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ABSTRACT

Schools have gone through educational reforms having various focuses on curriculum changes, consolidation, open classrooms, mastery learning, decentralization, shared decision-making, legislative mandates and controls, high expectations, integrated thematic instruction, professional development, technology integration, and standards with high-stakes accountability. Through all the reforms, the educational system has remained the same and student learning has continued to fall. Education today is facing a new challenge called virtual schools.

Virtual schooling is a growing phenomenon at all levels. In its contemporary form, virtual education provides asynchronous, computer-mediated iteration between teacher and student over the Internet. In just a decade, such virtual education has grown from a novelty to a movement that is burgeoning to meet the growing demands. In response to these changes and increasing enrollment demands, many organizations are working on strategic plans to implement virtual courses to meet the needs of their students or potential students. At the same time, there are misconceptions and myths related to the skills, resources, environment, tools, and support needed to prepare a teacher to teach in a virtual school. In this research, I looked at how new teachers are being prepared to teach in an environment that many educators have never experienced or even known about in the past.

I used a descriptive case study to present how new teachers are prepared to teach in a virtual setting. The school used for the study was a 6-12 virtual charter school located in Pennsylvania. In this study new teachers, administrators, teachers, and staff were observed and ten individual interviews were completed. The results showed that the induction/mentoring program is important for new teachers in transitioning into their job. Today’s technology
enables support to be provided twenty-four seven in multiple forms such as learning communities, database systems, and course content on the web, and methods such as email, text, chat, web conferences, text, and face-to-face. This study concludes showing that legitimacy is an important role for teachers and society for acceptance and accountability of the program and school.
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Chapter 1. New Teacher Induction and Mentoring Program for a Virtual Setting

Research shows that a highly-qualified teacher workforce composed of skilled, knowledgeable, culturally astute and compassionate teachers is the single greatest leverage point for assuring that all students achieve at their highest level (Berry, 2004; National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future, 1996). Unfortunately, highly-qualified teachers do not appear ready-made. Becoming a highly qualified teacher is a process that takes time and experience. To help teachers transition from novice to highly qualified, some schools offer an induction/mentoring program.

Currently, there are a vast number of educational inquiries on teacher induction/mentoring programs; this could be due to the different environments in which teachers instruct. For example, picture three classroom environments: First, there is a classroom where the teacher stands at the front of the room and lectures to the students. The students seldom speak, even if they do not understand a concept. Next, there is a classroom where the teacher lectures and students frequently raise their hands to participate and share. Students can work independently or in groups as the teacher walks around and offers help and support. Finally, there is a virtual classroom where the teacher is not physically present, instruction is presented via a web page, and students use a computer to complete course work, interact with peers, attend class and communicate with their teachers. A student can connect through e-mails, phone calls or web casts from anywhere, at any time. Regarding the program design, what elements do the relevant induction/mentoring programs need to contain to prepare teachers for each of these three environments? Moreover, as Ingersoll and Kralik (2004) indicate, the literature provides minimal guidance regarding which components of an induction program are most important in influencing particular outcomes.
Statement of Problem

Whisnant, Elliott, and Pynchon (2005) write:

Mastering the art of teaching is a process that takes time, and even new teachers with the best preparation require and respond to quality support. In the 21st century, the need to guide novice teachers in successfully navigating change in their profession, in learning standards, and in the student population itself is greater than ever before (p. 24).

Unfortunately, not every teacher from either traditional or alternative teacher preparation programs has the tools he or she needs to help students excel in the classroom and to implement systemic reform (Berry, 2004). Studies of beginning teachers demonstrate that many new teachers do not feel adequately prepared to meet the challenges when they first begin teaching (Berry, 2004). Such challenges include the pressures for standards-based teaching required by No Child Left Behind (2002), the demands of Average Yearly Progress (AYP), new and constantly changing technology tools, the multicultural composition of the student population, and having the skills to modify and adapt lessons to meet every student’s needs.

Across the United States, school leaders are beginning to recognize the critical importance of providing sustained and purposeful professional support to teachers as a means of maintaining a strong, stable workforce and improving student outcomes (Berry, 2004; Wechsler, Caspary, Humphrey, & Matsko, 2010). In a review of the literature for teacher support, the terms “mentoring,” “induction” and “professional development” were used in combination and/or interchangeably in reference to providing a range of assistance for teachers entering or already within the field. Many studies give teacher educators an outside view of what mentoring, induction and professional development looks like from the traditional classroom, where the
teacher teaches in the presence of the students (Berry, 2004; Ingersoll & Kralik, 2004; Whisnant et al., 2005; Wechsler et al., 2010).

There is a gap in the knowledge base for how mentoring, induction and professional development are presented in an environment where the teacher teaches virtually. One might think that any highly qualified teacher is already qualified to teach in a virtual setting. According to Davis and Rose (2007), however, this is not true. Virtual courses, whether synchronous or asynchronous, require different pedagogy, communication and pacing to be successful. Teachers need different techniques and strategies to be able to engage students, along with the skills and ability to use new technology and software applications in new ways in a virtual setting. Besides the pedagogical issues, understanding of application uses and technology skills, there also needs to be a paradigm shift in the virtual teacher’s perceptions of instructional time and place, management, and ways of engaging students through communication (Easton, 2003).

The growing number of virtual learning opportunities at the K-12 level in recent years means that states are no longer wondering if virtual learning is occurring, but instead are focused on how it is being implemented. State virtual schools or state-led virtual learning currently exists in 39 states (Watson et al., 2010). The data suggest that by 2019, approximately 50 percent of all high school courses will be delivered virtually (Christensen Horn, & Johnson, 2008), and “given the trajectory of substitution, about 80 percent of courses taken in 2024 will have been taught online in a student-centric way” (Christensen et al., 2008, p. 102). In preparing teachers for this new environment, further research is clearly and urgently needed into how induction/mentoring programs are being provided to produce and sustain highly qualified teachers for learners in a virtual environment. If educational leaders, policy makers, and the public expect teachers to
make the paradigm shift from face-to-face teaching to a virtual environment, teachers need to know how this is to be implemented.

The task of preparing teachers for teaching in a virtual school setting is often fundamentally different from what the teacher has experienced in his or her own learning. Historically, research shows that teachers will initially teach the way they were taught (Britzman, 1991; Lortie, 1975). As educators, we have to realize that our past and present teaching styles and methods are not necessarily incorrect but need to adapt and grow, and that we need to advance our teaching skills with the advancement of technology. Wood (2005) quotes Blomeyer’s observation that “(there is a) persistent opinion that people who have never taught in this medium can jump in and teach a class… A good classroom teacher is not necessarily a good online teacher” (p. 36). In addition, Kearsley and Blomeyer (2003) noted that professional development implemented with the intention of preparing “highly qualified” virtual teachers appears to have a positive effect on online student performance and suggested that educators call for performance-based professional requirements for all virtual teachers.

Statement of Purpose

There is an urgent need to study a teacher induction/mentor program in a virtual setting to generate data-rich results that will help to paint a picture of current practices. Ultimately, this will enable beginning virtual teachers to become highly-qualified teachers, equipped to prepare tomorrow’s learners to survive in the new global economy. This study will provide a descriptive holistic case study of a single new teacher induction/mentor program for current and future teachers at a virtual charter school. This study will use a social-constructivist philosophy for presenting and analyzing data, which will be presented within Vygotsky’s activity theory. The
essence of this case study is to illuminate the virtual school induction/mentoring program components, conditions, and benefits in preparing teachers to instruct in a virtual environment.

**Research Question**

The question that drives this research is, “How does a virtual charter school prepare teachers to instruct in a virtual secondary school setting?”

**Significance of the Study**

In the field of education research, there are those who contend that, although thought provoking, the data and conclusions drawn by positivist research fail to acknowledge key aspects of the achievement process. The interpretivist approach centers on the way in which human beings make sense of their subjective reality and attach meanings to it (Merriam, 1998). As a qualitative research method the phenomenon (new teacher induction/mentoring program) will be mediated through the researcher as instrument. The strategy is inductive, and the outcome is descriptive. Because the interpretivist views the world in this manner, some have suggested that what truly needs to be understood is how teaching and learning are affected by all of the forces, that act upon them (O’Connel Rust & Freidus, 2001).

The significance of this research can be viewed from two perspectives. First, it deepens and furthers emerging studies of teacher induction/mentoring programs. Second, this descriptive research will illustrate the components, conditions and benefits of a teacher induction/mentor program in a virtual setting. Insights generated by this study will help current and future educators understand how and why a new teacher induction/mentoring program is implemented in a virtual setting. Studies have not yet been conducted to explore an existing teacher induction/mentoring program in a virtual setting, so this study represents a significant first step in providing a foundation for future research into preparation for virtual teachers. Since
educators have moved from asking if virtual learning is occurring to how virtual learning is being implemented, studying a new teacher induction program for a virtual setting will provide the foundation for structuring future research and bring about understanding that, in turn, can affect and perhaps even improve educational practice. This study proposes to comprehensively describe the activities, environment, and population of the induction/mentoring program in a virtual setting.

**Limitations of the Study**

The limitation of using a thick description study within a real context is that it inhibits generalization to a broad population. The goal of this single case study is to offer a means of investigating a complex social unit consisting of multiple variables to gain a better understanding of different components of the phenomenon (Yin, 2009). Since case studies do not have variables to manipulate, there is no way to statistically analyze the results. Many scientists regard this type of study as unreliable and unscientific. In addition, since there is only one induction/mentoring program for this school, this research is limited to a single-case design. This means that the observational results are not repeatable, resulting in no replication of the observation and reviewing of the results for comparison with another program within this school.

According to Yin (2009), a protocol is a major way of increasing the reliability of case study research and is intended to guide the researcher in carrying out the data collection for a single case. A case-study protocol is a carefully designed research project that includes the instruments, the procedures and the general rules to be followed in the study. Preparing the protocol before conducting the study forces the researcher to anticipate problems and creates a road map to follow. In this research, a case-study protocol will be followed to help keep the research focused and to increase the reliability of the study.
**Definition of Terms**

**Case:** The case in this study is the teaching and learning that occur within the learning environments of one virtual charter school induction/mentoring program.

**Mentor teacher:** Tends to be connected with the induction program. The purpose of a mentor teacher is to help to guide a new teacher through the complexities of teaching (Wong, 2005a).

**Online learning, e-learning, virtual learning:** Online, or e-learning, refers to all forms of electronically supported learning and teaching.

**Student-centered:** Education that is focused on the needs of students, rather than on those of others involved in the educational process, such as teachers. Teachers may act as facilitators, but the focus remains on the activity of learning, not the activity of teaching (Elias and Merriam, 1995).

**Teacher-centered:** The belief that the responsibility for learning rests fully on the teacher’s creation of well-designed lessons that promote specific knowledge, skills and assessment (Izumi, 2001).

**Teacher induction program:** A program intended to provide a systematic structure of support focused on training and retention for beginning teachers (Wong, 2005a).

**Virtual school or cyber-school:** Terms used to describe an institution, private or public, that teaches courses entirely or primarily through online methods.

**Summary**

Schools are changing, and there is a new need for highly qualified teachers in the virtual setting. The number of virtual learning opportunities at the K-12 level has multiplied exponentially in recent years and will increase with time. Researchers have stated that being a highly qualified teacher in the classroom does not mean the teacher is highly qualified teacher in the virtual setting (Davis & Rose, 2007; Easton, 2003; Kearsley & Blomeryer, 2003).

Britzman (1991) states that teachers will initially teach the way they were taught. Does this matter for the virtual setting? Easton (2003) claims it does and virtual teachers need a
paradigm shift in their perceptions of instructional time and place, management, and ways of engaging students in communication. The task at hand is to find out how a virtual school prepares teachers for teaching in a virtual school setting. To address these needs, a number of schools offer new teachers support through an induction/mentoring program. The purpose of these induction/mentoring programs is to assist teachers moving into the workforce and guide them to become highly qualified. This researcher will observe, describe, and learn how new teachers are inducted/mentored in a virtual school setting. The goal is to obtain a deeper understanding of how this occurs and present a holistic picture of what it looks like.
Chapter 2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The role of a literature review is to inform and guide the research and to provide the researcher with a background by which to interpret data (Yin, 2009). Thus, the literature review is an essential part of the research process both before and during the research. The purpose of this study is to describe the new teacher induction/mentoring program for a virtual charter school. As a result, this review of literature will begin with an overview of the foundational perspectives and educational significance of the induction/mentoring program. Based on social constructivist theory, teachers acquire knowledge and skills through their induction/mentoring program that will assist them in promoting students’ deep understanding and creativity (Wink & Putney, 2002). Using this philosophical approach, induction/mentoring will be presented based on a theoretical foundation of three key components required by the program: the effective elements of induction/mentoring; conditions that help to support and sustain induction/mentoring efforts; and the potential benefits of induction/mentoring programs.

The philosophical, methodological and theoretical foundations will be unearthed by examining the historical roots, the underpinnings, and the research conducted on the key components of the induction/mentoring program. Once each of the components has been fleshed out, the reviewer examines what the research had to say about Vygotsky’s activity theory and how it intersects with the components. The review will be completed with an examination of all the components to help understand and describe how the induction/mentoring program is implemented in a virtual setting.
Professional Support

In the past decade, the advancement of technology and charter school law has allowed the creation of a new learning environment—the virtual school. The uses of technology in education, along with the push for standards-based teaching required by the No Child Left Behind law (2001), are some of the major trends in educational reform. This sounds promising, but how do schools meet these demands when every school day around a thousand teachers leave the profession (Alliance of Excellent Education, 2004)?

One of the main reasons teachers are leaving the profession is job dissatisfaction. Melnick and Meister (2008) found that once beginning teachers enter the classroom, reality often does not match previous expectations. This study was supported by Cookson’s (2005) study, which described the educational profession as a far more complex career than new teachers realize. According to Murshidi et al., (2006), “when beginning teachers enter the teaching force, they often encounter a reality shock as they confront the complexity of the teaching task. The reality of the actual teaching situation sometimes differs so much from what the beginners were expecting” (p. 266). Research has demonstrated, however, that offering comprehensive induction programs with quality mentoring to new teachers can cut turnover rates in half (Alliance of Excellent Education, 2004).

Schools in the United States recognize the critical importance of providing sustained and purposeful professional support to teachers as a means of maintaining a strong, stable workforce and improving measurable outcomes for student learning (Berry, 2004; Johnson Berg, & Donaldson, 2005). Teacher induction/mentoring programs are one way of achieving this, but they vary across and within states (Ingersoll & Kralik, 2004; Johnson et al., 2005; Smith &

Given the variety of induction and mentoring programs across the United States, I reviewed the induction/mentoring program literature with two key questions in mind. First, how does the field define induction/mentoring? Second, what are the key components of a successful program based on purpose, components and evaluation? This research, with a social constructivist conceptual lens, will describe how an induction/mentoring program prepares teachers for teaching in a virtual environment.

There is a growing body of qualitative research studies regarding the rationale, impact, and features of induction and/or mentoring programs, but only a small number of quantitative studies even exist. There are two major factors that make it difficult to make unequivocal statements about teacher induction programs. The first is the wide variability of factors within each induction/mentoring program, from whether participation is voluntary or mandatory to the variety of different components (Fideler & Haselkorn, 1999). Second, researchers report very few teacher induction programs contain rigorous outcomes-based orientation programs that lead to changes in teachers’ practice or show gains in student achievement (Ingersoll & Kralik, 2004; Lopez, Lash, Schaffner, Shields, & Wagner, 2004; Wong, Briton, & Ganser, 2005). Although Smith and Ingersoll (2004) found that comprehensive induction programs reduces teacher attrition, only 1% of beginning teachers currently receive the ongoing support that constitutes a comprehensive induction when they enter the profession (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2004).

Despite these factors, research done in traditional settings has shown that a highly qualified teacher workforce composed of skilled, knowledgeable, culturally astute and
compassionate teachers is the single greatest leverage point for assuring that all students achieve at their highest level (Berry, 2004). Unfortunately, not every teacher has the skills and knowledge they need to help children excel in the classroom. Studies from traditional and alternative teacher preparation programs show that many teachers are not at that quality level (Berry, 2004), which supports the need for schools to provide rigorous supportive induction programs to ensure all teachers attain this level.

In addition to the rapid changes in education, the increasing teacher expectations for the implementation of technology, and standards-based teaching required by No Child Left Behind (2001) today’s schools are evolving. Taking what we do know, which is that the greatest factor in a student’s achievement is a highly qualified teacher (Berry, 2004), and by offering a comprehensive induction program with quality mentoring to reduces teachers’ attrition rates (Smith & Ingersoll, 2004), how are virtual schools preparing their teachers with the added factor of total immersed technology environment?

**Social Constructivist Learning**

In this research, we are looking at how teachers are being prepared to teach in an environment that many have never experienced or even known about in the past. An activity theory serves as the conceptual framework for this study (see Appendix A). Additionally, a social constructivist and descriptive lens guides this research. Based on qualitative inquiry, an instrumental case study research design will be used to describe the induction/mentoring program for teaching in a virtual setting.

The integration of technology in education has revived the constructivist learning theory as a basis for the age of technology integration. Constructivist theories propose that “knowledge” is actively constructed by the individual, and that knowing is an adaptive process that organizes
the individual’s experiential world (Mayer, 1992). One of the main beliefs of constructivist theory is that individuals develop and build understanding from their own personal and subjective experiences. The challenge in the virtual world of education is that many educators have limited experience or knowledge of this new environment. Constructivism is not a new concept; its roots can be traced to the work of John Dewey (1933), Jean Piaget (1972), Jerome Bruner (1990) and Lev Vygotsky (1978). The main principle of constructivism is that a person interprets events, objects and perspectives from his or her experiences, mental structures, and beliefs.

This is in contrast of the behaviorist model of learning. Behaviorist views the mind as an empty vessel, a tabula rasa to be filled or as a mirror reflecting reality. Behaviorism centers on the concept that teachers transmits knowledge and that instruction is being teacher-directed and controlled. Learning is conceived as a process, what the teacher transmits is the same as what the student understands (Jonassen, 1991). Compared to the constructivist approach, individuals construct their own understanding and knowledge of the world through experiencing things and reflecting on those experiences. For example, when we encounter something new, we have to reconcile it with our previous ideas and experiences, maybe changing what we believe, or maybe discarding the new information as irrelevant. Based on this principle, knowledge is constructed and is personal and individualistic.

Constructivism brings about social and communication skills within environments that emphasize collaboration and exchange of ideas. Vygotsky’s theory of social constructivism was first made famous when his book *Mind in Society* (1978) was translated into English. Vygotsky (1978) rejected the assumption made by Piaget that it was possible to separate learning from its social context. His ideas formed the basis for social constructivism, which emphasized the
importance of social interaction and culture in the construction of knowledge and learning. Knowledge and learning are constructed through humans interacting with one another, with the consequence that knowledge is a socially and culturally constructed human product (Wink & Putney, 2002). For example, in an induction/mentoring program, new knowledge would be created through the social interaction of teachers regarding instruction within their school.

