2016

An Evaluation of Mentoring, Self-Efficacy, and Teacher Retention in an Induction Program

Sherri Latonya Henry
Walden University

Walden University

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

This is to certify that the doctoral study by

Sherri Henry

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee
Dr. Ann Jablonski, Committee Chairperson, Education Faculty
Dr. Gloria Jacobs, Committee Member, Education Faculty
Dr. Michelle Brown, University Reviewer, Education Faculty

Chief Academic Officer

Eric Riedel, Ph.D.

Walden University
2016

Abstract

An Evaluation of Mentoring, Self-Efficacy, and Teacher Retention in an Induction Program

by

Sherri L. Henry

MA, Prairie View A&M University, 2002

BS, Lamar University, 1997

Doctoral Study Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Walden University

November 2016

Abstract

Several decades of research have shown that quality teacher induction programs are effective in providing support to beginning teachers, improving teachers' performance, and increasing teachers' self-efficacy. A large urban school district implemented a new teacher induction program and the purpose of this quantitative study was to examine the program using beginning teachers' perceptions of program effectiveness, the mentor-mentee relationship, intention to remain in teaching, and self-efficacy scores. Bandura's self-efficacy theory provided the framework for this study. Research questions examined the relationships among the 4 variables of interest as well as the differences in each by the number of years of participation in the induction program. A modified version of the Teacher Efficacy Survey was used to obtain data from 124 beginning teachers in their 1st, 2nd, or 3rd year of the induction program. Pearson product-moment correlations resulted in statistically significant direct relationships between induction program effectiveness and self-efficacy, induction program effectiveness and mentor-mentee relationship, and mentor-mentee relationship and self-efficacy. Analysis of variance was used to examine differences in the dependent variables by group based upon year in the program. There were no significant differences found among the groups. Insufficient variance for the intention to remain in teaching variable precluded further analysis. Recommendations for future research included examining the fidelity of implementation of the new teacher induction program. Implications for positive social change include providing initial research findings to the study district's administration on the relationships between teachers' perceptions of the induction program effectiveness, the mentor-mentee relationship, intention to remain in teaching, and self-efficacy scores.

An Evaluation of Mentoring, Self-Efficacy, and Teacher Retention in an Induction Program

by

Sherri L. Henry

MA, Prairie View A&M University, 2002

BS, Lamar University, 1997

Doctoral Study Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Walden University

November 2016

Table of Contents

List of Tables v

Section 1: The Problem 1

Introduction 1

Definition of the Problem 3

Rationale 4

Evidence of the Problem at the Local Level 4

Evidence of the Problem from the Professional Literature 4

Definitions 5

Significance 5

Guiding Research Questions and Hypotheses 6

Review of the Literature 9

Theoretical Framework 10

Teacher Self-efficacy Related to Burnout and Retention 12

Teacher Retention 13

Mentoring 17

Effective Mentor-Mentee Relationships 18

Evaluation Research on Mentoring Programs 20

Summary of Literature Review 21

Implications for Social Change 22

Summary 22

Section 2: The Methodology 23

Introduction 23

Research Design and Approach 24
Setting and Sample 25
Instrumentation and Materials 27
Self-Efficacy Measure 29
Mentor-Mentee Relationship and the Induction Program 30
Demographic Data 31
Instrument Reliability and Validity 31
Survey Administration and Data Collection Process 32
Assumptions, Limitations, Scope and Delimitations 33
Assumptions 33
Limitations 33
Scope and Delimitations 33
Protection of Participant Rights 33
Data Analysis Results 34
Self-Efficacy 37
Retention 39
Mentor-Mentee Relationship 39
Induction Program 40
Conclusion 41
Section 3: The Project 43
Introduction 43
Description and Goals 43
Rationale 44

Review of the Literature 44
Principal's Role in the Induction Program.... 45
Criteria, Roles, and Training of Effective Mentors 47
Evaluation Models 50
Program Evaluation 52
Project Description....53
Potential Resources and Existing Supports.... 54
Potential Barriers 54
Implementation and Timetable 55
Roles and Responsibilities of Student and Others 55
Project Implications 56
Local Community 56
Far-Reaching.... 56
Conclusion 57
Section 4**:** Reflections and Conclusions 58
Introduction....58
Project Strengths and Limitations....58
Recommendations for Alternative Approaches....59
Scholarship....61
Project Development....61
Leadership and Change....62
Reflection on the Importance of the Work 63
Implications, Applications, and Directions for Future Research....63

Conclusion 64

References 66

Appendix A: Evaluation Report 78

Appendix B: Beginning Teacher Survey Instrument 88

Appendix C: Alief Independent School District Teacher Induction Survey 91

Appendix D: Research Question and Survey Alignment 99

Appendix E: Permission Letter For Ohio State Teacher Efficacy Scale 101

Appendix F: Permission to Use Mentoring and Induction Survey From The Author 102

Appendix G: Invitation Email Letter by Year of the Program 103

List of Tables

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of Participants 27

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of the Self-Efficacy, Mentoring, Induction Program, and Remain in Teaching Variables 29

Table 3. Correlations of efficacy, mentoring, and induction program variables 37

Section 1: The Problem

Introduction

Contemporary teacher induction programs aim to improve the performance and retention of new hires. Since their beginning in the late 1970s, teacher induction programs have encompassed five common goals: (a) to improve teacher performance, (b) to increase teacher retention, (c) to promote the personal and professional wellbeing of teachers, (d) to satisfy mandated requirements related to induction, and (e) to convey the culture of the system to beginning teachers (Huling-Austin, 1988).

During the 1980s, teacher induction programs, also known as mentoring programs, became an increasing familiar idea in the education field (Feimen-Nemser, 2012). Providers regard these programs as bridges to help transition new teachers into their role (Ingersoll, 2012). Research on induction programs and mentoring over the past 50 years shows a paradigm shift from easing teachers into their roles to working in a collaborative learning community (Hudson, 2012; Huling-Austin, 1988; Kane & Francis, 2013). Teacher induction programs provide support to help relieve teachers from the sink or swim mentality that has been associated with the first year of teaching.

Gless (2012) had stated that the conditions of success for any induction programs must include quality-trained mentors, principals that value the program, and structures at the campus level that build efficacy in new teachers. Gless further identified five components that are essential for induction program success: (a) capable instructional mentors, (b) effective principals, (c) support structures for beginning teachers, (d) strong program leaders, and (e) ongoing program evaluation.

Ingersoll (2012) considered induction programs as "an education reform whose time has come" (p. 47). Pre-employment teacher preparation courses are no longer sufficient to meet the demands of teaching today successfully. Districts must provide support for beginning teachers to learn how to develop skills to succeed in teaching. Induction programs that offer multiple components have a stronger indicator of whether or not beginning teachers would stay or leave the profession (Ingersoll, 2012).

Teacher attrition in the first 5 years of teaching is still a problem across the United States of America. As an example, according to the Texas Education Agency (2013), during the 2011-2012 school year, attrition rates were at the highest level in recent years. More than a decade ago, Darling-Hammond (2003) attributed high attrition rates to unprepared and unsupported teachers. Darling-Hammond has suggested strong induction and mentoring programs as a way in districts can improve their retention rates.

In line with the current research on educational practice, the school district for this study implemented an induction program 4 years ago. The school district, however, has not had the opportunity to evaluate the effectiveness of its teacher induction program. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the effectiveness of the program as it relates to new teacher self-efficacy and the mentor-mentee relationship. The current study involves this evaluative task for a few reasons. First, clarifying the link between self-efficacy of new teachers as it relates to participating in the induction program may help the district improve the retention rate. Second, examining the mentor and mentee relationship may provide the district with insight on what mentor teachers need to be effective in their roles. Third, examining the effectiveness of the program's goals as it relates to retaining

teachers in the profession at Year 1, Year 2, and Year 3 of induction may provide the district with information on how to improve the program.

Definition of the Problem

An urban school district in a large metropolitan city implemented a 3-year teacher induction program that is required for teachers new to the district. The teacher induction program is design to support teachers new to the district during their first 3 years of teaching; however, this induction program has lacked a formative evaluation since its implementation 4 years ago.

The purpose of the program is to assist new hires in transitioning to a new job, connecting with colleagues in the same content area, and meeting district personnel who will provide support. The program design also provides for training on district initiatives and content specific instruction and curriculum during the first 3 years of hire. The first year, new hires attend teacher induction week; which is one component of the teacher induction program. During the 2014-2015 school year, the district reported 500 teachers in attendance for the teacher induction week (Professional Development Coordinator, personal communication, February 10, 2015).

Teacher induction week occurs 1 week before the start of the school year. During this time, new hires receive their list of required professional development sessions, called graduate studies coursework, for the current school year. Teachers new to the district sign a contract that includes 5 days of professional development each year for the first 3 years. The contract also requires new teachers to complete 35 professional development hours each year for the first 3 years of employment with the district (Professional Development Coordinator, personal communication, February 10, 2015).

During the first year, beginning teachers are assigned a mentor teacher. The role of the teacher mentor is to provide guidance and support for the beginning teacher.

The second and third components of the induction program involve attending professional development courses during the school year and the summer. At the start of second and third year, participants in the induction program received a list of their essential courses that require completion during the school year.

Rationale

This section will discuss the rationale and provide evidence of the problem at the local level and evidence from the professional literature.

Evidence of the Problem at the Local Level

The idea to conduct an evaluation of the induction program came about in an informal meeting with the program coordinator and the researcher. The program coordinator indicated that no formal evaluation of the induction program had been conducted since its implementation 4 years ago. The program coordinator further indicated the value of a formative evaluation would provide the district with information for immediate changes and continued improvement for the program. The evaluation contains an examination of the program's goals as it relates to self-efficacy of beginning teachers, the mentor and mentee relationship, and teacher retention.

Evidence of the Problem from the Professional Literature

Gless (2012) explained that teacher induction programs have an impact on student success through program evaluation, mentor development, and principal leadership. Because induction programs are seen as having an impact on teacher retention and success, evaluating the effectiveness of the local program is imperative. Stakeholders of

an induction program need to be informed what services are working and which ones need improvement. Wood and Stanulis (2009) believed an evaluation of an induction program is essential because it identifies areas of improvement, keeps the program focus on beginning teachers' needs and provides feedback on how well the program is functioning. A formative evaluation may support a more effective induction program.

Definitions

Beginning teacher: A teacher with 3 years or less experience in teaching (Odell, 1990).

Formative evaluations: Provides feedback on how improve or change the current practices of the thing that is currently being studied (Lodico, Spaulding & Voegtle, 2006).

Mentoring: A relationship between an experienced teacher and inexperienced teacher where the experienced teacher offers support through reciprocal growth and learning (Lipton & Wellman, 2003).

Self-efficacy: One's belief in one's ability to succeed in specific situations (Bandura, 1971).

Teacher induction: A process that supports, trains, prepares and retains new teachers through a culture of professional growth (Wong, 2002).

Significance

An evaluation of the teacher induction program is important for several reasons. First, the district's induction program has never had a systematic evaluation since its implementation 4 years ago. By conducting an evaluation, the district is able to determine

if the induction program is worth the invested time and cost for implementing the program. Ingersoll and Strong (2011) noted that induction programs vary in financial costs and depending upon the budget, policy makers have to make decisions about what programs to fund. Secondly, examining the relationship between self-efficacy of beginning teachers and participation in the district's induction program provides the district with relevant information to improve the retention rate. Third, exploring the mentor and mentee relationship provides the district with an understanding of what is needed to help mentor teachers become more effective. Ultimately, this evaluation determines if the induction program has met its stated goals and objectives and provides the district with pertinent information to determine the program's effectiveness.

Guiding Research Questions and Hypotheses

Research questions addressed in this study are:

1. What is the relationship between beginning teachers' perceived effectiveness of the induction program and their self-efficacy?

$H_0$1 There is no relationship between beginning teachers' perceived effectiveness of the induction program and their self-efficacy.

H_a1 There is a relationship between beginning teachers' perceived effectiveness of the induction program and their self-efficacy.

2. What is the relationship between the perceived mentor-mentee relationship with the self-efficacy of beginning teachers who participated in the induction program?

$H_0$2 The mentor-mentee relationship is not significantly effective in increasing self-efficacy in beginning teachers.

H_a2 The beginning teachers' perceived mentor-mentee relationship leads to a significant increase in the self-efficacy of beginning teachers.

3. What is the relationship between the intention to remain in teaching with the self-efficacy of beginning teachers who participated in the induction program?

$H_0 3$ There is no relationship between the intention to remain in teaching with the self-efficacy of beginning teachers who participated in the induction program.

$H_a 3$ There is a relationship between the intention to remain in teaching with the self-efficacy of beginning teachers who participated in the induction program.

4. What is the relationship between the perceived mentor-mentee relationship and their intention to remain in teaching?

$H_0 4$ There is no relationship between the perceived mentor-mentee relationship and their intention to remain in teaching.

$H_a 4$ There is a relationship between the perceived mentor-mentee relationship and their intention to remain in teaching.

5. What is the relationship between the beginning teachers' perceived mentor-mentee relationship and their perceived effectiveness of the induction program?

$H_0 5$ There is no relationship between the beginning teachers' perceived mentor-mentee relationship and their perceived effectiveness of the induction program.

$H_a 5$ There is a relationship between the beginning teachers' perceived mentor-mentee relationship and their perceived effectiveness of the induction program.

6. What is the relationship between the beginning teachers' perceived effectiveness of the induction program and their intention to remain in teaching?

$H_0$6 There is no relationship between the beginning teachers' perceived effectiveness of the induction program and their intention to remain in teaching.

H_a6 There is a relationship between the beginning teachers' perceived effectiveness of the induction program and their intention to remain in teaching.

7. What are the differences in self-efficacy of beginning teachers by year in the program?

$H_0$7 There are no differences in self-efficacy of beginning teachers by year in the program.

H_a7 There are differences in self-efficacy of beginning teachers by year in the program.

8. What are the differences in perceptions of the mentor-mentee relationship of beginning teachers by year in the program?

$H_0$8 There are no differences of the beginning teacher's perceptions of the mentor-mentee relationship by year in the program.

H_a8 There are differences of the beginning teacher's perceptions of the mentor-mentee relationship by year in the program.

9. What are the differences of perceived effectiveness of the program of the beginning teachers by year in the program?

$H_0$9 There are no differences of the beginning teacher's perceived effectiveness of the program by year in the program.

H_a9 There are differences of the beginning teacher's perceived effectiveness of the program by year in the program.

10. What are the differences in the plan to remain in teaching of beginning teachers by year in the program?

$H_0$10 There are no differences in beginning teachers plan to remain in teaching by year in the program.

H_a10 There are differences in beginning teachers plan to remain in teaching by year in the program.

Review of the Literature

School districts created teacher induction programs to provide the support that new teachers need in order to be competent in their field. Effective teacher induction programs allow new teachers to transition smoothly and effectively into the teaching field and increase the probability of teachers remaining in education (National Association of State Boards of Education, 2012). Rogers, Arnett, and Harris (2008) stated that most induction programs had a goal of transitioning new teachers into the teaching field or new school district.

A review of literature of effective induction programs and the link between self-efficacy, teacher retention, and mentoring for beginning teachers provided a basis for this study. Part 1 examines Bandura's (1971) social cognitive theory on self-efficacy and how it relates to mentor teachers and beginning teachers. Part 2 is a review teacher self-efficacy as it related to teacher retention and burnout. Part 3 illustrates the importance of a mentoring and the mentor-mentee relationship. The last part is a review of evaluative research on mentoring programs.

The review of literature was developed from a search of the Walden University library databases EBSCO, Education Research Complete, ERIC, ProQuest, and Walden

dissertations. Other resources included Google Scholar, professional books and journals from educational websites, and access to the local county public library database of scholarly journals and peer-reviewed articles. Key terms included in the literature search were *mentor*, *mentee*, *induction program*, *new teacher*, *self-efficacy*, *teacher attrition* and *retention*.

Theoretical Framework

Self-efficacy is having a cognitive perception that one can succeed at the task placed before them. Bandura (1971) stated that people's self-efficacy beliefs stem from how they think, feel, motivate themselves, and behave. Self-efficacy can emerge through cognitive and motivational processes (Bandura, 1971). In the cognitive process, if a person has a strong sense of self-efficacy, they will visualize success and produce a mental scenario that shows a positive outlook on the task (Bandura, 1971). However, someone who has a low self-efficacy will visualize failure and have a negative outlook on the task (Bandura, 1971).

