus group participants shared a similar viewpoint that contact and communication with site-based administration has been lacking in both frequency and sustenance. The frequency of communication between site-based administrators and participants regarding induction requirements varied from “once a year” to more than one participant stating “never” or more specifically, “I have never sat down with the administrator.” Additionally, utilizing the communication method of email by most focus group participants is one of the only ways they have gotten responses regarding checking-in or getting support in completing induction requirements. One went so far as to say that because they had “never sat down with the administrator, they are doing a paper trail” in order to “show I’ve been communicating and trying to get answers.” Although this is an extreme example, sentiments were shared by another participant who emailed their site-based administrator in August of 2015 to sign paperwork, and was still awaiting a reply at the time of the focus group, two months later. More than one participant spoke about the responsibility of understanding the requirements and
completing the follow-up activities and paperwork being “up to us” with one stating that “it has been 150% my effort to communicate and get this accomplished.”

A majority of the focus group participants described their interaction with administrators regarding the teacher induction program with site based support having little sustenance and more often than not, just a way of “checking in,” mostly through email and completing the required paperwork. One participant “did approach [their] assistant principal a couple of times, but he was kind of nonchalant about it” and his response to her questions about the paperwork was “they don’t really read this, just turn it in.” The participant continued by stating that administrators “don’t take it as seriously as they probably could.” It should be known, that one of the participants, who started the program more recently has had a slightly different experience with their site based administrator, stating that whenever she had to call the district regarding the requirements, her administrator would say “let’s call together” and now the administrator “is checking in more frequently.” Her belief is that someone [from the district offices] “must be communicating more to [the assistant principal] about her responsibility.”

Clear communication (site based administrator interviews). During interviews with site based administration at the data collection stage of the process, the topic of “frequency of contact with induction participants” was central to the conversation. This was deemed important and necessary to discuss based upon the initial feedback received by the researcher from focus group participants. Administrators interviewed varied in their response from “monthly” to “every other month” as a common time in which they would contact or meet with participants to “check-in” regarding induction program requirements. This range matched similar timelines participants stated during survey and focus group conversations. Administrators additionally responded to questions about communication they receive from the school district in regard to updates or
changes to the program and stated they receive “frequent emails” as well as additional communication and support through whole group and small group assistant principal meetings. This echoed what program supervisors also stated, giving some credit to the notion that communication between the district and site based administrators has been improving as mentioned in the initial interview.

*CLEAR COMMUNICATION (SUMMARY).* Since the inception of the induction program within this county-based district, the program supervisor believes “communication at all levels has always been a challenge.” In analyzing the data collected from teacher participants, administrators, and designers and supervisors, it is evident that although some channels (between district and administrators) have improved over the years the program has operated, others (between program participants and the district as well as between site based administration and participants) still could improve in frequency and effectiveness.

*Summary.* The preceding section was designed to share data collected that could address the first research question of this study (How effective is this county-based district’s teacher induction program with site based support in supporting teachers to be successful and effective as perceived by teachers, administrators, and program supervisors?). There is a distinct importance in evaluating a program’s effectiveness that has so many inputs, activities, outputs and outcomes that are ultimately designed to raise teacher effectiveness and increase student learning. If ineffective, this can negatively impact hundreds of thousands of students over the duration of the program. Conversely, if effective, this county-based district will most likely increase the quality of teacher instruction as well as the overall impact this instruction has on student learning. This all-encompassing research question was addressed first because of its
importance to the overall program evaluation as well as to create a base of understanding before additional research questions and data are analyzed as this chapter continues to unfold.

In order to properly begin to answer this question, it was necessary to review intended outputs and outcomes designated within the logic model. This model, designed from data collected through an interview with the program designer exposed connections between what was intended for the program and the additional data gathered from a participant survey, focus groups, and other interviews. In addressing the effectiveness of the teacher induction program with site based support, as perceived by each of the groups of stakeholders, a review was conducted of the desired outputs of the entire program. Outputs, or overall goals of the induction program, consisted of producing effective teachers by providing a common level of support, supporting and training teachers on the evaluation system rubric, and providing every teacher with a clearly communicated and common message from the district and at their school site. Through the analysis of data viewed through the lens of this first research question, there is evidence of hesitation from program participants in believing the intended outputs of providing a “common level of support” and “clear communication” have not fully materialized as intended. However, further analysis provided several examples supporting the notion that induction could be positively contributing to teachers new to the district and their understanding of the evaluation system rubric and the impact it has on professional growth, effective teaching, and student learning.
Research Question #2: Which components of this county-based district’s teacher induction program with site based support are most valuable to teachers new to the district in support of their success, as perceived by them?

The second research question was: Which components of this county-based district’s teacher induction program with site based support are most valuable to teachers new to the district in support of their success, as perceived by them? This question was addressed using data collected from ranking, Likert scale and open-ended questions taken from the online survey and transcripts from both teacher focus groups.

**Educator participant ranking results (online survey).** Table 12 shows each of the required components of this county-based district’s teacher induction program with site based support and how 116 teacher respondents ranked its impact on their teaching practice and student learning with an answer of 1 having the most impact and an answer of 5 having the least impact. These components consist of required content (subject area) courses, other required courses, meeting with the site-based administrator, an assessment review, and use of the district’s proprietary student data reporting site, the Instructional Planning Tool (IPT).
**Table 12**

*Teacher Responses to the Impact of Required Components on Student Learning and Their Teaching Practice, Online Survey*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Components</th>
<th>1 (Most)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4 (Least)</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Required Courses – Content Area</td>
<td>23% (18)</td>
<td>15% (12)</td>
<td>20% (16)</td>
<td>18% (14)</td>
<td>14% (11)</td>
<td>9% (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Courses – All Others</td>
<td>10% (9)</td>
<td>21% (19)</td>
<td>19% (17)</td>
<td>27% (25)</td>
<td>15% (14)</td>
<td>8% (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with your Administrator</td>
<td>22% (20)</td>
<td>24% (22)</td>
<td>17% (15)</td>
<td>14% (13)</td>
<td>14% (13)</td>
<td>8% (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Review</td>
<td>12% (10)</td>
<td>15% (12)</td>
<td>28% (23)</td>
<td>22% (18)</td>
<td>11% (9)</td>
<td>12% (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of the Instructional Planning Tool</td>
<td>22% (24)</td>
<td>20% (22)</td>
<td>21% (23)</td>
<td>14% (15)</td>
<td>18% (20)</td>
<td>6% (7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In an initial review of the data, it appeared that based on participant responses, no clear component of the program had significantly more impact on teaching and student learning than any other component, meaning that component had considerably more “1” rankings than another. However, by combining the percentage in which participants ranked the component a “1” or a “2” and conversely, when they ranked a component a “4” or a “5” the results were slightly more conclusive. Eliminating any ratings of a “3,” the middle ranking allowed for two categories mostly impactful (1’s and 2’s) and least impactful (4’s and 5’s).

With 46% of participants ranking “meeting with your administrator” as mostly impactful, it was narrowly the highest ranked component with “use of the instructional planning tool”
(42%) following closely behind. “Required courses – content” (30%), “required courses – other” (28%) and “assessment review” (22%) round out the bottom of components having the most impact on student learning and teaching. Conversely, the components having the least impact on student learning and teaching based solely on their overall percentage of participants ranking it either a “4” or a “5” consist of “required courses – other” (39%) and “use of the instructional planning tool” (35%). Additionally, the remaining three components have similar percentage rankings of 27% (assessment review), 26% (meeting with your administrator), and 25% (required courses – content area).

**Required Coursework**

**Educator response to required coursework (online survey).** Although Question #8 of the online survey broke down components of the overall program based upon their impact on their teaching and student learning, Question #7 took that one step further by expanding the required coursework to allow participants to use a Likert scale to evaluate individual required courses. As it pertains to their coursework, a majority of all respondents chose either “some impact” or “greatly impacted” their teaching if they were required to take, or had taken the course already. Respondents had the option to check “not required to take” or “not taken yet” for each of these courses, which is included in Table 13.
Table 13

