

Indicator: The LEA/School offers an induction program to support new teachers in their first years of teaching. (5157)

Explanation: The evidence review indicates that an effective induction program serves as an impactful bridge between pre service teacher training and real time in classroom practice. A supportive induction program meets the distinct learning needs of new teachers while in their teaching novitiate. High performing LEAs and schools provide induction programs, which aim to improve the competencies of those new to teaching, advance the personal and professional self-esteem of new teachers in effort to increase the retention rates of novice teachers. Quality induction programs appear to have the following tenets in common: trained mentors for new teachers, routinely structured observations, targeted professional development opportunities, formative evaluations structures, actively involved administrators, a supportive school culture, reflective thinking about professional practices, research based, and all share a common vision for knowledge, teaching, and learning.

Questions: What process will the LEA/school use to establish a quality induction program for those new to teaching? How will the LEA/school aim to increase new teacher competencies? How will the LEA/school increase new teacher self-esteem and confidence? How will the LEA/school develop a mentor pipeline for new teachers? How will the LEA/school support and train mentors in that role? How will the LEA/school develop an induction program that promotes active administration involvement? How will the LEA/school integrate existing evaluation systems into the induction program?

Evidence Review:

Our definition of quality teacher induction builds on the work of Feiman-Nemser's (2001a) continuum of learning-to-teach, Britton, Paine, Pimm, and Raizen's (2003) conception of comprehensive induction, and Odell and Huling's (2000) quality mentoring framework. We define quality teacher induction as *the multi-faceted process of teacher development and novice teachers' continued learning-to-teach through an organized professional development program of educative mentor support and formative assessment*. A quality induction program enhances teacher learning through a multi-faceted, multi-year system of planned and structured activities that support novice teachers' developmentally-appropriate professional development in their first through third year of teaching (Alliance for Excellent Education (AEE), 2004; Ingersoll & Smith, 2004; Stanulis, Burrill, & Ames, 2007). Quality induction provides a bridge between teacher preparation and practice that supports the distinct learning needs of new teachers during their initial years of teaching.

Within induction research and conceptual work, three frameworks influence the way an induction program is designed. First, induction is often viewed as a *transitional phase in teacher development* between pre-service and in-service professional growth during which novice teachers are evolving from students of teaching to teachers of students (Feiman-Nemser et al., 1999). According to Ingersoll and Smith (2004), one component of a comprehensive induction system involves a guidance program for novice teachers during their transition into teaching. Induction grounded in the view of induction as a transitional stage of teacher development emphasis activities such as setting up classrooms or initiating classroom management routines.

Second, induction is commonly perceived as a *socialization process* in which novice teachers acclimate to school and district cultures where powerful school cultural norms often persuade novices to adapt to the status quo of schooling (Feiman-Nemser, 2001b; Kelchtermans & Ballet (2002). Peterson (2005), Quartz & TEP Research Group (2003), and the Urban Teacher Collaborative (2000) write about the culture shock novice teachers encounter when first faced with classroom realities. Induction focused on socialization emphasizes the development of skills that help novices feel like they fit into the teacher culture. Induction for socialization emphasizes orientation and other induction activities that stress novice teachers' acclimation to the school climate (Horn, Sterling, Blair, & Metler-Armijo, 2006).

Finally, induction is frequently viewed as a *coherent, comprehensive system of intensive support, professional development, and formative assessment for novice teachers lasting from one to three years* (Alliance for Excellent Education (AEE), 2004; Bartell, 2005; Olebe, 2001; Villani, 2002). Researchers and practitioners who hold this view of induction concentrate on helping novice teachers learn subject matter knowledge and pedagogical skills that develop and deepen over time. This induction focus is often grounded in teaching, as well as content standards. We believe that there are critical elements of all three conceptualizations of induction that are necessary to ground quality induction programs and contribute to the richness and reflective nature of an effective induction process.