Another component to consider as it relates to self-efficacy is conception of ability (Bandura, 1993). Some people view ability as a learned skill (Bandura, 1993). They see challenges as an opportunity to learn through taking risk or making mistakes. Others view ability as something inherited. They may view themselves as not being smart when challenges occur. Beginning teachers who perceive ability as a learned skill will view their role of a new teacher as an opportunity to learn and will be more willing to take on challenges and learn from mistakes made in the process. Motivation plays a key role in self-efficacy (Bandura, 1993). Self-motivated people will set goals for themselves, believe they can do what they say, and anticipate positive outcomes (Bandura, 1993).

Zimmerman (2000) stated that self-efficacy provides students with the motivation to learn through goal setting, self-evaluation, and self-monitoring. Zimmerman explained that students who exhibit strong self-efficacy set higher goals for themselves.

Bandura's four major influences on teachers' self-efficacy are mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, physiological arousal, and verbal persuasion (Bandura, 1971; Tschannen & Hoy 2007). Vicarious experiences are gained when watching someone else (Bandura, 1971). When a beginning teacher experiences success in a lesson from watching a mentor teacher model the lesson and receives positive experiences from mentor, efficacy beliefs are enhanced. However, experiencing an unsuccessful lesson from the mentor teacher may yield a lower self-efficacy belief for the beginning teacher. Tschannen and Hoy (2007) found that beginning teachers had a lower self-efficacy belief than experienced teachers. Since the first years of teaching are seen as the most critical point of developing self-efficacy, providing support through mentoring relationships can help foster self-efficacy.

Self-efficacy in beginning teachers can be developed through mentoring. Yost (2002) suggested that mentoring could have an impact on self-efficacy for beginning and mentor teachers. Yost's study of a mentor program demonstrated that both mentor teachers and beginning teachers' self-efficacy was enhanced due to mentoring. The reciprocal learning from the mentor and beginning teacher relationship made them feel more competent in their teaching, thus enhancing self-efficacy (Yost, 2002). Hemmings' study (2015) analyzed the views of early career academic staff to learn how their self-efficacy was strengthening during the first 5 years of employment. The study revealed that previous work experiences, mentoring support from colleagues, and professional

learning enhanced their level of self-efficacy since the staff reported they felt competent in their jobs. This evaluative study expanded on this framework by examining the perceived mentor-mentee relationship with self-efficacy of beginning teachers who participated in the induction program.

Teacher Self-efficacy Related to Burnout and Retention

Teacher self-efficacy can best be understood as one's beliefs in doing tasks related to the field of teaching (Skaalvik and Skaalvik, 2014). Researchers have examined teacher self-efficacy in relation to burnout and retention. Skaalvik and Skaalvik reported that self-efficacy increases motivation and decreases teacher burnout. Brown's (2012) systematic review of 11 studies revealed a negative correlation between self-efficacy and burnout in teachers. Teacher burnout also appears to be associated with classroom management and student behavior. Teachers who have a sense of self-efficacy in their classroom management are less likely to feel burn out (Aloe, Amo, & Shanahan, 2014; Dicke, Parker, Marsh, & Kunter, 2014; Shaukat & Iqbal, 2012). Pas, Bradshaw, and Hershfeldt's (2012) longitudinal study on self-efficacy and burnout revealed that teachers who felt prepared to handle classroom management and instructional challenges had high teacher efficacy. Teachers reported working in a positive school environment (parent and student involvement, leadership support and teacher affiliation) with great relationships with staff had less experiences of burn out and an increase of teacher efficacy over time (Fernet, Guay, Senecal, & Austin, 2012; Pas, Bradshaw & Hershfeldt, 2012).

Tschannen-Moran and Johnson's (2011) study revealed that teachers with stronger self-efficacy in student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management felt more capable to deliver literacy instruction. Furthermore, Martin, Sass,

and Schmitt (2012) confirmed a relationship between a teacher's efficacy and student behavior. Teachers who felt a lack of control in dealing with student behavior worked harder to maintain control lead to greater stress; causing an emotional drain and disconnect between student and teacher and diminish job (Tschannen-Moran & Johnson, 2011). Therefore, teacher self-efficacy plays an important role in preventing teacher burn out and retention.

Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2012) indicated that teacher self-efficacy was related to the teacher's relationship with the parents. Teachers had a stronger self-efficacy when there was a positive relationship with parents. However, the study also indicated emotional exhaustion and depersonalization are factors leading to teacher burnout (Skaalvik and Skaalvik, 2012). Emotional exhaustion stems from time pressure such as heavy workload, teacher preparation in the evenings and weekends, busy school day with minimum time for recovery (Skaalvik and Skaalvik, 2012). Depersonalization relates to the individual's feeling a loss of control over one's work situation (Skaalvik and Skaalvik, 2012). As a result, one may become detached from feeling apart of the school environment (Brown, 2012). Depersonalization and emotional exhaustion can weaken teacher efficacy. Understanding how emotional exhaustion and depersonalization lead to teacher burn out may support a correlation between perceived benefits from participating in an induction program and teachers' sense of efficacy.

Teacher Retention

Researchers have examined teacher attrition from various perspectives. Most agree that rates are steadily increasing (Howes & Goodman-Delahunty, 2015; Hughes, 2012; Mancuso, Roberts, Weston, White & Yoshida, 2011; Ndoye, Imig & Parker, 2010;

Petty, Fitchett & O'Conner, 2012). They reported that because new teachers are concerned with demands of grading, classroom management, lesson planning, appraisals, state assessments, and effective teaching they usually leave the field of teaching within their first 5 years (Howes & Goodman-Delahunty, 2015; Hughes, 2012; Mancuso et al., 2011; Ndoye, Imig & Parker, 2010). Most report feeling overwhelmed with these demands of teaching and with the lack of administrative support (Mancuso et al., 2011).

In a longitudinal study on beginning teacher attrition and mobility, the National Center of Education Statistics (National Center of Education Statistics [NCES], 2011) found that 10% percent of new teachers left the field of teaching after their first year and 12% left after their second year of teaching. Districts and schools are continually challenged to break the cycle of early teacher turnover by paying attention to its contributing factors and finding ways to retain quality teachers.

Several studies indicated that support from school administration is a significant factor in teacher retention. Hughes, Matt, and O'Reilly (2015) found that support from principals had a critical and important impact on teacher retention in hard to staff schools. They reported that emotional and environmental support received the highest rating of importance as it relates to teacher retention (Hughes, Matt, & O'Reilly, 2015). Teachers felt supported when principals showed recognition for a job well done. Teachers felt emotional support when principals agreed with a teacher's decision in front of parents and colleagues. Shaw and Newton (2014) showed a strong correlation between principals perceived as servant leaders and teacher retention rates. They found that principals who exhibit and model servant leadership to teachers could possibly decrease retention rates

(Shawn & Newton, 2014). Principals need to perceive their roles as an encourager and supporter, not as an enforcer.

Furthermore, Hughes (2012) found that support from administrators was a factor in improving teacher retention. Teachers felt they were not alone due to a feeling of support from administrators when facing the challenges of the profession. Furthermore, teachers who contributed in the decision-making process for the school motivated them to remain in teaching (Ndoye, Imig & Parker, 2010). Mancuso, Roberts, Weston, White, and Yoshida's (2011) qualitative analysis supports the role of the principal in teacher retention. Their analysis revealed three components of leadership that affect teacher turnover and retention: supportive leadership, shared leadership, and leader integrity (Mancuso et al., 2011). Supportive leadership involves the principal respecting and viewing teachers as professionals. Shared leadership allows collaborative decision making by a team, not just the administrator (Mancuso et al., 2011). Leader integrity is evident when the principal has a good relationship with the stakeholders at the school, treats people honestly and maintains a good reputation. One teacher in their study claimed he was staying at his school because "the school leaders respect staff and review them as professionals" (Mancuso et al., 2011, p. 829). School administrators and leaders support play an important role in maintaining beginning teachers by providing meaningful relationships and encouraging new teachers.

Job satisfaction is another significant factor in teacher retention. Hughes, Matt and O'Reilly (2015) determined the following factors to consider improving teacher retention: provide more planning time for teachers, provide frequent positive recognition, and provide opportunities for professional development and mentoring. Sedivy-Benton

and Boden-McGill (2012) examined factors in the work environment that influence teacher retention using the 2007-2008 School and Staffing Survey (SASS) provided by the NCES. Their results showed that more than 80% of the teachers would remain in the field as long as they could (Sedivy-Benton & Boden-McGill, 2012). One of the factors leading to this decision was salary (Sedivy-Benton & Boden-McGill, 2012). The more teachers were paid, the higher likelihood they would stay in the profession. The Petty, Fitchett, and O'Conner (2012) study revealed that money was the top indicator for retaining teachers. Participants reported that a stipend to teach at high needs schools could help retain teachers (Petty, Fitchett & O'Conner, 2012). However, teachers neither justified money as criteria for staying or leaving (Petty, Fitchett & O'Conner, 2012). Sedivy-Benton and Boden-McGill indicated that when teachers felt supported by their school they had a greater intention to remain in the profession. Furthermore, principals who provided a supportive school climate for their staff can potentially decrease teacher turnover. Research shows that schools can reduce retention rates by allowing teachers involvement in school decisions and providing them with some control over curricula and their classrooms (Hughes, 2011; Sedivy-Benton & Boden-McGill, 2012). Howes and Goodman-Delahunty's (2015) thematic analysis of current and former teachers found four key areas to help retain teachers:

> (1) foster positive and supportive relationships within school communities; (2) provide support for teachers to alleviate high workload; (3) provide greater job security or flexibility in response to teachers' needs and preferences; and (4) to offer new and interesting opportunities to diversify within teaching. (p. 32)

Mancuso, Weston, White and Yoshida (2011) indicated that teachers stay longer at schools when they feel supported, fairly compensated and involved in the decision making process. Hughes (2011) argued that teacher characteristics, school characteristics, organizational characteristics and teacher efficacy have an impact on teacher retention. Hughes suggested that (a) teachers' belief in their own abilities have an impact on teacher retention, (b) schools can expect to retain teachers with 10 years or more experience, (c) teachers that feel supported by administrators will remain in teaching, and (d) teachers that were satisfied with their salary were twice as likely to remain in teaching.

Dainty, Sandford, Su and Belcher (2011) extended this point about factors related to teacher retention. They surveyed 448 family and consumer science teachers to examine educational preparation, teacher commitment, social integration, skills and abilities, first year experiences, and institutional factors that most likely encourage teachers to stay in the profession (Dainty, Sanford, Su & Belcher, 2011). The study found that positive recognition from administrators, confidence in their teaching skills and abilities when implementing the content and having respect from students were noticeable factors for improving teacher retention (Dainty, Sanford, Su & Belcher, 2011). The aforementioned studies provide reasoning for this evaluative study to consider the relationship of beginning teachers' perceived effectiveness of the induction program and their intention to remain in teaching.

Mentoring

Since the 1980s, most states have implemented some form of mentoring or peer assistance for beginning teachers (Scherer, 2012). Mentoring is a personal and professional relationship that usually includes a more experience teacher supporting a

less experienced one. The most important role of a mentor is giving advice, counsel and guidance (Hassin & Abiddin, 2012; Hudson, 2010; Odell, 1990; Russell & Russell, 2011). Hobson, Harris and Buckner-Manley (2012) examined how student teachers valued the levels and categories of mentoring according to Mertz's Hierarchy of Mentoring Intent and Involvement Levels Framework (2004). Level 1- Role model, Peer Pal or Supporter, Level 2- Teacher or Coach and Level 6-Mentor ranked the highest roles of importance to student teachers (Hobson, Harris & Buckner-Manley, 2012). Researchers have investigated such programs from various perspectives including, the effective mentor-mentee relationships and evaluation research on mentoring programs (Barrera, Braley & Slate, 2010). Since mentoring is seen as an important role in helping beginning teachers, this evaluative study examined the effectiveness of the mentor-mentee relationship.

Effective Mentor-Mentee Relationships

Yaffe, Bender and Sechrest (2014) examined the effects of undergraduate research experiences on participants' career choices and satisfaction. Using online surveys and follow-up interviews, they investigated the roles played by the mentor at various stages of individual development (Yaffe, Bender & Sechrest, 2014). Yaffe, Bender and Sechrest found the majority of participants reported their mentor had a positive impact and great influence on their career choice. The role of a mentor goes beyond assigning a new teacher with a veteran teacher; it involves building a positive relationship between the mentor and mentee.

The mentoring relationship facilitates the growth of a mentee and can encourage and enable learning in order to maximize the mentee's potential (Yaffe, Bender &

Sechrest, 2014). Gardiner (2011) and Parker (2010) considered mentees have growing confidence in their abilities from their mentoring relationship depending on their interpersonal skills and level of trust with their mentor. In order to build those interpersonal skills and trust, time must be allotted for collaboration between the mentor and mentee (Gardiner, 2011). Gut, Bean, Henning, Cochran and Knight (2014) used a case study methodology to describe teacher and mentor interactions during student teaching, early field experience, and entry year teaching. The researchers reported two key differences in all three clinical settings (Gut and et al., 2014). The first difference is the more interaction time for the mentor and mentee collaboration, the greater chance of developing a positive relationship (Gut and et al., 2014). The lack of interaction time made the teacher candidate appear more passive and uncommitted in the eyes of the mentor (Gut and et al., 2014). The second difference was the mentor's degree of understanding about the program expectations (Gut and et al., 2014). Mentors had more confidence in their mentoring when expectations were clearly understood.

In a study with 77 participants, LoCasale-Crouch, Davis, Wiens, and Pianta (2012) found that time spent between new teachers and mentors supported a more effective collaborative relationship. However, these findings cannot be generalized that more time spent together results in an effective novice teacher. In addition to time, a highly trained mentor and a focus on content; not just emotional support lends itself to an effective mentor-mentee relationship (Grossman & Davis, 2012). This evaluative study examined the mentor-mentee relationship and its possible connection to the beginning teachers' intentions to remain in teaching.

Evaluation Research on Mentoring Programs

Mentoring programs are intended to provide guidance and support to new teachers, offer opportunities for reciprocal growth and learning, and improve student learning (Lipton & Wellman, 2003). Ingersoll and Strong (2011) examined 15 empirical studies related to induction and mentoring programs and concluded that such programs have a positive impact in retention, job satisfaction, and commitment. Mentoring programs also play an integral role in enhancing first year experiences of college students and teachers (Hall & Jaugietis, 2010; Ingersoll & Strong, 2011). Trenta and colleagues' (2004) mixed method evaluation of a three-year induction program examined the effectiveness of a teacher induction program to determine whether any improvements need to be considered. Results indicated that priority time should be given for the mentoring process to occur between the mentor and mentee, and mentor teachers should be allowed to have the dual role as a mentor and evaluator despite the contradiction that these roles should remain separate (Trenta et al., 2004). Hall and Jaugietis (2010) evaluated the components of a peer-mentoring program for first year undergraduate students. Participants were asked what impact did the mentor program have on their decision to stay in school, how helpful were their mentors, and what problems they experienced in the program. As a result of the feedback from the participants, modifications were made to improve the peer monitoring program in the following areas: (a) mentor recruitment and training; (b) scheduling difficulties; (c) adapting to the university teaching style forum; (d) a mentoring website; and (e) support for mentors (Hall & Jaugietis, 2010). Priest and Donley's (2014) qualitative evaluation of a leadership studies mentoring program indicated that participants preferred a mentor so they could

develop networking skills, be advised by an experienced person, broaden their knowledge about leadership opportunities and apply what they learned after graduating. Resta, Huling and Yeargain (2013) 10 year research study on the Novice Teacher Induction Program revealed mentoring was instrumental in beginning teacher's first year of teaching, promoted self-reflection in mentor teachers, and encouraged teachers who received mentoring to become mentors themselves.

Teaching mentor programs and college mentoring programs share a common goal of providing a beginning teacher or undergraduate student with the support and resources needed to succeed in their roles. This evaluative study examined the differences of the beginning teacher's perceived effectiveness of the induction program by year in the program.

Summary of Literature Review

Findings of research and professional literature consistently recommend that school districts develop induction to provide support and retain beginning teachers. These recommendations advocate that teachers need induction programs that provide effective mentoring, administrative support, and a positive climate that promotes teacher retention and self-efficacy for beginning teachers. Moreover, in order to retain teachers, the research indicates the need that induction programs must provide mentoring support to beginning teachers. This support needs to include sufficient training on how to mentor, allotted time for collaboration between the mentor and mentee, and a match of mentors by content areas. This evaluative study evaluated the effectiveness of an induction program as it relates beginning teacher self-efficacy, mentor-mentee relationships and retention.

