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ABSTRACT

ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS’ SUPPORT OF BEGINNING TEACHERS AND THEIR USE OF TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP IN A STATE-APPROVED INDUCTION PROGRAM

Patrick Enright, Ed.D.
Department of Leadership, Educational Psychology and Foundations
Northern Illinois University, 2019
Elizabeth A. Wilkins, Director

This case study investigated how elementary principals use transformational leadership and the Illinois Induction Program Continuum (IIPC) when supporting beginning teachers. The elementary principals who participated in the study (n=6) worked in the same school district that used a state approved new teacher induction program. Data collection methods included pre-written reflection questions, three formal interviews and a review of all induction program documents. The data analysis was initial and focused coding.

The most important finding from this study was how principals provided support for beginning teachers through dialogue, collaborative school context, professional development, and student behavior. The research findings also suggested that elementary principals used idealized influence more often than the other three traits of transformational leadership (individual consideration, intellectual stimulation, and inspirational motivation) when supporting beginning teachers. Finally, the research suggested that elementary principals do not rely on the standards outlined in the IIPC when supporting beginning teachers.

Future research should focus on elements of idealized influence (i.e., risk taking and collaboration) to determine if principal usage of this transformational leadership trait leads to higher retention rates or improved instructional practices. In addition, future research should
examine the frequency and depth of dialogue between principals and beginning teachers to unpack perceived and actual value. Finally, additional research on the use of the IIPC by principals at middle and high school levels may help determine changes in the criteria and expectations for planning, developing, and progress monitoring induction programs.
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Teachers leaving the profession continues to be an ongoing issue in the United States, as attrition rates range from 15-50% over the first few years of teaching (Goldring, Taie, & Riddles, 2014; Gray & Taie, 2015; Ingersoll & Smith, 2003). Currently, most teachers have fewer than 10 years of experience, compounding the issue of attrition rates (National Center on Time and Learning, 2015). Attrition and lack of experience have resulted in a high turnover of beginning teachers. The resulting high turnover of beginning teachers decreases the number of experienced teachers (Womack-Wynne, Dees, Leech, LaPlant, Brockmeier, & Gibson, 2011). To address this concern, the field of education has developed induction programs to support teachers in becoming effective instructors (Feiman-Nemser, 2003; Stanulis & Floden, 2009; Wood & Stanulis, 2009).

Induction programs have been designed to provide support for classroom (creating assessments and developing classroom procedures) and non-classroom (ordering materials) needs, guidance for instructional strategies, and general orientation for beginning teachers (Ingersoll & Smith, 2004; Wilkins & Okrasinski, 2015; Wood & Stanulis, 2009). Although induction programs have increased over 40% in the last 18 years, few beginning teachers experience a comprehensive induction program that includes a mentor, classroom support, and effective leadership (Fletcher, Chang, & Kong, 2008; National Center on Time and Learning, 2015).
Mentoring provides a beginning teacher with one-on-one guidance and opportunities to collaborate and socialize with experienced peers. Support from a mentor as part of an induction program resulted in higher teacher retention rates and increased student achievement (Gray & Taie, 2015; Ingersoll & Strong, 2011; Ronfeldt, Loeb, & Wyckoff, 2013; Womack-Wynne et al., 2011). Additionally, successful mentoring programs are characterized by a school context that is open and accepting of peer observation and feedback (Ingersoll & May, 2012; Ingersoll & Smith, 2004; Rowley, 1999). Mentor and peer-to-peer support can have a great impact on the school context. In addition, the building principal plays an important role in the development of the school climate and, in effect, enhancing teachers’ practices (Allen, Grigsby, & Peters, 2015; Ingersoll & Kralik, 2004; Ingersoll & May; Ladd, 2011; Norton, 2002). The principal is expected to play a role in the induction program and in doing so can shape the culture to enable peer relationships to develop and grow. A principal’s leadership and ability to support beginning teachers while shaping a culture in school is emphasized in the four elements of transformational leadership and in the Illinois Induction Program Continuum (IIPC, see Appendix A); both place specific focus on district and building leadership to support beginning teachers’ development in a collaborative and positive school environment (Illinois Induction Program Continuum, 2010).

Allen et al. (2015) found that a school increases in effectiveness when strong leadership is present. One leadership style that has had a positive impact on a school is transformational leadership (Allen et al.; Bass & Avolio, 1994; Burns, 1978; Chin, 2007). Transformational leadership through the four I’s has sought to support how a principal improves the motivation and abilities of a teacher through common interests and cooperation (Chin). However, when the search terms “elementary education” were coupled with “idealized influence,” “inspirational motivation,” “intellectual stimulation,” and/or “individual consideration,” limited research
studies were found to focus on transformational leadership at the elementary level (Fenn & Mixon, 2011; Mehdinezhad & Mansouri, 2016; Sagnak, 2016; Terek, Glušac, Nikolic, Tasic, & Gligorovic, 2015).

Additionally, no studies were found that used the IIPC as a framework to determine the influence principals have on beginning teachers. Therefore, the current study focused on transformational leadership traits of building principals when mentoring beginning elementary school teachers. The combination of the perspective of elementary principals, the model of transformational leadership, and the framework of the IIPC provided a new lens to view the journey of a beginning teacher.

Theoretical Framework

Chin’s (2007) meta-analysis of transformational leadership in multinational research reports established that teaching and modeling tenets of transformational leadership has been shown to have a high degree of positive influence on teacher job satisfaction and school effectiveness as perceived by teachers. Therefore, this study was framed by transformational leadership theory and the IIPC, specifically Standards 1, 2, and 4 (Chin, 2007; Moollenaar, Daly, & Sleegers, 2010). First, transformational leadership theory is grounded in the thought that through positive change, teachers can begin to live the mission of an organization and take on leadership roles. The construct of transformational leadership theory is defined as how a leader (i.e., a principal) engages with followers (i.e., faculty) to raise their level of motivation and morality (Bass & Avolio, 1994; Burns, 1978). A transformational leader seeks to bring a person past self-identified ability levels to recognize her/his greater potential (Allen et al., 2015;
Transformational leadership is comprised of four elements: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration.

Bass and Avolio (1994) theorized that idealized influence is leading by example, placing the needs of followers first, taking risks, allowing followers to do the same, and acting with high moral regard. Idealized influence can be seen in schools when beginning teachers are given the opportunity to take on leadership roles such as being a member of the school improvement team or other building committee or by providing in-house training on reading strategy. Bass and Avolio suggest that inspirational motivation is seen when followers understand the shared goal and are committed to the success of the organization. Inspirational motivation can be seen when principals and beginning teachers collaborate to align lessons to the goals of the school. Whereas, intellectual stimulation empowers followers to think critically about problems and approach challenges in new and innovative ways without fear of criticism. Intellectual stimulation is established in schools when challenges are addressed as opportunities for success. Bass and Avolio established that individualized consideration provides the leader with opportunities to mentor, to cater to the specific needs of the followers with professional development, to establish open communication, and to view the follower as a whole person. Individual consideration is identified in schools that create professional development (designing lesson plans, creating assessments, unpacking academic standards, dealing with challenging students, or equity education training) that addresses the needs of a beginning teacher. As a final point, the four elements of transformational leadership can be applied by school administrators regardless of experience as based on no statistical significance between the size of a district, years as a teacher or years as a principal (Bass & Avolio; Fenn & Mixon, 2011). The significance of being able to apply and utilize elements of transformational leadership by a
principal without experience or training could be significant when supporting beginning teachers.

The process to fully support beginning teachers was outlined in the IIPC.

The IIPC has outlined standards to ensure that beginning teachers, mentors, school administrators, and school district administrators are successful during the years of induction. The IIPC is designed to support the beginning teacher based on nine standards for school districts to use when implementing an induction program (Illinois Induction Program Continuum, 2010). The current study focused on Standard 1: induction program leadership, Standard 2: program goals and design, and Standard 4: site administrators’ roles and responsibilities (Illinois Induction Program Continuum). Standard 1 focuses on the leadership, implementation, and evaluation of an induction program. Standard 2 emphasizes teacher development and support through the district’s school improvement plan. Standard 4 details the positive climate administrators should create and their collective responsibilities for supporting and participating in an induction program (Illinois Induction Program Continuum). Taken collectively, using transformational leadership and the IIPC provided depth for understanding for how elementary principals approach induction (see Figure 1.1).

Figure 1.1 established the relationship among the four I’s of transformational leadership and the anchor elements of IIPC (each of the four I’s provided support and outcomes for Standards 1, 2, and 4). Transformational leadership theory and IIPC are discussed in greater detail in Chapter 2.
Figure 1.1: Transformational leadership and IIPC convergence.
Statement of the Problem

The reasons for teacher attrition include schools with high poverty rates (Ingersoll & Strong, 2011), teachers who were not assigned a mentor, a weak overall induction system (Fletcher et al., 2008), a lack of school support (either teachers or administration), and minimal classroom feedback (Feiman-Nemser, 2003; Gray & Taie, 2015; National Center on Time and Learning, 2015; Perry & Hays, 2011). However, research had shown that induction programs can make a difference in addressing teacher attrition. Schools with high poverty rates deal with more social-emotional challenges, larger class sizes, and lack of resources, resulting in low retention rates, but Ingersoll and Strong found that induction programs have a positive effect on teacher retention in high poverty schools. Unfortunately, less than one percent of beginning teachers were in a comprehensive (i.e., working with a mentor, a devoted principal, identified collaboration time, teacher network supports and reduced course assignments) induction program (Fletcher et al.). Induction programs that included quality mentoring such as ongoing conferencing between the mentor and beginning teacher, observation of classroom instruction, scheduled planning, co-teaching time (Alliance for Excellence in Education, 2010; Ames, Stanulis & VanZee, 2006; Arends & Rigazio-DiGilio, 2000; Feiman-Nemser, Schwill, Carver, & Yusko, 1999; Moir & Stobbe, 1995; Strong & Baron, 2004), and strong team support all increased retention rates (Perry & Hays).

One area that lacks research, however, is the role of the elementary building principal on teacher retention rates (Boyd, et al., 2011; Certo & Fox, 2002; Wood, 2005). The principal is a key factor to a successful induction program (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2010; Ingersoll & Kralik, 2004). What is more, research has shown that a principal’s interaction with a
beginning teacher has a great impact on whether s/he stays or leaves the teaching profession (Ingersoll & Strong, 2011; Wood). The gap in the research on induction programs for beginning teachers fails to account for the influence of the principals’ traits of transformational leadership and school context (Ingersoll & Kralik; Kapadia, Coca, & Easton, 2007; Wood).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine how elementary building principal leadership traits, through the lens of transformational leadership and the Illinois Induction Program Continuum, influenced the support and mentoring of beginning elementary school teachers.

Research Questions

The study was guided by the following research questions:

1. How do elementary principals describe their roles and responsibilities in mentoring beginning teachers?

2. Which transformational leadership traits do elementary principals use to mentor beginning teachers and why?

3. Which elements of Standards 1, 2 and 4 of the Illinois Induction Program Continuum do elementary principals use to support beginning teachers and why?

4. What influence, if any, do transformational leadership traits used by elementary school principals have on beginning teachers?
Significance of the Study

Many states and school districts have created induction programs to support beginning teachers and address retention (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2010; Odell & Hauling, 2000). Unfortunately, little effort has been made to identify how the transformational leadership qualities of an elementary principal may influence the mentoring, retention rates, and the school context (Wood, 2005). This study added to research on induction through the lens of transformational leadership and Standards 1, 2, and 4 from the Illinois Induction Program Continuum (IIPC). As an informational element, the Illinois Performance Standards for School Leaders (IPSSL, see Appendix B), formerly the Inter-state School Leadership Licensure Consortium or ISLLC Standards, was included in the analysis of information, specifically Standard III – improving teaching and learning.

Principals increasingly face challenges to hire and retain beginning teachers, as evidenced by higher-than-desired percentages of attrition that continue to raise concern (Goldring et al., 2014; Gray & Taie, 2015; Ingersoll & Smith 2003; National Center on Time and Learning, 2015). One way to address this chronic issue was for principals to better understand the four I’s of transformational leadership, the Illinois Induction Program Continuum (IIPC), and potentially other leadership traits and support strategies utilized by elementary-level principals, thus making this study significant. Principals can gain a better understanding of how the traits of transformational leadership can support beginning teachers. Principals can also better align the Standards 1, 2, and 4 of the IIPC when mentoring beginning teachers. Finally, the study also sought to identify other leadership traits and support strategies used by elementary principals to address the needs of a beginning teacher.
Definition of Terms

**Beginning teacher** (new teacher, mentee, protégé, or novice): a teacher newly entering the profession of teaching and in the first or second year of teaching (Illinois Induction Program Continuum, 2010).

**Elementary school** (primary or grammar): a school that educates students from kindergarten to fifth or sixth grade.

**Induction**: a distinct phase of teacher development that occurs upon an individual’s entry into the profession; a period of socialization and enculturation into the norms and practices of the teaching profession; a formal program for beginning teachers of guided entry into the profession of teaching (Illinois Induction Program Continuum, 2010).

**Mentor**: A veteran teacher assigned to help train and support a beginning teacher on facets of teaching.

**Principal**: the person designated as the building leader.

**Professional development**: Training that enhances needed support to become a more effective teacher and school leader that can be provided by both in and out of district personnel.

**Shared district goals**: Goals that are both defined by a school district and embedded in the behaviors of staff.

Methodology

A qualitative approach was chosen for this study. The participants were elementary principals who had multiple years of educational experience working with beginning teachers. Data collection included pre-written reflection questions and a semi-structured three-phase
interview procedure. Additionally, review of district documents assisted in identifying the purpose of the district’s induction program and the role of the principal within that program. Data analysis involved initial coding and focused coding.

Delimitations

This study was limited to one induction program in one district. The participant sample size in the study was limited to allow for in-depth data collection. The study was limited to elementary schools.

Organization

This study was organized into five chapters. This first chapter provided a foundation for the importance of the study. It included the problem and purpose of the study as well as an overview of the methods used in completing the study. The second chapter contains a detailed description of the framework: transformational leadership and the Illinois Induction Program Continuum standards as well as a review of the literature about school context, induction and mentoring programs and their influence on the retention of beginning teachers. The third chapter presents the methodology. The fourth chapter details the findings. Finally, the fifth chapter includes a discussion of the major outcomes from the study, recommendations, future research, and limitations.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter includes a review of literature about principal leadership traits and induction and mentoring programs for beginning teachers. The review is divided into six sections that serves as the foundation for understanding a) transformational leadership, b) the Illinois induction program continuum, c) history of induction programs, d) comprehensive induction programs, e) school context, and f) mentoring.

Transformational Leadership

Transformational leadership can provide a framework for principals and schools to gain a greater understanding of the steps necessary to keep, support, and develop the motivation and practices of a beginning teacher (Roth, 2011). Transformational leadership, as formulated by Bernard Bass, encourages leaders to motivate employees by raising followers’ levels of consciousness about the importance and value of designated outcomes and about ways of reaching them; by getting followers to transcend their own self-interest for the sake of the team; and by raising followers’ levels to the higher-order needs, such as self-actualization, or by expanding their portfolio of needs. (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2004, p. 177)

That is, principals need to establish an open and welcoming environment to help teachers, especially beginning teachers, grow into confident team-oriented faculty members who have a strong sense of acceptance and efficacy in teaching. All principals can apply foundations of
transformational leadership to develop this type of environment in school settings (Fenn & Mixon, 2011).

The theory of transformational leadership becomes more manageable when the leader is guided by the four “I’s” as identified by Bass and Avolio (1994): idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Each of the four “I’s” has character traits to support the follower (in the current study, the beginning teacher). The four I’s can be both defined and operationalized.

First, idealized influence, as described by Bass and Avolio (1994) involves leading by example, placing the needs of followers first, and allowing followers to take risks. Leaders who utilize idealized influence will build foundational trust between themselves and followers and instill a sense of mission and vision (Burns, 1978). Principals who display idealized influence create an environment of respect, vision, and goal orientation as well as ethical and moral soundness. Idealized influence is operationalized when principals collaborate with beginning teachers to create paths for leadership roles (Aydin, Sarier, & Uysal, 2013; Ling, 2012; Marks & Printy, 2003) and then support beginning teachers when developing and implementing new ideas that impact organizational change (Moolenaar, Daly, & Sleegers, 2010). For example, a beginning teacher may join the district or school improvement team, be a member of a grade level lesson study to support literacy and numeracy skills or assist in leading professional development in the areas of numeracy and literacy. The principal may assist the beginning teacher by providing on-site professional development on new lesson literacy strategies or teaching numeracy methods.

Second, inspirational motivation is seen when followers understand the shared goals of the school district and are committed to the success of the organization (Bass & Avolio, 1994).
Leaders who practice inspirational motivation communicate optimism and identify meaning to the tasks to accomplish the goals (Burns, 1978). Principals should introduce and revisit the shared goals throughout the school year and display optimistic character traits and enthusiasm toward the goal (Neissen, Mader, Stride, & Jimmieson, 2017). For example, a principal can work with a beginning teacher on lesson plans to link the shared goals of the district to the classroom. The principal can also use in person meetings or electronic platforms to discuss instructional challenges beginning teacher experience. For example, the beginning teachers may use Google docs for lesson planning. After the lesson is taught, the beginning teacher can reflect on the effectiveness and challenges of the lesson. The principal can then comment on the lesson reflection with ideas and thoughts on how to improve the instruction.

Third, intellectual stimulation empowers followers to think critically about problems and approach challenges in new and innovative ways without fear of criticism (Bass & Avolio, 1994). Leaders with this trait support and encourage creativity among followers (Burns, 1978). Principals should encourage and attend professional development with beginning teachers (Allen et al., 2015). Allen suggests that principals who encourage and support new ideas which are often found when attending professional development with beginning teachers, result in the beginning teachers having positive feelings about school climate. Principals should publicly commend creative thinking and refrain from criticism (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Principals should also visit beginning teachers’ classrooms and collaboratively identify challenges, for example, student engagement, procedures, or questioning techniques (Allen et al.; Avolio, Waldman, & Yammarino 1991). Principals can address these challenges by dialoguing with the beginning teacher to brainstorm alternative methods, assign the beginning teacher to see veteran teachers
apply best practices, or as previously discussed, attend identified professional development focused on beginning teacher’s needs.

Fourth and finally, leaders with a developed understanding of individual consideration can better mentor and support the strengths of followers (Bass & Avolio, 1994). Leaders will seek to understand the needs and concerns of followers and act as a mentor or coach (Burns, 1978). Principals can survey beginning teachers to gain an awareness of their needs and monitor and/or attempt to change the emotions of beginning teachers (Palmer, Walls, Burgess, & Stough, 2001). Principals who practice individual consideration provide written or oral feedback and celebrate the contributions of beginning teachers (Avolio & Bass, 1995; Burns; Palmer et al.). Through feedback and reflection, principals can recognize the individual differences among beginning teachers and identify needed areas for professional development (Allen et al., 2015).

An effective and competent administrator who is well versed in transformational leadership can help beginning teachers have positive perceptions of their school’s context and influence teacher retention (Boyd et al., 2011; Chin, 2007; Ross & Cozzens, 2016; Marks & Printy, 2003; Moolenaar et al., 2010). Positive perceptions include collaboration, instructional leadership, inquiry, reflection, unity of purpose, and visionary leadership (Ross & Cozzens). Marks and Printy found that establishing instructional practices and providing professional development and positive school perception increase beginning teachers’ commitment to the profession. In addition, school leaders who utilize the four I’s of transformational leadership heighten a beginning teacher’s opportunity for reflecting and reporting greater feelings of commitment toward the school and profession (Chin; Hauserman & Stick, 2013; Ling, 2012). Conversely, principals who do not display transformational leadership qualities are perceived to create a low climate for innovate support (Moolenaar et al.). Innovative support is
operationalized when principals develop a shared vision, support social needs of teachers, and focus on intellectual stimulation (Moolenaar et al.). In a climate that does not honor innovative support a beginning teacher may not take risks in order to create innovation possibly leaving them to abandon teaching or the school. In addition, Leithwood and Janzi (2006) discovered school context was negative when school leaders’ use of transformational leadership was weak, specifically in decision making, providing individual support or creating good relationships with beginning teachers.

Transformational leadership positively influences a beginning teachers’ participation in creation of the vision of a school and its policy through the leadership capabilities of teachers (Burns, 1978; Neissen et al., 2017), collegiality among staff (Allen et al., 2015), and administrator effectiveness (Fenn & Mixon, 2011). These factors have subsequently increased teacher commitment in a school building as evidenced by principals establishing the steps to empower staff and act as a role model for established global behaviors, such as involvement with staff and peers, supporting instruction, or collaboration (Allen et al.). An additional element of transformational leadership that supports teacher commitment and increases retention is the implementation of an induction program. The elements of transformational leadership can support both beginning teachers and the school through collaborative school context. In addition, transformational leadership has elements within the tool that outline performance standards for school administrators.

The Illinois Performance Standard for School Leaders (IPSSL), formerly the Inter-state School Leadership Licensure Consortium or (ISLLC), began in 1996 to strengthen organizations, lead instruction, and support teachers (ISBE). A statewide design team adopted the then ISLLC standards in 2007 and eventually became a part of the Performance Evaluation Reform Act of
2010 and officially adopted by the Illinois State Board of Education in 2012 under the 23 Illinois Administrative Code 29 (Iwanicki & Frazier, 2010; Illinois School Code). The IPSSL contains six standards to improve principal leadership. For this case study, Standard III, with a focus on improving teaching and learning, added depth to the use for principals. Standard III includes selecting and retaining teachers, developing structures for professional development, creating school improvement cycle, celebrating success, and providing feedback on instruction. The state of Illinois has, at various policy levels, focused on teacher induction programs for over 30 years.

The Illinois Induction Program Continuum (IIPC), created by the Illinois Department of Education, outlines steps and tasks to address retention issues and support beginning teachers. The use of transformational leadership theory by principals has an impact on implementing induction programs as defined by the IIPC. Transformational leadership can influence many elements found in the IIPC, including teacher commitment, professional development, planning the induction program, communication, and climate (Allen et al., 2015; Barton & Dereshiswky, 2009; Day & Sammans, 2013; DeMatthews, 2014; Yu, Leithwood, & Janzi, 2006; Ross & Gray, 2006). The State of Illinois uses an encompassing evaluation tool to support transformational leadership and the IIPC.

Illinois Induction Program Continuum

The Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE), through the Education Reform Act of 1985, mandated that schools review the first year of teaching and identify ways to support beginning teachers (Barger, 1986). After the Education Reform Act of 1985, school districts began to create their own induction programs. To support school districts’ new teacher induction programs, the ISBE partnered with multiple state universities to survey the status of induction
programs in Illinois. The first major report came at an induction summit in 1987. The report was to help design, create and evaluate the Illinois Initial Year of Teaching Program (Griffin & Millies, 1987). The outcome of the 1987 meeting included state recommendations to establish provisional teaching licenses, content specific teaching endorsements, and induction programs to include teacher mentors, attention to school context and involvement of the building administration (Griffin & Millies).

In the 1990s, school districts and universities collaborated to sustain unfunded induction programs in rural, suburban and urban schools (Presley, 2002; Presley & Konkol, 2001). In 1996, the state of Illinois began a formal partnership with the National Commission on Teaching & America’s Future. During the same year, two reports: *Rising to the Challenge: The Future of Teaching in Illinois* and *The Illinois Framework for Restructuring the Recruitment, Preparation, Licensure and Continuing Professional Development for Teachers* were published. These reports led to the Illinois Framework, which established that mentoring and professional development are major elements in teacher preparation (Kolbusz-Kosan, Clift, Clementz, & Herbert, 2007; Presley). The outcomes of the reports include the passage of Public Act 093-0355 in 2003, which requires induction programs and mentors for all new teachers (ISBE; Kolbusz-Kosan et al.). To support induction programs and coordination between the state and school districts, the Illinois New Teacher Collaborative (INTC) began in 2004 (Johnson, Goldrick, & Lasagna, 2010; Kolbusz-Kosan et al.). The INTC’s purpose is to support the administration of induction programming and provide technical support for new teachers (Johnson et al.). The INTC’s review of induction pilot programs in Illinois has recommended more building level administrative involvement for an induction program to be successful (Kolbusz-Kosan et al.). This recommendation was eventually acted on in 2013 through the 23 Illinois Administrative
Code 65, which calls for administrators to receive induction-related professional development for new teachers (ISBE). Kolbusz-Kosan et al. also called for written guidance that can be used by program coordinators to support the growth of new teachers and to evaluate an induction program. This recommendation along with the guidelines developed in the *Illinois Standards for Quality and Effectiveness for Beginning Teacher Induction Programs* in 2008 led to the release of the Illinois Induction Program Continuum (IIPC) in 2010 (Johnson et al.). The IIPC established clear criteria to support beginning teachers and tools to effectively measure the strength of induction programs against state standards, including school contexts (Johnson et al.; Wilkins, Holt, Nelson, Quinzio-Zafran, & Wells, 2012). Unfortunately, the IIPC is not mandated and the funding sources are limited when providing mentor support, leaving an inadequate number of schools receiving state funding for induction programs (Goldrick, Osta, Barlin, & Burn, 2012; Wilkins et al.).