Pairing the social constructivist philosophy with the new teacher induction/mentoring program demonstrates how teachers’ knowledge and practices can change by providing them with the opportunity to experiment and build on prior knowledge to acquire new knowledge. The induction/mentoring program provides this environment, in which teachers can critique and analyze each other’s practices, participate in the implementation of new models of work, and reflect on new ways of learning and teaching. Vygotsky, the main architect of social constructivism, claimed that through interaction with, and help from more knowledgeable individuals, one could develop more profound comprehension than possible in one’s individual capacity (Kuutti, 1996).

Definitions and Purpose of Mentor, Induction, and Professional Development

Teachers’ decisions to stay or leave a school are contingent on a variety of factors—ranging from teachers’ personal characteristics to their satisfaction within the environment. For this reason, giving teachers the support necessary to succeed is critical. Three methods of providing teachers’ professional support retaining teachers professionally are induction, mentoring, and professional development. It is critical to emphasize at this time, “mentoring” and “induction” are not the same; (Fulton Yoon, Lee, 2005; Prestine, 2008; Smith & Ingersoll, 2004; Wang, Strong, & Odell, 2005).
An induction program is a comprehensive process for training and supporting new teachers. The purpose is to transition novice teachers into the new profession, into the community of the school, and to support them through a course of structured learning that will lay the foundation of their professional development and learning throughout their careers (Fulton et al., 2005). The objective is to help new teachers improve their teaching management skills, adjust to the culture of the school, and better understand their role, responsibilities, and the expectations set by the organization. Successful induction programs result in up to a two-thirds decrease the attrition rates of first-year teachers (U. S. Department of Education, 2000).

Mentoring is one component of a more comprehensive induction process, which is itself a component of ongoing professional development for both beginning and experienced teachers. Mentoring in many schools is carried out one-on-one, in isolation, with no coherent curriculum, plan, or goal. In contrast, induction programs have clearly articulated goals (Wong, 2005b). Research has shown that mentoring alone is insufficient either to retain new teachers in the profession or to assist them in developing into highly effective teachers (Ingersoll & Smith, 2004; Wong, 2004). Studies describe different variation and purposes in mentoring (e.g., Ingersoll & Smith, 2004; Young, Bullough, Draper, Smith, & Erickson, 2005). A mentor might assist with structural-related supports or psychological and emotional support, or even both, depending on underlying theories or perspectives on learning within the school (Wang & Odell, 2002).

Professional development is the process of offering systematic activities in preparing teachers for their jobs within the school setting (Scheerens, 2010). The activities evolve around fostering educational performance and educational effective for student learning in raise student achievement. The forms of professional development that are typically offered are initial
training and in-service training courses in school. Professional development provides a method for schools to effectively support and foster teachers’ continuous professional development and for addressing societal and educational changes intended to improve education. The bottom line for all three programs is to provide professional development and retain teachers, resulting in raising student achievement.

**Components Identified as Effective**

Public education had its start as a factory-like system of mass education (Johnson et al., 2005). The common teaching methods were lecturing, note taking, question and answer, and set work (Cuban, 1984). In the 1960s the concepts of professionalism and autonomy resulted in increasing individualism, where teachers taught in their classes in isolation, separately from their peers, and success occurred through trial and error. In the 1970s and 1980s individualism and isolation became the culture of teaching (Roseholtz, 1989). Entering the 21st century, the world has changed socially, economically, politically, and culturally. The social geography of schooling has changed along with the teaching profession. The professional teacher now needs to encompass working with parents, becoming assessment literate, keeping up with the changing pedagogy of learning, and working with others for educational reform (Hargreaves & Fullen, 2000). As we move forward in this new age, the question is: will teachers transform and create new partnerships and work openly, or will the profession crumble under multiple pressures and work demands? According to Linda Darling-Hammond, founding director of the National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future, following the 2011 International Summit stated, “that the United States has been pursuing an approach to teaching almost diametrically opposed to that pursued by the highest-achieving nations …[this is] first time that the growing de-
professionalization of teaching in America was recognized as out of step with the strategies pursued by the world’s educational leaders.” (Strauss, 2011).

There needs to be a reconsideration of the aims and processes in initial teacher education and of teacher professional development. Research has shown that teacher quality is crucial to high quality education (Mourshed, 2007). Three additional studies (Sanders & Rivers, 1996; Wright, Horn, & Sanders, 1997) showed a direct relationship between teacher quality and student achievement. This makes teacher preparation and development a critical dimension in improving teacher quality (Darling-Hammond, 2000).

To address the above needs, American teachers need to be taken as seriously as teachers from countries like Finland and Singapore. American can start by focusing on how well teachers develop the whole child and contribute to each other’s efforts and to the whole school. One of those programs for supporting teachers is the induction/mentoring program that allows teacher to work and learn together—engaging in shared planning, training, creating, and observation in each other teaching. The induction/mentoring program has become widespread to help to acclimatize new teachers to the increasing demands and vigorous requirements of teaching. A program with the potential to cut new teacher turnover rate dramatically is a comprehensive induction (Smith & Ingersoll, 2004). A study by Alliance for Excellent Education (2004) showed teachers who participated in a comprehensive induction program had a 9% turnover rate compared to the 20% turnover for teachers who did not have an induction program. Current induction/mentoring programs are set up at the local or state level with the purpose of assisting beginning teachers in their first year or two of teaching. Some induction/mentoring programs are state sponsored and tied to licensure requirements, while individual districts develop others. The overarching goals of induction/mentoring programs should be to improve new teachers’ professional performance
with students and within the school and to increase teacher retention. The dominant component of most induction programs is mentoring, but it is important to note that quality induction programs are not comprised solely of mentoring (Breaux & Wong, 2003).

Students’ success pivots on good teaching. For a school to offer high quality teaching requires the school’s teacher development system to be based on what teachers need to know and be able to do. To do this, a school needs a cohesive, comprehensive system that encompasses the entire teaching continuum, from recruitment through preparation, certification and induction to continual professional development (Darling-Hammond, 2000).

In the literature the key component for a comprehensive induction program, for the 21st century, calls for clearly articulated goals, administrative supervision, long-term objectives, networks that allow structural and nurturing collaboration, demonstration, classes where teachers can observe and be observed, portfolio assessments to assess pedagogical knowledge and skill, and effective coaching (Wong, 2005a). The current studies on teacher induction/mentor literature do not conclusively establish the program components that have the greatest potential to affect the quality and retention of beginning teachers (Lopez et al., 2004). Researchers are starting to identify effective induction/mentoring program components, but more studies are needed (Lopez et al., 2004).

Numerous studies were used in determining the common components, conditions, and impacts that new teacher induction/mentoring programs have on teachers (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2004; Berry, 2004; Darling-Hammond & Baratz-Snowden, 2005; Britton, Raizen, Paine, & Huntley, 2000; Garet, Porter, Desimone, Birman, & Yoon, 2001; Johnson & Birkeland, 2003; Billingsley, Griffin, Smith, Kamman, & Israel, 2009; Curran & Goldrick, 2002; Education Week, 2000; Fletcher & Strong, 2009; Hanushek, Kain, & Rivkin, 2004; Huling & Resta, 2001;
Humphrey, Wechsler, Bosetti, Park, & Tiffany-Morales, 2008; Ingersoll, 2001, 2004; Ingersoll & Kralik, 2004; Ingersoll & Smith, 2004; Ingersoll & Strong, 2011; Johnson et al., 2005; Johnson & Birkeland, 2003; Lopez et al., 2004; Plecki, Elfers, Loeb, Zahir, & Knapp, 2005; Smith & Rowley, 2005; Saphier, Freedman, & Aschheim, 2007; Whisnant et al., 2005; Wong, 2003; Wong, 2004; Wong, Bullough, Draper, Smith, & Erickson, 2005). The articles were selected from a list of articles that included “teacher induction” and were subsequently narrowed to articles published in the last 15 years, resulting in 98 articles. To select the relevant ones, I examined their abstracts or the entire article. Literature selection was based on the following criteria: induction programs that referenced components, conditions, and impact; where the mentoring portion of the program was a sub-component of the induction program; and publication within the past 15 years. In addition, the research articles selected represented a cross-section of the states’ programs, making this valuable information for educators pursuing possible models for induction/mentor programs.

From the above studies, a list of all the induction/mentoring program components was created, along with a description of their functions and structure. Table 2.1 displays the results of the analysis.

Table 2.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Functions and structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orientation program</td>
<td>General orientation to district and/or school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Address school resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Earmarked funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality, structured mentoring</td>
<td>Criteria for selecting mentors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establish time, support, and stipends for mentors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mentor preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Set criteria for pair of mentors and new teachers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two other articles reviewed compared the induction/mentoring program elements in the United States with those in other countries (Britton et al., 2000; Wong et al., 2005). Programs in the other countries shared three common characteristics that were not found in the United States: a high degree of structure, a focus on professional learning, and an emphasis on collaboration.

In all the literature reviewed, teacher mentoring generates the most discussion, description and research. According to Wong (2004), teacher induction is not about mentoring. Mentoring is an action. It is what mentors do. Wong (2004) also states that mentoring needs to be a component of an induction program that is a system-wide, coherent, comprehensive training and support process that continues for two to three years and evolves into a lifelong learning program. Mentoring, in and of itself, has no purpose, goal or agenda for student achievement, but is used to respond to day-to-day crises, providing a safety net for new teachers (Britton et al., 2000).

Mentoring has evolved from addressing only the short-term and often emotional needs of the beginning teacher (Feiman-Nemser, 1996) to a tool to strengthen new teachers’ instructional capacity and to advance reform agendas. Feiman-Nemser (1996) found, after reviewing 20 years of claims about mentoring, that few studies existed that showed the context, content and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common planning time</th>
<th>Collaboration time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working with using assessment data for making decisions and planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on improving lesson design and instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ongoing professional development</th>
<th>Assessment of mentor and new teachers’ needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus on content knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address school changing culture and diversity in learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards-based evaluation</th>
<th>Match state-based standards to practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Documentation of performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
consequences of mentoring. Wang, Strong, and Odell (2002) suggest that a re-conceptualization of teacher mentoring may be required to meet the needs set by the reform agenda for change in schools. This is supported by Ingersoll’s (2004) statement on mentors using poor and/or outdated models while working with new teachers. Also, Darling-Hammond and Baratz-Snowden (2005) make note of the complexity of what teachers are asked to know and demonstrate today in comparison to prior years. Problems can arise when school districts’ mentors are not part of a mentoring or induction program, but simply a veteran teacher assigned by a principal (Wong, 2004).

Mentor teachers tend to be teachers with years of experience, which they tended to acquire through trial and error. Using this model for mentor selection is disconcerting, since today’s teachers are being asked to teach in ways that are substantially different from those that have been experienced before. Expecting a veteran teacher to possess the knowledge and communication skill to articulate a new agenda to new teachers is worrisome (Ingersoll, 2004). Mentors in today’s schools need to be carefully selected and trained to be able to guide, model, assess and give feedback to new teachers to help break down barriers of isolation while sharing knowledge and expertise from an experienced teacher (Bartell, 2004).

**Conditions to Support Induction/Mentoring Programs**

The second area of analysis was to reveal the conditions that were considered essential for the programs. Across these major studies, certain conditions were commonly shared and are listed in Table 2.2.
Table 2.2

Common induction/mentoring conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An induction/mentor program that is multi-year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program supported by administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment between induction/mentor programs with professional standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard-based formative feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network that creates learning communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every colleague as a potentially valuable contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor matches novice teacher by proximity, grade level, and content area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release time for new teachers to work with mentor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate time for induction/mentor member interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly qualified program trainers and mentors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All stakeholders in the school and community are involved in the integration of new teachers in the school culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit goals and purposes of the induction program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New teachers want more than a job: they want to feel a connection, experience success, and contribute to a group (Wong, 2004). This is evident from the fact that the key element noted in all the studies was a supportive school culture. In Toledo, Ohio, the induction/mentoring plan was created through a cooperative union/management focus, which not only resulted in teachers building their individual skills but also contributed to the development of a community of teachers who are learners (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2004). By creating a supportive school culture, all teachers can benefit as they find themselves in collegial, stimulating environments focused on teaching (Bickmore & Bickmore, 2010).

An induction/mentoring program embedded into the school culture creates a supportive environment, allowing all members to learn from each other (Portner, 2005). This element was also noted in Johnson and Birkeland’s (2003) study in Massachusetts that involved 50 teachers;
in their results they called for a “school wide structure that promoted the frequent exchange of
information and ideas among novice and veteran teachers” (p. 608). A study of 1,027 public
schoolteachers by Garet et al. (2001) stated that teachers learn more in teacher networks and
study groups than through mentoring, when there is collective participation and where teacher
learning and development is part of the professional development program.

Griffin, Winn, Otis-Wilborn, and Kilgore (2003) stated that a new teacher induction
program with strong leadership, shared governance, collaboration, and professional growth can
improve school culture and working conditions. With today’s flow of change in schools,
educators need to work smarter, not longer, to meet the increasing demands. One way in meeting
school demands is by diversify teachers’ individual expertise, and apply today’s technology
effectively. By schools diversifying individual teachers’ expertise creating a larger knowledge
base within the school creating a networks of shared and complementary expertise rather than
knowledge being shared in isolation or in a hierarchical structure (Fullan, 2001).

Potential Benefits of Induction/Mentoring Programs

The third area of analysis was to look for positive impact of the new teacher
induction/mentoring. Since induction/mentoring is one of the main policy responses to the
problems of turnover and inadequate preparation among beginning teachers it is imperative to
know the impact. According to several research reviews (Ingersoll & Kralik, 2004; Lopez et al.,
2004), studies completed in the past have not been conclusive or rigorous. The difficulty in
assessing induction/mentoring benefits could be attributed to the varying types of programs
available across the schools and districts.

The most current work addressing this need is Ingersoll (2011), which reviewed
empirical studies that evaluated the effectiveness of induction program. In the conclusion,
Ingersoll (2011) claims the studies reviewed provided the empirical support that induction programs for beginning teachers and teacher-mentoring programs have a positive impact. Beginning teachers who participated in the program demonstrated a higher satisfaction, commitment, or retention in teaching (Ingersoll, 2011). Plus, students of teachers who participated in the induction program displayed higher scores, or gains, on academic achievement test (Ingersoll, 2011).

**Affect Student Achievement**

The best way to produce effective teachers is with a comprehensive induction program (Wong, 2005). Wong’s statement was based on three primary studies, Sander’s (1993), Sanders and Rivers (1996), and Wong’s (2003) studies. Sanders (1993) study looking at student gains if assigned a highly effective teacher. Sander’s (1993) developed a value-added model to measure individual teacher contributions to student learning. By grouping teachers into quintiles according to the size of former students’ achievement gains, he was able to estimate how assignment to teacher of different levels of effectiveness would influence student outcomes. Using this method, Sanders and Rivers (1996) estimated that students assigned to effective teachers three year in a row would increase their mathematics test scores by as much as 50 percentile points than students with comparable beginning mathematics scores but who was assigned to an ineffective teacher three years in a row. Based on Sanders’ results, Wong (2003) implemented a three-year induction program study for new teachers and after three years the new teachers experienced a similar improvement in student achievement.

The same pattern of results was found in the Aaronson, Barrow, and Sanders (2007) study of ninth-grade student mathematics achievement. Aaronson, et al., (2007) estimated that a student one semester with a teacher rated two standard deviations higher in quality could add 0.3
to 0.5 grade point equivalents to a student’s math score performance. Villar & Strong (2007) studied years of teaching experience and student achievement and found that student achievement gains for new teachers in a comprehensive induction program were as high as those of fourth-year teacher who was never enrolled in an induction program.

These studies suggest that teachers are not equally effective at increasing student’s learning gains and that is possible to identify the contributions that individual teachers make to student learning. That said, the identification of highly effective or ineffective teachers is done after the fact by finding out which teachers produced the greatest student learning gains. The above studies do show some consistency in results, but they also share a number of limitations, which are noted by the authors. A true experimental design would require a random assignment of teachers and students among classes and schools, grades and resources, as these factors may all influence the outcome unless controlled. At this time we cannot state there is a direct link between teachers induction/mentoring program and rising student achievement because of all the other factors that may account for student achievement gains.

**Reduction in Teacher Attrition and Cost**

The largest share of the literature regarding the potential impact of new teachers’ participation in an induction/mentor program is focused on rates of attrition. According to the U.S. Department of Education (2007), almost a quarter of entering public-school teachers leave teaching within their first three years of teaching; the brightest novice teachers, based on college entrance exams, were among the most likely to leave, and teachers who did not participate in an induction/mentor program were twice as likely to leave teaching as others.

Lopez et al. (2004), reviewing 12 studies containing empirical evidence of impact, revealed that very few studies contain rigorous research and stated that the findings were not
strong enough to conclude that induction works to improve teacher retention. The authors did state that induction/mentor programs might work, but that the current literature prevents conclusions from being drawn about the impact of beginning teacher induction/mentoring on reducing attrition. Johnson et al. (2005), who conducted a similar review of induction/mentoring literature, drew similar conclusions.

There are some studies that provide empirical support for the claim that assistance for new teachers has a positive impact on teacher retention. In a study where retention data was collected for two groups of teachers involved in a mentoring program, the turnover rate for participants was four percent after four years, compared to nine percent for the average beginning teachers without the benefit of a mentoring program (Ingersoll & Kralik, 2004). In a National Center for Education Statistics (2007) study that looked at new teachers in an induction program over the first three years of teaching, the turnover rate for participants was 15 percent, compared to 26 percent for novice teachers who were not involved in the program (Berry, 2004).

When there is a scarcity of resources in education, Ingersoll and Smith (2003) and Berry (2004) both advocate attention to teacher retention to minimize the drain of money spent on recruitment. Attrition impacts the educational system in two ways. First, the constant preparing of novice teachers who do not become proficient results in money being spent on training that does not result in providing students with proficient teachers. Second, the organization suffers a loss of coherent educational programs, institutional memory and staff cohesion (Johnson et al., 2005).

**Increased Satisfaction and Professional Growth**

The report *Tapping the Potential* (2004) revealed that teachers who participated in a comprehensive induction program developed teaching skills and capacities faster to meet their
peer experience. In a study by Huling and Resta (2001) of 178 mentor teachers, two-thirds responded that they received improved professional competency, reflective practice, professional renewal, collaboration, collegiality, contribution to teacher leadership and pedagogical inquiry.

Many studies show that well-designed teacher induction programs reduce the turnover rates and increase teacher effectiveness during the educator’s early career (Ingersoll, 2001). To do this, an array of assistance is provided to new teachers, including help with policies and procedures, guidance on classroom management, feedback on instructional strategies, a network of resources, data collection, data analysis, and an emergency contact number for help. The goal is to connect new teachers to colleagues in order to reduce the isolation and frustration that are common characteristics of early professional experience (Ingersoll, 2001).

Recent research has changed the focus of the national agenda regarding student outcomes. Higher levels of teacher preparation and certification are associated with higher levels of student achievement (Darling-Hammond, 2005). Several studies document the corresponding negative impact on student achievement in schools and districts with high levels of teacher turnover, uncertified staff, and/or teachers teaching out of subject (Berry, 2004; Plecki et al., 2005). At the present, I did not find any outcome-based studies that directly link levels of participation in teacher induction/mentoring practices with a rising rate of achievement among the students they serve.