*Teacher Responses to the Impact of Required Courses on Their Teaching Practice, Online Survey*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Course</th>
<th>Greatly Impacted</th>
<th>Some Impact</th>
<th>Little Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Not Taken Yet</th>
<th>Not Required to Take</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Code of Ethics</td>
<td>21% (25)</td>
<td>26% (30)</td>
<td>21% (25)</td>
<td>23% (27)</td>
<td>7% (8)</td>
<td>2% (2)</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Teacher Orientation</td>
<td>27% (32)</td>
<td>31% (37)</td>
<td>14% (17)</td>
<td>12% (14)</td>
<td>3% (3)</td>
<td>13% (15)</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Rubric Overview</td>
<td>43% (51)</td>
<td>22% (26)</td>
<td>11% (13)</td>
<td>8% (9)</td>
<td>5% (6)</td>
<td>11% (13)</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAMPS</td>
<td>40% (47)</td>
<td>22% (26)</td>
<td>8% (10)</td>
<td>4% (5)</td>
<td>11% (13)</td>
<td>14% (17)</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline in Secondary Classrooms</td>
<td>9% (10)</td>
<td>11% (13)</td>
<td>5% (6)</td>
<td>8% (9)</td>
<td>14% (17)</td>
<td>53% (63)</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBS</td>
<td>12% (14)</td>
<td>12% (14)</td>
<td>7% (8)</td>
<td>10% (11)</td>
<td>15% (17)</td>
<td>44% (51)</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerful Lesson Planning</td>
<td>14% (17)</td>
<td>25% (29)</td>
<td>21% (25)</td>
<td>14% (17)</td>
<td>12% (14)</td>
<td>14% (16)</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Order Thinking</td>
<td>22% (26)</td>
<td>33% (39)</td>
<td>14% (17)</td>
<td>3% (4)</td>
<td>16% (19)</td>
<td>11% (13)</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiated Classroom (D.I.)</td>
<td>28% (33)</td>
<td>28% (33)</td>
<td>14% (16)</td>
<td>3% (3)</td>
<td>15% (18)</td>
<td>12% (14)</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The top two courses that had the largest percentage of respondents choosing either “no impact” or “little impact” on their teaching included the state-required “Code of Ethics” course (44% No/Little impact) and the “Powerful Lesson Planning” course (35% No/Little impact). Although these courses had the highest percentage with “no impact” or “little impact” chosen, this was still not a majority of respondents answer choices as seen within Table 13. Courses that had almost 2/3 of respondents stating that they had “some impact” on their teaching or “greatly impacted” their teaching consisted of the behavior management course “CHAMPS” (62%), the district’s evaluation system summary course, “Teacher Rubric Overview” (65%), and the varying set of courses depending on grade level and subject area, New Teacher Content Area Training (67%).

Each of the other required courses had over half of respondents stating they had “some impact” on their teaching or “greatly impacted” their teaching. A course on questioning and discussion in the classroom, “Higher Order Thinking” (55%), “The Differentiated Classroom” (56%), and the four-day, mostly offered during the summer induction course, “New Teacher Orientation” rounded out the top of these group of courses with 58% rating it this way.

The final group of courses discussed here are those related to classroom management, “CHAMPS,” “Discipline in the Secondary Classroom,” and “PBS.” Although “CHAMPS” was ranked quite high as seen in Table 13 and above, the other two courses are more specific to grade level and offered as another option in place of the more popular “CHAMPS,” so not all participants are required to take these, most likely the cause for the lower overall numbers from the survey data.

**Educator response to required coursework (focus groups).** In response to elaborating on the survey data regarding the impact of required coursework on induction in the district as
well as impact on teaching and student learning, focus group participants varied in their opinions regarding individual courses. One participant described the required coursework as “a refresher” and due to an absence from teaching for two years described it as “good,” “because you don’t know what’s been happening while not working in the classroom.” Others describe coursework as “repetitive” and “similar to what was learned in higher education,” or from previous district’s professional development. Most participants agreed that the time requirements for the coursework were “hard in the evenings” but ultimately they “enjoyed it.” The theme of professional development as a way of networking, discussed here and later in this chapter becomes evident as described through these two focus group participants’ experiences. The first regards face-to-face coursework in the following way:

One thing that brings you back alive is to sit with other peers and teachers, they keep you motivated and going. Joking about what we dealt with and our kids. We are tired when we get there but once we get there, we lift each other up and we say we can do this. When you leave, you are feeling good. You meet new people. Give emails. We exchange info. We just sit and start talking. The people you watch and observe, it’s refreshing. This is more exhilarating than anything they could have been given in the trainings.

Adding to this sentiment another focus group participant commented that “what I did appreciate about coming [to the trainings] wasn’t the content but meeting people and seeing where they work” as well as the “comradery” and “getting ideas.”

New Teacher Orientation (“NTO”), one of the required courses was discussed by several participants. At the time of the collection of this data, this course remained the longest in time requirement of all of the required coursework. If taken during the summer, as a vast majority
choose to take it, required four consecutive full days (roughly eight hours per day not counting breaks and lunch). Offered throughout the school year, the same hour requirement remained only it was separated among several weekday nights or Saturday sessions. As with the overall viewpoint of the courses, focus group participants felt this course required more time than was necessary, especially if taken during the school year. However, the overall feeling toward the course and their experience leaned more toward the positive. One described it as “coming in as a new employee I got all the employee stuff I needed to get.” Another, echoing the theme of professional development as a way to network, described “NTO” as an experience that builds community and even suggested the idea of an “NTO reunion” with the same instructors and participants just to see where they are.

Although it is a state requirement to include a course on ethics, participants described the “Code of Ethics” as a “waste of time” and “basic stuff you hear all the time, every year.”

Administrator response to required coursework (interviews). The response of site based administration to the impact of required coursework varied. Similar to the varied responses given by program participants, one administrator describes the required coursework as “extremely beneficial” while another administrator felt that the requirements were “very cumbersome to teachers who are trying to acclimate to a new district.”

Summary. The preceding paragraphs within this section look less at the overall effectiveness of the teacher induction program with site based support and more specifically at individual required components of the program. Each facet of this program has been viewed through the data collected as having both positive and negative qualities with some believing one component impacts them more than another, while others think the complete opposite. Views of site based administrators are equally polarized regarding coursework and components, leaving a
cloudier picture as to exactly what components ultimately have the greatest impact on teachers and student learning because of the induction program.

However, some aspects of the components were agreed upon by most participants. The idea of coursework being time consuming at times but valuable in the sense that the experience allows those educators new to the district an opportunity to connect and collaborate with others in the same position while also getting the added benefit of learning new content or getting a reminder of content already learned. This section also addressed the value of required components that are not course contingent such as meeting with an administrator and utilizing instructional tools to grow professionally and gain knowledge about students. Ultimately, it gave stakeholders as well as program participants an opportunity to shed light on what impact, if any, these components had on their growth.

Research Question #3: In what ways can this county-based district’s teacher induction program with site based support be improved to better support the success of teachers new to the district, as perceived by participants themselves, administrators, and program supervisors?

The third research question was: In what ways can this county-based district’s teacher induction program with site based support be improved to better support the success of teachers new to the district, as perceived by participants themselves, administrators, and program supervisors? This final question asks for feedback from all stakeholders as it builds upon what was gleaned from analysis of the previous two research questions. Question #1, in which the researcher shared data that shed light on the impact the program had on supporting their growth and how effective communication has been provided to teachers which led to Question #2 that allowed participants to openly share their personal perception of the value of individual
components. The final question was vital to the program evaluation as it allows the feedback
gathered from survey, focus groups, and interviews to be shared in order to identify the strengths
of the program. Moreover, it opens the door for all stakeholders to be given an opportunity to
shed light on the program’s design and intentions, individual components of the program and
other facets of induction that could stand some improvement.

**Program improvement.** This research question was addressed primarily through
question #11 on the online survey as well as in both focus groups with participants and
interviews with the program designer and site based administrators. The question on the survey
asked: “What suggestions do you have that could improve the teacher induction program with
site based support within this county-based district?” Participants then could give open-ended
responses regarding the effectiveness of each of the four required components. These consisted
of content and other coursework, the assessment review and use of the Instructional Planning
Tool, and a broad category (other) reserved for general suggestions for improvement.

**Required courses (content based).** Of the respondents that answered question #11 on the
survey, forty-six chose to respond to this particular component of the program leaving both a
combination of thoughts and opinions about it as well as some suggestions. In this facet of the
program, the content coursework that is required varies depending on subject area taught, grade
level, or specialization. For example, an elementary teacher is required to take content courses in
the subject areas of reading, writing, math, science and social studies. However, if they are a
primary teacher (K-1) they would have a slightly different writing course then the elementary
teacher who teaches 4th grade where an intermediate focused course is offered. Because
secondary educators are generally more specialized, their content area required coursework is
less broad and more focused on exactly what it is they are teaching.
Of all the responses of this component, most could be combined into four broad themes that read as suggestions as to how the program could be improved. These consist of a multi-faceted differentiation of required content courses, decrease in the quantity of required coursework and the amount of time needed to comply, increased availability of required courses, and more concrete applicability of course content.

Most commonly addressed was the suggestion of differentiation within required content courses. This recurring suggestion is multi-faceted as it refers to both the experience level of the educator new to the district as well as the subject matter taught and which position they held. The idea that the courses should be differentiated based on years of experience was addressed more than once in response to this question. One respondent suggested that teachers should be allowed to “select courses in each content area that they believe would most impact their learning” which would “be a way to differentiate instruction and make it more relevant to experienced teachers who do not need basics again.” A veteran teacher responded that “teachers that have taught twenty-six years do not need this.”