Induction Program Goals. Although modified by particular local contexts, commonly accepted goals of teacher induction have remained relatively consistent over time with different emphases in various waves of induction (Alliance for Excellent Education (AEE), 2004; Fox & Singletary, 1986; Wood, 2001). As more was learned about teacher development in first to fourth-wave induction programs, teacher well-being and retention were recognized as insufficient purposes for induction. Because fourth-wave programs developed in a time of assessment and accountability mandates and increasingly more diverse K-12 student populations, these fourth-wave programs place more emphasis on: (a) teacher quality, (b) developing a teaching practice for diverse learners (Darling-Hammond & Baratz-Snowden, 2005), and (c) increasing student achievement through improving teacher performance (Alliance for Excellent Education (AEE), 2004; Arends & Rigazio-DiGilio, 2000; Fletcher, Strong, & Villar, 2008). To date, goals of quality induction are to:

- Increase novice teachers' retention,
- Promote novice teacher personal and professional well-being,
- Improve teacher competence,
- Improve students' academic achievement through improving teacher performance,
- Satisfy mandated requirements related to induction and certification.

Program Components: Induction Content. Fourth-wave induction studies identify a somewhat consistent set of program components. These program components are listed in order of prominence in fourth-wave induction programs. Quality induction programs usually encompass the first six components, and inclusion of the last three components is less frequent with little descriptive or empirical research on these components. Our position is that quality induction should include all of the following nine program components (Alliance for Excellent Education (AEE), 2004; Bartell, 2005; Olebe, Jackson, & Danielson, 1999; Wood, 2001). They include:
(1) Educative mentors' preparation and mentoring of novice teachers,
(2) Reflective inquiry and teaching practices,
(3) Systematic and structured observations,

- (4) Developmentally appropriate professional development,
- (5) Formative teacher assessment,
- (6) Administrators' involvement in induction,
- (7) A school culture supportive of novice teachers,
- (8) Program evaluation and/or research on induction,
- (9) A shared vision of knowledge, teaching, and learning.

(Wood, A. L., & Stanulis, R. N. (2009, pp. 2–5)

Educative mentoring relies on developing an explicit vision of quality teaching and of teacher learning where mentors interact with novice teachers in ways that help them learn in and from their practice (Feiman-Nemser, 2001b). Quality educative mentors are prepared to use specific mentoring practices (Feiman-Nemser, 2001b) and focus on helping novices learn to teach along professional standards of teaching and learning (Odell & Huling, 2000).

In quality induction programs, mentors enact their practice in specific ways. These include interacting regularly with their assigned novice teachers (Arends & Rigazio-DiGilio, 2000); conducting formative assessment observations (Alliance for Excellent Education (AEE), 2004; Ames, Stanulis, & VanZee, 2006; Moir, 2003; Moir & Stobbe, 1995; Strong & Baron, 2004; Wood, 1999); reflecting with novice teachers on their strengths and areas of need for further growth (Wood, 1999); and coplanning and coteaching to strengthen the novice's instruction and classroom learning environment (Feiman-Nemser et al., 1999; Kershaw, Blank, Benner, & Cagle, 2006).

Mentor Selection. The selection of teachers as mentors is a critical component of induction programs (Arends & Rigazio-DiGilio, 2000; Gless, 2004). Since helping adults develop involves a distinct skill set from helping K-12 students learn, some mentoring programs seek indicators of excellence in multiple areas. For example, the mentor selection process in the *Launch into Teaching through Comprehensive Induction Program* at Michigan State University consists of interviews of potential mentors to try to uncover teachers' skills in articulating their thinking in order to help novice teachers think about decisions they are making in their own teaching practice (Stanulis, 2006).

Mentor selection criteria in quality induction programs include:

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

(Wood, A. L., & Stanulis, R. N. (2009, pp. 5–6)

According to Ingersoll (2012), "Beginners are now the largest group within one of the largest occupations in the nation, and these beginners have steadily become more prone to quickly leave

teaching. All of this suggests a strong increase in the need for support programs. [O]ur data indicate that over the past couple of decades, the number of induction programs also has grown considerably. The percentage of beginning teachers who report that they participated in some kind of induction program in their first year of teaching has steadily increased in recent decades—from about 50% in 1990 to 91% by 2008. Moreover, these percentages don't tell the whole story. The large increase in the number of first-year teachers...has meant that, numerically, far more beginners are receiving support. In 1991, about 61,000 first-year teachers participated in an induction or mentoring program; by 2008, this had almost trebled, to about 179,000. As of the 2010–11 school year, 27 states required some kind of induction program for new teachers (Goldrick et al., 2012).