Implications for Social Change

The results of this program evaluation study provides the district the opportunity to determine whether the goals of the program have been met and make necessary changes to their program in order to improve self-efficacy of beginning teachers and the district's retention rate. Data from the study provides district leaders with the strengths and weaknesses of the induction program with a focus on beginning teachers' perceptions of their self-efficacy as it relates to program effectiveness, mentor-mentee relationship, participants' plans to remain in teaching, and year of participation in the program.

Summary

Induction programs can provide positive outcomes for beginning teachers in the area of self-efficacy, teacher performance and retention. Fostering self-efficacy of beginning teachers through mentor support is critical during the first years of teaching. Self-efficacy stems from how people think and feel about being able to successfully complete a given task. Self-motivated people will set goals for themselves, believe they can do what they say and anticipate positive incomes.

Breaking the cycle of early teacher turnover is a constant challenge for districts and schools, making the focus on contributing factors and finding ways to retain quality teachers. Factors that lead to teacher retention include a quality induction program, effective mentoring, job satisfaction, supportive school climate, and administrator support. Prior to this study, the school district's induction program had not conducted a formal evaluation since its implementation three years ago. This evaluative study provides insight on the effectiveness of the program as it relates to new teacher self-efficacy and the mentor-mentee relationship.

Section 2: The Methodology

Introduction

The purpose of this quantitative study was to evaluate the effectiveness of the induction program as it relates to the self-efficacy and the mentoring of beginning teachers. The study explored the program goals as they related to the mentor and mentee relationship, self-efficacy of beginning teachers and teacher retention.

This study used a cross sectional survey design. For educational purposes, some common uses of cross sectional designs are to examine individual's attitudes, beliefs, or opinions about an issue; compare two or more educational groups; assess a large group of people through a statewide or national survey; and program evaluation (Creswell, 2012). This study examined beginning teachers' attitudes and beliefs about the induction program and mentoring as it relates to their level of self-efficacy.

In this study, the independent variable is the number of years the beginning teacher participated in the induction program. The dependent variables are the beginning teachers' responses to self-efficacy, mentor-mentee relationship, perceived effectiveness of the program and the intention to remain in teaching.

This evaluative study answered the following questions:

1. What is the relationship between beginning teachers' perceived effectiveness of the induction program and their self-efficacy?

2. What is the relationship between the perceived mentor-mentee relationship with the self-efficacy of beginning teachers who participated in the induction program?

3. What is the relationship between the intention to remain in teaching with the self-efficacy of beginning teachers who participated in the induction program?

4. What is the relationship between the perceived mentor-mentee relationship and their intention to remain in teaching?

5. What is the relationship between the beginning teachers' perceived mentor-mentee relationship and their perceived effectiveness of the induction program?

6. What is the relationship between the beginning teachers' perceived effectiveness of the induction program and their intention to remain in teaching?

7. What are the differences in self-efficacy of beginning teachers by year in the program?

8. What are the differences of perceived effectiveness of the program of the beginning teachers by year in the program?

9. What are the differences of perceived effectiveness of the program of the beginning teachers by year in the program?

10. What are the differences in the plan to remain in teaching of beginning teachers by year in the program?

Research Design and Approach

Creswell (2012) stated survey research is used to identify and relate variables, and to measure attitudes and beliefs. In this study, I used a cross sectional survey design to assess beginning teachers' attitudes and beliefs about self-efficacy, to examine the mentor-mentee relationship and to gauge beginning teachers' expectations to remain in teaching.

Information on mentor-mentee relationships, self-efficacy, and intention to remain in teaching were collected using a combination of two surveys (see Appendix A). The first survey was the Ohio State Teacher Efficacy Scale (OSTES) developed by

Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001). The OSTES measures teachers' beliefs in their instructional strategies, classroom management, and student engagement capabilities. The second survey was from Ackermann's (2012) study titled, *A Descriptive Study of the Effects of Mentoring and Induction Programs on Novice Teacher Self-Efficacy Beliefs*. The section of Ackermann's survey, New Teacher Efficacy/Mentoring Experience, provided data about the induction program; the relationship between mentors and mentees; and demographics.

Setting and Sample

The sample for this study was selected from beginning teachers participating in the teacher induction program at a diverse district located in a large metropolitan city. There are approximately 1,200 participants currently involved in the induction program, Professional Development Coordinator, personal communication, February 10, 2015). A stratified sampling design for this population was employed to attain the required participants for this study. This stratified random sampling was inclusive to all beginning teachers new to the district since the induction program implementation 4 years ago. Stratified random selection is ideal when subgroups are necessary to create a representation of the entire population (Lodico, Spaulding & Voegtle, 2006). From the stratified random sampling, I utilized simple random sampling to create subgroups. The subgroups consisted of participants who completed their first year, second year, and third year of the induction program. The coordinator of the induction program provided an Excel spreadsheet of beginning teachers involved in the induction program. The participants in the induction program received an invitation with a web link to Survey Monkey to complete a voluntary survey. The goal of the study was to have a minimum of

100 participants return the survey. Since the survey was voluntary, two reminder emails were sent to ensure the intended sample size was met. The researcher was excluded as a participant in the study.

According to Cohen (1992), effect size (ES) of a significance test provides meaning to the respective findings. It indicates how much a researcher can trust the findings in order to reject the null hypothesis (Cohen, 1992). Effect size, statistical power, the statistical criterion (alpha or *p*), and sample size are interrelated (Cohen, 1992). Cohen further explains that the required minimal sample size varies according to statistical test. For this study, a medium ES (.50), a statistical power of .80 and $p < .05$, a *t* test analysis requires a minimum sample size of 64. A Pearson correlation analysis with a power of .80, $p < .05$ and medium ES of .30 requires a minimum sample size of 85. The intended sample of 100 for this study exceeded the minimum sample sizes indicated for statistical tests.

An email was sent to 1,068 teachers currently in the induction program. About 130 emails were returned due to an undeliverable email address. Out of the 938 beginning teachers that successfully received the survey, 173 responses were obtained. However, the final sample size was 124 after incomplete surveys were omitted. A demographic summary regarding the gender, year in the program, and mentor assignment are provided in Table 1.

Table 1

Demographic Characteristics of Participants

	Frequency	*Percent*
Gender		
Male	22	17.7
Female	102	82.3
Total	124	
Year in the Induction Program		
Year 1	44	35.5
Year 2	32	25.8
Year 3	48	38.7
Total	124	100.0
Were you assigned a mentor teacher during your first year teaching in the district		
Yes	94	75.8
No	30	24.2
Total	124	100.0

Instrumentation and Materials

In this study, a cross sectional survey was used to evaluate the program effectiveness of an induction program. As Creswell (2009) indicated, the purpose of a survey is to describe trends, identify beliefs and attitudes of individuals, and evaluate programs. For this study, two surveys, the OSTES, developed by Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001), and the New Teacher Efficacy/Mentoring Experience developed by Ackermann (2012), presented together created the single sequential instrument titled, *Independent School District Teacher Induction Survey* (see Appendix B). These surveys aligned with the research questions and hypotheses of this evaluative study (see

Appendix C). Permission to use the OSTES was provided from the researcher's website (see Appendix D). A letter granting permission to use Ackermann's instrument is included (see Appendix E).

The independent variable in this study is the teacher participant's year in the program. The dependent variables consist of beginning teachers' responses to self-efficacy, mentor-mentee relationship, perceived effectiveness of the program and intention to remain in teaching. The survey (a) measured teachers' beliefs in their instructional strategies, classroom management, and student engagement capabilities as it relates to self-efficacy; (b) evaluated the induction program; (c) examined the relationship between mentors and mentees; and (d) provided demographics of the participants, which included a question about retention.

Table 2 shows descriptive data for four dependent variables, self-efficacy, mentoring, program effectiveness and remain in teaching. Highest levels of self-efficacy were reported for Year 3 participants with scores ranging from 142 to 216. These scores indicate that the longer the participant was in the program, the higher their perceived self-efficacy. The mean scores for mentoring, program effectiveness and remain in teaching were similar regardless of the year of the program. Even so, the differences in scores by year for self-efficacy, mentoring and induction program effectiveness were statistically tested using analysis of variance procedures. Results of these analyses are described in the data analysis section.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics of the Self-Efficacy, Mentoring, Induction Program, and Remain in Teaching Variables

				Range		
Variable	*n*	*M*	*SD*	Minimum	Maximum	Skew
Self-Efficacy						
Year 1	44	169.32	23.236	120	216	.243
Year 2	32	168.94	33.486	88	216	-.798
Year 3	48	178.58	20.354	142	216	.115
All Years	124	172.81	25.513	88	216	.500
Mentoring						
Year 1	44	18.05	5.473	5	25	-.695
Year 2	32	17.66	6.553	5	25	-.499
Year 3	48	18.19	4.770	5	25	-585
All Years	124	18.00	5.809	5	25	2.714
Induction Program Effectiveness						
Year 1	44	16.73	5.041	5	25	-.751
Year 2	32	18.13	6.009	5	25	-.723
Year 3	48	19.13	4.770	5	25	-.916
All Years	124	18.02	5.268	5	25	-.752
Remain in Teaching						
Year 1	44	4.0227	.150576	4	5	6.633
Year 2	32	4	4	4	5	5.657
Year 3	48	4	4	4	5	4.737
All Years	124	4.0323	.17740	4	5	5.360

Self-Efficacy Measure

The beginning teacher self-efficacy was measured with 24 items from Tschannen-Moren and Woolfolk Hoy's Ohio State teacher efficacy scale (2001). These items used a 9-point response scale with anchors at 1 (*nothing*), 3 (*very little*), 5 (*some influence*), 7 (*quite a bit*), and 9 (*a great deal*).

The efficacy portion of the survey examined the level of efficacy to determine a correlation between perceived benefits of participating in the induction program and the teacher's sense of self-efficacy for teaching. The Tschannen-Moren and Woolfolk Hoy (2001) Ohio State teacher efficacy scale measures three teaching areas: instructional strategies, classroom management, and student engagement of teachers. Sample items include, "To what extend can you use a variety of assessment strategies; How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom; and How much can you do to get students to believe they can do well in schoolwork?" (Tschannen-Moren & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001, p. 800).

The OHSES used an unweighted mean of the items in each subscale scores for efficacy of student engagement, efficacy of instructional strategies and efficacy of classroom management. The continuous scale for the OHSES range from a numeric score of 1 (*nothing*) to a numeric score of 9 (*a great deal*).

Mentor-Mentee Relationship and the Induction Program

The Mentoring and Induction Experience survey items measured the mentor-mentee relationship and the induction program. The two subscales are the mentor-mentee relationship and the induction program. Ten items use a response format of a 5-point Likert scale. The range for the scale is: 5 (*strongly agree*), 4 (*agree*), 3 (*neutral*), 2 (*disagree*), and 1 (strongly *disagree*). Sample of items about mentoring relationships are "My mentor has had a positive influence on my development as a novice teacher" and "The information provided by my mentor this year has been useful." (Ackermann, 2012) It also includes items about the induction program such as "As a result of participating in my school district's induction program, I feel more prepared to effectively plan for

instruction" and "As a result of participating in my school district's induction program, I feel more prepared to effectively handle discipline problems in my classroom." (Ackermann, 2012)

Ackermann's study did not state the scoring of each item. For this study, the continuous scale range of a numeric score of 5 (*strongly agree*) to a numeric score of 1 (*disagree*) was employed.

Demographic Data

The final portion of the survey included 10 demographic questions related to mentor assignment, mentor content area, induction year, retention, teaching assignment, years of teaching and gender. The majority of the demographic items were measured on a categorical scale with a mix of continuous data from the number of years teaching question. Items such, as "What induction year are you currently completing" and "Do you plan on continuing your career as a teacher in the upcoming school year 2016-2017" were significant to this evaluative study by classifying these items into groups to examine the relationship between retention and year in the program.

Score assignments for items regarding the mentor assignment, mentor content area, retention, and teaching assignment were 4 (*yes*) and 5 (*no*). A 1 (*year one*), 2 (*year two*) and 3 (*year three*) were assigned for the year in the induction program item. Codings of 1 (*male*), 2 (*female*) and 3 (*transgender*) were assigned for the gender item.

Instrument Reliability and Validity

Reliability refers to an instrument's ability to consistently produce the same score after repeated testing. To determine internal consistency of a survey, the reliability coefficient will have a value from zero to +1.00. The closer the reliability coefficient is to

+1.00, the more reliable the surveys are considered. The reliability and validity Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy's OSTES (2001) has been established through the testing of the instrument in three separate studies. The factor analysis of the 24-item instrument has a standard deviation of .94 and a mean of 7.1. Ackermann's study administered a pilot study. The reliability outcomes revealed a Cronbach's Alpha of .835 of the New Teacher Efficacy/Mentoring experience portion of the instrument.

Survey Administration and Data Collection Process

Data were collected for 3 weeks through an invitation email with a web link to the online survey (see Appendix B), distributed through Survey Monkey™. Once I received approval from Walden's Institutional Review Board (IRB), approval number 05-31-16-0299672, I begin my data collection. The coordinator of the district's induction program provided me with an Excel spreadsheet of all participants in the induction program. The spreadsheet allowed me to create subgroups of Year 1, Year 2, and Year 3 participants. Invitations to participate in the study were sent out by email to each subgroup with an introduction letter specific to the participants' year in the program (see Appendix F) with a web link to Survey Monkey™. This survey administration method insured participant anonymity. The survey included a cover page that contained the consent form. The consent form stated the title of the study, invitation to participate, purpose of the survey, procedures, the voluntary nature of the study, risks and benefits of being in the study, privacy, and contact information if questions arise (see Appendix B). Participates who clicked the "NEXT" button at the bottom of the cover page provided "implied consent to participate". A reminder email notice went out the second and final week of the data collection period.

Assumptions, Limitations, Scope and Delimitations

Assumptions

The assumptions in this study were (a) the induction program is important to the beginning teachers who participated in the program, (b) beginning teachers' responses to the survey will be accurate and honest and (c) beginning teachers may misunderstand some information in the surveys that may create bias or error.

Limitations

This study was limited to my own biases as a researcher because I have been a mentor in the induction program. To limit my bias, I worked closely with my committee during the data analysis phase to make sure I represented all responses fairly. In addition, I was excluded from participating in the study.

Scope and Delimitations

This evaluative study involved 124 beginning teachers currently participating in their first, second or third year of the induction program. The delimitations of the study included (a) only selecting beginning teachers in their first, second, or third year of the induction program and (b) data collection occurring for a short time period of 3 weeks.

Protection of Participant Rights

Before data collection, permission was granted by the participants and approved through the Institutional Review Board. I provided an informed consent that addresses the researcher's identification, sponsoring institution, purpose and benefits of the research, risks and confidentiality to the participants, level of participants involvement, participants' rights to withdraw, and contact information if questions arise (Creswell, 2009). To ensure anonymity, participant's name and current teaching assignment were

excluded from the survey. My role as the researcher included selecting the survey instruments, analyzing and collecting the data, reporting the data and making recommendations for the district involved in the project study. My current role at the setting is an instructional specialist and a campus mentor in the induction program. To ensure validity of the project study, I was excluded from participating in the study.

Data Analysis Results

The purpose of this evaluative study was to evaluate the effectiveness of an induction program in an urban school district as it relates to new teacher self-efficacy and the mentor-mentee relationship. Data were exported from Survey Monkey™ and entered into Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) to conduct all analyses. The data were used to test the following null hypotheses:

$H_0$1 There is no relationship between beginning teachers' perceived effectiveness of the induction program and their self-efficacy.

$H_0$2 The mentor-mentee relationship is not significantly effective in increasing self-efficacy in beginning teachers.

$H_0$3 There is no relationship between the intention to remain in teaching with the self-efficacy of beginning teachers who participated in the induction program.

$H_0$4 There is no relationship between the perceived mentor-mentee relationship and their intention to remain in teaching.

$H_0$5 There is no relationship between the beginning teachers' perceived mentor-mentee relationship and their perceived effectiveness of the induction program.

effectiveness of the induction program and their intention to remain in teaching?

$H_0$6 There is no relationship between the beginning teachers' perceived effectiveness of the induction program and their intention to remain in teaching.

$H_0$7 There are no differences in self-efficacy of beginning teachers by year in the program.

$H_0$8 There are no differences of the beginning teacher's perceptions of the mentor-mentee relationship by year in the program.