In total, the IIPC contains nine standards (see Appendix A). For the current study, however, only three of the nine standards were of focus, as they directly address induction program leadership (i.e., principals). The three standards include Standard 1: Induction Program Leadership; Standard 2: Program Goals and Design; and Standard 4: Site Administrators’ Roles and Responsibilities (see Table 2.1).
Table 2.1
Illinois Induction Program Continuum: Standards 1, 2, and 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 1-Induction Program Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criteria</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 2-Program Goals and Design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criteria</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table continued on next page
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Establishes program goals for beginning teacher development, retention, and student learning.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Standard 4-Site Administrators Roles and Responsibilities**

**Purpose**-Site leaders will collaborate to ensure that they understand how to support beginning teachers and the overall induction program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Establishes that program leaders design professional development for principals and other site administrators to implement which would sustain the school and district induction program.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Informs that program leaders collaborate with all stakeholders to ensure that a positive school climate is evident for beginning teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Outlines that principals, stakeholders, and site administrators develop a collaborative learning community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Includes ongoing communication and feedback regarding program design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Emphasizes that confidentiality is a priority between program leaders, mentors, beginning teachers, and stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Ensures that the principal’s goals coincide with the standards of the induction program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Illinois Induction Program Continuum, 2010)

All three standards align with transformational leadership. Standard 1: Induction Program Leadership has elements from idealized influence (leading the visions and mission of the induction program), inspirational motivation (creating a culture of commitment), individual consideration (using feedback to support the induction program), and intellectual stimulation (the principal would attend professional development with the beginning teacher). Standard 2: Program Goals and Design relates to inspirational motivation (providing meaning and purpose to the induction program) and individual consideration (supporting beginning teachers’ emotional...
needs and strengths). Standard 4: Site Administrators’ Roles and Responsibilities includes aspects of inspirational motivation (collaboration between program coordinators, principals, mentors and mentees) and individual consideration (identifying effective paths for growth for beginning teachers).

The IIPC provides detailed gradations of implementation, and the criteria for implementation varies depending on the standard and subsection (see Table 2.2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Establishing</th>
<th>Applying</th>
<th>Integrating</th>
<th>Systematizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programs at the establishing level are learning about the induction program standards and establishing program components. Limited involvement of all stakeholders occurs at this level.</td>
<td>Programs at the applying level have some experience and are applying knowledge of induction program standards and moving toward full implementation of program components. Program is shared with additional stakeholders.</td>
<td>Programs at the integrating level are more experienced with induction program standards and accomplished in implementation of program components. They are working collaboratively with an expanded group of stakeholders on a regular basis.</td>
<td>Programs at the systematizing level collaborate regularly with all stakeholders to integrate induction program standards and program components throughout the district/consortia. Program is beyond compliance and embodies innovative practices by contributing to the broader educational community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Illinois Induction Program Continuum, 2010, p. 6)

Currently, over half of US schools have an induction program, but many have yet to create and implement policy for intense long-term support for new teachers (Goldrick, 2016). It should be noted that district induction programs may vary widely in both application and quality.
In addition, the New Teachers Center emphasizes that a robust state induction program can provide long term benefits to teachers, students, and school districts. To better understand the development of induction programs, it is essential to review past implementation practices and efforts.

History of Induction Programs

The first year of teaching can be unmanageable and uncontrolled if the teacher is not given proper support (Feiman-Nemser, 2003). The National Center on Educational Statistics (1997) reported that 15% of teachers will leave the industry in the first year of teaching and that 17% of teachers (2015) will leave within five years of teaching (Goldring et al., 2014; Gray & Taie, 2015), which is higher than other professions (Ingersoll, 2001; Ingersoll & Smith, 2003). High teacher turnover has been found to compromise the education system’s ability to grow skilled teachers (Haynes, Maddlock, & Goldrick, 2014; Ingersoll, Merrill, & Stuckey, 2014), and as a result, teacher induction programs have been introduced to support beginning teacher development and combat attrition rates. Studies on teacher induction programs began several decades ago and continue today. The research on induction programs reveals that beginning teachers face many challenges including job satisfaction, professional competency, effective instructional practices, and collaboration (Feiman-Nemser et al., 1999; Fuller, 1969; Odell, 1986; Perry & Hays, 2011; Wood & Stanulis, 2009; Williams, Gillham, & Evans, 2016).

Induction programs have developed from trying to understand the challenges of beginning teachers to state mandated programs. Fuller (1969), a seminal researcher on the topic of supporting beginning teachers, identified that teachers encounter the induction stage after their first contact with students. Fuller discovered that teachers in the induction phase, or first year of
teaching, are concerned with their ability get through a school day, understand content, and address student behavior. By the mid-1970s, states began to offer formal induction programs for teachers. Although teacher induction programs have been dependent on state educational reforms and education programs through universities, school districts have taken on a large role in supporting beginning teachers (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2010; Odell & Hauling, 2000). Wood and Stanulis (2009) categorized five waves of teacher induction programs, which began in Florida in 1978 (Feiman-Nemser et al., 1999).

The first wave of programs focused on addressing teacher attrition, job satisfaction, and teacher competency (Arends & Rigazio-Digilio, 2000). The second wave, from 1986 to 1989, focused on professional development and included classroom observations (Odell, 1986; Wood & Stanulis, 2009). The third wave, established between 1990 and 1996, began to support beginning teachers by adding formative assessments (Fideler & Haselkorn, 1999; Wood & Stanulis). Fourth wave programs, implemented between 1997 and 2006, focused on teacher quality and teacher practices for diverse populations (Darling-Hammond & Baratz-Snowden, 2005), student achievement through teacher performance (Alliance for Excellence in Education, 2010; Arends & Rigazio-DiGilio; Fletcher, Strong & Villaro, 2008), and support and training on assessments and instructional strategies (Alliance for Excellent Education; Wood & Stanulis). Fifth wave programs focused on student achievement outcomes along with subject based programs (Wood & Stanulis) and diverse learners in impoverished urban communities (Haberman, 2005). The fifth wave induction programs were influenced by No Child Left Behind and focused on more accountability (Wood & Stanulis). The focused elements of each phase aided in the creation of induction programing.
Feiman-Nemser (2003) emphasizes that induction programs need to place a new teacher in the center of a professional culture that is defined by teacher learning. Successful induction programs establish professional cultures that support shared responsibilities and collaboration. In earlier work, Fieman-Nemser et al. (1999) described induction programs as “a phase in learning to teach, a process of enculturation, or a formal program for the supportive development and assessment of a beginning teacher” (p. 31). Induction programs should support new teachers in different ways including school orientations, collaboration with peers, effective classroom practices, and mentoring (Ingersoll & Strong, 2011). Three main factors have been shown to have the greatest impact on teacher retention: a comprehensive induction program, a positive school context, and mentoring. Multiple researchers have clearly shown that the presence of an effective principal will positively influence comprehensive induction programs, school context, and mentoring (Borman & Dowling, 2008; Boyd et al., 2011; Certo & Fox, 2002; Cherian & Daniel, 2008; Liu, 2007; Wilkins et al., 2012)

Comprehensive Induction Programs

Comprehensive induction programs are designed to support teacher performance, address retention, improve the social and emotional well-being of beginning teachers, and help beginning teachers understand a school’s culture (Hauling-Austin, 1991). Schools increase retention by building a reflective and positive culture in which the principal is highly involved (Cherian & Daniel, 2008; Liu, 2007). Comprehensive induction programs include principal observations of instructional practices (lesson delivery, student engagement, and activities) of beginning teachers (Glazerman et al., 2008; Perry & Hays, 2011; Wood, 2005). Comprehensive induction programs provide a trained full-time mentor whose traits are effective (Fletcher & Strong, 2009; Rowley,
Kaplan, Chan, Farbman, and Novoryta (2014) among others (Perry & Hays, 2011; Wood, 2005) found that comprehensive induction programs are successful when the principal has positive interactions with and supports beginning teachers. Positive interaction entails creating supportive and non-judgmental environments (Wood) that lead to transformational leadership and a positive school context. Elements of school context include school policy, collegial relationships, and the competency of administrators (Borman & Dowling, 2008; Certo & Fox, 2002; Wilkins et al. 2012).

Principals who provide opportunities through induction programs for beginning teachers to grow professionally in a non-judgmental environment, similar to idealized influence, strengthen the school context. Principals who broaden communication, similar to intellectual stimulation, while creating collegial support strengthen their school’s context. Principals who promote an understanding of the school culture, similar to inspirational motivation, will also strengthen a school’s context (Perry & Hays, 2011; Williams et al., 2016).

School Context

Research has gradually identified that school context has a greater influence on teacher retention rates than induction programs or mentors (Wilkins et al., 2012). School context is based on five categories: 1) teacher’s influence on school policy, 2) staff relationships, 3) student behavior, 4) facilities and safety, and 5) competency of administrators (Borman & Dowling,
A positive school context is one key element to improve teacher retention through effective leadership, collegial support, and sufficient teaching materials (Humphrey, Wechsler, & Hough, 2008; Ingersoll & Kralik, 2004; Lesnick, Jiang, Sporte, Sartain & Hart, 2010; Wechsler, Caspary, Humphrey, & Matsko, 2010; Wood, 2005). Teachers stay in the field when there is a commitment to the profession, a positive school context that is supported by effective administrator support, and strong collegial relationships with staff (Certo & Fox).

The principal, as the primary leader, should create a school context to stimulate beginning teachers’ full potential by building a professional culture of learning (Cherian & Daniel, 2008; Owens, 2004; Vos, van der Westruizen, Mentz, & Ellis, 2012). The principal should create this culture of learning through the four I’s of transformational leadership by promoting a professional relationship among staff as well as supporting school context (Allen et al., 2015; Boyd, et. al., 2011; Cherian & Daniel). Wechsler et al. (2010) sought to identify the outcomes of various induction programs that supported new teachers and addressed the challenges of retention. The study found that induction programs focused on mentoring, instructional practices, and professional development and were not conducted with fidelity did not increase retention. The research did discover that the greatest predictor of retention was school context.

Aubusson, Buchanan, Schuck, and Prescott (2015) investigated the types of school support that beginning teachers perceived as beneficial. They identified a positive school context present when peers collaborated on lesson plans, held professional conversations about teaching, and worked with a mentor teacher. A prior study found that collegial support, offsite professional development, and access to a mentor positively impacted teacher retention, all elements of
school context (Buchanan, Prescott, Schuck, Aubusson, & Burke, 2013). Buchanan et al. discovered that lack of school support regarding poor student behavior had a negative impact on a teacher’s decision to stay. Aubusson et al.’s study also found negative school contexts include perceived feelings of isolation as well as limited access to teaching resources and lack of professional conversations. The Aubusson et al. study revealed negative school context indicators that led to low teacher retention, while Buchanan et al. found a singular indicator.

Previous research found that the first year and former teachers’ decisions to stay were dependent on school context, specifically dissatisfaction with the principal (Boyd et al., 2011). Dissatisfaction was described as the principal rarely working with staff on curriculum, not discussing instructional needs, and not supporting a collaborative environment.

Contrary to the research previously discussed, Hughes (2012) studied teacher retention by analyzing four traits: a) teacher characteristics, b) school characteristics, c) organizational characteristics, and d) teacher efficacy. Hughes suggested that school characteristics and teacher efficacy had a small impact on a teacher’s decision to stay and determined that lack of principal support did not influence retention. However, Hughes’s study did not include the thoughts and perceptions of teachers who left the profession. This fact could be one reason why the outcome of this study was inconsistent with other research. Certainly, school culture plays a role in teacher retention, but mentoring also has an impact on a teacher’s decision to stay in the field.

Mentoring

Another major element of a comprehensive induction program is a teacher mentor. Beginning teachers who were assigned a mentor had higher retention rates and greater student success than teachers who were not assigned a mentor (Fletcher & Strong, 2009). Ingersoll and
Smith (2004), through the 1999-2000 Schools and Staffing Survey, discovered four important factors of mentoring to reduce teacher turnover: a) being mentored by a teacher who teaches the same subject or grade level, b) having a common planning time, c) sharing instructional methods and, d) being partners in a professional community. Although these four factors establish identifiable steps school and induction leaders can use to initiate and implement mentoring programs to increase retention rates, school context and building leadership ultimately support successful mentoring programs (Borman & Dowling, 2008). However, for mentoring to be successful, beginning teachers need to have a positive perception of the induction program and the mentor they are assigned (Fletcher & Strong; Ragins, Cotton, & Miller, 2000).

Researchers found that when beginning teachers collaborate with trained mentors, positive collegial relationships form. Through these relationships beginning teacher become members of a professional community and can influence curriculum and professional development leading to empowerment and job satisfaction (Boyd et al., 2011; Fletcher & Strong, 2009; Kidd, Brown, & Fitzallen, 2015; Lesnick et al., 2010; Ingersoll & Smith, 2004). Pogadzinski (2015) added to research on school context by focusing on a school administrator’s beliefs and behaviors toward the beginning teacher and mentor relationship. The study proposed that an administrator can create an environment of mentor support and a positive school context by providing a trained mentor who teaches in the same area as the beginning teacher and giving release time for beginning teacher-mentor collaboration. Beginning teachers reported that when administrator-teacher relationships were positive, beginning teachers spent more time with their mentor. Conversely, beginning teachers identified that a lack of time to build a strong relationship with a teacher made mentoring programs less valuable and, therefore, less worthwhile (Womack-Wynne et al., 2011). Beginning teachers who perceived that time spent on
mentoring did not result in an increase of their instructional practices had lower retention rates (Kidd et al.). Even though trained teacher mentors approach beginning teachers as prescribed by the induction program, slight differences and the mentor-mentee relationship may create outcomes contrary to a mentoring program and lead to the principal having to calibrate the program (Lesnick et al.; Ragins et al., 2000). The findings of these studies determined that administrative practices can have a direct influence on mentoring.

Conclusion

A principal who practiced transformational leadership had some level of positive impact on school context and teacher retention. As discovered, regardless of experience, all principals can utilize elements of transformational leadership (Fenn & Mixon, 2011). Principals who established an environment that was predicated on transformational leadership with the support of a comprehensive induction program produced a positive school climate and ultimately address the challenge of teacher retention.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to examine how elementary building principal leadership traits, through the lens of transformational leadership and the Illinois Induction Program Continuum, influenced the support and mentoring of beginning elementary school teachers. This chapter includes a description of the research design, participants, data collection techniques, and data analysis methods. Each section was informed by the research questions:

1. How do elementary principals describe their roles and responsibilities in mentoring beginning teachers?

2. Which transformational leadership traits do elementary principals use to mentor beginning teachers and why?

3. Which elements of Standards 1, 2 and 4 of the Illinois Induction Program Continuum do elementary principals use to support beginning teachers and why?

4. What influence, if any, do transformational leadership traits used by elementary school principals have on beginning teachers?

Research Design

Currently there are numerous research studies on induction programs that use quantitative design (Boyd et al., 2011; Borman & Dowling, 2008; Glazerman et al., 2008; Ingersoll & May,
While quantitative research provides strong data on the effectiveness of induction programs, qualitative method provides detail about the human experience (Merriman, 1998), which for this study involved principals’ interactions with and support of beginning teachers. Ethnography, phenomenology, grounded theory, and case studies are all options for qualitative research methods (Mertens, 2015) that add depth to research by examining the individuals’ experiences based on their words (Merriman). Because this study focused on the lived experiences (Merriman; Mertens) of elementary school principals through the lens of transformational leadership when supporting beginning teachers, a case study design was used. A basic case study is a “holistic description and analysis of a single unit or bound system” (Merriman, p. 13), providing a rich description of the lived experiences (Mertens). A case study approach provided insight into the nuances and complexities of elementary principals’ support of beginning teachers. In addition, this study focused on elementary principals from one school district who use the same induction program, making the use of a bounded case study the most appropriate design (Merriman).

Choosing the Elementary Level

As of 2015, there were a total of 2,605 elementary principals and 66,000 teachers in the state of Illinois. The number of elementary principals and teachers was far greater than middle or high school numbers in the state of Illinois, as shown in Table 3.1. It was decided that focusing on elementary principals would impact more teachers due to the number of teachers at the elementary level.
Table 3.1
Number of Schools and Staff in Illinois by School Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
<th>Number of Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>2,605</td>
<td>66,000</td>
<td>2,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>39,500</td>
<td>744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>51,000</td>
<td>759</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


School District and Its Induction Program

Variation sampling was used to choose a school district whose average retention rate of teachers (91%) was four percent above State of Illinois’s average (Merriam, 1998). The district, located in the northern part of Illinois, includes grades kindergarten through twelfth and has over 6,500 students and more than 450 teachers (ISBE). There are eight elementary schools, which are detailed in Table 3.2.

Table 3.2
Number of Students, Teachers, and Retention Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Student Population</th>
<th>Number of Total Teachers</th>
<th>Average Number of New Teachers in Past 5 Years</th>
<th>Retention Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Illinois Induction Program Continuum is used by the district to create and carry out their induction program. Since 2010, the school district has offered a one- or two-year mentor induction program depending on the amount of experience new teachers bring to their position. Teachers in the one-year mentor induction program have more than four semesters of full-time teaching experience prior to coming to the district. Teachers in the two-year mentor induction program have four or less semesters of teaching experience. Throughout the year, mentors and beginning teachers conduct peer observations, attend professional development training both provided by the district and outside vendors, and discuss a variety of topics including instructional design, classroom management techniques, and professional practices. A description of the district induction program and representative materials can be found in Appendix C, which include the following: 1) a school district manual for new teacher induction programming, 2) agendas from mentoring meetings, and 3) observation feedback/reflective tools for beginning teachers.

The induction program outlines the expectations of the principal. For example, each building principals met with her/his beginning teachers for one hour on the second day of the three day induction training to discuss identified topics (e.g., teaming, positive behavior intervention systems (PBIS), standards based grading, bathrooms, meeting schedules, multi-tiered system of support (MTSS), incentive days and advisory). The induction program also suggests a list of items or information that the principal should share with the beginning teacher. (see Appendix D). Examples from the list include a building tour, access to resources, expectations about student behavior, curriculum, student management procedures, and institute day instructions.
Participants

The purpose of the study was introduced via a phone conversation with the district superintendent. An email, as part of the IRB, was sent to the district superintendent requesting permission to interview principals and use the district induction documents for this study. After permission was granted, a phone conversation was made to each prospective participant to inquire if they would like to participate in the study. Purposeful sampling was used as the researcher sought to determine how elementary principals used the four I’s of transformational leadership to support their beginning teachers. The participants were male and female elementary school principals from the same district who had multiple years of experience working with beginning teachers. The school district has eight elementary schools. Of the eight principals available, two did not participate. One principal was not included in the study due her being named principal of the school during the time of principal interviews. Meaning, she had never worked in that school, and another principal was unable to complete all pre-written questions. Therefore, the study included the remaining six principals.

The principals who verbally agreed to be a participant in the study were sent the written request via email. The written request included the purpose, method, steps to ensure confidentiality, and reciprocity of the conclusions discovered (see Appendix E). The principals signed and returned the written request at the first semi-structured interview.

Confidentiality was maintained by using participant pseudonyms, chosen by the participants themselves. In addition, the school district and schools were given pseudonyms to keep their identity confidential. Any documents containing names, titles, emails, phone numbers,
or locations or other indicators of the school were redacted. A detailed, narrative description of each principal follows in Chapter 4.

Data Collection

This section of the chapter provides information about each of the data collection techniques used in the study. The next two subsections describe the interview and document review.

Interviews

Seidman (2013) summarizes that the purpose of using interviews in a case study is to gain insight into an individual’s lived experience and attached meaning. In addition, Seidman concludes that the most effective method for understanding educational issues is through interviewing people who work in the field to be studied. Through interviews, the elementary principals were able to express their interactions with beginning teachers and share ways they supported them. In support of this approach Merriam (1998) argues that interviewing provides information such as the participants’ feelings, thoughts, intentions, and experiences specific to them, which goes beyond what can be obtained through observations or document review.

Prior to interviewing the participants in this study, a current elementary principal reviewed the protocols to determine clarity and understanding. Given her 25+ years as an educator and eight years as a sitting principal, she possessed experience and insight on the topic. In my role as researcher, I had a phone conversation with this principal to clarify the purpose of the study and her role. After that, all remaining communication was via Google document, where she could provide feedback and critique. When review of all questions was complete, she
reported to me that they were clear and specific enough for the principals to answer. Therefore, no changes were recommended.

Both pre-written reflection questions and semi-structured interviews were used to gather data from the principals. First, the pre-written reflection questions were shared with each principal as a Google doc to allow time to deeply reflect on their responsibilities, roles, and traits of transformational leadership when supporting beginning teachers. The principals received a different set of pre-written reflection questions before each of the three face-to-face interviews. Each set contained 4-6 questions, with alignment to the research questions. For example, one pre-written reflection question asked prior to the first face-to-face interview read, “Describe your first year as a principal and your experience working with beginning teachers.” The convenience of using a shared Google doc to capture the pre-written reflections allowed for immediate review, and if needed, the opportunity to ask follow-up questions during the semi-structured interview. Using the pre-written reflection questions also reduced the number of questions asked during the semi-structured interviews, as to honor the principals’ time.

In addition, there were three semi-structured interviews conducted to gain deeper insight about each principal, his/her experiences, and meaning assigned to those experiences (Bailey, 2007; Mertens, 2015; Merriam, 1998; Seidman, 2013). The purpose of the first interview was to gain as much insight as possible about the participant in relation to the topic (Seidman) – for example, “How do you support beginning teachers who try new teaching practices or instructional methods? (idealized influence).” The second interview discovered the details of the principal’s lived experiences with mentoring, transformational leadership, and the Illinois Induction Program Continuum (Seidman). For instance, each principal was asked to “describe the steps that are in place for a beginning teacher to be included in the decision making process
(intellectual stimulation).” The third interview discovered how each principal reflected on her/his experience when mentoring beginning teachers (Seidman). A reflective question of this type included: “Describe how you assist in the continued growth of the induction program.” A complete list of all interview questions is included in Table 3.3, followed by their alignment with each research question.

Whereas the pre-written reflection questions were conducted via Google docs, the interviews were conducted in person or via telephone and did not exceed 60 minutes. All interviews were conducted at least one week apart, but due to scheduling conflicts, the second and third interview with Allison was 5 days apart and the first and second interview with Zach was 4 days apart.
Table 3.3

Crosswalk of Research Questions to the
Pre-Interview Written Reflection Questions and Interview Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre Interview Written Reflection</th>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Pre Interview #1 Written Reflection Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>How do elementary principals describe their roles and responsibilities in mentoring beginning teachers?</td>
<td>1. Describe your first year as a principal and your experience working with beginning teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Describe the training you received as an administrator to support induction and mentoring of beginning teachers. (standard 1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. What do you believe is the role(s) of the principal in mentoring beginning teachers? (standard 1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. What do you believe should be a principal’s responsibilities in mentoring beginning teachers? (standard 1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Research Questions</td>
<td>Interview #1 Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Which transformational leadership traits do elementary principals use to mentor beginning teachers and why?</td>
<td>1. How do you support beginning teachers who try new teaching practices or instructional methods? (idealized influence)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Which elements of Standards 1, 2 and 4 of the Illinois Induction Program Continuum do elementary principals use to support beginning teachers and why?</td>
<td>2. How do you build a foundation of trust with beginning teachers? (idealized influence)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. How do you model risk taking for your teaching staff? (idealized influence)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. How do you create paths for beginning teachers to take on leadership roles? (idealized influence)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. What input do you have with district coordinators and mentoring teams when it comes to implementation of the induction program? (standard 1 – 1.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Describe the system that is in place for program coordinators, site administrators and mentor teams to collaborate and create a culture of commitment for the induction program. (standard 1 – 1.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Describe how program leadership and site leadership collaborate to guide and implement the induction program. Do you and the beginning teachers attend PD together? (standard 1 – 1.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table continues on next page
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre Interview Written Reflection</th>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Pre Interview #2 Written Reflection Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2                               | Which transformational leadership traits do elementary principals use to mentor beginning teachers and why? | 1. How do you inspire motivation for a beginning teacher? (inspirational motivation)  
2. How do beginning teachers understand the goals of the school? (inspirational motivation)  
3. What suggestions do you typically need to give beginning teachers to improve lesson planning or instructional methodologies? (inspirational motivation)  
4. What steps are taken to support how to write and create goals for beginning teachers? (inspirational motivation)  
5. How do you respond to a beginning teacher who is growing negative and pessimistic about teaching? (inspiration motivation)  
6. How have you gotten beginning teachers to align their lessons to the overall goals of the school? (inspirational motivation) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview</th>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Interview #2 Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2         | Which transformational leadership traits do elementary principals use to mentor beginning teachers and why?  
Which elements of Standards 1, 2 and 4 of the Illinois Induction Program Continuum do elementary principals use to support beginning teachers and why? | 1. Describe the steps that are in place for a beginning teacher to be included in the decision making process. (intellectual stimulation)  
2. How often do you attend professional development with beginning teachers? (intellectual stimulation)  
3. What processes are in place to commend beginning staff members for their work and effort? (intellectual stimulation)  
4. How do beginning teachers inform you of a creative way they addressed challenge? (intellectual stimulation)  
5. How do program leaders, site administrators and mentor teams define learning outcomes for beginning teachers to support student learning? (standard 2 – 2.1)  
6. In what ways do the program leaders, site administrators and mentor teams use the school improvement plan (SIP) help beginning teachers grow and develop? (standard 2 – 2.2)  
7. What is the process for program leaders and site administrators when selecting, training, and evaluating the mentor teachers? (standard 2 – 2.3)  
8. How do program leaders, site administrators and mentor teams help beginning teachers reflect on feedback provided by mentor or principal? (standard 2 – 2.4)  
9. What data are used to review the goals of the induction program? (standard 2 – 2.5) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre Interview Written Reflection</th>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Pre Interview #3 Written Reflection Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3                                | Which transformational leadership traits do elementary principals use to mentor beginning teachers and why? | 1. Explain how you gain an understanding of the needs of beginning teachers? (individual consideration)  
2. How do you respond to the needs of a beginning teacher? (individual consideration)  
3. Describe the different experiences that you have seen among beginning teachers? (individual consideration)  
4. How have you responded to these different experiences? (individual consideration)  
5. How do you approach classroom conversations with beginning teachers when supporting academic challenges/behavioral issues? (individual consideration) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview</th>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Interview #3 Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3         | Which elements of Standards 1, 2 and 4 of the Illinois Induction Program Continuum do elementary principals use to support beginning teachers and why?  
What influence, if any, do transformational leadership traits used by elementary school principals have on beginning teachers? | 1. Describe how you assist in planning for the continued growth of the induction program. (standard 4 – 4.1)  
2. How do you support the induction program in the following areas? (standard 4 – 4.2):  
a. Teacher schedules  
b. Classroom assignments  
c. Total student load  
d. Teaching materials  
3. How is a beginning teacher introduced to and supported by a professional learning community? (standard 4 – 4.3)  
4. How do you gauge the communication and feedback between the mentor and beginning teacher? (standard 4 – 4.4)  
5. How is confidence maintained between you and the mentor when discussing the strengths and weaknesses of a beginning teacher? (standard 4 – 4.5)  
7. How can you use teacher mentoring more effectively for beginning teachers?  
8. How would you involve beginning teachers when creating school policies? (school context)  
9. How do you ensure that beginning teachers stay current on best teaching practices? (school context)  
10. How do you increase collegial interactions among teachers? (school context)  
11. How do you build a culture that moves negative student behavior to positive outcomes? (school context)  
12. How do you include the thoughts and perspectives from beginning teachers on facilities and school safety? (school context)  
13. What would you change about the current induction program? (school context) |
Document Review

Multiple sources can be used for document review, including online materials, written forms of communication, personal documents, and/or public records (Merriam, 1998). Documents provide clues and insight that reveal information about a program of study, in this case an induction program (Merriam). The case study of an induction program naturally leads the researcher to the set of induction program documents that have been created by the district to support beginning teachers.

