Supporting Novice Faculty: Induction and Retention

Sean Bates and Linda Feldstein

Teacher turnover represents one of the largest educational problems in the U. S. today, a problem that is heightened in low performing, high poverty schools, which can experience teacher attrition rates that are twice those for higher performing schools (Smith & Ingersoll, 2004; Petty, Fitchett, & O'Connor, 2012). Nearly one third of all teachers leave the field during the first three years of teaching and up to half leave by their fifth year of teaching (Brown & Wynn, 2009). In high-need schools, those schools where at least 80% of students are eligible for Title One funds, the problem is even worse, with increased turnover and less qualified teachers (Petty, et al., 2012). The combined effect of decreasing class sizes and teacher attrition, together with staffing challenges for persistently underperforming, high poverty schools make recruiting and retaining high quality teaching staff a constant imperative for administrative staff.

Retaining well-educated, high quality teachers has become of paramount importance for most public school districts in the U.S. When districts lose teachers, they lose the opportunity to recoup what they have already invested in recruitment and professional development, and then must expend budgetary and personnel resources in the hiring process again. There is also research to suggest a strong link between the high rates of new teacher attrition and perennial teacher shortages overall (Smith & Ingersoll, 2004). For many school districts, this has prompted the development and implementation of teacher induction programs; systematic, sustained assistance programs for providing support to new teachers during the novice years of teaching. Many of these programs also include a mentoring component, typically characterized by an older, more experienced teacher offering guidance, support, modeling and advocacy to the younger novice (Colley, 2002). Induction programs can include assistance with teaching competencies like planning, instruction, and/or classroom management, or impart knowledge regarding district policies and procedures.

Higher education institutions with solid induction, recruitment and retention policies are often able to recruit and retain quality faculty. Research conducted by Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute (2012), suggests that quality faculty is an important asset for any higher education institution. The Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute research suggests that low faculty retention rates can create negative consequences in both the fiscal and academic realms. Monetary consequences can include lost return on previous investment, the cost of recruiting a replacement, and faculty time diverted from teaching to the hiring process (Xu, 2007). Academic consequences include disruption of research and teaching programs, discontinuity in student mentoring, disruptions to department planning, and a loss of graduate student advisors.

Historical and Theoretical Perspective

The concept of mentoring has roots in Victorian England, where wealthy citizens were encouraged to "mentor" a poor family, with the hope of inculcating values like hard work, thrift, diligence, and self-discipline (Colley, 2002). The idea of mentoring can also be seen in programs like Big Brothers, Big Sisters, where adults are recruited and trained to befriend and nurture at-risk youth. Although many induction programs include an aspect of mentoring, not all do. In recent years, the inclusion of mentoring as a part of teacher induction programs has become so commonplace, that the two terms are often used interchangeably (Smith & Ingersoll, 2004).

Induction programs present the opportunity for novice teachers to obtain mastery experiences in order to increase their sense of teaching efficacy (Hoy, 2000). Social Learning Theory explains this window of learning as critical to the process of self-management and personal beliefs, which in turn influence thinking about perseverance, resiliency, and stress (Bandura, Caprara, Barbaranelli, Gerbino, & Pastorelli, 2003). Bandura, et al. theorize that personal efficacy beliefs develop from mastery experiences, social modeling, and persuasive forms of social influence. For beginning teachers, developing strong self-efficacy beliefs may be critical to success. Mastery experiences in the classroom will lead to increased self-efficacy, and contribute to the belief that one will continue to be successful. The perception of failure will also contribute to efficacy beliefs, but those beliefs will likely relate to poor or negative expectations for future outcomes. (Hoy, 2000). Social modeling gives novice teachers the opportunity to assess their own teaching capabilities by comparing themselves with more experienced peers (Bandura, 1993), highlighting

the purpose for the mentoring aspect many induction programs provide. Social persuasion may come in several forms including performance feedback, systematic professional learning community meetings, discussions with a valued mentor, or casual "teachers' lounge" conversations.