$H_0$9 There are no differences of the beginning teacher's perceived effectiveness of the program by year in the program.

$H_0$10 There are no differences in beginning teachers plan to remain in teaching by year in the program.

Descriptive statistics and inferential statistics were computed in this evaluative study. Descriptive statistics classified the participants' gender, year in the program and mentor assignment. Inferential statistics are used when comparing groups or two or more variables (Creswell, 2012). Inferential statistics were used to make inferences and draw conclusions about the induction program as it relates to self-efficacy of beginning teachers. Descriptive and inferential statistics were computed using the SPSS for the survey. Inferential statistics were analyzed using the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient to determine the relationship between beginning teachers' perceived effectiveness of the induction program to their self-efficacy (RQ1); beginning teachers' perceived mentor-mentee relationship to their self-efficacy (RQ2); and beginning teachers' mentor-mentee relationship to the effectiveness of the induction program (RQ5). Since the retention data are categorical, a chi-square test for independence was performed to determine the relationship between retention as it relates to self-efficacy

(RQ3), mentor-mentee relationship (RQ4), effectiveness of the induction program (RQ6), and year in the program (RQ10). A chi-square test was used to evaluate categorical data to determine how likely the distribution is due to chance (Creswell, 2012). A one-way ANOVA was used to compare the three groups (Year 1, Year 2, and Year 3 beginning teachers) to determine if they were significantly different or relatively the same in self-efficacy (RQ7), mentor-mentee relationship (RQ8), and effectiveness of the induction program (RQ9). The cross sectional survey contains 35 items that were used to test the hypotheses. The data were compiled and summarized into topics of self-efficacy, retention, mentor-mentee relationship, and the induction program.

Table 3 shows correlation data for efficacy and induction program, efficacy and mentoring, and induction and mentoring data. There were significant positive correlations for year 1 and year 2 participants for the following variables: (a) efficacy and induction, (b) efficacy and mentoring and, (c) induction and mentoring. This indicates that as year 1 and year 2 participants' level of efficacy increase, their perceptions of mentoring and the induction program score increase. A significant negative correlation for efficacy and mentoring was reported for Year 3 participants. This correlation indicates that as year 3 participants' efficacy increase, their perceptions of mentoring decrease.

Table 3

Correlations of efficacy, mentoring, and induction program variables

Variable	*n*	*r*	*P*
Efficacy and Induction Program			
Year 1	48	.363	.011
Year 2	32	.604	.000
Year 3	44	-0.27	.864
All Years	124	.350	.000
Efficacy and Mentoring			
Year 1	48	.522	.000
Year 2	32	.494	.004
Year 3	44	-.352	.019
All Years	124	.240	.017
Induction and Mentoring			
Year 1	48	.638	.000
Year 2	32	.707	.000
Year 3	44	.439	.003
All Years	124	.586	.000

Note. *p* value is significant at the $p<0.05$ level.

Self-Efficacy

Research question 1 asked what is the relationship between beginning teachers' perceived effectiveness of the induction program and their self -efficacy. To test the null hypothesis, a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was computed regarding a relationship between beginning teachers' perceived effectiveness of the induction program and self-efficacy. There was a significant positive correlation between the two variables, $r = 0.350$, $p = 0.000$. Thus, the results indicate that beginning teachers' level of

self-efficacy is higher when they have a stronger sense of the induction program. The null hypothesis, there is no relationship between beginning teachers' perceived effectiveness of the induction program and their self-efficacy can be rejected.

Research question 2 asked what is the relationship between the perceived mentor-mentee relationship with the self-efficacy of beginning teachers who participated in the program. To test the null hypothesis, another Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was computed regarding a relationship between the mentor-mentee relationship and beginning teachers' self-efficacy. There was also a significant positive correlation between the two variables, $r = 0.240$, $p = 0.007$. The results indicate that beginning teachers' levels of self-efficacy is higher when they perceive a strong relationship with their mentee. The null hypothesis, the mentor-mentee relationship is not significantly effective in increasing self-efficacy in beginning teachers, can be rejected.

Research question 7 asked what are the differences in self-efficacy of beginning teachers by year of the program. To test the null hypothesis, a one-way between subjects ANOVA was conducted to compare the effect of number of years in the induction program and beginning teachers' self-efficacy levels. There was no strong evidence of a relationship between number of years in the program and self-efficacy at the $p < .05$ level for the levels [$F(2,121) = 2.04$, $p = 0.134$]. The null hypothesis, there are no differences in self-efficacy of beginning teachers by year of the program, can be retained. However, the mean for number of years ($M = 173$) was close to the maximum number of points of 216 for the self-efficacy score. The results indicate that beginning teachers' self-efficacy levels are constant across each year of the program.

Retention

Research question 3, as well as questions 4, 6 and 10 were intended to measure beginning teachers' intention to remain in teaching as it related to self-efficacy, the mentor-mentee relationship, the effectiveness of the induction program, and the year in the program. The null hypotheses related to these questions could not be tested statistically due to the lack of significant number of expected frequencies to complete the chi-square analysis. Descriptive data indicated that 97% (N=120) of beginning teachers will continue their career as a teacher and 3% (N=4) of beginning teachers would not continue their career as a teacher.

Mentor-Mentee Relationship

Research question 5 asked what is the relationship between the beginning teachers' perceived mentor-mentee relationship and their perceived effectiveness of the induction program. To test the null hypothesis, a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was computed regarding the relationship between mentor-mentee relationship and beginning teachers' perceived effectiveness of the induction program. There was a strong positive correlation between the two variables, $r = 0.586$, $p = 0.000$. The results indicate that beginning teachers' perceived the relationship with their mentee as a part of the effectiveness of the induction program. The null hypothesis, there is no relationship between the beginning teachers' perceived mentor-mentee relationship and their perceived effectiveness of the program, can be rejected.

Research question 8 asked what are the differences in perceptions of the mentor-mentee relationship of beginning teachers by year of the program. To test the null hypothesis, a one-way between subjects ANOVA was conducted to compare the effect of

number of years in the induction program and mentor-mentee relationship. There was not a significant effect of number of years in the program and the mentor-mentee relationship at the $p < .05$ level for the conditions [$F(2,121) = 0.081$, $p = 0.922$]. However, the mean for number of years ($M = 18$) was close to the maximum number of points of 25 for the mentoring score. The results indicate that beginning teachers' perceive the mentor-mentee relationship the same across each year of the program. The null hypothesis, there are no differences of the beginning teachers' perceptions of the mentor-mentee relationship by year in the program, can be retained.

Induction Program

Research question 9 asked what are the differences of perceived effectiveness of the program of the beginning teachers by year of the program. To test the null hypothesis, a one-way between subjects ANOVA was conducted to compare the effect of number of years in the induction program and beginning teachers' perceived effectiveness of the program. There was not a significant effect of number of years in the program and perceived effectiveness of the program at the $p < .05$ level for the conditions [$F(2,121) = 2.44$, $p = 0.091$]. However, the mean for number of years ($M = 18$) was close to the maximum number of points of 25 for the induction program score. The results indicate that beginning teachers' perceive the effectiveness of the induction program the same across each year of the program. The null hypothesis, there are no differences of the beginning teachers' perceived effectiveness of the program by year in the program, can be retained.

Conclusion

The purpose of this quantitative program evaluation of the school's district induction program was to evaluate the effectiveness of the program as it relates to new teacher self-efficacy, the mentor-mentee relationship and retention. The guiding research questions addressed the relationship of beginning teachers' perceived effectiveness of the induction program, mentor-mentee relationship and their intention to remain in teaching.

The findings of this research indicate that the induction program were effective in beginning teachers having self-efficacy in classroom management, instructional strategies, and student engagement. Results also indicated that beginning teachers perceive the mentor-mentee relationship as a component of the effectiveness of the induction program. Data show that year 2 participants had the lowest range of self-efficacy and lowest average of mentoring. This could indicate that year 2 participants' first year of the induction program mentoring was not effective in increasing levels of self-efficacy. It is possible that Year 1 participants reported a higher level of self-efficacy due to feeling a sense of accomplishment for completing their first year of teaching. Mentor assignments are during the first year of the induction program. The second and third year of the program, participants do not have an assigned mentor; therefore, responses from year 2 and year 3 participants are perceptions of their mentoring experiences during year 1 of the induction program. Data show that participants in year 3 had a significant negative correlation between efficacy and mentoring. This indicates that as efficacy in year 3 participants goes up, the perception of the mentoring relationship goes down. The significant relationship between mentoring and efficacy for year 3 participants is perplexing. A thought to consider is asking participants to think back two

years about their mentoring experiences from year 1 of the induction program may raise questions about the validity of the data. Another consideration is the types of questions asked about the mentoring relationship.

Hypotheses for relationships between measures of teacher retention with mentor-mentee relationship, self-efficacy, or the induction program could not be tested. However, the findings indicated that 97% of beginning teachers in the study stated they would remain in teaching. Findings also indicated no statistically significant relationships of self-efficacy, mentor-mentee relationship, and induction program with participants' year in the induction program. An evaluation report of the findings would validate efforts in the program as well as identify areas of improvement that will lead to social change.

Section 3: The Project

Introduction

The project for this study is an evaluation report. This section provides the description and goals of the project based upon the findings. Additionally, the review of literature supports the recommendations to strengthen identified areas in the induction program already in place and provide implications for positive social change.

Description and Goals

This evaluation report is intended to provide the school district with the results of a research study conducted on its teacher induction program. The goal of the study was to examine effectiveness of the induction program as it relates to self-efficacy, the mentor-mentee relationship, and retention. The focus of the report is to provide the school district with pertinent information from the study regarding the program's effectiveness during the initial 3 years of implementation. This report focuses on three aspects of the induction program: relationship between program mentor-mentee, levels of participants' sense of self-efficacy for teaching, and participants' plans to remain in teaching.

Spaulding (2014) suggested that the basic sections of an evaluation report include a cover page, introduction, executive summary, methods, and the body of the report, which contains the analyzed data and findings of the study. There are different forms of written evaluation reports, from scholarly academic to brochures, webpages and memos. Common sections found in a scholarly academic report are introduction, evaluation, methodology, results, and conclusion (Mertens & Wilson, 2012). The evaluation report contains the following sections: Introduction, Self-Efficacy, Retention, Mentor-Mentee Relationship, Induction Program, Overall Results, and Recommendations.

The goals of the evaluation report is to describe the effectiveness of the induction program as it relates to the mentor-mentee relationship, give details on the effectiveness of beginning teachers' self-efficacy, and explain on the effectiveness of the induction program as it relates to retention of beginning teachers. In the report, I discuss the results from the survey and make recommendations for the induction program based upon the findings. The report will be presented to the district leaders of the induction program.

Rationale

A moderately sized urban school district in the southwest part of the United States implemented a teacher induction program 4 years ago. The district lacks a formal evaluation of the program. I conducted a research study to contribute to evaluating the induction program. The evaluation report presented here provides district leaders with feedback and recommendations about on mentoring, self-efficacy and retention. The evaluation report is drawn from the findings from my study in which I explored the relationships of the mentor-mentee, beginning teachers' perceived level of self-efficacy, and their intentions to remain in teaching.

Review of the Literature

This review of literature supports the evaluation report for this project study. The review of literature was developed from using Walden University library databases EBSCO, Education Research Complete, ERIC, ProQuest, and Walden dissertations. Other resources include Fort Bend County Public database of scholarly journals, peer reviewed articles and the interlibrary loan system. Key terms included in the literature review were *induction program, instructional leaders, principals and induction, mentoring, mentor role and induction, mentor training, program evaluation, evaluation*

summary, evaluation report, logic model, evaluation models and *induction program evaluation*. The review is organized into the topics of principal's role in the induction program; criteria, roles and training of effective mentors; evaluation models; and program evaluation. This review provides an explanation of how program evaluation addressed the problem and guided the evaluation report.

Principal's Role in the Induction Program

Researchers concluded that the principal's role in the induction program contributes to teacher retention and teacher self-efficacy (Brock & Grady, 1998; Sanford & Self, 2011). Since principals are responsible for the hiring, continuing professional development, and successful integration of new teachers to the staff and profession, they are challenged with the realities of teacher turnover (Donaldson, 2013; Hughes, Matt, & O'Reilly, 2015). Principals who take on the role of servant leadership instead of a dictatorship role can alleviate teacher retention (Shaw & Newton, 2014). Beginning teachers expect principals to communicate their expectations of a good teacher, visit their classrooms on a regular basis, and offer feedback and affirmation (Brock & Grady, 1998).

The principal's role in the induction of beginning teachers is multilayered. Research findings suggest that principals who were effective in supporting beginning teachers were instructional leaders, provided reflective feedback, assigned proper mentors, and encouraged a positive school climate (Angelle, 2002; Brock & Grady, 1998; Sanford & Self, 2011; Wood, 2005). Therefore, the school administrator multilayered role is essential in teacher retention.

Brock and Grady (1998) found that beginning teachers expect principals to communicate their expectations of a good teacher, classroom visits, feedback, and affirmation. Beginning teachers also wanted support for the entire school year, not just the beginning (Brock & Grady, 1998). This support could come through more principal walkthroughs and feedback since the principal is seen as the most important person in the school.

In a qualitative case study, Wood (2005) explored the role of principals from high, middle, and elementary schools in an induction program. Mentors, principals, novice teachers, and induction coordinators participated through interviews to determine the roles of principals in induction. Findings indicated that principals have three main roles in relation to novice teachers: coordinator of mentors, culture builder, and instructional leader (Wood, 2005). Principals in the study monitored the relationships mentors had with the novice teachers (Wood, 2005). Findings suggested that principals ensure a good match between the mentor and novice teacher, provide opportunities for mentors and novice teachers to collaborate, and provide professional development opportunities for novice teachers (Wood, 2005). Morris and Morris (2013) suggested principals allow mentors time to meet with new teachers during school hours and provide opportunities for new teachers to observe exemplary teachers. As a culture builder, findings indicated that when principals organized and supported campus activities that promote a professional relationship between new and experienced teachers, this creates a positive school culture (Morris & Morris, 2013). Lastly, the study indicates principals serve as instructional leaders by providing regular feedback to novice teachers in their

content, pedagogical and classroom management approaches (Morris & Morris, 2013). This feedback is vital for novice teachers to understand the principal's expectations.

Sanford and Self (2011) found that administrators classified themselves as someone who acclimates new teachers, help with retention by meeting the needs of teachers, communicating with teachers on a regular basis, and informing new teachers about organizational expectations. Administrative support is vital in the success of a beginning teacher. Boyd et al. (2011) found that dissatisfaction with the lack of administrative support was one of the most influential factors that lead first year teachers to leave the profession. Morris and Morris (2013) analyzed the responses of first year teachers who were asked what are the most valuable features of your support program and what are the most challenging working conditions. First year teachers reported that the mentor's emotional support, accessibility to meet with them and professional expertise were the most valuable features of their support program (Morris & Morris, 2013). Most challenging was lack of support from administration. New teachers reported negative communication and lack of assistance from principals and veteran teachers was a barrier during their first year of teaching (Morris & Morris, 2013). Although the results of the program have reported success, the findings also reinforce the importance of having administrative support for beginning teachers as part of the induction process (Morris & Morris, 2013).

Criteria, Roles, and Training of Effective Mentors

Research reviewed here provides evidence that training mentors is an important component to teacher induction program. This program evaluation found the mentee-mentor relationship had a significant relationship with self-efficacy of beginning

teachers. Without such preparation, mentors are likely to build their relationships with mentees based on their own experience. Researchers advocate that components for mentor training include listening skills, scaffolding activities, constructive feedback skills and evaluation techniques (Womack-Wynne, Dees, Leech, LaPlant, Brockmeier & Gibson, 2011); matched by content area (Grossman & Davis, 2012); and time for reflection on practice (Resta, Huling &Yeargain, 2013). Therefore, training mentors is an important component that has the potential to enhance the mentor-mentee relationship and the induction program.

