

## **New Teacher Perceptions of Induction Programs: A Study of Open-Ended Commentary**

*Nicole V. Williams*

*John C. Gillham*

**University of Findlay**

*The purpose of this study was to learn if teachers believe their experiences with the Ohio Resident Educator Program (OREP) improved their ability to meet the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession (OSTP). Two hundred forty-five teachers voluntarily participated in a thirty-three question Likert-based survey with seven open-ended comment sections. For this study, the researchers analyzed the Likert-based survey responses through basic descriptive analysis and ANOVAs and the 456 comments from the seven open-ended comment sections regarding the seven OSTP standards through grounded theory. The findings indicate that the beginning teachers do not believe the Ohio Resident Educator Program improved their ability to meet these standards. However, they reported their teacher preparation programs, classroom experiences, and mentors, colleagues, and administrators did improve their ability to meet the standards.*

The number of beginning teachers is growing rapidly within the United States and abroad. The New Teacher Center forecasts the number of beginning teachers employed each year will increase from 200,000 to 376,000 per year and reach an estimated 427,000 by 2018 (New Teacher Center, 2014). However, the “revolving door” through which approximately 40-50% of these beginning teachers will leave the profession within the first five years (Ingersoll, 2012) has created a proliferation of teacher induction programs throughout the United States. In their *Review of State Policies on Teacher Induction*, Goldrick, Osta, Barlin, and Burn (2012) found that “more than half the states require new teachers to participate in some form of induction or mentoring, and, as a result, more new teachers receive mentoring or induction support than ever” (p. iii).

Although Ohio has had a beginning teacher induction program since 2011 (Ohio Department of Education, 2015), the Ohio Resident Educator Program (OREP) has recently undergone significant changes that have created immense concern in the field, especially from those beginning teachers required to participate in it. The Ohio Department of Education (DOE) defines induction as “a systematic process specifically designed to orient newly recruited people to their work and support them through ongoing professional development” (Ohio Department of Education, 2011, p. 12). In 2006, the Ohio State Board of Education adopted educator standards based on what teachers and principals should know and be able to do at various stages of their careers. In continuation of that work, in 2007, the department worked with stakeholders to perform a comprehensive analysis of teacher induction programs. The result of these combined efforts is the Ohio Resident Educator Program (OREP) (Ohio Department of Education, 2011). According to the Ohio DOE (2015), the OREP is a “four-year program of formative assessment and mentoring support that will culminate in the completion of a statewide summative, performance-based assessment and the advancement to the five year professional educator license” (n.p.). More specifically, the Ohio Department of Education (2015) states:

The Ohio Resident Educator Program provides a system of support that addresses challenges of beginning teachers such as:

- Understanding district policies and school cultures
- Designing and delivering instruction
- Adapting to a variety of learning styles
- Motivating and assessing students
- Communicating with students, parents and colleagues (n.p.)

During the first and second year in the Resident Educator program, beginning teachers (referred to as “resident educators”) discover, practice, and refine their teaching as they learn to self-assess, adjust their teaching, reflect upon their progress, and continually strengthen their teaching practices. More specifically, resident educators are required to meet regularly with their OREP mentor to participate in self-assessment, assessment of student learning, instructional planning, mentor observation, and professional goal setting. Through these activities, the mentor and resident educator collect and reflect on the evidence of practice and work to demonstrate progress in relationship to the Ohio standards and the Ohio Continuum of Teacher Development. In the third and fourth years of the program, resident educators assess their teaching through the Resident Educator Summative Assessment (RESA). The RESA is a performance-based assessment that requires teachers to demonstrate knowledge and skills in real time through four tasks: 1) first lesson cycle, 2) formative and summative assessment, 3) second lesson cycle, 4) communication and professional growth. Through extensive evidence such as detailed lesson plans, student data, student artifacts, and video recordings of teaching, the resident educators are asked to showcase their teaching process, demonstrate how they implement the Teaching-Learning Cycle day-to-day, and assess their teaching impact on student learning and achievement by responding to self-reflection questions (Ohio Department of Education, 2015).