**Conclusion**

It is clear that “the quality of our nation’s schools depends on the quality of our nation’s teachers” (Feiman-Nemser, 1996, p. 1013), and differences in teacher capability can account for great variation in student learning (National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future, 1996). Unfortunately, high-quality teachers do not appear ready-made out of college.
Becoming a high-quality teacher is a process that takes time, as well as experience. Schools need to guide novice teachers to be high-quality teachers by successfully navigating changes in their profession, in their use of tools, in learning standards, in diverse cultures, and in meeting expectations that are greater than ever before. Teachers need skills in problem solving, working with standards, working with diversity, communicating with multiple mediums, and finding solutions to engage students in preparing for a new global future.

Teachers need to refine their skills and become systemic change agents and leaders. Feiman-Nemser (1996) states that teachers are the center of school reform. For education reform to occur, we need to address our new teacher induction/mentoring program and professional development that leads to lifelong learning to ensure sustainability for all.

A step in ensuring this is to establish an in-depth, effective induction program that meets the needs of beginning teachers. The theory behind induction holds that teaching is complex work, that pre-employment teacher preparation is rarely sufficient to provide all of the knowledge and skill necessary for successful teaching, and that a significant portion of such knowledge and skill can be acquired only while on the job (see, e.g., Feiman-Nemser, 2001).

There is a need for widespread comprehensive, long-term teacher induction/mentoring programs for new teachers. A number of useful literature reviews on the topic of induction have been published (Wang, Odd, & Schwille, 2008), but there is currently a gap in the knowledge base regarding new, innovative induction/mentoring programs for teaching in a virtual setting.

Induction is both a period of time and a network of relationships and supports, well-defined roles, containing activities and outcomes (National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future, 2005). Induction ought to last up to three years and include elements such as observation of other teachers; common planning time; participation in a network of teachers,
reflection of and on teaching, in which activity and people are connected and there is administrative support and funding; and a rigorous structured program with oversight (Fulton et al., 2005; Wong, 2005a).

According to the literature, only six percent of new teachers receive mentoring monthly, and the support received is often superficial, rather than support to help improve their skills and knowledge of instructional techniques and classroom management (Shields, Humphrey, Wechsler, Riehl, Tiffany-Morales, Woodworth, Young, & Price, 2003). The professional development programs offered in the United States are often sporadic, incoherent, lacking in alignment, and possessing no adequate follow-up procedures. Schools tend to treat professional development as an isolated event and not as a comprehensive, coherent and sustained process (Wang, Coleman, Coley, & Phelps, 2003).

Currently, teacher induction/mentoring continues to be a nebulous concept in the education literature due to its complexity and variety. To further educational reform and to meet today’s needs, we must move beyond the traditional one-to-one mentoring model; otherwise, we will continue to reinforce the industrial-era practice of standalone teaching in isolated classrooms (Fulton et al., 2005). With the continual growth of the virtual learning environment, it is only logical that we have a quality teacher induction/mentoring program for supporting teachers through this transition. I support Fulton et al. (2005) in their call for a new teacher induction/mentor program that is different in scope and design from what currently passes for induction/mentoring in this country. Only then will our schools obtain a stable, highly qualified teaching workforce, a culture in which teachers stay to be successful and are qualified to meet all students’ individual needs.
Induction brings order and vision to a very valuable process. A successful induction program familiarizes each new teacher with the culture of the school that is adapting to society’s changing needs. As educators we need to collaborate, making holistic decisions that will benefit the organization, not work in isolation. Educators need to adapt to the advancement of technology that will open doors to new ways of advancing learning to meet society’s changing needs.

Summary

This chapter has explored the philosophical underpinnings of induction/mentoring as it relates to education. It also offered an overview of an induction/mentor program and the three key elements of the program, along with previous research and a review of Vygotsky’s activity theory for studying activity and how it intersects with the components of the induction/mentoring program. Throughout the review of literature, key issues were brought forward and explained. This process has brought to light the antecedents upon which this research is based. In the following chapter this research and analysis process will be illustrated.
Chapter 3. DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this chapter is to define the purpose of this study, the questions to be answered, and the method for finding the answers. The research design and utilized is broken down into multiple sections. It begins with a detailed explanation and justification for the research techniques selected. That section will be followed by a section on data collection: from whom, when, where, and how data were gathered. The last component will describe the data analysis, covering the interpretation of the data and the limitations of the research techniques selected and the steps taken to minimize these limitations.

Statement of Purpose

There is an urgent need to study teacher induction/mentor programs in a virtual setting to generate data-rich results that will help to paint a picture of a current practice. The publications regarding teachers’ skill needed for systemic change needed in school reform (Feiman-Nemser, 1996) and induction/mentoring program criteria (Fulton et al., 2005; Wong, 2005a) helped to produce an image of details to look for in an induction/mentoring program.

The purpose of this research was to provide a descriptive holistic case study of a single new teacher induction/mentor program within a virtual charter school. The literature on research of innovation programs in education and induction/mentoring programs in virtual schools suggests that more qualitative studies should be conducted in order to better understand what is happening within the particular learning environment. O’Connell, Rust, and Freidus (2001) stated that to truly understand innovative programs, it is imperative to not only ask what is happening, but to observe the happenings. Supporting the social constructivist philosophy for gathering, presenting, and analyzing data, I used Engeström’s (1987) model of human activity.
The essence of this case study was to illuminate the virtual school induction/mentoring program components, conditions, and benefits involved in preparing teachers for teaching in a virtual environment.

**Restatement of the Research Question**

The question that drives this research is, “How does a virtual charter school prepare teachers to instruct in a virtual secondary school setting?”

**Research Methodology**

Taking into consideration the purpose of this study, the unit of analysis, and the result of my literature review, I decided that the best design to employ to conduct the proposed study was a qualitative case study applying a phenomenological inquiry. Phenomenologists agree that a rich, full understanding of human phenomenon requires a deep, probing examination of people’s lived experience (Heidegger, 1972, Husserl, 1973, Van Manen, 1990). Since the purpose of this study was to gain a richer, fuller understanding of VHS induction/mentoring program, applying a phenomenological inquiry of the program from VHS new teachers seemed most appropriate.

A descriptive case study was selected to allow for examining the program’s individuals, topics, and issues. According to Stake (1995) the “first obligation” (p. 4) of a case study is to fully develop and understand the case at hand the foal point of the study. This was accomplished through an inquiry investigation and by presenting a holistic picture of the phenomenon (the induction/mentoring program) for one to develop a better understanding of the program. Answers to the “how” and “why” question was based on theoretical proposition pointing attention to possible links between phenomena—matching information to rival patterns that can be derived from the propositions.
According to Merriam (1998) a case study approach is the best methodology for addressing problems in which understanding is sought in order to improve practice (Merriam, 1998). Since new virtual learning environments are being created it is important to study the induction/mentoring program to answer the “how” and “why” questions are being posed to improve teacher’s transition and performance. However, schools comprise complex cultures (Geertz, 1973), and being in a new culture required me to be open to the multiple and sometimes unnamed forces within a teacher’s culture (Glaser & Strauss, 1967), since the whole of the teacher’s experience is more than the sum of the parts (Rossman & Rallis, 2003).

Lastly, Yin (2009) mentions that case study provides an intensive and complete explanation of a facet to illuminate meaning and communicate understanding. For years, schools have been preparing teachers for teaching, and schools have been inducting new teachers into their work setting. The results of this study may be used by teachers and administrators of induction/mentoring programs to better understand how one virtual school inducts/mentors its teachers for instruction in a virtual setting. Other teachers and administrators may use the results to better understand what is happening for teaching and learning in the virtual environment and adjust their practice as needed.

Question

My research question was: “How and why is an induction/mentoring program implemented in a virtual charter school environment?”

Unit of Analysis

The design and implementation of new teacher induction programs has been studied extensively, resulting in induction programs becoming a major component in states’ licensure programs for teachers (e.g. 22 PA Code, sections 49.82 and 49.83). This single case will help in
presenting the phenomenon of an induction/mentoring program in a virtual setting to get a full understanding of the program (Merriam, 1998). Based on circumstances and rationales outlined by Yin (2009), a single case study allowed me to uncover the distinct characteristics of the induction/mentoring program. Unlike most other research methods, case study design permits data collection and data analysis to be done at the same time (Yin, 2009). Since there is limited research regarding new teacher induction programs in a virtual school setting, this study could contribute significantly to new knowledge and theory building.

According to Yin (2009) the case study approach allows the use of theory development in selecting the case, developing the data collection protocol, and organizing the initial data analysis strategies (Yin, 2009). An initial theoretical perspective about a successful induction/mentoring program must take into account the following: that it occurs over a number of years, where mentoring is a sub-component of induction; that human activity is mediated by artifacts; and the subjects (new teachers) work as part of a community to achieve the object (Wong, 2005).

In this study I used the above theoretical perspective to connect the data with the literature regarding the induction/mentoring program. The findings are generalized in a naturalistic manner, allowing the reader to find their own personal meaning from the data (Stake & Turnbull, 1982) to be used in their own future experiences. The findings of this case study, therefore, cannot be determined by the researcher, but by the individual reader through the change brought to their educational practice.

**The Research**

In June 2011 the dissertation committee approved the prospectus for this research. Documents were submitted to Pennsylvania State University Institutional Review Board (IRB)
and IRB approved the research. In compliance with IRB requirements, I received a school approval form (see Appendix D) and informed consent (see Appendix E) from each participant involved in the induction/mentoring program. To get participants’ consent, a meeting was scheduled and held at the beginning of an induction/mentoring meeting to cover the research study’s goals, objective, and participants’ role in this study. Time was provided for questions and answers, followed by distributing the consent form. All participants’ consent forms were returned in person to the investigator. Each participant gave his or her consent to be part of the study. All data collected was stored at the researcher’s residence in a locked filing cabinet and will be disposed of six years after the completion and publication of the study.

**Setting**

The goal of a case-study method is to provide as accurately as possible the fullest, most complete description of the case. Merriam (1998) defines case study as “an intensive, holistic description and analysis of a single instance, phenomenon or social unit” (p. 27). Defining the bounded context of the phenomenon being studied is an essential element of case study research (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2007; Stake, 1995), and for this particular case the VCS Induction/Mentoring Program covers a two year period and the novice teachers who participate in the program are the defined subjects. To select the case, a criterion sampling strategy was applied. The criteria for selection, according Hammersley and Atkinson (1995), are based on gaining some perspective on chronological time of the culture-sharing group in terms of demographics, and contexts that lead to different or shared behavior. The selection will be based on five criteria: the school’s success in making adequate yearly progress (AYP); use of licensed instructors; the school is a licensed Pennsylvania cyber-charter school; the existence of active two-year teacher induction/mentoring program; and accessibility for the researcher. This study
will focus on the detailed design and process of the school’s induction/mentoring program. The research will take place during the 2011–2012 school year.

The physical structures of traditional school buildings have not changed much since the 1800s. School building designs originating from the single schoolhouse of one classroom developed into cloned colonies of separate classrooms, resulting in teachers instructing in isolation from other teachers. Even in the 1960s, the building of the open-space school structure resulted in limited impact on classrooms, since they were transformed over time into traditional structured facilities with partitions, doors, and intercom systems. Historically teachers have worked in isolation between high walls and behind closed doors. The physical structure of the school building in this study does not look or appear to be a school.

The school in this study is located in Pennsylvania and is a state-chartered public asynchronous virtual school and diploma granting high school. Public school means the school is supported by public funds and provides free education for children in the state (Carr-Chellman & Marsh, 2009). Being a virtual school means that the school is not "brick and mortar" bound; teachers and students are connected through the Internet using computers. Being a charter school means the school is held to the same regulations as all public schools in regard to the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) requirement. Diploma granting means the school has its own recognized educational credential that signifies satisfactory completion of the requirements of a postsecondary education program.

The concept of the VCS was created in 1999 by five intermediate units in Pennsylvania who saw the need for a virtual school to serve their students. They wanted to ensure that the virtual school offered a high quality education. In 2001, four intermediate units and their 64 member school districts founded the VCS. The first two years of the VCS offered courses for
Grades 9-12. In 2003, in order to allow students to remain in the school for the duration of their secondary schooling, middle school grades were added. The governing school board consists of four intermediate executive directories, two school district superintendents from each of the four counties, and one parent.

The leadership structure

VCS is a free public school, open to any student in the state of Pennsylvania. The demographics and statistics for the school, Table 3.1, were taken from documents posted to the Pennsylvania Department of Education web site. The demographics information was pulled from the posted school annual reports.

Table 3.1

VCS Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certified Staff</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>92.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Teachers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Left</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student/ Teacher Ratio</td>
<td>21:1</td>
<td>23:1</td>
<td>20.6:1</td>
<td>20.8:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free/Reduced</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demographics

- **American Indian/Alaskan**
  - Native: 1%
  - Native: .3%
  - Native: .5%
- **Asian/Pacific Islander**
  - 2%
  - 1%
  - .5%
  - .8%
- **Black (Non-Hispanic):**
  - 7%
  - 6%
  - 6.1%
  - 6%
- **Hispanic:**
  - 5%
  - 5%
  - 2.3%
  - Hispanic: 3%
- **White (Non-Hispanic):**
  - 86%
  - 86%
  - 87.8%
  - White (Non-Hispanic): 86.2%
- **Multicultural:**
  - 1%
  - 1%
  - 3%
  - 2.9%
**Population**

Selection of a population sample is dependent on the research problem. My population was a purposive sample of fourteen participants comprised of fourteen new teachers who participated in the new teacher induction/mentoring process and three induction/mentoring teachers. Merriman (1998) states, “Purposive sampling is based on the assumption that the investigator wants to discover, understand, and gain insight and therefore must select a sample from which the most can be learned” (p. 61). The criteria for the population, or participants, in this study were VCS first- and second-year teachers involved with the induction/mentoring program. The induction/mentoring teachers were my resource for information on course content being covered. My unit of analysis, an induction/mentor program for new teachers teaching in a virtual school, was the phenomenon in this study. The primary unit of observation was the actions of the participants in the induction/mentoring program. The population being studied is part of the larger population at VCS. VCS is comprised of 58 staff members (see Table 3.2, provided by the Administrative Secretary for the 2011-2012 school year). There were thirteen participants in this study, five males and eight females (see Table 3.3).

Table 3.2

*VCS Staff Number and Position*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Director- Chief Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Principal High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>School Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Accounting Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Human Resource Generalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Marketing/Recruiting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Business Services Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>social studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>business education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>Math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>Math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>Math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>Math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3

*VCS Participants' Demographics*
The size of the sample within the study was determined by factors relevant to the purpose, participant criterion, availability of participants, and location. Research participants helped the researcher build an understanding of the who, what, and why of the program.

**Research Design**

A research design is considered the logic that links the collected data to the initial question of the study (Yin, 2009). Yin describes a research design “as a logical plan for getting from here to there, where here may be defined as the initial set of questions to be answered, and there is some set of conclusion (answers) about the question” (Yin, 2009, p. 20). Research in this case study was constructed by attending and observing two new teacher induction/mentoring sessions led by the instructors, and holding two one-on-one interviews with a year one and a year two new teacher following their induction/mentoring observation. Prior to my securing data, all participants were given “Consent for Participation” form outlining the purpose of and steps involved in the empirical case study.

I chose a case study method because the research strategies contribute to the knowledge of the induction/mentoring program in the virtual setting phenomenon I focused on. I patterned by case study design on Yin’s comment: “The researcher needs to focus on three conditions of (a) the type of research question posed, (b) the extent of control an investigator has over actual behavioral events, and (c) the degree of focus on contemporary as opposed to historical events” (2009, p. 5). In this case study the methods and analysis occurred simultaneously, allowing me to answer underlying questions in the study and posing more “how” and “why” questions (Yin, 2009). Such questions create links that are operational over time. In this case study the “how” and “why” questions relate to the contemporary event of the induction/mentoring program at VCS. I was curious from the beginning about how the program was designed to prepare teachers
to work with tools and in an environment that they might have never been exposed to. In doing this case study, I examined the various elements associated with a comprehensive induction program and how the South Region Education Board (SRED) Standards for Quality Online Teaching endorsed by International Association for K-12 Online Learning (iNACOL) and Charlotte Danielson’s framework was applied.

This case study is a typical case in capturing the circumstances and conditions of activities of an everyday situation (Yin, 2009). The resulting examination is a “holistic case study design” (Yin, 2009, p. 43) in presenting data related to the induction/mentoring program’s design and expectation of new teachers in their first and second years teaching at the VCS. My interview questions for the teachers were designed to reaffirm that what was captured is accurate with respect to the induction/mentoring program process and activities. In designing the interview questions, my goal was to ensure an accurate perception was being described.

A protocol will be used for this research. A protocol for a case study is a document used to help guide my research study (see Appendix B). The goal is to provide a holistic view of how and why an induction/mentoring program is provided in a virtual school setting. The research instrument was constructed based on the information obtained from review of previous research, theory and literature. The instrument goal is threefold: (1) Participating teachers' background information. (2) Identify the activities, strategies, contexts, and tools involved in the induction/mentor program. (3) To understand the purpose of the activities, strategies, contexts and tools within the induction/mentoring program.

Capturing the circumstances and conditions through triangulation that involves using a variety of methods adds rigor, breadth, and depth to the research (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003). Triangulation helps to increase confidence and build a confirmatory edifice in the interpretation
of the data by using multiple approaches within a single study (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003). Triangulation in this study was accomplished through building an in-depth perspective by accessing data at the state level, first- and second-year teachers, and induction/mentor instructors, using a variety of methods to collect and analyze the data. Denzin and Lincoln (2003) support the use of multiple sources to confirm and secure an in-depth understanding of the phenomenon.

**Data Collection**

The multiple resources and detailed information provided by the artifacts, observation, and participants helped in answering the research question. Principally, data was derived from the use of field notes gathered through direct observation of four one-hour sessions, guided interviews, two one-hour sessions with an instructor, and documentations from lesson plans, announcements, meeting notes, handouts, support material, schedules, and reports sent to the state Department of Education describing the school’s induction/mentoring program (Rossman & Rallis, 2003). All the data sources were transcribed and assembled into database to create tables, charts, and grids to assist with the clustering of concepts. Presenting data in this method allowed the researcher to describe the process and meaning of the phenomenon as the participants experience it, and to elucidate the particular and the specific (Pinnegar & Daynes, 2006).

**Documentation**

The first data for analysis was accessed from the Pennsylvania Department of Education web site. In the state of Pennsylvania, each school district is required to design and implement a state-approved induction/mentoring program to assist new teachers in their school district. Each school is required to submit a detailed description of their program.
Appendix E was used as a reference for gathering data to ensure a holistic picture was collected and analyzed for this study. Each of the questions for this study is located in the left-hand column of the table. The columns line up with each question to denote the source of the data, the method of data collection and the method of analysis.