From a psychological framework, equity theory can also be instructive in explaining why higher education faculty remain in their positions. This theory makes assumptions about how people think and behave. Institutions are dependent upon faculty to teach, sharing their knowledge and expertise, as well as honoring their commitment to the school's mission and remaining responsive to stakeholders. From the faculty perspective they are looking for institutions to foster professional growth, job security, and recognition and financial rewards (increase in salary, benefits and reduce teaching loads). The ultimate goal of equity theory in higher education is to build and maintain relationships and to motivate its employees to make contributions that will allow the institution to meet its strategic goals. Institutions must incorporate strategies that will attract and retain faculty members and identify ways to enhance transparency in their hiring practices (Scholl, 2000).

In higher education, the central role of faculty is framed into three areas: teaching, research, and service (TRS). The perception within our higher education institutions regarding the complexity for faculty to obtain tenure is regularly cited in the literature. Data collected by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP, 2006) suggest that in 2006 approximately 53.5% of all full-time faculty held tenure, roughly the same percentage that held tenure in 1975. The data suggest the parameters and conditions for incoming faculty is changing as a direct result of institution hiring practices, policies and program ranking (AAUP, 2006).

In addition to TRS, higher education institutions must develop retention programs that incorporate several components. Piercy, Giddings, Allen, Dixon, Meszaros, and Josest (2005) points to six critical areas colleges and universities can implement to maintain a diverse faculty. First, institutions must be committed and sustain mentorship programs. The authors suggest developing new faculty groups, where they can share survival strategies. Piercy et al. also suggest creating an environment where new faculty feel accepted and they perceive they work in a collegial environment. In addition, they suggest creating room for leadership opportunities, developing opportunities for faculty to integrate into the university culture, serve on committees

and school wide initiatives that will enhance tenure and promotion and retention is fair and transparent. Finally they suggest, creating an environment where faculty can make complaints and feel that their issues will be heard and supported by senior leadership.

School leaders in higher education, like its K-12 counterpart, are also concerned with recruitment and retention issues, but are often pulled to view the issue from a student and faculty perspective. In both systems, quality assurance and accountability are seen as viable processes that greatly impact faculty induction and retention and ultimately impact student learning. Both systems also seek to widen opportunities for underrepresented groups in faculties.

Induction Program Components

Induction programs are based on the idea that "teaching is complex work, that pre-employment teacher preparation is rarely sufficient to provide all the knowledge and skill necessary to successful teaching, and that a significant portion of this knowledge can be acquired only on the job" (Ingersoll, 2012, p. 1). Many states in the U.S. now mandate teacher induction programs, with varying levels of flexibility in design and implementation (Smith, 2006). Often formed through partnership with a local university's education department, induction programs are universally motivated by the need to significantly reduce teacher attrition rates. In some cases, school districts also report a rise in achievement scores after implementing an induction program, possibly based on reduced turnover in teaching staff (Maciejewski, 2007).

Novice teachers in public schools often face what has been characterized as a "sink or swim" mentality at their first jobs (Maciejewski, 2007), and struggle with the demands of learning to teach. Lacking support, many will quit, and others find their contracts non-renewed due to poor performance. Although districts will always need the capacity to cull teachers who do not develop the skills and competencies to engage in effective teaching, induction programs show promise for improving teacher quality and hence, both teacher retention and student performance. Research has shown that teacher retention is also related to instructional leadership and administrative support, where principals have shared their vision, clearly elucidated expectations, recognized high performing teachers, and support teachers with discipline referrals (Smith, 2006).