Qualities of an effective mentor are not automatically found in a veteran teacher. Rogers, Arnett and Harris (2008) argued that in order to be confident, competent, and successful, mentors require specific training. A mentor teacher needs to be confident and competent in their role (Rogers, Arnett & Harris, 2008). Further, Russell and Russell (2011) examined cooperating teachers' perceptions on the mentor-protégé relationships. They found that not only cooperating teachers valued and perceived their role as critical in developing the new teacher but also that teacher education programs put in the extra effort to ensure that mentor teachers were effectively prepared for their roles (Russell & Russell, 2011). These findings extend Odell's (1990) suggestion that in addition to having least three to five years of teaching experience, possessing the skills of reflective listening and critical thinking, mentor teachers should receive intensive training on how to mentor a new teacher effectively. Thus, in an effective mentoring program, training mentors is just as important as providing a new teacher with an experienced mentor. Dombi and Kovács (2015) study examined the essential abilities and personality traits needed for a successful mentor. The study found significant characteristics of a

successful mentor were professionalism, creativity, empathy, helpfulness, patience, good communication skills, and good reflective capabilities (Dombi & Kovács, 2015). Womack-Wynne et al (2011) indicated that mentor training should include listening skills, scaffolding activities, constructive feedback skills, and evaluation techniques. Grossman and Davis (2012) advocated that in addition to training and allowing time for mentor and mentee that mentor and mentee be matched by content area.

In contrast, Resta, Huling and Yeargain (2013) showed that the absence of quality formal mentor training yielded mentors were able to provide only minimal to moderate support to their mentees. Mentors reported if ongoing mentor training in best practices were available; they could have better provided effective mentoring to beginning teachers instead of modeling mentoring practices based upon what they received when they were mentored (Resta, Huling & Yeargain, 2013). Therefore, providing mentoring training can assure that mentors are well qualified to assist beginning teachers with transitioning from pre-service to professional teaching.

Researchers have further identified training programs that provided mentor teachers with time for reflection of their own professional beliefs and practices helped them to become more effective in their mentoring roles. (Barrera, Braley, & Slate, 2010; Beautel & Lane, 2009). Mentors' effectiveness lies in their ability to break down complex teaching practices into smaller understandable components for new teachers (Resta, Huling & Yeargain, 2013). In order for this to happen, mentor teachers need to be provided with adequate training and appropriate guidelines.

Evaluation Models

Research on evaluation and program evaluation supports selecting this genre to address the problem in this study. Evaluation is a multidisciplinary field use to improve programs. Evaluation is a reactive focus of research that seeks to offer solutions to problems. There are three effects of evaluation:(a) instrumental, which informs decision making; (b) conceptual, which provides a better understanding; and (c) symbolic, which confirms pre-existing conditions (Green & South, 2006; King & Stevahn, 2013; Lederman, 2012). Practical evaluation is one type of evaluation that involves stakeholders participating and collaborating with the evaluation (Tomas, 2016). This participative strategy assumes the results and suggestions from the evaluation will increase the likelihood of the accepting the results and implementing recommended changes (Brandon & Fukunaga, 2014). An evaluation is more useful and more useable when the evaluator makes the evaluation comprehensible, interpretable and comparable Green & South, 2006). The evaluation report for this study contains those attributes.

Weiss, Fullan, and Chan are pioneers for program theory in evaluation (Knowlton & Phillips, 2013). Complexity, reductionism, and system theory are the original theories that two of the common models such as Kirkpatrick's four levels of evaluation and the logic model derived (Ahmady, Lakeh, Esmaeilpoor, Arab & Yaghmaei, 2014; Frye & Hemmer, 2012). Kirkpatricks' (2006) model evaluated learner outcomes in training programs by gathering data related to the participant's progress (level one), assessing what the participants learned (level two), focusing on how participants' behavior changes as a result of the program (level three), and focusing on the program's results in a larger context (level four). The logic model is an evaluation structure that provides continuous

feedback throughout a program's life cycle (Frye & Hemmer, 2012). It articulates program theory and works best when developers understand their program and identify intended and unintended outcomes (Green & South, 2006). Therefore, understanding the components of the logic model in evaluating a program has the potential to provide continuous feedback to the induction program evaluated in this study.

The logic model is one recommendation listed in the evaluation report to apply for future evaluations of the induction program. The logic model offers a visual road map to show connections between a program's goals and evaluation results (Knowlton & Phillips, 2013). The four components of the logic model are inputs, activities, outputs and outcomes (Holliday, 2014; Knowlton & Phillips, 2013; Strycker, 2016). The input component asks what resources are relevant for the program (Knowlton & Phillips, 2013). The activities component contains specific actions that make up the program using the identified resources (Knowlton & Phillips, 2013). The output component is what the activities will create also called product (Knowlton & Phillips, 2013). The outcome is the changes expected because of the activities, which could be short term or long term (Knowlton & Phillips, 2013). Newton, Poon, Nunes, and Stone (2013) used the logic model in their longitudinal study on an undergraduate math and science teacher education program to show a connection between teacher education programs and student learning outcomes by focusing on the five principles: content, inquiry, equity, community, and cohesion. The results showed empirical evidence on how and why the program worked and advanced their knowledge on what context of the program are effective (Newton, Poon, Nunes & Stone, 2013). Holliday (2014) used the logic model to evaluate fidelity in a training program by examining the relationships between program activities and

outcomes. The study focused on support provided to teachers by school support staff and the use of logic mapping resulted in the development of a theory from the data enabling the evaluators to identify areas where activities were not resulting in desired outcomes (Holliday, 2014). The findings resulted in modifications to the program. Urban, Christenson, and Benson's (2015) case study used the logic model and impact model to evaluate a graduate student research project. The logic model was a guide to show the resources and activities that went into the event, the outputs, and the desired short and long-term goals (Urban, Christenson & Benson, 2015). The recommendation for future evaluations of the induction program in this study includes the use of the logic model.

Program Evaluation

Program evaluation is relatively young compared to other disciplines and focuses on program theory (King & Stevahn, 2013). Around the 1950s and 1960s, program evaluation became a national concern when the government required comprehensive social programs (King & Stevahn, 2013). The use of evaluations is vital at the federal level since government agencies must justify training and development programs (Brill, 2016). Evaluations help organizations improve their program by examining its training components and the affect the training has on meeting the needs of its participants.

Waters' (2011) case study emphasized the importance of implementing a program evaluation. A formal program evaluation revealed the inadequacies of a summer reading program that was anticipated to be successful according to empirical literature, experienced program developers, and staff (Waters, 2011). The purpose was to train families on implementing the reading program to their children over the summer in order to improve reading skills (Waters, 2011). The findings revealed that there were not

enough participants to have a significant impact (Waters, 2011). Despite having only a handful of surveys returned, the program developer was able to use the results to modify the existing program (Waters, 2011). Strategically planned program evaluations allow developers to make changes to lessen the likelihood of continuing ineffective programs.

Program evaluation goes beyond assessing and modifying an existing program; it is a strategy for promoting social and community change. Cook (2014) discussed the following evaluation strategies to affect community change: (a) focusing evaluation on the needs of the client by looking at the program goals; (b) obtaining input from the client through the evaluation; (c) presenting actionable results to the stakeholders; (d) including research questions that would be of interest to the stakeholder; and (e) sharing results with those who can make a change. The formative evaluation of the induction program for this study was developed because of meeting with the program director of the induction program. The program director indicated the need and value of a formative evaluation of the district's induction program. This evaluation study examined the program's goals as it related to self-efficacy of beginning teachers, the mentor and mentee relationship, and teacher retention. The evaluation report provides information about the effectiveness of the current practices and offers recommendations that could potentially bring positive social change and program improvements.

Project Description

After presenting the evaluation report to the director of the induction program, I will schedule a meeting to present the results to the school district superintendent. In addition, my plan is to conduct a formative evaluation of the induction program at the end of each school year using the instruments from the study. I will also investigate ways to

improve the evaluation process. For example, the logic model is an evaluation process often used by nonprofit organizations to communicate an idea, resolve a challenge or assess a program's progress (Knowlton & Phillips, 2012). This model allows the program developers and leaders to focus on essential information needed in order to determine program effectiveness.

Potential Resources and Existing Supports

As an instructional coach in the district, I have established a relationship with the director and coordinator of the induction program through meetings that involved developing an evaluation that would support the goals of the induction program. This relationship will facilitate my having a formal meeting with the director of the induction program to discuss the evaluation report. As an existing support, the director of the district's induction program can assist in scheduling the meeting with the superintendent to present the evaluation report. In addition, the district's improvement plan includes a goal of recruiting, developing and retaining highly qualified and effective personnel. This goal could be measured annually using formative evaluation processes.

Potential Barriers

One potential barrier to this evaluation study was the timing of the data collection. The data collection took place during the last week of school and the first two weeks of summer school. Participants might have been reluctant to complete the survey due to the demands associated with end of the year responsibilities.

Another barrier to this evaluation study is my current position as an Instructional Coach and Instructional Mentor for the district. One may conclude that the results of the evaluation report are biased because of my role as a mentor in the induction program. As

a researcher, however, I did not participate in the study and the findings of the report were written with integrity.

Implementation and Timetable

The time line for the implementation of this evaluation report was as follows:

1. Met with the director and coordinator of the induction program to discuss a possible evaluation of the induction program's goals and requested approval for implementation (May 2014).
2. Obtained names and email addresses of participants in the induction program from the coordinator (May 2016).
3. Contacted participants via email to complete online survey. Sent a reminder email at the beginning of week 2 and a final reminder email at the beginning of week 3 (June 2016).
4. Analyzed data in SPSS and drew conclusions regarding the hypotheses and wrote up findings (July 2016).
5. Developed evaluation report based upon data analysis and results. The evaluation report will be presented in a meeting with the director and coordinator of the induction program. A presentation of the report is also planned with the district superintendent. The evaluation report will be available on the district's professional development website in the future (November 2016).

Roles and Responsibilities of Student and Others

As the researcher and evaluator for this study, I had the responsibility of developing research questions that corresponded with the program goals, designing the

survey, collecting and analyzing data, and presenting the results in an evaluation report. I designed the evaluation report to include six sections where results could be shared in a clear, understanding manner. I was excluded from participating in the research since I currently work as an instructional coach and teacher mentor in the district.

The program director's and coordinator's role were to provide pertinent information about the program that needed to be evaluated. Upon receiving the evaluation report, their responsibility will be to examine the recommendations and prioritize which to make the changes.

Project Implications

Local Community

Since the implementation of the induction program, the district has not had the opportunity to conduct a formal evaluation. This evaluation report provides the district with information on successful initiatives already in place and recommendations to address the needs of beginning teachers and teachers new to the district. This evaluation report can be a catalyst to implement an annual evaluation of the induction program. As the district continues to support beginning teachers by providing three years of induction with an emphasis on building self-efficacy in teaching through mentoring and administrative support, teachers may be better prepared to educate students, support their families and the local community.

Far-Reaching

The findings and recommendations from this evaluation study may be used to inform other districts in the surrounding area on how to best support beginning teachers. The protocol for this evaluative study can be adapted to evaluate similar induction

programs. The study may also assist other researchers in similar fields to better understand self-efficacy and mentoring as it relates to induction.

Conclusion

In this section, the description, the goals, and the rationale of the evaluation report were explained. I included a review of literature relating the principal's role, mentor training, evaluation, and program evaluation as essential components of the induction program. I concluded this section by discussing the implications of the project study. The next section includes the project strengths and limitations, my reflections, directions for future research and conclusions.

Section 4**:** Reflections and Conclusions

Introduction

This section addresses the strengths, limitations, and recommendations for alternative approaches for this project study. An analysis of my research practices relating to scholarship, project development, and leadership and change are also discussed. Lastly, I reflect on the importance of the work, implications, and directions for future research.

Project Strengths and Limitations

One strength this project study includes is creating a formal evaluation based upon the need to assess the effectiveness of the teacher induction as it relates to the program's goal. Mertens and Wilson (2012) stated evaluations are developed to gain insight, find areas in need of improvement, or to assess program effectiveness. The program coordinator provided input on which areas of the program to evaluate. Since the implementation of the program several years ago, an opportunity for an informal evaluation has not occurred until now.

Another strength of the project study was my role as a researcher and instructional mentor of the teacher induction program. As an instructional mentor, I was able to develop a positive relationship with the project leader and coordinator of the program. As a researcher, I was able to develop and oversee the project evaluation study from start to finish. Both roles will provide me the opportunity for future projects to affect the mentoring component of the induction program in a positive way.

The last strength of the project study is the development of an evaluation report to present to district leaders. Providing feedback will provide program leaders with the

opportunity to validate their efforts and make necessary changes to improve the program. Evaluations are a way to enhance organizational learning so program leaders can know how well they are doing, address problems, increase their performance, and provide a better service to their customers (Fitzpatrick, Sanders, & Worthens, 2011).

Although this project study has successes, it also has limitations. One limitation for this study was the timing of the data collection. The data collection period began the last week of school and ended on the second week of summer break. This resulted in a limited number of responses from participants. This limitation could be addressed by implementing the survey at the beginning of the last month of school. Additionally, participants could be provided with remote access to complete the survey at home during the summer months.

My involvement as an instructional mentor since the inception of the program could pose a limitation since some of the participants may know me. Despite informing participants on the consent form that my role in the evaluation is a researcher, this knowledge may have caused some participants not to answer difficult questions honestly. This limitation could be addressed by selecting an evaluation agency outside the district to complete the data collection. This may help participants feel more comfortable when answering difficult questions about the induction program.

Recommendations for Alternative Approaches

The teacher induction program did not have an opportunity to complete a formal evaluation since it was implemented 4 years ago. The research method for this study was quantitative and used a cross sectional survey to evaluate the effectiveness of the program as it relates to the mentor-mentee relationship, self-efficacy, and beginning teachers'

intentions to remain in teaching. Two recommendations for alternative approaches to evaluate the teacher induction program could be a case study and practical action research.

A case study as an alternative approach to this project study provides qualitative data collection through interviews and focus groups. The purpose of the focus group is to provide interaction between the participants to discuss their perceptions of the induction program effectiveness as it relates to the mentor-mentee relationship, self-efficacy, and retention. The researcher can moderate the discussion and tape-record the session. Each focus group can consist of six teachers, two from each year of the program. Member checks can be used throughout the study to ensure validity. Member checks, also known as respondent validation, are commonly used in qualitative studies (Meriam, 2009). The researcher can also look for common themes within each session. Personal interviews can provide the researcher the opportunity to meet one-on-one with each participant if they are unable to meet with the focus group.

The second recommendation for an alternative approach to research can be to conduct practical action research. Creswell (2012) explained that practical action research is a process in which teachers seek to solve problems within their own classroom or school so they can improve student learning. By using practical action research, teams of beginning educators, instructional mentors, and administrators can research the effectiveness of the induction program. Practical action research allows the team to test their theories about the effectiveness of the induction program as it relates to the mentor-mentee relationship, self-efficacy, and retention. In practical action research, teachers are

the researchers (Creswell, 2012). They will select a topic of study; collect, analyze, and interpret data; and develop an action plan.

Scholarship

When I first began my doctoral program at Walden University, I was unaware of the level of research and knowledge I needed to complete a doctoral study. I was uncertain on how to analyze a peer-reviewed article and lacked the skills required to write a literature review. Through time and individual determination, I have embraced research as an opportunity to grow, learn, and become the confident practitioner that I am today. As I developed understanding on how to write a literature review, I gained a new appreciation for the field of educational research. Being able to read and synthesize research in mentoring and teacher induction help me to discover new information that enables me to be more effective as an instructional mentor. Creating research questions, developing hypotheses, and aligning questions to correlate with a survey instrument was a learning experience that has given me better understanding on how to create and conduct surveys. The scholarly work I have completed on my project study affords me the opportunity to empower my colleagues and the classroom teachers whom I lead daily. Becoming a researcher has also provided me with the tools needed to be a change agent in my school, district and community.

Project Development

My previous experience as a project developer was improved with this project study. I was able to gain a deeper understanding on how to conduct a program evaluation on my school district's teacher induction program. I learned the importance of aligning research questions to the goals of the program. This was challenging but very exciting

because I was learning how the evaluative process works. Through reading peer-review articles on how program evaluations are conducted, I was able to find an existing survey that aligned with my research questions. Creating an online survey instrument for the first time was another great opportunity for learning because I was able to design and format the survey instrument using an online survey tool. I also learned how to analyze quantitative data using SPSS software, which was intimidating at first. After reading about how to analyze statistical data and writing up results, I was able to gain a better understanding of data analysis. As I am provided with future opportunities to conduct research, I will become more efficient in data analysis. Most importantly, I learned how to write an evaluation summary report of the findings from the study. Reports have to be written and presented in a way that is understandable to the stakeholders so they may find it useful in promoting positive social change.