Typically, analysis of documents can be a rich source of data. In this case, analysis will be completed on the course design submitted to the state, which outlines the goals and objectives of the induction/mentoring program. The second set of documents used are the lesson plans, meeting notes, handouts, resources, schedules, and postings of the induction/mentoring program.

Detailed documentation of the data processing was kept in a database in a codebook format. One of the key elements in qualitative data analysis is the systematic coding of text (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). The Codebook will be broken into parts. The first part of the Codebook will explain the procedures for handling all types of data. In the second part, the coding scheme was listed. The Codebook provides detailed documentation of the data handling and the coding scheme to help future researchers in judging the transferability of the criteria to other user populations. The transferability of the identified criteria was also supported by the fact that the criteria identified in this study were also widely documented in previous research work (Groves & Dale, 2005; Hardman, 2005; Robertson, 2008).

**Interviews**

When conducting an interview, it is important to build a trust relationship, so the interaction between the researcher and participant is genuine and not limited by an outsider’s presence (Roosman & Rallis, 2003). Prior to the interview, I communicated with the participants to enlighten him or her on the purpose behind the study in order to establish a trusting relationship. During the researcher’s interview, it is important to use mindful rapport,
anticipation, positive naivety, active thinking, and easygoing probing, which are all critical in
gathering insight and understanding the data (Roosman & Rallis, 2003; Patton, 2002).

The individuals were random selected from the program participant list were selected for
interviewing following an induction meeting for year one and year two (in table 3.4). Using an
interview-guided-approach the mentors and mentees were each interview independently. Prior to
the interview, the interviewees were sent a cover letter and the case study protocol. The
interview was scheduled according to the interviewee’s timetable and took place at the school
through face-to-face communication. Between September 2011 and December 2011, interviews
were conducted and tape-recorded and transcribed after completion and submitted to the
respective individuals for member checking, which Guba and Lincoln (1985) consider the single
most important provision that can be made to bolster a study’s credibility. During this time
detailed field notes were taken to add support and depth to the actual taped interview. I checked
with interview participants for accuracy and clarification regarding the induction/mentoring
observation. Throughout the interview process, I was looking for concrete descriptions from the
respondent on how the induction/mentoring program process occurred at VCS, using fixed
questions and an open response format in collecting empirical data. Data was gathering using
forms (see Appendix E) during the observation and interview to draw attention to the issues of
immediate concern. The primary purpose of the interview was to check trustworthiness and to
explore the possibility of new avenues of inquiry. In qualitative research the idea of validity is
replaced by trustworthiness (Mishler, 2000) that is defensible (Johnson, 1997, p 282) and
established in the findings (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).
Table 3.4

*Interview Data Gathered*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Interview</th>
<th>Event/Time</th>
<th>Follow-Up Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentor - Year One</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Following a September Induction/Mentoring Meeting</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor - Year Two</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Following a October Induction/Mentoring Meeting</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentee - Year One</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Following a September Induction/Mentoring Meeting</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentee - Year Two</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Following a October Induction/Mentoring Meeting</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Administrator</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>End of August/November</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data gathering techniques include audio-recorded interview-guided-approach with induction/mentoring teachers and informal interviews within the office setting (Rossman & Rallis, 2003), document analysis of lesson plans, schedules, meeting notes, and field notes of observation (Rossman & Rallis, 2003). The data gathering techniques were chosen as techniques used in everyday life (Rossman & Rallis, 2003), for understanding what goes into an induction/mentoring program at VCS.

To gather history and background information an interview-guide-approach was also used with the school program administrator. Open-ended questions regarding the induction and mentoring program were asked allowing for elaboration and responses. The interview in November allowed for follow-up questions regarding my interviews and observation of the program.

*Observations*

My observations were made during induction and mentoring meetings for first-year and second-year teachers. The induction meetings were held bi-weekly for year one and year two
teachers throughout the school year for one hour. Each meeting contained a detailed agenda to guide the sessions. Mentoring meeting occurred at various times throughout the week.

Using observation for data collection enabled me to get a sense of the school culture (Geertz, 1973) and allowed me to “feel” (Rossman & Rallis, 2003, p. 195) what the environment was like in “real time” (Yin, 2009, p. 86). Also, observation allowed better understanding of participants. Geertz (1973) wrote that researchers observe to gain “access to the conceptual world in which our subjects live so that we can in some extent – sense of the term – converse with them” (p. 24). As Geertz suggested, I was able to use observations to further question teachers. For example, when I observed teacher A, I noted that in the spreadsheet that some students’ names were highlighted with different colors. I asked for the rationale, which led to the explanation about how the colors occur with Excel’s conditional formatting feature, for denoting progress levels during the week for the students.

Each meeting had a varied agenda presented in a professional but relaxed environment. In attending the meeting, my goal was to develop a deeper understanding of what, how, and why information was being delivered to the new teachers, and to gain further insight into the overall program structure. During the school year 2011-2012 my role with the induction/mentoring program was completely for research. Prior years at VHS I was lead mentor within the induction/mentoring program (see table 3.5)
For gathering data I used a naturalistic observation approach that allowed me to observe
the participants in the real-world settings. According to Yin (2009) one cannot separate the
context from the phenomenon providing support for conducting all engagement and observation
within the school. The strength of this method is that it allowed me to capture human activity as
it actually happens in the real setting, to view the procedural features of the behaviors to provide
a more graphic description of social life, and to explore areas that might need more attention. It
also allowed for a more interpretive stance for doing the research and gave me an opportunity to
share impressions of the program. The weakness of this method, identified by traditional
experimentalists or positivists, would be that I couldn’t control any outside variables that might
impact participant’s behaviors. During this study there were many outside unpredictable
variables that helped illustrate the complexities of the induction/mentoring program and the
multiple factors that new teachers deal with while enrolled in the VCS induction/mentoring
program.

**Data Phenomena**

Qualitative researcher provided the framework to understand the induction/mentoring
phenomena, the tools interviews, observation, and field notes were applied to strengthen my
study. Yin (2009) stated, “A case study’s focus should be to maximize four conditions related to
design quality: (a) construct validity, (b) internal validity, (c) external validity, and (d)
readability” (p. 19). Construct validity can be tough in case studies because of potential
investigator subjectivity. To remedy this concern I followed Yin’s (2010) recommendation for
strengthening case studies first evidence was gather from multiple sources, a chain of evidence
was establish, and last my draft report was reviewed by one of my key informants.

To confirm the overall validity of the research processes, triangulation was done using
multiple sources of data (Yin, 2009). To address internal and external validity, Campbell’s
(1975) “pattern-matching was used to match several pieces of information and linking them to a
theoretical proposition. I subscribe to the interpretivist view of phenomenology that all human
experiences are by definition interpretive (Heidegger, 1972; Husserl, 1973). Supporting the
process to gain a richer, fuller understanding of the induction/mentor program phenomenon.
Since internal validity is typically concerned with casual cases and external validity used for
generalizable to other cases, because this was a single case study and limited prior research in
neither could be developed or address.

To ensure accuracy and alternative explanation triangulation of data was used.
Establishing research that is viewed as respectable and valued is important part of creating
trustworthiness, which Lincoln & Guba (1985) claims is done through credibility, transferability,
dependability, and conformability. Triangulation allowed for checking consistency and
inconsistencies across all data sources in order to increase understanding and decrease the
potential of bias (Denzin, 1970; Patton, 2002; Thurmon, 2001). Credibility and trustworthiness
was established through inquiry that ensured that the details of the program were accurately
described (Marshall & Rossman, 1989) and triangulation of multiple data collection methods (in
table 3.5) for strengthening findings and conclusion. All interviews were tape-recorded with the
assurance to participants that the transcriptions would involve member checking to allow for the participants’ reflective perspectives.

Table 3.6

Data Gathering Techniques

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Techniques</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document Analysis of School Document</td>
<td>Documents such as writings</td>
<td>Parse out philosophy, look for critiques and acknowledgement of ideas (Geertz, 1973)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Analysis of Induction/Mentoring Plan</td>
<td>Induction/mentoring assignments and plans</td>
<td>Look for alignment and dissonance between instructor’s beliefs and teachers activities (Smith &amp; Ragan, 1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation of teachers within Induction Session</td>
<td>Observed a session for 1 hour. Made a map of the room. Audio-taped.</td>
<td>Researcher - look for alignment and dissonance between instructors’ beliefs and activities, which include session layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation of teacher within Mentoring Session</td>
<td>Observed a mentoring session for 1 hour. Made a map of the arrangement. Audio-taped.</td>
<td>Researcher - look for alignment and dissonance between mentor beliefs and activities, which include mentoring layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation of School</td>
<td>Observation included interaction with other teachers, the demeanor of students, and others.</td>
<td>Establish the culture of the school in which the teachers operates (Geertz, 1973).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Interview</td>
<td>Audio-tape interviews. Interviewed teacher after sessions for approximately 1 hour. Follow-up interview</td>
<td>Gain insights into the experience, struggles, obstacles, etc., of communication. Ascertain goal of session (Van Manen, 1997)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Analysis

Analyzing, interpreting, and theorizing about the phenomenon at each stage of data collection provided me with the conceptual framework to interpret the data with rich, thick
description. Document analysis of school artifacts and induction/mentoring plans provided additional insights into the school culture and for understanding the program.

The data collection and analysis was an ongoing process from the very inception of this study. An interactive approach was used, which the researcher experiences in the collection and analysis of the data, in order to have believable and trustworthy results (Merriman, 1998). An interpretive lens was used in this research, and the model for analysis was inductive. The amount of analysis due to the complexity, depth, and theoretical orientation yields to being inductive and analytical (Merriman, 1998). Data analysis involved transcribing of observations and interviews, followed by member checking of transcriptions and careful coding of all data.

Member checks, according to Lincoln and Guba (1985), are a process whereby research participants play a role in checking or validating the trustworthiness of the researcher’s interpretation.

Field notes that were compiled throughout the study were written up and coded. I developed a coding system based on Charlotte Danielson’s professional teaching standards and Activity Theory elements as the descriptive tool for categorizing the induction/mentoring system activity. This allowed me to consider the entire program activities beyond just one teacher. The activities that were considered were goal-directed actions that are conscious. Triangulation in the data analysis process was accomplished through the varied sources of data collected and analysis that added details to the study.

The purpose of the observations was to describe the nature and function of the activities performed by teachers in the induction/mentoring program. The activities were described in relation to the variables set by the AT framework and professional teaching standards. Presenting a phenomenon using the AT framework allows for activity to be present and viewed
in multiple ways. The researcher believes that this framework helped shed light on the activities of teachers in the induction/mentoring and aided in presenting the factors that helped prepare teachers in this environment.

The AT model, as described by Engeström’s work (1987), was used to explain collective activities and cooperative work, emphasizing the mediating role of the community and that of social structures of the induction/mentoring program for preparing teachers for instructing in a virtual setting. Since education is in the process of transformation from face-to-face teaching to a virtual teaching system, activity is changing and evolving to meet new needs. Understanding how the subjects of this study used instruments, obey rules and conform to divisions of labor to perform in this new setting will shed light on how this program can adapt and transform, consciously and unconsciously, to meet the new requirements of this setting (Mwanza, 2001). The content analysis was reported by describing each component outline in the activity theory model outcome, allowing for interdisciplinary contexts to emerge from this study.

The analysis of activities is theoretically and methodologically rooted in AT. Activity is always directed towards a motive; an activity is divided into a series of actions, which each are directed towards a more specific goals. Individual seldom interact with the object of the activity directly, but the activity is mediated by a number of artifacts. An Eight-Step Model incorporating open-ended questions based on the various components of the activity triangle representation. The Eight-Step Model was a modified version of Mwanza and Engeström’s (2003) model (in table 3.7).
Table 3.7

The Eight-Step-Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The Eight-Step-Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Object or Objective of activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Subject(s) in the activity (Actors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tools mediating the activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Rules and regulations mediating the activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Division of labor mediating the activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Community of the activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Outcome or results of the activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Eight-Step Model was used to produce an activity system of the situation being investigated. While viewing the situation being examined the questions enabled the investigator to acquire basic knowledge about the situation. To enhance the investigation additional questions were created (in table 3.8).
Table 3.8

Additional Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Additional Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Does the (Activity) require the (Subject) to use (Tools) for meeting the (Objective).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Does the (Activity) require the (Subject) to work with (Divisions) for meeting the (Objective).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Does the (Activity) require the (Subject) to learn new rules for meeting the (Objective).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Does the (Activity) require the (Subject) to work within the (Community) for meeting the (Objective).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Does the (Activity) impact the (Community) (Tools) for meeting the (Objective).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Does the (Activity) impact the (Community) (Division) for meeting the (Objective).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Does the (Activity) impact the (Community) (Rules) for meeting the (Objective).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Does the (Activity) have direct impact on the (Community) for meeting the (Subject) Objective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The activity system produced can be very complex because it incorporates the various sub-activities that together make up the main activity system being analyzed. Thus, an Activity Notation (see Figure 3.9) was created to aid the process of breaking down the situation’s activity triangle system into smaller manageable units or sub-activity triangles.

![Activity Notation](image)

**Figure 3.9: Activity Notation**

For clarification and consistency three rules were used to enhance the Activity Notation. The rules stated that each combination within the activity notation consists of: 1.) An Actor represented by the (Subject) or (Community) component of the triangle model. 2.) A Mediator...
represented by the (Tools), (Rules), or (Division of Labor) component of the triangle. 3). The (Object) on which activity is focused.

Each combination within the activity notation represented a completed sub-activity triangle from the main activity system. For example, it is possible to identify in an activity additional sub-activity triangles according as Subject-Rules-Object and Community-Tools-Object. The mediated relationship could be analyzed in terms of Rules and Tools. This was necessary for the purpose of mapping Engeström’s model (Figure 2.4) onto the situation in order to produce an activity system of that situation of the phenomenon. Thus, helping to identify area to be focused on during the investigation.

The Activity needed to be an element or purpose of the study; the activity of interest was the components within the induction/mentoring program for sharing of knowledge. The Object was for the school to prepare new teachers for teaching in a virtual setting. The Subjects was identified as single new teacher working on their own, a group of new teachers working together in a cohort setting. The Community was identified as the virtual school environment.

The Mediators to support the activity of sharing knowledge about work were Tools, Rules, and Division of Labor. We look at mediators since individuals may act directly upon the object of interest, but on most occasions interpose an artifact between themselves and the object or interest (Well, 2002). VCS already had in place several mediators to support the activity of sharing knowledge about work. These mediators included the use of SIS, LMS, web sites, and Learning Communities within FirstClass (Tools). The LMS and LMS were used to track and monitor the progress of individual teachers progress. Online and paper based manuals (Tools) were used as information resources for teachers for review when working with students. The school contains different departments (Division of Labor) for supporting teacher’s needs. The
departments were technology, human resource, special education, guidance, mentors, business, and administration. Depending on the topic and urgency determined the priority for support. A forum (Tool) was used to ask questions as a way of encouraging all staff to sharing experiences for solving questions. This also was a way to keep a pulse on common issues occurring across the system to prevent down time and individual frustration when the cause of the problem is a system issue not end user. VCS was in the process of taking common questions and creating an FAQ area.

VCS also uses a teacher handbook, induction web site (Rules) to provide policies and procedures for teachers. The web site contains information regarding what has been covered, what will be covered, and the information and criteria regarding the individual teacher portfolio required at the end of the programs to demonstrate success. The portfolio is created online so mentors and administrators can view to determine the level of understanding and individual skills.

The last area of coding was Danielson's Framework for Teaching base on the four areas of preparation, environment, instruction and responsibility (in table 3.10). Since, the commonwealth of Pennsylvania adopted Charlotte Danielson’s Framework for Teaching as the overarching bases for evaluating effective instruction. The activity within and during the Induction/Mentoring program was coded based on the impact of the activity.
Table 3.10

*The Danielson’s Framework for Teaching*

| (1) Planning and Preparation | Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy  
|                             | Demonstrating Knowledge of Students  
|                             | Setting Instructional Outcomes  
|                             | Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources  
|                             | Designing Coherent Instruction  
|                             | Designing Student Assessments  
| (2) The Classroom Environment | Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport  
|                             | Establishing a Culture for Learning  
|                             | Managing Classroom Procedures  
|                             | Managing Student Behavior  
|                             | Organizing Physical Space  
| (3) Instruction | Communicating with Students  
|                             | Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques  
|                             | Engaging Students in Learning  
|                             | Using Assessment in Instruction  
|                             | Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness  
| (4) Professional Responsibilities | Reflecting on Teaching  
|                             | Maintaining Accurate Records  
|                             | Communicating with Families  
|                             | Participating in a Professional Community  
|                             | Growing and Developing Professionally  
|                             | Showing Professionalism  

In order to make sense of what has happened within the activity system, the data gathered throughout the Induction/Mentoring program was analyzed and interpreted to present elements of the different activity within the induction and mentoring program at VCS.

**Conformability**

Conformability was established through a conformability audit, which is suggested by Lincoln and Guba (1985), along with the detailed documentation of data handling. Throughout the data analysis phase of the study the consistent question being addressed was: “What are the main concepts, purpose, elements, mediation, and tensions being teased out of the observations, interviews, and program documentation?” Data were compiled on field data sheets to help answer the questions after the complete write-up. The goal of the analysis is to reflect the complexity of human interaction by portraying it in the words of the interviewees and through
actual events, and to make that complexity understandable to others. Data collected from observations, interviews, program documentation, field notes, and member checking were all utilized in the data analysis triangulation process. The transferability of this study will be the rich description and reporting of the research process. This allows future researchers to make transferability judgments based on the detailed description provided.

**Transferability or Naturalistic Generalization**

Lincoln and Guba (1985) point out that it is “not the naturalist’s task to provide an index of transferability, it is his or her responsibility to provide the database that makes transferability judgments possible on the part of potential appliers” (p. 316). Stake (1995) agrees, suggesting that generalization is not the purpose of the case study at all. He prefers the term “particularization.” Since the purpose of the case study is not to compare multiple cases, but to become intimately aware of the inner workings of a particular case, he suggested, “there is an emphasis on uniqueness, and that implies knowledge of others that the case is different from, but the first emphasis is on understanding the case itself” (p. 8). In addition, Stake (2005) proposes that if any generalization is appropriate for qualitative research it is “naturalistic generalization.” The readers form such generalizations as the case is unveiled for them. In this case the readers, teachers and administrators may be able to better understand the virtual environment for teaching and learning in their own environment. Other readers may be trying to understand the appropriateness of the program or the overall scheme of the virtual world movement.

**Researcher Identity**

Lincoln and Guba (1985) suggest that because the researcher is intimately involved in the research, he or she must continually focus on the neutrality of the data. They point out that
hidden biases by the researcher may affect how the data is interpreted. Furthermore, once the bias is known, it may be accounted for in the interpretations (Yin, 2009).