Research conducted by the Education Trust (2006) explored teaching inequality and the impact novice, out-of-the field teachers have on student learning

in high poverty/high minority schools. The report examined teaching inequalities of three states and their three biggest school systems. The article highlighted teachers' qualifications and preparations, and provided some insight on how school systems can better distribute their more experience teachers to schools with the greatest instructional need. In addition, the report examined the impact of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) and the provision in the law that required school districts "to ensure that poor and minority children are not taught at higher rates than other children by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers". The authors provided school district leaders tangible and obtainable goals to improve the inequality of teaching in their schools. They suggested providing a series of incentives offered to teachers working in high-poverty schools by "giving teachers reduced student loads, so they can have more time with individual students, more time to collaborate with their colleagues and more time for coaching and induction." The report highlights the impact of induction and the impact it could have on improving the quality of teachers in the schools and its long-term impact on reducing the achievement gap in our education system.

In general, K-12 induction programs can fall into one of three categories. These are a) basic orientation, b) instructional practice model, and c) school transformation model (National Education Association, 2002). Basic orientation is the model maintained by most school districts, offering new teachers a chance to learn procedures and policies, understand responsibilities, and assist with classroom management. In this model, teachers may be assigned a mentor, but contact is usually informal. The instructional practice model adds skilled, well-trained mentors who assist in linking induction activities to state or local standards for excellence in teaching, and help to bridge the gap between theory and practice. The school transformation model is rare, and uses the attributes of the previous two models while connecting induction activities to systemic, school-wide reform efforts using data to evaluate professional growth. This model enables new teachers to engage in professional learning communities in order to create challenging goals for student growth.

Induction programs can vary greatly from state to state, and even from district to district. Mentorship may or may not be an aspect of any particular induction program, but it is far more likely to happen in states where an induction program is required (Smith, 2006). Mentoring new teachers can take several forms, in some cases districts hire full-time mentor teachers who spend their time working with all new teachers in a district, regardless of level or discipline. Other districts seek to match mentors and mentees in areas like grade level, subject taught, or even whether they teach in the same building. Although mentoring is a popular aspect of induction, it has also been shown to be most effective when mentors are matched on some or all of the above variables, as the effectiveness of mentoring seems to be reduced by mismatches (Smith, 2006).

Induction programs in higher education are an evolving process that works best when done in a collaborative format. In higher education there is very little research that focuses solely on induction from a higher education perspective, but there is evidence in the literature of state and local entities developing partnerships with colleges and universities to develop and promote these programs for teachers in the K-12 systems. Operationally induction programs are more comprehensive, intensive, structured, and sequentially delivered in response to teachers' emerging pedagogical needs. Research conducted by Klug and Salzman (1991), suggests that higher education participation in teacher induction was found to contribute to the overall effectiveness of the teacher induction program. When universities are involved in beginning teacher induction programs, using faculty representatives to contribute to the development and implementation, they provide a resource not found in the local school system. The American Association of State Colleges and Universities concluded, "Mentoring and induction can bridge the gap between pre-service education and the classroom, and higher education institutions must be an important part of this picture" (2006, p. 4).

In order to be as effective as possible in both reducing teacher attrition and contributing to the growth and development of highly competent teachers, induction programs need some key components. Maciejewski (2007) reports that mentors need to be extensively trained in providing classroom-based assistance, and aiding beginning teachers to translate theory in to practice. Other important components of effective mentoring are a formative assessment system, opportunities to observe experienced teachers, a support network of other new teachers, and targeted professional development. As Hoy (2000) pointed out, "Neophytes are confronted with a set of organizational norms and values that are usually at variance with those espoused by their college professors" (pp. 4-5). Carefully matched mentoring and thoughtfully designed induction can help to ease this transition from university to work.

In higher education more institutions are investing additional resources on retention efforts. The goal is to bolster the retention and continued recruitment of outstanding faculty, colleges and universities have developed flexible and accommodating policies and programs to remove obstacles to productivity, improve the integration of life and work, and enhance job satisfaction and reduce turnover (Xu, 2007). In many colleges, professional development policies and programs have been shown to be a contributing factor in faculty retention. These programs are designed to orient employees or help them transition into the institution by providing opportunities for new faculty to become acquainted with resources on campus. Research shows that transition programs increase the likelihood that incoming faculty will be retained because they gain an understanding of the workings of the institution and the local community. Most institutions provide an orientation program to help new faculty transition into the institution (Lavania, Himanshu, & Gupta, 2011).