Documents collected and reviewed were 1) a school district manual for new teacher induction programming, 2) agendas from induction meetings, and 3) observation feedback/reflective tools for beginning teachers. These documents were collected at the school district office from the Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction on February 26, 2018.

Table 3.4 visually depicts the alignment between the research questions and the data collection tools used.
Table 3.4
Alignment of Research Questions with Data Collection Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Pre-Interview Written Reflections</th>
<th>Semi-Structured Interviews</th>
<th>Document Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How do elementary principals describe their roles and responsibilities in mentoring beginning teachers?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which transformational leadership traits do elementary principals use to mentor beginning teachers and why?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which elements of <em>Standards 1, 2 and 4 of the Illinois Induction Program Continuum</em> do</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What influence, if any, do transformational leadership traits used by elementary school principals have on beginning teachers?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Analysis Techniques

Each of the data analysis techniques is described in detail next. These subsections include transcription and data analysis procedures, coding procedures, and integrity procedures to the study.

Transcription and Data Analysis Procedures

The interviews were recorded using a digital voice recorder. The researcher took working notes as the interviews were conducted (Siedman, 2013). After interviews were completed, the researcher made an audio file and sent it to a transcribing company, Rev.com. The company
provided a secure account and transcription services. The transcription was then returned via a secured email and downloaded into a password protected file for analysis. The researcher reviewed the recorded notes and aligned them to the elements of transformational leadership to allow for coding and additional note taking.

Coding Procedures

The purpose of coding is to assign words or phrases to data that can be retrieved and used in analysis (Merriam, 1998; Saldana, 2013). The coding process for this study was broken into two cycles: initial coding and focused coding. Initial coding was the starting point for deconstructing the qualitative data, examining them, and beginning to determine similarities or differences across participants (Bailey, 2007; Saldana). After the initial coding, the next technique was focused coding to reduce data by “identifying and combining initial coded data into larger categories” (Bailey, 2007, p. 129). As such, patterns developed into categories that began to explain the principals’ experiences with transformational leadership when working with beginning teachers (Saldana).

More specifically, upon receipt of the transcribed audio from Rev.com the initial read through occurred. Each interview response was read once to reengage with the thoughts of the principals. After the first read of each response, the proposed question was re-read. A brief reflection followed by an immediate second read of the principals’ responses to highlight key terms and phrases. For instance, when reading question seven from interview number 1, “Describe how program leadership and site leadership collaborated to guide and implement the induction program. Do you and the beginning teacher attend PD together?” Professional development was highlighted 35 times. The frequency of the term, professional development,
was then broadened to determine its use. The focus on professional development lead principals to reveal that they provide professional development at faculty meetings, during teacher institute days, and although with less frequency, the elementary principals attended professional development with beginning teachers. These steps were repeated for each question and response. Table 3.5 provides the frequency that the elementary principal stated the term for idealized influence.

Table 3.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>Collaborate</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Trust</th>
<th>Mission/Vision</th>
<th>Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allison</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zach</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, initial coding was used to identify the themes and focused coding was used to add depth to the three most frequently stated terms as shown in Table 3.5. For instance, principals reported that collaboration was maintained by adjusting the weekly schedule for beginning teachers to work with colleagues and building specialists or joining a committee.

Document Analysis Procedures

Document analysis provided a full understanding of the district’s procedures for induction programming (Mertens, 2015). A review of district documents was compared with the
formal induction plans and processes, the elements of transformational leadership, and the Illinois Induction Program Continuum (IIPC). Document analysis followed the same two-part coding cycle and analytical techniques of initial and focused coding. As an example, the district document for the induction program contained a “Principal Checklist”. The checklist was reviewed then cross-referenced with the principal experiences. This cross reference produced the alignment of student behavior. The principals were required to discuss behavioral expectations in the hall, lunch, washroom and playground along with procedures for notifying parents, detentions and referrals. However, the elementary principals supported beginning teachers on addressing student behavior was discussed by using Positive Behavior Intervention Systems (PBIS), a tiered classroom management plan, and using social workers to address behavioral challenges.

Integrity Procedures

Upon completion of each interview question, when necessary, the principals were asked a follow-up question for clarity or the working notes were used to gain complete understanding of the interviewees’ statements (Seidman, 2013). Verbal verification was used to ensure that statements of the participants were accurate (Ezzy, 2002).

Conclusion

This chapter established the purpose of the study along with the research questions. The subsequent sections explained the research design, participants, data collection methods and data analysis techniques. The next chapter will discuss the findings of the study.
CHAPTER 4
RESULTS OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this case study was to examine how elementary building principals’ leadership traits influence the support and mentoring of beginning elementary school teachers. The study was conducted using the lenses of transformational leadership and the Illinois Induction Program Continuum. The findings answer the four research questions:

1. How do elementary principals describe their roles and responsibilities in mentoring beginning teachers?
2. Which transformational leadership traits do elementary principals use to mentor beginning teachers and why?
3. Which elements of Standards 1, 2 and 4 of the Illinois Induction Program Continuum do elementary principals use to support beginning teachers and why?
4. What influence, if any, do transformational leadership traits used by elementary school principals have on beginning teacher retention?

Six current elementary principals described their experiences working with beginning teachers. They did so by completing three sets of pre-written reflection questions and participating in three interviews. Responses to the pre-written questions were provided via Google docs, with the interviews captured using a digital recorder. Table 4.1 provides a general overview of the principals who participated in this study, followed by narrative descriptions of each. All participants have been given pseudonyms.
Table 4.1

Participant Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Elementary School</th>
<th>Years in Education</th>
<th>Number of Years Principal at School</th>
<th>Number of Total Teachers</th>
<th>Average Number of New Teachers in Past 5 Years</th>
<th>Retention Rates of New Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faith</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zach</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faith

Faith began a career in education after success in private industry. Her approach as a building leader was business-like, as her responses to questions were direct and to the point.

Faith described her first year as a principal as “very difficult and wrought with challenges” (Pre-written reflection 1). The 20-year veteran explained that the school lacked a focus on student growth and behavior expectations.

Within the first three days a parent was threatening to sue me and the district overall for the rights of a service dog, and by day 21 I was working on a Conditional Probationary Agreement in lieu of expulsion for a student who stabbed another student in the leg with a compass TWICE! (Pre-written reflection 1)

Faith did not have an opportunity to work with any beginning teachers in her first year as principal. However, she reflected that when she started as principal it “was the first year that the district was shifting more fully to the New Illinois Reading and Math standard (Common Core), and we had just shifted to standards based grading as well” (Pre-written reflection questions). As
a result, Faith commented that the adjustment to the new standards along with standards-based grading “put every teacher in the ‘beginning’ phase again” (Pre-written reflection 1). Although the start of her tenure as a building administrator was stressful, Faith noted that she has successfully faced challenges at the school through collaboration and team building. “All the work was done collectively as a group so that our instructional coaches, professional development cadres, and I could all be present to answer and shape thinking” (Pre-written reflection 1). Over the past five years Faith’s school averaged 1.8 beginning teachers whose retention rate was 84%.

Allison

Allison has the longest tenure in education of all the principals. Prior to serving as an elementary principal, she taught physical education at the high school level. Allison was confident in her role as principal and open to explaining her experiences. Allison explained that in her first year as a principal she worked with a tenured staff who exhibited a “this is the way we have always done it” attitude (Pre-written reflection 1), which she described as being “a difficult year.” She explained that “the staff was a majority of tenured staff that had worked in this building for many years” and the high “turnover of administrators at this building” resulted in a “staff divided” (Pre-written reflection 1). She recalled working with only one new teacher in her first year, noting that it was not a positive encounter. “The beginning teacher saw me as a possible enemy” (Pre-written reflection 1). However, Allison beamed when she discussed building relationships with the staff in response to the negative environment. She began to provide in-house professional development with reading and math specialists, grade level department chairs, and teachers. When helping new staff, Allison said she sought to “support
them in any way possible and help them feel comfortable with being part of the team” (Pre-written reflection 1). Over the past five years Allison’s school averaged 4 beginning teachers per year with a retention rate of 89%.

Tom

Tom had spent his entire eight-year career at the elementary level and in the same school district. Tom was reassuring as he spoke. He described “year one [as] a learning experience” (Pre-written reflection 1). He did not have any first year teachers but did have the opportunity to work with three-second year teachers and “spent the first year getting to know them” (Pre-written reflection 1). Tom explained that after he got to know each teacher’s needs, he “was able to support and coach them” (Pre-written reflection 1). Tom further detailed that the evaluation process and subsequent conversations allowed him to build rapport and add support for his beginning teachers. Tom’s school averaged 3.4 beginning teachers with a retention of 90% over the past five years.

Zach

Zach has been an educator for 12 years. His entire career has been at the elementary level. Zach would ponder the question and continually provide a detailed, well thought-out response to all questions. He described his first year as “a honeymoon period” (Pre-written reflection 1). He noted that he had a built-in support system because “the outgoing principal was still working in the district, which was a huge help since there was no assistant principal” (Pre-written reflection 1). In addition to having access to the former principal, Zach did not have any
beginning teachers, although some veteran teachers had transferred into his school. Over the past five years, Zach’s school averaged 1.6 beginning teachers, resulting in a retention rate of 92%.

Brad

Brad had been in education for only seven years, making him the youngest principal in the study. Brad was quick to respond to questions, but at times refrained. Brad was also serving in his first principal position at the same school in which he had started teaching. Brad described his experience as an administrator as a journey in which all members of the school take responsibility for both the success and failures of students. He described the message that he conveys to his teachers: “We will have fun together. We will learn together, we may cry together, but the important aspect in all of this is that we are together. It is not your kid or my kid; they are our kids” (Pre-written reflection 1). Brad’s perspective of working with beginning teachers was to provide validation for their efforts by visiting their classrooms, leaving encouraging notes, and “getting them up to speed on how to be an effective teacher” (Pre-written reflection 1). He said he explained to beginning teachers that he would meet them where they were both academically and emotionally. “Every interaction is different and I believe we must meet each teacher where they are at academically and mentally” (Pre-written reflection 1). Brad’s school averaged 2.4 beginning teachers with a retention rate of 92% over five years.

Matt

Matt was a former math teacher who had been in education for 14 years and had experience at the secondary, middle, and elementary levels. His responses were matter of fact, he was by no means ridged, but understood his role as principal. Matt described his first year as
principal: “It was also my first year at the elementary level, so I had a lot to learn myself” (Pre-written reflection 1). He worked with only one beginning teacher that first year. He supported her in several ways: “frequent feedback on her practice; encouraged her to work with our instructional coaches which she did; and provided her with a great mentor” (Pre-written reflection 1). Of all of the principals in this study, he had worked with the most beginning teachers over the past five years (n=4+). Over the past five years Matt’s school averaged 4.2 beginning teachers with a retention rate of 83%.

Findings

The findings for each research question follow. The themes and subthemes that emerged from the pre-written reflection questions and interviews are detailed along with the number of data points. Narrative comments are woven throughout to substantiate all themes and subthemes.

Research Question 1
How do elementary principals describe their roles and responsibilities in mentoring beginning teachers?

Two themes emerged from the data: support through dialogue and lack of training as based on IIPC Standard 1.1 (program leadership roles and duties, which include planning, oversight, and gathering data on the induction program). Each of the standards in the IIPC includes a rubric to determine a school’s or district’s level of development. Table 4.2 details program leadership roles and duties for Standard 1.1.
Table 4.2

Standard 1.1 Program Leadership Roles and Duties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Establishing</th>
<th>Applying</th>
<th>Integrating</th>
<th>Systematizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program leadership is selected and role is clearly defined to include being responsible for program planning, operation, oversight, and use of data.</td>
<td>Organizational leadership designates program leadership and begins to define their roles and responsibilities based on the Illinois Induction Program Standards. Full definition of role and responsibilities occurs as the year progresses.</td>
<td>Program leadership understands its role and takes full responsibility for program planning, operation, oversight, and use of data while consulting district/site administrators to inform program implementation.</td>
<td>Program leadership collaborates with district/site administrators and mentoring teams to ensure effective program planning, operation, oversight, and use of data.</td>
<td>Program leadership, district/site administrators and induction and mentoring teams share responsibility in collaborative decision making process to design, implement, and revise the program through the use of data. The program is integrated throughout the larger system of the district.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 illustrates the number of data points for the themes that emerged to answer Research Question 1.

Table 4.3

Research Question 1: Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Total Number of Data Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support Through Dialogue</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Training</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Support through Dialogue

Support through dialogue was defined as the principal engaging a beginning teacher in conversations to determine his/her academic needs and emotional state. From this discourse, the
principal could then identify how to support the beginning teacher. For example, Allison emphasized that building rapport and creating relationships through dialogue allows a beginning teacher to feel comfortable and become a member of the teaching team. She observed that “conversations can go a long way to help someone feel comfortable and welcome in a new place” (Pre-written reflection 1). Allison also reported that a strong relationship with a beginning teacher was sustained by being available, providing support, and ensuring that a beginning teacher had a mentor. “I check in often with new staff and let them know that I am here if they need any assistance or support…I provide professional development…I assign a mentor within the building” (Pre-written reflection 1). Brad echoed that open conversations with a beginning teacher that included their academic and emotional wellbeing provided better connections with the school and mentors. He specifically identified responsibility in mentoring beginning teachers as “help[ing] foster a teacher who is well rounded” (Pre-written reflection 1) in all areas of pedagogy.

Faith concurred that dialogue surrounding best teaching practices and feedback were the primary way to support a beginning teacher. She emphasized that dialogue with a beginning teacher needs to stay focused on standards and practices for professional growth to occur. Matt struck a similar tone. He said he worked to establish dialogue with beginning teachers that highlighted “professional practices and a positive outlook toward the profession” (Pre-written reflection 1). He emphasized that ongoing observations and feedback provide beginning teachers with a strong understanding of effective professional practices. Matt also felt that the principal needed to include the mentor and professional development coach when dialoging with beginning teachers: He noted that “the principal should observe and coach a beginning teacher on a regular basis and utilize others, such as professional development coaches or mentors” when
providing support (Matt, Pre-written reflection 1). Tom held a similar approach to Matt’s in that “constantly having discussions and understanding where your teachers are at is vital to their growth and success as an educator” (Pre-written reflection 1).

Tom, Faith, Matt, and Zach all framed dialogue with beginning teachers around identifying teachers’ strengths and weaknesses and addressing how to support their growth through the established teaching evaluation tool (i.e., Danielson). A representation of thoughts from Tom, Faith, Matt, and Zach are illustrated in Table 4.4.

Tom was the only principal who mentioned using adult learning theory to mentor a beginning teacher. “Knowing how your teachers learn and understanding adult learning theory has helped me mentor/coach teachers through their needed areas of growth” (Pre-written reflection 1). Zach was the only principal to base his role when working with beginning teachers around student growth. “For new teachers in our district, the student growth process happens very quickly, and coaching them through that is a major role” (Pre-written reflection 1).

Additionally, Zach believed “that a principal should facilitate introductions and collaboration with new teachers and their teams, as well as [the] support staff, professional development staff, and other district resources (Pre-written reflection 1).
Table 4.4
Principal Dialogue Focused on Teaching Evaluation Tool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRINCIPAL</th>
<th>REPRESENTATIVE QUOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>“You're working with them through your evaluation system. So you're asking kinda what do you need from me, what are you struggling with right now, and how can I support that or how did you work through it?” (Interview 2). “Having those conversations through evaluation and then leading them to specific resources, whether that's the professional development specialist or back to their team mates or kind of having them observe another peer that maybe is really good in an area that their lacking in their teaching strategy or has some really good tools that they haven't used yet, in their classroom.” (Interview 3). “Be sure to visit the teacher’s room, in a non-evaluative way. Observing and having conversations need to be a part of the norm for new teachers. I feel that the principal should be hands on in this [evaluation] process. Constantly having discussions and understanding where your teachers are at is vital to their growth and success as an educator” (Pre-written reflection 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith</td>
<td>“Principals have the awesome privilege of setting the standard of excellent teaching practices by spending time with the teacher through conversation, joint analysis of the Framework for Teaching (Danielson), and observational feedback” (Pre-written reflection 1). The “evaluation process also is where we hold lots of conversation. I front-load it with walking them through step by step of what that evaluation rubric looks like, and we'd talk about, especially in Domain 1, in the planning of how those things might look and really try to answer questions that the teacher might have.” (Interview 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>“The principal is responsible for the development of the teacher through the evaluation process. As direct supervisor, it’s incumbent upon us that we provide the necessary training and support to do an outstanding job…it should include regular feedback and availability. Strengths and opportunities for growth should be provided in writing” (Pre-written reflection 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zach</td>
<td>“I try to give positive feedback early and offer suggestions or set-up communication with teachers that do things they need help with very well. I ask them to let me know things that are going well when they describe their struggles” (Pre-written reflection 1). “Having that open-door policy that once you establish that relationship, if you are having a challenge you can come to me with it or if I see things I can help with, instead of pretending I don't see it and then letting you know during your evaluation… a lot of times I think if it goes the wrong way your teacher finds out during your evaluation that they weren't doing this right and there's not time to correct that. It is my belief, I don't think anyone can walk in year one and have that perfect year so you're going to have those challenges so why not be up front and say, ‘Here's something that I saw.’” (Interview 2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The principals in the study clearly established that dialogue with beginning teachers was the norm for supporting their growth and development. However, the principals’ purposes for dialogue varied. Allison and Brad emphasized the emotional wellbeing of the beginning teacher. Four of the principals (i.e., Faith, Matt, Tom, and Zach) focused on the evaluation framework. In addition, Tom discussed framing his dialogue around adult learning theory while Zach did so using student growth as the focus.

Lack of Training

The theme, lack of training, was operationalized as elementary principals experiencing little to no training about the district-created new teacher induction program. Lack of training also included the principals’ exposure to the IIPC and its standards. This theme was best captured when Allison shared that she met with the district coordinator and attended (although not required) the start of the year induction meetings to better understand the goals of the program. She recalled that meeting new staff at the start of the school year was enjoyable, but noted that “I did not really receive any training” (Pre-written reflection 1). Similarly, Tom reflected that he also attended the beginning teacher induction meeting. He was aware that part of the induction training was devoted to the Danielson Framework for teaching model, “but beyond that there was not much training” (Pre-written reflection 1) about the induction program itself.

Brad reported a parallel experience to Allison and Tom when discussing the lack of formal training. He was led to understand that the district staff (assistant superintendent of curriculum and instruction, director of secondary education, director of elementary education, director of special education, and mentor teachers) would train the beginning teachers on
technical aspects of the job and principals would train them on how to be an effective teacher. He identified that he had gained technical skill to support teacher development in graduate school but could not “recall any formal training [in the district] besides attending the new teacher luncheon” (Pre-written reflection). Faith’s experience with the induction program was similar to Allison’s, Brad’s, and Tom’s in that no technical training was provided. She shared, I received “no technical training for the program, but I was provided [by the induction program leaders] the agenda packet that the teachers received” (Pre-written reflection questions). Matt and Zach shared similar comments: “I cannot think of any formal training I received to support [the] induction and mentoring of beginning teachers” (Matt, Pre-written reflection 1) and “We did not receive training on supporting and mentoring beginning teachers” (Zach, Pre-written reflection 1).

The lack of overall training provided the principals the best alignment with the Establishing category in Table 4.2. Allison, Faith, Brad, Tom, and Zach all understood that district leaders planned and implemented the induction program, but they contended that the roles and responsibilities for site leadership were not presented either through formal or informal training for the induction program.

Summary of Research Question #1

Faith best expressed the attitude held by all of the principals: “The time invested in mentoring beginning teachers may cost a lot up front, but it also pays long lasting dividends for years to come” (Pre-written reflection 1). From that perspective, these principals identified that their roles are to 1) provide a supportive atmosphere for beginning teachers to grow professionally and emotionally and 2) be a mentor for the new teachers. They acknowledged that
their responsibilities include helping develop instructional practices and providing professional development. But unfortunately, these principals reported that district-level training about how to accomplish those tasks was not present for working with beginning teachers.

Research Question 2
Which transformational leadership traits do elementary principals use to mentor beginning teachers and why?

This question includes the four I’s of transformational leadership: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration. Each of the I’s is presented independently when answering Research Question 2, beginning with idealized influence.

Idealized Influence

Idealized influence, as described by Bass and Avolio (1994), involves leading by example, placing the needs of followers first, and allowing followers to take risks. Leaders who utilize idealized influence build foundational trust between themselves and followers and instill a sense of mission and vision (Burns, 1978). Principals who display idealized influence create an environment of respect, vision, and goal orientation as well as ethical and moral soundness. Idealized influence is operationalized when principals collaborate with beginning teachers to create paths for leadership roles (Aydin, Sarier, & Uysal, 2013; Ling, 2012; Marks & Printy, 2003) and then support beginning teachers when developing and implementing new ideas that impact organizational change (Moolenaar et al., 2010).
Two themes emerged from the data based on the elements of idealized influence: trust (supported by two subthemes, risk taking and collaboration) and encouraging leadership (see Table 4.5).

**Table 4.5**

Research Question 2: Themes and Subthemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Subtheme</th>
<th>Number of Data Points</th>
<th>Total Number of Data Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>Risk Taking</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trust

Trust was defined as giving permission to a beginning teacher to try new instructional practices and to take risks knowing that the response from their administrator would be non-judgmental. Both Allison and Matt felt that trust began with getting to know the beginning teachers. Allison did this by “talking with them, asking them about their family or their interests” (Interview 1). In a similar way, Matt shared that building trust began with “getting to know them personally” (Interview 1), which also included learning the name of their spouse or significant other, their children’s names, and discussing the schools they had attended.

Zach took a different approach. He explained that trust with beginning teachers “started with him” and noted that “he gained their trust by not expecting perfection” (Interview 1). For example, he recalled a conversation with a beginning teacher about a lesson that did not go well. “Instead of pointing out, ‘Yeah that went really bad for you’ and ending it there, talking them through it” (Interview 1) established trust they “could try things out” (Interview 1). An
influential element to Zach’s approach was that he offered non-judgmental feedback. In a similar way, Tom described offering this type of feedback as creating a “non-judgmental space” (Interview 1), while Matt explained it as, “trying not to be critical about things” (Interview 1).

During the evaluation process Faith created a non-judgmental space to build trust. As Faith began to discuss building trust via the evaluation process, she paused and then said she knew beginning teachers were especially concerned about the evaluation process. She explained that “huge chunks of time” (Interview 1) are used to educate beginning teachers about the evaluation process and to convince beginning teachers that evaluations are not “gotcha kind of deals” (Interview 1). As such, she met individually with beginning teachers and identified their growth as a professional. “I am really looking for that coherence of instruction, and how all the pieces are really coming together so that we might have something to talk about” (Interview 1).

Collectively, the principals believed that efforts made to form trust by establishing personal relationships, providing non-judgmental feedback, and understanding the evaluation process can lead to opportunities for risk taking.

Risk taking. The first subtheme, risk taking, was defined as trying instructional practices known to be beneficial for students but not yet attempted by the beginning teacher. Allison encouraged beginning teachers to take risks to become better instructors. In fact, she noted, “The request for help is in of itself taking a risk” (Interview 1). She also felt that beginning teachers were more inclined to take risks than veteran teachers because of their growth mindset. In support of taking risks, she purposely chose to model risk taking at faculty meetings by sharing her current professional challenges with the staff.