In this research, I came to the study with a number of biases. First, I worked at the virtual school for six years, plus helped instruct and implement components of the induction program during those years. During the six years my role consisted of instructor, P4SL coach, lead instructor for cohort group, mentor, lead mentor, lead instructional designer for over eighty courses, and instructional designer for the LMS. Second, in the last nine years my husband has been the chief executive officer for the school. Even though I have not been working at the school during the last two years, I have visited and interacted with the staff on a regular basis continuing to support the LMS and instructional design. Third, prior to teaching in a virtual setting I have taught in a traditional setting for twenty years. Finally, the researcher’s background in special education and educational technology has revolved around individualization of instruction and technologies used as a constructivist tool.

It is my opinion that the primary function of technology in the classroom is to be used as a tool to aid in instruction, learning, and communication, so as to promote collaboration of concepts and improve achievement with a community of learners. For this reason, I may be apt to notice or ignore non-constructivist activity in the induction/mentoring program.

To ensure I stayed cognizant of my biases, they were first listed here and a detailed account of my personal views of teaching and learning was created, along with an overview of the models. The document was consulted many times throughout the research, as a reminder of my biases and to examine the data for contrary themes to my own view. In addition, an audit trail was used, where the researcher details all of the data collection and interpretation processes, and can check for research biases. According to Richards (2005), “Good qualitative research gets
much of its claim to validity from the researcher’s ability to show convincingly how they got there, and how they built confidence that this was the best account possible” (p. 143). The audit, data, and researcher interpretation of the data were shared with an outside researcher. The purpose of using an outside research was to crosscheck and verify the interpretation of the data. Analysis of data by multiple analysts may increase trustworthiness and reliability (Banik, 1993).

**Limitations**

The goal of thick description within a real context inhibits generalization to a broad population. The research findings do not make such claim: rather, the interpretive nature of the study is one of its strengths alongside its weaknesses. Since this study involved only a single school, two limitations in this case study are the relatively small sample size of seventeen participants and a single school. When I entered the study, I was aware of this factor, but due to the growing virtual education movement, there was a growing need for a descriptive case study offering a deeper understanding of what an induction/mentor program for a virtual school looks like.

Another limitation could be that the short time span of data gathering of six months covering two years may be seen as a threat to the internal validity. Additionally, the findings generated from this case study may not be applicable to other virtual schools within the United States.

**Ethical Considerations**

The Penn State Instructional Review Board (IRB) approved this study, and throughout, I upheld participant and university integrity. Appendix C contains the recruiting information that I presented to the school. The crucial procedures I followed are: All participants signed an informed consent form (see Appendix D). Pseudonyms were used for all participants, including the school. Any data that could identify the participants were removed or modified. When I
interpreted the sessions, each was sent to the participant for review. In e-mail, I encouraged the participant to make any corrections. In conclusion, I have upheld all ethical standards of which I am aware of at this time.

Summary

The design and implementation of new teacher induction programs has been studied extensively, and an induction program is becoming a major criterion in states’ licensure programs for teachers. This single case study will help to describe the current theory’s propositions for new teacher induction programs, or if an alternative set of explanations might be more relevant in a school designed for virtual instruction. Since research into new teacher induction programs in a virtual school setting is limited, this study could contribute significantly to new knowledge and theory building. The single-case study was chosen on the basis of uniqueness and ease of access for collecting data. The study will be conducted at VCS with the purpose of assessing how and why an induction program is implemented in the school. Chapter 4 presents the findings of the study based upon the use of the methods described throughout this chapter.
Chapter 4: The Findings

The methods of data collection used in this descriptive case study yielded an enormous amount of information. The data came from interviews, informal communications, field notes, artifacts, and observations of activities. The data for this study was repeatedly analyzed to develop themes that begin to answer the research question. The data collection and analysis resulted in a holistic understanding of the induction/mentoring program. The purpose of this chapter is to share the data and findings.

The following information will be presented: background of Pennsylvania Department of Education state guidelines connected to certification, VCS teachers’ expectations, induction/mentoring leadership, purpose and goals, context, induction program, mentors, VCS framework and reflection, and summary.

Pennsylvania Department of Education State Guidelines

In 1986, the state of Pennsylvania recognized the need to provide stronger and more effective support for beginning teachers (Hawk & Robards, 1987). To address this issue, a mandate from the State Board of Education and the enactment of legislation mandated that induction programs for beginning teachers be developed and that participation be required (Pennsylvania Code, Title 22, §49.160). The purpose of the induction program is to transform a new teacher into a more confident teacher and to determine if a teacher meets the criteria to move from Level I to Level II certification in the state of Pennsylvania.

Pennsylvania currently has two levels of teacher certification. The Level I certificate is valid for 6 years of service, not calendar years. To move from a Level I to a Level II certification, or “permanent certificate,” a teacher must teach 3 to 6 years, undergo six semi-
annual evaluations of successful teaching (attested to by a school administrator), have earned 24 additional post-baccalaureate credits, completed an induction program, and exhibited satisfactory achievement on a PDE 427 assessment form. In 2004, PDE 427 was required by all Level I teachers moving to Level II. PDE 427 addresses four categories of teaching: planning and preparation, classroom environment, instructional delivery, and professionalism.

**VCS Teachers’ Expectations**

VCS teachers are hired at will and are paid a set salary based on the individual’s experience and degree. Teachers put in a minimum of 40 hours per week. The VCS teacher’s day is filled with attending meetings, contacting students and parents, grading, creating lesson plans for webcasts, holding webcast sessions, continual teacher collaboration, and holding office hours via webcasts. A VCS teacher begins his or her day by logging into FirstClass e-mail, iChat, SIS, Webcast, and LMS before starting to work with students. All of these programs run throughout the day and allow for interaction and collaboration with students and staff. Student interaction is performed through e-mail, phone, course assignment feedback, or a webcast class or learning session.

A webcast class session, in which teachers meet with all the students enrolled in their class, takes place at a set time each week. A webcast learning session or virtual office is maintained and covered by a team of five teachers. The middle school teams were grouped by grade level and by subject content for the high school teams. The number of teachers in the virtual office is based on student need. The virtual office activity is student driven and based on the teacher’s assessment of pedagogical scaffolding regarding students’ points of confusion. The webcast learning session is open from 8:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. Monday through Thursday and until 4:00 p.m. on Fridays.
The teacher’s role in a virtual office is to guide and direct student understanding of course content, help with technology questions, or answer school process questions. The type of activity is based on data analysis conducted by the teacher to determine what scope and sequence of a lesson plan will ensure student success. Webcast class lesson plans are submitted weekly to the principal, along with data analysis presenting students’ weekly progress, analysis of the SIS, content from course sections, a description of areas that are problematic for students, and activities that allow formative assessment. The number of courses taught by a teacher will determine the number of weekly lesson plans submitted. Webcast software is a vital tool used in the school. The webcast system enables socialization, course instruction, and formative assessment of students’ understanding.

Teachers connect by phone with students, parents, or guardians a minimum of every 3 weeks regarding students’ progress. Connecting with students and parents is instrumental for building relationships and empowering students regarding their learning. At VCS, teachers welcome and encourage parents to be an active part of the learning community. This occurs through regular e-mails, posts to websites, and field trips. Teachers are required to post on the course home page weekly announcements for each of their courses. The announcements need to include webcast dates and links and suggest points the students should have achieved by this date to be on track for success in the course. In addition, each teacher maintains a web page about him- or herself. These web pages may include pictures of family, pets, and vacations and lists of favorite books, types of music, and movies. The teacher web page provides another resource for building relationships and creating connections with students. Teachers are able to create web pages with ease with the use of Moodle, an open-source web application. The benefit of using Moodle is ‘What You See IS What You Get’ (WYSIWYG), meaning what you view during the
creation process is very similar to the end result. Another benefit of Moodle is it allows the teacher to be in control of his or her content.

Moodle is the VCS learning management system (LMS), and it contains the teachers’ course content. Teachers are responsible for keeping up-to-date the following: contact information, course links, student work graded within 24 hours, weekly announcements, and any small edits to assignments or content as needed.

The teachers proactively monitor students’ progress using web-based tools within the LMS and reach out to students who are falling behind or struggling with course content. Teachers need to use their professional insight to know when and how to intervene with students’ learning by providing additional instruction, resources, peer tutoring, or other types of support.

Teachers are continually doing data analysis on completed work to ensure students understand the material. Additional resources, such as web links, teacher-created video, teacher audio recording, annotated feedback, or help sessions, are added for areas in which students are struggling with concepts. Help sessions might be one-on-one or a small group session. Finally, data analysis is used in evaluating course lessons, quizzes, and activities to determine future modifications.

**Induction/Mentoring Leadership**

The VCS has a total of four induction/mentoring teachers. Two induction/mentoring teachers work with the first-year group and two-induction/mentoring teachers work with the second-year group. The criteria for this position include the following: the teachers have worked with VCS for more than 3 years; they have earned, met, or exceeded criteria on their evaluations; and they hold a master’s degree. The denoted lead mentor for each group has demonstrated
commitment and competence and shares his or her expertise and training with new teachers. The lead mentors connect with the curriculum director and/or school principal by phone or e-mail on a weekly basis.

Induction/mentoring teachers are responsible for induction/mentoring documentation, mentees’ meetings (see Appendices I and K), mentees’ Act 48 paperwork, and coordinating and implementing induction meetings. Act 48 of 1999 required persons holding Pennsylvania professional educator certification to complete continuing education requirements every five years in order to maintain their certificates as active. First-year induction/mentoring teachers work with new teachers from the first day of employment until the completion of phase one and two of the induction/mentoring program. Teachers move to phase three of the induction/mentoring program in their second year of employment. At both levels, mentors coach new teachers in working with students in the virtual office and virtual classroom and in other teacher functions guided by VCS induction/mentoring program standards (see Appendix G).

**Purpose and Goal**

The VHS induction/mentoring program covers the following areas: (1) supporting all new teachers in the school, (2) increasing retention of promising beginning teachers, (3) promoting the personal and professional well-being of beginning teachers, (4) satisfying requirements related to induction and certification, and (5) preparing teachers to be world-class educators. The five areas above support the school’s Wildly Important Goals (WIGS) of (1) balance growth, (2) customer service, and (3) asynchronous online instructions posted in the VHS staff handbook.

Lead mentors and mentors have similar goals within the program, but their different roles tend to emphasize different purposes. New teachers often spoke about the supportive nature of
the induction/mentoring program. For example, one new teacher emphasized the relationship building as a retention method: “I think the induction group is a great idea—they put you with other new teachers so you don’t feel like the only one.” (Female mentee, personal communication, November 11, 2011). The more “good relationships” one creates in a school, the more one feel a part of the school and the greater chance of teacher retention. Mentors and lead mentors stressed the impact of the program for creating resourceful professional teachers. One lead mentor said, “The goal is make you a world-class teacher. That’s the bottom line. To help you become a better teacher . . . . The more information and experience you have, the better you are at meeting our learners’ needs.” (Female mentor, personal communication, August 18, 2011). This statement is supported by the VHS 100% course-approved tuition reimbursement program and a comment from one administrator: “Creating highly qualified teachers takes time and money and we want them to stay with VHS. We are always telling our teachers how we value them and appreciate their time and effort. It takes a lot of time and money to replace and train new teachers and that is not even addressing the disruption in student learning.” (Male administrator, personal communication, December 16, 2011)

Most new teachers understood the relationship of the induction program to the Pennsylvania Department of Education state licensing requirement. Several third-year teachers reported that VHS supported and guided them through the Pennsylvania Department of Education licensure process to ensure they earned and received their Level II certification.

**Context**

The VHS induction/mentoring program was developed to meet part of the Pennsylvania induction requirements, §49.16, for teachers to obtain their Level II certification and to provide guidance to all new VCS teachers. As one new teacher stated, “I would not have been as
successful without my lifelines,” (Female mentee, personal communication, December 15, 2011) referring to the mentors. Funding for support of new teachers is provided through the VCS budget; mentors are compensated by earning $2,500 per mentee. In addition, their student teaching load consists of 60 to 80 students—compared to the average teacher load of 100 students. The reduced workload allows mentors to schedule meetings with mentees during work hours. Mentees also teach under a reduced workload—an average of 60 students during their first year. The first-year program focuses on the classroom environment and teacher expectations. Concepts covered under classroom environment include rapport between student and teacher, VCS culture, procedures for teachers and student at VCS, documentation of student information and communication, and student expectations at VCS. The items covered under teacher’s expectations are teachers work hours, staff collaboration, webcast guidelines, student and parent communication, field trip events, and state testing. The second-year program focuses on course planning and preparation regarding content and pedagogy, designing instruction, evaluating outcomes, assessments, and instruction regarding engaging students in learning and the importance of providing purposeful and measurable instruction. A school mentor characterized the role of virtual instructors as follows: “As teachers we love our subjects, but students they just want to get in and get out. Students and parents need clear expectations, timely information, easy navigation, easy to read and progress reports and no spam.” (Female mentor, personal communication, September 9, 2011)

VHS parents and students do not want to deal with connection issues or message errors caused by cute transitions or lame media effects that are not relevant. To prevent issues with links caused by external website changes, VCS creates and stores course information within their own LMS to prevent connection issues and bad links. As the VHS induction/mentoring website
states, “VCS teachers are the content and learning experts for providing learners with what is needed in a timely, clear, purposeful, and relevant manner.” (VCS Induction Site, 2011)

Mentees attend induction/mentoring meetings and school training sessions in addition to participating in local professional development training. This information is shared through the school calendar, online conference groups, and professional websites. Most participants agreed that the induction/mentoring program activities were directly connected to professional development. The training activities are relevant to the school’s daily functions, and they apply and encourage the recourses and technology being provided by the Pennsylvania Department of Education; for example, the Standards Aligned System (SAS), Keystone exams, and Classroom Diagnostic Tools (CDT).

**Induction Program**

During the first week of work all new teachers receiving their equipment and access to information systems, such as the student information system, the course content system, an e-mail account, an iChat account, and server storage. Plus, complete the new student orientation course. The orientation course covers VHS cyber student expectation, the student handbook, how to navigate the LMS, instruction and activities on different software applications, how to access third-party website resources, how to track and log student work hours, who their P4SL is and what his or her role is, and care and usage of their computer. New teachers are required to complete this new student orientation class as if they were a student working remotely. This is a critical part of the new teacher training because it provides new teachers with a similar experience as their VHS students during their first week (see Figure 4.4).
In addition to completing the orientation course and receiving their equipment, new teachers also meet their mentors and school staff; tour the school; fill out administrative paperwork; undergo training on the student information system, iChat, and FirstClass.

The second week of work, teachers are provided access to their course content, instruction for working with Moodle, third-party instructional resources, their Plan for Student Learning (P4SL) list and role, instruction for working with the Student Information System (SIS), and access to the new student orientation class. Courses at VCS have been teacher created, meaning the curriculum has been mapped out to the state standards and the lessons, activities, and assessments have been designed and put into the LMS. The teacher of record, one who is teaching the class for that semester, needs to add his or her personal information and
become acquainted with the content and the navigation of the class. Even though the course is set and ready for instruction, teachers are provided with a process to add, enhance, and/or modify the course to make it fit the needs of the currently enrolled students. As one mentor stated, “There is always modification and tweaks needed, because of students’ needs, spelling, grammar, or technical issues. We encourage students to share if any of the course content is confusing, because if they are confused others students might also be confused.” (Female mentor, personal communication, August 22, 2011)

The P4SL model is a critical component of the VCS charter school plan. The plan was initially used as part of a coaching strategy to increase student retention by developing a personal connection with students and their families. The feedback from parents and students has been very positive, resulting in the plan becoming a cornerstone of the school improvement plan. Every student at VCS is assigned to a P4SL cohort group based on the student’s grade level. Each cohort group of students is divided into smaller groups of about 25 students and assigned a specific teacher to be their learning coach. The coaches of a cohort group, based on grade levels, are seated together in the school, as these coaches often deal with similar challenges and can more easily collaborate on effective strategies. Students attending VCS have the same P4SL coach during their years in middle school or high school.

The new teachers’ cohort group, based on subject and grade level, determines their seating arrangement. Seating is a critical component of teacher and student success. At the VCS, close proximity and absence of walls allow teachers to collaborate and learn from each other throughout the day. Exemplary teachers are also strategically placed to provide support to new teachers throughout the day.
The role of the VHS P4SL coach is to advocate for the student, track student activities, provide pertinent school information, and provide encouragement. Students bring their questions, concerns, or problems within the school to their P4SL coach. The P4SL coach works as a student’s personal liaison between home and school to streamline and provide consistent communication. All student communications and interactions at VHS are documented in the student information system (SIS) (see Figure 4.3). The SIS is a database that provides a complete picture of a student’s engagement within the school. During the first week of new teacher orientation, teachers learn how to navigate, export data, enter data, analyze, synthesize, and interpret information contained within the SIS. The SIS provides a place to bring all interactions together and offers a holistic picture of a student’s progress, plus an excellent source for verifying communication between school and home.

Figure 4.3. Student Information System (Document Log 343, January 5, 2012)
During new teachers first 2 years of employment, they attend biweekly induction meetings, staff development meetings, and are actively involved throughout the week with their mentor. The new teacher curriculum covers Charlotte Danielson’s *A Framework for Teaching*, which explains teaching standards needed to be an effective teacher in today’s learning contexts, and the National Standards for Quality Online Courses (iNACOL) outlined in the Induction/Mentoring Program Standards (see Appendix G). The content is divided into three phases; phases one and two are addressed the first year, and phase three the second year. All three phases diffuses into each other, and are continually addressed throughout the two years of new teacher induction/mentoring program. The phases denotes area of focus and instruction. The first phase covers certification, securing materials needed for teaching, access to technology, becoming familiar with the school, state procedures, policies, and requirements to assure that new teachers have the support needed to succeed. The purpose of the second phase is to provide a clear picture of the virtual learning environment as a teacher of record, specifically individual’s roles and responsibilities. The third phase focuses on development of virtual lessons with the use of the Pennsylvania Standards Aligned System and evaluating assessments. Activities during phase three include evaluation and reflection on four recorded class sessions, creation of two virtual lessons created with the use of Pennsylvania’s curriculum framework, and the completion presentation of their portfolio. The observation and reflection are guided by Danielson’s rubric (see Appendices J and L). All teachers are evaluated two times per year—December and May—using the Teacher Evaluation Form (see Appendix M). The form was created by VCS using the same standards outlined and covered within the induction/mentoring program (see Appendix G).
The teaching portfolio is a way for new teachers to demonstrate their teaching credentials to their colleagues and administrators. The teaching portfolio allows teachers to share specific components covered during the new teachers’ induction/mentoring program. To ensure that teachers have an understanding and the acquired skills needed to be successful in the teaching profession, the administration evaluates new teachers based on their teaching portfolio, classroom and virtual office observation, and their student achievement. The portfolio framework is built around Charlotte Danielson’s professional teaching standards and SRED Standards for Quality Online Teaching (see Appendix G). Teachers present their portfolios to the staff and administration at the end of their second year. A new teacher’s presentation and portfolio then provides the basis for determining if additional training is required.

**Mentors**

The mentors at VHS are also responsible for documenting, organizing, and conducting the induction program for new teachers. At the beginning of their employment, new teachers complete a 3-day orientation session, typically in mid-August, prior to the start of the school year. Teachers hired during the school year are also required to complete a 3-day orientation session, but the time frame is modified to accommodate the schedules of the mentor and new teacher. The orientation session covers the VHS teacher’s handbook, student handbook, human resources paperwork, business paperwork, equipment and key applications, the teacher orientation website, and the student orientation course.