Although the Resident Educator Program is currently in its fourth year, there is limited research on the implementation and impact of this program on the resident educators that it is intended to “support.” The purpose of this study was to learn how resident educators believe their experiences with the OREP improved their ability to meet the *Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession* (OSTP). To guide this investigation, the following research question was utilized: How do teachers believe their experiences with the OREP improved their ability to meet the seven standards, which focus on (1) Students, 2) Content, 3) Assessment, 4) Instruction, 5) Learning Environment, 6) Collaboration and Communication, and 7) Professional Responsibility and Growth? This study seeks to broaden the limited scope of research on teachers’ perceptions of teacher induction programs and to disseminate the perceptions of Ohio’s new teachers in response to their current mandatory participation in the OREP.

### **Literature Review**

Over the last ten years, there has been an international movement toward the systematic evaluation of teachers through teacher induction programs. New teacher induction programs exist in countries throughout the world including Australia, Austria, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Croatia, Denmark, Estonia, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Macedonia, New Zealand, Norway,

Portugal, Romania, Scotland, Shanghai, Slovenia, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, and the United States. However, the international and national research related specifically to teachers' perceptions of the implementation of these teacher induction programs is limited. Many of the studies that have been conducted have a relatively small number of participants or include a case-study approach, and the research often focuses on program design rather than teacher perceptions of the induction experience. Regardless, some of the findings from these studies are particularly relevant to this study with respect to how teachers perceive their experiences in induction programs.

### **Positive Teacher Perceptions of Induction Programs**

Beginning teachers in the United States and Europe have reported positive experiences with some induction programs. In Joest's (2003) study of a selection of Texas school districts, teachers who experienced quality induction programs were quick to voice their pleasure with these programs: "the novice teachers who teach in the districts and campuses with the strongest support could not say enough positive comments about how the support program helped them through the first year" (p. 155). In Bickmore & Bickmore's (2010) study of beginning teacher induction in a district in a southeastern metropolitan area of the United States, participants favorably assessed mentors, interdisciplinary teams, and administrative support in the program. In Greece, induction participants found training in teaching strategies to be an effective aspect of the program (Grammatikopoulos, Tsigilis, Gregoriadis, & Bikos, 2013). Among beginning special education teachers participating in an induction program, all participants valued the mentoring relationships and reported that they would participate again (Marshall et al., 2013). In a Texas induction support program "participants' feelings of preparation... [were] significantly stronger than non-participants" (Van Zandt Allen, 2013, p. 87). In Vogrinc, Kristof, & Zuljan's (2007) study of a beginning teacher induction program in Slovenia, novice teachers overwhelmingly stated that the amount of work meetings in the induction program was adequate. Over 86% of participating teachers also agreed that the teacher certification exam at the conclusion of this program was needed. In another Slovenian study, beginning teachers in a teacher induction program rated their mentor teachers highly in regards to capabilities and specific duties within the program (Zuljan & Bizjak, 2007).

### **Mixed Teacher Perceptions of Induction Programs**

Oftentimes the perceptions of teachers are mixed in respect to their induction programs in that teachers perceive some aspects of the induction program to be more helpful than others. For example, in their study of induction programs in North Carolina, Algozzine, Gretes, Queen, and Cowan-Hathcock (2007) found that beginning teachers favored induction program activities that were focused, individual, and specific whereas they perceived collective, group, and diverse opportunities less favorably. In another study in western New York, when asked to identify what factors were most supportive during their induction program, beginning teachers identified various forms of human contact (Marable & Raimondi, 2007). The researchers noted that "any person—an administrator, a mentor, a colleague in the same certification area, or a teacher in close proximity were cited as being the primary support" (p. 283). Most participants in this study directed their responses about the least supportive aspects of the program towards the role of the administrator, including "policies, procedures, confidentiality, support, guidance,

supervision, or contact [with participants]” (p. 284). These beginning teachers also identified more mentoring and administrative support as factors that would have been beneficial during the first year.