Tom took a different perspective than Allison. He indicated that new teachers “don’t want to take risks, because they don’t want to fail…The biggest challenge is putting them in a
space where they feel comfortable taking risks in front of their peers” (Interview 1). He went on to explain that he created spaces to take risks by modeling lessons in front of his entire staff and making it acceptable to try new instructional practices.

> With the PD-based staff meeting, myself and the professional development specialists…will run a model lesson of something that we’ve seen as a group…sometimes even in that lesson will bring in examples of model examples of risk-taking, not knowing exactly where the outcome is going. (Interview 1)

Similar to Tom, Matt also modeled instructional practices at faculty meetings. Whereas Tom and Matt modeled risks when demonstrating new instructional practices, Allison chose to model risk taking when discussing her emotional self. “I open up quite a bit at faculty meetings about what I might be going through…It could even be with my evaluation” (Interview 1). Brad stated, “I encourage them to do new teaching practices because I need and want them to fail” (Interview 1). But he tempered this statement by identifying that “risk taking is encouraged as long as there is solid rationale behind it” (Interview 1). Like Allison, he referenced growth mind set as a framework for taking risks. Faith reemphasized that communication allows beginning teachers to feel comfortable enough to take a risk and try a new instructional strategy. To ensure that a beginning teacher is successful when taking a risk, Faith relied on a team approach. As she peered out the window, her black rimmed glasses reflecting the light, she said, “I think my own willingness to try new things [instructional practices]” (Interview 1) with a team orientated approach allowed beginning teachers to take risks.

**Collaboration.** The second subtheme, collaboration, was defined as working within groups of professionals to be supportive of beginning teachers. Collaboration was discussed by all of the principals, with the exception of Brad, as a tool that created trusting relationships. Faith and Matt used the same tone when allowing experts or colleagues to support a beginning teacher.
Faith wanted a team-oriented approach to support beginning teachers. For instance, the teams in her building are “always trying to aim a little higher for the work that we do” (Interview 1). Matt used instructional coaches and the mentor teacher to collaborate with his beginning teachers. By doing so beginning teachers could gain a “large amount of growth in a short amount of time” (Interview 1).

Growth and risk taking were supported by offering the assistance of an instructional coach and mentor. Like Matt, Zach also encouraged his beginning teachers to collaborate with specialists, mentors, and veteran teachers. He shared a story about a beginning teacher who was experiencing classroom management issues. “I linked her up with a peer teacher that could help her and observe her” (Interview 1) and identify the exact challenge. The collaboration resulted in new risk taking on behalf of the beginning teacher to improve her classroom management techniques. Similarly, Tom discussed that collaboration was a way to support a beginning teacher, but he noted he would rather focus on determining the beginning teacher’s strengths and weaknesses and then provide support through collaborating with building experts. Allison commented that the mentor and specialists collaborate and identify areas of growth for the beginning teacher. The mentor, specialist, and beginning teacher then implement evidence-based practices. Collaboration was an element of Idealized Influence the principals believed lead to paths for leadership for beginning teachers.

**Encouraging Leadership**

The second major theme centered on encouraging leadership. All principals implied that encouraging leadership was based on joining a committee within the school or district. As a result, much of the evidence of beginning teachers taking on leadership roles was dependent on
being part of a committee. Faith, for instance, encourages beginning teachers to join a committee of interest, but she selects the committee to join. To model this point, she recalled discussing committee work with one of her beginning teachers: “I told her I thought it would be advantageous for her to be on the subcommittee because it captures the heartbeat of the work that the school will do” (Interview 1). Matt, similar to Faith, encouraged beginning teachers to “join a committee right away” (Interview 1) so they “have some say in the adjustments to [curricula] scope and sequence, writing of rubrics, bring[ing them] back to their departments and talk[ing] about things in the upcoming school year” (Interview 1). Matt explained that he pushed beginning teachers to “start their master’s degree right away” (Interview 1), as that created more leadership opportunities, too. He modeled this point by explaining “I have an administrative intern who was a new teacher for me three years ago…she is leading a staff meeting and a committee” (Interview 1). Like Faith and Matt, Zach encouraged beginning teachers to be on “PBIS, team, a book study, things like that” (Interview 1). He felt that the energy a beginning teacher has benefits a PBIS or book study team.

Tom, Allison and Brad all encouraged teachers to use their leadership strengths when on a committee. Tom expressed that identifying a beginning teacher with leadership traits starts at “the hiring process…we have a profile of what the team needs…for example, we just hired a new teacher on a team that we knew needed to be somebody who was a good processor” (Interview 1). Allison commented that she has told beginning teachers, “I see leadership potential in you. This is how I see it” (Interview 1). The response from the beginning teacher is “You’re right. I’m ready. I can do this” (Interview 1), and they “step up” (Interview 1) when asked to complete a task and be a member of a team. Allison asked beginning teachers to facilitate discussion on the topic of using technology in the classroom and training on the
“Danielson Framework for Teaching as they had this as an entire course in college” (Pre-written reflection 3). In agreement about a beginning teacher ready to lead, Brad contended, “There is always an opportunity to be on the leadership team” (Interview 1). The first team Brad discussed was the district-designed equity team in “which they [beginning teachers] go to Beyond Diversity…which is a two-day seminar” (Interview 1). The other team was the school and leadership team that is staffed on a rotating basis. Brad smiled as he recalled a beginning teacher who spearheaded the Fun Fair that provided the students and parents a night of games and activities at school organized and managed by teachers or PTOs. Through organizing the Fun Fair, the beginning teacher was involved in leading groups of people. Encouraging leadership was observed by principals as a way to support the growth of beginning teachers.

Summary of Idealized Influence

The principals used idealized influence by building foundational trust, allowing their beginning teachers to take risks, promoting collaboration, and encouraging leadership. Building a foundation of trust was highlighted by getting to know the beginning teacher on a personal level, creating a non-judgmental space, and providing an understanding of the evaluation process. The principals modeled risk taking when presenting new instructional methods to staff and through acknowledging that new ideas are supported and encouraged. Collaboration was embedded in many of the schools through professional development specialists, math and reading interventionists, and mentors. The principals also encouraged beginning teachers to take on leadership traits as another form of support to help them be successful.
Inspirational Motivation

The next trait of transformational leadership is inspirational motivation where followers understand the shared goals and are committed to the success of the organization (Bass & Avolio, 1994). Leaders who practice inspirational motivation communicate optimism and identify meaning for the tasks to promote accomplishment of the goals (Burns, 1978). Research shows that principals should introduce and revisit shared goals throughout the school year and display optimistic character traits and enthusiasm toward those goals (Neissen et al., 2017). For example, a principal can work with a beginning teacher on lesson plans to link the shared goals of the district to the classroom. The principal can also use in-person meetings or electronic platforms to discuss instructional challenges beginning teacher experience. For example, a beginning teacher may use Google docs for lesson planning. After the lesson has been taught, the beginning teacher can reflect on the effectiveness and challenges of the lesson. The principal can then comment on the lesson reflection with ideas about how to improve the instruction.

One theme and one subtheme emerged from the participant interviews: goal development and professional support. Table 4.6 illustrates the frequency with which the principals referenced those themes.

Table 4.6
Research Question #2: Theme and Subtheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Subtheme</th>
<th>Number of Data Points</th>
<th>Total Number of Data Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goal Development

Goal development was defined as communicating the district and school mission along with creating professional goals for all teachers, including those just beginning their careers. When communicating shared goals with faculty, Matt discussed his process for sharing goals on a regular basis at faculty meetings, during data days (twice a year), and “with each new teacher individually during the summer right before school starts” (Pre-written reflection 2). As Matt pointed out, “Individual teachers write the same goals for their classrooms…so there isn’t much thought that goes into those” (Pre-written reflection 2). Meaning, beginning teachers replicate their classroom goals to the classroom goals of the building. Similar to Matt, Faith took time with beginning teachers and reviewed the “district’s and school’s vision statements as well as the identified goals and committees that create the goals and objectives aligned to the school’s main goals for the year” (Pre-written reflection 2). Again, like Matt, during monthly faculty meetings, Faith was also “dedicated to sharing information about the committee’s goals and either doing the work during the staff meeting to accomplish the goal or sharing the progress of the goal” during monthly faculty meeting (Pre-written reflection 2). Faith stated,

At the first staff meeting, everyone [beginning and veteran teachers] makes a goal for their own professional development as well as with a personal goal. We also talk about making the goals SMART so that they can be measured throughout the year. (Pre-written reflection 2)

Faith established opportunities for beginning teachers to make goals and develop measurement techniques. This reinforced inspirational motivation and further connected the beginning teacher with district and school goals. Tom (echoing Matt and Faith) pointed out that all goals in his school are aligned to the mission and vision, and additionally that beginning and veteran “teachers are provided updates on committee work [school goals] at staff meetings” (Pre-
written reflection 2). Tom’s process also provided beginning teachers, “time with their mentor to
go over the school’s improvement plan which is driven and embedded with the mission and
beliefs” (Pre-written reflection 2). Similarly, Allison posted the district, school, and equity
missions on all meeting agenda notes for beginning and veteran teachers to view. Her
commitment to each mission is evident: “I have stated that if we are doing something that does
not align with any of these statements, then we need to question why we are doing that, as these
are our focus and what grounds us” (Pre-written reflection 2). Zach encouraged beginning
teachers “to join a few school teams so that they begin to not only know the goals of the school
but to continue their development” (Pre-written reflection 2). In contrast, Brad expressed that he
would like the goals of his school to be more structured and noted that the mission of the school
is not currently posted or discussed by beginning or veteran teachers. The principals clearly have
processes in place to communicate goals; they also influence professional goal development for
beginning teachers. Tom captured the sentiment of all the principals best when describing one
challenge for beginning teachers in that they “have a means of ensuring the goal is being met, or
not being met, and needing additional support or revision” (Pre-written reflection 2).

Professional support. Professional support was defined as providing direct support to or
connecting beginning teachers with experts to model or further develop goals. For instance,
when providing direct support, Matt’s school aligned scope and sequence for all subject areas, so
beginning teachers do not need to focus time or energy on aligning their lessons to the overall
goals of the school. For example, Matt explained,

We all write similar goals in our building and they are based exclusively on student
achievement. Grade level teams will write goals related to how many students will move
up categories on their benchmark tests. Individual teachers will write the same goals for
their classrooms. (Pre-written reflection 2)
In addition to school wide support, Matt connected beginning teachers with experts by “push[ing] beginning teachers to use more technology in their instruction and work with math and ELA instructional coaches” (Pre-written reflection 2) for even deeper alignment to school goals. Similar to Matt, Faith used the school improvement team to provide direct support to beginning teachers by aligning one of the school goals to student achievement. “Our committees establish and create goals, the strategy, and the objectives that will make the goal achievable” (Pre-written reflection 2). Faith stated, “We operate as a team first and foremost” (Pre-written reflection 2). Allison used a team approach process as well. She ensures that the professional development specialist, literature specialist, social workers, and administrators directly support the beginning teacher.

While Matt and Faith utilize teams to identify school wide goals, Allison, Tom, Zach, and Brad independently reviewed the goals of beginning teachers and provide feedback. Allison stated, “I always want to see what their [beginning teachers] personal/professional goals are and then see if there is a way that I can assist them in attaining those goals” (Pre-written reflection 2). Similarly, Tom will provide professional support through discussing with a beginning teacher “areas of needed improvement and how we can support these areas. Through the conversation we discuss what resources are needed, whether that be physical resources or people” (Pre-written reflection 2). Zach was very specific on a needed goal. He guides beginning teachers on how to achieve a student-centered classroom. For example, he modeled “pre-staging” a question in which students have more time to work with a question independently before a group discussion occurs. Brad, while independently with beginning teachers, used the evaluation process to ensure that beginning teachers have “posted learning targets referring to I can statements, and aligning to the scope and sequence” (Pre-written reflection 2).
Summary of Inspirational Motivation

The principals used inspirational motivation by communicating the district’s and schools’ missions and visions and initiating goal development and professional support for beginning teachers. Goal development was established by principals prior to starting the school year, during school wide faculty meetings, as well as through mentors, and school committees. Goal development included district and school goals and individual professional goals. When aligning the district’s and schools’ goals to beginning teachers’ goals, all principals required written professional or student learning objectives (SLOs). To achieve the goals, the principals provided a content area specialist, team support, feedback, and modeling. Attaining district, school, and professional goals may require principals to use innovative strategies such as changing the master or daily schedule, assigning substitutes to cover classes when beginning teachers observe classes, or working with mentor teachers outside of the school.

Intellectual Stimulation

Intellectual stimulation empowers followers (in this case beginning teachers) to think critically about problems and approach challenges in new and innovative ways without fear of criticism (Bass & Avolio, 1994). Leaders with this trait support and encourage creativity among followers (Burns, 1978). Research suggests that principals should encourage and attend professional development with beginning teachers (Allen et al., 2015) as well as publicly commend creative thinking and refrain from criticism (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Principals should also visit beginning teachers’ classrooms and identify challenges: e.g., student engagement, procedures, or questioning techniques (Allen et al.; Avolio et al., 1991).
Two themes, staff driven commendation and principal driven commendation, emerged from the interviews. The principals explained their schools have a process for recognizing beginning teachers. The principals also identified that they have both formal and informal methods to commend beginning teachers. Table 4.7 illustrates the frequency of the themes.

Table 4.7
Research Question #2 – Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Number of Data Point</th>
<th>Total Number of Data Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Driven Commendation</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Driven Commendation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff Driven Commendation

Staff driven commendation was operationalized as a recognition system or appreciation system that commends beginning teachers for their efforts. For example, Allison smiled when she explained that her school has a “whatever it takes [attitude]…it’s really where staff members recognize [beginning teachers] for their efforts” (Interview 2). Staff submit a note prior to faculty meetings, and Allison reads the note and congratulates the beginning teacher. This practice may also include other staff. Zach’s school used the same language as Allison’s. His school also has a “whatever it takes” approach “when you see that [beginning teachers] are doing good things, they can fill it out and commend them” (Interview 2). Then, the teacher who wrote the note also reads the note. Brad’s school, similar to Allison and Zach, established a commendation program as well. Brad started “a program called Red Carpet Recognition” (Interview 2) and similar to Allison’s and Brad’s schools, the staff recognize each other by simply writing something great
that a beginning teacher had done. Brad then reads the commendation at the faculty meeting.

Tom’s school has a similar program to Brad’s. We have a “kindness tree so each staff member can recognize a [beginning teacher] for their work or something that they’ve done to help them out” (Interview 2). Tom then reads the notes of the person who received the most “leaves.” Faith, like Allison and Brad, included herself in recognizing beginning teachers who are commended during faculty meetings and read the notes at faculty meetings. The recognition procedures at Matt’s school are also based on staff participation and staff input, but his school differs slightly in that “teachers will talk about the good stuff they see from beginning teachers because then the praise is more genuine” (Interview 2). Principals extended the staff driven commendation to include their own recognition of beginning teachers.

**Principal Driven Commendation**

Principal driven commendation refers to the methods these principals used to acknowledge the efforts and innovative practices of beginning teachers. These methods are both public (staff meeting, classroom conversations) and private (one on one discussions) and can be associated with the evaluation process. Faith, for instance, commended her beginning teachers on their innovative traits, which are often far more advanced than their veteran counterparts. “There’s some innovations with new teachers that are just uniquely different [from veteran teachers] on how they organize information to how they go about collecting data. They [beginning teachers] are not afraid of formative assessments, summative assessments, and organizing data” (Interview 2). Similar to Faith, Allison often suggested that a veteran teacher observe a beginning teacher’s class because a veteran teacher may have “been out of school for so long…we haven’t always gotten those new best practices” (Interview 2). Allison also likes to
commend a beginning teacher by saying, “Your class is doing such a good job in the hallway” (Interview 2) and acknowledges their strengths and efforts during formal and informal observations. Like Faith and Allison, Mike also provides beginning teachers with a “lot of positive [public] praise”, an example being a strong “science lesson or assisting someone on how to use software” (Interview 2). Mike left notes commending a beginning teacher on “two or three things…over the last week or two” (Interview 2). Brad, like Allison, used formal and informal evaluations to acknowledge the efforts of a beginning teacher. Similar to Mike, Brad provided beginning teachers with note “about a lesson they did or something [he] heard or saw them do and provide praise on that” (Interview 2). Tom repeated Brad’s procedure by privately commending beginning teachers after a formal or informal observation. Tom, similar to Matt, placed a commendation in the teacher’s mailbox immediately following an observation. Zach, similar to Mike, praised a beginning teacher about positive classroom practices like “establishing procedures that students follow” (Interview 2) during the evaluation process. Although all beginning teachers had a mentor, Zach was the only principal to include praise from the teacher mentor.

Summary of Intellectual Stimulation

The principals used intellectual stimulation by commending beginning teachers through an embedded process and public and private acknowledgment. The three embedded process included “What Ever it Takes,” “Red Carpet Recognition,” and “The Kindness Tree” in which staff had a significant role. Principals shared in the recognition by reading the positive notes to all staff, with the exception of two schools. The principals linked commending a beginning teacher to the evaluation process and acknowledged positive traits of beginning teachers. The
principals praised the positive traits of beginning teachers by sharing their innovative ideas and recommending that veteran teachers observe the beginning teacher. Allison expressed, beginning teachers are worried about the evaluation process and linking concerns of a beginning teacher could have a reverse impact on the feeling of empowerment, which leads to the final element of transformational leadership: individual consideration.

Individual Consideration

Leaders who possess high levels of individual consideration can better mentor and support the strengths of followers (in this case beginning teachers) (Bass & Avolio, 1994). Leaders seek to understand the needs and concerns of followers and act as a mentor or coach (Burns, 1978). Principals can survey beginning teachers to gain awareness of their needs and monitor and/or attempt to change the emotions of beginning teachers (Palmer et al., 2001). Principals who practice individual consideration provide written or oral feedback and celebrate the contributions of beginning teachers (Avolio & Bass, 1995; Burns; Palmer et al.). Through this feedback and reflection, principals can recognize individual differences among beginning teachers and identify areas for professional development (Allen et al., 2015).

Based on the interviews, all six principals sought to discover the needs of beginning teachers and ways to provide necessary support. The data did not show a consistent process or plan to determine needs nor was there one prescribed way to respond to beginning teachers’ needs. However, two themes emerged from the data were: Offering Support and Identifying Needs (Table 4.8).
Table 4.8

Research Question #2 – Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Number of Data Point</th>
<th>Total Number of Data Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offering Support</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying Needs</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Offering Support

Offering support was defined as providing beginning teacher’s resources and personnel to grow as a professional. Zach believed that beginning teachers need more direct support to help them gain confidence and skill development because they may lack the confidence to ask for support. Zach felt that confidence can be developed through mindful inquiry (using questions to allow the beginning teacher to gain insight to their teaching practices) in which beginning teachers are led to a fulfilling career. Similar to Zach, Tom used mindful inquiry to guide beginning teachers to uncover answers while being “supportive as possible” (Pre-written reflection 3). Matt, like Tom responded to the needs of beginning teachers by holding conversations with teachers to generate reflection, recommending specific professional development, and “provid[ing] time for new teachers to observe strong teachers and meet with them to talk” (Pre-written reflection 3). Similar to Zach, Tom, and Matt, Brad has “honest and respectful dialogue” (Pre-written 3) with beginning teachers. Along with Matt, Brad then “pairs them with a veteran teacher when responding to their needs.” (Pre-written 3). Matt and Allison were in agreement when responding to individual needs of beginning teachers by offering assistance “through PD specialists, modeling, problem solving and offering suggestions” (Pre-written reflection 3). In addition, she acts as a cheerleader and counselor. Faith concurred with
Matt and Allison by providing professional development specialists and instructional coaches to support her beginning teachers. Faith also included that it is the responsibility of the “administrator, the staff, and the mentor” (Interview, 3) to support beginning teachers when addressing their needs.

**Identifying Needs**

Identifying needs was defined as the principal seeking information from beginning teachers to help structure professional growth or development. Matt attempted to identify the needs of beginning teachers at the start of the year through multiple avenues, including the interview process, visiting with beginning teachers every two to three days, observing beginning teachers, and finally meeting with their mentor. Matt discovered that beginning teachers were overwhelmed by the amount of work required of being a teacher and handling classroom management. Similar to Matt, Faith will “schedule meetings periodically throughout the year with the [beginning] teacher to discuss his/her specific needs and touch base with the mentor teacher” (Pre-written reflection 3). She, too, felt that beginning teachers get overwhelmed, and they need to have space to grow. Although Zach did not discuss how he discovered the needs of beginning teachers, he was introspective when discussing the needs of beginning teachers. He identified that his experiences (as a teacher and principal) were similar to current beginning teachers in that the greatest challenge they face, similar to Matt and Faith, is feeling overwhelmed. He explained,

> The biggest needs are feeling that it is OK and preferable to reach out for support…that it is hard not to become self-deprecating and that any struggles come with supports and a focus on what it going well. (Pre-written reflection 3)
Tom, similar to Matt and Faith, sought to “visit the teacher’s room, in a non-evaluative way” (Pre-written reflection, 3) to identify the needs of a beginning teachers. Tom identified that beginning teachers need to be open to accept feedback and have a growth mindset. Tom captured the idea of growth as he wrote: “The ones who learn from their mistakes, and admit to it, typically make great growth and form strong professional and personal bonds with their peers” (Pre-written reflection 3).

Both Allison and Brad used the evaluation process to discover the needs of their beginning teachers. Allison explained that she used dialogue and the evaluation process and found that each beginning teacher may have different needs, including “communication with families…classroom management…time management…data assessments and designing curriculum” (Pre-written reflection 3). Brad stated, “I find out their needs mainly through their evaluation process” (Pre-written reflection 3). Brad did not expound on any specific beginning teacher needs.

Summary of Individual Consideration

The principals reported the themes of offering support and identifying needs to describe individual consideration. The principals provided professional development, support for developing a growth mindset, opportunities to observe strong teachers, and time to become a stronger teacher. The principals noted that they discovered the needs of the beginning teachers through dialogue, the evaluation process, and classroom observations. The principals reported that beginning teacher need work through feeling of being overwhelmed, as well as challenges in communication, classroom management, and confidence.
Summary of Research Question #2

All of the principals used the four I’s of transformational leadership when working with the beginning teachers. Table 4.9 illustrates the total number of themes and subthemes accompanied by the total number of data points.

Table 4.9
Four I’s of Transformational Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transformational Leadership Traits</th>
<th>Total Themes and Subthemes</th>
<th>Total Number of Data Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Influence</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Consideration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational Motivation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9 established that when focusing on total themes and subthemes and total number of data points, Idealized Influence was the transformational leadership trait (n=64 data points) most used by the elementary principals when working with their beginning teachers. The remaining transformational leadership traits in order of usage included individual consideration (n=33 data points), intellectual stimulation (n=31), and finally, inspirational motivation (n=23) data points.

Research Question 3
Which elements of Standards 1, 2, and 4 of the Illinois Induction Program Continuum do elementary principals use to support beginning teachers and why?

The focus of Standard 1 was to identify program leadership roles and duties to include planning, oversight, and gathering data on the induction program (IIPC, 2010). Standard 2
focused on “beginning teacher development, support, retention and improved student learning”
(IIPC, p 4), and Standard 4 specified that

Site administrators lead efforts to create a positive climate for the delivery of all essential
program components and collaborated with program leadership to ensure that they are
well prepared to assume their responsibilities for supporting beginning teachers in the
induction program. (IIPC)

Each of the standards in the IIPC includes a rubric to determine the level of implementation
within a school/district. To reference the rubric for each standard, see Appendix A.

Standard 1

Standard 1 has four sub-standards, each with a specific criterion. Principal interviews
revealed that sub-standard 1.1 – “responsible for planning, operation, oversight” – had the
highest level of frequency. The major themes that emerged from the data include minimal
planning and unbalanced collaboration. Table 4.10 provides the number of principals who
referenced, although not directly, each theme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Total Number of Data Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Planning</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unbalanced Collaboration</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimal planning. Minimal planning was defined as district coordinators inconsistently
requesting or seeking out principal input or recommendations when planning the induction
program. Tom’s direct response was “minimal to none” (Interview 1). He recalled that the
principals had been asked for input on topics, such as teachers having a better understanding of social emotional training, and as a result, more time was spent on that topic during the induction training days. Similar to Tom, Allison’s initial response to providing plans for implementing the induction program was “I’m not sure that I feel like I have any input” (Interview 1). However, after a moment, her response aligned to Tom’s. She recalled having been asked to provide input for what beginning teachers need to be successful, but she confirmed that her thoughts were not sought out by program leaders on a consistent basis. Brad said he had a similar experience to Tom’s and Allison’s regarding providing input for the induction program: “I’m not on that committee…they [district administration] don’t take us through what they even do with the [beginning] teachers” (Interview 1). Brad clearly recalled being asked by the district administration, “Is there anything that you want to add to the new teacher induction?” (Interview 1). He reflected that the conversation about the new teacher induction program was brief. Matt echoed Brad’s experience, Matt noted that “surprisingly, I don’t think district administration has even asked me or the other principals what we would want to see in an induction program” (Interview 1). Matt explained that collaboration with program administrators occurs a couple times a year stating there is a “biannual mentor-mentee meeting that administration are invited to…but do not participate in” (Interview 1). Faith’s experience was similar to Allison’s and Matt’s, on her role in implementing the induction program and concluded with “Gee, I don’t think I have any, really” (Interview 1). Like Matt, Faith could not recall being asked to complete surveys or answer any questions. Zach’s experience was slightly different than the other principals. He recalled that several years ago agenda items from the induction program were shared with the building principals, but he noted that recently that information had been scaled
back. However, Zach’s experience did liken Matt’s and Faith’s in the fact that he was not asked for input on the induction program.