The new teacher orientation website is framed around Charlotte Danielson’s professional teaching standards that are divided into 22 components and clustered into four domains of teaching responsibilities and (SRED) Standards for Quality Online Teaching. According to Susan Patrick, president and CEO of iNACOL, “Standards help ensure the quality and
consistency of online learning in K-12” (iNACOL, 2012). The website also provides information and passwords to access third party sites, VCS and links to Pennsylvania Department of Education state forms, teaching tips, completion milestones and meeting dates for the academic year, framework for reflection, checklist, and job aids for supporting teachers in their role. The website is a living site that evolves throughout the year with updates and new content provided by mentors (see Figure 4.5).

Figure 4.5. VHS Induction/Mentoring Website (Document Log 95, September 3, 2011)
Mentors work with new teachers in using technology tools in the electronic environment for gathering information for making teaching decisions. The different technology tools available are face-to-face, webcast, e-mail, iChat, learning communities, SIS, paper, FirstClass Forums, and phone. New teachers use multiple tool throughout their workday to gather information to make instructional decisions. This is possible through the use of technology tools that provide the network, collaboration, and speed. The network provides the means for teachers to connect from anywhere. Collaboration is the application that allows teachers to share and respond to each other information. Speed is critical to insure that student and teacher information is up today and circulating to insure accuracy. The applications provided the medium for creation, elaboration and diffusion of information for decision-making. For example, a teacher seeking additional information regarding a student's progress or the last time someone has connected with this student; the teacher would access the SIS. Another example, is if a teacher needs to post their final grades, but they don't know the date and time this needs to be completed; the teacher could check the FirstClass teacher's learning community or use iChat to ask another teacher who is working online. Technology in a virtual school setting has created new ways in which knowledge is produced and relationship between individuals and systems are constructed within the educational world.

Mentees during their first semester of teaching are scheduled to team teach a course with their mentor. The purpose of co-teaching at VCS is to improve sustainability of teachers' and continue professional development. Plus, a mentor stated, "Many new teachers lacked the training and confidence in using the technology for teaching in a virtual setting. (Female mentor, personal communication, November 13, 2011). Through the use of co-teaching, mentors provided support to new teachers through the use of modeling, shared workload, and one-to-one
help. New teachers did share that so new teachers are able to increase their technology skills and confidence. An example of the important of co-teaching was shared by mentee's, “In my first webcast my mentor saved me…she didn’t just observe, she teamed with me and we did it… I could not have done it without her help… I was so stressed!” (Female mentee, personal communication, November 13, 2011).

Mentors had set times and dates for meeting and documenting content, but mentors also provided mentees support throughout the day and evening. For example, "My mentor was always checking on me and iChat me" (Male mentee, personal communication, November 11, 2011). Besides the use of iChat, support for new teachers at VCS was provided through cohort groups, self-help systems, job aids, staggered mentor's work times, email, webcasts, videos, and super awesome friendship club. Super awesome friendship club was an after school event, attendance not required, to socialized away from work. Throughout my study mentors needed all types of support from personal to skill specific, each one was unique and distinctive depending on the mentee's needs (e.g., teaching, advising, supervising, counseling, friendship). Throughout the induction/mentoring program, mentors guide their instruction and activities according to the data they gather from observations (see Appendix J), new teacher feedback, administrative feedback, and student scores.

**VHS Framework**

Because of their differences from traditional school districts, VHS has experienced a significant amount of change to its program. For the first few years, VHS met their induction/mentoring requirements by contracting with the local intermediate unit. The second induction/mentoring program implemented at VHS created the foundation for the current program. During VHS’s first four years as a virtual school, between 2002-2005, an induction
coordinator was responsible for matching new teachers with individuals teaching in their subject area, holding induction meetings, and completing program paperwork (see Appendix L). The forms for documenting attendance and reflections are still being used at VHS. With an increase in the number of new teachers hired during the school’s fourth year and to create a committee of learners, biweekly induction meetings were started and aligned with the weekly mentoring meetings. New teachers and mentors are still required to complete meeting time logs and individual reflections regarding instruction.

Participants who previously completed the program experienced some problems with their reflections and documenting examples of online instructional standards due to a lack of understanding of the set criteria and the absence of prior new teacher examples. To help with this issue, current mentors’ objective is to insure new teachers see the connection between standards and teaching and by new teachers being able to demonstrate this within their portfolio. One new teacher said, “I think the hardest thing for me was I had the training, and I was doing it, so why did I have to document it? You can train me and I can do it, but until I actually do the documentation and reflection in my portfolio is when I really get it...” (Male mentee, personal communication, November 11, 2011). Another agreed, saying, “I also hated it, but in the end, I am proud of my portfolio.” Another stated, “It makes you step back and look at what you’re doing.” (Male mentee, personal communication, November 11, 2011). Yet another mentor stated:

Doing it the right way means taking it seriously and filling out the questions and actually doing the reflection as you go. I think for the new teachers coming in the door, it’s an awesome program. That’s the feedback I’ve heard because you have to have someone help you get through that first year of school. In addition to that, you are making a
connection in the school where you are being given professional development on a continual basis. The program helps because it is relevant to what is happening throughout the school day. (Female mentee, personal communication, November 11, 2011).

All of the participants commented on the value of the program’s observation and reflection components. One second-year teacher viewed the observations and reflections as a way of forcing teachers to actually sit down with their mentors and go through what they did and saw: “We communicate all day with each other, but not at that level. The mentor brings to light actions and concepts I was not aware I was missing or doing—always followed with encouragement.” (Female mentee, personal communication, October 23, 2011). Some mentors noted that mentoring made them reflect back on the basics of teaching. One mentor remarked, “It makes you begin to question everything you do. You start to think of things from different perspectives; there’s a different in mindset.” (Male mentee, personal communication, October 23, 2011). Finally, an administrative leader commented on the observations: “New teachers learn from watching themselves, it brings them to their own reality and their own plan self-improvement, which is lifelong learning.” (Female administrator, personal communication, December 16, 2011)

Summary

The VHS induction/mentoring program meets Pennsylvania’s Department of Education teacher licensure program that requires all new teachers to complete a state-approved new teacher induction program. This is part one of the requirements for teachers to earn their Level II certification. Each school district induction/mentoring program is locally determined and specified in a plan that is sent to the state department.
The VHS induction/mentoring program is designed to meet VHS school goals and the state and national standards. In reviewing the induction/mentoring program, VHS spends an extensive amount of time defining expectations and covering different methods to assess student learning—formative and summative—in order to evaluate and guide student learning in the new virtual world arena.

Mentors play an important daily role in guiding and supporting new teachers through their first and second years. By the new teachers’ third year, they have developed their own support network. During the first year, mentors and mentees connect frequently on a daily basis to ensure new teachers are able to achieve their job.

The induction/mentoring program at VHS is evolving because of the continuing changes in technology, tools, and procedures. The state and national standards provide the framework for strength and stability for the induction/mentoring program. These standards support new teachers as they transfer their prior knowledge for teaching in the medium of the virtual world.
Chapter 5. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

An orientation or induction program for new employees is not a new concept. The purpose of the program is the problem, employee retention. In education, a student’s success pivots on good teaching. To achieve this, a school needs a cohesive, comprehensive system that encompasses the entire teaching continuum (Darling-Hammond, 2000). VCS induction/mentoring program was organized and accepted and supported by the school. Based on my analysis of the interviews, along with field notes, informal communications, artifacts, and observations resulted in three overlapping themes that characterized the strength of VCS induction/mentoring program. They were: (a) accountability: (b) student centered learning: (c) data driven decisions.

In addition to the themes, this graphic presents a model of what the program looks like put into practice (see Figure 5.1). The program is divided into three PHASES contain seven parts. The VCS Induction/Mentoring process begins with teachers acquiring and learning about the national and state educational standards (Common Core, PA Common Core, Keystones, and National Standards for Quality Online Teaching), access, and technology. The center circle is the instructional process comprising of six parts. The seven parts are continuously being addressed through out the induction/mentoring program. Part two outlines the school's expectation for students and teachers. Part three is the instructional design model for providing content and gathering information. Part four covers the different means for providing instruction, covering tools and process. Part five is instruction, which is performed by the teacher. Part six is the analysis of data and benchmarks of teachers and students for measuring progress and teachers’ evaluation. Part seven is modification, base on analysis. All seven parts are supported through
the use of different tools that support teacher collaboration to ensure students’ and teachers’ success. Teachers’ collaboration is a critical part for creating a school climate that promotes open and trusting relationships among teachers. The VCS induction/mentoring model was created based on the information gathered throughout this study.

Figure 4.3. VCS New Teacher Induction/Mentoring Model

Accountability
When I started my study on the induction/mentoring program at VCS, I expected to describe a unique, comprehensive induction program. According to the information subsequently collected at VCS, I found that the school induction/mentoring program was designed and created based on the guidelines outlined by the state department. For example, in the state of Pennsylvania, it is not an option to not provide an induction/mentoring program for teachers. The Pennsylvania Department of Education requires each school district to design and implement a state-approved induction/mentoring program to assist new teachers in their schools. The state department provides guidelines to help schools in preparing induction plans to meet the state requirements.

Changes in today's education, one might see tight coupling as a form of “new institutionalization” that requires schools to be more accountable for their actions (Heinz-Dieter & Rowan, 2006). For example, the state-mandated guidelines include detailed information regarding the induction of council members, a plan for the approval of an induction coordinator, guidelines for building induction teams and determining member responsibilities, stipulations and a set of criteria for the mentors, the content of the Code of Professional Practice and Conduct for Educators (22 PA. Code 235), the program schedule for at least one school year or longer, procedures for monitoring and evaluating the induction program, and records of the teachers’ participation in and completion of programs. Using the state set guidelines; VCS induction/mentoring program was approved by Pennsylvania Department of Education.

The induction guidelines apply to teachers across the commonwealth. The mission is to provide leadership for improving the quality of education with high standards for preparation, certification, practice, and ethical conduct of all teachers. The state applies governance for
quality assurance across all the schools to address autonomy granted to all institutions and to ensure accountability for the certification of teachers.

Pennsylvania Department of Education have implemented a state wide Pennsylvania Value Added Assessment System (PVAAS), a statistical analysis of students’ formal assessments, including PSSA and standardized assessment. PVAAS provides districts with individual student and aggregated scores that compare actual performance on the Pennsylvania System of School Assessment (PSSA) mathematics and reading tests with what is called the “growth standard,” or how students with an average educational experience would have performed. A second component of PVAAS provides projections about the performance of students on future PSSA tests. Along with the PVAAS implementation, research studies are being conducted to compare value-added measures to other measures of teaching, including classroom observation, and teacher performance to develop an alternative value-added models of teachers’ effectiveness. Both systems are looking for accountability of student growth and teacher accountability within all types of schools.

Since virtual education was largely unheard of even a decade ago, the public has been grappling over the effectiveness and the accountability of public virtual schools. Examples of discord may be found in the New York Times article “Profits and Questions at Online Charter Schools” (Saul, 2011) or the book written by Terry Moe and John Chubb (2009), Liberating Learning. The news article addresses test scores, funding, and high turnover rates of students in for-profit virtual charter school. This raises the concern that do for-profit virtual charter schools focus primary on growth and profits and not on student learning? Anytime you have a government company that is public, it is imperative that there is careful regulation and oversight. As technology improve accountability will also be more effective than it currently is: in part
because technology leads to the collection, analysis, and dissemination of much better information on schools' performance and limiting outside bias and the political effects.

Moe and Chubb (2009), claim that academic excellence will occur through accountability. To establish accountability schools need clear standards that define what students need to know and are tested. Testing provides the means for holding students, teachers, and administrators accountable for outcomes. Virtual schools need to prove their accountability to legitimize their place in American school system. Acceptances of virtual schools has a ways to go this can be seen from the conversations of the new teachers’ when they shared with family and friends that they teach at a virtual school. Some of the comments where, “How does that work”, “Are you really teaching”, “Do you like it”, “Must be nice to work from home”, “I bet you miss the students”, and “Maybe next year you will get in a school” (Mentees, personal communication, October 23, 2011)

To gain school legitimacy, the PVAAS and teacher effectiveness may help virtual schools become accepted social actors and contributors to the public’s greater good. An attempt to gain accountability or legitimacy within society and educational institutions could be seen in VCS mission statement and design of their induction/mentoring program. VCS’s mission statement is to –maximize student achievement of the Pennsylvania Academic Standards while developing high order thinking and complex problem-solving skills. VCS induction/mentoring program embedded national online standards for teaching along with Charlotte Danielson’s, A Framework for Teaching that has been sanctioned by Pennsylvania Department of Education.

By designing the induction/mentoring program around state approved research and national standards promotes communication that bridges the boundary between the teacher and the program. The quality of the program could also be reflected by the turnover rate of four percent
and VCS achieving adequate yearly progress for seven of the last eight years. By virtual school defining their mission statement, values, answering questions about legitimacy and accountability, and with increased transparency will likely help gain staffs, allies, and public support.

VCS induction/mentoring program has had some changes over the past years that led to some confusion and difficulties in the implementation. For example, the first induction/mentoring program at VCS didn’t hold bi-weekly induction meeting, went for one year, nor was it based on SRED Standards for Quality Online Teaching. Current mentors stated that they wished when they started at VCS that they had the support structure that current teachers have today. On the other hand, new teachers involved in the current program complain about the bi-weekly meetings and burdensome work, portfolio and reflection. While talking with third year teachers, who had just completed the current program three months ago, shared that yes the meetings, portfolio, and reflections were burdensome but essential. One suggestion from third year teachers was to hold new teachers accountable to set due dates for portfolio components, indicating that the program has improved, and the portfolio and paper work is not just busy work.

VCS instructors and mentors, take a practical approach to dealing with the difficulties and challenges a new teacher faces. For example, the course covers content, pedagogy, student management, reimbursement, technology, communication, resources for home office setup, licensure, external resources, and much more all accessible from the induction course page in Moodle open to new and old teachers year round. This helps teachers, who are participants in the information society; stay current with changes within their field. The induction course content is designed and presented from the philosophy of teaching learning. Plus, mentors are
also available to take question by chat, forum, text, email, or phone during the evening and weekends. As a mentor stated, “When a teacher needs help they need the help” (Female mentor, personal communication, October 23, 2011).

For many of the first year teachers they found it difficult to find the time and energy for one more thing or the type assistance they needed. The numerous demands of curriculum, accountability to standards, classroom management, committee meeting, and student individual needs are overwhelming, and all seem equally important and time consuming. For support, new teachers connected with mentors, induction content, other new teachers, teacher within their cohort, teacher within their content area, and FirstClass learning communities. Many of the new teachers reflected on the benefit and power of being a part of the learning community. The community provided the opportunity to ask questions and view other teacher’s questions. Some of the new teachers shared that they were able to answer some of the posted questions, giving them a sense of satisfaction and connection with the school. Building on the literature regarding social interaction and constructivist learning environment are indispensable to the transition of new teachers.

**Skills Needed**

The data offered two important finding that may help developing future skills needed by new teachers in a virtual setting. This finding has to do with student centered learning and data analysis. Student-centered learning deals with focusing on the needs of the student, rather than those of others involved in the educational process, such as teachers, administrators, and other students. Yes, other students, since VCS is an asynchronous learning environment students had benchmarks to base progress on compared to due dates. The asynchronous learning environment allows students to have the flexibility to log on to school at any time and download documents or
send messages to teachers or peers. Student in asynchronous environments may spend more time refining their contribution, which tend to be more thoughtful communication (Hrastinski, 2008). The new teachers struggled with building and sustain learning communities with their students. To address this concern, three types of communication were continuously covered within the induction/mentoring program: content-related exchange, planning of tasks exchange, and social support exchange.

First, content communication is related to course content and being able to guide and encourage students to ask question and share information and ideas. The challenge for new teacher is to guide students who are all working at different place within the course content but still create a learning community, which is essential for collaboration and learning (Haythornthwaite & Kazmer, 2004). Second, support for planning tasks were student’s produce a product requiring collaborate with peers or stages to complete assignment. Since all students are working asynchronous teachers needs to teach students how to work and collaborate in a virtual environment, which most have never experience or had exposure of. Finally, developing social supportive environments in a virtual environment that create an atmosphere that fosters companionship, support, and collaboration. Mentors shared ideas, activities, and methods in connect with students to foster social interaction between students. For example,

Paired with student centered learning is data analysis. Teachers in the virtual world need to be able to use the technology tools available to analyze and decipher individual student’s strengths, progress, and gaps in creating the supportive environment for student’s success and achievement. As a mentor stated, “Students need to be held accountable and that requires you the teacher to hold them to it” (Female mentor, personal communication, October 23, 2011). Throughout the induction/mentoring program, different technology tools where demonstrated for
monitoring and guiding student’s progress and achieving standards. For example, database systems, spreadsheets, web base system, and paper. Teachers relied on multiple systems to measure students progress, but based on each teachers skills and confidence with technology determined the system they used to store and document students overall progress.

**Future Research**

Many institutions, organizations, and corporations offer a form of induction for their new staff members. It is particularly relevant for schools to bridge that gap from a new teacher to becoming proficient teachers. For this reason, rather than being left to sink or swim, newly appointed teachers are enrolled in an induction program. Teachers who have a well thought-out induction/mentoring program are more likely to stay with the teaching. However, designing an appropriate, cost-effective, and evolving induction/mentoring program can be a complex task. The length and nature of the induction process depends on the role and the background of the new teacher. An area of future research is needed in how an analysis of student learning is completed in a virtual school setting? VCS has a system and a process within their school, but what are other systems used along with their strengths and weaknesses.

Legitimacy is a core element in dealing with societal acceptance within institutions. Studies of educational reform claims that new schools tend to be created in the image of legitimized educational organization that exists at their founding (Hanson, 2001). There is caution, any new school that strays too far form the establish norm risks the loss of legitimacy and social support that goes with it (Smith & Keith, 1971). As demonstrated earlier, legitimacy was a factor in the creation of the induction/mentoring program. More research is needed to understand what are the other factors that are impacting virtual schools decisions and strategies around educational change?

**Conclusion**

For years society has attempted education reform, but with todays access to technology and with globalization the opportunities have grown. However, with the increasingly diverse society and wide
variety of needs, the expectations of the organization must be understood for acceptance. Concurrently, scrutiny of choice school has increased as schools have been convicted of illegal action within their organization. Therefore, with the increasing growth of school choice society is calling for increased institutional autonomy, guidelines, and governance put in place. Guidelines and governance can be used as a starting point to examine regulation in determining what is autonomy and accountability. Educational reform is still needed, but since public schools use taxpayers’ money, there is a need for greater transparency and public accountability. Pennsylvania’s induction/mentoring program guideline is a starting point to insure accountability for teacher quality, school autonomy, and best practice for teaching in a virtual setting. Plus, future virtual schools creating a new teaching induction/mentoring program may gain some insight from VCS induction/mentoring program.
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Appendixes

Appendix A. Conceptual Framework/Diagram

*Conceptual Framework*

![Conceptual Framework Diagram]

**New Teacher Induction/Mentoring in a Virtual Setting**

**Tools:**
Induction/Mentor Resources, applications, computers, books, electronic devices......

**Subject:**
New Teacher Induction Program

**Object:**
Learning how to teach in a virtual setting.

**Production**

**Consumption**

**Exchange**

**Distribution**

**Rules:**
Teacher handbook, evaluation, daily, materials, expectations of the teacher, and resources

**Community:**
students, parents, teachers, support staff, outside resources, and administration

**Division of Labour:**
Roles & responsibilities of students, parents, teachers, support staff, outside providers, curriculum developers, and administration.