Leadership and Change

I have learned that leadership and change is challenging if you do not understand what is involved in being an effective leader. Throughout my career as an educator, I have had many different leaders. Some were effective in motivating, encouraging, and promoting change while others struggled to find cohesiveness. I also learned there are two types of leaders. Leaders are formal or informal (Gabriel, 2005). A formal leader has an official title as a principal; however, an informal leader may be a classroom teacher who mentors a beginning teacher. Both play a huge role in ensuring student achievement. Gabriel (2005) categorized teacher leaders into four areas: (a) influencing school culture, (b) building and maintaining a successful team, (c) equipping other potential teacher leaders, and (d) enhancing or improving student achievement. As an instructional leader,

I see the importance of providing my team with honesty, support, fairness, motivation, resources, and opportunities to become leaders themselves. Being mindful of these qualities of leadership helps me continue to provide positive social change in my school district.

Reflection on the Importance of the Work

The purpose of this project study was to evaluate the effectiveness of the teacher induction program as it relates to the mentor-mentee relationship, self-efficacy, and the beginning teachers' intentions to remain in teaching. The findings indicated the need to continue the goals of the induction program through support and preparation of beginning teachers. This project has taught me the importance of identifying a problem, researching the literature, developing a plan of action based upon the literature, analyzing the results, and presenting the results in a written report that can lead to positive social change. I have also learned the importance of implementing an effective induction program and the outcome it can have on beginning teachers' self-efficacy. Believing one has the ability to complete a given task as it relates to teaching students can greatly impact student achievement and success.

Implications, Applications, and Directions for Future Research

Although induction programs have begun to increase throughout the states and local districts; evaluation of these programs need to increase as well. The literature discusses why program evaluation is important in determining the success of an induction program (Cook, 2014; Duerden & Witt, 2012; Fitzpatrick, Sanders & Worthens, 2011; Walters, 2011). This project study reflects beginning teachers' perception of the effectiveness of the induction program as it relates to self-efficacy, the mentor-mentee

relationship, and their intentions to remain in teaching. Although the results provided recommendations for future evaluation of different areas within the induction program, they could also be generalized to other induction programs in the surrounding area with similar systems.

The direction for future research includes two recommendations. The first recommendation is to evaluate the program's implementation practices. Some examples of program implementation practices for the teacher induction include the selection of program's courses, beginning teachers' individualized training schedule, and organizational systems. Duerden and Witt (2012) suggest using program implementation evaluation to examine whether a program is working the way it was designed. By focusing on each implementation of practice within the induction program, the district could get a stronger sense of the program's impact and operation.

The second recommendation is to evaluate the program's effectiveness based upon the principal's perception on how the beginning teacher has benefited from participating in the induction program. It could also evaluate the induction program's effectiveness based upon the beginning teachers' annual evaluation from year 1 of the induction program to year 3. The data from the principals' perceptions and the teacher evaluations could provide valuable information on how to improve the induction program.

Conclusion

Beginning teachers are faced with many challenges such as writing and developing lesson plans; adhering to district policies and procedures; transitioning from a pre-service teacher to a teacher of record; and figuring out how to communicate

effectively with students and parents; and ensuring student success. These challenges can become overwhelming for a first year teacher. Induction programs were created to support, prepare, and retain beginning teachers as they transition into their professional career as a teacher. Components of induction program include support systems such as mentoring and professional development. Program evaluation is an essential factor in maintaining an effective induction program. A program evaluation was conducted for this project study to determine its effectiveness as it related to the mentor-mentee relationship, self-efficacy, and beginning teachers intentions to remain in teaching. The results in the evaluation report indicated that the induction program and the mentor-mentee relationship are effective in beginning teachers having self-efficacy in classroom management, instructional strategies, and student engagement. Also 97% of the beginning teachers in the study reported they would remain in teaching. Further research on administrator's role in the induction could provide essential information to improve the effectiveness of the induction program.

References

Ackermann, J.M. (2012). *A descriptive study of the effects of mentoring and induction programs on novice teacher self-efficacy beliefs:* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/docview/1267152170?accountid=14872

Ahmady, S., Lakeh, M., Esmaeilpoor, S., Arab, M., & Yaghmaei, M. (2014). Educational program evaluation model, from the perspective of the new theories. *Research and Development in Medical Education, 3*(1), 5-8. doi: 10.5681/rdme.2014.003

Aloe, A., Amo, L., & Shanahan M. (2014). Classroom management self-efficacy and burnout: A multivariate meta-analysis. *Educational Psychology Review 26*(1), 101-126. doi:10.1007/s10648-013-9244-0

Bandura, A. (1971). Social learning theory. Retrieved from www.esludwig.com/uploads/2/6/1/0/26105457/bandura_sociallearningtheory.pdf

Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning. *Educational Psychologist, 28*(2), 117-148. Retrieved from eds.b.ebscohost.comezp.waldenulibrary.org

Barari, R., & Barari, E. (2015). Mediating role of teachers self-efficacy in the relationship between primary teachers emotional intelligence and job burnout in Babol City. *International Journal of Management, Accounting and Economics, 2*(1), 46-63. Retrieved from www.ijmae.com

Barrera, A., Braley, R., & Slate J. (2010). Beginning teacher success: An investigation into the feedback from mentors of formal mentoring programs. *Mentoring and*

Tutoring: Partnership in Learning, 18(1), 61-74. doi:10.1080/13611260903448383

Bogdan, R. & Biklen, S. (2007). *Qualitative Research for Education: An Introduction to Theories and Methods.* Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon

Boyd, D., Grossman, P., Ing, M., Lankford, H., Web, S., & Wyckoff, J. (2011). The influence of school administrators on teacher retention. *American Educational Research Journal, 48*(2), 303-333. doi:10.3102/0002831210380788

Brandon, P. & Fukunaga, L. (2014). The state of the empirical research literature on stakeholder involvement in program evaluation. American *Journal of Evaluation, 35*(1), 26-44. doi:10.1177/1098214013503699

Brill, J. (2016). Logic models guide agencies in evaluating training program effectiveness. *TD Magazine, 6,* 42-47. Retrieved from eds.b.ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org

Brown, C. (2012). A systematic review of the relationship between self-efficacy and burnout in teachers. *Educational and Child Psychology, 29*(4), 47-63. Retrieved from eds.b.ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org

Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin, 112*(1). 155-159. Retrieved from eds.b.ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenulibary.org

Cook, J.R. (2014). Using evaluation to effect social change: Looking through a community psychology lens. *American Journal of Evaluation, 36*(1), 107-117. doi:10.1177/1098214014558504

Creswell, J. (2012). *Educational Research*. Boston, MA: Pearson Learning Solutions.

Creswell, J. (2009). *Research Design Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods*

Approaches. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Dainty, J., Sanford, B., Su, S., & Belcher, G. (2011). Factors influencing the retention of secondary family and consumer science teachers. *Journal of Career and Technical Education, 26*(2), 42-56. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.21061/jcte.v26i2.524

Darling-Hammond, L. (2003). Keeping good teachers: Why it matters, what leaders can do. *Educational Leadership, 60*(8), 6-13. Retrieved from eds.b.ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org

Dicke, T., Parker, P. D., Marsh, H. W., Kunter, M., Schmeck, A., & Leutner, D. (2014). Self-efficacy in classroom management, classroom disturbances, and emotional exhaustion: A moderated mediation analysis of teacher candidates. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *106*(2), 569-583. doi:10.1037/a0035504

Donaldson, M. (2013). Principals' approaches to cultivating teacher effectiveness: Constraints and opportunities in hiring, assigning, evaluating, and developing teachers. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 49*(5), 838-882. doi:10.1177/0013161X13485961

Dombi, A., & Kovács, K. (2015). Mentor teacher training in the light of a study at the University of Szeged. *New Educational Review, 40*(2). doi:10.15804/tner.2015.40.217

Duerden, M., & Witt, P. (2012). Assessing program implementation: What it is, why it's important, and how to do it. *Journal of Extension, 50*(1), 1-8. Retrieved from eds.b.ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org

Escudero, T. (2016). Evaluation research in the 21st century: A more and more relevant

tool for the educational and social development. *Relieve, 22*(1), 1-20. doi: http://dx.doi.org10.7203/relieve.22.1.8164

Feiman-Nemser, S. (2012). Beyond solo teaching. *Educational Leadership*, *69*(8), 10-16. Retrieved from eds.b.ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenulibary.org

Fernet, C., Guay, F., Senecal, C., & Austin, S. (2012). Predicting intraindividual changes in teacher burnout: The role of perceived school environment and motivational factors. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 28*(4), 514-525. Retrieved from eds.a.ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org

Fitzpatrick, J., Sanders, J., & Worthens. (2011). *Program Evaluation: Alternative approaches and practical guidelines.* Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Fry, A. & Hemmer, P. (2012). Program evaluation models and related theories: AMEE Guide No. 67. *Medical Teacher, 34*(5), 288-299. doi: 10.3109/0142159X.2012.668637

Gabriel, J. (2005). *How to thrive as a teacher leader.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Gardiner, W. (2011). Mentoring in an urban teacher residency: Mentor's perceptions of yearlong placements. *The New Educator, 7*(2), 153-171. doi:10.1080/1547688X.2011.574591

Gless, J. (2012). The big picture: Comprehensive systems of teacher induction. *Reflections*. Retrieved from www.newteachercenter.org

Green, J. & South, J. (2006). *Evaluation: Evaluation.* New York, NY: Open University Press.

Grossman, P. & Davis, E. (2012). Mentoring that Fits. *Educational Leadership, 69*(8),

54-57. Retrieved from eds.b.ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenulibary.org

Gut, D., Beam, P., Henning, J., Cochran, C., & Knight, R. (2014). Teacher perceptions of their mentoring role in three different clinical settings: Student teaching, early field experiences, and entry year teaching. *Mentoring and Tutoring: Partnership in Learning, 22*(3), 240-263. doi:10.1080/13611267.2014.92664

Hall, R., & Jaugietis, Z. (2011). Developing peer mentoring through evaluation. *Innovative Higher Education*, *36*(1), 41-52. doi:10.1007/s10755-010-9156-6

Hassin, A., & Abiddin, N. (2012). A review of effective mentoring practices. *Journal of Studies in Education, 2*(1), 73-89. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/jse.v2i1.1226

Hemmings, B.C. (2015). Strengthening the teaching self-efficacy of early career academics. *Issues in Educational Research, 25*(1), 1-17. Retrieved from eds.a.ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org

Hobson, L., Harris, D., & Buckner-Manley, K. (2012). The importance of mentoring novice and pre-service teachers: Findings from a HBCU student teaching program. *Educational Foundations, 26*(3-4), 67-80. Retrieved from eds.a.ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org

Holliday, L. (2014). Using logic model mapping to evaluate program fidelity. *Studies in Educational Evaluation, 42*(1), 109-117. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2014.04.001

Howes, L., & Goodman-Delahunty, J. (2015). Teacher's career decisions: Perspectives on choosing teaching careers, and on staying or leaving. *Issues in Educational Research, 25*(1), 18-35. Retrieved from eds.a.ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org

Hudson, P. (2012). How can schools support beginning teachers? A call for timely induction and mentoring for effective teaching. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 37*(7), 84. Retrieved from http://eprints.qut.edu.au/56785/

Hudson, P. (2010). Mentors report on their own mentoring practices. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 35*(7), 30-42. Retrieved from files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ910409.pdf

Huling-Austin, L., & Southwest Texas State Univ., S. M. (1988). A synthesis of research on teacher induction programs and practices. Retrieved from files.eric.ed.gov

Hughes, A., Matt, J., & O'Reilly, L. (2015). Principal support is imperative to the retention of teachers in hard-to-staff schools. *Journal of Education and Training Studies, 3*(1), 129-134. doi:10.11114/jets.v3i1.622

Hughes, G.D., (2012). Teacher retention: Teacher characteristics, school characteristics, organizational characteristics and teacher efficacy. *The Journal of Educational Research, 105*(4), 245-255. doi:10.1080/00220671.2011.584922

Ingersoll, R. & Strong, M. (2011). The impact of induction and mentoring programs for beginning teachers: A critical review of research. *Review of Educational Research*, *81*(2), 201-233. doi:10.3102/0034654311403323

Ingersoll, R. (2012). Beginning teacher induction what the data tell us. *Phi Delta Kappan, 93*(8), 47-51. Retrieved from http://repository.upenn.edu/gse_pubs/234

Kane, R. & Francis, A. (2013). Preparing teachers for professional learning: is there a future for teacher education in new teacher induction? *Teacher Development, 17*(3), 362-379. doi:10.1080/13664530.2013.813763

King, J. & Stevahn, L. (2013). *Interactive Evaluation Practice.* Thousand Oaks, CA:

Sage Publications.

Kirkpatrick, D., & Kirkpatrick, J. (2006). *Evaluating Training Programs.* San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.

Knowlton, L. & Phillips, C. (2013). *The Logic Model Guidebook Strategies for Great Results*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Ledermann, S. (2012). Exploring the necessary conditions for evaluation use in program change. *American Journal of Evaluation, 33*(2), 159-178. doi: 10.1177/1098214011411573

Leidenfrost, B., Strassnig, B., Schütz, M., Carbon, C., & Schabmann, A. (2014). The impact of peer mentoring on mentee academic performance: Is any mentoring style better than no mentoring at all?. *International Journal Of Teaching And Learning In Higher Education*, *26*(1), 102-111. Retrieved from http://www.isetl.org/ijtlhe/

Lipton, L. & Wellman, B. (2003). *Mentoring Matters*. Sherman, CT: Mira Vira.

Lodico, M., Spaulding, D., & Voegtle, K. (2010). *Methods in Educational Research*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.

LoCasale-Crouch, J., Davis, E., Wiens, P., & Pianta, R. (2012). The role of the mentor in supporting new teachers: Associations with self-efficacy, reflection, and quality. *Mentoring and Tutoring: Partnership in Learning, 20*(3), 303-323. doi:10.1080/13611267.2012.701959

Mancuso, S., Roberts, L., Weston, D., White, G., Yoshida, R. (2011) Strategies to improve teacher retention in American overseas schools in the near east south Asia region: A qualitative analysis. *Journal of School Leadership, 21*(6), 819-844.

Retrieved from eds.a.ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org

Martin, K., Buelow, S., & Hoffman, J. (2016). New teacher induction: Support that impacts beginning middle-level educators. *Middle School Journal, 47*(1), 4-12. doi:10.1080/00940771.2016.1059725

Martin, N., Sass, D., & Schmitt, T. (2012). Teacher efficacy in student engagement, instructional management, student stressors, and burnout: a theoretical model using in-class variables to predict teachers' intent-to-leave. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 28*(4), 546-549. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2011.12.003

Merriam, S. (2009). *Qualitative Research*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.

Mertens, D. & Wilson, A. (2012). *Program Evaluation Theory and Practice*. New York, NY: The Guildford Press.

Moran-Tschannen, M. & Hoy, A. (2007). The differential antecedents of self-efficacy beliefs of novice and experienced teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 23* 944-956. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2006.05.003

National Association of State Boards of Education (2012). Retrieved from www.nasbe.org

National Center of Education Statistics (2011). Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/

Ndoye, A., Imig, S., & Parker, M., (2010). Empowerment, leadership and teacher's intentions to stay in or leave the profession. *Journal of School Choice, 4*(2), 174-190. doi:10.1080/15582159.2010.483920

Newton, X., Poon, R., Nunes, N., & Stone (2013). Research on teacher education programs: Logic model approach. *Evaluation and Program Planning, 36*(1), 88-

96. Retrieved from sciencedirect.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org

Odell, S. & National Educational Association, W.D. (1990). Mentor teacher programs. What research says to the teacher. Retrieved from eds.b.ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org

Pas, E., Bradshaw, C., & Hershfeldt, P. (2012). Teacher and school level predicators of teacher efficacy and burnout: Identifying potential areas for support. *Journal of School Psychology, 50*(1), 129-145. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2011.07.003

Parker, M. (2010). Mentoring practices to keep teachers in school. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring, 8*(2), 111-123. Retrieved from www.business.brookes.ac.uk/research/aeas/coachingandmentoring/

Petty, T. M., Fitchett, P., & O'Conner, K. (2012). Attracting and keeping teachers in high-need schools. *American Secondary Education*, *40*(2), 67-88. Retrieved from eds.a.ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org

Priest, K. L., & Donley, S. (2014). Developing leadership for life: Outcomes from a collegiate student-alumni mentoring program. *Journal of Leadership Education*, *13*(3), 107-117. doi:101280/V13/I3/A2

Resta, V., Huling, L., & Yeargain, P. (2013). Teacher insights about teaching, mentoring, and schools as workplaces. *Curriculum and Teaching Dialogue, 15*(1), 117-132. Retrieved from eds.a.ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org

Rogers-Arnold, J., Arnett, S., & Harris, M. (2008). Mentoring new teachers in Lenoir City, Tennessee. *The Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin,* Summer 2008, 18-23.