Several respondents presumably have employment positions that fit into the non-classroom “support” category as opposed to being a full-time classroom teacher. These educators still hold a teaching degree and thus are required to participate in the teacher induction program, even if they don’t always have direct contact with students. This consists of school psychologists, social workers, guidance counselors and speech language pathologists. Responses to content area coursework fit mostly in the negative designation from respondents in this employment category as statements made reflect a desire to have content courses more focused on their job descriptions as opposed to having to attend content courses containing subject matter that is designed for the classroom teacher.
The final piece regarding differentiation of content area courses that arose was the need for differentiation based on subject matter taught. One response states they should offer “a variety of differentiated options like “Math in the Content Areas” or “Math in Reading” as opposed to just a reading course or math course, especially if the teacher is departmentalized, which many of the district’s elementary teachers are (they just teacher math/science or reading/writing). Another category of teachers, those certified to teach students with special needs, believe their content should be more focused on pedagogical strategies addressed toward their students as opposed to a “generic” course on a specific subject area, like elementary math or science. To differentiate even more specifically, the concept of content courses targeting individual grade level curriculum would be another way respondents felt this component could be improved.

Another dimension in which respondents had strong opinions and suggestions toward is the quantity of required coursework and the time needed to fulfill those program requirements. A majority of educators that addressed this topic believe that required coursework takes too much time when time is already stretched thin. A majority of all required coursework both content related and otherwise are offered on weeknights or Saturdays throughout the summer and school year. Some content, especially for secondary teachers is offered during set weeks leading up to the school year, while others are offered on-going throughout the year. Most courses are six hours in length which can be accomplished in one sitting during the summer or a Saturday but during a weekday evening in the school year that would be split into two three-hour sessions on a Monday and Wednesday, for example. The more blunt respondents used phrases like “overwhelming,” “a bit much,” “monotonous,” and a “huge waste of time” in response to the time required and quantity of courses. Some also critiqued the length of individual classes being
too long as well and that the content could be more “streamlined” because there are “too many [courses] to complete in the time allowed” which is currently two years, depending on the date of first employment.

Being such a large school district, it was not surprising that respondents also felt that the availability of required courses was limited, especially for those hired to start at the beginning of the school year. One respondent felt that because there were not enough openings of required content courses at the beginning of the year they were left to “guess expectations or blindly follow peers.” Others responded had to take their final courses right before their two year deadline because the course they needed was offered so infrequently throughout the year.

A final area in which respondents gave suggestions was the area of relevancy of course content and the need for more applicable examples or demonstrations of content instruction. Some believed that providing more materials for use in the classroom would improve the program as opposed to a “textbook” sharing the course’s content. Others felt that a demonstration of what an “ideal lesson” would look like could have improved their experience as well. A concept that applies here and could bleed into time requirements discussed in the last paragraph would be, as a respondent commented, “more direct and to the point.” Elaborated they said the courses should “deal only with the curriculum that we will be teaching” and not “how to teach math in general.”

**Required courses (other).** Although this component of the teacher induction program requirements is listed in the survey separately from content-based course requirements, several of the same themes emerged from analyzing the responses regarding this component. Similarly, multi-faceted differentiation of required courses, quantity of required coursework, and the amount of time needed to comply were all themes that emerged within responses related to this
component. Additionally, responses targeted toward individual courses were shared to gain a clearer overall picture of required courses outside of the content area.

As with the required content courses, respondents suggested that time expectations for courses and differentiation of those courses based on experience were two main areas where changes could be made to this component of the induction program. Several suggestions echoed respondents’ viewpoints from content-area requirements such as shorter or combined classes and differentiation of coursework for “novice” vs. “experienced” teachers. Some believed that coursework was “repetitive” based upon professional development experiences they had completed in other school districts or within higher education programs. The sentiment of a majority of respondents felt that most of these courses were not necessary to the veteran teacher but are more suited for teachers “new to the profession.” One educator sees more of a need for veteran teachers new to the district to gain an “understanding of the district’s expectations and jargon.”

Emerging from these comments was the suggested idea of variety or choice in professional development requirements with one educator signifying that “we don’t all fit in the same box” thus the desire for requirements in the program to be “tailored to experience and needs” in order to be considered purposeful and effective.

**Assessment review and use of the Instructional Planning Tool requirements.** Although these requirements do not have a specific course attached to them, they are still requirements of the program and were included within the survey and discussed briefly in focus groups. Assessment review, recently changed to “Assessment for Learning” involves providing a sample of an assessment used in classroom instruction as well as a reflection on the assessment to be included as an artifact to be collected for induction completion. The idea is that the educator
utilizes the site-based contact, usually the assistant principal, to share this assessment and reflection with so that through this dialogue, the induction participant can be assured they are designing assessment appropriately and this conversation and requirement validates its importance. Survey respondents agreed as to its importance and added that it was “effective” and “helpful” but making it more “meaningful” with a higher level of “accountability” attached to it would even be better. Others were confused to what it even was or were not aware of it being a requirement.

Included as a requirement at the time of the survey administration and throughout the past six years of the program was the use of the district’s Instructional Planning Tool. As a brief overview, this “tool” is an online database in which each educator is able to look at large amount of historic and current data on their students through a searchable website. Broken down by year and class, student demographic, behavioral, and academic data is available for an educator to use as they see fit. As part of the induction program requirement, it has always been included so that participants could be made aware it existed and ultimately be able to access data and prove they could do so by showing at least a printout of a report from the system. Multiple respondents found this “tool” and thus, the requirement to be “valuable,” “helpful,” ”important,” and one even stated that “knowing how to use this is one of the best things to have.” Several respondents suggested this requirement could be improved if a course or tutorial was designed to teach inductees, either face-to-face or online, how to access and properly use this tool. Others echoed this sentiment but suggested it be a site-based training so that those new to the district could learn in an environment where staff “collaboration” could be encouraged through its usage.

Other suggestions for program improvement. The online survey included an “other” option if any respondents had comments or ideas for improvement beyond the program
requirements. It is important to include this as some themes that emerged here also came up in focus groups and through administrator interviews. To paraphrase, the two most frequent suggestions for improvement and increased support would be to provide educators new to the district with a mentor, regardless of teaching experience and to improve the quality and quantity of communication from the district as well as the site based level.

The other population supported in this school district, those in their first or second year of teaching anywhere are currently supplied with a fully released mentor. Several respondents of this survey and focus group participants have also shown that being supported by a mentor, “regardless of teaching experience” would be more “useful” than the coursework requirements. In addition, induction participants should have a mentor but “be afforded the right to waive their right to a mentor if they feel more comfortable.” This would support their induction and allow them to get the “many questions” they have in their first year with the district answered without having to “seek them out” on their own.

Additionally, within the open-ended responses for improving the induction program with site based support, educators felt communicating requirements of induction could be more streamlined and less “confusing.” One respondent stated that they had three different “checklists” each with different requirements, one provided from the district on the first day, another one in a folder, and third one printed electronically. They believe a better solution would be to “post remaining requirements on-line so it could be viewed as current and confirmed at any point in time.” Another stated that having “set dates for meeting with administrators” would improve frequency of communication as there was “a lot of lack of communication” at the site based level.
Summary. Much like previous research questions addressed within this chapter, suggestions introduced in this section vary by stakeholder but revolve around similar themes revealed within responses previously shared. Several respondents in both survey and focus group mediums suggested the idea of differentiation among requirements for completing the induction program. Concerns around experience in the classroom, repetition from previous professional development coursework, and higher education all attributed to this sentiment. Offering more “choice” in how an inductee could complete requirements to satisfy the school district arose among suggestions as well as in what way courses could be taken (online or face to face) and what content might be prescribed to individual inductees (subject area, grade level, experience level, etc.). Including online options for follow-up assignments as well as direct instruction was echoed throughout participant feedback. Additionally, as addressed in the first research question, improved communication could add to the overall success of the entire induction program from a micro level at a school site between participant and site based administration to the macro level involving the participant and all other outside stakeholders, including those at the district level. In addition to how educators new to the district are currently supported, this data unveiled an overwhelming desire for more personal, individualized support from a mentor, much like what already exists for this county-based district’s teachers new to the profession. These supports as well as responding to experienced educators who request choice into what coursework is necessary for their growth and how they choose to receive it could ultimately strengthen the teacher induction program with site based support as the program continues to evolve following this evaluation.
Summary of Findings

On a grand scale, everything addressed within this entire chapter revolved around one thread woven throughout each research question and analysis of the collected data. Simply put, the teacher induction program with site based support was designed and is currently operated with very clear expected outcomes since its inception in 2009. This analysis of data collected from online surveys, focus groups, and interviews alludes to these ideals memorialized within the logic model that informed the path of inquiry among these findings. Ultimately, each resource and activity developed over years of refinement and evolution of the induction program have led to a point where an evaluation of both outputs and outcomes of this system became a necessity. Data analyzed within this chapter identify several areas of strength as well as a need for programmatic improvements to quality and quantity of communication, increased support at the school level, and choice among course offerings and delivery. Once these needs are addressed and accomplished, stakeholders and participants suggest the possibility of offering more choice in how inductees complete the program while expecting an overall rise in effectiveness of those inducted as well as having a positive impact on the learning and achievement of their students.
Chapter V: Discussion of the Research Findings

The final chapter serves to review the educational problem of practice that motivated the researcher to investigate, analyze, and evaluate this county-based district’s induction program with site based support. Included will be a summary of research findings and the methodology employed to identify these. This is followed by a discussion of how findings relate to the theoretical framework and literature reviewed in the study. Concluding the final chapter will be limitations to the study, recommendations for program improvement, and to share the study’s significance and value to benefit other districts in various stages of induction development, evaluation, or revision.