Internationally, a study of beginning teachers in a new teacher induction program in Estonia revealed the most positive aspects of the teachers’ experiences were personal support, positive reinforcement, sharing of contextual knowledge about the school community, mentor availability, mutual trust in the mentoring relationship, and reciprocal learning between the mentor and mentee. Negative experiences resulted from mentors who were overbearing, provided insufficient support, or were disengaged from the beginning teacher (Lofstrom & Eisenschmidt, 2009). In New Zealand, new teacher perceptions’ about government-mandated induction programs varied according to local understandings and the local implementation practices of the program (Anthony, Haigh, & Kane, 2011). Finally, in a study of German primary teachers, new teachers’ success in induction programs was tied to a variety of factors including school climate, knowledge level, and belief systems (Blomeke et al., 2015). Perhaps teachers’ mixed perceptions of induction programs are not surprising in light of the fact that “teacher satisfaction and motivational factors are generally not included or are not part of the intent of most induction programs” (Shockley, Watlington & Felsher, 2013, p. 373).

### Methods

To better understand new teacher experiences with the Resident Educator Program and their perceptions as to how the program improved their ability to meet the Ohio standards, the researchers employed grounded theory. According to recent research conducted by students of Glaser and Strauss, “grounded theory is a way of thinking about data—processes of conceptualization—of theorizing from data, so that the end result is a theory that the scientist produces from data collected by interviewing and observing everyday life” (Morse et al., 2009, p. 18).

In this study, the researchers examined the OREP, which is a formal four-year program of support for beginning teachers (Ohio Department of Education, 2014). According to the Ohio Department of Education (2014), it is “part of a comprehensive system that provides job-embedded, professional growth for Ohio’s teachers from pre-service and throughout their professional life” (p. 4). During the first and second year in the OREP, beginning teachers (referred to as “resident educators”) discover, practice, and refine their teaching as they learn to self-assess, adjust their teaching, reflect upon their progress, and continually strengthen their teaching practices. In the third and fourth years of the program, resident educators assess their teaching through the RESA.

### Data Collection

The researchers employed survey research to learn more about the resident educators’ perceptions related to the OREP, and created a survey that consisted of thirty-three Likert-based questions with a four point scale (*strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree*). The thirty-three questions asked participants the level to which they believed their experience with OREP improved their ability to meet the seven standards: 1) Students (4 questions), 2) Content (5

questions), 3) Assessment (5 questions), 4) Instruction (7 questions), 5) Learning Environment (5 questions), 6) Collaboration and Communication (3 questions), and 7) Professional Responsibility and Growth (3 questions). The language of the thirty-three questions mirrored the precise language of the standards. For example, the first group of questions for Standard 1 stated:

My experience with the Resident Educator Program improved my ability to:

1. Display knowledge of how students learn and of the developmental characteristics of age groups.
2. Understand what students know and are able to do and use this knowledge to meet the needs of all students.
3. Expect that all students will achieve to their full potential.
4. Model respect for students' diverse cultures, language skills and experiences.
5. Recognize characteristics of gifted students, students with disabilities and at-risk students in order to assist in appropriate identification, instruction and intervention.

After each group of standard questions, the participants could provide commentary regarding that specific standard. The survey also included a brief demographics section to determine the participant's school district type (rural, urban, suburban), licensure band (early childhood, middle childhood, adolescent/young adult, multi-age), OTES rating (accomplished, skilled, developing, ineffective), year in OREP, and type of education program (undergraduate, graduate).

To disseminate the survey, the researchers' utilized the graduate contact information for their three universities. In addition, an email was sent to all Ohio Confederation of Teacher Educator Organization Field Directors and all Ohio building administrators requesting them to forward the recruitment email to their graduates/teachers in their third and fourth year of OREP. The email included the link to the survey to be completed electronically and anonymously through Survey Monkey. Because the number of teachers who received the email cannot be determined, the researchers could not calculate a response rate.

## Participants

A total of 245 resident educators participated in the study. Of the 245 participants, 219 reported their demographic information. The largest proportion (46.12%) of resident educators identified their district as rural while 38.36% identified suburban and 20.09% urban<sup>1</sup>. Within these districts, 38.36% of the participants teach in the Early Childhood licensure band, 24.66% in Middle Childhood, 25.11% in Adolescent/Young Adult, and 19.18% in Multi-Age<sup>2</sup>. Although the survey was intended for third and fourth year resident educators, some of the participants were only in their first and second year of the OREP. Forty-four percent of the participants were in their fourth year, 52.97% in their third year, 1.83% in their second year, and 1.37% in their first year. Of the 219 participants who reported their Ohio Teacher Evaluation System (OTES) rating, 32.42% reported they earned an 'accomplished' rating, 55.71% earned a rating of Skilled,

---

<sup>1</sup> Participants could select multiple responses for resident educators who teach in multiple districts for both district label and licensure band.