Russell, M. & Russell, J. (2011). Mentoring Relationships: Cooperating Teachers'

Perspectives on Mentoring Student Interns. *The Professional Educator, 35*(2) 16-35. Retrieved from www.files.eric.ed.gov

Sanford, B. & Self, M.J. (2011). The role of administrators in career and technical teacher induction. *Scholar-Practitioner Quarterly, 5*(2), 188-200. Retrieved from www.files.eric.ed.gov

Scherer, M. (2012). The Challenges of Supporting New Teachers. *Educational Leadership, 69*(8), 18-23. Retrieved from www.pi-34.pbworks.com

Sedivy-Benton, A. & Boden-McGill, C. (2012). Unpacking the effects: Identifying school and teacher factors and their influence on teacher's intentions to stay or leave the profession. *Research in the Schools, 19*(2), 75-89. Retrieved from eds.b.ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org

Shaukat, S., & Iqbal, H. M. (2012). Teacher self-efficacy as a function of student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management. *Pakistan Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 9*(3), 82-85. Retrieved from eds.b.ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org

Shaw, J., & Newton, J. (2014). Teacher retention and satisfaction with a servant leader as principal. *Journal of Education, 135*(1), 101-106. Retrieved from eds.b.ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org

Skaalvik, E., & Skaalvik, S. (2014). Teacher self-efficacy and perceived autonomy: Relations with teacher engagement, job satisfaction, and emotional exhaustion. *Psychological Reports: Employment Psychology and Marketing, 114*(1), 68-77. doi:10.2466/14.02.PRO.114k14w0

Skaalvik, E., & Skaalvik, S. (2012). Teacher self-efficacy and teacher burnout: A study

of relations. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 26*(4), 1059-1069. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2009.11.001

Strycker, J. (2016). Logic models as a way to support online students and their projects. *Journal of Educators Online, 13*(2), 135-150. Retrieved from eds.b.ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org

Texas Education Agency (2013). Retrieved from www.tea.texas.org

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Johnson, D. (2011). Exploring literacy teachers' self-efficacy beliefs: Potential sources at play. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 27*(4), 751-761. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2010.12.005

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17*(7), 783-805. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(01)00036-1

Trenta, L., Newman, I., Newman, C., Salzman, J., & Lenigan, D. (2004). Integrating mixed methods and stakeholders participation in the evaluation of a teacher induction program. *International Electronic Journal for Leadership in Learning*, *8*(3), 14pgs. Retrieved from www.files.eric.ed.gov

Urban, L., Christenson, M., & Benson, S. (2015). Learning the ropes of program evaluation: A case study. *Performance Improvement, 54*(1), 7-13. doi: 10.1002/pfi.21450

Waters, K.R. (2011). The importance of program evaluation: a case study. *Journal of Human Services, 31*(1), 83-93. Retrieved from eds.b.ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org

Wong, H. (2002). Induction: the best form of professional development. *Educational*

Leadership, 59(6), 52-55. Retrieved from www.newteacher.com

Wood, A. (2005). The importance of principals: Site administrator's role in novice teacher induction. *American Secondary Education, 33*(2), 39-62. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/41064612

Wood, A. & Stanulis, R. (2009). Quality teacher induction: "fourth-wave" (1997-2006) induction programs. *The New Educator, 5*(1), 1-23. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1547688X.2009.10399561

Womack-Wynne, C., Dees, E., Leech, D., LaPlant, J., Brockmeier, L., & Gibson, N. (2011). Teacher's Perceptions of the First-Year Experience and Mentoring. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation, 6*(4) 1-11. Retrieved from www.files.eric.ed.gov

Yaffe, K., Bender, C., & Sechrest, L. (2014). How does undergraduate research experience impact career trajectories and level of career satisfaction: A comparative survey. *Journal of College Science Teaching, 44*(1), 25-33. Retrieved from www.static.nsta.org

Yost, R. (2002). "I think I can": Mentoring as a means of enhancing teaching efficacy. *The Clearinghouse, 75*(4) 195-197. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00098650209604930

Zimmerman, B. (2000). Self efficacy: An essential motive to learn. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 25* 82-91. doi:10.1006/ceps.1999.1016

Appendix A: Evaluation Report

Teacher Induction Program

A Formative Evaluation Report

December 2016
Independent School District
Houston, Texas

Contents

Introduction

Self-Efficacy

Retention

Mentor-Mentee Relationship

Induction Program

Results

Recommendations

Introduction

The first year of teaching is an overwhelming time where beginning teachers have to find a balance between understanding school policies, implementing effective lessons, communicating with parents, building relationships with students, and connecting their previous learning to new learning. The complex list of demands causes some teachers to leave within the first five years of their career; some teachers even leave after the first year. To increase the retention rate of beginning teachers, many school districts have created induction programs to support and encourage beginning teachers. These programs usually include a mentoring component and provide beginning teachers with professional development courses to build their knowledge and skills.

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the effectiveness of the teacher induction program as it relates to new teacher self-efficacy, the mentor-mentee relationship and retention. The goals of the teacher induction program are: 1) transition beginning teachers to a new job; 2) provide opportunities for collaboration with colleagues in the same content area; and 3) introduce beginning teachers to district personnel that will provide support. Two major components of the teacher induction are specialized professional development courses and the instructional mentor program. The professional development courses are completed in three years: Year 1 is titled Undergraduate Studies; Year 2 is called Graduate Studies; and Year 3 is named Continuing Education. These professional development courses are individualized for the beginning teacher's content area. The mentor program is designed to retain teachers, build self-efficacy and provide instructional support. A mentor leader and instructional

mentors are selected at each campus where beginning teachers are assigned. Instructional Mentors provide support and build a learning focused relationship with the beginning teacher. Mentor leaders collaborate and support instructional mentors through monthly meetings.

The results of evaluation report indicted that beginning teachers agreed that participating in the induction program provided a higher level of self-efficacy in classroom management, student engagement and instructional strategies; and the mentor-mentee relationship was perceived an important factor in the effectiveness of the induction program. However, results indicated no significant relationships of self-efficacy, mentor-mentee relationship, and induction program with participants' year in the induction program. Further evaluation of the impact the teacher induction program has provided to beginning teachers from an administrator's viewpoint may provide insight how to improve the program.

The evaluation report addressed the goals of the teacher induction to determine their effectiveness as it related to self-efficacy, the mentor-mentee relationship, and retention. To assess beginning teachers' perceptions the teacher induction, an online survey was sent to participants in their first, second, or third year of the program. A total of 124 participants voluntarily completed the online survey. Out of the 124 participants, 44 were in year 1 of the program; 32 were in year 2 of the program; and 48 were in year 3 of the program. The results of the data were compiled into the following topics: self-efficacy, retention, mentor-mentee relationship, and the induction program. The following questions were addressed:

1. What is the relationship between beginning teachers' perceived effectiveness of the induction program and their self-efficacy?

2. What is the relationship between the perceived mentor-mentee relationship with the self-efficacy of beginning teachers who participated in the induction program?

3. What is the relationship between the intention to remain in teaching with the self-efficacy of beginning teachers who participated in the induction program?

4. What is the relationship between the perceived mentor-mentee relationship and their intention to remain in teaching?

5. What is the relationship between the beginning teachers' perceived mentor-mentee relationship and their perceived effectiveness of the induction program?

6. What is the relationship between the beginning teachers' perceived effectiveness of the induction program and their intention to remain in teaching?

7. What are the differences in self-efficacy of beginning teachers by year in the program?

8. What are the differences of perceived effectiveness of the program of the beginning teachers by year in the program?

9. What are the differences of perceived effectiveness of the program of the beginning teachers by year in the program?

10. What are the differences in the plan to remain in teaching of beginning teachers by year in the program?

Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy is belief in one's ability to successfully complete a given task and teacher self-efficacy is one's belief in doing tasks successfully in the field of teaching.

Self-efficacy was analyzed for instructional strategies, classroom management, and student engagement as it related to participation in the induction program. The results indicated that beginning teachers' level of self-efficacy was high when they had a stronger sense of the induction program. The minimum self-efficacy score 88 was reported was by 1 participant (.08%) and the maximum self-efficacy score 216 was reported by 4 participants (3%). Self-efficacy was also analyzed as it related to the mentor-mentee relationship. The results indicate that beginning teachers' levels of self-efficacy is higher when they perceive a strong relationship with their mentee. There was no strong evidence of a relationship between number of years in the program and self-efficacy. The maximum possible points for self-efficacy were 216. The average score for both Year 1 and Year 2 participants were the same at 169; however, the average score for Year 3 was slightly higher at 179. The average score reported by all participants was 173. The results indicated that beginning teachers' self-efficacy levels are constant across each year of the program.

Retention

Retention data was analyzed to determine beginning teachers' intention to remain in teaching as it related to self-efficacy, the mentor-mentee relationship, the effectiveness of the induction program, and the year in the program. The hypotheses related to these questions could not be answered due to the lack of required frequencies to run the analysis. However, descriptive data indicated that 97% of beginning teachers reported they will continue their career as a teacher and only 3% reported they would not continue their career as a teacher. The majority of the participants perceive the induction program effective in retaining beginning teachers.

Mentor-Mentee Relationship

Mentoring was analyzed to determine if beginning teachers perceived the mentor-mentee relationship as a component in the effectiveness of the induction program. The results indicated that beginning teachers' perceived the relationship with their mentee as a part of the effectiveness of the induction program. The minimum mentoring score of 5 was reported by 8 participants (7%) and the maximum mentoring score of 25 was reported was by 26 participants (21%). There was not a significant effect of number of years in the program to the mentor-mentee relationship. However, the average score18 for number of years in the program was close to the maximum number of points of 25 for the mentoring score. This indicates that beginning teachers' perceive the mentor-mentee relationship the same across each year of the program.

Induction Program

Induction programs are designed to ease beginning teachers into their new roles while providing professional development to build on knowledge and skills. The teacher induction program was analyzed to determine what are the differences of perceived effectiveness of the program of the beginning teachers by year of the program. There was not a significant difference in the number of years that participants were in the program to their perceived effectiveness of the program. The minimum induction program score 5 was reported by 5 participants (4%) and the maximum induction program score 25 was reported by 19 participants (15%). The average induction program score was 18 out of the maximum score of 25. This indicated that beginning teachers' perceived the effectiveness of the induction program the same across each year of the program.

Overall Results

The majority of the participants in the teacher induction perceived the program to be effective in building self-efficacy, retaining teachers and providing mentoring support. Beginning teachers who completed the Teacher Induction Survey included 35% first year, 26% second year, and 39% third year participants of the program. Participants answered questions related to self-efficacy, the mentee-mentor relationship, and the effectiveness of the induction program. Beginning teachers perceived their level of self-efficacy to be higher as it related to the participation in the induction program and having a mentor. Mentors are assigned to new teachers during the first year of the induction program. The second and third year of the program, participants do not have an assigned mentor; therefore, responses from year 2 and year 3 participants are perceptions of their mentoring experiences during year 1 of the induction program. Data show that year 2 participants had the lowest range of self-efficacy and lowest average of mentoring. This could indicate that year 2 participants' first year of the induction program mentoring was not effective in increasing levels of self-efficacy. It is possible that Year 1 participants reported a higher level of self-efficacy due to feeling a sense of accomplishment for completing their first year of teaching. There was not a significant difference in self-efficacy, the mentor-mentee relationship, and the effectiveness of the induction program with participants' year in the program. However, data show that participants in year 3 had a significant negative correlation between efficacy and mentoring. This indicates that as efficacy in year 3 participants goes up, the perception of the mentoring relationship goes down. The significant relationship between mentoring and efficacy for year 3 participants is puzzling. A thought to consider is asking participants to think back two years about their mentoring experiences from year 1 of the induction program may raise questions

about the validity of the data. Another consideration is the types of questions that were asked about the mentoring relationship. Participants perceived their level of self-efficacy, the mentor-mentee relationship, and the effectiveness of the induction the same in year 1, 2, and 3 of the program. Over 95% of the beginning teachers that completed the survey reported they would return to teaching the upcoming school year.

Recommendations

This section will discuss the recommendations for future research and practice based upon the results from the evaluation and the induction program goals.

1. A recommendation for a future study would be to conduct an evaluation of the effectiveness of induction program from the administrators' viewpoint.
2. Another future study would include an evaluation of the mentor component of the program from the mentors' viewpoint. This information may be useful in determining if a mentoring training program is needed to further enhance the district's induction program.
3. Since induction programs are known to improve retention, a future study would be to involve other school districts in the surrounding area with a similar population to examine the effectiveness of induction programs. The results may provide ideas on how to enrich the district's induction program.
4. The district should provide ongoing evaluations. Develop evaluations for participants of the program, instructional mentors, and administrators to track the effectiveness of the induction program using the Logic Model.
5. The district can continue to track Year 3 participants to see if the negative correlation between efficacy and induction and efficacy and mentoring trend still

holds. However, consideration should be given on the validity of the data reported from Year 3 participants on mentoring since they have not had a mentor for two years. As well, they could have had a strong relationship with their mentor and are still collaborating even though it is no longer required by the district. Further research could involve asking questions about the relationship after the first year. Example questions include: (a) Does the mentoring relationship still exist, (b) Do you still have a relationship with your mentor, and (c) How often do you collaborate with your mentor.

6. The mentor support and specialized professional development should remain in effect. These support systems were proved to be a reason for perceived self-efficacy and retention of the beginning teachers in the induction program.

Appendix B: Beginning Teacher Survey Instrument

This questionnaire is designed to help us evaluate the effectiveness of the Teacher Induction Program. Your answers will remain confidential.

Directions: Please indicate your belief about each of the questions by selecting one of the following responses ranging from: 1-Not at All, 3-Very Little, 5-Some Influence, 7-Quite A Bit, and 9-A Great Deal.

Efficacy for instructional strategies

1. To what extent can you use a variety of assessment strategies?
2. To what extent can you provide an alternative explanation or example when students are confused?
3. To what extend can you craft good questions for your students?
4. How well can you implement alternative strategies in your classroom?
5. How well can you respond to difficult questions from your students?
6. How much can you do to adjust your lessons to the proper level for individual students?
7. To what extend can you gauge student comprehension of what you have taught?
8. How well can you provide appropriate challenges for very capable students?

Efficacy for classroom management

9. How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom?
10. How much can you do to get children to follow classroom rules?
11. How much can you do to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy?
12. How well can you establish a classroom management system with each group of students?
13. How well can you keep a few problem students from ruining an entire lesson?
14. How well can you respond to defiant students?
15. To what extend can you make your expectations clear about student behavior?
16. How well can you establish routines to keep activities running smoothly?

Efficacy for student engagement

17. How much can you do to get students to believe they can do well in schoolwork?
18. How much can you do to help your students value learning?
19. How much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in schoolwork?
20. How much and you assist families in helping their children do well in school?
21. How much can you do to improve the understanding of a student who is failing?
22. How much can you do to help your students think critically?

23. How much can you do to foster student creativity?
24. How much can you do to get through to the most difficult students?

From: Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17*(7), 783-805.

Mentoring and Induction Experience

Instructions: The statements presented below are about the induction program and mentoring. Please indicate your beliefs about each statement by selecting one of the responses: (5) strongly agree (4); agree (3); neutral (2); disagree (1); and strongly disagree.

Mentoring Experience

25. The information provided by my mentor this year has been useful.
26. The courses I have taken as part of the induction program have been useful.
27. My mentor teacher has shared instructional strategies that I have used in my classroom.
28. My mentor teacher has provided me with useful information on classroom management.
29. My mentor teacher has provided me with useful information on student engagement.
30. My mentor teacher has had a positive influence on my development as a beginning teacher.

Induction Program

31. As a result of participating in my school district's induction program, I feel more prepared to effectively plan for instruction.
32. As a result of participating in my school district's induction program, I feel more prepared to effectively handle discipline problems in my classroom.
33. As a result of participating in my school district's induction program, I feel more prepared to communicate effectively with parents.
34. As a result of participating in my school district's induction program, I feel more prepared to implement the school district's initiatives.

From: Ackermann, J.M. (2012). *A descriptive study of the effects of mentoring and induction programs on novice teacher self-efficacy beliefs:* UMI 3546697 (published doctoral dissertation). Indiana University of Pennsylvania, Indiana, PA.