Summary of the Problem

This county-based district has been operating a teacher induction program in the current formation since the beginning of school year 2010-2011. This support system has been provided as a state and district mandated requirement for all teachers new to teaching as well as those newly employed in district instructional positions. For beginning teachers, the purpose of such a program bridges the gap between formal academic training from a university with the experience of applying the acquired skills in the classroom. Similarly, teachers and instructional personnel new to the district could encounter vast differences in instructional strategies, philosophies, and content taught in comparison to circumstances or conditions in which they have migrated. District designed induction gives program architects an opportunity to rectify this problem and tailor learning experiences and requirements to desired intentions. However, programs in districts as large as this are fiscally significant and impact thousands of teachers annually, affecting an even greater number of students during the time of operation.
This county-based district’s teacher induction program with site based support has been administered to newly employed teachers having at least one year of experience since operations began in 2010 (six years ago at the time of this study). Until this study, the program has been in operation without conducting a formal evaluation to determine effectiveness in meeting intended outcomes. The lengthy absence of feedback for such a fundamental program provided an entry point needed to address this problem on behalf of the school district.

Once demand had been established by supervisors for this program evaluation to occur, it became evident an understanding of what exactly the district’s intentions and goals of induction have been and will be going forward. This was accomplished through an interview with the program designer and current supervisor and a review of program documentation. As a result, the researcher designed a logic model to visualize these discoveries (Appendix C). Included within this model are a multitude of resources and activities making up inputs that if functioning properly could produce outputs and outcomes desirable to program supervisors. Anticipated outputs from inception through the interview process of the study consisted of the following: producing effective teachers by providing a common level of support, supporting and training teachers on the evaluation system rubric, and providing every teacher with a clearly communicated and common message from the district and at their school site. It was the expectation doing this would lead to short and long term increases in teacher effectiveness, student learning, and level of support for inductees while providing them choice in how induction requirements can be completed.

To ascertain if intended goals and outcomes have been reached, a program evaluation launched with the following research questions guiding the inquiry process:
1. How effective is this county-based district’s teacher induction program with site based support in supporting teachers to be successful and effective as perceived by teachers, administrators, and program designers and supervisors?

2. Which components of this county-based district’s teacher induction program with site based support are most valuable to teachers new to the district in support of their success, as perceived by them?

3. In what ways can this county-based district’s teacher induction program with site based support be improved to better support the success of teachers new to the district, as perceived by participants themselves, administrators, and program designers and supervisors?

**Review of Methodology**

To conduct this program evaluation, a qualitative methodology was used to employ several data collection methods informed by the completed logic model. The logic model was designed during the course of this study combining information from an interview with the program architect and supporting program documentation. Inputs, activities, outputs, and outcomes identified at this stage of the research design provided direction for the creation of online survey questions to gather information from past and present induction participants. Responses from the Likert scale, ranking, and open-ended questions enabled the researcher to further develop a path of inquiry through the remaining components of the data collection process, including focus groups and interviews with site based administrators. Once this stage of the process was completed, the coding process began. The coding method used to analyze text from interviews, focus groups, and open-ended responses to online survey questions eventually uncovered a set of themes evident throughout each of these data collection techniques. The
emerged themes were then categorized by appropriate research questions setting the stage for further analysis connecting them to intended logic model outputs and outcomes.

Discussion of the Key Findings

In 2009, this county-based district’s professional development supervisors and supporting personnel ambitiously initiated a much needed redesign of the decade-old and growingly inadequate induction program for both beginning teachers and those new to the county with teaching experience. This led to the creation of a new program designed with philosophical ideals and programmatic goals still standing today as resolute as they were when created. Guided by research questions and intended outputs and outcomes of the logic model, key findings of this study were established from results of the analysis process encompassing data collected from a survey, interviews, and focus groups.

Expected program outputs. After reviewing various data collected during this study, findings indicate each of the three outputs as well as the on-going short and long term outcomes identified in the logic model have at least partially met expectations. Suggestions provided from data led to recommendations for improvements to induction program requirements and components, which will be included within the conclusion of the chapter. Each of the key findings will be organized by the intended output or outcome in order to provide consistency with previous organization methods.

Produce effective teachers by providing a common level of support. Inductees in the study revealed they had received support through coursework and human resources both at their individual school site and within the district. Based on the aforementioned data from Chapter 4, findings reveal that the level of support inductees receive can vary depending on individual circumstances such as the school in which they are employed or the effectiveness of the site.
based administrator. Intentions of the program designers has always been to provide a “common level of support,” to inductees. However, the experiences shared provide evidence that support is not always equal (or common) at the time data was collected. Respondents shared negative anecdotes describing months of attempts to contact administrators while being left in the classroom without support in a new district. This sentiment, echoed by a majority of others in similar situations, consider the frequency of opportunities to work with site based administrators to support their induction as unsubstantial. Support was not entirely negative as others spoke of impactful learning experiences contained within required courses and portrayals of site administrators who have facilitated the induction throughout. As evidenced through preceding chapters and summarized here, findings indicate variability in induction experiences could have limited the program’s ability to provide a “common level of support,” regardless of how effective inducted teachers had become.

**Support and train teachers on the evaluation system rubric.** Unlike the first finding, this intended output appears to have fully met expectations based upon findings within Chapter 4’s analysis. This goal of the program was born from the desire of program designers to include support and training on the evaluation system rubric for induction program participants. Because of the distinct correlation between the evaluation system rubric, the state’s Educators Accomplished Practices, and the induction program coursework and requirements, it was made evident that this has always been integral in the foundation and design of the program. Participants claimed that course experiences such as New Teacher Orientation, and the more explicit Teacher Rubric Overview, gave ample opportunities for the understanding of the evaluation system rubric. Others described tools and concepts learned within the additional
required courses as both supportive to their growth and helpful in the understanding of accomplished teaching practices outlined within the rubric.

Induction program requirements, especially coursework, have been created for purposes of meeting state and district guidelines linked to mastery of accomplished teaching practices both measured by the state’s Educator Accomplished Practices and this county-based district’s evaluation system rubric. Because each induction program participant is required to attend each course and complete any necessary follow-up assignments, findings suggest that participants who complete induction successfully will have succeeded in contributing to the success of this program goal.

*Provide every teacher with a clearly communicated and common message from the district and at their school site.* From the earliest stages of program design, controlling what message is distributed to the vast array of stakeholders connected to induction has always been a challenge in this county-based district. Based upon data collected and analyzed, the findings provide less evidence of this output being met than those previously addressed. Data suggested some channels (between district and administrators) have improved over the years since implementation while other lines of communication have had mixed results. Although not entirely negative, several examples of experiences shared by program participants indicate a need for the improvement of communication through the remaining channels. Most commonly discussed was the need for increased regularity in interactions between participants and site based administrators. The quality and frequency of support were cited as deficient in several ways from responses in the online survey as well as what participants elaborated on during both focus group sessions. Based on the strong opinions of participants included in this study, findings elude to this output having lasting effect on inductees’ overall experience. Because the
results related to this output skew toward the negative, the finding of this study concludes that providing every teacher with a “clearly communicated and common message” from the district and at their school site is not an expectation that has fully been met at the time this research was conducted.

**Intended short and long term outcomes.** The logic model used in the evaluation of this induction program provided clarity and direction throughout the duration of the research. As indicated in previous chapters, a clearly defined model had not existed before this study, therefore it had to be created during the research process to provide a clear roadmap to proceed effectively. The “outcome” component of a logic model exists to guide and predict what is desirable within a program over a short or long period of time after all resources and activities produce outputs designated by program architects.

Short and long term outcomes created by the researcher and vetted by program supervisors build upon the foundation of expected outputs previously described. Ultimately, the outcomes this county-based district’s teacher induction program supervisors anticipate consist of the following: increasing support for inductees, providing more choice in how inductees complete their requirements, and increase effectiveness of teaching practices and student learning. Findings of the study do not necessarily prove or disprove the outcomes established during this research because the outcomes have not been established long enough to measure whether or not they can be considered met. However, further exploration of outcomes will be addressed later in this chapter as program recommendations are provided, especially the short term outcome of providing more choice in how induction can be completed.
Discussion of the Findings in Relation to the Theoretical Framework of the Study

**Adult learning theory.** This theory provided the necessary lens in which to view the findings of the study and will lead to a discussion of the facets within this program and how they embody the assumptions of andragogy. The organization of this section will combine what was gained from the research findings with Malcolm Knowles’ principles of andragogy, commonly considered “adult learning” in the modern vernacular.

