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The Delaware Department of Education (DOE) mandates that all new teachers participate in a mentoring and induction program that meets the DOE’s four measures of success:

- participants see personal and professional value in the program;
- participants enhance their personal and/or professional attitudes, perceptions, or knowledge;
- new teachers apply new learning to their practice;
- new teachers demonstrate an improved performance level as a result of their enhanced professional behaviors.

The Delaware Department of Education offers a three-year induction program that is mandatory for all new teachers in district schools. However, many school districts wanted greater control and flexibility to adapt the induction program to their specific programs and student populations, rather than use the state’s model. In 2013, the state responded by creating the Comprehensive Induction Program (CIP) Grant. The grant allows for districts to develop, implement, and evaluate their own innovative induction program models. Each district in the state has the option either to utilize the state’s prescribed mentoring and induction program or apply for the CIP grant. Grantees must submit a proposal that outlines an induction program that meets the DOE’s four measures of success in innovative ways. There are currently 13 grantees either in their first or second year of the grant program.

This evaluation conducted an in-depth case study of two CIP grantees, District A and District B, examining how each implements their individual induction programs and achieves the four measures of success. According to the logic model, both districts proposed to select mentors and provide them with effective orientation on how to support new teachers. Mentors should then receive ongoing training at intervals throughout the school year. Developing the
professional practice of mentors will give them the ability to provide consistent and effective support to new teachers. Mentors are then expected to observe new teachers throughout the year and provide feedback to enhance their reflective practice and provide improved teaching strategies. Mentors should provide novice teachers with a minimum of 30 hours of one-on-one support in both school districts.

The logic model assumed that each school district supported novice teachers through cycles that involve some combination of co-planning, observation, and feedback (See Figure 1). In the District A schools, novices and mentors should observe veteran teachers to reflect on teaching strategies, use videotaping of lessons to assist in analysis of the lessons, and work together to evaluate the novice’s teaching through a teacher evaluation framework. Novice teachers in the District B schools should be observed by their mentors bi-monthly and use iPad Mini’s used for videotaping lessons to facilitate self-reflection and analysis of the lesson. Schoology is another proposed component of induction to encourage blogging and sharing amongst teachers.

Districts A and B proposed to implement effective professional development for new teachers in August prior to the school year’s start and throughout the year. Both districts planned for a four-day new teacher orientation at the beginning of the school year. Professional development will also be held in District A once per semester and include training on how to use iPad Mini’s and other technology to record and analyze teaching practices. District A Year Two teachers will participate in a book study and complete a portfolio. District A Year Three teachers will develop their own individualized growth plans and create five-year professional development plans. District B teachers will be provided with several books at the beginning year orientation as resources. iPad minis should be used to videotape the three observations between
mentor and novice teacher to analyze using Danielson’s Frameworks. All District B new teachers should use Schoology, 2nd year teachers should participate in a book study, and 3rd year teachers should develop individual professional growth plans (See Figure 1 for Logic Model).
Figure 1. Logic Model. This model incorporates each component of induction that was outlined in each LEA’s CIP grant proposal.
Teacher Induction Literature Review

Induction programs for new teachers have come to the forefront of education because of concerns over teacher retention rates and overall teacher quality. In general, the goal of induction programs is to socialize new teachers to the school, enhance their effectiveness, and to increase retention rates (Smith, Desimone, Porter, McGraner, & Haynes, 2012). Induction is a “planned program intended to provide some systematic and sustained assistance, specifically to beginning teachers for at least one school year” (Lawson, 1992). Induction programs are distinct from teacher training; it is designed for teachers who already have pre-service training and now need to bridge the gap between student-teaching and theoretical knowledge and skills to implementation as a full-time teacher (Ingersoll & Smith, 2004).

The most commonly used method of induction is using mentors to support novice teachers. Informal mentoring programs give new teachers the opportunity to develop a relationship with a veteran teacher and ask for advice on a myriad of obstacles faced throughout the year. More recently, mentoring has developed into a more sophisticated part of a larger, more comprehensive induction program. Comprehensive induction programs generally include: mentors that are grade and/or subject aligned, allocated times for mentor and novice teacher to meet, and advance training as well as on-going professional development for mentors. Greater emphasis is now being placed on the preparation and selection of the mentor as previous induction and mentoring program studies have shown that “poorly designed mentoring may even produce negative results: when mentors have no training, lack clear goals and expectations, and have little or no time to do the work they may add to new teachers’ feelings of discouragement, isolation, and even cynicism” (Feiman-Nemser, 2012).
Research shows that the strongest factors to determining if a new teacher stays in the profession are having a mentor in the same subject area, having common planning time with teachers in the same subject area, having regularly scheduled collaboration with other teachers, and being part of an external network of teachers (Ingersoll & Smith, 2004). The greatest rates of retention among new teachers are among those who participated in induction programs that included several of these factors. Lambeth (2012) has researched the psychological phases of teaching to determine new teachers’ needs at various points during the school year. The beginning of the year is when the “reality shock” of teaching is highest and new teachers’ idealism is confronted with the reality of the classroom experience. Lambeth (2012) argues that the reality shock stage is where induction programs need to support the emotional and professional side of the new teacher. It is not until the middle of the school year where new teachers feel they are “caught up” enough to work on curriculum development. Induction programs that require tasks of new teachers that match these psychological phases may be more successful because it gives teachers what they need at specific times. Induction programs that emphasize curriculum planning and analysis of assessments at the beginning of the school year would be unhelpful to teachers in that stage of their development (Lambeth, 2012).

In addition, Smith (2007) and Lambeth (2012) have shown that administrators play an important role in effective induction programs. New teachers need to be able to apply their skills and knowledge to the particular culture and context of the school. Principals develop school culture and must be able to assimilate new teachers to it. This is particularly important for high-poverty schools where new teachers will need support to navigate the needs of the students and families. The principal is also responsible for the effectiveness of the mentors. The principal needs to ensure that mentors are carefully selected and provided with on-going support in their
role. Principals should also be aware of each mentor/mentee relationship and know if each is successful and how to mediate the situation so that the new teacher feels supported (Smith et al, 2012).

A thorough 2010 study by the NCEE showed that there were no statistically significant differences in the teacher impact on student achievement in years one and two when comparing teachers who received a basic induction program that lasted one year versus a more comprehensive program that last more than one. However, statistically significant improvements in student achievement were seen in year three. This finding lends credibility to the notion that new teachers need several years of support and development to hone their practice and skills and, with three or more years of comprehensive supports, teachers can make greater impacts on student achievement (NCEE, 2010).

In a 2008 report, four different case studies were explored to study different types of mentor induction programs in California. These models included using a provided curriculum, adapting mentor scripts, adapting mentor curriculum, and inventing a focused curriculum. In the first case study of using a provided curriculum, the researchers found that although a large supply of materials were given to the mentors to use with new teachers, they were generally found frustrating and unhelpful. The materials ended up being time-consuming tasks and paperwork for new teachers to fill out, and most mentors stopped using them. Instead, the mentor became a source of emotional support for the new teacher. The researchers found that there was no critical feedback or review of teaching practices and that mentors either followed a prescribed curriculum or became a backboard to understand the challenges the new teacher faced- there was no middle ground. The mentors were unsure how or if they could adapt the materials they were given to better fit particular situations (Athanases et al, 2008).
The second case study used selected tools and training methods to use in developing mentor skills. Scripts were provided to help mentors engage in constructive conversations with their mentees and push away from emotional support and guidance. The mentors reported that they found the scripts very helpful to learn how to actively observe classroom instruction and give constructive feedback. However, mentors also reported needing more time to collaborate and practice utilizing the language since they sometimes felt as if they only knew the scripted language and had difficulty adapting to specific situations (Athanases et al, 2008).

The third case study cohort was in a large, urban, minority-majority district. The mentors received specific training in cultural competency in order to help new teachers face the inequities they would see in their classrooms and understand the cultural backgrounds of their students. Two-thirds of the new teachers in this program believed the mentorship to be extensive, high-quality, and highly-effective to their practice (Athanases et al, 2008).

The fourth case study highlighted induction leaders who specifically developed a program to prioritize subject-matter knowledge and pedagogy in literacy instruction. Teachers and mentors worked together with literacy coaches and attended professional development sessions to use data to drive instruction. Observations of new teachers and mentors were used to critique instruction and showcase best practices. This approach was well received because it was well-resourced with expert literacy coaches, and novices and mentors worked collaboratively to improve practice (Athanases et al, 2008).

These case studies demonstrate the need for mentors to be well-prepared to adapt to specific scenarios, provide constructive feedback, and for the district to develop induction programs that are specifically tailored to the needs and goals of their individual district. This makes the work new teachers engage in more practical and useful to implement in the classroom.
**Technology and Online Platforms**

Online platforms and technological resources can facilitate the efforts of teacher induction. One such form is video chat which enables the remote classroom. Some universities are already using this technology as a way to conduct clinical observations. Live-streaming video allows observers to conduct more observations since it reduces travel time as well as appears less intimidating to the student teacher. Using applications like Skype or FaceTime even allow for classrooms to connect across the country and around the world. If novice teachers can participate in these types of activities during their induction experience, this can shape how they use their future classrooms. K-12 students can interact with classrooms across the globe and experience new cultures and ideas in real-time (Wash, Bradley, & Beck, 2014).

A distributed learning model can allow a combination of virtual and face-to-face experiences. Participants of these models perceive that activities like threaded online discussions allow them to learn and participate more. These activities are not bound to a specific time and place, so participants can jump into a discussion when it is convenient to their schedule. They are also able to broaden their community and network with teachers they would not get to connect with under normal circumstances (Dede, 2004).