Unbalanced collaboration. Unbalanced collaboration was defined as district and site administrators (principals) included in the oversight of the induction program. Allison noted that the district leadership created a well-rounded induction program that “has a lot of different topics and things they work on” (Interview 1). The different topics were the Danielson Framework for Teaching, instructional methods, and reflective tools. Allison’s thoughts were shared by Faith. She pointed out that “there is a nice program in place…they [district administration] review Danielson…and common questions or concerns that teachers have” (Interview 1), but “we don’t collaborate to guide and implement the induction program…because the program is up and running…it hasn’t needed my guidance at all at this point” (Interview 1). Faith was pleased that the induction program covers topics and was slightly relieved that she does not have that responsibility in addition to being a principal.

When discussing working with program leaders to guide and implement the induction program, Matt stated, “We don’t do enough of that. We need to do more” (Interview 1). Tom’s response was similar to Matt’s. Tom did not comment on any collaboration between district leadership and site administrators to guide and implement the induction program. Zach, like Tom, could not recall working with district administrators or program coordinators regarding oversight of the induction program. He further explained that the site administration did not work with program leadership to guide or implement the induction program. Zach’s experience was supported by Brad. He concluded that he “couldn’t even lay out what their [the district administrators’] plan is” (Interview 1). He found out about meeting topics when conversing with beginning teachers or mentors.
Standard 2

Standard 2 focused on improved student learning, beginning teacher development, support, and retention. Five criteria make up this standard (see Appendix A). The criteria the principals referenced most often were 2.3, 2.4, 2.5 and 2.1 (2.2 will be discussed in Document Review section). Table 4.11 details the number of principals who discussed the criteria description.

Table 4.11
Research Question 3 – IIPC Standard 2 Criteria and Number of Principals Who Discussed Each

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Criteria Definition</th>
<th>Total Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Mentor Selection</td>
<td>Building principals identifying who would be best for mentoring and working with beginning teachers</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Reflecting on feedback</td>
<td>Beginning teachers given feedback by the principal or mentor followed by a discussion</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Data Review</td>
<td>Principals being provided qualitative or quantitative information on the goals of the induction program</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Standards</td>
<td>Learning outcomes for students and standards for the induction program</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mentor Selection – 2.3

Mentor selection was defined by the building principals as a process of identifying who would be best for mentoring and working with beginning teachers. When responding to Standard 2.3, all of the principals reported being involved in selecting the mentor teachers. Faith immediately established, “I only use excellent teachers” (Interview 2), meaning a teacher who “has great communication skills…that are open…that isn’t afraid to share the good, the bad, the ugly…a willing partnership with me” (Interview 2). Faith aligned teachers by grade or specialization as much as possible to “build a future with that teacher” (Interview 2). Matt echoed Faith’s decision when he said, “The first thing that I think about when I assign a mentor is, is there an excellent teacher in that grade level?” Matt also considers a mentor teacher who does not teach in the same grade or even in the classroom. “If there isn’t somebody at that grade level…then I just ask the next great teacher available because I think great teaching transcends…a great reading teacher can be a mentor to a librarian” (Interview 2). Matt did not give specifics about what constitutes an excellent teacher, but Zach described that the mentor needs to be non-judgmental and have a solid footing in classroom management “because for new teachers that’s always a struggle” (Interview 2). He grounded identifying a teacher from a book entitled *Find Your Marigold*. He smiled as he summarized the main idea of the book: “Finding that marigold or teacher or that staff member that people can grow from” (Interview 2). Zach’s perspective differed from Faith’s but was similar to Matt’s when aligning teachers in similar grades. A mentor and a beginning teacher do not need to be at the same grade or content level; as Zach explained: “just because they [a mentor] knows the content, doesn’t mean that it’s going to be a good relationship” (Interview 2). He also noted that he had seen a beginning teacher struggle
immediately when the mentor and beginning teacher are in the same grade level. Tom’s perspective on selecting a mentor varied slightly from Faith, Matt, and Zach. Tom selected mentors based on the needs of the beginning teacher and used the interview process to identify the needs of a beginning teacher. Based on those needs, he said he seeks out a mentor without being concerned about grade level or subject alignment, similar to Matt and Zach. As Faith, Matt, Zach, and Tom sought out mentor teachers, Allison and Brad asked for volunteers.

Allison was reluctant to express her experience when she said, “When I’m selecting a mentor, it’s sometimes who is available and willing. I hate to say that” (Interview 2). She kept in mind the personalities of the mentor and beginning teacher and tried to match likenesses, likened to Tom’s perspective on beginning teacher needs. Like Faith, Allison is cognizant of grade level or specialization. She had gone as far as finding a music teacher in another building to be a mentor to a beginning music teacher. Brad had a similar experience to Allison when selecting mentors. Brad said, “to be honest, when selecting a mentor teacher, it’s ‘who wants to be a mentor teacher’ because there aren’t a lot of hands in the air” (Interview 2). Brad understands that mentor teachers need to “have a certain rating on their evaluation in previous years” (Interview 2) but no other indicators are needed. Brad pointed out that there is no cohesiveness across the district when it comes to choosing mentors.

When determining who will mentor a beginning teacher, it is clear that the principals had complete autonomy and freedom, so each sought to identify a mentor for each beginning teacher. Although the principals selected the mentors, they never discussed or referred to training teachers to act as mentors.
Reflecting on feedback occurred when a beginning teacher was given feedback by the principal or mentor which was followed by a discussion. Tom detailed that feedback was given “heavily through the evaluation” (Interview 2), but he noted that he does not provide specific guidance on the reflection to the beginning teacher because he is seeking to identify how “they are reflecting on the evidence or feedback they are given” (Interview 2). Tom said he pressed beginning teachers to discuss specific elements of the lesson. “We really dig deeper into the why; why didn’t that go well? And not even for the whole class, but for the individual students” (Interview 2). Similarly, Allison used the “evaluation process and the reflection component with new teachers” (Interview 2). She received insight from written feedback from beginning teachers, but similar to Tom’s experience, Allison stated, “they [beginning teachers] need to go more in-depth, so I’m prodding more often…with some open-ended questions like, ‘Tell me more about that’” (Interview 2). Faith also used the evaluation process to provide feedback. She required “every teacher to do a reflection on their [evaluation] observation” (Interview 2). Faith contended that “when they [beginning teachers] think they’ve messed up, that’s really the beauty of where real teaching actually occurs, so, for me, the reflection shows the genius of the person involved” (Interview 2). Like Tom, Allison, and Faith, Zach used the evaluation process for beginning teachers to reflect. Zach stated, “We do the informal and formal evaluation, and with each of those we do a reflection form” (Interview 2). While reflecting, Zach, similar to Tom and Allison, asked reflective-type questions: “How can you use this to plan and move forward in a different way? What things would you change?” (Interview 2). Matt used evaluations to provide feedback as well. Matt reflected with a beginning teacher “within [the] Danielson piece”
Allison explained that there are multiple opportunities for reflection based on mentor observations. “They [beginning teachers] do some observations of their mentors as well as other people…and there is feedback…and there is a reflection tool” (Interview 2). Similarly, Faith knew both the mentor and beginning teacher would observe and reflect. “They’ll be looking at a [one] specific component [Danielson Framework for Teaching] at a time; they don’t look at the whole kit and caboodle. It’s just one thing at a time” (Interview 2) when observing each other. After each observed the other, they “reflect about what [they] saw in conjunction with whatever component” (Interview 2). The mentor “will actually go over their [beginning teacher] reflection with them” (Interview 2). Like Faith, Zach explained that the reflection opportunities are provided by the mentor. The “mentor will observe and then write up some things, and then the beginning teacher will reflect and have kind of a conference with them on here’s what I saw” (Interview 2). Although Zach knew that feedback was given by mentors, he was not part of those conversations. Matt’s experience differed slightly from Tom’s, Allison’s, and Faith’s. Matt recalled very little discussion around reflection with the mentor teacher. “I think in the mentor/mentee program they do some written reflection as part of the process” (Interview 2), but he could not think of a time when he had “specifically asked a mentee about the feedback he or she has received” (Interview 2). Brad’s experience was very different from the other principals: “What’s sad about this is there’s only been an issue when there’s negative feedback, when the mentee is having an issue and isn’t necessarily following our values and mission” (Interview 2). Brad responded to the negative feedback and had “those more difficult conversations with them that the mentor teachers tried to have in a collegial way” (Interview 2). Brad continued his
thought and discovered that “unless it’s explicitly told to me what they’re doing correctly or I see it in evaluations or I see it through just casual walk throughs” (Interview 2), he was unaware.

Data Review – 2.5

Data review was defined as principals being provided qualitative or quantitative information on the goals of the induction program. The principals were unable to recall being provided data to review the goals of the induction program. Table 4.12 provides representative quotes by the principals of data used to review the goals of the induction program.

Principals were unable to use data to discuss the short or long-range plans for the induction program. The principals, however, were capable of identifying academic standards used to support the instructional practices of beginning teachers.

Table 4.12
Principal Review - Goals of the Induction Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRINCIPAL</th>
<th>REPRESENTATIVE QUOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allison</td>
<td>“I have no idea. I can’t answer that question. I’m not sure what data they use” (Interview 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad</td>
<td>“I wouldn’t say, if there is data it’s not shared with me” (Interview 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith</td>
<td>“I don’t use any data. I’m so detached, really, from the big idea of it. I just assume responsibility within the space of the school” (Interview 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>“I think it’s just survey feedback and that survey is probably given only to mentors and mentees” (Interview 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>“Induction program specifically, I would say there’s not… I mean, we’ve never gotten any of the feedback from their forms they have to turn in” (Interview 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zach</td>
<td>“That would be at the district level. There’s not any data that I would know of” (Interview 2).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standards – 2.1

Standards were defined both as learning outcomes for students and standards for the induction program. Standards were defined by what elementary students should learn - specifically, Common Core Standards in reading or math. Faith, Brad, Allison, and Tom referred to academic standards. Whereas, Faith referred to math standards established by the school improvement team who determine growth for students in math and support beginning, along with all other, teachers to meet the learning goals. Faith noted that her school remains realistic by focusing on “like two or three goals” (Interview 2). Similar to Faith, Brad emphasized that during institute days, the school unpacked standards for reading and math and then the staff choose standards for the year. Brad’s school had an expectation that beginning and veteran teachers will post and refer to the learning standards during class. Like Brad and Faith, Allison used teacher teams to understand standards. Allison provided “quite a bit of time at grade level teams” (Interview 2) to support beginning and veteran teachers’ understanding and application of standards. Allison also felt that beginning teachers had a better grasp of new student learning standards and evaluation process because of preparation in college. She identified that beginning teachers understood “The standards [state learning standards] as well as the evaluation [Danielson] process” (Interview 2). Like Allison, Tom reported that beginning teachers had a strong understanding of the Illinois Common Core learning standards. Tom reported, “They [beginning teachers] come in with a pretty good understanding of the learning targets for students” (Interview 2).

Both Tom and Zach differed from the other principals as they referred to the overall induction program goals. Tom mentioned that the “main outcomes we want beginning teachers
to know come from the Illinois Induction Program Standards” (Interview 2). Similar to Tom, Zach thought that “the outcomes [for beginning teachers] were defined through the Illinois Mentoring [program], whatever those guidelines were” (Interview 2).

Matt did not share the same sentiment of the other five principals. He was not confident about his level of involvement. “I’m sure they have learning outcomes for those meetings or for the mentor program itself, but I haven’t been a part of those conversations” (Interview 2).

In summary, the interviews reveal no clear definition of standard (either learning standards for students or standards related to the IIPC) held by all principals as three varied perspectives were shared about induction program standards. Specifically, three of the principals used the common core academic standards as the anchor for the induction program. Two principals identified that the Illinois Induction Program Continuum guided the standards of the induction program, and only one principal was unable to state which standard was used to define the induction program.

Standard 4

Standard 4 was the final element to address Research Question 3. Standard 4 focused on “Site administrators and program leadership [to] collaborate to ensure that they are well prepared to assume their responsibilities for supporting beginning teachers in the induction program” (IIPC, 2010). Six criteria make up this standard (see Appendix A). The principals referenced all six, but their involvement was limited while working with program leadership to support the induction program. Table 4.13 illustrates principal quotations for Standard 4.1. - planning of the induction program with program leadership.
Table 4.13

Site Administration and Program Leadership Collaboration on Planning – Standard 4.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRINCIPAL</th>
<th>REPRESENTATIVE QUOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allison</td>
<td>“I guess I give feedback to the individuals that are running the induction program. I don’t specifically plan anything within my own building” (Interview 3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad</td>
<td>“I guess I wouldn’t say it’s alignment because I’m not even familiar with exactly everything that the induction…all the standards that the induction actually is” (Interview 3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith</td>
<td>“I do nothing. I mean technically, I am not part of that planning process at all” (Interview 3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>“I am not involved in the planning of what they do when they meet with the mentors or when they meet with their colleagues” (Interview 3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>“The actual assisting of the program in itself, I would say not strong. It really comes from the district” Interview 3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zach</td>
<td>“I did not assist in the planning for the program” (Interview 3).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The criteria for Standard 4.1 sought to have program leadership and principals collaborate to promote full involvement in program operations. Unfortunately, the principals reported no involvement in the planning of the induction program. Criteria for Standard 4.2 emphasized collaboration between program leadership and site administrators to create positive work environments. The principals reported on four aspects of supporting beginning teachers: 1) teacher schedules as defined by mentors and beginning teachers holding the same preparation time and opportunities to observe each other, 2) classroom assignments as defined by proximity to the mentor teacher or grade level team, 3) total student load as defined by the number of students assigned to a beginning teacher, and 4) teaching materials as defined by resources given to beginning teachers to meet the needs of providing instruction.

Teacher schedules. The principals reported that they used imaginative methods to ensure beginning and mentor teachers had time to plan and observe classroom practices. Tom and Zach
indicated that they had control over the master schedule to support beginning teachers. Tom stated, “They are given four to five days a week of common planning time” I created the master schedule for them, “but the mentor should help with the planning of their schedule” (Interview 3). Zach added, “I try to build the schedule out so they [beginning teachers] can have some common planning time with grade level peers and help them plan their reading or math block” (Interview 3). Tom and Zach were the only two principals to discuss what a beginning teacher will need to do during class time to address teaching skill development. Faith and Matt had a pragmatic approach to the challenge of teacher schedules. Faith stated, ‘There is a built-in piece of the teacher schedule where they [mentee] work with their mentor. We just assign subs for them’ (Interview 3). Matt concurred, “The induction program calls for new teachers to observe their mentors, then debrief. So I accommodate that by either providing a substitute or I’ve subbed myself” (Interview 3). Both Brad and Allison felt that providing a common planning time was out of their control. Brad clearly stated the challenge: “I try to get a common planning, but it is limited due to lunches and specials” (Interview 3). Allison explained the challenge in this way: “If the mentor and mentee teacher the same grade level, they have time to plan” (Interview 3). Otherwise, the mentor and beginning teacher needed to find time before or after school.

Classroom assignments. The principals attempted to place beginning teachers close to their mentor and grade level team but were hampered by building space and proximity to classrooms. For example, Tom tries to assign a beginning teacher’s classroom “close to their mentor” when it was possible (Interview 3). Agreeing with Tom, Faith responded, “I try to put them close to their mentor and their grade level team” (Interview 3). Allison was not overly concerned with placement of the beginning teacher due to the size of her building. “Some grade levels are closer, otherwise proximity is not a huge deal” (Interview 3). Brad stated that
classroom assignments “fall on the needs of the building” (Interview 3), meaning when a new teacher starts, classroom assignments stay the same.

In contrast, Zach did not place emphasis on classroom assignments in proximity to the mentor teacher. Like Zach, Matt believed that classroom assignments in relationship to students in the class are more significant than proximity to a mentor. “I would assign new teachers to not what I consider the most difficult group of kids, but not necessarily the easiest either, kind of the middle of the road kids in terms of behavioral challenges, but also academic spread” (Interview 3). Similarly, the principals balanced clustering (classrooms with students with both high and low ability levels) and equity (keeping class size close to the same number) when assigning total student load.

**Total student load.** Faith stated the balance between clustering and equity succinctly: “We do clustering here, so I wouldn’t typically put a brand new teacher with an IEP cluster just because I want that teacher to have the time and space to figure out who they are within that grade” (Interview 3). Zach’s line of thought was similar to Faith’s. Zach was willing to “give a little bit on grade level class. After the first year I like to see how a new teacher will do in a cluster classroom.” Allison had a similar approach, “Not to max out [27 students] or give them heavy clusters of students with IEPs” (Interview 3) to allow beginning teachers to grow. Tom’s response was similar to Faith’s and Allison’s. “I look at the ability level of the students coming in. The actual number is equal across all classrooms, but clustered appropriately is really trying to differentiate at an appropriate level” (Interview 3).

Matt and Brad focused on balancing class sizes. Matt, for instance, sought to strike a balance for grade level classes: “I try to make it pretty balanced throughout a grade level. I don’t have one that’s 25 and one that’s 18, they are typically pretty close [in size]” (Interview 3). Brad
also wanted to have a perception of equality in his school. He explained, “I can’t make classes lopsided because they are first year [teachers] so they get what they get” (Interview 3). The final element of supporting beginning teachers was teaching materials.

Teaching materials. The principals reported the beginning teachers received the same materials as all other teachers. Table 4.14 illustrates the principals’ responses to providing teaching materials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Teaching Materials – Principal Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allison</td>
<td>“No. They [beginning teachers] use the same materials as other people”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad</td>
<td>“Nothing different with materials, but I would say that the level of support they [beginning teachers] receive is higher”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith</td>
<td>“I do try to stick with the district [materials]”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>“Not specifically teaching materials, they [beginning teachers] get additional material on teaching practices”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>“We choose the same things [materials] for every teacher”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zach</td>
<td>“Nothing specific”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criterion 4.3 established that “site administrators [should] initiate and/or extend the development and support of collaborative learning groups in partnership with mentors” (IIPC, 2010). In support of this criterion, principals in this study were adding to the induction program by creating opportunities for collaborative learning communities to meet. The principals expressed various solutions to the inflexibility of elementary schedules when creating a collaborative learning community. Tom scheduled A days “where grade levels are together” for planning (Interview 3). Beginning teachers “are able to hear from their grade level team, but also another grade level team, and [learn] how they work through curriculum or different discipline
type things, and they’re [beginning teachers] naturally supported that way” (Interview 3). Faith’s school had the same A meeting time as Tom’s. “We have an extra planning day once a month, where we [beginning and veteran teachers] intentionally meet with the coaches to discuss whatever needs come up in their professional learning world” (Interview 3). Matt, Allison and Brad all used the school day for beginning and veteran teachers to collaborate.

Matt remarked, “We don’t provide set times for teams to meet at the elementary level. Our schedule doesn’t allow for that. I’m not able to create a situation where grade-level teams have common planning time” (Interview 3). He clearly expressed that grade level teams will meet “at staff meetings, SIP days, and even institute days” (Interview 3). The district offered a stipend to meet after school, “and many of them [beginning and veteran teachers] do, but it’s not prioritized” (Interview 3). Like Matt, Allison used faculty meetings “because our schedule does not provide that [time] within the school day” (Interview 3). Similar to Matt’s school, beginning and veteran teachers at Allison’s school “decided as a team that they would meet once a week together after school” (Interview 3). Brad also noted that his beginning and veteran teachers “have grade level meetings once weekly that are optional. I had the AP [Assistant Principal] do an assembly [during the school day] so they can get some time with their team during the day too” (Interview 3). All five principals used grade level teams to support beginning teachers in a collaborative learning community; however, Zach wanted beginning teachers to have deeper collaboration.

I try to pull them [beginning teachers] into some of the teams, particularly PBIS (Positive Behavior Intervention System), so they can learn a little bit from their mentor, but also people across all grade levels, and pick up a lot of tricks with that, and see that there’s more resources than just your grade level team had a different approach.(Interview 3)
While the principals extended both time and opportunities for beginning teachers to collaborate with veteran teachers as prescribed by Criterion 4.3, the principals furthered the collaborative relationship between the beginning and mentor teacher when creating an environment of confidentiality as prescribed in Criterion 4.5: “Site administrators ensure that positive mentoring experiences and uphold the relationship between mentor and beginning teacher as confidential” (IIPC, 2010). Two themes emerged from the data: direct confidentiality and indirect confidentiality (see Table 4.15).

Table 4.15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Number of Data Points</th>
<th>Total Number of Data Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Confidentiality</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Confidentiality</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Direct confidentiality was defined as the principal not discussing the challenges of the beginning teacher but rather guiding the mentor to work with the beginning teacher to address an issue. Faith expressed that her first priority was to hire a mentor who had the “highest level of professionalism and capacity for truth” (Interview 3) to ensure that confidentiality is maintained. Faith described that “information from the mentor travels the same path back” (Interview 3). In this regard, she was not part of the discussion with the beginning teacher. Faith also posed questions to the mentor “so they [mentor] can develop their own solutions to the process” (Interview 3). Tom shared Faith’s perspective on hiring a mentor. “We chose the mentor, which is a key factor because we can make sure that were getting somebody who kind of has those pieces that we feel the beginning teacher needs to grow on” (Interview 3). Tom created an
understanding with the mentor teacher “that any conversations we have are not an evaluation” of the beginning teacher (Interview 3). Similar to Faith, Tom discussed the challenges of the beginning teacher lead to “an honest conversation [allowing] the mentor to support that new teacher to the best of their ability” (Interview 3), noting that he was not part of the conversation between the mentor and beginning teacher. Zach, like Faith and Tom, was not engaged in the conversation between the mentor and beginning teacher. He and Faith had a similar approach to support mentors in that Zach provided mentors with “possible resources that beginning teachers can use” (Interview 3), specifically people in the school or district. Zach suggested that the mentor teacher should “tell her [beginning teacher] who to reach out to” (Interview 3), such as an instructional coach, professional development specialist, or veteran teacher for support. Brad captured the feeling of all the principals who provided direct confidentiality. He stated, “We [the mentor and principal] need to be honest and own what is going on, but that [conversation] doesn’t need to get back to the mentee” (Interview 3). Unlike Faith, Tom, and Zach, Brad focused on the best practices of the beginning teacher. “It shouldn’t be ‘here’s how we support the [beginning] teacher,’ but we need to discuss what they are doing that is not best practice, and if they’re not [best practices], then what are we going to do about it?” (Interview 3). Allison and Matt were more involved in conversations with beginning teachers.

Indirect confidentiality was defined as the principal discussing the challenges of the beginning teacher while maintaining confidentiality for the mentor. After conferencing with the mentor teacher, Allison said she would “do an informal [observation], not even related to the evaluation, to see if I can see what they’re [the mentor teacher] was talking about, then I have that discussion” (Interview 3) with the beginning teacher. However, she “never brings it [the reason for the visit] back to the mentor because I don’t want to break that confidence with them”
(Interview 3). Matt approached conversations with the beginning teacher as Allison did. Matt stated, “When I speak to the beginning teacher about those strengths and weaknesses, I’ll always approach it as if it’s my observation and wanted to talk to the beginning teacher directly about that” (Interview 3).

Criterion 4.6 established that “site administrators [should] align their work in support of beginning teachers with the standards for administrators” (IIPC, 2010). The Illinois Performance Standards for School Leaders contains six standards. These are 1) living a mission and vision focused on results, 2) leading and managing systems change, 3) improving teaching and learning, 4) building and maintaining collaborative relationships, 5) leading with integrity and professionalism, and 6) creating and sustaining a culture of high expectations. Table 4.16 illustrates which standard the principals reported using when aligning goals of the IIPC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal performance standard</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
<th>Total Number of Data Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improving Teaching and Learning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading with Integrity and Professionalism</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living a Mission and Vision Focused on Results</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All principals reported aligning elements of the Illinois Performance Standards for School Leaders (IPSSL) with elements of the induction program but with varying intent.
Beginning with improving teaching and learning as defined, “The principal works with the school staff and community to develop a research-based framework for effective teaching and learning that is refined continuously to improve instruction for all students” (Illinois Performance Standard for School Leaders, 2012, p. 1). Faith explained, “We have a high emphasis on that piece [improving teaching and learning of beginning teachers] in everything we do” (Interview 3). Faith detailed how beginning teachers were supported. “We have coaching cycles where a beginning teacher will have at least one meeting with the professional development [ELA and math]” (Interview 3). Zach agreed with Faith that improving teaching and learning was most aligned to the IIPC. However, his perspective on how beginning teachers were supported was not as defined as Faith’s. Zach felt it was “just [the] best practice of being the support for that teacher…finding out where they are and where you want them to be, and differentiating your approach to help them [beginning teachers] get there” (Interview 3). Matt’s thoughts aligned with Faith’s and Zach’s. He explained, “I try to hire, develop and retain great employees, and that includes all new teachers” (Interview 3). He stated, “I guess all of that [alignment of the IPSSL and IIPC] happens indirectly…I don’t participate in the induction program” (Interview 3). As a result, Matt explained, “I guess I can’t say specifically how they [IPSSL] align to the program” (Interview 3).