<sup>2</sup> Participants could select multiple responses for resident educators who teach in multiple districts.

5.02% were rated Developing, 0.46% selected Ineffective, and 6.39% reported having no OTES rating. Finally, the majority (71.69%) of the participants obtained their initial licensure in an undergraduate teacher education program, with 28.31% doing so at the graduate level.

## Results

### Likert-Based Questions Results Summary

Based on the descriptive analysis of the data from the thirty-three Likert-based questions, the resident educator participants do not believe the Resident Educator Program improved their ability to meet the Ohio Standards. A slight majority (34.22%) strongly disagreed and 33.33% disagreed that their experiences with the Resident Educator Program improved their ability to meet *Standard 7: Professional Responsibility*. A large number of respondents (42.78%) disagreed that their experiences with the OREP improved their ability to meet *Standard 1: Students*. Only 3.45% of the resident educator participants strongly agreed (3.45%) that their experiences with the OREP improved their ability to meet *Standard 5: Learning Environment*, but almost a third (30.05%) agreed that their experiences with the OREP improved their ability to meet *Standard 3: Assessment* (see Table 1 for complete data).

Table 1

*Response Frequency to Standards on Likert-Based Questions (N = 245)*

My experience with the Resident Educator Program improved my ability to:	SA	A	D	SD
Standard 1: Students	2.12%	26.29%	42.78%	28.82%
Standard 2: Content	2.47%	23.66%	42.73%	31.15%
Standard 3: Assessment	2.59%	30.05%	39.55%	27.81%
Standard 4: Instruction	2.27%	27.74%	40.48%	29.51%
Standard 5: Learning Environment	3.45%	23.03%	39.42%	34.10%
Standard 6: Collaboration and Communication	3.10%	28.47%	35.10%	33.34%
Standard 7: Professional Responsibility and Growth	2.67%	29.78%	33.33%	34.22%

Respondents most strongly disagreed (35.84%) with the statement “My experience with the Resident Educator Program improved my ability to “treat all students fairly and establish an environment that is respectful, supportive and caring,” which is within *Standard 5: Learning Environment*. There was little agreement from participants that the Resident Educator Program improved the ability to “maintain an environment that is conducive to learning for all students” (also within *Standard 5: Learning Environment*) or to “communicate clearly and effectively,” with over 70 and 60% choosing one of the disagree responses, respectively, to these prompts. In summary, the participants believed their experience with the Resident Educator Program helped them improve their ability to meet the learning environment and assessment standards the most and the professional responsibility and students standards the least (see Table 1).

### Commentary Section Results

For the purpose of this study, the researchers analyzed 456 comments from the seven open-ended comment sections to answer the research question: How do teachers believe their experiences

with the OREP improved their ability to meet the seven *Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession*? Within the grounded theory methodology, the data was first organized by standard and analyzed by the researchers independently. However, the researchers participated in constant comparison to generate concepts from the data while applying theoretical sensitivity to understand the concepts. Concepts that immediately emerged from the data within and across each standard, for both researchers, included teacher preparation program, mentors (including school-based and resident educator program mentors), school-based collaboration, colleagues, administrators, classroom experiences, professional development, stress, time away from students, more work, and excessive paperwork. The researchers worked together to raise the concepts to a higher conceptual level. Finally, theoretical sampling was employed to further develop and verify the concepts until theoretical saturation was reached (Oktay, 2012).

Of the seven standards, the resident educator participants provided the greatest amount of commentary for *Standard 1* (Teachers understand student learning and development, and respect the diversity of the students they teach) with 108 responses and the least (37 responses) for *Standard 7* (Teachers assume responsibility for professional growth, performance, and involvement as an individual and as a member of a learning community) (see Table 2).