A Video Technology Mentoring Program (VTMP) allows teachers to determine their own learning needs and be active in the process of professional development. It is the opposite of the traditional approach where teachers attend a one-day district-mandated workshop and are expected to implement the presented strategies to achieve instant results. VTMP is traditionally used to facilitate professional development for veteran teachers to allow them to voice their specific needs and receive support “with teachers setting professional goals, observing and
videotaping in one another’s classrooms, and reflecting collaboratively on their progress toward these goals” (Yusko, 2008, p. 206). This model has implications for teacher induction as well.

A study of Linus Elementary explored the implementation of VTMP and how it is used to support mentoring of new teachers. Linus Elementary was labeled as being in a state of “academic emergency” (p. 207). It has a diverse population with many students living in poverty. Pairs of novice and veteran teachers identified goals through domains B and C of Danielson’s 1996 framework for teaching and then participated in monthly visits to each other’s classroom where lessons would be videotaped. Clips from these lessons were shown at biweekly meetings of the group to discuss. The phrase “partner-teacher” was used to describe mentors who facilitated a reciprocal learning relationship with both participants setting learning goals. Summer training was provided to partner-teachers where they learned to edit video, ask probing questions, and provide descriptive feedback (Yusko, 2008).

The process of participating in this program proved challenging for the participants of Linus Elementary. Teachers were not used to designing and leading their own professional development and many found it overwhelming. The VTMP also challenged the idea of the traditional mentor-mentee relationship where some mentors struggled to be on a more equal playing field. The persistent viewing of videotapes placed teachers under constant examination and study. Some teachers felt as though the program was an additional mandate by the district and teachers found it difficult to find the time to meet and get substitute coverage because of reduced budgets. The lessons learned from their participation included facilitating teachers to participate through their own personally motivated reasons, matching pairs through common goals, building in time throughout the work day to participate in VTMP activities, and providing technology support through in-house sources (Yusko, 2008).
Another way that videotaping can be incorporated into an observation of a new teacher’s classroom is to shift the focus to what students are doing during the lesson rather than only what the teacher is doing. New teachers are often concentrating so much on the implementation of their lesson that they are not always aware of how their students are engaging with the lesson. The mentor can walk around the room taping students’ participation so that the new teacher can watch the footage later to reflect on how effective different parts of the lesson were received by the class. The mentor can pose questions such as, “Were the students on task? Did their questions indicate that they understood the reading? Were they using effective strategies?” (Rose, 2009, p. 208). Placing the emphasis on the students takes pressure off the teacher and allows him/her to focus on the teaching strategies being discussed. Since students will often change their behavior when they know they are being watched, it is recommended to use a small video camera to make it less obtrusive during the lesson (Rose, 2009).

When using an online platform to facilitate induction, a variety of methods should be employed to deliver information. Many college students are used to online coursework such as completing reading assignments and uploading assignments. Therefore, new teachers coming out of college can receive more benefit from participating in such a course if a range of activities are incorporated and assignments are shorter or broken into small sections. Schoology is a learning management system that allows teachers an online location to manage and share academic materials. It is available to schools for free except in the case of add-on features (Stear & Mensch, 2012). One benefit of Schoology is that users can upload documents from Google Docs, Moodle, and Blackboard so these materials do not need to be recreated. There is also an analytic function that allows teachers to view items that are used the most. It has been found to be user-friendly and offers an orientation of its features through tutorials and videos. The
Schoology interface is similar to social media sites like Facebook. However, one should also keep in mind some of the drawbacks of an online system like power outages that can prevent signing onto the system at crucial moments, the need to convert video files to acceptable formats, and that online assessment programs like Examview cannot be transferred straight into Schoology but must go through an intermediate platform like Blackboard before arriving where it is needed (Stear & Mensch, 2012).

**Book Study**

A literature study group allows readers to join together on a regular basis to share their interpretations of a book and allow the ensuing conversation to generate deeper meanings of the text. This allows for a social interaction that John Dewey often advocated for in the classroom to help facilitate the learning process. “Literature study groups are effective for use in a heterogeneous society because they embrace diversity by allowing for and encouraging different viewpoints” (Roberts, Jensen, & Hadjiyianni, 1997, p. 2). Such a group was used with pre-service teachers at a mid-western U.S. university that was taking an education class in the social foundations of American education. A study of their participation revealed the following benefits:

1. The social interaction aided the learning process and many pre-service teachers found other responses to be valuable.

2. Participation in the literature study group allowed for an increased exposure to diversity that could resemble what teachers find in the classroom. It is important for teachers to know how to respond to a variety of answers which the group gave the prior exposure to.
3. Conversation about the text allowed participants to create larger meaning than what they would have experienced by themselves.

4. The use of a literature study group exposes pre-service teachers to another strategy that can be recreated in their own classrooms with students (Roberts et al, 1997).

In addition to the benefits listed above, book studies can allow new teachers to feel less isolated as they meet with other teachers going through similar experiences. A book study allows beginning teachers to better appreciate the idea of a professional learning community and help build strong professional habits. These groups can be tailored to the needs of the teachers participating in the book study and not require the school district to pay large costs to implement a book study. Rose (2009) recommended to keep these groups small, from five to seven participants, in order to maximize benefit. These meetings should occur regularly with participants facilitating the process to encourage ownership and value (Rose, 2009).

Methods

Several studies have been done to determine the effectiveness of teacher induction programs, particularly those involving mentors. Ingwalson (2006) conducted a study of a mentoring program with the goals of determining if the program is improving teaching performance, promoting personal and professional attitudes, improving retention rates among new teachers, and developing a love for continued learning. The methods used included phone or email interviews with a set list of questions, as well as data collection of the observation notes and evaluations of the program coordinator. Two other studies included the new teachers and mentors as participatory action researchers and relied primarily on their weekly journal reflections of their experiences throughout the induction program (Athanases et al 2008; Bang,
A study of mentor experiences by Kent, Green & Feldman (2012) used electronic surveys and focus groups with mentors in the program to gain qualitative data.

A thorough impact evaluation study of induction programs throughout the country used surveys of the new teachers and mentors and classroom observations as their main source of data collection. Further, the researchers collected documents on the program description, student records, and school characteristics to determine how induction programs were effective in various situations. This study was rigorous as it collected data from various teachers in induction programs (treatment) as well as new teachers that were in a school district without an induction program (control). The researchers designed the study in order to be able to run several statistical tests to determine whether there was a statistically different outcome for teacher efficacy and student achievement between the treatment and control groups (Glazerman, Senesky, Seftor, & Johnson, 2006).

This evaluation used these research design methods as a model as well as interviews, surveys, and analysis of professional development materials. Due to time constraints, we only interviewed and surveyed participants once rather than at time intervals as suggested by the literature. Since this evaluation was conducted mid-year, it relied on responses from participants on their overall experience and was not able to use the technique described by Athanases et al and Bang of recruiting participants to write reflective responses throughout the process. Survey and interview questions were adapted from a variety of previous induction program studies to utilize for our own purposes.

**Data Methods**

Two Delaware school districts were analyzed using a case study methodology. The following methods were implemented to answer the four research questions of the evaluation.
Research Questions

The focus of this evaluation is the implementation of the program as a whole and whether or not those participating in it are benefitting from the New Teacher Induction Program. The combination of Delaware’s Department of Education’s four measures of success, the background and goals of the program, and conversations with the Director of the New Teacher Induction Program led us to create our four research questions for this evaluation:

1. To what extent is the induction process being implemented as stated in the proposal?
2. To what extent do participating mentors, administrators, and new teachers see personal and professional value in the program?
3. To what extent do new teachers, mentors, and school administrators believe that new teachers have applied skills learned in the induction program to their practice?
4. Is there a relationship between integrity of implementation of the induction program and the value that teachers and mentors place on the program?
Table 1

*Research Questions, Measures, and Methods*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To what extent is the induction process being implemented as stated in the proposal?</td>
<td>Responses by Administrators and Mentors</td>
<td>Survey Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation Rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Induction Program calendar</td>
<td>Document Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schoology/PD artifacts/documentation of number of observations completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To what extent do participating mentors, administrators, and new teachers see personal and professional value in the program?</td>
<td>Teacher Efficacy</td>
<td>Survey Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To what extent do new teachers, mentors, and school administrators believe that new teachers have applied skills learned in the induction program to their practice?</td>
<td>Responses by Teachers, Mentors, and Administrators</td>
<td>Survey Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Is there a relationship between the integrity of implementation of the induction program and the value that mentors and novice teachers place on the program?</td>
<td>Responses by Teachers, Mentors, and Administrators</td>
<td>Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Induction Program calendar</td>
<td>Implementation Rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schoology/PD artifacts/documentation of number of observations completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey

A survey was a main source of data collection from a large sample of New Teacher Induction Program participants. The survey included questions that helped us to answer all four research questions. The survey was created through SurveyMonkey and emailed directly to the work emails of each participant by the site coordinator and did not ask participants for any self-identifying information such as their name or the name of the school. No one besides the researchers saw the individual responses. Respondents were asked for information regarding their role in the New Teacher Induction Program and, if they were a new teacher, to state their year in the program. This allowed survey responses to be disaggregated into groups of Year 1 teachers, Year 2 teachers, and Year 3 teachers, so patterns could emerge through these sub-groupings.

The new teacher survey was sent to all 115 District A teachers, the mentor survey was sent to all 20 District A mentors, and the administrator survey was sent to all 32 District A principals and assistant principals participating in the Teacher Induction Program. The same process was completed for District B; however, responses rates were low, and the researchers were not provided with the number of participants who received the survey by email.

The logic model was used to guide the creation of the questions to ensure that all activities were addressed in the survey to participants. Other questions were based on survey questions by similar research studies on new teachers and mentor programs (Glazerman et al, 2006; Benson-Jaja, 2010; Kapadia, Coca, Easton, 2007; Silet et al, n.d.; Wilson, 2013; Raffel & Holbert, 2006).