Knowles et. al., (2012) have described the following six principles of andragogy (adult learning) which will provide the foundation for the discussion applying the research to the theory. They include: (1) The learner’s need to know; (2) self-concept of the learner; (3) prior experience of the learner; (4) readiness to learn; (5) orientation to learning; and (6) motivation to learn.

**The learner’s need to know.** By the time adults have completed their formative schooling, they have most likely acquired a foundation of knowledge preparing them for some path in life in which to apply their learning. It is suggested that a further desire for learning beyond this stage needs to have some intrinsic value to the adult or solve an immediate “problem.” Since inception, induction program designers have continually supported the idea that educators need to be continuously learning to stay abreast of frequent changes within the education system on a national, state, and district level. Courses required to be completed by inductees were designed to address both the ideals of the state’s Educator Accomplished Practices and to support the understanding of the evaluation system rubric, one of the intended outputs revealed previously. Additionally, the professional development department has established annual reviews of induction course content, utilizing resources they have available, to keep content pertinent to what is actually going on in classrooms and what teachers and students...
need. The desire to learn something that will be immediately applicable within inductees' own world was a sentiment shared by several participants in both the online survey and focus groups.

A recent addition to the required coursework is the inclusion of “follow-up assignments” designed to encourage inductees to plan, apply, and share evidence as to how the strategies or concepts learned within coursework could be applied within their own classroom. The addition of this requirement will create more value pertaining to this assumption making what is learned both relevant and actionable.

**Self-concept of the learner.** “Self-concept” refers to the phenomena that as an adult ages, gains wisdom, and grows within their profession, they become more independent learners and generally are more intrigued to embrace learning if given a choice as to what topic and through what method of delivery the knowledge will be acquired. This theoretical assumption of “self-concept” was fully supported by these findings and ultimately evolved into one of the program’s primary intended outcomes to be addressed and implemented as soon as possible by supervisors. Within the first interview, the program supervisor suggested that goals for the program haven’t changed over the past six years, however recently she states that “they have taken a closer look” at the concept of giving more options to teachers participating in this facet of the induction program (site based support) to “make sure they are getting what they need,” while not making it as “standardized” as the requirements in place for those teachers new to the profession. This revelation has the potential to change the program in a way that could alleviate many of the concerns participants brought up in both online survey responses and within focus group discussions.

As discussed earlier in this study, participants have overwhelmingly critiqued various aspects of program and course requirements due to the lack of differentiation and a “one-size-
fits-all” model for learning and induction requirements in the district. Glazerman et. al., (2006) state that there is “no ‘one-size-fits-all’ model of teacher induction either in theory or in practice: different programs emphasize different goals. One survey respondent summed this idea up stating:

I think there needs to be some differentiation for experienced vs. novice teachers. We don't all fit in the same box, and this need wasn't recognized or met in any of these classes.

As a short term expected outcome stated by the program supervisor it directly aligns with this assumption of adult learning. Additionally, the supposition of “choice” in learning and induction was just as clearly echoed by program participants giving credence to the potential of this being an area where change is possible in the near future.

**Prior experience of the learner.** Similar to the belief behind “self-concept,” life experiences gained from both a personal and professional perspective instill an internal confidence giving adult learners the fuel to more actively participate in adult learning experiences. As positive as this can be for the adult learner, it may also present a challenge when too much experience blinds the learner to new knowledge being presented. This argument was repeated the most often of all themes presented from past or present induction program participants. As data presented in the previous chapter attested to, almost three-fourths of all respondents to the online survey had at least three years of education experience, with over a third celebrating ten years or more of experience. With a population comprised of this level of experience, it is not surprising that so many comments and suggestions spoke to this assumption of adult learners and requested the program requirements be adjusted to reflect not only
individual learning needs but honor the experience each educator brings to the table and adjusting requirements accordingly.

As mentioned previously, one of the goals program supervisors have communicated through the interview process in this study is the need to differentiate induction requirements for teachers with experience to “make sure they are getting what they need and not making [the induction program with site based support] as standardized as it is for those new to the profession.”

**Readiness to learn.** A “readiness to learn” is most often triggered by a direct need for adults to gain knowledge to cope with a challenge they face in some aspect of their personal or professional life. Teachers and other instructional support personnel entering this county-based district are required to participate in the district-designed teacher induction program either with the support of a mentor (beginning teachers) or site based administrator (teachers with experience). Program designers and supervisors believe the “challenge” facing site based support participants new to the district is that they don’t have a “frame of reference for [district] philosophies and the foundations behind what we do in this county.” Additionally, because school systems are constantly undergoing shifts in initiatives or instructional focus, the need to be kept current is always be present.

One of the established findings of this study and intended outputs of the induction program was to “support and train teachers on the evaluation system rubric.” When an inductee new to the district is hired and learns they will be observed and ultimately evaluated on a proprietary rubric as soon as one month after stepping foot in the classroom, the urgency and genuine relevancy of understanding the rubric becomes a bona fide necessity. Suddenly, a “need” arises and participants must recognize the challenge they face is career-dependent and if
they accept the challenge and have a willingness to learn, the coursework in the induction will
provide the foundational learning necessary to understand the rubric, especially the Teacher
Rubric Overview and New Teacher Orientation.

As presented in Chapter 4, online survey respondents considered the Teacher Rubric
Overview to have the most impact on their instructional practice giving support to the value of
the courses in building an understanding of the rubric and meeting a participant need by
preparing them for an observation and evaluation. Additional support for the value of taking
New Teacher Orientation, which orients teachers to the rubric as well as all of the philosophies
of the district, before the 1st day in the classroom was evident in survey and focus group findings
and relevant to this assumption of adult learning.

Orientation to learning. Similar to the assumption that adults need to have a “readiness
to learn” and a “need to know” something in order to engage in an adult learning experience,
they can also be encouraged by the perception that what they are learning will have an impact on
what they need to do in their personal or professional lives. Designing coursework and follow-
up assignments that “sell” the instructional strategies and concepts gained from successful
completion of the coursework adds one more layer of motivation for adult learners. As recently
described, the program output of supporting and training teachers on the evaluation system rubric
is something that can only be avoided for so long as the inevitability of being observed using it
will occur more than once a year, regardless of teaching experience. Knowing courses will
provide strategies to help build effectiveness of teaching practices and increase student learning
could be a message program supervisors should spread through communication channels. If the
focus becomes more about the “message” and what is being communicated to inductees and their
supports, “orientation to learning” will also be aligned with the third output (providing clear
communication) and finding of the study that “clear communication” and a “common message”
will be provided to every teacher.

**Motivation to learning.** Imbedded within the induction program is the undeniable need
for each inductee to complete the program in no more than two school years. This unavertable
deadline could be considered a factor that overrules the assumption that adult learners need to be
motivated to participate in learning experiences. In this case however, motivation may be
garnered from fear of participants losing a job if requirements aren’t completed in time.
However, data discovered that participants who merely comply by physically showing up to
required courses can have negative effects not only on the learning (or lack thereof) of the adult
student, but on others as well. One survey respondent described their experience and feelings
toward this type of complacency in the following way:

There needs to be an agreement that teachers will focus on the coursework during the
class. I attended several TIP (teacher induction program) courses last year and there were
teachers who simply graded papers and talked the entire time.

Another extrinsic motivator brought up during the program supervisor interview and
online survey was the fact that induction program participants currently receive $15.00 an hour
for every required course they take. This was made possible per an agreement made between the
school district and the district’s Classroom Teachers Association. Some participants shared their
view through the survey of this being one of the only motivators for attending induction program
courses, outside of the necessity to finish in order to maintain employment.

**Summary of the Findings in Relation to the Theoretical Framework of the Study.**
Each assumption of the adult learner and concept behind the adult learning theory (andragogy)
align with findings discovered during this research process, giving a level of credit to program
designers and to the success of the program. Although participants have voiced concern across the survey and focus groups regarding the program, on a theoretical level the logic behind requirements and components is sound. Recommendations for programmatic change supported by this research gathered from viewpoints of stakeholders participating in the study will provide further opportunity to apply the assumptions of this theory and improve the program simultaneously.

**Discussion of the Findings in Relation to the Literature**

The findings shared in this section connect to the literature reviewed in Chapter 2 through a variety of extrapolations. Although several themes were originally addressed in the literature review, not all were as significant once data was collected and analyzed. Of the nine categories that had been elaborated upon, those aligning most with the study findings will be expanded upon within this section following an overview of induction programs discovered within the literature. They consist of the following: (1) mentoring within induction; (2) components of induction programs; (3) appropriate professional development; (4) administrators’ involvement in induction; (5) program evaluation and induction; (6) shared vision of knowledge, teaching, and learning.