Table 2

*Response Frequency to the Open-Ended Commentary by Standard (N = 245)*

	Responses	Percentage
Standard 1: Students	108	44%
Standard 2: Content	76	31%
Standard 3: Assessment	62	25%
Standard 4: Instruction	62	25%
Standard 5: Learning Environment	62	25%
Standard 6: Collaboration and Communication	49	20%
Standard 7: Professional Responsibility and Growth	37	15%

**Standard 1.** All 108 responses provided by the resident educator participants reported that the OREP did not prepare them to meet *Standard 1*. There were no positive comments (comments in which participants expressed some benefit from an aspect of the program) provided for this standard. The negative commentary (comments in which participants expressed a negative response about an aspect of the program) reflects the quantitative results for this standard, in that the largest number of respondents (42.78%) disagreed, and 28.82% strongly disagreed, that their experiences with the OREP improved their ability to meet *Standard 1*. The concepts that emerged from the data analysis for this standard included the participants' perception that their teacher preparation programs, classroom experiences, and mentors, colleagues, and administrators improved their ability to meet OSTP more than the OREP did. For example, one resident educator explained:

All of these components were stressed to me during my college experience. The University emphasized these expectations throughout my entire college experience. Also, my field experiences and cooperating teachers covered all of this. This RESA process has been nothing but more work and stress for beginning teachers.

The perception by resident educators that the OREP and the RESA were “more work,” “busy work,” and/or unnecessary “paperwork,” that created additional stress for the new teachers and/or took time away from their responsibilities as a teacher, was an additional concept that emerged through the data analysis for this standard.

**Standard 2.** The resident educator participants were again overwhelmingly negative in the commentary they provided for *Standard 2* (Teachers know and understand the content area for which they have instructional responsibility). Of the 76 responses provided, only three of the responses were positive. As one beginning teacher stated:

This is truly one of my greatest disappointments with the Resident Educator Program. One area in which I felt I needed help as a young teacher was in learning new, exciting strategies for teaching my content area. The Resident Educator program provided no help at all in this area.

The researchers noticed the same concepts emerged—the participants’ perception that their teacher preparation programs, classroom experiences, and mentors, colleagues, and administrators improved their ability to meet the OSTP more so than the OREP, and that the program created more work and stress for them and took time away from their responsibilities as a teacher. One beginning teacher explained:

I find the resident educator system to be very offensive to my education, because all of the above statements were taught and monitored throughout my college career. My highly qualified professors and mentors showed me and taught me how to become the best teacher possible. From numerous field experiences and observations, I was able to graduate with a Master’s Degree in Education. They believed in my teaching because they saw me teach in person, not from paper.

For this standard, some of the beginning teachers also believed their collaboration with mentors, colleagues, and administrators improved their content knowledge. One noted, “My district requires weekly meetings with a cluster of teachers where we plan common lessons and assessments together. This work with colleagues has improved the above skills, not the resident educator program.”

**Standard 3.** For this assessment standard (Teachers understand and use varied assessments to inform instruction, evaluate and ensure student learning), the response was again overwhelmingly negative. Of the 62 responses, there were only three positive comments and the same concepts emerged from the data analysis as for the previous standards—the resident educators’ perception that their teacher preparation programs, classroom experiences, and mentors, colleagues, and administrators improved their ability to meet the assessment standard more than did the OREP. One beginning teacher was particularly specific in his/her concern with respect to this standard as experienced in the program:

Because my students have a multitude of disabilities, many of the assessments that were required within the Resident Educator program were not useful to me. I did learn how to effectively take data on IEP goals and how to teach functional communication skills and



pre-requisite skills, but the Resident Educator program played no role in me doing that. The Resident Educator program was forcing me to use extended standards that often need to be extremely modified to meet the practical needs of the students I serve. I feel the Resident Educator program required me to stretch what I was doing that was important in the classroom to meet the needs of their program. It is unfortunate for the students.

However, the resident educator participants strongly believed that their *own* classroom experiences improved their ability to meet this standard. As one explained, "I have been implementing assessments in my room from the first year of teaching. I already know how to do these things and the RESA didn't help me do anything." Another teacher stated: "...I feel as though these were actions I was already working on as an educator. I am still uncomfortable assessing data and continually feel it is a weak point for me as an educator." The resident educators also believed their teacher preparation programs improved their ability to meet this standard; as one wrote, "... I learned about assessments and assessment types in college. I graduated college and would like to apply what I learned during that time. The RESA program is duplicating the content that I have already learned."