**Research Question 1.** The survey asked specific questions related to the implementation of the program and the extent to which activities were carried out. These responses were used
for triangulation while completing the implementation rubric during the analysis and scoring phase described later in the report.

**Research Question 2.** The survey was the main data collection point in determining the degree to which new teachers and mentors see personal and professional value in the induction program. These responses may indicate the effort that participants are putting into the program: if participants see no value in the program, they may be working with mentors and applying skills learned less faithfully.

**Research Question 3.** In addition, specific survey questions determined the extent to which new teachers, mentors, and school administrators believe that new teachers have applied skills learned in the induction to their practice. The survey results were disaggregated to determine if there is a consistency between the beliefs of the new teacher and the beliefs of mentors and administrators. A chi-square test of association was used to determine whether there is a difference in the way mentors, administrators, and new teachers each believe strategies are being implemented in the classroom.

**Research Question 4.** The responses from Research Question 2 were further analyzed against the results of the implementation rubric to address Research Question 4, which asks if there is a relationship between the value teachers and mentors see in the program and the level of implementation. This analysis may help future program designs since the level of value participants have in the program may affect the level of implementation. The implementation rubric will be addressed in detail in the next section.

The three different surveys were piloted before being sent to participants. The administrator survey was piloted by a retired assistant principal. He felt that the question asking administrators how often they complete walkthroughs to observe new teachers should not be
open-ended but have choices such as more than once a week, once a week, once a month, or less than once a month in order to be consistent with the rest of the survey. This change was made in the final survey (see Appendix A).

The mentor and new teacher surveys were piloted with a literacy coach who works for The George Washington University providing clinical training to new teachers and assisting with their field experiences. She has 12 years of experience teaching in the classroom. For the mentor survey, she suggested that mentors be asked about whether they received training in conferencing as part of their mentoring preparation. She also wondered whether the mentor should be asked about the use of a self-reflection analysis handout required by District B since it implied that the handout would be used by the new teacher for self-reflection. With respect to the new teacher survey, the literacy coach suggested adding a question about how new teachers view the time commitment demanded by the induction program in addition to their teaching responsibilities. These changes were included in the final survey for mentors and new teachers (see Appendix A).

A George Washington University student who is participating in the teacher-training program also piloted the new teacher survey. He felt that the questions could be grouped together by common categories to make answering them more cohesive. He also expressed a concern about the survey being too long. However, the researchers explained that not every new teacher would answer every question since the survey used skip logic so that teachers would only answer questions that pertained to their year in the program (see Appendix A for final New Teacher, Mentor, and Administrator surveys).
Interview

An interview was an opportunity for the researchers to hear a more nuanced explanation of participants’ perspectives on the induction program. Interviews could help us to understand how the program was implemented in various schools and situations. If there is any aspect of implementation that was changed from the proposal, the interview would allow for participants to explain why elements changed or if participants were aware that they did.

Interviews also allow for teachers and mentors to explain the value they see in the program and why. Perceptions of value can be difficult to tease out in surveys whereas an interview will allow respondents to explain which elements of the program held most value for them. This same reasoning holds true for teachers and mentors explaining whether they believed that teachers are utilizing their skills in the classroom.

A semi-structured interview model was designed to guide participants in answering specific questions but still allowing interviewees to expand on their answers and follow a line of questioning that makes sense based on the unique perspectives of the interviewee (see Appendix B for the interview questions).

Interviews were requested from two new teachers, two mentors, and two administrators in each district. However, due to a low response rate, only two interviews (one new teacher and one administrator) were conducted. Both interviewees were from District A; no interviews were conducted from District B. Since only two interviews were conducted, the answers could not be considered generalizable to the entire population of District A and were not included in the data analysis (see Appendix C for the notes taken during each of the two interviews).
Implementation Rubric

In order to address Research Question 1, “To what extent is the induction process being implemented as stated in the proposal?” an implementation rubric was used to gauge the level of implementation. An implementation rubric, created by Bambrick-Santoyo & New Leaders for New Schools (2008) ranked levels of implementation on a scale of 1 to 4 (1 = no implementation, 2 = beginning implementation, 3 = proficient implementation, 4 = exemplary implementation). We adapted this rubric by dividing it into the four categories described in the Logic Model for each LEA, which was originally based on each CIP Grant: LEAs Provide Support to Mentors, Mentors and Other Personnel Provide Consistent Support Provided to New Teachers, Professional Development Implemented for New Teachers, and LEAs Collect Data to Evaluate Program Implementation and Use it to Drive Change. The implementation rubric used is shown below (Figure 2):
# District A New Teacher Induction Program Implementation Rubric

(Adapted from Paul Bambrick-Santoyo & New Leaders for New Schools, 2008)

This rubric is intended to be used to assess the present level of implementation of the New Teacher Induction Program based on its original CIP Grant Proposal. The rubric specifically targets LEA-provided support to mentors, support provided by mentors and other personnel to new teachers, professional development implemented for new teachers, and the data collected by LEAs to evaluate program implementation and drive program change.

4 = Exemplary Implementation 3 = Proficient Implementation 2 = Beginning Implementation 1 = No Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEA’s Provide Support to Mentors</th>
<th>Sub-ranking:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Mentor training during new teacher orientation (1 hour)</td>
<td>/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lead mentors deliver mentor training and ongoing support</td>
<td>/4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentors and Other Personnel Provide Consistent Support Provided to New Teachers</th>
<th>Sub-ranking:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 30 hours of ongoing support</td>
<td>/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. New teachers observe mentors &amp; veteran teachers (6 in a year)</td>
<td>/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 4 observations by mentor</td>
<td>/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. New teacher/mentor pairs observe veteran teachers to target areas of focus</td>
<td>/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mentors assist new teachers in evaluating their practice based on Danielson’s Frameworks</td>
<td>/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Use videotaping to review for feedback</td>
<td>/4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Development Implemented for New Teachers</th>
<th>Sub-ranking:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. New Teacher Orientation (4 days)</td>
<td>/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Y2 teachers participate in PLC’s and book study of Assessment of Learning by Stiggins</td>
<td>/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Y2 teachers build a portfolio (Schoology use)</td>
<td>/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Training on using iPad Mini’s and Swivl for observations</td>
<td>/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. PD implemented in each semester &amp; Training at the beginning of each cycle</td>
<td>/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Y3 teachers create and implement individual growth plans</td>
<td>/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Y3 teachers created a 5-year plan for professional development</td>
<td>/4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEA’s Collect Data to Evaluate Program Implementation and Use it to Drive Change</th>
<th>Sub-ranking:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Administer feedback surveys to new teachers and mentors at the end of each cycle</td>
<td>/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Administer Pre- &amp; Post-surveys about Charlotte Danielson and the Framework for teaching (looking for evidence of growth)</td>
<td>/4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Ranking: /17

*Figure 2.* District A New Teacher Induction Program Implementation Rubric. This rubric was based on the logic model that detailed the implementation of District A’s induction program and used to calculate the level of implementation for each sub-category and overall program implementation.
We created a list of artifacts to use as evidence for each element in the implementation rubric and requested that the site coordinators of the New Teacher Induction Program in each district provide us with these artifacts. For example, to determine if LEAs are holding all stated professional development workshops described in its original CIP Grant application, we requested agendas from the professional development and attendance totals. We held a phone conference with each site coordinator to determine the plausibility of the artifacts requested and discussed that confidentiality of all program participants would be preserved. One of the site coordinators mentioned that DPAS II data may be difficult to obtain due to the sensitive nature of the material. Consequently, we were not sent DPAS II artifacts and therefore could not include that element in our overall evaluation. The site coordinators agreed to provide us with the list of artifacts requested and understood their purpose. However, we only received artifacts from District A and therefore could only proceed with the case study in that district. The full list of requested artifacts is shown below (Table 2):
### Induction Program Artifacts Requested

#### District A
1. Agenda and Attendance totals from Mentor Training Session during New Teacher Orientation (Who provided this training?)
2. Agenda and Attendance totals from New Teacher Orientation
3. iPad Training Agenda and Attendance totals
4. Documentation of support provided to mentors from lead mentors
5. Logs of support provided to new teachers from mentors (concerned with frequency of support—number of observations in a year, number of meetings in a year, etc.)
6. Log of number of times new teachers observed mentors or veteran teachers
7. Log of videotaping sessions (how many per teacher)
8. Y1/Mentor Training for Cycles 1 and 2-Agendas/Attendance totals
9. Log or Calendar of Book Study Meetings
10. Portfolio samples from Y2 teachers
11. Samples of Y3 growth plans and 5-year professional development plans
12. Samples of Feedback Surveys from the end of each cycle
13. Pre-Surveys administered about Charlotte Danielson’s Frameworks for Teaching
14. Evidence of comparing DPAS II rubric criteria from the school year

#### District B
1. Agenda and Attendance totals from CIP District training in August (Who provided this training?)
2. Agenda and Attendance totals from the two different district trainings on best mentoring practices during school year (Who provided these trainings?)
3. Agenda and daily Attendance totals from New Teacher Orientation
4. Agenda and attendance totals from the different professional development sessions held for Y1 teachers throughout the school year
5. Logs of support provided to new teachers from mentors (concerned with frequency of support—number of observations in a year, number of meetings in a year, etc.)
6. Log of videotaping sessions (how many per teacher)
7. Reports of uploads to Schoology (video, artifacts, blogging)
8. Checklists or Evidence of walkthroughs completed by administrators and site coordinator
9. Log or Calendar of Book Study Meetings
10. Samples of Y3 teacher PD plans
11. Samples of quarterly surveys administered to new Y1-3 teachers
12. Samples of workshop surveys
13. Evidence of examination of common areas of growth and concern in DPAS II novice teacher evaluations

When all the artifacts were received, we used a triangulation method, to the extent possible, to create an overall score on the implementation rubric. We analyzed data from survey
responses from new teachers, mentors, and administrators, and the artifacts themselves to determine a score that reflects the degree of implementation. Discussion between the researchers also allowed for further triangulation to reduce individual bias. We allowed half-scores (1.5, 2.5, etc.) so that scores would be more reflective of the stage of implementation.