In higher education there are several professional groups that have dedicated substantial resources to develop induction programs. These groups, which are described in greater detail in the model program section of this paper, highlight the work of institutions and teaching advocacy groups in addressing the shortage of these programs. However, in higher education induction and mentoring programs are used interchangeable in the field. For most institutions, mentoring programs often serve as a platform where new faculty members are introduced to the inner working of the department and institution. Not all institutional mentoring programs are designed to achieve the desired support, due to lack of resources, departmental commitment, and overburden faculty who are already busy trying to maintain their own credentials for promotion and tenure.

Additional Factors in Faculty Retention

Several other factors in addition to induction programs have found to influence teacher retention (Smith, 2006). In a study utilizing multiple year data from the National Center for Education Statistic's Schools and Staffing Survey and the Teacher Follow-up Survey, Smith found that mentorship alone was not significantly related to teacher retention. What did make a difference was the inclusion of greater numbers of induction-related supports. Additional collaboration and external networks of new teachers both added to the likelihood that a new teacher would remain in his/her position. Strong administrative support was also found to be a factor contributing to reduced turnover. These

are principals who share their vision with staff, clearly communicate their expectations, talk frequently about effective instruction strategy, and reinforce high achieving staff. Brown and Wynn (2009) report that the principals most successful with teacher retention,

> provide conditions and resources needed to support new teachers in their continuous learning, growth, and professional development. They share decision making with new teachers on substantive issues, work collaboratively with others to reach shared goals, and expand teacher leadership capacity. They model high expectations for all and keep the vision of student learning alive and at the forefront of all decisions. They maintain an open door and a visible presence throughout their schools. They encourage and support collegiality among all teachers and provide nurturance, guidance, and leadership when needed. In many ways, they actually foster unofficial professional learning communities that reduce teacher isolation, increase teacher responsibility and understanding, and improve teacher satisfaction, morale and commitment. (p. 58)

These results speak to the profound educational impacts that might result from improvements in school leadership.

Smith and Ingersoll (2004) found that for teachers who entered the teaching profession and received no induction support, the turnover rate at the end of their first year was 40%. Basic induction programs decreased that rate to 39%. When teachers received induction and mentoring, plus added benefits like supportive communication, common planning time, and planned collaboration, the attrition rate went to 27%. For teachers who get the "full package" (above plus reduced teaching schedules and teacher aides) the attrition rate is further reduced to around 20%. Tai, Lui, and Fan (2007) found that after controlling for other factors, teachers in higher earnings brackets were 1.46 times more likely to stay than those in lower brackets. In a study examining attracting and retaining faculty in high-need schools, Petty, et al. (2012) also found that earnings were viewed as a significant factor in teacher retention, but teachers in this study also responded that respect and recognition were critical factors.

Barriers to Retention

An issue of concern in higher education institutions today is the national trend away from creating and filling full-time tenure-track faculty

positions, which greatly constricts the career options faced by members of underrepresented groups. American Federations of Teachers (AFT) argues that these barriers in the faculty hiring process coupled with state funding cutbacks and negative administrative policies have generated a rapid and continuing loss in the proportion of full-time tenure-track faculty positions (AFT, 2010). According to the AFT, "only about a quarter of the people teaching undergraduate courses are tenured or on the tenure track, and two-thirds of new hiring in the ranks of faculty is in contingent, mainly part-time/ adjunct positions" (AFT, 2010, p.13). In a study of nursing school faculty, Bittner and O'Connor (2007) found the most frequently cited barriers to job satisfaction were a sense of accomplishment, role autonomy, support for professional growth, collegial atmosphere, and academic freedom. Most often, there are extreme limitations on the salaries, pensions, and benefits offered by contingent positions, along with little or no job security, time to conduct research, or academic freedom. In other words, the loss of full-time tenure-track positions greatly complicates the process of offering stable, well-paid careers to faculty and instructors from underrepresented ethnic and racial groups.