**An overview of teacher induction programs.** The first section of the literature review gave an overview of induction programs, defining what they are and what makes up their composition. Guided by two accepted definitions consisting of Huling-Austin’s (1990) describing induction as “a planned program intended to provide some systematic and sustained assistance to beginning teachers for at least one year” (Huling-Austin, 1990, p. 536), with the more modern view from Feiman-Nemser (2010) who states that induction is “a phase of learning to teach, a process for enculturation, and a program of support and development” (Feiman-
Nemser, S., 2010). Additionally, the five goals developed by Huling-Austin (1990) dictate that any induction program should include: improving teacher performance, increasing retention of promising beginning teachers during the induction years, promoting personal and professional well-being of beginning teachers by improving their attitudes toward themselves and the profession, satisfying mandated requirements related to induction and certification, and transmitting the culture of the system to beginning teachers (Huling-Austin, 1990).

Findings of this study show several overlapping themes as to how induction should be defined as well as what they should contain. Although the induction program of this county-based district does not have a standard definition, the combination of program outputs and outcomes paints a picture of what the program should look like, much like the function of a definition. The relationships between facets of the induction program with themes from Chapter 2’s literature review to be expanded upon in this section.

**Mentoring within teacher induction programs.** The component of mentoring within a teacher induction program has been revealed as having a strong impact on the level of support provided for teachers. Currently, this is not a component of induction for site based support participants, therefore evidence of its existence was not ultimately discovered in the findings. However, it remains valuable to the study and is included here because it was highlighted as one of the most commonly recommended changes to the program deemed necessary by teachers and site based administrators alike. As it stands now, mentors are only assigned to teachers new to the profession (less than six months of teaching experience). The recommendation encourages program supervisors to provide a similar level of support by implementing a mentoring program for any teacher new to the district regardless of experience.
Ingersoll and Smith (2004) reveal that “well-conceived and well-implemented teacher mentoring and induction programs are successful in increasing the job satisfaction, efficacy, and retention of new teachers.” Ellen Moir, founder of the New Teacher Center, believes that the “heart of our (induction) model is regular, one-on-one mentoring in which new teachers are matched with exemplary teachers who analyze their practice and, using classroom data, offer constructive suggestions for improvement” (Moir, 2009, p. 16). Additionally, mentors offer emotional support, establish trust and respect, and have strong interpersonal skills (Smith and Evans, 2008).

The literature on mentoring can be connected to study findings by the aforementioned recommendation for programmatic changes, but additionally it can be connected by the theme of “support.” This theme has been woven throughout the study and findings and is the backbone of the mentoring process. To visualize the idea of “support” and how it weaves throughout the study, the findings and program outputs are minimalized in the following way: a common level of “support,” “supporting” teachers on the evaluation system rubric, and the desire to increase teacher effectiveness through an increased level of “support.” Mentoring provides beginning teachers in the district with on-going support, expanding the program to include inductees currently working with site based administrators could have a lasting effect on the experience.

Components of teacher induction programs. It is important to look at a program of this magnitude as if under a microscope to determine if each component is effectively impacting teachers and leading toward the meeting of program goals and outcomes. Chapter 4 revealed data associated with research question #2 (Which components of this county-based district’s teacher induction program with site based support are most valuable to teachers new to the district in support of their success, as perceived by them?), collected from each of the sources
taking part in this study. Understanding the value of each component of the program and how it impacted teachers and for what reason it was included in the induction program design was important for this evaluation because it allowed the researcher to objectively look at this crucial resource and share findings as part of this study.

As stated in the literature review, Glazerman et. al., 2006 say components within induction programs may include “orientation, assessment, professional development workshops, mentoring, peer coaching, small group activities, and classroom observations” (Glazerman et. al., 2006). This induction program contains facets that mirror what the literature suggests, such as: courses designed to provide an overview and “orientation” (New Teacher Orientation), “assessment” and “classroom observations” (imbedded in required coursework and evaluation system rubric training and support), professional development workshops (the entire list of required courses), “small group activities” (built into nearly every induction program course), and “mentoring” and “peer coaching” (currently provided by site based administrators).

Of Wood and Stanulis’s (2009) components of the modern “wave” of induction programs, those that coincided most with findings consist of: mentoring of novice teachers; developmentally appropriate professional development; administrators’ involvement in induction; program evaluation and/or research on induction; and a shared vision of knowledge, teaching and learning (Wood and Stanulis, 2009, p. 5).

**Developmentally appropriate professional development.** Aligning with this county-based district’s induction program, Wong (2004) adds that induction programs should provide a continuum of professional development through systematic training over a period of two to three years (Wong, 2004). “Quality induction program” goals compiled by Wood and Stanulis (2009) and paraphrased for relevance to this study consist of the delivery of professional development in
multiple ways including: “workshops and district or state-sponsored online courses including an emphasis on deepening content knowledge, classroom management skills, and the ability to establish and maintain good relationships with students and their families (Alliance for Excellent Education (AEE), 2004; Ingersoll & Smith, 2004). Each of the suggested goals of induction in relation to the development of professionals run parallel to the outcomes and findings of this study. In agreement with Wong, the district’s induction program is expected to be completed within a two year window consisting of a series of trainings. Similar to what Wood and Stanulis (2009) emphasize as what course content should include, this program provides coursework in both content and instructional practices backed by the well-researched the state’s Educator Accomplished Practices and the district’s own Teacher Evaluation System Rubric, aligning directly with findings of the study pertaining to level of support provided to train teachers on the evaluation system rubric

**Administrators’ involvement in induction.** As shared in the literature review and within the findings, having a supportive administrator is considered to be one of the “most critical factor(s) in [beginning teachers] professional development” (Wood and Stanulis, 2009; Wood, 2005; Bartell, 2005; Brock & Grady, 1997). Results of the research in this study support a similar notion as the impact of site based administration on inductees. Those surveyed ranked principals and assistant principals as either having “some impact” or were said to have “greatly impacted” teachers new to the district at combined rates of 66% and 67%.

Additionally, findings in relation to both the first (produce effective teachers by providing a common level of support) and the third expected output of the program (provide every teacher with a clearly communicated and common message from the district and at their school site) directly tie to this goal of quality induction reviewed within the literature. Findings
discovered participants don’t always receive a “common level of support” from site based administration beyond signing paperwork. It appears the variability depends on what administrator you’re working with or at what school site you are employed. By the same token, analysis of survey and focus group data led to findings that hypothesized the “common message” inductees receive from administrators has not consistently been communicated clearly or even at all, frustrating past and present inductees missing out on this critical support they require.

**Program evaluation and induction.** The subject of “evaluating a program” was explored in the literature review, as it was planned as the intended backbone of the research design from the earliest moments of the study. Knowing the teacher induction program with site based support had been in operation since the fall of 2010 without the implementation of a formal evaluation provided the motivation to continue researching the concept. Literature revealed that “a thoughtful, collaboratively designed program evaluation or research study: (a) keeps the program grounded in (novice) teachers’ needs, (b) produces information on how well the program is functioning, and (c) identifies areas for program improvement” (Wood and Stanulis, 2009, p. 14).

It has been the goal of this study and the researcher to model what the literature revealed would make a successful program evaluation. Findings addressed each of the three points above. The “needs of participants” were gathered through the survey and focus groups which led to either supportive or contrary opinions. These have been shared as they relate to program outputs and outcomes throughout the 4th and 5th chapters. Others will be shared later in this chapter as “recommendations for program improvement,” another point addressed by the literature. A combination of the entirety of Chapter 4, as well as the “summary of findings” that introduces Chapter 5, provide the framework for addressing the second point above, how program
evaluations “produce information on how well the program is functioning.” Everything that has gone into the design of this study and program evaluation results from the research and desire to evaluate an existing program having a major impact on teachers and students in this county-based district.

**Shared vision of knowledge, teaching, and learning.** A final and important component reviewed within the literature of induction includes the notion of a “shared vision” between program designers from the earliest days of idea forming through implantation and looking forward, to revisionists aligning each component of the program to goals and expected outcomes for the future. As shared in Chapter 2, Moir (2009) believes that “induction programs are most effective when all stakeholder groups are represented in the program design and when new teacher induction is part of a districtwide initiative to improve teaching and learning” (Moir, 2009, p 16) while Wood and Stanulis (2009) believe that high quality induction programs must unite program goals with each of the program components. The research conducted during the past seven months has uncovered evidence of the success derived from the current teacher induction program with site based support as well as having exposed areas where the realities of the program’s operation have not lived up to designers original intentions. The intentions of this researched component, and the idea of developing a “shared vision” going forward is both relevant and essential to what may result from the delivery of findings to program supervisors. They will elude to the current state of the program based upon initial intentions, but will also include recommendations from each group of stakeholders to share ideas for program improvement.