**Data Analysis**

Data analysis was used to find statistically significant relationships between groups of participants and their survey answers. These relationships included if subgroups of participants observed the same amount of implementation with different components of the induction program as well as the value they placed on the program and its various components.

**Research Question 1.** Research Question 1 was answered through the implementation rubric as already described. We created scores for each subcategory to better understand the implementation of each section of the program as well as an overall implementation score.

**Research Question 2.** For Research Question 2, “to what extent do participating mentors, administrators, and new teachers see personal and professional value in the program?” survey results were analyzed to compare new teachers, mentors, and administrators.

Results were inputted into SPSS software to run a cross tabulation. A cross tabulation is a contingency table where each cell of table provides the frequencies of how many responses are in common for two categories or in this case, two different groups. By organizing the data into a cross tabulation, we were able to run a chi-square test of association. This test is “is used to determine whether there is an association or relationship between two categorical relationships (Lomax & Hahs-Vaughn, 2012, p. 221).” The chi-square test of association is related to the chi-square goodness of fit test but allows us to examine two categorical variables as opposed to just one (Lomax & Hahs-Vaughn, 2012).
Even though SurveyMonkey provides tallies and percentages, SPSS software allowed the running of a chi-square test of association to see whether there are any statistically significant associations between specific groups of participants. Survey participants were divided into two different categories, new teachers were placed into one group and mentors and administrators were combined into the second group. Also, participant ratings were condensed into two different categories, no value and a little value in the first and moderate and a lot of value in the second. This allowed the expected counts in each cell of the contingency table to be above 5 and produced a reliable chi-square value to determine if there was a statistically significant association between groups of participants.

**Research Question 3.** For Research Question 3, “to what extent do new teachers, mentors, and school administrators believe that new teachers have applied skills learned in the induction program to their practice?” we used similar methods that were applied to analyze Research Question 2. Survey answers that pertained to this question were inputted into SPSS software in order to create another cross tabulation and run a chi-square test of association to determine statistically significant associations between different groups of participants. The same groupings were once again used to ensure a reliable chi-square value to determine if there was a statistically significant association between groups of participants.

**Research Question 4.** For Research Question 4, “Is there a relationship between the integrity of implementation of the induction program and the value that mentors and novice teachers place on the program?” the ranking determined by the implementation rubric and the value assigned by participants in their surveys were compared together and analyzed. Since the survey answers from new teachers, mentors, and administrators allowed us to see how individual participants interacted with different components in the logic model, an average rating was
calculated for relevant survey questions by subgroups of participants. For example, the survey questions that asked “to what extent” a component was completed by a participant, an equivalent numerical rating can be applied (i.e., 1 = “none” or “not at all,” 2 = “a little” or “very little,” 3 = “a moderate amount,” 4 = “a lot”). The average ratings from the survey results were compared with the corresponding rankings from the implementation rubric.

Average ratings from survey responses and corresponding rankings from the implementation rubric were graphed on a scatterplot to determine the extent to which a relationship existed between participant perceptions and program implementation as assessed through an analysis of the artifacts. A Pearson correlation coefficient was also calculated to help determine the direction and strength of the relationship (Lomax & Hahs-Vaughn, 2012).

**Reliability and Validity**

Validation occurred through the triangulation of data between the different sources of data measured. Reliability occurred through inviting all participants in the induction program to answer the survey. Response rates were noted to allow researchers to gauge the level of reliability based on the percentage of responses that are collected. All participants were invited to volunteer to be interviewed. Then random selection was used to select who would be interviewed.

**Limitations of the Study**

This evaluation was impacted by the number of survey responses since a small sample can lead to an unreliable study. District A response rates were 55% (63 of 115) new teachers, 75% (15 out of 20) mentors, and 47% (15 out of 32) administrators, including principals and assistant principals. District A also provided numerous documents to analyze with the implementation rubric. In District B, survey responses were received from 17 new teachers, 9
mentors, and 5 administrators. The total population of each subgroup could not be determined, and very few members of the target population responded to the survey. In addition, a list of total induction program participants and document artifacts were never provided, so the response rate percentage could not be determined. Since there was such a small response rate from District B as well as a lack of document artifacts provided, data analysis could not be conducted in a valid way. In this case, final results would be based more on the how District B responded as opposed to how it was implementing its program. As a result, District B was removed from the case study.

The overall evaluation was further limited by the time allocated to data collection and the necessity for the study to begin mid-year. If the evaluation were to be conducted in a full school year, observations of professional development sessions and book study would have been useful in contributing further to the findings. In addition, a longer time frame may have allowed for a greater number of interviews to be conducted in order to provide additional insight of the induction programs. Both logic models stated that the districts were evaluating their respective induction programs by looking at trends in DPAS II evaluations. This is not something that could be verified because neither the evaluators nor the site coordinators could not access this information due to its confidential nature.
Findings

Since response rates and document collection were low for District B, analysis could not be completed. The following findings are only for District A.

Research Question 1: To what extent is the induction process being implemented as stated in the proposal?

1. Overall implementation of the New Teacher Induction Program in District A is approaching proficient.

   The overall implementation of the program received a score of 2.7 out of 4-therefore it is approaching the 3.0 (proficiency) marker. Some aspects of the program are implemented more consistently and to a higher degree of effectiveness than with components like LEA evaluation of the program and the use of videotaping. Specific findings in regards to subsections of the implementation rubric are discussed below.

2. Mentor support is the strongest feature of the program in District A.

   Mentors feel supported and ready to mentor first-year teachers. Sixty-five percent of mentors reported feeling “very well-prepared” to become an effective mentor while the remainder felt “somewhat prepared.” Eighty percent of mentors reported valuing the beginning of the year mentor training session either “a moderate amount” or “a lot.” Ninety percent of mentors valued the New Teacher Induction Program either “a moderate amount” or “a lot” (see Figure 3).
3. **Professional development for new teachers is proficient in District A.**

Professional development implementation was rated as proficient for new teachers. There was strong implementation of the beginning of the year sessions, Year 2 teachers’ portfolios, and Year 3 teachers’ individual growth plans. Implementation was lowest in videotaping and Swivel camera technology and Year 3 teachers’ five-year plans for professional development. The lack of training in videotaping will be addressed in the coming section. The five-year plans for professional development lacked detail and specificity and did not emphasize a specific plan for continued learning and growth. Further, almost half of Year 3 teachers saw “none” or “a little” value in the plans (see Figure 4).

There was a wide range between how new teachers felt about participating in a book study during the induction program (see Figure 5). Fifty-five percent of new
teachers reported finding “no or little value” in participating in book study while the other half did find value in participating in a book study.

*Figure 4.* Year 3 teacher survey responses on individual growth plans and five-year professional development plans. These bar graphs show the level of value that Year 3 teachers placed in developing individual growth plans and five-year professional development plans.
District A New Teacher Survey (Year 2 Question)

Figure 5. Year 2 teachers survey responses on the value of participating in a book study. These bar graphs show how much value Year 2 teachers placed in participating in a book study.

4. Ongoing support by mentors to new teachers is between beginning and proficient in District A.

Although new teachers see a great deal of value in their mentors, the ongoing supports they receive are inconsistent among the new teachers. The implementation score was lowered due to the lack of videotaping as well as the lack of consistency in the number of mentor observations. Mentors must observe their new teachers four times throughout the year; by March, we felt as though three observations should have been completed on average, but 70% (according to the new teacher survey) were below that threshold. We believe this is significant since new teachers need more observations and feedback in the beginning of the year rather than “fitting it in” at the end.

Yet, it is important to note that mentor survey results show a drastically different picture, with 71% of mentors reporting that they had observed their mentee four or more
times (see Figure 6). There may be a discrepancy with language around observations—mentors may refer to any amount of time spent in their new teachers’ classrooms as an observation, while new teachers may only believe mentors spending a full class period in their room as an observation.

In addition, mentors should be using Danielson’s Frameworks to guide their analysis and feedback of the new teacher so that language is consistent according to the district’s Induction Program plans. Survey results show Danielson’s Frameworks are being used in some, but not all, feedback sessions.

**District A New Teacher Survey**

![Graph showing number of new teacher observations reported on survey.](image1)

**District A New Mentor Survey**

![Graph showing how many times new teachers reported being observed by their mentor versus mentors reporting how many times they observed new teachers.](image2)

*Figure 6.* Number of new teacher observations reported on survey. These bar graphs show how many times new teachers reported being observed by their mentor versus mentors reporting of how many times they observed new teachers.

5. **LEA evaluation of the program is the weakest feature in District A.**

The New Teacher Induction Program proposal from the district indicated that the LEA would evaluate its program throughout the year with end-of-training surveys and
pre and post surveys regarding Danielson’s Frameworks. Although the district is using the surveys, they are not being used to evaluate the program for growth and impact.

6. In District A, training in videotaping and the use of the Swivel camera was not emphasized in professional development sessions and the implementation and value placed in the use of videotaping was both low. This has significant financial implications.

Almost a third of mentors reported videotaping their new teachers only once during the year, while 70% of responding new teachers reported seeing “a little” or “no” value in being videotaped to receive feedback from their mentors (see Figure 7). The document analysis showed that there was little to no training in the use of videotaping technology and its use in the mentoring process which translated into the lack of use and value seen during the year. The district’s CIP proposal reported using $18,000 of its budget for the New Teacher Induction Program for videotaping technology, yet the technology component of the program was rarely implemented.
Research Question 2: To what extent do participating mentors, administrators, and new teachers see personal and professional value in the program?