Leading with integrity and professionalism was defined as “the principal works with the school staff and community to create a positive context for learning by ensuring equity, fulfilling professional responsibilities with honesty and integrity, and serving as a model for the professional behavior of others” (Illinois Performance Standards for School Leaders, 2012, p. 1). Tom explained, “I feel like all the standards of school leaders really focus around the idea of climate and culture” (Interview 3). Tom proposed that a positive climate and culture results in
“professional development [for beginning teachers] and that becomes consistent communication, transparency, [and] making sure it [climate and culture] all aligns to the mission and the vision” (Interview 3). Brad concurred with Tom for both the IPSSL standard and how it built on other criteria of the IPSSL. Brad stated, “leading with integrity means that we can have [beginning] teachers that become better instructionally, and really in all areas” (Interview 3). His perspective on leading with integrity included discovering “what that [beginning] teacher specifically needs and give it to them in a way that doesn’t make them feel inferior” (Interview 3).

Living a mission and vision focused on results was defined as “the principal works with the staff and community to build a shared mission, and vision of high expectations that ensure all students are on the path to college and career readiness, and holds staff accountable for results” (IPSSL, 2012, p. 1). Allison was the only principal to cite mission and vision as being related to the induction program. Allison stated, “I align the mission and vision of the school all of the time. It’s at our faculty meeting agendas. I’ve brought that [mission and vision] forward to every faculty meeting” (Interview 3).

In addition to interviewing elementary principals, a review of the school districts’ induction program documents provided answers to the research questions.

Document Review

Elementary principals, beginning teachers, and mentor teachers received descriptions of the induction and mentoring program from district leadership (see Appendix C for a summary of the mentor/mentee program, professional development meeting dates for mentors and mentees, peer observation pre-conference form, observer feedback for peer observation form, and the peer observation post-conference form). The principals were also provided a checklist to help guide
and support beginning teachers (see Appendix D for information about the building tour, access to resources, student behavior, curriculum, procedures, and institute day). In total there were 48 items on the checklist; however, only four items align to Standards 2 and 4. Table 4.17 illustrates a crosswalk between the standards and induction items.

Table 4.17

IIPC Standards and Induction Items Crosswalk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Description for Standard</th>
<th>Induction Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>How program and site leaders integrated the school improvement goals and professional development</td>
<td>School Improvement Program and Professional Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Analyzing a beginning teacher’s instruction</td>
<td>Lesson plan guidelines and expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Collaboration between program leadership and site administrators in creating positive work environments</td>
<td>Textbooks, supplemental materials, shared equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Foster collaborative learning communities to promote a program of support for all staff</td>
<td>Staff Meetings, timing, schedule for team meetings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criterion for Standard 2.2 outline how program and site leaders should integrate the school improvement goals and professional development. The principals expressed various experiences with this process. Matt was frustrated because “there’s no specific school improvement plan process. Like we are not given any template or guidelines on how to do that”
He explained that the district is beginning a one-to-one initiative because the leadership team decided to “have everybody go through Google Certification Level One, so new teachers were involved in that [professional development] directly because they did the modules with everybody else” (Interview 2). Zach, like Matt, explained that the school’s professional development was driven in part by the district’s long-range plan, specifically reading comprehension. Similar to Matt, Zach “pull[ed] the new teachers to do guided reading and DRAs [Developmental Reading Assessment]” on professional development days (Interview 2). In addition to Matt and Zach, Allison relied in part on the district’s long-range plan to guide the school improvement plan, specifically equity and trauma-informed classrooms. She described the “School Improvement Plan as an overarching umbrella” in which we put on equity or trauma-informed lenses to support school improvement (Interview 2). Tom also captured how the school improvement plan and goals are linked for beginning staff in that there were “three main goals: student learning, collaboration and communication, and equity in instruction” (Interview 2). Tom explained that beginning teachers’ professional development should focus on those three goals and “they’re going to quickly see that they’re a part of that [school improvement] overall plan” (Interview 2). Faith differed from all other principals; she relied on the mentors to help the beginning teacher use pacing guides to understand the instructional piece of the school improvement plan. Brad stated, “That’s an area [school improvement plan] that I need to work on” (Interview 2).

Standard 2.4 includes “analysis of beginning teacher instruction” (IIPC, 2010, p. 13). The focus of the document that aligns closest to the criterion was Lesson Plan Guidelines and Expectations. The new teacher training document and seminar included Domain 1 – Planning and Preparation from the Danielson Framework for Teaching that details components for lesson
planning to support beginning teachers. During the two-day new teacher seminar, a district administrator provided a brief training on the Danielson Framework for Teaching and ongoing support was provided by the principals. All principals identified areas that beginning teachers could address when writing lesson plans. The principals reported either direct (Allison and Faith) or indirect (Brad, Matt, Tom, and Zach) alignment to the Danielson Framework for Teaching when supporting beginning teachers. Allison and Brad suggested beginning teachers should reflect on their lesson plans, while Faith and Tom wanted beginning teachers to use standards to anchor the lesson plans. Matt identified that beginning teachers need help with routines and protocols when writing lesson plans, and Zach contended that beginning teachers needed to focus questions, discussions and engagement when designing their lessons. Table 4.18 provides an illustration of representative quotations by the principals on identified areas beginning teachers should address.

Criterion for Standard 4.2 emphasized collaboration between program leadership and site administrators in creating positive work environments. As previously discussed, criteria for Standard 4.2 that support a positive work environment include teachers’ schedules, classroom assignments, total student load, and teaching materials. The principals reported that the process of supporting beginning teacher based on their teaching schedules is varied. Tom, Zach, Faith, and Matt were able to control scheduling by adapting the master schedule or assigning substitutes. In contrast, Brad and Allison felt little to no control over teacher schedules to support beginning teachers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRINCIPAL</th>
<th>REPRESENTATIVE QUOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allison</td>
<td>I typically ask them what their thoughts are on what they could have done differently [on a lesson plan] or what they might change in the future. I typically use the Danielson Framework to help guide those conversations, but I want the teachers to try to reflect on their practices first.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad</td>
<td>Don’t be afraid to try new things or afraid to let a lesson tank. To me, it is about how you adapt to the lesson failing more than the lesson itself that shows me the strengths you have as a teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith</td>
<td>I always start with a backward design template in conjunction with the [Danielson] Framework for Teaching. I [have beginning teachers] drive everything from the assessment and then determine what students should know. We use the [Danielson] Framework for Teaching as a guide as well. This helps to shape the criteria for mastery which then helps to shape the rest of the lesson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>This varies by [beginning] teacher but most suggestions [on lesson planning] revolve around routines and procedures, questioning, and incorporation of multiple sources/resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Looking at how to spiral standards and skills. New teachers are really good about basic planning for standards, but most of the time lack how they can bring old standards back in order to continue generalization and base skill building of the content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zach</td>
<td>They [beginning teachers] need strategies for questions and discussions. Other things that I have [beginning teachers] focus on are how to check that students are engaged while working away from the teacher (ex. give your small group a task to be completed while you check on other groups), rethinking placement of rotations/stations to make it easier to manage, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The principals were split on classroom placement for beginning teachers. Tom and Faith placed beginning teachers in close proximity to their mentor; however, Allison, Brad, Zach, and Matt did not see proximity as a priority or need for beginning and mentor teachers. All principals wanted to have both clustered and balanced classrooms to support beginning teachers. Finally, principals reported that beginning teachers were provided the same teaching materials as all other grade level teachers. Although the principals did not indicate consistency when approaching Standard 4.2, they provided consistent opportunities to foster collaborative learning environments.

Standard 4.3 established that “site administrators [should] foster the development of collaborative learning communities to promote a program of support for all staff” (IIPC, 2010, p.20), which was discussed previously. The principals reported that for beginning and veteran teachers to meet, the principals created specific “A” schedules that allowed meetings to occur; principals also used faculty or staff training and afterschool time for meetings.

Summary of Research Question #3

All of the principals discussed using Standards 1, 2, and 4 of the Illinois Induction Program Continuum when supporting beginning teachers. Table 4.19 illustrates the total number of themes and subthemes accompanied by the total number of data points.

Table 4.19 shows that when focusing on total themes and subthemes, elementary principals used most often Standard 4 - site administrators and program leadership collaborate to ensure that they assume their responsibilities for supporting beginning teachers in the induction program (n=5 total themes and subthemes). It should be noted that Standard 4 had the most criterion: six as compared to Standard 1 with five and Standard 2 with four. When focusing on
the total number of data points, Standard 1 - program leadership roles and duties include planning, oversight, and gathering data on the induction program (43 data points) was used most often by elementary principals to support beginning teachers. Finally, Standard 2 - focused on improved student learning, beginning teacher development, support, and retention was equal to the number of themes and subthemes as Standard 1, but had fewer data points than Standard 1.

Table 4.19

Illinois Induction Program Continuum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illinois Induction Program Continuum</th>
<th>Description of Standard</th>
<th>Total Themes and Subthemes</th>
<th>Total Number of Data Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Program leadership roles and duties include planning, oversight, and gathering data on the induction program</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Focused on improved student learning, beginning teacher development, support, and retention</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Site administrators and program leadership collaborate to ensure that they assume their responsibilities for supporting beginning teachers in the induction program</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question #4
What influence, if any, do transformational leadership traits used by elementary school principals have on beginning teachers?

Interviews revealed that all the principals used the four I’s of transformational leadership when working with beginning teachers. Idealized influence was the trait used with the most frequency, followed by individual consideration, intellectual stimulation, and inspirational motivation (see Table 4.9). Based on the principals using all of the traits, it is difficult to ascertain which trait had an influence over teacher retention. However, school context emerged from the data as having an influence on beginning teachers’ retention, which the principals influenced because of their building leadership traits.

School Context

One element not directly included in the research questions was school context. However, previous research has identified that school context had a greater influence on teacher retention rates than induction programs or mentors (Wilkins et al., 2012). School context was based on five categories: 1) teacher’s influence on school policy, 2) staff relationships, 3) student behavior, 4) facilities and safety, and 5) competency of administrators (Borman & Dowling, 2008; Boyd et al., 2011; Certo & Fox, 2002; Wilkins et al.). Interview three, specifically questions 8 through 12 focused on the elements of school context; however, consistent principal responses evolved around the teachers’ influence on school policy, staff relationships, and student behavior.

Teacher’s influence on school policy. A beginning teacher’s influence on school policy was defined as having an opportunity to be a part of a committee that impacted school policy in
various ways. The principals reported that beginning teachers can be members of established school committees and provide a voice to influence school policy for various reasons. Brad explained, “They [beginning teachers] would either be on the leadership team, the school improvement team, or the equity team on a volunteer basis” (Interview 3) and through these teams, beginning teachers have an active voice in making decisions on school policy. Matt acknowledged that “beginning teachers typically aren’t involved in creating school policies” but noted that “new teachers are welcome to be on the Positive Behavior Intervention System team (PBIS), and some of them are” (Interview 3). Matt also agreed with Brad’s point about including the entire staff in decisions. “We worked on a mission and vision that involved our entire staff” (Interview 3). Matt extended this thought: “one of our beginning teachers was influential in one of the phases in our vision about 21st century skills” (Interview 3). Zach agreed with Matt regarding PBIS. “I think PBIS lends itself well because they are going to be thoughtful about it” (Interview 3). Similar to Brad, Tom provided opportunities for staff to give feedback. “We do sub-committee work that is brought back to the full staff where everybody’s voice can be heard and add something. So beginning teachers are naturally involved” (Interview 3). Allison’s thoughts were similar to Matt’s and Tom’s. Allison declared: “I get feedback from everyone. I do not want a beginning teacher to feel like they do not have a voice just because they are new” (Interview 3).

Faith’s perspective on beginning teachers having a voice differed from Allison. Faith identified that beginning teachers have space to listen and understand policy before being part of the change. “I just like the ideas of providing spaces where people can just come in and absorb information” (Interview 3). She wanted beginning teachers to “just come in the first year or two and just listen to what is going on and how those things impact instead of trying to create new
ideas” (Interview 3). Increasing collegial interaction supported a beginning teachers’ voice, possibly leading to better staff relationships.

**Staff relationships.** The theme of staff relationships was defined as creating a space and activities for beginning teachers to meet and get to know fellow teachers. Tom, Matt, and Faith explained that they used scheduled meeting time to increase collegial interaction. Tom stated, “During institute or professional development days, teachers are able to interact with each other in small groups. They push themselves out of their grade level teams into ‘vertical communities”’ (Interview 3). While beginning and veteran teachers worked in the vertical communities, “they give themselves a title and make up a song. They’re revealing some things about themselves or placing themselves in a vulnerable spot” (Interview 3). Similar to Tom, Matt was “intentional about designing activities in our staff meetings where teachers are talking to each other about instructional practices, assessments, [and] standards” (Interview 3). Along with Tom and Matt, Faith created “spaces in faculty meetings and cook-outs where teachers talk about practices and find out little things” about each other (Interview 3). The meeting spaces “build trust relationships and friendships” (Interview 3). Zach looked to enhance staff relationships but not during scheduled meeting times. “With a new teacher [I try] to plan connections for them with case managers, the psych [psychologist], and social workers and encourage them to be on teams” (Interview 3).

Allison did not discuss how she supported staff relationships; instead she explained how she had to address the lack of staff professionalism when she began as principal. She recalled that interactions among staff appeared “to be very rude and not professional in any manner” (Interview 3). “I had to let them [teachers] know what my expectations were for meetings and professional development; we talked a lot about what an active listener is, what a participant is
and a lot of modeling” (Interview 3). The staff relationships led to addressing student behavior through school wide supports.

**Student behavior.** The principals defined school wide programs as systems that addressed student behavior. Table 4.20 illustrates the frequency to which the principals referred to that theme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Total Number of Data Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Wide Support</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Brad’s and Tom’s schools were trauma-informed schools that prepared teachers and staff to respond to students who have faced adverse experiences. Brad stated, “We are in our second year as a trauma-informed school so I have some expectations [for the beginning teacher] using the comfort corner or using de-escalation techniques” (Interview 3). Brad used the social worker and observations when helping beginning teachers address student behavior. “Social workers and I do observations and let them [beginning teachers] know what behaviors we are seeing and how they can interact with the negative behaviors” (Interview 3). Tom stated, “We had a focus on trauma-informed instruction and within that philosophy is understanding the negative student behavior; you can’t focus on the student, you have to focus on the teacher” (Interview 3). Tom included more team members than Brad. Tom explained the team approach at his school:

*We have a student support team which is our special education teacher, our social worker, and our administrators. We meet once a month and we invite [beginning] teachers who are struggling a bit in their classroom, thinking that the student behavior is negative, but really not understanding how they can work with the students from their own aspect and beliefs. So then, we [principal and social worker] would go in there and*
we would observe in their classroom, we would then meet again, and then we would kind of share the observations and then walk the [beginning] teacher through what the student is communicating or what piece of the student's day is portrayed as negative. You know, it could be an academic issue, it could be a peer issue, it could be a home issue.

(Interview 3)

Matt’s school was similar to Brad’s when approaching student behavior. “In our building we meet together and we involve the new teacher and it would be a team decision on what we’re going to do” (Interview 3). Although Matt’s approach was not as specific as Brad’s, Matt has similar strategies in place to support a beginning teacher when dealing with student behavior. “We provide a lot of tier 2 and tier 3 services. I’m thinking specifically of Check-In Check-Out, Check and Connect, Calm Down Corners, Chart Systems, and/or Token Systems” (Interview 3). Faith, along with Brad and Matt, used school wide student behavioral systems. “We use a very tiered system for classroom management plans, [specifically] PBIS and Second Step” (Interview 3). Faith also discussed that her school used an approach similar to the trauma-informed schools Brad and Tom referenced by “looking at behavioral theory and trying to grow an understanding of what has happened to children, looking at ACE’s [Adverse Childhood Experiences] scores on the impact of students” (Interview 3).

While Brad, Tom, Matt, and Faith used identified systems to support beginning teachers when dealing with student behavior, Allison and Zach looked at student behavior from a teacher’s perspective and did not discuss a systems approach in their schools. Allison stated, “We talked a lot about how we may look or sound to a student, what we are bringing to the table, whether we had a bad morning, didn’t eat our breakfast, just frustrated because the student behavior is negative” (Interview 3). During her second interview, Allison described using a trauma-informed lens to support her school. She added in the third interview that “sometimes as a group of educators, we don’t understand where the student or family is coming from”
(Interview 3). Zach’s school, like Allison’s, focused on the mindset of beginning teachers when dealing with student behavior. “The [beginning] teachers have to believe that behavior is a skill that can be learned and improved upon…It’s all about [having] positive relationships and looking at behavior as a growth mindset” (Interview 3).

Summary of Research Question #4

The principals reported using all four I’s of transformational leadership when supporting a beginning teacher to address teacher retention. The principals reported using three elements of school context when offering support for beginning teachers: 1) teachers’ influence on school policy, 2) staff relationships, and 3) student behavior (through school wide support programs). However, the principals did not report focus on the facilities and safety or the competence of the administrators as measures to address teacher retention.

Conclusion

This chapter began by identifying the purpose of the study, presenting the research questions, and providing a thumb-nail description of all of the principals. The chapter also provided the principals’ responses to the pre-written questions and interview questions and aligned the responses to the research questions. The chapter concluded with additional data on the school contexts. The next chapter includes a discussion of the findings as well as revisits the limitations of the study and recommendations for practice and future research.
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

Introduction

This study sought to gain an understanding of how elementary building principals use transformational leadership and Standards 1, 2, and 4 of the Illinois Induction Program Continuum (IIPC) to support and mentor beginning teachers. Whereas Chapter 4 detailed the findings, the purpose of this final chapter is to discuss major outcomes of the study, recommendations to administrators and induction site leadership, future research, and limitations.

Discussion

Finding 1
Principal Support of Beginning Teachers through Dialogue, Collaborative School Context, Professional Development, and Student Behavior

The most important finding from this study was how principals provided support for beginning teachers. Although much of what is identified in Finding 1 has been established, the outcomes of this study extend what has been researched by providing an example of lived transformational leadership. While transformational leadership operationalized through dialogue, collaborative school context, professional development, and student behavior has been shown to increase job satisfaction for teachers, research has not looked at it through the lens of mentoring
for beginning teachers. Therefore, leadership behaviors are critical to look at and emphasize for administrators while working with beginning teachers.

**Dialogue**

Past research has shown that induction programs are successful when principals had positive interactions with beginning teachers (Kaplan et al., 2014). This study supports that research as the elementary principals reported they sought to build positive interactions through open dialogue by framing conversations around beginning teachers’ strengths and weaknesses as well as their personal and professional growth. Identifying beginning teacher’s strengths and weaknesses parallels Hauling-Austin’s (1990) research that found some induction programs are designed to support the social and emotional well-being of a beginning teacher. In this study, the principals reinforced Hauling-Austin contention when they used dialogue to help identify a beginning teacher’s emotional state. Brad, for example, stated, “Every interaction is different and I believe we must meet each teacher where they are at academically and mentally” (Pre-written reflection 1). In a similar fashion, Allison added, “Conversations can go a long way to help someone feel comfortable and welcome in a new place” (Pre-written reflection 1). By creating this open space for dialogue, the principals felt they promoted a positive climate and school context. Interestingly, the IIPC standards do not make reference to dialogue; there is only a vague nod to “stakeholder communication” in Standard 1 (Induction Program Leadership, Administration, and Support). In addition, the principals in this district were not instructed or trained by district induction leadership to use dialogue when working with beginning teachers. Yet, all of the principals often described dialogue to support their beginning teachers. This dialogue is an important element because it confirms that the principals fell back on coaching
beginning teachers thorough their own leadership framework, specifically idealized influence. Training principals in the induction program would afford principals a deeper understanding of the tenets of the program. Also, principals could collaborate with the program designers to establish how they can leverage their leadership framework to enhance the experience for the beginning teacher. This would codify actual principal behavior such as using dialogue when supporting beginning teachers.

The elementary principals in this study, however, did receive training through an outside source about mindful inquiry and growth mindset, which I conjecture may have influenced their use of dialogue with their beginning teachers. The elementary principals completed two years of training with the Pacific Education Group, which provides training to address equity on race and gender in school settings. The training pushed the elementary principals to consistently use open-ended questions to better understand the perspective of another person. The district also trained principals on Carol Dweck’s perspective on growth mindset to further advance elementary principals to support beginning teachers. Finally, although this study found these principals valued dialoguing, the frequency and depth of that dialogue were not the focus of this study. That said, future researchers should consider examining the frequency and depth of dialogue between principals and beginning teachers to unpack perceived and actual value.

Collaborative School Context

Aubusson et al. (2015) identified the presence of a collaborative school context when professional conversations occur. In support, the elementary principals in this study reported holding professional conversations with their beginning teachers around lesson planning (alignment to Common Core) and instruction. For instance, Faith and Tom requested that
beginning teachers use Common Core academic standards to anchor lesson plans, while Allison and Brad wanted their beginning teachers to regularly reflect on their lesson planning. The principals reported that creating a collaborative school context involved linking and creating working relationships between beginning teachers and building specialists. For example, the principals reported that often they assigned instructional coaches to work with beginning teachers on specific strategies. In doing so, the instructional coach provided an additional layer of support for the beginning teacher. To create additional collaborative opportunities, the beginning teachers were supported when the principals encouraged them to work with a literacy, math, or instructional coach in order to enhance instruction. Although a principal telling a beginning teacher what steps they need to take to improve their instruction may not completely align with collaboration, these principal’s felt that they needed to model direct instruction behavior, when necessary, to support their beginning teachers.

Another significant indicator of school context that influences retention rates entails the competency of the administrators (Borman & Dowling, 2008; Boyd et al., 2011; Certo & Fox, 2002; Wilkins et al., 2012). The state of Illinois has defined six standards that determine the competency of administrators. The six standards are outlined in the Illinois Performance Standards for School Leaders or IPSSL (2010). The six standards range from school climate to teacher training/staffing to budgeting. Standard III, Element “A,” of the IPSSL established that distinguished administrators “regularly assess instructional practices and build teacher capacity” (p. 6). In this study, when the principals asked their beginning teachers to anchor their lessons to Common Core standards and to reflect on their lesson planning, their comments align with IPSSL Standard III, in particular being a distinguished administrator when focused on instructional practices and building teacher capacity. However, the principals in this study were
not “assessing” their beginning teachers in a formal capacity, but in a formative capacity, when asking them to reflect on their lesson plans. In doing so, the principals’ focus may have simply been to encourage their beginning teachers to build their instructional skill set and ultimately their teacher capacity. Even so, it begs the question: Does creating a collaborative school climate for beginning teachers involve two-way dialogue with the building principal or is it more one-way (i.e., telling beginning teachers what to do – in this case to reflect – rather than collaborate and/or exchange ideas about lesson planning framed around the Common Core)?

In using a different lens, transformational leadership was found to have a positive influence on school climate when arrangements are made for veteran and beginning teachers to collaborate (Burns, 1978; Fenn & Mixon, 2011; Neissen et al., 2017). This pattern was also found in this study. Tom, Matt, and Faith scheduled meeting times to build staff relationships, whereas Zach worked to build faculty/staff relationships by connecting beginning teachers to building specialists. The data infer that a collaborative school context where connections are made by the principal between beginning teachers and building specialists (e.g., professional development specialists, literacy coaches, numeracy coaches) may positively influence teacher retention. In this study, principals told their beginning teachers who were the literacy, numeracy, and instructional coaches in their building to seek them out for assistance when needed. One principal commented that when a beginning teacher did ask for help, it was a form of risk-taking, which aligned to Idealized Influence. However, the research has shown that beginning teachers often do not be comfortable asking for help, as competency in their classroom and with students may draw undue attention from others in the building. What is lacking is a systemized way for a beginning teacher to get support. In current practice, the principals direct the beginning teachers to seek out the specialists. Future research is needed to determine if there is any benefit when
using a systematic process to provide beginning teachers support versus leaving the beginning teachers to determine when they need support.

**Professional Development**

The principals in this study described providing professional development for their beginning teachers as a responsibility. Their actions support past research that has shown that principal and beginning teachers attended professional development together (Allen et al., 2015; Perry & Hays, 2011). For example, Faith expressed that she attended professional development with her beginning teachers in an effort to grow as an instructional leader. Her focus was also on assisting beginning teachers to understand and implement new instructional practices. She supported these efforts by being in the classroom as the beginning teacher put innovations into practice. She then reflected on implementation with the beginning teacher and collaboratively identified next steps.

Other principals (Allison, Brad, Matt, Tom, and Zach) discussed attending professional development with their beginning teachers was beneficial as the district professional development was created collaboratively by teachers and administrators. Unfortunately, no other principal with the exception of Faith, discussed how the information gained from professional development was used. Their actions support Buchanan et al. (2013) who found that beginning teachers valued professional development. It also supports IIPC Standard 7 (Development of Beginning Teacher Practice) that details beginning teachers need to have regularly scheduled time to participate in ongoing professional development, specifically focused on their professional growth to support student learning.
Although the principals encouraged professional development both on- and off-site, the responsibility or expectation to do so was not part of the district induction program. Formalizing the expectation for the principal and beginning teacher to attend professional development could add value to the current district induction program. In addition, the opportunity to engage in professional development with other beginning teachers might be helpful, too. Data about attending on- and off-site professional development with peers (i.e., other beginning teachers) was not captured in this study. Therefore, future researchers may want to consider studying professional development when administrators and beginning teachers attend together as well as when beginning teachers attend with peers, giving particular attention to the influence on teacher retention.