“However, while most beginning teachers now participate in some kind of formal induction program, the kinds of support that schools provide to them vary. The most recent data available—from the 2007-08 school year—show that the most common induction activity that beginners participated in was having regular supportive communication with their principal, other administrators, or their department chair (87%). Slightly fewer beginning teachers, about 80%, said they received ongoing guidance and feedback from a mentor teacher. Just over half of beginning teachers said they had common collaboration and planning time with other teachers in the same subject area. Interestingly, almost one-third received extra classroom assistance, such as a teacher aide. On the other hand, fewer than 20% of beginning teachers reported receiving a reduced teaching load or schedule to ease their transition—a support that is probably more common for beginning professors in higher education” (Ingersoll, 2012, pp. 49–50).

In answering the question, “Does participation in induction slow the high attrition rate of beginners?” Ingersoll (2012) found, “After controlling for the background characteristics of teachers and schools, we did find a link between beginning teachers’ participation in induction programs and their retention. But we also found that the strength of the effect depended on the types and number of supports that beginning teachers received. Participation in some types of activities in the first year was more effective at reducing turnover than participation in other types. The factors with the strongest effect were having a mentor teacher from one’s subject area and having common planning or collaboration time with other teachers in one’s subject area” (Ingersoll, 2012, p. 50).

References and Resources

- Alliance for Excellent Education (AEE). (2004). *Tapping the Potential: Retaining and Developing High-Quality New Teachers*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <http://chalkboardproject.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/ment-15.pdf>
- Ames, K. T., Stanulis, R. N., & VanZee, D. (2006). *Moving Beyond Superficial Conversations: Mentoring Beginning Teachers in Literacy*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Reading Conference. Los Angeles, CA.
- Arends, R. I., & Rigazio-DiGilio, A. J. (2000). *Beginning Teacher Induction: Research and Examples of Contemporary Practice*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Japan-United States Teacher Education Consortium. Tokyo, Japan. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED450074.pdf>
- Bartell, C. (2005). *Cultivating High-Quality Teaching through Induction and Mentoring*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Britton, E., Paine, L., Pimm, D., & Raizen, S. (2003). *Comprehensive Teacher Induction: Systems for Early Career Learning*. Boston, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

- Costa, A. L., & Garmston, R. J. (2002). *Cognitive Coaching: A Foundation for Renaissance Schools* (2nd ed.). Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers.
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Baratz-Snowden, J. (2005). *A Good Teacher in Every Classroom: Preparing the Highly Qualified Teachers Our Children Deserve*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Feiman-Nemser, S. (2001a). From Preparation to Practice: Designing a Continuum to Strengthen and Sustain Teaching. *Teachers College Record*, 103(6), 1013–1055. Retrieved from http://www.brandeis.edu/mandel/questcase/Documents/Readings/Feiman_Nemser.pdf
- Feiman-Nemser, S. (2001b). Helping Novices Learn to Teach: Lessons from an Exemplary Support Teacher. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52(1), 17–30. Retrieved from <http://ncrtl.msu.edu/http/rreports/html/pdf/rr916.pdf>
- Feiman-Nemser, S., Schwille, S., Carver, C., & Yusko, B. (1999). *A Conceptual Review of Literature on New Teacher Induction*. Washington, DC: National Partnership for Excellence and Accountability in Teaching. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED449147.pdf>
- Fletcher, S., Strong, M., & Villar, A. (2008). An Investigation of the Effects of Variations in Mentor-based Induction on the Performance of Students in California. *Teachers College Record*, 110(10), 2271–2289. Retrieved from http://www.researchgate.net/publication/228654314_An_investigation_of_the_effects_of_variations_in_mentor-based_induction_on_the_performance_of_students_in_California
- Fox, S., & Singletary, T. (1986). Deductions about Support Induction. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 37(1), 12–15.
- Gless, J. (2004). *Mentor Teacher Selection*. Santa Cruz, CA: The New Teacher Center at the University of California.
- Gold, Y. (1996). Beginning Teacher Support: Attrition, Mentoring, and Induction. In J. Sikula, T. Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education* (2nd ed., pp. 548–594). New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Horn, P. J., Sterling, H. A., Blair, H. C., & Metler-Armijo, K. (2006). *Induction Strategies for Future Teachers*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE). San Diego, CA. Retrieved from http://citation.allacademic.com/meta/p_mla_apa_research_citation/0/3/5/9/7/pages35975/p35975-1.php
- Ingersoll, R. (2012). Beginning Teacher Induction: What the Data Tell Us. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 93(8), 47–51. Retrieved from <http://pdk.sagepub.com/content/93/8/47.full.pdf+html>
http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2012/05/16/kappan_ingersoll.h31.html
- Ingersoll, R. M., & Smith, T. M. (2004). Do Teacher Induction and Mentoring Matter? *NASSP Bulletin*, 88(638), 28–40. Retrieved from http://repository.upenn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1134&context=gse_pubs
- Kelchtermans, G., & Ballet, K. (2002). The Micropolitics of Teacher Induction: A Narrative-Biographical Study of Teacher Socialization. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 18(1), 105–120. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0742051X01000531>
- Kershaw, C., Blank, M., Benner, S., & Cagle, L. (2006). *Talented Teachers as Leaders in Supporting Their Beginning Colleagues: The Urban Specialist Certificate and Mentoring and Induction Programs*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education. San Diego, CA.
- Levine, M. (2008). *PDS Pathways: The Preparation and Induction of New Teachers in Learning Communities*. Denver, CO: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality (NCCTQ)