1. New teachers perceive strong personal and professional support from their mentors in District A.

The core of the induction program for Year 1 teachers is the mentor support system, so it is imperative that mentors provide the needed personal and professional support necessary for new teachers to be effective in their first year. Sixty percent of first-year teachers reported that their mentors supported them personally, and 80% felt that their mentors supported them professionally (see Figure 8). New teachers reported seeing stronger impacts with mentors who are in the same building and teach the same grade and/or subject levels (see Figure 9).
**District A New Teacher Survey**

**Figure 8.** New teacher feelings on mentor supports. These bar graphs show the survey responses of new teachers and how much they feel supported personally and professionally.

**District A New Teacher Survey**

**Figure 9.** Mentor in the same building and in the same grade level or subject matter. These bar graphs show how much of an impact that new teachers feel having a mentor in the same building and in the same grade level or subject matter has on their induction experience based on their survey responses.
2. *Mentors and administrators both see more value in the New Teacher Induction Program in District A than do the new teachers themselves.*

Mentors and administrators value scores are somewhat higher than New Teacher scores. However, new teachers are asked to fulfill more requirements by the program. Ninety-two percent of mentors and administrators found “moderate” to “a lot” of value in the induction program as a whole, compared to only 39% of new teachers (see Table 4). A chi-square test of association showed that there is a statistically significant association between the role you hold in the induction program and how much value you place in the program ($\chi^2(1, n = 86)=19.838, p < .001$, See Table 5). This role has a large effect ($\phi = .480$) on the level value reported by new teachers versus mentors and administrators (See Table 6). Our hypotheses for why this is: new teachers are overwhelmed with their first-year of teaching and while the program adds needed supports, it also adds work that new teachers may see as unnecessary.

Also, Year 2 and 3 teachers reported in open response sections of the survey that they did not believe all three years of the program were needed. For example, one teacher wrote “Year 1 was beneficial… having a mentor to observe you and give you feedback. I did not feel that Year 2 benefitted my teaching or my students much.” Mentors and administrators could be encouraged to share with their new teachers why they believe the program is valuable for their development as teachers.
Table 4

*Role in New Teacher Induction Program * Value Category

Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role in New Teacher Induction Program</th>
<th>Value Category</th>
<th>No Value to A Little Value</th>
<th>Moderate to A lot of Value</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Teachers Count</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Role in New Teacher Induction Program</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors and Administrators Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Role in New Teacher Induction Program</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>92.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Count</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Role in New Teacher Induction Program</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5

*Chi-Square Tests*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (2- sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (1-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square Correction</td>
<td>19.838a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity Correction</td>
<td>17.770</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>22.765</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher's Exact Test</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>19.607</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.34.
b. Computed only for a 2x2 table
Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symmetric Measures</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approx. Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominal by Phi</td>
<td>.480</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal Cramer's V</td>
<td>.480</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. *Few teachers use Schoology regularly in District A, and few see value in its use.*

There are few teachers who are using Schoology regularly, and teachers report seeing little value in its use. However, due to the low numbers of teachers using the program, we believe that the value scores are not fully accurate or generalizable.

**Research Question 3: To what extent do new teachers, mentors, and school administrators believe that new teachers have applied skills learned in the induction program into their practice?**

1. *Mentors and administrators were more likely than new teachers to report that new teachers were incorporating strategies learned in the District A induction program into their practice.*

   About 82% of mentors and administrators reported believing that new teachers were incorporating new strategies into their practice, whereas 52% of new teachers felt they were incorporating new strategies (see Table 7). There is a statistically significant association between the role in the program (mentor, administrator, new teacher) and the extent to which they feel new teachers incorporated strategies learned from the induction program into their practice ($\chi^2(1, n = 78)=5.949, p=.015$, see Table 8). There is a
moderate effect ($\phi = 0.276$) that can be contributed to the role of the person in the induction program and the extent to which he or she feels that a new teacher incorporated strategies learned in the program (see Table 9).

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role in New Teacher Induction Program</th>
<th>To What Extent Did New Teachers Incorporate Strategies to Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% within New Teacher Induction Program</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors and Administrators</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Teachers</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (1-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>5.949*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity Correction</td>
<td>4.761</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio Fisher's Exact Test</td>
<td>6.402</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>5.873</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.74.
b. Computed only for a 2x2 table
Research Question 4: Is there a relationship between the integrity of implementation of the induction program and the value that mentors and novice teachers place on the program?

1. There is a strong relationship between the level of implementation and the value participants see in the District A induction program.

In the process of comparing implementation rubric scores to the value scores for participant subgroups, specific relationships were found. Overall, there was a weak to moderate correlation between the value each group (new teachers, mentors, administrators) placed in the Induction Program and the implementation rubric score for their subcategory. For example, mentor supports received the highest implementation score on the rubric and also saw the most value in the induction program (see Table 10). In contrast, new teachers saw lesser value in the program and also had a lower score on the implementation rubric for the on-going supports they were receiving. All scores were in the upper right quadrant-showing an overall positive output with a weak to moderate correlation between all of the scores, though new teachers and mentors had a stronger relationship (see Figure 10). This means that the level of implementation of the program had a correlation with how much value, or how favorably, participants viewed the program.

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symmetric Measures</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approx Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominal by Phi</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal Cramer's V</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10

*Implementation Rubric Rankings vs. Value Scores from Survey*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rubric Ranking</th>
<th>Value Score from Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Rubric Ranking vs NT value</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Rubric Ranking vs Mentor value</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Rubric Ranking vs Admin value</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA Support to Mentors Sub-ranking vs Mentor value</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors provide support to new teachers Sub-ranking vs NT value ranking regarding mentor support</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development for New teachers vs NT value ranking regarding professional development</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Highlighted rows show rubric rankings and value scores from survey that have a difference of 0.2 or less.

*Figure 10.* Correlation between value score and implementation score. This scatterplot shows the relationship between the rubric ranking from the implementation rubric as well as the average value score awarded by participants in the survey.
Recommendations

Overall, the New Teacher Induction Program in District A is being implemented and mentors, administrators, and new teachers report seeing value in the program. It is important to note the elements of the program that are most effective and should be continued as well as those that need further attention. Based on the findings of the evaluation, the following recommendations for improvement are provided.

1. **Increase implementation and value placed on videotaping lessons in District A.**

   Videotaping can be an effective tool for new teachers to observe their own teaching and students’ engagement with the class (Rose, 2009). Although the district recognized this need and heavily invested in technology for videotaping, training in using the technology was not made a priority. The use of videotaping needs to be emphasized by implementing training sessions for mentors and new teachers as well as communicating the value videotaping can have on effective feedback sessions between mentors and mentees. The LEA should evaluate whether and how the technology is being used and the impact on the process of improving practice for new teachers.

2. **District A needs to strengthen on-going evaluation of the program to assess impact and implementation.**

   The New Teacher Induction Program proposal from the district indicated that it would evaluate the program throughout the year with end-of-training surveys and pre and post surveys regarding Danielson’s Frameworks. Although the district is asking participants to fill out surveys, they are not being used to evaluate the program for impact and implementation. We recommend that the LEA put more emphasis on using the
surveys to evaluate the impact and learning of the participants and gain understanding of what participants value and do not value during the training sessions.

3. **Maintain strong supports for mentors in District A.**

   The mentors feel prepared and supported in the program so the LEA should continue to maintain the training and supports for mentors as they are an integral part of the induction program.

4. **Maintain purposeful mentor/mentee pairing in District A, especially having mentors in the same subject and grade level.**

   New teachers see strong value in mentors who teach in the same grade level and/or subject area, and most new teachers reported feeling strongly supported by their current mentors. We believe that the purposeful mentor/mentee pairings result in new teachers seeing high value in the program and support systems and should continue to be a priority in future years.

5. **Increase the implementation of on-going supports for new teachers in District A.**

   We recommend greater accountability for mentors in how they use Danielson’s Frameworks so that a common language is implemented throughout the program. This will allow new teachers to see their growth on Danielson’s frameworks, in informal observation and feedback sessions, over time. We also recommend giving mentors guidelines for when observations should take place so that new teachers are receiving feedback when it is most needed. Lead mentors can follow up to ensure that observations take place in a timely manner.
6. **Schoology has low value scores but also low use in District A - this calls for further study.**

   We recommend looking into the use and impact of Schoology in the future to determine if it should be scaled up in use and emphasized as a tool, or eliminated.
 Appendix A

Survey Questions

(A = District A only questions, B = District B only questions)

New Teacher Survey

1. What do you believe is the primary purpose of the induction program?
   a. General support/guidance
   b. Orientation to the school district
   c. Promote standards-based teaching
   d. Classroom management support
   e. Other: please specify

2. Is your mentor currently a full time teacher?
   a. Yes
   b. No

3. Is your mentor a teacher in your building?
   a. Yes
   b. No

4. Does your mentor teach the same subject matter as you?
   a. Yes
   b. No

5. Does your mentor teach the same grade level as you?
   a. Yes
   b. No

6. How much of an impact does your mentor being in the same building have on the support you receive?
   a. Doesn’t have an impact
   b. Has a very little impact
   c. Has somewhat of an impact
   d. Has a significant impact

7. How much of an impact does your mentor teaching the same grade or subject matter has you have on the support you receive?
   a. Doesn’t have an impact
   b. Has a very little impact
   c. Has somewhat of an impact
   d. Has a significant impact

8. How often do you have a face to face meeting with your mentor?
   a. Multiple times a week
   b. Once a week
   c. Twice a month
   d. Once a month
   e. Less than once a month
9. On average, how long are your meetings with your mentor?
   a. Less than 15 minutes
   b. 15-30 minutes
   c. 30 minutes to 1 hour
   d. 1-2 hours
   e. More than 2 hours

10. Do you feel your mentor spends a sufficient amount of time with you?
    a. Yes, it is sufficient
    b. No, I wish we met more frequently or for a longer duration

11. How many times total has your mentor observed your teaching?

12. How many times total have you observed your mentor or another veteran teacher’s class?

13. A-Have you observed veteran teachers based on your target focus area?

14. A-How many times this school year have you been assisted your mentor in evaluating your practice based on Danielson’s Frameworks?