Student Behavior

Similar to Fuller (1969), who discovered that beginning teachers were concerned with addressing student behavior, all of the principals in this study reported providing system wide or individual support when dealing with student behavior. Specifically, Brad, Tom, Matt, and Faith identified systems such as PBIS and trauma-informed schools, while Allison and Zach worked with beginning teachers individually to address student behavior. Allison reported that these discussions occurred with both beginning and veteran teachers. The content of the conversations focused on where the student may be coming from emotionally and how the student perceives the teacher. Again, the training principals received through the Pacific Education Group provided greater insight into equitable practices in education and how to better approach students from the perspective of discipline. Zach reported using the language “growth mind-set” with both teachers and students to address negative behaviors. Zach stated, “First the teacher has to believe that
behavior is a skill that can be learned and improved upon” (Interview 3). Again, in this example, principals could apply learning from Growth Mind Set training to build and sustain a positive school climate. When viewing student behavior through the lens of school context, Borman and Dowling (2008), Boyd et al. (2011), Certo and Fox (2002), and Wilkins et al. (2012) found that student behavior was an influential factor to increase teacher retention. Moreover, Buchannan et al. (2013) reported that lack of school support regarding poor student behavior had a negative impact on a teacher’s decision to stay. All of the principals in this study provided some level of support to beginning teachers when managing student behavior.

The district’s induction program did include student behavior as an item that principals needed to discuss with beginning teachers specifically, “establishing classroom behavior expectations” (see Appendix D), which is also found in IIPC Standard 4.3 (role and responsibilities associated with discipline procedures). In addition, the district required principals to support the challenges that beginning teachers faced through a PBIS. In particular, the principals reported using Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions with students; however, they did not discuss formal training for beginning teachers. An established training within the induction program on PBIS (or whatever discipline procedures used) may be of great benefit for beginning teachers.

Finding 2
Use of Idealized Influence to Support Beginning Teachers

The second most important finding from the study was the use of idealized influence by the principals to support their beginning teachers. Idealized influence was operationalized by the experiences of the elementary principals. The research findings from this study suggested that
the elementary principals, within this particular district, used idealized influence more often than the other three traits of transformational leadership (individual consideration, intellectual stimulation, and inspirational motivation). Idealized influence included building trusting relationships that encouraged risk taking, creating leadership opportunities, and establishing a collaborative environment for their beginning teachers.

Past research by Bass and Avolio (1994) described risk taking as one element of idealized influence. All principals reported that risk taking was acceptable. For instance, Allison encouraged her beginning teachers to try new instructional practices through experimentation, while Tom created a safe place for risk taking to occur. Both Allison and Tom’s approach supports Moolenaar et al. (2010), who argued for creating space for risk taking as well as the need for principals to support beginning teachers when developing or implementing new ideas to positively impact organizational change.

In addition, all of the principals in this study encouraged beginning teachers to have leadership opportunities by serving on at least one committee. For Matt and Brad, they asked their beginning teachers not only to lead staff meetings but also to create community events. For a beginning teacher, the opportunity to serve on a committee, lead staff meetings, or create community events involves risk taking. However, the time commitment needed to complete those responsibilities can take away from beginning teachers’ time to plan lessons and find classroom resources.

Idealized influence also includes establishing a collaborative environment for beginning teachers. Previous research by Wood (2005) and Ingersoll and Strong (2011) reported that supportive induction programs include collaboration with beginning teachers. In this study, Matt and Tom adjusted weekly meetings to ensure their beginning and veteran teachers had time to
work together. During this work time, Matt and Tom felt that the beginning teachers were able to
gain valuable insight about lesson planning, instructional strategies, and classroom management
while working with their veteran teaching counterparts. Unfortunately, Allison and Brad did not
provide time during the school day for the beginning teacher and mentor to collaborate. The lack
of administrator’s support for the beginning teacher and mentor to collaborate may have an
adverse impact on the overall induction program at their schools.

Collaboration between the principals and beginning teachers to create a path for
leadership was discussed by all principals (Aydin et al., 2013; Ling, 2012; Marks & Printy,
2003). For example, Faith encouraged beginning teachers to join a committee of interest while
Allison told beginning teachers which committee would benefit from their knowledge. Although
the committee work may not have directly impacted classroom instruction, beginning teachers
gained the opportunity to deepen connections and collaborate with veteran teachers as well as
gain leadership opportunities from joining committees.

Although the elementary principals reported using idealized influence when supporting
beginning teachers, none indicated that the topic was part of induction training nor were the
principals asked by program leadership to use idealized influence when supporting beginning
teachers. This disconnect between how principals use their own leadership behaviors and the
IIPC clearly suggests that principals do not use the elements found in the IIPC to support
beginning teachers. Principals need to review the elements of the IIPC and determine which
standards need to be in focus to support beginning teachers. Identifying the level of knowledge
and use of idealized influence by elementary principals and then building on that expertise
through training may be of benefit to supporting beginning teachers in this and other school
districts. The consistent use of idealized influence by these principals over the other I’s of
transformational leadership (i.e., inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration) to use idealized influence might enhance induction programming. Training could be designed around building trusting relationships that encourage risk taking, creating leadership opportunities, and establishing a collaborative environment. Future research could focus on how principals at the elementary, middle, and high school levels use idealized influence to support beginning teachers. Particular attention could be given to studying similarities and differences by level as well as evaluating the training received and materials used.

Finding 3
Principals’ Awareness about the IIPC and Involvement in the District

Kolsubz-Kosan (2007) called for evaluation of the induction program to include more building level administration. Disappointingly, the principals in this study reported that they rarely were asked for feedback or involved in the planning of the induction program. The elementary principals reported that the standards detailed in the Illinois Induction Program Continuum (IIPC) were not familiar with them, and as such, the standards were not influential in how they supported beginning teachers. What the principals reported clearly stands in contrast to IIPC Standard 1 that states an induction program should have “an administrative structure” (IIPC) where leaders both plan and implement the program. The data revealed that the opportunity to involve both induction program leaders and building administrators as described in IIPC Standard 1 did not exist. Faith was blunt when describing her experience: “We don’t collaborate to guide and implement the induction program.” Zach captured it best when he said, “The site administration did not work with program leadership to guide or implement the induction program.”
Although 23 Illinois Administrative Code 65 calls for administrators to receive induction related professional development for new teachers, these principals reported receiving little to no professional development about beginning teachers’ induction. Yet, despite the overall lack of administrative structure, the principal’s followed through on many of the elements necessary to support beginning teachers: identifying a mentor, establishing classroom support, and providing professional development. This raises the question about how to make IIPC Standards 1, 2, and 4 of benefit to principals in their support of beginning teachers and how to optimize awareness by induction program leaders to include principal involvement. Future research should focus on how to develop principal awareness about induction standards and ways to encourage collaboration between induction program leaders and building administrators.

Recommendations to Administrators and Induction Site Leadership

This research identified that the most significant finding was that principals used dialogue, collaborative school context, professional development, and addressing student behavior to support beginning teachers. It is recommended that these four criteria of support be implemented by administrators no matter the grade level (elementary, middle, or high school) when working with beginning teachers. Based on the principals’ use of Standards 2.4, 2.6 of the IIPC, and Standard 3 of the IPSSL, it is recommended that these standards be emphasized and serve as focal points of induction programs. The experiences reported by the principals in this study, their higher than average retention rates of beginning teachers in the district, and findings from past and current research support this recommendation.

The research provided that elementary principals used idealized influence more often than other three traits of transformational leadership (individual consideration, intellectual
stimulation, and inspirational motivation). Idealized influence included building trusting relationships that encouraged risk taking and leadership opportunities as ways to support beginning teachers. Based on this study it is recommended that principals model risk taking. As an example, Tom modeled new lessons to his entire staff. In addition, it is recommended that schools create a path to leadership for beginning teachers. Beginning teachers should be provided a list of committees and teams that includes a brief description. This recommendation should be used with caution as to not overwhelm a beginning teacher with duties that fall outside of the practice of teaching.

The elementary principals reported that the standards outlined in the IIPC did not significantly impact their approach to supporting beginning teachers. Elementary principals did not articulate using Standards 1, 2, or 4 beyond surface application. However, the elementary principals did not report being provided any specific training on the induction program or the IIPC. In retrospect, this district provides thoughtful support for beginning teachers in spite of the lack of training on the induction program for the principals or the IIPC. This suggests that induction programs, principal training on induction programs, and the IIPC are woefully inadequate. The recommendation for induction site leadership would be to re-evaluate how Standards 1, 2, and 4 are applicable to the daily work of administrators.

Theoretical Framework Revisited

The theoretical framework for this study was initially provided in Figure 1.1. The figure intended to establish an alignment between the four I’s of transformational leadership and Standards 1, 2, and 4 of the IIPC. Figure 5.1 provides an updated version of the theoretical framework:
The study discovered that the lack of alignment between transformational leadership and the IIPC was due in part to the minimal use of the IIPC by the elementary principals. The study
clearly indicated that the elementary principals used idealized influence as a major element to support beginning teachers and to a degree the other three I’s of transformational leadership. However, Standards 1, 2, and 4 of the IIPC were not used operationally by the elementary principals to support beginning teachers. Therefore, based on the results of this study, the intended theoretical framework does not provide a valid alignment between transformational leadership and the IIPC. The lack of alignment may suggest that 1) Standards 1, 2, and 4 of the IIPC are ineffective because they do not align to the behavioral traits of transformational leadership; 2) The principals in this study were not well versed in the application of Standards 1, 2, and 4 of the IIPC; 3) The principals are more focused on other elements of their duties than a reliance on the Standards of the IIPC to support a beginning teacher, and finally; 4) The district may not be fully invested and committed to the induction program, in particular from the administrator standpoint.

Future Research

This study set out to determine how elementary principals used traits of transformational leadership and the IIPC to support beginning teachers. This study may provide opportunities for future research. Finding 1 revealed that principals used dialogue, collaborative school context, professional development, and effective methods to address student behavior to support beginning teachers. As stated previously, future researchers should consider examining the frequency and depth of dialogue between principals and beginning teachers to unpack perceived and actual value. In addition, future research can focus on building relationships between the principal, beginning teachers and building specialists (e.g., professional development specialists, literacy coaches, numeracy coaches) and the effect on teacher retention may help determine its
impact. Building these connections between the principal, beginning teacher, and building specialists needs to be structured as a response to the specific needs of the beginning teacher, similar to that of tiered system of interventions. The structure and steps to connect with the building specialist need to be clear along with expectations of support. Beginning teachers will need reassurance that seeking support to address challenges is an acceptable norm and honored by the school. To gain a stronger understanding of professional development, future researchers may want to consider studying professional development when administrators and beginning teachers attend together as well as when beginning teachers attend with peers, giving particular attention to the influence on teacher retention. This may reveal the level that professional development has when addressing teacher retention. Clearly, in this study the application of idealized influence is used extensively by principals. Would professional development on idealized influence for both district leadership and mentors support beginning teachers? In addition, interviewing the beginning teachers who worked with the principals may provide a richer insight on the impact of dialogue, collaborative school context, professional development, and addressing student behavior because only considering the impact from the administrators’ stance leaves out the teacher’s voice.

Finding 2 identified that two elements of idealized influence (risk taking and collaboration) were used most often by elementary principals to support beginning teachers. Future research may be conducted to determine how supported risk taking in terms of instructional methods can lead to higher retention rates or improving instructional practices. In addition, future research may be conducted to determine whether the types of leadership duties that a beginning teacher engages in impacts his/her effort or focus on the art of teaching. Also, future research could focus on how principals at the elementary, middle, and high school levels
use idealized influence to support beginning teachers. Particular attention could be given to studying similarities and differences by level as well as evaluating the training received and materials used.

Finding 3 found that principals require additional training on supporting induction programs as outlined in the IIPC. Future research could focus on which standards of the IIPC elementary principal’s use to support beginning teachers. The results of that research on the use of the IIPC by school districts may help determine changes in the criteria and expectations for planning, developing, and progress monitoring induction programs.

Limitations

The elementary principals did not appear to have a complete grasp of the Illinois Induction Program Continuum. It would be of great benefit to provide the IIPC standards in advance of the interviews, doing so may provide more detailed responses by the principals. Additionally, as principals responded to the pre-written question and interview questions it was clear that the answers became abbreviated. The number of questions may have caused question fatigue. To address the challenge of fatigue questions could have been adapted into a Likert-styled survey.

Another limitation for the study is that only one school district served as the research site. The use of one school district interrupts the opportunity to draw generalizations for induction programs in other school districts (Mertens, 2015). Case study results may not show the entire picture of all elementary principals’ understanding of transformational leadership and/or its impact on beginning teachers. In general, case studies lack repeatability.
In addition to the limitation of observing one school district, the training that the principals received over three years by the Pacific Education Group clearly influenced the principals’ approach when supporting beginning teachers. The training directly aligns to the operationalized behaviors of idealized influence, specifically collaboration and risk taking. In addition, the superintendent of the school district made it a goal for all staff, beginning with principals and teacher leaders to be fully trained by Pacific Education Group resulting in a massive behavioral shift for the entire district.

Conclusion

This study sought to gain an understanding of how elementary building principals use transformational leadership and Standards 1, 2, and 4 of the Illinois Induction Program Continuum (IIPC) to support and mentor elementary teachers. A case study of six practicing elementary principals revealed that transformational leadership was used to support and mentor elementary teachers, in particular idealized influence. More specifically, the data revealed that building trusting relationships that encourage risk taking and establishing a collaborative school context for beginning teachers influenced elementary principals when working with beginning teachers.

Of the three elements of idealized influence presented from the data, the most applicable to the daily routine of a principal at any level is to build trusting relationships that encourage risk taking. The significance of this finding is that idealized influence can now be operationalized and applied by principals when supporting beginning teachers. The application of idealized influence by principals is seen when they work closely with beginning teachers by observing their lessons, identify areas of strength and providing support when needed. Operationalized idealized
influence can also include building trusting relationships between beginning teachers (and all staff) which may lend to higher retention rates. As principals create a caring climate in the building, they can exercise their idealized influence through supporting risk taking among the staff. As an example, risk taking can be seen when a beginning teacher practices a new instructional methodology which was provided at a professional development conference. Within building trusting relationships, elementary principals encourage another aspect of idealized influence, risk taking. In addition, building trusting relationships supports a collaborative school context that values warm professional staff relationships and prosocial student behavior. Principals who focus on strong staff relationships and a proactive approach to support beginning teachers when addressing student behavior may have a positive impact on retention rates.

The study also sought to identify how elementary principals use Standards 1, 2, and 4 of the IIPC when supporting beginning teachers. The principals were unable to comment on using the standards when supporting beginning teachers, which is unfortunate, but not surprising as the district administrators need to recognize how the elements of the IIPC are important to the success of a beginning teacher. District administrators may need to provide support for principals to see the elements of the IIPC as a priority. District administrators need to provide detailed professional development for the principals to fully link transformational leadership and the IIPC. Principals may then be able to draw connections between transformational leadership and the IIPC to provide greater opportunities for beginning teachers to become more successful and in turn address retention rates not only in the school district in this study, but in any school district.
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About the Illinois Induction Program Standards

Illinois Induction Program Standards are intended to set forth a clear framework to assist in the development of research-based programs that meet local needs and are responsive to local context. The standards are broad and interdependent, describing a vision of a comprehensive and dynamic program for beginning teachers and those who support them. The standards provide a research-based foundation that will guide and support development of induction programs. The intent of these standards is to foster thoughtful, high quality growth and development. The standards become purposeful and meaningful when implemented fully at the local level. The standards help reflect on best practices and effective structures necessary to the design and delivery of high quality, effective induction programs.

Illinois Induction Program Standards have been developed by a diverse stakeholder group that has broadly reviewed the research on induction and induction programs as well as their implementation. Illinois Induction Program Standards are offered to facilitate and support the development, implementation and continual improvement of induction programs that in turn achieve the goals of induction programs.

In accordance with Article 21A of the 2008 Illinois School Code, the goal of beginning teacher induction program is to:

- Assist new teachers in developing the skills and strategies necessary for instructional excellence.

Each program must include at least the following elements:

- Provision of two years of mentoring and support for each new teacher
- Alignment with the Illinois Professional Teaching Standards, content area standards, and applicable local school improvement and professional development plans, if any.
- Professional development specifically designed to ensure the growth of the new teacher’s knowledge and skills.
- Formative assessments designed to ensure and reflection, which must not be used in any evaluation of the new teacher.
- A defined process and criteria for mentor selection and training.
Illinois Induction Program Standards*

**Standard 1: Induction Program Leadership, Administration, and Support**

The induction program has an administrative structure with specified leaders who plan, evaluate and refine the program through data analysis, program evaluation, and stakeholder communication linked to relevant standards.

**Standard 2: Program Goals and Design**

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

**Standard 3: Resources**

Programs leadership allocates and monitors sufficient resources to meet all goals and deliver program components to all participants.

**Standard 4: Site Administrator Roles and Responsibilities**

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

*The Illinois Induction Program Standards were approved by the Illinois Certification Board in December 2008. That document contained criteria that provided a description for each standard. To provide expediency and usability, the criteria were consolidated for this continuum document. The content and intent of the original criteria were maintained.*

**Standard 5: Mentor Selection and Assignment**

Mentors are recruited, selected and assigned using a comprehensive strategy that includes clearly articulated, open process and specific criteria that are developed by and communicated to all stakeholder groups.

**Standard 6: Mentor Professional Development**

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

**Standard 7: Development of Beginning Teacher Practice**

Beginning teachers have regularly scheduled time, provided during the two year program, to participate in ongoing professional development that is focused on their professional growth to support student learning.

**Standard 8: Formative Assessment**

Beginning teachers and mentors participate in formative assessment experiences, collaborative collecting and analyzing measures of teaching progress, including appropriate documentation, mentor observations and student work, to improve classroom practices and increase student achievement.

**Standard 9: Program Evaluation**

Programs operate a comprehensive, ongoing system of program development and evaluation that involves all program participants and other stakeholders.
Continuum Organization

The Continuum is organized by the induction program standards and their respective criteria. Each row in the Continuum begins with the criteria on the left. Going left to right across the row, the boxes describe the four levels of program implementation – Establishing, Applying, Integrating, and Systematizing.

Below are the descriptions of the criteria and the four levels of program implantation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Establishing</th>
<th>Applying</th>
<th>Integrating</th>
<th>Systematizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple criteria describe each of the essential components of features of a given program standard</td>
<td>Programs at the establishing level are learning about the induction program standards and establishing program components. Limited involvement of all stakeholders occurs at this level.</td>
<td>Programs at the applying level have some experience and are applying knowledge of induction program standards and moving toward full implementation of program components. Program is shared with additional stakeholders.</td>
<td>Programs at the integrating level are more experienced with induction program standards and accomplished in implementation of program components. They are working collaboratively with an expanded group of stakeholders on a regular basis.</td>
<td>Programs at the systematizing level collaborate regularly with all stakeholders to integrate induction program standards and program components throughout the district/consortia. Program is beyond compliance and embodies innovative practices by contributing to the broader educational community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is understood that program development does not always occur in a linear and sequential path from left to right on the Continuum. There are many contributing factors that affect program development over time. Changing context may affect movement on the Continuum as program leadership and program partners self-assess and shape program development. For all levels of program development the Continuum should be thought of as a supportive reference guide for ongoing use in assessment and evidence-based action planning for program improvement to promote quality mentoring and success for beginning teachers and their students.
Illinois Induction Program Standard 1: Induction Program Leadership

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Establishing</th>
<th>Applying</th>
<th>Integrating</th>
<th>Systematizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.1</strong> Program leadership is selected and role is clearly defined to include being responsible for program planning, operation, oversight, and use of data</td>
<td>Organizational leadership designates program leadership and begins to define their roles and responsibilities based of the Illinois Induction Program Standards. Full definition of role and responsibilities occurs as the year progresses.</td>
<td>Program leadership understands its role and takes full responsibility for program planning, operation, oversight, and use of data while consulting district/site administrators to inform program implementation.</td>
<td>Program leadership collaborates with district/site administrators and mentoring teams to ensure effective program planning. Operation, oversight, and use data.</td>
<td>Program leadership, district/site administrators and induction and mentoring teams share responsibility in collaborative decision-making process to design, implement, and revise the program through the use of data. The program is integrated throughout the larger system of the district.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possible evidence:
- Steering committee member list
- Documentation of role requirement(s)
- Job description(s)
- Organizational chart

| 1.2 Program leadership, program partners and all stakeholders have the time, fiscal resources, and authority to implement and support the program. | District administration maintains authority over time and fiscal resources and provides limited funds for implementation of high quality program. | Program leadership consults with district/site administrators to identify needs, resources and make recommendations for the appropriate use of fiscal resources and time to support the program. | Program leadership collaborates with district/site administrators to ensure ongoing district/consortia commitment to provide the time and fiscal resource required to implement a high quality induction program. | Program leadership, district/site administrators and induction and mentoring teams share leadership in providing the program with the full range of sufficient tangible support required for high quality program implementation. |

Possible evidence:
- Budget proposal
- Evidence of release time (e.g. substitute teachers logs)
- Job description(s)
- Organizational chart
Illinois Induction Program Standard 1: Induction Program Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Establishing</th>
<th>Applying</th>
<th>Integrating</th>
<th>Systematizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Program leadership. Program partners and all stakeholders collaborate to create a culture of commitment to beginning teacher induction and improving student achievement.</td>
<td>Program leadership becomes aware of the importance of the creation of a committed culture for beginning teacher induction and of linking the program to improving student achievement</td>
<td>Program leadership seeks input from district/site administrators towards establishing which focuses on beginning teacher development and student achievement</td>
<td>Program leadership collaborates with district/site administrators to develop a system of regular collaboration that contributes positively to building a culture of commitment focusing on beginning teacher development and student achievement.</td>
<td>Program leadership, district/site administrators and induction and mentoring teams collaborate a culture of commitment and student achievement. There is a systematic collaboration between all stakeholders to ensure consideration and support of program and district/site needs in planning, dialogue, and decision making.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possible evidence:
- Steering committee agenda, minutes, and other supporting materials
- Mission/vision statements, shared norms, assumptions, etc.
- Cross team involvement in other committees/initiatives, etc.
- Strategic plan for induction program
**Illinois Induction Program Standard 1: Induction Program Leadership**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Establishing</th>
<th>Applying</th>
<th>Integrating</th>
<th>Systematizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.4 <em>Program leadership engages in initial and ongoing professional development to understand, design and implement high-quality induction and mentoring</em></td>
<td>Program leadership attends mandated professional development which provides guidance in program implementation.</td>
<td>Program leadership participates in professional development provided and seeks out additional professional development to augment knowledge and skills while making adjustments in program implementation based on learning.</td>
<td>Program leadership and district/site administrators identify needs and plan for professional development. Program leadership participates in both initial and ongoing professional development to expand understanding of essential elements in implementation of high quality induction and mentoring programs and to guide program improvement.</td>
<td>Program leadership, in collaboration with district/site leadership, actively participates in a professional learning community that meets on a regular basis to deepen understanding, guide innovative program design, and implement a high quality induction and mentoring program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Possible Evidence:**
- Professional development opportunities for beginning teachers and/or administrators attended.
- Professional development agendas, evaluations, etc.
- Regional and statewide networking sessions, seminars, trainings, workshops, etc.
Illinois Induction Program Standard 2: Program Goals and Design