In the K-12 realm, there are two areas of recruitment and retention that deserve additional focus, high need schools and special education faculty. In high needs schools, there is increased teacher turnover above the already troubling numbers given. In a study designed to discover the best ways to attract and retain teachers for these difficult teaching placements, investigators found teachers wanted smaller class sizes, additional planning time, more visible administrators, more autonomy, support with student discipline, and collegial relationships (Petty, et al. 2012). In the case of special educators, Kamman and Long (2010) reference chronic shortages, high turnover rates, inadequate supply and poor teacher quality as areas of concern. Since the majority of research on induction programs had been done in the general education setting, Kamman and Long examined a program designed specifically for special educators. This program was a full five years long, with the first three years featuring mentoring, provision of a district-based instructional facilitator for classroom support, targeted instruction in specific skill areas, and emotional support. Years four and five added a focus on analyzing student data and using research-based strategies to increase student achievement. Data on the effectiveness of these programs are inclusive and additional analysis is needed to determine the impact on student achievement.

Model Programs

In higher education induction programs are usually conducted in collaboration with other educational entities, whose mission parallels. One of these programs is the New Teacher Center (NTC) at the University of California, Santa Cruz. The central element of the NTC Induction Model is one-on-one mentoring by a carefully selected and highly-trained mentor. Additional components include participation by all first- and second-year teachers, a network of support for both new teachers and mentors, mentors being released from teaching duties to assist new teachers, formative assessment, linkages to pre-service education, program evaluation, and other elements. This model promotes the expectation that teaching is collegial and that learning is a lifelong process (AASCU, 2006). In higher education the Educational Testing Service has developed the Pathwise Framework Induction Program, a comprehensive mentoring and support program for beginning teachers. This program provides training and support for mentors and structured tasks through which beginning teachers, with the assistance of a mentor, can develop and hone their skills. An online component, including discussion boards, courses, mentor refreshers, and resource pages enhance communication (AASCU, 2006). Finally, the Teachers for a New Era Project of the Carnegie Corporation of New York is attempting to strengthen K-12 teaching by developing state-of-the-art programs at schools of education. One guiding principle is the establishment of teaching as a clinical profession. Exemplary teacher education programs will consider the first two years of teaching as a residency period requiring mentorship and supervision. During this induction period, higher education faculty will confer with, observe, and provide guidance to the new teacher to improve practice (AASCU, 2006).

Conclusion

The challenges faced by newcomers in the world of education are significant, and the work of teachers is frequently done in isolation. The novice teaching years have been likened to a "sink or swim" or "lost at sea" experience (Ingersoll, 2012). Beginners are also more likely to be given the most difficult classes to teach, notes Ingersoll, leaving neophyte teachers to question whether they truly belong in an education career. Induction programs at both K-12 and higher education seek to address these issues for new teachers, providing an environment where they are able to learn, grow, and eventually thrive as teaching professionals. As induction programs proliferate around the U.S., schools find they are able to increase retention of quality teaching

personnel, and also impact the achievement of students, the stability of the work force and improve organizational climate for everyone involved.

References

American Association of State Colleges and Universities. (2006). Teacher induction programs: Trends and opportunities. Policy Matters, 3(10). Retrieved from: http://hermes.aascu.org/media/pm/pdf/v3n10.pdf

American Association of University Professors (2007). "2006-07 Report on the Economic Status of the Profession." Retrieved from www.aaup.org.

American Federations of Teachers. (2010). Promoting Racial and Ethnic Diversity Faculty: What Higher Education Unions can Do. Retrieved from ERIC database (ED511576).

Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning. *Educational Psychologist*, *28*(2), 117 – 148.

Bandura, A., Barbaranelli, C., Caprara, G. V., & Pastorelli, C. (2001). Self-Efficacy Beliefs as Shapers of Children's Aspirations and Career Trajectories. *Child Development*, *72*(1), 187–206. doi:10.1111/1467-8624.00273

Bittner, N. P., & O'Connor, M. (2007). Focus on retention: Identifying barriers to nurse faculty satisfaction. *Nursing Education Perspectives*, *33*(4), 251–4. Retrieved from http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22916629

Brown, K. M., & Wynn, S. R. (2009). Finding, supporting, and keeping: The role of the principal in teacher retention issues. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *8*, 37–63. doi:10.1080/15700760701817371

Colley, H. (2002) A 'rough guide' to the history of mentoring from a Marxist feminist perspective. *Journal of Education for Teaching,* 28(3), 247-263.

Education Trust (2006). Funding Gaps. Retrieved from http://www.edtrust.org/sites/edtrust.org/files/publications/files/FundingGap2006.pdf

Hoy, A. W. (2000). Changes in teacher efficacy during the early years of teaching. In *American Educational Research Association* (pp. 1–26).

Ingersoll, R. M. (2012). Beginning teacher induction: What the data tell us. *Phi Delta Kappan International,* Retrieved from www.edweek.org

Kamman, M. L., & Long, S. K. (2010). One district's approach to the induction of special education teachers. *Journal of Special Education Leadership*, *23*(1), 21–29.

Klug, B. J., & Salzman, S. A. (1991, February). Strengthening the team: An inclusive model of university/ school district support for novice teachers. *Paper presented to the annual meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators*, New Orleans, LA. Retrieved from ERIC database (ED330668).

Lavania D., Himanshu S., & Gupta, N. (2011). Faculty Recruitment and Retention: A Key for Managing Talent in Higher Education. *International Journal of Enterprise Computing and Business Systems.* Vol. 1, Issue 2, July 2011. Retrieved from: http://www.ijecbs.com/July2011/32.pdf

Maciejewski, J. (2007). Supporting new teachers: Are induction programs worth the cost? *District Administration*, (September), 48–52.

National Education Association (2012). Using data to improve teacher induction programs. The NEA Foundation for the Improvement of Education. Retrieved from nea.org.

Piercy, F., Giddings, V., Allen, K., Dixon, B., Meszaros, P., & Joest, K. (2005). Improving Campus Climate to Support Faculty Diversity and Retention: A Pilot Program for New Faculty. *Innovative Higher Education, 30*(1), 53-66.

Petty, T. M., Fitchett, P., & O'Connor, K. (2012). Attracting and keeping teachers in high-need schools. *American Secondary Education*, *40*(2), 67–89.

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute. (2012, February16). Faculty retention proves a major Challenge for universities. Science Daily. Retrieved March 14, 2014 from www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2012/02/12 0216144240.htm

Scholl, R. (2000). Primer on Equity Theory. The University of Rhode Island, Labor Research Retrieved March 11, 2014 from http://www.uri.edu/research/lrc/scholl/webn otes/Motivation_Equity.htm

Smith, T. M. (2006). How do state-level induction and standards-based reform policies affect induction experiences and turnover among new teachers? *American Journal of Education*, *113* (February), 273–309.

Smith, T. M., & Ingersoll, R. M. (2004). What are the effects of induction and mentoring on beginning teacher turnover? *American Education Research Journal*, *41*(3), 681–714.

Tai, R. H., Liu, C. Q., & Fan, X. (2007). Factors influencing retention of mathematics and science teachers in secondary schools — A study based on SASS/TFS. *Science Educator*, *16*(2), 27–33.

Xu, Y. J. (2008). Faculty turnover: Discipline-specific attention is warranted. *Research in Higher Education, 49*, 40-61.