15. A-What value do you place in having your lessons being videotaped in order to received feedback later on?

16. During your formal meetings with your mentor, has your mentor…
    a. Given you suggestions to improve your practice
       i. Yes
       ii. No
    b. Given you encouragement or moral support?
    c. Provided an opportunity for you to raise issues/discuss your individual concerns?
    d. Provided guidance or information on administrative/logistical concerns?
    e. Provided guidance on teaching to meet state or district standards?
    f. Provided guidance on designing lesson plans?
    g. Identified teaching challenges you are facing and possible solutions?
    h. Discussed your instructional goals
       i. Provided guidance on assessment of students?

17. To what extent has your mentor provided guidance on the following:
    a. School culture, policies, and practices
       i. Not at all
       ii. A little
       iii. A moderate amount
       iv. A lot
    b. Handling paperwork
    c. Teaching your subject matter
    d. Teaching your grade level (student development needs)
    e. Reviewing and assessing student work
    f. Implementing classroom management strategies
    g. Managing student discipline and behavior
    h. Reflecting on your instructional practices
       i. Teaching students with disabilities
       j. Teaching ELL students
       k. Motivating students
       l. Creating engaging lessons
18. What topics are most useful that you and your mentor discuss?
19. What topics do you wish you and your mentor discussed more?
20. Do you feel your mentor supports you personally?
   a. No
   b. Somewhat
   c. Yes
21. Do you feel your mentor supports you professionally?
   a. No
   b. Somewhat
   c. Yes
22. How much value do you place in the observations and meetings with your mentor?
   a. None
   b. Very little
   c. Moderate amount
   d. A lot
23. Did you attend a new teacher orientation at the beginning of the school year?
24. If not, why did you not attend the new teacher orientation?
25. If so, what value did you place in having attended new teacher orientation?
26. What topics from new teacher orientation were most helpful in starting the school year?
27. To what extent was the following topics addressed during your Teacher Induction Program professional development sessions (not during your whole school PD sessions)?
   a. Parent relationships
      i. None
      ii. A little
      iii. Moderate amount
      iv. A lot
   b. Classroom management
   c. Instructional techniques/strategies
   d. Content knowledge
   e. Lesson planning
   f. Using assessment data to drive instruction
   g. Student motivation and engagement
   h. Differentiated instruction
   i. Preparing students for standardized testing
28. Overall, how useful did you find the Teacher Induction Program Professional Development sessions?
   a. Not at all useful
   b. Mostly not useful
   c. Mostly useful
   d. Very useful
29. What topics were most helpful?
30. What topics do you wish were covered?
31. Overall, how satisfied are you with your mentor?
   a. Very dissatisfied
   b. Somewhat dissatisfied
   c. Somewhat satisfied
   d. Very satisfied

32. B-How much value do you place in the use of Schoology to support your induction program?
   a. None
   b. Very little
   c. Moderate amount
   d. A lot

33. B-How often do you use Schoology each week?

34. B-What value do you place in the use of Schoology to upload your videotaped observations?

35. B-What value do you place in the use of Schoology to blog with other new teachers?

36. B-What value do you place in the use of Schoology to share with peers?

37. B-How helpful has the iPad Mini been in helping you videotape lessons?

38. For Y2 teachers, how much value do you place in participating in a book study?

39. For Y2 teachers, what elements of a book study have helped you grow as teacher?

40. B-For Y3 teachers, how much value do you place in creating and implementing a professional development plan?

41. A-For Y3 teachers, how much value do you place in creating and implementing an individual growth plan?

42. A-For Y3 teachers, how much value do you place in creating a 5 year professional development plan?

43. B-Have you filled out quarterly surveys with a focus on teacher needs?

44. B-Have you filled out surveys at the end of each professional development workshop?

45. B-Has your administrator and other district personnel walkthrough your classroom this school year? How often?

46. A- Have you filled out surveys at the end of each cycle?

47. Overall, how satisfied are you with the PD you have received through the Teacher Induction program?
   a. Very dissatisfied
   b. Somewhat dissatisfied
   c. Somewhat satisfied
   d. Very satisfied

48. How much do you feel you have incorporated the strategies learned in the induction program to your teaching practice?
   a. Not at all
   b. A little
   c. Moderate amount
   d. A lot

49. Were you aware of what the Teacher Induction Program would entail at the beginning of the year?
   a. Yes
   b. No
50. To what extent has the Teacher Induction program been implemented in the way you were lead to believe?
   a. Not at all
   b. A little
   c. Moderate amount
   d. A lot
Any other comments on the program?

**Mentor Survey**

1. How long have you been teaching?
2. Have you ever been a mentor before?
   a. Yes
   b. No
3. If so, how long have you been a mentor?
4. Are you mentoring teacher(s) that are in the same subject area that you teach?
5. A-Did you attend a mentor training session during New Teacher Orientation?
6. A-If not, why did you not attend a mentor training session during New Teacher Orientation?
7. B-Did you attend a district CIP training session in August?
8. B- If not, why did you not attend a district CIP training session in August?
9. B-Did you attend any other training sessions on mentoring best practices this school year? If so, how many?
10. B-If not, why did you not attend any other training sessions on mentoring best practices this school year?
11. A-What type of support have you received from your lead mentor to help you with the mentoring process this school year?
12. As part of your mentoring preparation, did you receive training in…
   a. Coaching strategies?
   b. Content focused coaching?
   c. Grade level focused coaching?
   d. Giving effective feedback
   e. Working with adult learners
   f. Roles and responsibilities of a mentor
   g. Providing lesson planning strategies
   h. Providing classroom management strategies
   i. Analyzing student work
   j. Encouraging teachers to reflect on their practice
13. What topics in your mentor training were most useful?
14. What topics in your mentor training do you wish had been covered, or covered in more depth?
15. Overall, how well do you believe you were prepared to become a mentor?
   a. Not well prepared
   b. Somewhat prepared
   c. Very well prepared
16. How did you obtain your position as a mentor teacher?
   a. Applied voluntarily
   b. Someone in the district approached me and asked me to apply
   c. Assigned
   d. Other: specify
17. How much value do you place in the training you received?
   a. None
   b. A little
   c. Moderate amount
   d. A lot
18. How many hours per week do you spend providing support to your new teacher?
19. How many hours per month do you spend providing support to your new teacher?
20. A-How many times this school year have you observed your new teacher in their classroom?
21. B-How many times per month have you observed your new teacher in their classroom?
22. A-How many times this school year has your new teacher observed you teach a lesson?
23. A-How many times this school year have you and your new teacher gone to observe another veteran teacher teach a lesson in the new teacher’s targeted area of focus?
24. How many times this school year have you viewed a videotaped lesson of your new teacher and provided feedback?
25. B-Do you use a self-reflection analysis handout while viewing a videotaped lesson of your new teacher?
26. B-How much value do you find in the use of the self-reflection analysis handout for viewing a videotaped lesson?
27. A-How many times this school year have you assisted your new teacher in evaluating their practice based on Danielson’s Frameworks?
28. A-At the end of Cycle 1, did you complete a feedback survey?
29. B-At the end of attending any professional development workshops, have you completed any surveys based on the attended session?
30. How effective do you feel as a mentor?
   a. Not effective
   b. A little effective
   c. Moderately effective
   d. Very effective
31. To what degree do you believe your mentee is implementing the strategies that you provided?
   a. Not at all
   b. A little
   c. Moderate amount
   d. A lot
32. In your opinion, in what ways does the mentoring program support beginning teachers?
33. In your opinion, in what ways can the mentoring program be improved to better support beginning teachers?
34. How much value do you place in the Teacher Induction Program?
   a. Not at all
   b. A little
   c. Moderate amount
   d. A lot

35. Did you have an understanding of what the Teacher Induction program would be at the beginning of the year?
   a. Yes
   b. No

36. To what extent has the Teacher Induction program been implemented in the way you were led to believe?
   a. Not at all
   b. A little
   c. Moderate amount
   d. A lot

Any other comments on the program?

Administrator Survey

1. Overall, do you feel the selection criteria for mentors is appropriate?
   a. Yes
   b. No

2. Overall, do you feel mentors and mentees are matched appropriately?
   a. Yes
   b. No

3. How well prepared do you believe mentors are to work with new teachers?
   a. Not well prepared
   b. Somewhat prepared
   c. Very well prepared

4. On average, how often do you have meetings with lead mentors to discuss the program?
   a. More than once a week
   b. Once a week
   c. Twice a month
   d. Once a month
   e. Less than once a month

5. On average, how often do you have meetings with mentors and discuss their role as a mentor?
   a. More than once a week
   b. Once a week
   c. Twice a month
   d. Once a month
   e. Less than once a month
6. On average, how often do you have meeting with new teachers and discuss the program?
   a. More than once a week
   b. Once a week
   c. Twice a month
   d. Once a month
   e. Less than once a month

7. How often do you complete walkthroughs to observe new teachers?

8. What do you feel is the primary purpose of the induction program?
   a. General support/guidance
   b. Orientation to the school district
   c. Promote standards-based teaching
   d. Classroom management support
   e. Other: please specify

9. Overall, what percentage of new teachers in the building do you see using strategies learned in the Teacher Induction program?
   a. 0-20%
   b. 21-40%
   c. 41-60%
   d. 61-80%
   e. 81-100%

10. To what extent has the Teacher induction program been implemented the way you were led to believe?
    a. Not at all
    b. A little
    c. Moderate amount
    d. A lot

11. How much value do you place in the program?
    a. None
    b. Very little
    c. Moderate amount
    d. A lot
Appendix B

Interview Questions

(A = District A only questions, B = District B only questions)

New Teacher-Year 1

1. Describe your relationship with your mentor
2. How often did you meet with your mentor?
3. How helpful were your meetings with your mentor?
4. What topics/strategies did you and your mentor most often discuss?
5. Did you feel your mentor was effective? Why or why not?
6. Did you feel you incorporated strategies you learned in the program into your teaching? Why or why not?
7. Describe your experiences being observed and observing other teachers.
8. Describe how being videotaped affected your experience with observations.
9. If you used it, describe your experience using Schoology.
10. What were the most beneficial aspects of the induction program?
11. What parts of the induction program were most frustrating?
12. Describe your experiences with the Induction program PD sessions
13. Did you find that PD sessions helpful?
14. B- Were you provided with books during the summer orientation? Were those books useful to you?
15. Is there anything you wish the PD sessions covered?
16. Are there other ways that you interact with the induction program? Describe those interactions.
17. How, if at all, have you been able to provide feedback about the program to your school district other than this interview?
18. What improvements would you make to the Induction program?
19. How much value do you see in the program?
20. Has the program met your expectations? Why or why not?