**Summary of the Findings in Relation to the Literature.** Moir states that successful induction programs “incorporate both the passion of new teachers and the expertise of
experienced teachers to ensure all students in America receive the best education” (Moir, 2009, p. 19). This idealistic viewpoint does not seem as unattainable when analyzing the literature reviewed and how it is connected to this county-based district’s six year old teacher induction program with site based support. Findings of this program evaluation were compared with the following categories within the body of literature most relevant to the program following an overview of teacher induction programs as found in the literature. The following six topics were ultimately chosen as they aligned best with the findings: (1) mentoring in teacher induction programs; (2) components of induction programs; (3) appropriate professional development; (4) administrators’ involvement in induction; (5) program evaluation and induction; (6) shared vision of knowledge, teaching, and learning. After examining each of the topics in comparison to the findings, some identified evidence backs up the validity of the original design of the induction program (components of induction and appropriate professional development), while other areas need a closer look or could possibly be revised (administrators involvement within induction). The remaining topics best align with the recommendations stakeholders revealed throughout the study and among the findings (mentoring, program evaluation, and a “shared vision”) and will be unveiled in the upcoming section.

Recommendations

Recommendations included in this program evaluation for this county-based district’s teacher induction program with site based support were developed from data collected throughout the research process by suggestions, comments, thoughts, and opinions shared by program supervisors, site based administrators, and induction program participants both past and present. The suggestions included here were the result of some “need” not being met by current or past induction program components. These suggestions are organized in this section by
popularity among respondents although they remained aligned with program outputs, outcomes, and study findings. Specifically, they address the need to increase teacher effectiveness by providing a common level of support, improve communication by all stakeholders in the program, and provide a more differentiated adult learning experience for inductees by offering more choice in completing induction requirements.

**Provide a more differentiated adult learning experience for inductees.** By far the most common suggestion or recommendation as to how the induction program could improve from the participant perspective was to differentiate the induction program learning experience and required components based upon specialization (special education, geometry, kindergarten, etc.) or level of experience. As explained previously, there are not separate courses for induction program participants with experience, the selection is currently standardized for both audiences. A solution to meet this participant need could be to offer more variety in course content selection and choice in preferred delivery method (online or face to face) while still meeting state and district induction requirements. Providing this expanded menu of options would allow the experienced teacher a more personal learning experience tailored to individual needs supporting them as they grow as educators.

**Increase teacher effectiveness by providing a common level of support through the mentoring process.** Another main recommendation within findings of this study spoke to the need for inductees, regardless of experience level, to have the support of a full-time mentor, similar to what beginning teachers receive. Perhaps this was revealed because several survey and focus group participants spoke of inadequacies in level of support provided by their site based administrator. The mentoring program expects beginning teachers to complete follow-up learning activities collaboratively with their mentor while discussing and sharing learning
experiences gained from induction program coursework. Adding this layer of support could
imbed accountability and fidelity into experienced teachers’ professional development
experiences, creating another reason to be motivated to learn. It could also strengthen all around
support for teacher growth in developing instructional practices, acclimating to a new district,
and empowering newly employed teachers to build confidence through an imbedded support
system.

**Improve communication by all stakeholders to provide a common message.** This
intended output received some of the most passionate outpouring of negativity by participants of
both the survey and focus groups. Complaints focused mostly on poor communication between
the participant and site based administrators, but also included confusion and inconsistencies as
to how program requirements are initially shared with new employees, what needs to be
completed, and how it is to be done. It is worth noting, these comments and grievances came
from a mixed group of respondents having possibly finished induction as long as four years ago.
Evidence showed communication related comments decreased by focus group participants
having recently completed induction or who currently are enrolled in the process.
Recommendations to increase the commonality of the message received have recently been
refined to include more direct communication between the professional development supervisors
and site based administrators as indicated in the study findings. However, communication at the
school level remains most inadequate, and perhaps could improve by addressing the first
recommendation, the inclusion of mentors for all inductees in order to have another person
supporting induction, and thus another contact to assist with induction.
Validity

Ethical considerations were paramount to this study as the participants surveyed and administrators interviewed had the potential to be familiar to the researcher due to current employment and experience within the district. To validate the data collected and any liberties taken by the researcher, a member check was suggested to give due diligence opportunities to program supervisors, especially to the design of the logic model which informed the majority of the study. Professional proximity of the researcher to the program participants, supervisors, and stakeholders made this safeguard a necessary step in the process. This stage of the study helped to verify district provided facts and gain the supervisor endorsement of the researcher-designed logic model and each of its facets.

Limitations

Limitations of this study and research process dealt mainly with time restrictions effecting the overall quantity of volunteer participants for the survey, focus groups, and interviews. Additionally, the lack of research pertaining to induction programs for experienced teachers left the researcher basing most of the literature reviewed on traditional induction programs designed for beginning teachers.

Time constraints. The time available to collect data turned out to be shorter than desired due to a lengthy district approval process. Having permission from Northeastern University to begin collecting data at the end of May 2015 but having to wait for approval to conduct research within the district until August 2015, just as the new school year began and teacher’s free time diminished, was certainly a setback to the data collection process. Being able to navigate the district approval process earlier could have moved back the time available to collect data well
into the summer which would have provided more time for participants to respond to the online survey invitation and allow for several additional months to schedule more focus group sessions.

**Lack of research.** Because this study focused on participants required to complete an induction program because they were employed in a school district for the first time, but already had at least a year of teaching experience, peer reviewed studies and research was sparse. This left the researcher no choice but to spend a majority of the time researching and understanding the traditional induction program designed for teachers stepping into the classroom for the first time. Although much of what was gathered was beneficial, this area of academia could benefit from continued research and exploration nationwide. As the natural migration of people including teachers will continue to exist, understanding barriers they may encounter in new school systems, even with experience in other classroom settings could have a positive impact on teachers everywhere.

**Conclusion**

The study was designed to solve a problem of practice having surfaced following the researcher’s inquiry into the supervising department of his current position as a fully-released mentor to beginning teachers in this county-based district. The goal was to conduct research intended to benefit the professional development department and school district while providing a service that could have a lasting impact on teachers and students of his district and beyond. The result of this inquest was realized when a significant problem of practice was identified in conversations with professional development supervisors.

In the fall of 2010, the school district was undergoing a massive shift in philosophy and structure, and thanks to a $100 million grant from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, was able to design and implement an entirely redesigned teacher induction program to replace an
outdated model that had been used for at least a decade. The program architects designed a program to provide a two-year formal induction experience for any teacher new to the district. Teachers with less than six months of teaching experience would be provided a mentor and be required to complete a combination of coursework and follow-up assignments while receiving support of the mentor to help navigate the process and do whatever necessary to make the first two years in the classroom successful. The other population served by this induction program were the teachers newly employed by the district who had a year or more of experience in any full-time teaching position. The former branch of the program has been well-funded and because of the mentoring program, has been continually monitored and evaluated over the past six years. However, the latter branch of the program, officially named the teacher induction program with site based support, has been in operation for the same six years and has never undergone any formal evaluation to ascertain its value or if it has been successful. This revelation solidified the problem of practice in need of addressing which launched this study, research process, and ultimately will produce an evaluation of the program for current program supervisors to inform future intentions and expected outcomes of induction for experienced teachers new to the district.

Through an interview with the program supervisor an understanding of induction within the district was established consisting of the resources and activities that produce outputs and outcomes informing the researcher’s design of a logic model to visualize and guide the study going forward. This led to the development of an online survey administered to past and present induction program participants to collect data as to their overall experience with induction, the support they received, opinions regarding components of the program, and recommendations that could improve its effectiveness. Follow-up focus groups were administered with teacher participants to further delve into initial findings of the survey. A final round of interviews were
conducted with site based administrators responsible for managing the teacher induction program with site based support at their individual school site.

A combination of the three research questions and the intended outputs and outcomes of the program designated by the logic model informed the data analysis process ultimately resulting in findings built from the outputs and outcomes. Findings uncovered a need for improvements to the quality and quantity of communication among induction program stakeholders, increased support at the school level, and choice among course offerings, and delivery for experienced teachers. Long term outcomes having the potential to be accomplished once these needs are addressed and met, stakeholders and participants suggest there will be an overall rise in effectiveness of those inducted as well as an increased impact on the learning and achievement of district students. These findings were then examined through the lens of the adult learning theory and the collection of literature reviewed earlier in the study.

The program evaluation concluded with the sharing of several recommendations based upon the data collected and findings of the study to better meet the needs of program participants and assist the district in more effectively meeting expected outputs and short or long term outcomes. Beyond the impact the program evaluation may have on this county-based district’s teacher induction program, the goal of the researcher is to spread the knowledge gained from the research process to other districts in the state and beyond, regardless of the status of their induction program. As this process concludes, an ambitious goal of the researcher is to assist other school districts through the process of induction program design, implementation, evaluation, or revision in order to have an opportunity of impacting an even greater number of teachers and students beyond his current reach.
**Induction Program Updates**

**Induction program updates.** Since the beginning of school year 2015-2016 when the data collection process for this study began, simultaneous program adjustments and a redesign of requirements began to unfold within this county-based district’s teacher induction with site based support. To finalize this program evaluation it seemed beneficial to share some of the latest changes which have either been implemented or plan to be by the beginning of school year 2016-2017. To the satisfaction of the researcher, these changes directly align with recommendations unveiled at the conclusion of this program evaluation and have the potential to improve participant contentment with the induction program and its requirements.