**Standard 4.** For *Standard 4* (Teachers plan and deliver effective instruction that advances the learning of each individual student), the beginning teachers only provided one positive comment out of sixty-four responses. They were particularly critical of the lesson plans that were required of them through the program:

This program prohibited me from creating meaningful and powerful lessons. So much time was spent covering one specific lesson that I was unable to spend quality time on other lessons... so much writing, editing, and meetings were required, that I had to take time out of my school day to reach the requirements meant for this program.

A second teacher explained:

As a teacher already in the classroom, the Resident Educator program only added to the massive amounts of work required within the classroom. My lessons are already required to be aligned with state standards and must include differentiation to be effective. Time spent analyzing and reflecting outside of what is done naturally was a huge burden.

Similar to responses about the assessment standard, the resident educators reported that their *own* classroom experiences improved their ability to meet this standard more than the Resident Educator Program. Another teacher explained: "Teaching did a lot of this for me, not resident educator. As I gained more experience in teaching, I learned how to apply goals and communicate better. Resident Educator didn't help at all." Another teacher noted:

Once again, the RESA program did not teach me anything, it is not designed to. I applied what I have learned elsewhere and formatted it to fit the rubrics of RESA. I spent my entire experience with RESA stressing out about deadlines and requirements, not learning anything.

**Standard 5.** Regarding the learning environment standard (Teachers create learning environments that promote high levels of learning and achievement for all students), the beginning teachers did not provide any positive comments about the OREP in their sixty-two comments. Although participants provided more ‘strongly agree’ responses (3.45%) to the Likert-based questions for this standard than to any of the other standards, their responses still overwhelmingly fell into the ‘disagree’ (39.42%) and ‘strongly disagree’ (34.10%) categories. Participants provided sixty-two comments for standard 5 yet none of them indicated a positive experience with the OREP. Though many perceived learning environments as their strength, they reported that participation in the OREP did not improve their ability to meet this standard:

I have been working hard since the first day of my hiring to ensure that my students are in a safe and positive learning environment. The RE program did nothing to help enhance the way I treated my students, it only required me to explain to the best that I could, the relations I have with my students and their families. This is not something that is easily explained to a stranger in charge of my passing or failing the program when I have a word limit to my response.

Much like the previous two standards, many of the resident educators again reported that their own classroom experiences improved their ability to meet this standard: “Again, these things are things that good teachers do and improve upon with EXPERIENCE. Putting together portfolios, writing reflections, and videotaping me teaching do not enable a person to be a good teacher.” Additionally, many of the resident educators perceived their teacher preparation programs prepared them for this standard: “The Resident Educator Program did not improve these things for me. Classroom environment was developed by me through collegiate classwork.”

**Standard 6.** For *Standard 6* (Teachers collaborate and communicate with students, parents, other educators, administrators and the community to support student learning), the resident educators did not provide any positive comments in their forty-nine responses. Many of the teachers reported their collaboration with mentors, colleagues, and administrators improved their ability to meet this standard, not the requirements of the OREP. For example, one resident educator wrote: “I feel these are all important. However, these were not improved through the Resident Educator Program. I have improved these skills through collaboration with my colleagues and working with the administrative team in my building.” One beginning teacher actually described how the program was counterintuitive in respect to this standard: “I felt as though this program separated me from other teachers and collaboration because they didn't understand the requirements I had to meet and I spent all of my time working on this instead of in meetings and collaboration.”

**Standard 7.** Finally, for this professional growth standard (Teachers assume responsibility for professional growth, performance, and involvement as an individual and as a member of a learning community), the beginning teachers provided three positive comments out of the thirty-seven responses. Almost 70% had disagreed or strongly disagreed that their experiences with the OREP improved their ability to meet this standard. Many of the teachers felt the Resident Educator Program actually impeded their ability to meet this standard:

If anything, RESA has hindered my ability to seek out other professional development opportunities for myself. I would love to take another class right now to further my knowledge of classroom content or teaching pedagogy, but the amount of time that I waste doing RESA is frustrating.