New Teacher-Year 2

1. Did you feel you incorporated strategies you learned in the program into your teaching? Why or why not?
2. Describe your experiences with the book study
3. What, if any, were the benefits of the book study?
4. If you used it, describe your experience using Schoology.
5. A-Have you been building a portfolio this year? Has this been helpful? How or how not?
6. What were the most beneficial aspects of the induction program?
7. What parts of the induction program were most frustrating?
8. Describe your experiences with the Induction program PD sessions
9. Did you find that PD sessions helpful?
10. Is there anything you wish the PD sessions covered?
11. Are there other ways that you interact with the induction program? Describe those interactions.
12. How, if at all, have you been able to provide feedback about the program to your school district other than this interview?
13. What improvements would you make to the Induction program?
14. How much value do you see in the program?
15. Has the program met your expectations? Why or why not?

New Teacher-Year 3

1. Did you feel you incorporated strategies you learned in the program into your teaching? Why or why not?
2. How much do you think developing your own professional growth plan has helped your focus on your areas of growth?
3. If you used it, describe your experience using Schoology.
4. What were the most beneficial aspects of the induction program?
5. What parts of the induction program were most frustrating?
6. Describe your experiences with the Induction program PD sessions.
7. Did you find those PD sessions helpful?
8. Is there anything you wish the PD sessions covered?
9. Are there other ways that you interact with the induction program? Describe those interactions.
10. How, if at all, have you been able to provide feedback about the program to your school district other than this interview?
11. What improvements would you make to the Induction program?
12. How much value do you see in the program?
13. Has the program met your expectations? Why or why not?

Mentor

1. What training did you receive to fulfill your role as a mentor?
2. Did you feel that your training was sufficient?
3. What did you think the program would be like before it started?
4. How is the program different, if at all, than what you thought it would be?
5. Describe your relationship with your mentee
6. How often did you observe and meet with your mentee?
7. What were the biggest areas of support you believe you provided the mentee with?
8. Did you observe your mentee using strategies you taught them?
9. Do you believe they frequently improved and/or incorporated strategies learned in the induction program into their practice?
10. What types of interactions do you have with administrators, lead mentors, and other district staff?
11. Are there other ways that you interact with the induction program? Describe those interactions.
12. How, if at all, have you been able to provide feedback about the program to your school district other than this interview?
13. What improvements would you make to the induction program?
14. How much value do you see in the program?
15. Has the program met your expectations? Why or why not?

**Administrator**

1. How do mentors get chosen and assigned?
2. Do you conduct meetings with new teachers and/or mentors? Describe those meetings.
3. Do you conduct walkthroughs of the new teachers’ classrooms? How do they work?
4. Describe your interactions with lead mentors and district staff.
5. How, if at all, have you been able to provide feedback about the program to your school district other than this interview?
6. Are there other ways that you interact with the induction program? Describe those interactions.
7. Have you observed new teachers using strategies learned in the program in their practice? Can you share any examples?
8. When you learned of the implementation of an induction program in your district, what were your expectations for it? Does the current program match or exceed these expectations? If so, in what ways?
9. What do you think are the most beneficial aspects of the program?
10. What improvements would you make to the program?
11. How much value do you see in the program?
Appendix C

District A New Teacher-Year 2 Interview Notes

1. Did you feel you incorporated strategies you learned in the program into your teaching? Why or why not?

Yes, already had teaching experience although is considered a new teacher (2nd year) based on when degree was finished. Was a long term substitute teacher (7 years)/already a dance teacher for several years working with young kids.

Incorporated “Grading harder not smarter” strategy /spoke with principal in last meeting and gave feedback about using it/The idea behind the strategy is that you don’t want to see kids fail because of their lack of not turning in work, it’s not based on their ability/don’t fail them because of not turning in work/having an open-ended deadline. Teacher gives suggested deadlines/shows their ability/con-the teacher still has to get grades in by a certain date so the teacher is held accountable to deadlines but student is not/had to put I’s (incompletes) on report card because most students turned in their work, including papers, the same day that grades were due so didn’t have time to grade everything so gave the students I’s on report card. Was questioned by school about why so many students were given I’s/ accountability is still there for teachers/feeling frustration/feels it doesn’t show their ability if they don’t turn in their assignments on time because in a college they would expect work to be turned in on time/a college won’t do this/not showing students anything-a project at work still has to be turned in on time/I have 2 kids and make sure they do their projects before anything else is done during a break/in parent conferences this is discussed.

Don’t see it being very helpful (“Grading harder not smarter” strategy)

Kegan(?) strategy-from NCLB/group kids by mixed ability (each group has a lower level student, mid to low student, mid to high student, and higher level student)/the idea is that students learn from each other/Teachers aren’t teaching the whole time/ students do some of the teaching/learned the strategy this year but also had learned it at a school taught at the year before/within a lesson-teachers teach it, students work independently, then work in groups.

This works for the true academic special education students-they thrive off of working in groups and high level kids do also. However, special education students with behavioral issues have difficulty and cause problems in their groups-they keep the rest of the members from working and distract them/decided to group behavior problems
together/there are more pros than cons/you need to figure out where to group the students to make it effective.
Pros-Teacher isn’t teaching all the time/lets kids be more independent and help them in high school/but it doesn’t work all the time.

Need to change them out (switch groups) every 6-8 weeks? (was not sure of exact time frame) Happens in the middle of marking period
One class has 19 boys and it’s a big behavioral issue class/”social experiment”-placed 4 of the heavy hitters together-these students thought it was cool in the first couple of weeks-teachers keep them on track in beginning-after 4 weeks they said they couldn’t get anything done with the others in their group. One came up to the teacher and said “I can’t be here with these guys”. A second one then asked them to move him to another group. Not causing other people not to get other people to not get work done.

If you followed the book exactly, it might not always work.

2. Did the school site hold you accountable to group students in a specific way (low, mid to low, mid to high, high) or could you change the way you grouped?

Administrators do the walkthroughs-but they did not necessarily know how the groupings were actually set up at the tables/the teachers did state to principals they were going to group that way and they didn’t object.

3. Do the administrators ask to see any paperwork when they walkthrough your classroom?

Administrators do unofficial observations-now it’s sporadic in all different classes/but at first they kept visiting at the same time and teachers were getting “dinged” for a small amount and not seeing how teacher do everything throughout all their classes/10 min observation-when they write report after they use phrasing like “teacher possibly did that before I came in”. This new teacher usually gives them a copy of what students are working on but the administrator might take it with them or they might leave it in the classroom.
30 min formal observations

4. Describe your experiences with the book study.

Book discusses having kids set them up with goals and self-evaluate/the teachers in her book club already do this on a normal basis anyway but they did try to incorporate as much as they could in each class.
Their group included 4 teachers from same school/done together/have little study sessions/included 3 (?) ELA, 1 science, and 1 Spanish teacher. They helped him with how to incorporate the strategies/They gave them sheets they had to grade peers on. Most felt very relaxed with it since they already did most of these strategies. They checked we already it. It was very easy for them except for the Spanish teacher-He only has students for 15 weeks and then changes students (but he cycles them out). He didn’t have as much flexibility to do all that was asked to do. The other teachers have whole marking period to complete a student goal. They can have students come in during lunch to retake test. He can’t do that.

Last year, in the new teacher’s first year, it was very hard to be a co-teacher in a classroom and to be considered special ed. It was hard to implement classroom placement since it was not the new teacher’s classroom to change things around in. Couldn’t have mentor come in to room to make it work. Struggled with last cycle last year. She wrote about this issue on evaluation filled out last year. Thinks it should be modified for special ed teacher since she didn’t have her own room-had to always focus on classroom management. Shared room last year with math teacher and had to ask if it was ok to switch things around.

The book study group meet monthly even it’s just for 15 min They would help everyone out with all the paper work. Included a typical 24-year-old new teacher/the members were all in different places with respect to the amount of experience they had/Spanish teacher had switched from teaching something else?

The meetings acted as more a support for each other and making sure they were completing requirements in a timely manner as opposed to just discussing the book.

5. **What, if any, were the benefits of the book study?**

It was a good book. It gave you good ideas to implement/wasn’t a waste of time-like why do we have to this?/strategies could be done in real life lessons/could keep using the strategies more than once/didn’t just did it to do it.

Nice to have a network of teachers to work with.