*Provide a more differentiated adult learning experience for inductees.* The need for a more differentiated learning experience for inductees was discovered as one of the most critical needs of the program throughout this research process and it is now being addressed through two new options inductees with prior experience can choose to complete the program.

*Early completion option.* The first offering giving inductees “choice” is the Early Completion Option. This consideration was introduced prior to the beginning of the study but was not available when the program launched in 2010 nor is it an option for everyone in the program. For these reasons, it was purposely excluded from previous sections of the study. However, its importance as a current option meeting the needs addressed in the study makes it valuable to explain here. Inductees must have three or more years of successful teaching experience to apply for this option and must do so within 90 days from their start date in the district. The requirements related to subject matter taught is identical to what has always been a requirement, however, the additional coursework relating to classroom management, differentiation, questioning and discussion, and lesson planning is removed leaving only the state
required Code of Ethics and the Teacher Rubric Overview. This significantly decreases the total course count as well as time spent completing professional development. Per the study findings and recommendations, this option has the opportunity to satisfy some qualified participant’s desire for a more differentiated learning opportunity with less time commitment.

*Teacher induction program training matrix.* The newest option being developed for inductees within the site based support program gives an opportunity to complete requirements by choosing from a larger selection of course options. Per a conversation with the program supervisor, these options which will satisfy induction completion requirements will be laid out in a “matrix” including additional non-stipend options. Although this may deter some participants as it was made clear in the findings that the $15.00 per hour stipend for attending current courses, the freedom to choose may be equally as motivating. As of now, the matrix will include a column of face-to-face courses, a column of online courses, and a column containing non-course options such as a faculty book study on a particular accomplished practice. This is still in development but will be available as a full option in the near future which will certainly address the recommendation of allowing more differentiation and choice for induction completion.

*Produce effective teachers by providing a common level of support.* Addressing the shared need of participants to be granted a common level of support through the induction process, especially those indicating an inadequate experience with site based administrators, the district will be including fully released mentors as a layer of support for all teachers new to the district, now including those with experience. This recommendation from the study’s findings will certainly increase the level of support teachers receive and will balance how it is divided creating a “common” level of support among all participants regardless of school site or
administrator. The details are still being developed as of February 2016, but the intention is to launch this expanded mentoring program as the 2016-2017 school year begins.

Each of these updates within the program are supported by the research gathered within the program evaluation. By delivering findings of this program evaluation to supervisors, it should serve to both justify and support the changes to induction that are being developed as well as those already implemented.

**Personal Comments and Future Recommendations**

As a doctoral student and education professional, deciding the direction of my thesis and ultimately undergoing a program evaluation took more years than I would have hoped, but once I settled upon it, I knew I had made a wise choice with great possibilities for impact. I had found myself in a position with approachable and willing supervisors that expressed a need that could be addressed though my research. Moreover, my work could provide a lasting impact on not only my career, but my school district and the students within it as well. These conditions allowed for the opportunity to address a problem head-on and the resulting study commenced swiftly and concluded after just a few short months. This will allow delivery of the evaluation in a timely manner to the district giving it the most chance of having an impact on the future of the program.

Having been given the opportunity to research, study, and evaluate an induction program impacting so many teachers and students within a district of this magnitude was both an honor and a privilege. The evaluation uncovered six years of much needed data and feedback from teachers currently enrolled or having completed their induction in the district. In addition to the programmatic recommendations laid out previously within this chapter, it is my personal, professional, and now scholarly belief that the completion of this study should not finalize the
inquiry process into teacher induction and adult learning within my district or anywhere else. Ideally, an on-going, participatory program evaluation will continue this cycle of feedback, analysis, and revision starting with the 2016-2017 school year and continuing at least annually. Additionally, it is now my professional goal to pursue this opportunity as my learning throughout this process has given me the confidence to follow the delivery of this study with a proposal to continue evaluating the next generation of induction in our district as we move forward.

As the evaluation process concludes, I reflect positively upon the experience of working through a particular problem of practice, understanding what it takes to analyze a program, look at a system from multiple angles, and eventually see the solutions present themselves. Combining what I have learned as a doctoral student in formal classes, with the opportunity to conduct this research and learn from educational consultants and evaluators along the way has certainly left a lasting impact on myself as a learner and built my confidence as a professional in the field. As trends change and new initiatives drive instruction, further research is needed to measure the impact of the type of learning offerings this district makes available to adults as well as the ways in which it is delivered. Regardless of what happens beyond this program evaluation, it is worth stating that it will always be beneficial to continue the inquiry process by questioning, evaluating, and revising programs within systems of education that directly impact effective teaching and student learning.
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Appendix A

Interview Questions for Program Designers

1. Can you describe how the district’s teacher induction program was created?
2. What stakeholders were involved in the design process? To what extent?
3. What were some pitfalls during early implementation six years ago?
4. What goals did you have for the program at the beginning? Have those goals changed?
5. What, if any support did the district receive from outside?
6. How were the individual components of the teacher induction program selected?
   A. Have they been modified over the last six years?
   B. Do you feel that the chosen components are still viable?
7. In what ways does the district support teachers in the teacher induction program with site based support?
8. In what ways does the district support administrators in the role of site based support contacts for the t
9. Teachers new to the district?
Appendix B

Online Survey (Administered through SurveyMonkey.com)

1. Do you agree to the above terms? By clicking yes, you consent that you are willing to answer the questions in this survey.
2. What level do you currently teach?
3. What type of school do you work in? You may choose more than one.
4. How many years have you taught in the district including this current school year?
5. How many years of teaching experience do you have outside of the district?
6. Where was your teaching experience outside of the district? You may choose more than one.
7. Based upon your experience with this county-based district’s site-based support Teacher Induction Program’s required courses, please describe your thoughts on how it impacted your teaching?
8. How would you rank each required component of this county-based district’s site-based support Teacher Induction Program? #1 having the most impact on your teaching and student learning, #5 having the least impact.
9. How often do you meet with your administrator regarding your induction requirements?
10. How have the following stakeholders impacted your induction in the district?
11. What suggestions do you have that could improve the site-based support Teacher Induction Program within the district?
12. Are you employed at the same school as last year? If not, for what reason did you move to another school?
Appendix C

County-based district’s Teacher Induction Program with Site Based Support Logic Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources (Inputs)</th>
<th>Activities (Inputs)</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Short and Long Term Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In order to accomplish a set of activities we will need the following:</td>
<td>In order to address the assets we will accomplish the following activities:</td>
<td>We expect that once accomplished these activities will produce the following evidence:</td>
<td>We expect that if accomplished these activities will lead to the following changes in 1-3 then 4-6 years:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • Funding from the district/Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation Grant and an annual budget | • Create, administer and refine district and state mandated professional development including coursework | • Produce effective teachers by providing a common level of support  
• Support and train teachers on the evaluation system rubric | • Increase effectiveness of teaching and student learning in the district  
• Increase support for program participants  
• Provide choice in completion of program requirements |
| • Professional Development Personnel                                              | • Monitor participant progress through site-based administration                     | • Provide every teacher with a clearly communicated and common message from the district and at their school site                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |                                                                                            |
| • Administration                                                                  | • Monitor participant progress through administration from a district level           |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |
| • District Provided Coursework                                                     | • Maintain a working database of site-based support program participants and those completed |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |
| • Content Departments                                                             | • Communicate effectively with site-based administration and participants regarding the program and requirements |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |
| • Site based Administration Contacts                                               |                                                                                     |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |
| • Participating educators new to the district                                      |                                                                                     |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |
| • The district’s Classroom Teachers Association                                    |                                                                                     |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |
| • The State’s Educator Accomplished Practices                                      |                                                                                     |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |
| • Evaluation system rubric                                                         |                                                                                     |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |
Appendix D
Teacher Focus Group Discussion Questions

1. In what type of school do you currently teach?

2. How many years of experience do you have teaching full-time outside of the district?

3. How did you first learn about the teacher induction program with site based support?

4. Do you feel supported in your induction into the district?
   a. By the district?
   b. By school administrators?
      i. How often do you meet with your administration regarding TIP requirements?
   c. Other?

5. Are you aware of program requirements?
   a. Are you aware of deadlines within the TIP program?
   b. What components or courses of the TIP program have been helpful in your induction into the district?
   c. What components or courses have been unhelpful in your induction into the district?

6. What components would be more beneficial to teachers new to the district?

7. How would you change site-based support teacher induction in the district?
Appendix E

Interview Questions – Site Based Administrators

1. What is your official role within your school?

   a. Are you aware of the induction requirements for your teachers that are new to the district?

2. How often do you meet with your teachers new to the district regarding their induction requirements?

3. Do you feel supported by the district in your role as the site based contact for teachers new to the district?

4. What components of the TIP do you feel are helpful to your new teachers? Unhelpful?

5. What would you change about the site-based TIP?