A second participant stated that “this process hampered my ability to improve my teaching practice through meaningless and impersonal requirements that did not help me to take responsibility for anything other than RESA deadlines.”

### **Implications and Recommendations**

As a result of the data analysis, the researchers learned that resident educators do not believe the Ohio Resident Educator Program improved their ability to meet the *Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession* and their predominately negative comments explained their perceptions:

I really dislike the fact that I have to choose strongly disagree for all of the items, because I am open to continued learning and experiences but as far as the Resident Educator program goes, this is not how I improved my abilities as a new teacher. I actually felt like the Resident Educator program was unfair to my students, requiring them to participate in activities too high for their levels of functioning so they could work in the mold that was provided. Sometimes, I had to use students that weren't even in my class so I could complete the required tasks, taking away valuable time from my students.

In addition, they believe the OREP created more work and stress for them and took time away from their responsibilities as a teacher. However, the teachers believe that their teacher preparation programs, classroom experiences, and mentors, colleagues, and administrators improved their ability to meet the Ohio standards.

Although these findings are limited to Ohio's standards, new teacher induction system, and new teachers, these findings have educational importance in respect to the creation and implementation of teacher induction programs. First and foremost, the perceptions of the participants of mandatory teacher induction programs, such as the OREP, should be continually consulted to provide insight and feedback throughout the creation, implementation, and evaluation of these programs. For many of these beginning teachers, this study was the first time they were provided with an opportunity to provide feedback about this program even though a majority of the participants are in their third and fourth year of the program.

If program creators, coordinators, mentors, etc. continually elicit the feedback of participants, they will learn what the researchers of this study learned in that the program oftentimes is counterintuitive to its purpose. For example, the resident educator participants in this study reported that the requirements of the program, specifically the large amounts of paperwork, actually impeded their ability to improve in the seven areas of OSTP. The requirements of the OREP should instead be modified to strengthen these standards and move away from the reported “stressful busywork.” Participants generally indicated that their classroom experiences, and mentors, colleagues, and administrators improved their ability to meet the each of the *Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession*. As the program evolves, program designers should seek

ways to maximize the interaction between resident educators and these individuals without contributing additional paperwork. In addition, the purpose of the requirements of teacher induction programs should be made clear to the beginning teacher participants in relation to the teaching standards.

Overwhelmingly, the teachers who participated in this study consistently, across all seven standards, reported that their collaboration with mentors, colleagues, and administrators improved their ability to meet OSTP more so than the Resident Educator Program. This is supported by the work of Nielsen, Barry, and Addison (2007) who found that teachers valued the instructional resource teacher, collaboration with colleagues, and differentiated professional development directed towards teacher needs as the most valuable aspects of their teacher induction program while they valued other aspects of the program much less. Therefore, the collaboration with mentors, colleagues, and administrators should be further incorporated into teacher induction programs.

The findings of this study combined with prior research (Anthony, Haigh, & Kane, 2011; Algozzine, Gretes, Queen, and Cowan-Hathcock, 2007; Blomeke et al., 2015; Lofstrom & Eisenschmidt, 2009; Marable & Raimondi, 2007; Shockley, Watlington & Felsher, 2013) raise several important questions: How should international, national, state, and local educational organizations and institutions utilize the perceptions of teachers in the creation and implementation of teacher induction programs? How should participant satisfaction be included in the design of teacher induction programs? How can teacher induction programs more effectively integrate the knowledge that teachers acquire through their preparation programs, their classroom experiences, and through their collaboration with mentors, colleagues, and administrators? Further research should be conducted to answer these questions. It is imperative that the international educational community begin to address this revolving door in our schools and promote beginning teachers' development more efficiently and productively.

#### **Author Notes**

*Nicole V. Williams* is an Assistant Professor in the College of Education at the University of Findlay.