- Issue Forum. Retrieved from
<http://www.gtlcenter.org/sites/default/files/docs/MarshaLevine.pdf>
- Moir, E. (2003). *Launching the Next Generation of Teachers through Quality Induction*. Paper prepared for the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. 2003 Annual Commissioners and Partner States' Symposium. Retrieved from
<http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED479764.pdf>
- Moir, E., & Gless, J. (2001). Quality Induction: An Investment in Teachers. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 28(1), 109–114. Retrieved from
<http://search.proquest.com/docview/222893605/fulltext/C7831BFA644A46A9PQ/1?accountid=14270>
- Norman, P. J., & Feiman-Nemser, S. (2005). Mind Activity in Teaching and Mentoring. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21(6), 679–697. Retrieved from
<https://doi.org/doi:10.1016/j.tate.2005.05.006>
- Odell, S. J., & Huling, L. (Eds.). (2000). *Quality Mentoring for Novice Teachers*. Indianapolis, IN: Association of Teacher Educators & Kappa Delta Pi.
- Olebe, M. (2001). A Decade of Policy Support for California's New Teachers: The Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Program. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 28(1), 71–84. Retrieved from
http://teqjournal.org/Back%20Issues/Volume%2028/VOL28%20PDFS/28_1/v28n1_olebe.pdf
- Peterson, M. (2005). Hazed! *Educational Leadership*, 62(8), 20–23. Retrieved from
<http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/may05/vol62/num08/Hazed!.aspx>
- Quartz, H., & TEP Research Group. (2003). "Too Angry to Leave": Supporting New Teachers' Commitment to Transform Urban Schools. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 54(2), 99–111. Retrieved from <http://jte.sagepub.com/content/54/2/99.full.pdf+html>
<http://idea2.gseis.ucla.edu/publications/utec/reports/pdf/rrs-rr001-0902.pdf>
- Stanulis, R. N. (2006). Keeping Content and Context Central: District-based Comprehensive Induction in the Michigan State University/Teachers for a New Era Induction Program. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. San Francisco, CA.
- Stanulis, R. N., Burrill, G., & Ames, K. T. (2007). Fitting In and Learning to Teach: Tensions in Developing a Vision for a University-based Induction Program for Beginning Teachers. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 34(3), 135–147. Retrieved from
<http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ795180.pdf>
- Strong, M., & Baron, W. (2004). An Analysis of Mentoring Conversations with Beginning Teachers: Suggestions and Responses. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20(1), 47–57.
- Urban Teacher Collaborative. (2000). *The Urban Teacher Challenge: Teacher Demand and Supply in the Great City Schools*. Belmont, MA: Recruiting New Teachers.
- Villani, S. (2002). *Comprehensive Mentoring Programs for New Teachers: Models of Induction and Support*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Wood, A. L. (1999). How Can New Teachers Become the BEST? In M. Scherer (Ed.), *A Better Beginning: Supporting and Mentoring New Teachers* (pp. 116–123). Alexandria, VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development. Retrieved from
<http://www.ascd.org/publications/books/199236/chapters/How-Can-New-Teachers-Become-the-BEST%C2%A2.aspx>
- Wood, A. L. (2001). What Does Research Say about Teacher Induction and IHE/LEA Collaborative Programs? *Issues in Teacher Education*, 10(2), 69–81.

Wood, A. L., & Stanulis, R. N. (2009). Quality Teacher Induction: "Fourth-Wave" (1997-2006) Induction Programs. *The New Educator*, 5(1), pp 1–23. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/EJ868911.pdf>

©2015 Academic Development Institute