Demographics

The remaining questions will provide us with demographical information. Your responses will remain confidential.

35. Were you assigned a mentor teacher during your first year teaching in Alief? Yes/No
36. Does or did your mentor teach the same content area(s) as you currently teach?
37. What year of the induction program are you currently completing? Year 1, Year 2, Year 3.
38. Do you plan to continue your career as a teacher in the upcoming school year 2016-2017? Yes/No
39. If you responded "No" to question 38, skip questions 40-42.
40. If you are currently completing year 1 of the induction program, do you plan to return to the same teaching assignment in the 2016-2017 school year? Yes/No
41. If you are currently completing year 2 or year 3 of the induction program, do you plan to return to same teaching assignment in the 2016-2017 school year?
42. If you are currently completing year 2 or year 3 of the induction program, did you transfer to a different campus/school in the 2015-2016 school year? Yes/No
43. How many years of teaching experience do you have not counting student teaching or substitute teaching?
44. What is your gender? Male/Female/Transgender

Appendix C: Teacher Induction Survey

CONSENT FORM

Study Title: An Evaluation of Mentor-Mentee Relationships, Self-Efficacy, and Teacher Retention in an Induction Program

You are invited to take part in a research study about the Teacher Induction Program., The study focuses on the induction program's impact on teacher retention, mentoring and self-efficacy. The researcher is recruiting beginning teachers and teachers new to the district in their first, second, or third year of the induction program to be in the study. This form is part of a process called "informed consent" to allow you to understand this study before deciding whether to take part.

This study is being conducted by a researcher named Sherri L. Henry, who is a doctoral student at Walden University. You might already know the researcher as a ELA Specialist, but this study is separate from that role.

Background Information:

The purpose of the study is to evaluate the effectiveness of the induction program to determine the impact it has on teacher retention, mentoring and self-efficacy.

Procedures:

If you agree to be in this study, you will be asked to complete a survey. The survey should take approximately 15-20 minutes to complete.

Voluntary Nature of the Study:

This study is voluntary. Everyone will respect your decision of whether or not you choose to be in the study. Declining or discontinuing will not negatively impact your relationship with the researcher nor will anyone at the Independent School District treat you differently if you decide not to be in the study. If you decide to join the study now, you can still change your mind later. You may stop at any time.

Risks and Benefits of Being in the Study:

Being in this study will not pose risk to your safety or well being.

The results of this study is not based upon individual responses rather a collection of responses that will indicate the effectiveness of the induction program as it relates to retention, self-efficacy and mentoring. The data will allow district leaders to identify strengths and weaknesses to improve the induction program. Your most likely benefit from participating in the study is that of self-reflection and the opportunity to contribute to improving the program.

Payment:

There will be no compensation or cost to you if you participate in this study.

Privacy:

Any information you provide will be kept anonymous. Your name will never be used in any of the collected data so you may respond to all questions with this confidence. Data will be kept secure for all respondents together in a password protected Google drive created by the researcher. Data will be kept for a period of at least 5 years, as required by the university.

Contacts and Questions:

You may ask any questions you have now. Or if you have questions later, you may contact the researcher by email at sherri.henry@waldenu.edu. If you want to talk privately about your rights as a participant, you can call Dr. Leilani Endicott. She is the Walden University representative who can discuss this with you. Her phone number is 612-312-1210. Walden University's approval number for this study is 05-31-16-0299672 and it expires on May 30, 2017. Please print and keep a copy of this consent form for your records.

Obtaining Your Voluntary Consent

If you understand the statements above and freely consent to be in this study, click on the "NEXT" button below to begin.

Teacher Efficacy for Instructional Strategies

Please indicate your beliefs about each of the questions by selecting one of the following responses ranging from 1-Not at all, 3-Very Little, 5-Some Influence, 7-Quite A Bit and 9-A Great Deal.

1. To what extent can you use a variety of assessment strategies?

1-Not at all	3-Very Little	5-Some Influence	7-Quite A Bit	9-A Great Deal
○	○	○	○	○

2. To what extent can you provide an alternative explanation or example when students are confused?

1-Not at All	3-Very Little	5-Some Influence	7-Quite A Bit	9-A Great Deal
○	○	○	○	○

3. To what extend can you craft good questions for your students?

1-Not at All	3-Very Little	5-Some Influence	7-Quite A Bit	9-A Great Deal
○	○	○	○	○

4. How well can you implement alternative strategies in your classroom?

1-Not at All	3-Very Little	5-Some Influence	7-Quite A Bit	9-A Great Deal
○	○	○	○	○

5. How well can you respond to difficult questions from your students?

1-Not at All	3-Very Little	5-Some Influence	7-Quite A Bit	9-A Great Deal
○	○	○	○	○

6. How much can you do to adjust your lessons to the proper level for individual students?

1-Not at All	3-Very Little	5-Some Influence	7-Quite A Bit	9-A Great Deal
○	○	○	○	○

7. To what extend can you gauge student comprehension of what you have taught?

1-Not at All	3-Very Little	5-Some Influence	7-Quite A Bit	9-A Great Deal
○	○	○	○	○

8. How well can you provide appropriate challenges for very capable students?

1-Not at All	3-Very Little	5-Some Influence	7-Quite A Bit	9-A Great Deal
○	○	○	○	○

Teacher Efficacy for Classroom Management

Please indicate your belief about each of the following questions by selecting one of the following responses ranging from 1-Not at All, 3-Very Little, 5-Some Influence, 7-Quite A Bit, and 9-A Great Deal.

9. How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom?

1-Not at All	3-Very Little	5-Some Influence	7-Quite A Bit	9-A Great Deal
○	○	○	○	○

10. How much can you do to get children to follow classroom rules?

1-Not at All	3-Very Little	5-Some Influence	7-Quite A Bit	9-A Great Deal
○	○	○	○	○

11. How much can you do to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy?

1-Not at All	3-Very Little	5-Some Influence	7-Quite A Bit	9-A Great Deal
○	○	○	○	○

12. How well can you establish a classroom management system with each group of students?

1-Not at All	3-Very Little	5-Some Influence	7-Quite A Bit	9-A Great Deal
○	○	○	○	○

13. How well can you keep a few problem students from ruining an entire lesson?

1-Not at All	3-Very Little	5-Some Influence	7-Quite A Bit	9-A Great Deal
○	○	○	○	○

14. How well can you respond to defiant students?

1-Not at All	3-Very Little	5-Some Influence	7-Quite A Bit	9-A Great Deal
○	○	○	○	○

15. To what extend can you make your expectations clear about student behavior?

1-Not at All	3-Very Little	5-Some Influence	7-Quite A Bit	9-A Great Deal
○	○	○	○	○

16. How well can you establish routines to keep activities running smoothly?

1-Not at All	3-Very Little	5-Some Influence	7-Quite A Bit	9-A Great Deal
○	○	○	○	○

Teacher Efficacy for Student Engagement

Please indicate your belief about each of the questions by selecting one of the following responses ranging from 1-Not at All, 3-Very Little, 5-Some Influence, 7-Quite a Bit, and 9-A Great Deal.

17. How much can you do to get students to believe they can do well in schoolwork?

1-Not at All	3-Very Little	5-Some Influence	7-Quite A Bit	9-A Great Deal
○	○	○	○	○

18. How much can you do to help your students value learning?

1-Not at All	3-Very Little	5-Some Influence	7-Quite A Bit	9-A Great Deal
○	○	○	○	○

19. How much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in schoolwork?

1-Not at All	3-Very Little	5-Some Influence	7-Quite A Bit	9-A Great Deal
○	○	○	○	○

20. How much can you assist families in helping their children do well in school?

1-Not at All	3-Very Little	5-Some Influence	7-Quite A Bit	9-A Great Deal
○	○	○	○	○

21. How much can you do to improve the understanding of a student who is failing?

1-Not at All	3-Very Little	5-Some Influence	7-Quite A Bit	9-A Great Deal
○	○	○	○	○

22. How much can you do to help your students think critically?

1-Not at All	3-Very Little	5-Some Influence	7-Quite A Bit	9-A Great Deal
○	○	○	○	○

23. How much can you do to foster student creativity?

1-Not at All	3-Very Little	5-Some Influence	7-Quite A Bit	9-A Great Deal
○	○	○	○	○

24. How much can you do to get through to the most difficult students?

1-Not at All	3-Very Little	5-Some Influence	7-Quite A Bit	9-A Great Deal
○	○	○	○	○

Mentoring and Induction Experience

The statements presented below are about the induction program and mentoring. Please indicate your beliefs about each statement by selecting one of the responses: (1) strongly disagree (2); agree (3); neutral (4); agree (5); and strongly agree.

25. The information provided by my mentor this year has been useful.

1-Strongly Disagree	2-Disagree	3-Neutral	4-Agree	5-Strongly Agree
○	○	○	○	○

26. The courses I have taken as part of the induction program have been useful.

1-Strongly Disagree	2-Disagree	3-Neutral	4-Agree	5-Strongly Agree
○	○	○	○	○

27. My mentor teacher has shared instructional strategies that I have used in my classroom.

1-Strongly Disagree	2-Disagree	3-Neutral	4-Agree	5-Strongly Agree
○	○	○	○	○

28. My mentor teacher has provided me with useful information on classroom management.

1-Strongly Disagree	2-Disagree	3-Neutral	4-Agree	5-Strongly Agree
○	○	○	○	○

29. My mentor teacher has provided me with useful information on student engagement.

1-Strongly Disagree	2-Disagree	3-Neutral	4-Agree	5-Strongly Agree
○	○	○	○	○

30. My mentor teacher has had a positive influence on my development as a beginning teacher.

1-Strongly Disagree	2-Disagree	3-Neutral	4-Agree	5-Strongly Agree
○	○	○	○	○

31. As a result of participating in my school district's induction program, I feel more prepared to effectively plan for instruction.

1-Strongly Disagree	2-Disagree	3-Neutral	4- Agree	5- Strongly Agree
○	○	○	○	○

32. As a result of participating in my school district's induction program, I feel more prepared to effectively handle discipline problems in my classroom.

1-Strongly Disagree	2- Disagree	3-Neutral	4-Agree	5- Strongly Agree
○	○	○	○	○

33. As a result of participating in my school district's induction program, I feel more prepared to communicate effectively with parents.

1-Strongly Disagree	2- Disagree	3-Neutral	4-Agree	5-Stongly Agree
○	○	○	○	○

34. As a result of participating in my school district's induction program, I feel more prepared to implement the school district's initiatives.

1-Strongly Disagree	2-Disagree	3-Neutral	4-Agree	5-Strongly Agree
○	○	○	○	○

Demographics

The remaining questions will provide us with demographical information. Your responses will remain confidential.

35. What is your gender?

- ◯ Male
- ◯ Female
- ◯ Transgender

36. How many years of teaching experience do you have not counting student teaching or substitute teaching?

- ◯ 0-5 Years
- ◯ 6-10 Years
- ◯ 11-15 Years
- ◯ 16 Years or More

37. Were you assigned a mentor teacher during your first year teaching in the district?

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

38. Does or did your mentor teach the same content area(s) you currently teach?

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

39. What year of the induction program are you currently completing?

- ◯ Year 1
- ◯ Year 2
- ◯ Year 3

40. If you are currently completing year 1 of the induction program, do you plan to return to the same teaching assignment in the 2016-2017 school year?

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No
- ◯ N/A

41. If you are currently completing year 2 or year 3 of the induction program, do you plan to return to the same teaching assignment in the 2016-2017 school year?

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No
- ◯ N/A

42. If you are currently completing year 2 or year 3 of the induction program, did you transfer to a different campus/school in the 2015-2016 school year?

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No
- ◯ N/A

43. Do you plan to continue your career as a teacher in the upcoming school year 2016-2017?

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

Thank you for completing the survey.

Appendix D: Research Question and Survey Alignment

Research Question	Survey Question (s)
1. What is the relationship of beginning teachers' perceived effectiveness of the induction program and their self-efficacy?	Questions #31-34
2. What is the relationship of the perceived mentor-mentee relationship with the self-efficacy of beginning teachers who participated in the program?	Questions #25-30
3. What is the relationship of the intention to remain in teaching with the self-efficacy of beginning teachers who participated in the induction program?	Questions #1-24, 38
4. What is the relationship between the perceived mentor-mentee relationship and their intention to remain in teaching?	Questions #25-30, 38
5. What is the relationship between the beginning teachers' perceived mentor-mentee relationship and their perceived effectiveness of the induction program?	Questions #25-34
6. What is the relationship of the beginning teachers' perceived effectiveness of the induction program and their intention to remain in teaching?	Questions #31-34, 38
7. What are the differences in self-efficacy of beginning teachers by year in the program?	Questions #1-34, 37
8. What are the differences in perceptions of the mentor-mentee relationship of beginning teachers by year in the program?	Questions #25-30, 37
9. What are the differences of perceived effectiveness of the program of the beginning teachers by year in the program?	Questions #31-34, 37
10. What are the differences in the plan to remain in teaching of beginning teachers by year of the program?	Questions #37-38

Appendix E: Permission Letter

For Ohio State Teacher Efficacy Scale

Anita Woolfolk Hoy, Ph.D. Professor Psychological Studies in Education

Dear

You have my permission to use the *Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale* in your research. A copy the scoring instructions can be found at:

http://u.osu.edu/hoy.17/research/instruments/

Best wishes in your work,

Anita Woolfolk Hoy, Ph.D. Professor Emeritus

College of Education 29 West Woodruff Avenue Columbus, Ohio 43210-1177

www.coe.ohio-state.edu/ahoy

Appendix F: Permission to Use Mentoring and Induction Survey From The Author

February 11, 2016

To Whom It May Concern:

Permission is granted for Sherri Henry to use the survey instrument as well as any component of my research findings relative to her doctoral research.

Sincerely,

John M. Ackermann

John M. Ackermann, Ed. D.

Appendix G: Invitation Email Letter by Year of the Program

Invitation Letter- First Year Participants

My name is Sherri Henry and I am a doctoral student with Walden University.

I am conducting research titled, *An Evaluation of Mentor-Mentee Relationships, Self-Efficacy, and Teacher Retention in an Induction Program* for the partial fulfillment of a Doctorate of Education degree. I am recruiting teachers who have completed their first, second or third year of the induction program. I would like to extend an invitation to you to participate in this research.

The purpose of this research is to evaluate the effectiveness of the Teacher Induction Program, as it relates to teacher retention, mentoring, and self-efficacy.

The survey takes about 15-20 minutes to complete. I am simply trying to capture your thoughts and perspectives on being a first year participant in the Teacher Induction program. You are in an ideal position to give me valuable information from your own perspective. Your responses to the questions are anonymous.

If you are willing to participate, please click on the link for detail information about the survey.

https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/induction

Thank you

Invitation Letter- 2nd Year Participants

My name is Sherri Henry and I am a doctoral study with Walden University.

I am conducting research titled, *An Evaluation of Mentor-Mentee Relationships, Self-Efficacy, and Teacher Retention in an Induction Program* for the partial fulfillment of a Doctorate of Education degree. I am recruiting teachers who have completed their first, second or third year of the Teacher Induction program. I would like to extend an invitation to you to participate in this research.

The purpose of this research is to evaluate the effectiveness of the Teacher Induction Program, as it relates to teacher retention, mentoring, and self-efficacy.

The survey takes about 15-20 minutes to complete. I am simply trying to capture your thoughts and perspectives on being a second year participant in the Teacher Induction program. You are in an ideal position to give me valuable information from your own perspective. Your responses to the questions are anonymous.

If you are willing to participate, please click on the link for detail information about the survey.

https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/induction

Thank you

Invitation Letter- 3rd Year Participants

My name is Sherri Henry and I am a doctoral study with Walden University.

I am conducting research titled, *An Evaluation of Mentor-Mentee Relationships, Self-Efficacy, and Teacher Retention in an Induction Program* for the partial fulfillment of a Doctorate of Education degree. I am recruiting teachers who have completed their first, second or third year of the Teacher Induction program. I would like to extend an invitation to you to participate in this research.

The purpose of this research is to evaluate the effectiveness of the Teacher Induction Program, as it relates to teacher retention, mentoring, and self-efficacy.

The survey takes about 15-20 minutes to complete. I am simply trying to capture your thoughts and perspectives on being a third year participant in the Teacher Induction program. You are in an ideal position to give me valuable information from your own perspective. Your responses to the questions are anonymous.

If you are willing to participate, please click on the link for detail information about the survey.

https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/induction

Thank you