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Establishing</th>
<th>Applying</th>
<th>Integrating</th>
<th>Systematizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Program design includes <strong>learning outcomes for beginning teacher participants</strong> that recognize a continuum of teacher development and a focus on student learning with clearly defined participant expectations for program completion.</td>
<td>Program leadership uses a teacher continuum as a reference when developing learning outcomes for participants and becomes aware of the need to define expectations for program completion.</td>
<td>Program leadership meets with district/site administrators to identify learning outcomes for participants based on a continuum of teacher development, designs clear expectations for program completion, and share expectations with beginning teachers, mentors, and district/site administrators.</td>
<td>Program leadership, district/site administrators, and mentors implements and monitor a program that includes learning outcomes for participants that recognize a continuum of teacher development, a focus on student learning and clearly defined participant expectations for program completion.</td>
<td>Program leadership, district/site administrators, and induction and mentoring teams continuously define learning outcomes for participants to move to highest levels of performance on a teacher development continuum with a focus on improving student learning. Use of a teacher continuum and focus on student learning are integrated across all school faculties to impact all teachers’ practices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possible Evidence:
- Letter to beginning teacher stating program expectations
- Beginning teacher outcomes posted
- Professional development plan
## Illinois Induction Program Standard 2: Program Goals and Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Establishing</th>
<th>Applying</th>
<th>Integration</th>
<th>Systematizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Program design for effective communication among program leadership, mentors, beginning teachers, and site administrators and is consistently integrating into district/school improvement goals and ongoing professional development initiatives.</td>
<td>Program leadership communicates with some district/site administrators regarding program implementation and becomes aware of the need to make connections between program design, school improvement, and professional development.</td>
<td>Program leadership consults with district/site administrators to design a program that provides for regular communication among stakeholders regarding program implementation and identifies some school improvement goals for induction and mentoring activities.</td>
<td>Program leadership collaborates with district/site administrators to design a program that provide for effective communication and feedback among program leadership, mentors, beginning teachers, and district/site administrators to support ongoing program implementation. Program design is consistent with and integrated into district/school improvement goals and ongoing professional development initiatives.</td>
<td>Program leadership district/site administrators, and induction and mentoring teams ensure that program design supports ongoing, effective, and consistent communication among all stakeholders to maintain high quality program implementation. Program design is aligned with the school improvement plan and provides innovative strategies to accomplish school improvement goals and support professional development initiatives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possible Evidence:
- Program goals articulated in district/school improvement plan
- Articles in newsletters
- Presentation(s) to board of education and other district/regional entities
- Website postings
### Illinois Induction Program Standard 2: Program Goals and Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Establishing</th>
<th>Applying</th>
<th>Integrating</th>
<th>Systematizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.3 Program design includes high quality mentor selection, training, assessment/evaluation and ongoing support in a mentor learning community</strong></td>
<td>Program leadership disseminates information about mentor selection to site administrators at district/consortia meetings and suggests topics for supporting mentors.</td>
<td>Program leadership consults with district/site administrators to establish criteria for mentor selection, training, and support for mentors.</td>
<td>Program leadership collaborates with district/site administrators to design and implement a program that includes selection of high quality mentors, mentor training, assessment/evaluation, and ongoing support in a mentor learning community.</td>
<td>Program leadership, district/site administrators an induction mentoring teams integrate into the district improvement plan a clearly articulated process for mentor selection, training, reflection, assessment/evaluation, and ongoing support in a mentor learning community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Possible Evidence:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Training agendas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Course syllabus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Website for mentor conversations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mentor selection rubric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mentor posting application</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Illinois Induction Program Standard 2: Program Goals and Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Establishing</th>
<th>Applying</th>
<th>Integrating</th>
<th>Systematizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Program design defines <strong>essential activities</strong> including beginning teacher formative assessments, written documentation of beginning teacher/mentor work, analysis of beginning teacher instruction and student learning, and professional development for all stakeholders. Possible Evidence:</td>
<td>Program leadership designs a program that demonstrates awareness of essential activities. These activities vary with respect to clarity of learning outcomes across activities, formative assessments, and written documentation.</td>
<td>Program leadership designs and establishes a program that defines essential activities regarding formative assessment, written documentation of beginning teacher/mentor work, and initial professional development for all stakeholders.</td>
<td>Program leadership implements a program design that includes essential activities such as a beginning teacher formative assessment, written documentation of beginning teacher/mentor work, analysis of beginning teacher instruction, and regular professional development for all stakeholders.</td>
<td>Program leadership, district/site administrators, and induction and mentoring teams implement a program that integrates innovative activities, use of a wide-range of beginning teacher formative assessment, written documentation of beginning teacher/mentor work, analysis of beginning teacher instruction and student learning into the professional development plan. Program design includes planned processes of reflection, and ongoing feedback for the purpose of moving beginning teachers from initial to standard certification.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Illinois Induction Program Standard 2: Program Goals and Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Establishing</th>
<th>Applying</th>
<th>Integrating</th>
<th>Systematizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.5 <em>Program goals and outcomes for teacher development, retention, support, and student learning are reviewed and revised as necessary by designated program leaders and stakeholders based on the analysis of multiple sources of program evaluation data</em></td>
<td>Program leadership develops program goals that are informal and are communicated within program and completes analysis of student achievement data as requires by Illinois State Board of Education.</td>
<td>Program leadership articulates and communicates program goals to district/site administrators, mentors, and beginning teachers. Program leadership and site administrators analyze student achievement data and make some revisions of program goals and outcomes around teacher development</td>
<td>Program leadership, district/site administrators, and mentors analyze multiple sources of program evaluation data and revise as necessary the program goals and outcomes around teacher development, retention, support, and student achievement data to impact student learning.</td>
<td>Program leadership, district/site administrators, and induction and mentoring teams align program goals and outcomes to the district and school improvement plan goals and outcomes. Program design integrates a process that uses multiple sources of program evaluation data to review, analyze, and revise actions for teacher development, retention, support, and student learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possible Evidence:
- Training evaluations
- Survey results lead to revised activities
- Relevant Human Resources (e.g. retention)
- Administrative meeting agendas
Illinois Induction Program Standard 4: Site Administrators Roles and Responsibilities

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Establishing</th>
<th>Applying</th>
<th>Integrating</th>
<th>Systematizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders collaborate to design effective professional development for site administrators and promote their full involvement in program operations to maximize ongoing program improvement</td>
<td>Site administrators receive information on professional development on induction and mentoring from program leadership. Site administrators rely on Program leadership to manage program operations.</td>
<td>Site administrators participate in initial professional development on induction and mentoring. Site administrators’ involvement in program operations is characterized by being available to program leadership to problem solve issues of site implementation as they arise.</td>
<td>Site administrators participate in research based professional development and apply their learning to ongoing support for local induction and mentoring program. Site administrators’ involvement in program operations is characterized by engagement in program design and participation in ongoing problem solving and implementation at the local site.</td>
<td>Site administrators actively participate in initial and ongoing professional development and apply their learning to ensure full implementation of site program and to support district/consortia induction and mentoring program. Site administrators’ involvement in program operations is characterized by ongoing participation in strategic monitoring of program operations, and planning for continual program improvement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possible Evidence:
- Mentor survey results regarding site administrators
- Attendance rosters
- Level of participation in training
### Illinois Induction Program Standard 4: Site Administrators Roles and Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Establishing</th>
<th>Applying</th>
<th>Integrating</th>
<th>Systematizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders collaborate with site administrators to ensure positive working environments for beginning teachers.</td>
<td>Program leadership identifies for site administrators challenging aspect of beginning teachers’ working environments, operational barriers, and logistical barriers as they arise.</td>
<td>Program leadership provides site administrators with a list of typical concerns about working environments, operational barriers, logistical barriers for beginning teachers, and possible ways to mediate issues. Some site administrators assist in brainstorming positive approaches to challenging situations.</td>
<td>Site administrators consult and collaborate with program leadership to anticipate challenges of beginning teachers with regard to working environments, operational barriers, and logistical barriers. Site administrators ensure assignment of beginning teachers to a placement that matches the preparation/credentialing and provide adequate teaching materials.</td>
<td>Site administrators collaborate with stakeholders to proactively create a positive working environment for beginning teachers that is appropriate to their teaching assignment and context. Site administrators are proactive in ensuring appropriate teaching/time schedules, assigning classrooms, creating manageable caseloads/class size, maintaining adequate teaching materials, and early identification and response to challenging situations for beginning teachers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possible Evidence:
- Mentor/beginning teacher release time provided by administrators
- Relevant meeting notes that reflect interactions
- Beginning teachers schedules
**Illinois Induction Program Standard 4: Site Administrators Roles and Responsibilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Establishing</th>
<th>Applying</th>
<th>Integrating</th>
<th>Systematizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders collaborate with <strong>site administrators</strong> to foster the development of <strong>collaborative learning communities</strong> to promote a program of support for all staff.</td>
<td>Site administrators may introduce beginning teachers to staff and/or may meet with all beginning teachers to explain such things as discipline procedures, evaluation processes, and/or provide a school handbook.</td>
<td>Site administrators seek information on the implementation and/or enhancement of learning communities from such a variety of sources as program leadership, district personnel, and other site administrators. Site administrators initiate and/or extend the development and support of collaborative learning groups in partnership with mentors and staff leadership teams.</td>
<td>Site administrators use research-based information for the implantation and/or enhancement of learning communities to districts/site administrators. Site administrators facilitate the inclusion of beginning teachers in collaborative work groups.</td>
<td>Site administrators systematize the creation and ongoing development of a culture which promotes induction and mentoring activities and includes all staff members in program of support. Site administrators ensure that collaborative learning communities further enhance the professional practice of beginning teachers and mentors and promote the commitment of all staff to fully participate in collaborative learning communities. Site administrator support beginning teachers to collaborate with colleagues in areas such as dedicated meeting time, observation time, and collaborative planning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Possible Evidence:**
- Administrators sanction time for professional collaboration, e.g. PLC, grade level meetings
- Meeting agendas/minutes
- Observation documentation of beginning teacher observing mentor or other veteran teachers
### Illinois Induction Program Standard 4: Site Administrators Roles and Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Establishing</th>
<th>Applying</th>
<th>Integrating</th>
<th>Systematizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.4 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders support site administrators to provide ongoing high quality communications regarding induction program design and implementation.</strong></td>
<td>Program leadership provides informational materials to site administrators describing the induction and mentoring program.</td>
<td>Site administrators share written materials with mentors and beginning teachers and meet-to-face to clarify roles, responsibilities, and expectations. Site administrators seek out program leadership to ensure clarity of understanding of program components and parameters.</td>
<td>Site administrators use multiple methods for regular communication such as electronic, memo, face-to-face, small groups, and survey to clarify roles, responsibilities, and expectation with program leadership, mentors, and beginning teachers to support ongoing effective program implementation.</td>
<td>Site administrators ensure ongoing communication and feedback regarding roles, responsibilities, and expectations for mentors and beginning teachers. Site administrator and program leadership consult frequently to ensure a high level of program implementation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possible Evidence:
- Online surveys, chat rooms, etc.
- Ongoing formal and informal feedback into program design
- Program checklist
**Illinois Induction Program Standard 4: Site Administrators Roles and Responsibilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Establishing</th>
<th>Applying</th>
<th>Integrating</th>
<th>Systematizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders engage with site administrators to ensure positive mentoring experiences and to uphold the relationship between mentor and beginning teacher as confidential.</td>
<td>Site administrators rely on program leadership and/or mentors to identify challenging situations for mentors as they provide support to beginning teachers. Consideration is made to meet needs. Program leadership informs site administrators, mentors and beginning teachers about the necessity of confidentiality in the mentor/beginning teacher relationship.</td>
<td>Site administrators engage with program leadership and mentors to identify and respond to the needs of mentors. Site administrators work to ensure that mentors have private meeting time with beginning teachers to regularly reflect on professional practice and its impact of student work. Program leadership reviews expectations of confidentiality and clarifies the general types of information sharing that mentors will exchange with site administrators such as updates of program professional development, formative assessments tools in general, advocacy for beginning teacher.</td>
<td>Site administrators work with stakeholders to determine the needs of mentors and ensure sufficient meeting time between mentors and beginning teachers, arranging substitutes for mentoring activities, and prioritizing beginning teacher participation in induction and mentoring activities. Site administrators initiate clarification of confidentiality with mentors and beginning teachers and maintain confidentiality in conversations with mentors.</td>
<td>Site administrators work with stakeholders to maintain a positive climate among all staff that ensures broad-based active support of mentors in their work with beginning teachers and of induction activities. Site administrators uphold confidentiality of the mentor/beginning teacher relationship and support staff to understand the role of confidentiality between professionals and particularly within mentor/beginning teacher relationship.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possible Evidence:
- Induction checklist reinforcing the norm of confidentiality in all communications
### Illinois Induction Program Standard 4: Site Administrators Roles and Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Establishing</th>
<th>Applying</th>
<th>Integrating</th>
<th>Systematizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.6 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders collaborate with site administrator to align their work and support of beginning teachers with the standards for administrators.</td>
<td>Program leadership engages with district leadership to identify the benefits of aligning the work of site administrators and support of beginning teacher induction with the standards for administrators.</td>
<td>Program leadership meets with site administrators to clarify expectations that site administrators will incorporate work in support of beginning teacher induction with the standards for administrators. Individual support of site administrators is provided as needed to achieve expectations.</td>
<td>Program leadership and district/site administrators collaborate to ensure that all site administrators incorporate their work in support of beginning teacher induction with the standards for administrators.</td>
<td>Site administrators systematically align their work in support of beginning teacher induction with the standards for administrators.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Possible Evidence:**
- Course or workshop certificate of completion on topics relevant to induction and mentoring
- Induction and mentoring strategies embedded in school improvement plan
APPENDIX B

ILLINOIS PERFORMANCE STANDARDS FOR SCHOOL LEADERS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illinois Performance Standards for School Leaders</th>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Setting Mission and Vision for Students and Teachers</td>
<td>a. Develops and implements a school improvement plan that aligns with the school’s vision and is supported by evidence of student and educator engagement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Ensures that the school’s mission, vision, and values are clear and communicated throughout the school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Provides ongoing professional development opportunities for educators to improve their instructional practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Utilizes data to drive decision-making.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2. Leading and Managing Change | a. Develops and implements strategies to improve student and educator achievement. |
| b. Secures and uses data to drive decision-making. |
| c. Collaborates with staff to create a transparent, collaborative culture that values feedback and continuous improvement. |
| d. Uses current technologies to improve instruction. |

| 3. Improving Teaching and Learning | a. Works with teacher teams to develop coherent instructional models that align with student learning needs. |
| b. Ensures that instruction is differentiated and responsive to the needs of all students. |
| c. Provides ongoing professional development opportunities for educators to improve their instructional practices. |
| d. Uses data to drive decision-making. |
| e. Establishes a culture of high expectations and continuous improvement. |

| 4. Building a Collaborative School Community | a. Establishes and maintains collaborative school communities that support student learning and development. |
| b. Ensures that the school’s mission, vision, and values are clear and communicated throughout the school. |
| c. Provides ongoing professional development opportunities for educators to improve their instructional practices. |
| d. Utilizes data to drive decision-making. |
| e. Establishes and maintains a safe and inclusive learning environment. |

| 5. Leading with Integrity and Professionalism | a. Promotes a culture of high expectations and continuous improvement. |
| b. Ensures that the school’s mission, vision, and values are clear and communicated throughout the school. |
| c. Provides ongoing professional development opportunities for educators to improve their instructional practices. |
| d. Utilizes data to drive decision-making. |

| b. Ensures that the school’s mission, vision, and values are clear and communicated throughout the school. |
| c. Provides ongoing professional development opportunities for educators to improve their instructional practices. |
| d. Utilizes data to drive decision-making. |
1. **Commitment:**
   a. Two year program for teachers who are new to the school district and have four or less semesters teaching experience.
   b. One year program for teachers who are new to the school district but have more than four semesters of full time teaching experience.

2. **Meeting Commitments for Mentors and Mentees:**
   a. Mentee to attend 3 days of Induction in August.
   b. Attend two meetings together (end of quarter 1 and end of quarter 2).
   c. Planning conference with mentor/mentee (and/or other teacher being observed) before each peer observation.
   d. Post conference with mentor/mentee (and/or other teacher being observed) after each peer observation.
   e. All mentees must complete a Meeting Time Log to document pre and post conferences and peer observations.
   f. Mentee & mentor must attend two professional development sessions together and turn in a reflection.
   g. Turn in all paperwork at scheduled deadlines (see deadline dates).

3. **Peer Observations:**
   a. Three observations total
      i. Mentor must observe mentee by end of quarter 1.
      ii. Mentee must observe mentor by end of quarter 2.
      iii. Mentee has option to observe any teacher willing to meet and complete required documents or may be observed by any teacher willing to meet and complete required documents.
   b. All observations must include:
      i. Pre-Conference forms
      ii. Observation forms
      iii. Post-Conference forms
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 18, 2017</td>
<td>3:15 - 4:45 pm</td>
<td>Elementary Quarter 1 Meeting (Topic: Domain 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 19, 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peer Observation #1 Documents Due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 25, 2017</td>
<td>4:00-5:30 pm</td>
<td>Secondary Quarter 1 Meeting (Topic: Domain 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 20, 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peer Observation #2 Documents Due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 10, 2018</td>
<td>3:15-4:15 pm</td>
<td>Elementary Quarter 2 Meeting (Topic: Domain 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 10, 2018</td>
<td>4:00-5:30 pm</td>
<td>Secondary Quarter 2 Meeting (Topic: Domain 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 8, 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peer Observation #3 Documents Due</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Must choose two Professional Development sessions to attend together and turn in reflections by April 30, 2018.

Class Name: ____________________________ Date: ________________

Class Name: ____________________________ Date: ________________
QUARTER 1 PEER OBSERVATION PRE-CONFERENCE FORM

Mentor must observe mentee for this observation.

Mentee Name (person being observed): Mentor Name
(observer): Class/Subject:
Date of scheduled Observation: Date of pre-conference:

*Mentee and Mentor should complete this form together during the pre-conference for a peer observation.*

- Indicate the one or two components from the Framework for Teaching on which the mentee and mentor have decided to focus (Identify the Component(s) number and title)
- What evidence has led you to choose this/these component(s) for focus?
- What instructional strategies will the teacher being observed (either the mentor or the mentee) be using to strengthen the mentee's practice as it relates to the critical attributes described in the Framework for Teaching for this/these component(s)?
- How will you know the extent to which your strategy(ies) was/were successful? What will students be doing/saying? What will the teacher be doing/saying?
Quarter 1 - OBSERVER FEEDBACK FOR PEER OBSERVATION

Mentee Name (person being observed):
Mentor Name (observer-person completing this form during observation): Class/Subject:
Date of scheduled Observation: Date of post-conference:

FfT Component(s) of Focus:

1. I observed the following indicators, critical attributes, or examples aligned with this component(s) in your classroom during the lesson:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Behaviors/Actions</th>
<th>Teacher Behaviors/Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUARTER 1- PEER OBSERVATION POST-CONFERENCE FORM

Mentee Name (person observed): Mentor Name (observer): Class/Subject: Date of Observation: Date of post-conference:

Mentee and Mentor should complete this form together during the post-conference for a peer observation.

1. Review the Elements of the Component(s) that were chosen for this peer observation. What indicators, critical attributes, or examples were evident in your classroom during the lesson?

2. What actions on your part led to these indicators, attributes or examples being observed?

3. Compare your expectations for the lesson with how it actually went. What were the similarities and differences between what you had planned and what actually happened?

4. To what extent did you meet the instructional goals of the lesson?

5. Did you make any modifications to your plan during the lesson?

6. Describe any changes you would make if you were to teach this lesson again to the same group of students.

7. The next time you teach this lesson, what are some of the outcomes you would want to happen again?

8. Think about the results you got. How did the way you designed the lesson help yield those results?

9. What additional support does the mentee need in order to strengthen his/her practice in the future?
QUARTER 2 - PEER OBSERVATION PRE-CONFERENCE FORM

Mentee must observe mentor for this observation.

Mentee Name (observer):
Mentor Name (person being observed): Class/Subject:
Date of scheduled Observation: Date of pre-conference:

Mentee and Mentor should complete this form together during the pre-conference for a peer observation.

- Indicate the one or two components from the Framework for Teaching on which the mentee and mentor have decided to focus (Identify the Component(s) number and title)
- What evidence has led you to choose this/these component(s) for focus?
- What instructional strategies will the teacher being observed (either the mentor or the mentee) be using to strengthen the mentee’s practice as it relates to the critical attributes described in the Framework for Teaching for this/these component(s)?
- How will you know the extent to which your strategy(ies) was/were successful? What will students be doing/saying? What will the teacher be doing/saying?
QUARTER 2-OBSERVER FEEDBACK FOR PEER OBSERVATION

Mentee Name (observer-person completing this form during observation): Mentor Name {person being observed):
Class/Subject:
Date of scheduled Observation: Date of post-conference:

FIT Component(s) of Focus:

1. I observed the following indicators, critical attributes, or examples aligned with this component(s) in your classroom during the lesson:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Behaviors/Actions</th>
<th>Teacher Behaviors/Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


QUARTER 2- PEER OBSERVATION POST-CONFERENCE FORM

Mentee Name (observer):
Mentor Name (person being observed): Class/Subject:
Date of Observation:
Date of post-conference:

*Mentee and Mentor should complete this form together during the post-conference for a peer observation.*

1. Review the Elements of the Component(s) that were chosen for this peer observation. What indicators, critical attributes, or examples were evident in your classroom during the lesson?

2. What actions on your part led to these indicators, attributes or examples being observed?

3. Compare your expectations for the lesson with how it actually went. What were the similarities and differences between what you had planned and what actually happened?

4. To what extent did you meet the instructional goals of the lesson?

5. Did you make any modifications to your plan during the lesson?

6. Describe any changes you would make if you were to teach this lesson again to the same group of students.

7. The next time you teach this lesson, what are some of the outcomes you would want to happen again?

8. Think about the results you got. How did the way you designed the lesson help yield those results?

9. What additional support does the mentee need in order to strengthen his/her practice in the future?
QUARTER 3 - PEER OBSERVATION PRE-CONFERENCE FORM

Mentee has the option to observe any teacher willing to meet and complete documentation or be observed by any teacher willing to meet and complete documentation.

Mentee Name: 
Check one of the following:  ______________ I was observed.  ______________ I had someone observe me.

Mentor Name: 

Person being observed/Person observing: Class/Subject: 
Date of scheduled Observation: Date of pre-conference:

Mentee and teacher observing or being observed should complete this form together during the pre-conference for a peer observation.

• Indicate the one or two components from the Framework for Teaching on which the mentee and mentor have decided to focus (Identify the Component(s) number and title)

• What evidence has led you to choose this/these component(s) for focus?

• What instructional strategies will the teacher being observed (either the mentor or the mentee) be using to strengthen the mentee’s practice as it relates to the critical attributes described in the Framework for Teaching for this/these component(s)?

• How will you know the extent to which your strategy(ies) was/were successful? What will students be doing/saying? What will the teacher be doing/saying?
QUARTER 3 - OBSERVER FEEDBACK FOR PEER OBSERVATION

Mentee
Name:
Mentor
Name:
Teacher observed:
Person providing feedback on this form: Class/Subject:
Date of scheduled Observation: Date of post-conference:

FIT Component(s) of Focus:

1. I observed the following indicators, critical attributes, or examples aligned with this component(s) in your classroom during the lesson:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Behaviors/ Actions</th>
<th>Teacher Behaviors/ Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
QUARTER 3 - PEER OBSERVATION POST-CONFERENCE FORM

Mentee
Name:
Mentor
Name:
Teacher working with mentee to complete this peer observation:
Class/Subject:
Date of Observation:
Date of post-conference:

*Mentee and the teacher he/she worked with to complete the observation should meet to discuss and complete this document together.*

1. Review the Elements of the Component(s) that were chosen for this peer observation. What indicators, critical attributes, or examples were evident in your classroom during the lesson?

2. What actions on your part led to these indicators, attributes or examples being observed?

3. Compare your expectations for the lesson with how it actually went. What were the similarities and differences between what you had planned and what actually happened?

4. To what extent did you meet the instructional goals of the lesson?

5. Did you make any modifications to your plan during the lesson?

6. Describe any changes you would make if you were to teach this lesson again to the same group of students.

7. The next time you teach this lesson, what are some of the outcomes you would want to happen again?

8. Think about the results you got. How did the way you designed the lesson help yield those results?

9. What additional support does the mentee need in order to strengthen his/her practice in the future?
APPENDIX D

PRINCIPAL CHECKLIST
Checklist

The following is a list of possible items/information, which the mentor and/or principal may want to share with a new teacher. Mark off the Items as they are shared.

Building Tour

- Bus zone
- Employee parking area
- Staff workroom
- Cafeteria- where and how to purchase lunch
- Custodial area
- Office
- Rooms for specialists, nurse, social worker, psychologist, Music/A rt/P.E., dept. offices, administration offices
- Staff eating area - microwave, refrigerator
Supply room/area
Restrooms
Building Representative

Access to Resources

- Talk with principal about School Improvement Program team goals
- Textbooks, supplemental materials, share equipment
Class lists
- How to access student records (cumulative files, special services files.)

Student Behavior

Behavior expectations for hallway, lunch, washroom, and playground
Establishing classroom behavior expectations
Expected staff supervision outside of classroom
Procedures for notifying parents
- Forms-discipline, detention, referrals

Curriculum

- Lesson plan guidelines and expectations
Procedures

Regular hours for all employees
Calling in sick, personal, or professional days Substitute folder, lesson plans, seating charts Building use during non-school hours
Alarm system
- Staff meetings, timing and schedule for team meetings etc. Fire, tornado, disaster, crisis drills
Student accidents, emergencies
Extra duties, bus, clubs, activities, chaperoning Student and staff dress codes
- Movement of students- entry/exit from building, washrooms, lunch
- Passes-when to use, how to use
- Elementary lunch count and ticket procedures
- Sport eligibility/weekly reports
- Progress report procedures
- Report card process and deadlines
- Annual benchmark testing, District and State
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- Work order procedures (classroom/building repairs)
- Field trips and tours
- What to do on the First Day of School (meet buses, etc.)
- How to prepare for Open House
Bus procedures/dismissal procedures
Procedures for school closing due to bad weather Copy machine procedures

Institute Day (Instructional Leaders)

- Introductions to specialists: gifted, reading LD/BD, speech, social worker, psychologist, nurse, guidance, music, art, physical education, etc.
- Subject matter experts in the building staff
- Grading procedures for day-to-day records/report cards
APPENDIX E

LETTER TO PARTICIPANTS
I agree to participate in the research project titled *A Case Study of Elementary School Principals: The Use of Transformational Leadership When Mentoring Beginning Teachers in a State-Approved Induction Program* being conducted by Patrick Enright a graduate student at Northern Illinois University. I have been informed that the purpose of the study is to examine how elementary building principal leadership traits and mentoring of beginning elementary school teachers influences retention rates.

I understand that if I agree to participate in the study, I will be interviewed three times for up to 60 minutes.

I am aware that my participation is voluntary and may be withdrawn at any time without penalty or prejudice, and that if I have any additional questions concerning this study, I may contact Patrick Enright at [contact information] and Dr. Elizabeth Wilkins at [contact information]. I understand that if I wish further information regarding my rights as a research subject, I may contact the Office of Research Compliance at [contact information].

I understand that the benefits of this study include mentoring of beginning teachers and the use of leadership styles to support teacher growth. I understand that all information gathered during this study will be kept confidential by identifying the school by a pseudonym. All participants will have identifiers to keep anonymity.

I understand that my consent to participate in this project does not constitute a waiver of any legal rights or redress I might have as a result of my participation, and I acknowledge that I have received a copy of this consent form.

_______________________________________                ___________________________
Signature of Subject Date

I agree to be audio taped during the interview for the purpose of this study.

_______________________________________                ___________________________
Signature of Subject Date