**Outcome**
Highly qualified teacher.
Appendix B. Research Protocol

Setting up the case study:

Significance of the phenomena of interest (Chapter 1)
Research questions (Chapter 1)
Theoretical framework for the case study (Chapter 2)
Design based on the unit of analysis and research purpose (Chapter 3)

Purpose and rationale for case study

I am interested in an induction/mentoring program for preparing new teachers for teaching in a virtual setting. The question that drives this research is how does a virtual charter school prepare teachers to instruct in a virtual secondary school setting?

My hypothesis is that since teachers are a critical factor in student learning, and they now work within a growing virtual world of learning, it is critical to ensure new teachers’ induction/mentoring programs are providing the skills needed to continue impacting student academic gain. I believe this hypothesis to be true because: (1) previous research has indicated teaching face-to-face (Figure 2.4) requires different pedagogy and skills than teaching virtually (Figure 2.5), and with the growing online movement additional support is needed for teachers for this transition; and (2) it is logical to think that if teachers are the one critical factor to ensure student academic gain, then assisting teachers in transitioning to this new virtual environment would be a priority.

Independent and dependent variables

My independent variable is the induction/mentoring program for teaching new teachers skills and knowledge for instructing in a virtual setting contrasted with no induction/mentoring program. The induction/mentoring program is the independent variable because it is the variable that is expected to cause a change in some outcome variable, in this case, teachers’ instruction. In other words, a new teacher’s knowledge and skills are expected to be better or worse depending on whether or not the teacher
attends a induction/mentoring program. New teachers’ knowledge and skills (DV) are expected to change as a result of the effects of the independent variable: rules, community, division of labor, and tools.

**Method: Data collection**

Principal data will be derived from the use of field notes and information gathered from direct observation, focused interviews, and documentation from lesson plans and school induction/mentoring program guidelines sent to the state department. Consent forms will be obtained from new teachers in the induction/mentoring program.

I plan to do two direct observations of new teachers’ induction/mentoring sessions during the first week of induction/mentoring. The session will be videotaped, and field notes (see Appendix E) will be taken. Later that same day the researcher will review field notes and start transcribing the session.

I plan to do one focused interview (see Appendix F) of a new teacher randomly selected for an induction session that was observed. The interview will occur no more than one week following the observation session at the school. The session will be tape-recorded, and field notes (see Appendix E) will be taken. Later that same day the researcher will review field notes and start transcribing the session.

I plan to do one direct observation of a new teacher’s mentoring session. The observation will occur one week following the induction session. The session will be videotaped, and field notes (see Appendix E) will be taken. Later that same day the research will review field notes and start transcribing the session. The teacher selected for observation will be randomly selected from the group.

I plan to do one focused interview (see Appendix F) with the teacher whose mentoring session was observed. The interview will occur no more than one week following the observation session at the school. The session will be tape-recorded, and field notes (see Appendix E) will be taken. Later that same day the researcher will review field notes and start transcribing the session.

The following documents will be gathered for analysis: induction/mentoring lesson plans, and the course guide of the school induction/mentoring plan.

*Conduct the case study:*
Select and define site to be visited

IRB Approval

**Collect data**

Transcribed notes and interviews

Mapping of major concepts

**Analyze case-study evidence**

Describe the full case

Focus the analysis built on themes linked to purpose and unit of analysis

Analyze findings based on the purpose, rationale, and research questions

**Write up the case**

Establishing rigor

Data source triangulation will be used for this study. This involves the researcher looking at data gathered from different contexts, and ensuring the data remains the same (Denzin, 1984). The need for triangulation arises from the ethical need to confirm the validity of the processes. In these case studies, this is done by using multiple sources of data (Yin, 2009).

**Develop conclusions, recommendations, and implications based on the evidence**
Appendix C. School Letter

Induction/Mentoring Program in a Virtual Setting  
Rose Marsh Research Overview

Goal of Research: Understand and gain insight into the induction/mentoring program in preparing teachers for teaching in a virtual setting. (Participants are the teachers and staff members involved in the induction/mentoring program.)

Rationale: The research deepens and furthers the emerging studies done on teacher induction/mentoring programs. Plus, this descriptive research will illustrate the components, the conditions, and the benefits of a teacher induction/mentor program in a virtual setting.

Benefit to the School and Others: Insights generated from this study will help current and future educators to understand the how and why of a new teacher induction/mentoring program in a virtual setting. Current studies have not been conducted to explore teacher induction/mentoring programs existing in a virtual setting. This study makes a significant first step in providing a foundation for building future research in the area of teacher preparation for virtual teachers.

Researcher needs from the school
1. Person(s) that will give permission to have access teachers and staff members involved with the induction/mentoring program during the 2011-2012 school year.
2. 2- Observations of an induction session.
3. 1- teacher willing to do the following:
   a. Engage in a follow up 1-hour interview following induction sessions.
4. 1- teacher willing to do the following:
   a. Observation of a mentoring session.
   b. Engage in a follow up 1-hour interview following mentoring session.
5. Access to school’s induction/mentoring lesson plans.

Issue for discussion – anonymity:
Two equal goals: Maintain integrity of school, and allow others to learn from the experience. Thought: Use pseudonyms for research materials, and prior to publication, study participants read and critique information.

Researcher background: Taught in public school for 18 plus years and in virtual settings 7 plus years; taught at West Chester University, PA and University of Minnesota, MN; currently a student at PSU and Working at Chester County Intermediate Unit, PA.

Contact researcher: Rose M. Marsh; rmm281@psu.edu; 484-881-125
Appendix D. Informed Consent Form for Social Science Research

INFORMED CONSENT FORM FOR SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH
The Pennsylvania State University
Title of Project: Induction/Mentoring Program in a Virtual Setting (IRB# 37802)

Principal Investigator: Rose Mary Marsh,
Department of Learning and Performance Systems
314 Keller Building, Penn State University
University Park, PA 16802-1301
(484) 881-1256; rmm281@psu.edu

Student’s Advisor: Alison Carr-Chellman, Professor
Department of Learning and Performance Systems
314 Keller Building, Penn State University
University Park, PA 16802-1301
(814) 855-0624; aac3@psu.edu

Purpose of this study: Understand how and why an induction/mentoring program prepares teachers for teaching in a virtual setting

Procedures to be followed:

   a. A letter sent to researcher providing a signed statement of permission from the school to perform this research.
   b. Participation in this research will be observed during two induction sessions. The session will be videotaped.
   c. A randomly selected willing teacher from the program will be interviewed for 60 minutes, within three days of induction sessions. The session will be videotaped and interview recorded.
   d. A randomly selected willing teacher from the program will be observed during one mentoring session, within three days of mentoring session. The session will be videotaped and interview recorded.
   e. After all the interviews are conducted, a report will be written. Participant will receive a copy of the report, and participant will be asked for feedback. At that time comments, insights, corrections and modifications will be welcome.
   f. The unedited tapes will be stored in a locked filing cabinet at the home of the principal investigator, Rose Mary Marsh, and will be destroyed in the year 2016. Only Rose Mary Marsh will have access to un-edited video and tape recordings.

Discomforts and Risks: There are no risks in participating in this research beyond those experienced in everyday life. Some of the questions are personal and might cause discomfort.

Benefits: You might gain insight into teaching by participating in this study. Receive a thorough description of the induction/mentoring program so that we can better understand how and why it is done. Hopefully identify meaningful professional development for transitioning teachers.

Statement of Confidentiality: Your identity and the school’s identity will be confidential. Pseudonyms will be used to retain confidentially in research, and if research is published. Direct quotes
will be used. However, if you reference people, institutions, or information that is not recommended for public knowledge, pseudonyms will be used. The following may review and copy records related to this research: The Office of Human Research Protections in the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, and Penn State University’s Social Science Institutional Review Board, and Penn State University’s Office for Research Protections.

**Right to Ask Questions:** You can ask questions about the research. The person in charge will answer your questions. Contact Rose Mary Marsh at (484) 881-1256, rmm281@psu.edu, with any questions. If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, contact Penn State’s Office for Research Protections at (814) 865-1775.

**Compensation:** There is no compensation for participating in this study.

**Voluntary Participation:** You do not have to participate in this research. You can end your participation at any time by telling the person in charge. You do not have to answer any questions you do not want to answer.

You must be 18 years of age or older to consent to participate in this research study. If you consent to participate in this research study and to the terms above, please sign your name and indicate the date below.

You will be given a copy of this consent form to keep for your records. Please place a check mark next to the following statements that apply to audio taping and or videotaping:

- ______ I **give** my permission to be **audio** taped during the interview.
- ______ I **do NOT give** my permission to be **audio** taped during the interview.
- ______ I **give** my permission to be **video** taped during the induction session.
- ______ I **do NOT give** my permission to be **video** taped during the session.
- ______ I **give** my permission to be **video** taped during the mentoring session.
- ______ I **do NOT give** my permission to be **video** taped during the mentoring session.

**Unedited audio will be destroyed 2016**

__________________________________________
Participant Signature Date

**The informed consent procedure has been followed.**

__________________________________________
Investigator Signature Date
Appendix E. Observation Protocol

Date: _____________ Location: _____________ Event: ________________

Drawing of Environment:

Description of Environment:

Date: _____________ Location: _____________ Event: ________________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question/Source(s):</th>
<th>Analysis/AT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who is involved in the planning of learning objectives, methods, and assessment?</td>
<td>Content analysis (Community)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who is responsible for what?</td>
<td>Content analysis (Community)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What activities are teachers expected to learn?</td>
<td>Content analysis (Objective)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the rules within this environment for teachers?</td>
<td>Content analysis (Rules)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the different roles within this environment?</td>
<td>Content analysis (Division of Labor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What tools are available and how are the tools used within the learning environment?</td>
<td>Content analysis (Artifacts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is learning assessed in the program?</td>
<td>Content analysis (Objective)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do teachers know if they successfully meet the objective?</td>
<td>Content analysis (Objective)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F. Teacher Interview Protocol

Initial Information for the participants: Thank you for your willingness to participate in this interview regarding your induction/mentoring program. I am Rose Marsh and this research is being conducted for my dissertation in Instructional Systems at Penn State.

Your answers to these questions are very important to the study and to me. By understanding the program through multiple perspectives, I will be able to develop a full description of how induction/mentoring is done for a virtual school environment. Your confidentiality is assured. Pseudonyms will be used so that location, subject, or individual statements cannot identify participants. All data that I collect will be stored in a password-protected folder on my home computer and/or in a locked file cabinet at my residence.

With your permission I would like to make an audio recording of this interview as well as take notes while you speak. This will help me to collect your thoughts and ideas more accurately.

(Check the recording device and begin interview)

I would like to ask you a few questions regarding your experiences as a teacher in the virtual charter school. If at any time you feel uncomfortable about a question, just let me know and we will move on to the next question. Remember that you may stop the interview at any time.

1. Who is involved in the planning of learning objectives, methods, and assessment? Did the induction/mentoring program have any impact regarding these skills and knowledge?
2. In the course lessons who is responsible for what? Did the induction/mentoring program have any impact regarding these skills and knowledge?
3. What activities are teachers expected to learn? Did the induction/mentoring program have any impact regarding these skills and knowledge?
4. What are the rules within this environment for teachers? Did the induction/mentoring program have any impact regarding these skills and knowledge?
5. What are the different roles within this environment? Did the induction/mentoring program have any impact regarding these skills and knowledge?
6. What tools are available and how are the tools used within the learning environment? Did the induction/mentoring program have any impact regarding these skills and knowledge?
7. How is learning assessed in the program (induction/mentoring program)?
8. How do teachers know if they successfully meet the objectives of the induction/mentoring program?
Appendix G. VCS Induction/Mentoring Program Standards (DI:1A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charlotte Danielson's, A Framework for Teaching &amp; INACOL Online Teaching Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Domain 1: Planning and Preparation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Component 1a: Demonstrating Knowledge</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • Knowledge of content | • Knowledge of Content and Prerequisite Relationships  
("Teacher displays extensive knowledge of subject matter content and necessary prerequisite relationships.") |
| | A0. The teacher meets the professional teaching standards established by a state-licensing agency or the teacher has academic credentials in the field in which he or she is teaching.  
A1. Meets the state’s professional teaching standards or has academic credentials in the field in which he or she is teaching.  
A2. Provides evidence that he or she has credentials in the field of study to be taught.  
A3. Knows the content of the subject to be taught and understands how to teach the content to students.  
A4. Facilitates the construction of knowledge through an understanding of how students learn in specific subject areas.  
A5. Continues to update academic knowledge and skills. |
| • Knowledge of Content and Prerequisite Relationships  
• Knowledge of content-related pedagogy | • Knowledge of Instructional Strategies  
("Teacher plans multiple approaches and a broad range of instructional strategies that are effective and appropriate to the content.")  
• Knowledge of Instructional Strategies  
("Teacher plans multiple approaches and a broad range of instructional strategies that are effective and appropriate to online in their content area.") |
| | B0. The teacher has the prerequisite technology skills to teach online.  
B1. Demonstrates the ability to effectively use word-processing, spreadsheet and presentation software.  
B2. Demonstrates effective use of Internet browsers, e-mail applications and appropriate online etiquette.  
B3. Utilizes synchronous and asynchronous tools (e.g., discussion boards, chat tools, electronic whiteboards) effectively.  
B4. Troubleshoots typical software and hardware problems (i.e. change passwords, download plug-ins, etc).  
B5. Demonstrates growth in technology knowledge and skills in order to stay current with emerging technologies and trends. |
Appendix G. VCS Induction/Mentoring Program Standards (DI:1B)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component 1b: Demonstrating Knowledge</th>
<th>Component 1b: Demonstrating Knowledge of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Knowledge of characteristics of age group</td>
<td>• Knowledge about Students as Learners (&quot;Teacher acquires detailed information about individual students as learners from a variety of sources and in an ongoing manner.&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use of Information about Students as Learners  * Knowledge of students’ varied approaches to learning  * Knowledge of students’ skills and knowledge</td>
<td>• Use of Information about Students as Learners (&quot;Teacher planning shows thorough awareness of information about students as learners.&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C0. The teacher plans, designs and incorporates strategies to encourage active learning, interaction, participation and collaboration in the online environment.  C1. Demonstrates effective strategies and techniques that actively engage students in the learning process (e.g., team problem-solving, in-class writing, analysis, synthesis and evaluation instead of passive lectures).  C3. Builds and maintains a community of learners by creating a relationship of trust, demonstrating effective facilitation skills, establishing consistent and reliable expectations, and supporting and encouraging independence and creativity.  C4. Promotes learning through group interaction.  C5. Leads online instruction groups that are goal-oriented, focused, project-based and inquiry-oriented.  C7. Differentiates instruction based on students’ learning styles and needs and assists students in assimilating information to gain understanding and knowledge.  C8. Demonstrates growth in teaching strategies in order to benefit from current research and practice.  C9. Creates a warm and inviting atmosphere that promotes the development of a sense of community among participants.  C11. Mandates participation by setting limits if participation wanes or if the conversation is headed in the wrong direction.  C12. Provides structure for students but allows for flexibility and negotiation. Uses best practices to promote participation.  C13. Uses best practices to promote participation.  C14. Begins each lesson with a short, student-friendly, summary statement indicating the goal of the lesson and the primary benchmarks that will be covered.  C15. Provides extended resources and activities to increase achievement levels.</td>
<td>C6. Demonstrates knowledge and responds appropriately to the cultural background and learning needs of non-native English speakers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix G. VCS Induction/Mentoring Program Standards (D1:1C-1D)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component 1c: Selecting Instructional Goals</th>
<th>Component 1c: Selecting Instructional Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Value</td>
<td>Value (“Not only are the goals valuable, but teacher can also clearly articulate how goals establish high expectations and relate to curriculum frameworks and standards.”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clarity</td>
<td>D0. The teacher provides online leadership in a manner that promotes student success through regular feedback, prompt response and clear expectations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Suitability for diverse students</td>
<td>D3. Persists, in a consistent and reasonable manner, until students are successful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Balance</td>
<td>D6. Provides an online syllabus that defines the terms of class interaction for both teacher and students, defines clear expectations for both teacher and students, defines the grading criteria, establishes inappropriate behavior criteria for both teacher and students, and explains the course organization to students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D7. Uses student data to inform instruction, guides and monitors students’ management of their time, monitors learner progress with available tools and develops an intervention plan for unsuccessful learners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D8. Provides timely, constructive feedback to students about assignments and questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D9. Gives students clear expectations about teacher response time. demonstrating mastery of the content in other appropriate ways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D13. Communicates high expectations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component 1d: Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources</th>
<th>Component 1d: Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Resources for Teaching</td>
<td>• Resources for Teaching (“Teacher takes steps to utilize district and non-district resources, and actively seeks other materials to enhance instruction.”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Resources for Students</td>
<td>• Resources for Students (“Teacher advocates for connecting to appropriate school or community resources.”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M0. The teacher arranges media and content to help students and teachers transfer knowledge most effectively in the online environment.</td>
<td>M0. The teacher arranges media and content to help students and teachers transfer knowledge most effectively in the online environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1. Demonstrates the ability to modify and add content and assessment, using an online Learning Management System (LMS).</td>
<td>M1. Demonstrates the ability to modify and add content and assessment, using an online Learning Management System (LMS).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2. Incorporates multimedia and visual resources into an online module.</td>
<td>M2. Incorporates multimedia and visual resources into an online module.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3. Demonstrates the ability to effectively use and incorporate subject-specific and developmentally appropriate software in an online learning module.</td>
<td>M3. Demonstrates the ability to effectively use and incorporate subject-specific and developmentally appropriate software in an online learning module.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4. Reviews all materials and Web resources for their alignment with course objectives and state and local standards and for their appropriateness on a continuing basis.</td>
<td>M4. Reviews all materials and Web resources for their alignment with course objectives and state and local standards and for their appropriateness on a continuing basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M5. Creates assignments, projects and assessments that are aligned with students’ different visual, auditory and hands-on ways of learning.</td>
<td>M5. Creates assignments, projects and assessments that are aligned with students’ different visual, auditory and hands-on ways of learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M6. Arranges media and content to help transfer knowledge most effectively in the online environment.</td>
<td>M6. Arranges media and content to help transfer knowledge most effectively in the online environment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix G. VCS Induction/Mentoring Program Standards (D1:1E-1F)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component 1e: Designing Coherent Instruction</th>
<th>Component 1f: Assessing Student Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Learning Activities</td>
<td>Learning Activities and Instructional Groups (&quot;Learning activities and grouping are relevant to students and instructional goals. They progress coherently, producing a unified whole and reflect best practice.&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Instructional Materials and Resources</td>
<td>• Instructional Materials and Resources (&quot;Materials and resources support the instructional goals, and most engage students in meaningful learning. There is evidence of some student participation in selecting or adapting materials when appropriate.&quot;)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • Instructional groups                       | F0. The teacher has experienced online learning from the perspective of a student.  
F1. Has taken an online course and applies experiences as an online student to develop and implement strategies for online teaching.  
F2. Demonstrates the ability to anticipate challenges and problems in the online classroom.  
F3. Demonstrates an understanding of the perspective of the online student through appropriate responsiveness and a supportive attitude toward students. |
| • Lesson and Unit Structure                  | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component 1f: Assessing Student Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Congruence With Instructional Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Criteria and Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use for Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix G. VCS Induction/Mentoring Program Standards (DII:2A-2B)

### Domain II: The Classroom Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component 2a: Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport</th>
<th>Component 2a: Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Teacher Interaction with Students</td>
<td>Teacher interaction with Students (*)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • Student Interaction | "Teacher and students mutually demonstrate genuine, consistent care and respect for each other."