*John C. Gillham* is an Assistant Professor in the College of Education at the University of Findlay.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to John C. Gillham at [gillham@findlay.edu](mailto:gillham@findlay.edu)

### References

- Algozzine, B., Gretes, J., Queen, A. J., & Cowan-Hathcok, M. (2007). Beginning teachers' perceptions of their induction program experiences. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas*, 80(3), 137-143.
- Anthony, G., Haigh, M., & Kane, R. (2011). The power of the 'object' to influence teacher induction outcomes. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27(5), 861-870.
- Bickmore, D. L., & Bickmore, S. T. (2010). A multifaceted approach to teacher induction. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 26(4), 1006-1014.
- Blömeke, S., Hoth, J., Döhrmann, M., Busse, A., Kaiser, G., & Köenig, J. (2015). Teacher change during induction: Development of beginning primary teachers' knowledge, beliefs and performance. *International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education* 13(2), 287-308.
- Goldrick, L., Osta, D., Barlin, D., & Burn, J. (2012). Policy paper: Review of state policies on teacher induction. *New Teacher Center*. Retrieved from <http://newteachercenter.org>.
- Grammatikopoulos, V., Tsigilis, N., Gregoriadis, A., & Bikos, K. (2013). Evaluating an induction training program for Greek teachers using an adjusted level model approach. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 39(4), 225–231.
- Ingersoll, R. M. (2012). Beginning teacher induction: What the data tell us. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 93(8), 47-51.
- Joest, J. A. F. (2003). *The impact of induction programs on retention of novice teachers as reported by novice teachers and district administrators in selected Texas public schools in regions XIII & XX education service centers* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Texas A & M University: College Station, TX.
- Löfstrom, E., & Eisenschmidt, E. (2009). Novice teachers' perspectives on mentoring: The case of the Estonian induction year. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25(5), 681-689.
- Marable, M. A., & Raimondi, S. L. (2007). The role of the mentor and the administrator in teacher induction. In M.V. Zuljan & J. Vogrninc (Eds.), *Professional inductions of teachers in Europe and elsewhere* (pp. 280-288). Ljubljana, Slovenia: University of Ljubljana.
- Marshall, K. J., Karvonen, M., Yell, M. L., Lowrey, A., Drascow, E., & Seaman, M. A. (2013). Project ReSpecT: toward an evidence-based mentoring model for induction teachers. *Journal of Disability Policy Studies*, 24(3), 127–136.

- Morse, J., Stern, P., Corbin, J., Bowers, B., Charmaz, K., & Clark, A. (2009). *Developing grounded theory: The second generation*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
- New Teacher Center. (2014). *Annual Report 2013-2014*. Retrieved from <http://newteachercenter.org>.
- Nielsen, D. C., Barry, A. L., & Addison, A. B. (2007). A model of a new-teacher induction program and teacher perceptions of beneficial components. *Action in Teacher Education*, 28(4), 14–24.
- Ohio Department of Education. (2011). *Introduction to the Ohio Resident Educator Program standards*. Retrieved from <http://www.ode.state.oh.us>
- Ohio Department of Education. (2014). *Resident educator program overview*. Retrieved from <http://www.ode.state.oh.us>
- Ohio Department of Education. (2015). *Ohio resident educator summative assessment instrument*. Retrieved from <http://www.ode.state.oh.us>
- Oktay, J. S. (2012). *Grounded theory*. [electronic resource]. n.p.: Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press. Retrieved from: <http://www.oxfordscholarship.com/view/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199753697.001.0001/acprof-9780199753697-chapter-001>
- Shockley, R., Watlington, E., & Felsher, R. (2013). Out on a limb: the efficacy of teacher induction in secondary schools. *NASSP Bulletin*, 97(4), 350-377.
- Van Zandt Allen, L. (2013). The impact of induction support on teacher development, teacher retention, and the teacher quality issue. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 40(3), 75-92.
- Vogrinc, J., Kristof, C., and Zuljan, M. V. (2007). The system of teacher induction in Slovenia. In M.V. Zuljan & J. Vogrninc (Eds.), *Professional inductions of teachers in Europe and elsewhere* (pp. 191-214). Ljubljana, Slovenia: University of Ljubljana.
- Zuljan, M. V., & Bizjak, C. (2007). A mentor between supporting and challenging a novice's reflection. In M.V. Zuljan & J. Vogrninc (Eds.), *Professional inductions of teachers in Europe and elsewhere* (pp. 309-323). Ljubljana, Slovenia: University of Ljubljana.