Other Y2 teachers in induction program were the only ones in their building. They had to meet at another school to do their lessons since they were all located at different schools. This new teacher has no idea how frustrating that might be since this new teacher had all of her group members at the same school. Their group originally had someone from another building but it didn’t make sense to them to go to the other teacher’s building.
Her kids go to the same school so she would have to bring them home and then travel to another school. It would be hard to travel to other places. She thinks that to make it work those other teachers would have to find alternative ways to meet to make it manageable. “Let’s do it over speaker phone”.

6. **If you used it, describe your experience using Schoology.**

6th & 7th grade kids have iPads. They upload assignments to it. Because of her age, the new teacher struggled with the technology. It’s beneficial/it’s all right there. You can walk around with iPad. If you have a few minutes, you can grade assignments. The new teacher has hockey duty once a week for four hours and would prefer to have paper assignments to grade because there’s no internet in the rink. The new teacher prefers paper assignments. For ELA, it’s much easier to grade on paper and make notes and circle and correct grammar. It’s good for multiple choice items because it grades it for you. But it can be frustrating from an ELA perspective-printing them out and checking them. She can’t read papers on a screen. She goes back and forth on how she feels about Schoology. Some tests have story on one side and questions on the other side. She also has to print out when doing IEP updates and needs to put physical paper in student file. If it done straight on paper, she would already have it done/But if you print assignment from Schoology, it doesn’t print the grade on it and have to go back and find grades and write it on top which takes more time. iPad is so small. School asked why she didn’t use it all the time and they understood. Math never uses it for test because they have to show their work. Science and Social Studies use it all the time.

In the middle on how she feels about it.

It gives flexibility to students to complete the assignment whenever they want-teachers can grade as assignments come in. If it was a paper assignment, then students would have to turn it in all at the same time and the teacher would have to wait to grade it until then. Her child had an assignment over the weekend and was able to submit it before it was due.

7. **Have you been building a portfolio this year? Has this been helpful? How or how not?**

Didn’t ask for a portfolio so we really didn’t focus on it. Everything is right there so if we need anything it’s there in Schoology. She prints everything anyway and needs for special ed work. Not done formally. Mentor in first year said that she had have this huge binder when she was a new teacher years ago but now everything is in Schoology. It’s just a couple of clicks away.
Lead mentors look at Schoology to see everything for each new teacher/teachers keep hard copies of what is scanned in.

8. **What were the most beneficial aspects of the induction program?**

There is a group of you going through the same thing so if you need feedback or need help, you’re not alone. She ran it like mama bear (the book study group)-kept everybody on track it’s nice to know someone there/even if not in building there’s someone to call Our site coordinator is awesome. You email her and she answers questions right away/you need something she sends it her right away. Before she worked as a teacher and a site coordinator at the same time. She had responsibilities as a teacher in addition to her responsibilities as a site coordinator.

Wonderful this year/so available to us/nice to have someone in the district and not have other responsibilities

Nice to have one on one mentor in 1st year.

9. **What parts of the induction program were most frustrating?**

When not being specialized, it’s written for a whole umbrella of teachers. Very frustrated last year that you couldn’t do everything that you were supposed to.

Can any only imagine being younger and help someone who has never had experience/not dealing with it alone. A second year she spoke to said she felt like she had more support this year but felt like she couldn’t do everything she needed to do for her students last year.

Her mentor was always there and she felt she could go to her mentor to just vent/it didn’t mean anything and the mentor wouldn’t go tell anyone and report what she said.

10. **Describe your experiences with the Induction program PD sessions.**

Went to IEP PD and outside PD/just book study for induction program.

All the new teachers (Y2?) met once at beginning of school year and get into little teams for book study. 
One more meeting as a whole district would have been nice.
She would pass on info to site coordinator and then site coordinator would share with other teachers.
11. Did you find that PD sessions helpful?

n/a

12. Is there anything you wish the PD sessions covered?

Wanted a second meeting that would act as a check-in point midyear-how is everyone doing/have you done visits/is it making sense/nice to hear from other schools.

She already had training specific to special training
More stressful to add additional trainings.
More important to have training specific to subject-area/specialty.

Science teacher had to get kit training. It would have been more stressful to add more training to everything else asked of her to do. Already have to do other PD with school/evaluation training.

13. Are there other ways that you interact with the induction program? Describe those interactions.

no

14. How, if at all, have you been able to provide feedback about the program to your school district other than this interview?

Did not get an official survey this year/last year had a survey but met more frequently/always sent concerns straight by email to site coordinator/wouldn’t mind filling one out/it’s site coordinator’s whole job so she might have more time to look at email suggestions to apply immediately in program (this was her theory as to why there was no formal survey)

15. What improvements would you make to the Induction program?

Tailor to your subject area

16. How much value do you see in the program?

Extremely valuable-it feels like something else you have to do/it’s the people going through the same thing as you.

17. Has the program met your expectations? Why or why not?

It definitely met it. It was very useful. Last year was more frustrated trying to complete tasks.
Appendix D

District A Administrator Interview Notes

1. **How do mentors get chosen and assigned?**

   The school site looks at the new teacher to be hired and makes a decision on which mentor to pair with the new teacher. The first goal is to pair the new teacher with a department chair and then to make sure they are paired with a mentor who teaches the same courses. They also look at personality traits.

2. **Do you conduct meetings with new teachers and/or mentors? Describe those meetings.**

   Yes-meet with mentors/talk about process/how to support new teachers.

   Instructional coaches oversee mentoring programs/conduct sessions in addition to what district requires/Sessions include ways to get to know each other like ice breakers/discuss what’s happening in the schools.

   Mentes-meet 1 on 1 with instructional coaches in addition to meeting with mentors.

   When new teachers come in, meeting with principal in 1st month.

   Administrators check in with new teachers every month/2 walkthroughs (10-15 min each) per month. They provide feedback electronically with suggestions made for support.

   These walkthroughs are in addition to regular observations.

   Topics of the meetings-teacher needs at the time/what’s happening in the school year (i.e. open house)

   New teachers have access to administrators at any time informally.

3. **Do you conduct walkthroughs of the new teachers’ classrooms? How do they work?**

   See above
4. **Describe your interactions with lead mentors and district staff.**

Lead mentor and site coordinator works with instructional coach to organize district side of the program.

Meet with lead mentor weekly (The lead mentor is an instructional coach at the school)

The school has 2 instructional coaches:

- English coach that teaches 2 classes—also fluent with Spanish
- Math & Science that teaches 2 classes—

Outside of teaching those 2 classes, they then provide support to the school in the other class blocks.

Coaches help with everybody—They are unique to the school (not mandated by district). The assistant principal had worked with coaches at a previous school and suggested bringing in similar support so they piloted this feature at their school site.

(school is on block schedule)

They have 16 new teachers (staff of over 100)—which is kind of a normal amount.

“An instructional coach is an effective support which is non-threatening (since they are not in a supervisory role).” People feel more comfortable than sharing with direct supervisor.

5. **How, if at all, have you been able to provide feedback about the program to your school district other than this interview?**

Informally/no talks to lead mentors/District told them they can do anything additional they want with the induction program.

No formal survey/don’t know what the principal does.
6. **Are there other ways that you interact with the induction program? Describe those interactions.**

Nothing at district level

School level—meet with instructional coaches every week—conversation about how to support new teachers and then coaches talk to lead mentors

Makes sure supports are there for new teacher.

Casual talks with new teachers/conduct walkthroughs.

7. **Have you observed new teachers using strategies learned in the program in their practice? Can you share any examples?**

Yes, through walkthroughs (2 a month)

Coaches in addition to mentors and department chair and supervisor

School site goals are to:

a. focus on collaboration in the classroom
b. higher order thinking and making assessments

They are a learning focus school (LFS). The school site goals came from district walkthroughs and the resulting feedback provided. They are also had a curriculum review (CSR-didn’t know what S stood for in acronym) that came from DOE-These goals were incorporated in their school success plan (SSP). They also looked at results from SAT/Smarter Balanced/AP exams to develop goals.

Coaches do this work through PLCs, cycle of inquiry

For unique new teacher needs—mentor helps with the day to day going-on’s of the classroom

Instructional coaches do cycle trainings—new topics every 4-5 weeks (Attend training/make plan/observe/provide feedback). Topics include classroom management
techniques, using technology in the classroom

DPAS observations also allow administrators to diagnose teacher needs and formally provide support based on that.

8. **When you learned of the implementation of an induction program in your district, what were your expectations for it? Does the current program match these expectations? In what ways?**

Initial expectations-Just to have teachers supported successfully/ no formal information was provided/learned about program through lead mentor/heard they would have different topics they would cover including the DPAS process. They would also be able to see other teachers and observe them as well as be provided with 1 on 1 support.

Current program exceeds initial expectations-exceeds through the instructional coaches their school site provides. Exceeds through the supervisors who have no formal requirements but add a personal touch of checking in and providing support to new teachers (some administrators provide more support than others). Now only do they conduct walkthroughs but follow through with feedback after it. Administrators constantly know how new teacher is doing.

This School site has 4 administratoes-1 principal and 3 assistant principals

9. **What do you think are the most beneficial aspects of the program?**

   It’s a formal process to ensure that everything that needs to happen be learned about by the new teacher and is addressed.

   Emphasis on all the important things that need to be done by new teacher

10. **What improvements would you make to the program?**

    Admin/mentor/coaches should talk to district about what supports are needed at their specific school site so the program can be tailored to the school (customized). All that is asked of new teacher can be overwhelming. District may find that all that they want may not be necessary for a particular school site, depending what the school site may already be implementing as support.
11. How much value do you see in the program?

A “10” (being the highest score)

Additional Comments:
Mentors could use a more formalized training. They need more practice on how to approach a new teacher—be aware of the emotional cycles of being a new teacher. Not sure if mentors received any training before school started or in first month/might not. Does know that mentors attended training with mentee to discuss paperwork and conduct bonding activities/Then they met a few times over the year at the district level to receive training with mentee.
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