- **E0.** The teacher models, guides and encourages legal, ethical, safe and healthy behavior related to technology use.
- **E1.** Facilitates student investigations of the legal and ethical issues related to technology and society; teaches students that copyright laws are created for a reason.
- **E2.** Establishes standards for student behavior that are designed to ensure academic integrity and appropriate uses of the Internet and written communication.
- **E3.** Identifies the risks of academic dishonesty for students.
- **E4.** Demonstrates an awareness of how the use of technology may impact student testing performance.
- **E5.** Uses course content that complies with intellectual property rights policies and fair use standards.
- **E6.** Provides students with an understanding of the importance of Acceptable Use Policies (AUP).
- **E7.** Demonstrates knowledge of resources and techniques for dealing with issues arising from inappropriate use of electronically accessed data or information.
- **E8.** Informs students of their rights to privacy and the conditions under which their names or online submissions may be shared with others.

### Component 2b: Establishing a Culture for Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component 2b: Establishing a Culture for Learning</th>
<th>Component 2b: Establishing a Culture for Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Importance of the Content</td>
<td>Importance of the Content (*)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • Student Pride in Work | "Teacher demonstrates enthusiasm for the content. Students reflect this attitude by active participation, curiosity, and attention to detail."
| • Expectations for Learning and Achievement | "Students take obvious pride in their work and initiate improvements in it."

- **G0.** The teacher understands and is responsive to students with special needs in the online classroom.
- **G1.** Understands that students have varied talents and skills and uses appropriate strategies designed to include all students.
- **G2.** Provides activities, modified as necessary, that are relevant to the needs of all students.
- **G3.** Adapts and adjusts instruction to create multiple paths to learning objectives.
- **G4.** Encourages collaboration and interaction among all students.
- **G5.** Exhibits the ability to assess student knowledge and instruction in a variety of ways.
- **G6.** Provides student-centered lessons and activities that are based on concepts of active learning and that are connected to real-world applications.
- **G7.** Demonstrates ability to identify students struggling with ELL or literacy issues and delivers specific strategies.
- **G8.** Identifies options to expand student thinking, address styles of learning and avenues for enrichment or intervention.
- **G9.** Knows how to implement a team teaching concept.
## Appendix G. VCS Induction/Mentoring Program Standards (DII:2D-2E)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component 2d: Managing Student Behavior</th>
<th>Component Ze: Managing Student Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Expectations</td>
<td>* Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(&quot;Standards of conduct are clear to all students and appear to have been developed with student participation.&quot;)</td>
<td>(&quot;Standards of conduct are clear to all students and appear to have been developed with student participation.&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Monitoring and Responding to Student Behavior</td>
<td>* Monitoring and Responding to Student Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(&quot;Monitoring by Teacher is subtle and preventative. Students participate in monitoring their)</td>
<td>(&quot;Monitoring by Teacher is subtle and preventative. Students participate in monitoring their)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H0. The teacher demonstrates competencies in creating and implementing assessments in online learning environments in ways that assure validity and reliability of instruments and procedures.</td>
<td>H0. The teacher demonstrates competencies in creating and implementing assessments in online learning environments in ways that assure validity and reliability of instruments and procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1. Creates or selects fair, adequate and appropriate assessment instruments to measure online learning that reflect sufficient content validity (i.e., that adequately cover the content they are designed to measure), reliability and consistency over time.</td>
<td>H1. Creates or selects fair, adequate and appropriate assessment instruments to measure online learning that reflect sufficient content validity (i.e., that adequately cover the content they are designed to measure), reliability and consistency over time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2. Implements online assessment measures and materials in ways that ensure instrument validity and reliability.</td>
<td>H2. Implements online assessment measures and materials in ways that ensure instrument validity and reliability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C0. The teacher plans, designs and incorporates strategies to encourage active learning, interaction, participation and collaboration in the online environment.</td>
<td>C0. The teacher plans, designs and incorporates strategies to encourage active learning, interaction, participation and collaboration in the online environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1. Demonstrates effective strategies and techniques that actively engage students in the learning process</td>
<td>C1. Demonstrates effective strategies and techniques that actively engage students in the learning process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2. Facilitates and monitors appropriate interaction among students (e.g., team problem-solving, in-class writing, analysis, synthesis / evaluation instead of passive lectures).</td>
<td>C2. Facilitates and monitors appropriate interaction among students (e.g., team problem-solving, in-class writing, analysis, synthesis / evaluation instead of passive lectures).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C11. Mandates participation by setting limits if participation wanes or if the conversation is headed in the wrong direction.</td>
<td>C11. Mandates participation by setting limits if participation wanes or if the conversation is headed in the wrong direction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component Ze: Organizing Physical Space</th>
<th>Component Ze: Organizing Physical Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Safety and arrangement of Classroom</td>
<td>* Safety and Arrangement of Furniture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Accessibility to learning and use of physical resources</td>
<td>(&quot;The classroom is safe, the furniture arrangement is a resource for learning, and students have the opportunity to adjust the furniture to advance their own purposes in learning.&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Accessibility to Learning and Use of Physical Resources</td>
<td>(&quot;Both teacher and students use physical resources to make learning accessible to all&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E0. The teacher models, guides and encourages legal, ethical, safe and healthy behavior related to technology use.</td>
<td>E0. The teacher models, guides and encourages legal, ethical, safe and healthy behavior related to technology use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1. Facilitates student investigations of the legal and ethical issues related to technology and society; teaches students that copyright laws are created for a reason.</td>
<td>E1. Facilitates student investigations of the legal and ethical issues related to technology and society; teaches students that copyright laws are created for a reason.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2. Establishes standards for student behavior that are designed to ensure academic integrity and appropriate uses of the Internet and written communication.</td>
<td>E2. Establishes standards for student behavior that are designed to ensure academic integrity and appropriate uses of the Internet and written communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3. Identifies the risks of academic dishonesty for students.</td>
<td>E3. Identifies the risks of academic dishonesty for students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4. Demonstrates an awareness of how the use of technology may impact student testing performance.</td>
<td>E4. Demonstrates an awareness of how the use of technology may impact student testing performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5. Uses course content that complies with intellectual property rights policies and fair use standards.</td>
<td>E5. Uses course content that complies with intellectual property rights policies and fair use standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6. Provides students with an understanding of the importance of Acceptable Use Policies (AUP).</td>
<td>E6. Provides students with an understanding of the importance of Acceptable Use Policies (AUP).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E7. Demonstrates knowledge of resources and techniques for dealing with issues arising from inappropriate use of electronically accessed data or information.</td>
<td>E7. Demonstrates knowledge of resources and techniques for dealing with issues arising from inappropriate use of electronically accessed data or information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E8. Informs students of their rights to privacy and the conditions under which their names or online submissions may be shared with others.</td>
<td>E8. Informs students of their rights to privacy and the conditions under which their names or online submissions may be shared with others.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix G. VCS Induction/Mentoring Program Standards (DIII:3A-3B)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain III: Instruction</th>
<th>Component 3a: Communicating Clearly/Accurately</th>
<th>Component 3b: Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Directions and procedures | • Directions and Procedures  
("Teacher directions and procedures are clear to students and anticipate possible student misunderstanding.") | • Quality of Questions  
("Teacher’s questions are of uniformly high quality, with adequate time for students to respond. Students formulate questions as a result of the learning activities.") |
| • Oral and Written Language | • Oral and Written Language  
("Teacher’s spoken and written language is correct and expressive, with well-chosen vocabulary that enriches the lesson.") | • Discussion Techniques  
("Students assume appropriate responsibility for the success of the discussion, initiating topics and making unprompted contributions.") |
| | K.0. The teacher demonstrates frequent and effective strategies that enable both teacher and students to complete self- and pre-assessments.  
K.1. Employs ways to assess student readiness for course content and method of delivery.  
K.2. Employs ways for students to effectively evaluate and assess their own readiness for course content and method of delivery.  
K.3. Understands and understands that student success (e.g., grade, level of participation, mastery of content, completion percentage) is an important measure of teaching and course success.  
K.5. Empowers students to independently define short- and long-term learning goals and monitors their personal progress. | • Student Participation  
("Students engage one another in discussion.") |
| | D.0. The teacher provides online leadership in a manner that promotes student success through regular feedback, prompt response and clear expectations.  
D.1. Models effective communication skills and maintains records of applicable communications with students  
D.2. Encourages interaction and cooperation among students, encourages active learning, provides prompt feedback, communicates high expectations, and respects diverse talents and learning styles.  
D.3. Persistently and in a consistent and reasonable manner, until students are successful.  
D.5. Provides an online syllabus that defines objectives, concepts and learning outcomes in a clearly written, concise format.  
D.10. Contacts students who are not participating.  
D.11. Recognizes that student interaction with the lesson has instructional value and therefore encourages students to participate in leading the instruction and/or demonstrating mastery of the content in other appropriate ways. |
Appendix G. VCS Induction/Mentoring Program Standards (DIII:3C)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component 3c: Engaging Students in Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Representation of Content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(“Presentation of content is appropriate and links well with students’ knowledge and experience. Some students contribute to presentation of content.”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Activities and Assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(“Students are cognitively engaged in the activities and assignments in their exploration of content. Students have the opportunity to influence the structure and tasks of the groups and to initiate the choice, adaptation, or creation of materials to enhance their own purposes.”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Grouping of Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(“Instructional groups are productive and fully appropriate to the instructional goals of a lesson. Some students influence instructional groups to advance the group’s understanding.”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Structure and Pacing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(“The lesson’s structure is highly coherent, allowing for reflection and closure as appropriate. Pacing of the lesson is effective.”)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. The teacher demonstrates competencies in using data and findings from assessments and other data sources to modify instructional methods and content and to guide student learning.

11. Assesses each student’s background and content knowledge and uses these data to plan instruction.

12. Reviews student responses to test items to identify issues related to test validity or instructional effectiveness.

13. Uses observational data (e.g., tracking data in electronic courses, Web logs, e-mail) to monitor course progress and effectiveness.

14. Creates opportunities for self-reflection or assessment of teaching effectiveness within the online environment (e.g., classroom assessment techniques, teacher evaluations, teacher peer reviews).

15. Addresses multiple intelligences and levels of ability through a variety of alternative interventions such as adjusting lessons based upon re-teaching and using varied assessment strategies.

16. Provides evidence of effective learning strategies that worked for the individual student and details specific changes in future instruction based upon assessment results and research study (data-driven and research-based).

17. Evaluates instructional strategies to determine their accuracy and usefulness for presenting specific ideas and concepts.
Appendix G. VCS Induction/Mentoring Program Standards (DIII:3D-3E)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component 3d: Providing Feedback to Students</th>
<th>Component 3d: Providing Feedback to Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Quality: Accurate, Substantive, Constructive, and Specific</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Timeliness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Quality: Accurate, Substantive, Constructive and Specific</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Timeliness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J7. Evaluates instructional strategies to determine their accuracy and usefulness for presenting specific ideas and concepts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1. Models effective communication skills and maintains records of applicable communications with students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2. Provides timely, constructive feedback to students about assignments and questions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4. Communicates high expectations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component 3e: Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness</th>
<th>Component 3e: Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Lesson Adjustment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Response to Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Persistence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lesson Adjustment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Response to Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Persistence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3. Demonstrates an understanding of the perspective of the online student through appropriate responsiveness and a supportive attitude toward students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G. VCS Induction/Mentoring Program Standards (IV: 4A-4C)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV: Professional Responsibilities</th>
<th>Component 4a: Reflecting on Teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Accuracy</td>
<td>• Accuracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use in Future Teaching</td>
<td>• &quot;Teacher makes a thoughtful and accurate assessment of a lesson’s effectiveness and the extent to which it achieved its goals, citing many specific examples from the lesson and weighing their relative strength.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Use in Future Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• &quot;The teacher may offer specific alternative actions, complete with rationale about why he or she believes it will be successful.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

J6. Provides evidence of effective learning strategies that worked for the individual student and details specific changes in future instruction based upon assessment results and research study (data-driven and research-based).  
J7. Evaluates instructional strategies to determine their accuracy and usefulness for presenting specific ideas and concepts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV: Professional Responsibilities</th>
<th>Component 4b: Maintaining Accurate Records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Student Completion of Assignments</td>
<td>• Student Completion of Assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Student Progress in Learning</td>
<td>• &quot;Teacher’s system for maintaining information on student completion of assignments is fully documented. All students have the opportunity to monitor their progress.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Non-instructional records</td>
<td>• Student Progress in Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• &quot;Teacher’s system for maintaining information on student progress in learning is effective. Students have the opportunity to contribute information and interpret individual progress.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D7. Uses student data to inform instruction, guides and monitors students’ management of their time, monitors learner progress with available tools and develops an intervention plan for unsuccessful learners  
D10. Contacts students who are not participating  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV: Professional Responsibilities</th>
<th>Component 4c: Communicating with Families</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Information about the instructional program</td>
<td>• Instructional Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Information about individual students</td>
<td>• &quot;Teacher has organized a successful pattern communication process that involves students, displays sensitivity for families, and involves families in the instructional activities.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Engagement of families in the instructional program</td>
<td>• Individual Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• &quot;Teacher provides information to parents on a regular basis on both positive and negative aspects of student progress. Response to parent concerns is handled in a professional and sensitive matter.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D8. Provides timely, constructive feedback to students about assignments and questions  
D6. Provides an online syllabus that defines the terms of class interaction for both teacher and students, defines clear expectations for both teacher and students, defines the grading criteria, establishes inappropriate behavior criteria for both teacher and students, and explains the course organization to students.
## Appendix G. VCS Induction/Mentoring Program Standards (IV:4D-4F)

### Component 4d: Contributing to the School/District

- Relationships with Colleagues
  - Support and cooperation characterize productive relationships with colleagues. Teacher takes an active role in collabrowal work and consensus building with colleagues.
- Service to the School and/or District Projects
  - L0. The teacher collaborates with colleagues.
  - L1. Networks with others involved in online education.
  - L2. Leads collaborative efforts to create common assessments among grade-level and/or content-area teachers and share assessment results with colleagues to collaboratively plan instruction that will best meet individual student needs.

### Component 4e: Growing and Developing Professionally

- Enhancement of Content Knowledge and Pedagogical Skill
  - "Teacher seeks out opportunities for professional development and makes a systematic attempt to conduct action research in his or her classroom."
- Service to the Profession
  - "Teacher initiates important activities to contribute to the profession."

- K0. The teacher demonstrates frequent and effective strategies that enable both teacher and students to complete self- and pre-assessments.
- K1. Employs ways to assess student readiness for course content and method of delivery.
- K2. Employs ways for students to effectively evaluate and assess their own readiness for course content and method of delivery.
- K3. Understands student success (e.g., grade, level of participation, mastery of content, completion percentage) as an important measure of teaching and course success.
- K4. Provides opportunities for student self-assessment within courses.
- K5. Empowers students to independently define short- and long-term learning goals and monitors their personal progress.

### Component 4f: Showing Professionalism

- Advocacy and Service to Students
  - "Teacher makes a pronouncement to challenge negative attitudes and helps ensure that all students are honored in the school."
- Decision Making
  - "Teacher promotes values-based decision-making within the school community."

- M0. The teacher arranges media and content to help students and teachers transfer knowledge most effectively in the online environment.
- M1. Demonstrates the ability to modify and add content and assessment, using an online Learning Management System (LMS).
- M2. Incorporates multimedia and visual resources into an online module.
- M3. Demonstrates the ability to effectively use and incorporate subject-specific and developmentally appropriate software in an online learning module.
- M4. Reviews all materials and Web resources for their alignment with course objectives and state and local standards and for their appropriateness on a continuing basis.
- M5. Creates assignments, projects, and assessments that are aligned with students' different visual, auditory, and hands-on ways of learning.
- M6. Arranges media and content to help transfer knowledge most effectively in the online environment.
Appendix H. Codes to Themes

| Activity | Action | Context | Actors | Focus | Text Area
|----------|--------|---------|--------|-------|-----------

The theme code—Structure, Support, Instruction, Communication, and Analysis of Data, and Voice, Leadership, and Empowerment—was evident in chapter 4 through the coding activities, domains, and online standards for teaching. The data from the VCS Induction/Mentoring framework was used to code activities gathered through documentation, observation, and interviews checking for accuracy. Following my thought: Structure, Support, and Communication were important. This was then checked against chapter 2 literatures. From chapter 2, researchers found that the themes were elements for creating a quality
induction/mentoring program (Berry, 2004; Brittion et al., 2000; Fletcher & Strong, 2009; Hanushek et al., 2004; Ingersoll & Kralik, 2004; Wong et al, 2005).
Appendix I. Mentoring Discussion Log

Activity Reflection (by Teacher/student):

- What support and advice would you like to request or provide to assist in the process?
- What will be your next steps in considering your classroom plans with other school personnel?
- What concerns do you have about communicating the components of planning to the teacher in the written plan?
- What challenges and concerns do you face when planning?
- What evidence was presented in the plan in the discussion that would indicate that the lesson would be effective?

Planning Reflection (by Teacher/student):

Date: ____________________________  Mentor: ____________________________

Discussion Log: Instruction
Appendix J. Mentoring Observation Guide

Guiding Questions for Observation:

• Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport
  o How is respect and rapport modeled by the teacher and students in this classroom?
  o How does the teacher encourage students to interact in a respectful way and take responsibility for their actions?
  o How does the teacher recognize the achievements and contribution of all students?
  o How does the teacher encourage the students to take risks and be creative?
  o How does the teacher respond to inappropriate behavior in a fair and equitable way?

• Establishing a Culture for Learning
  o How does the teacher help the students to accept and respect the difference within the classroom in regard to experiences, ideas, culture, feelings, and points of view?
  o How does the teacher group students for various assignments to promote social development?
  o How does the teacher help the students to recognize their personal identify and as an important member of the classroom?
  o How does the teacher help the students to take responsibility for their behavior and learning?
  o How do the rules, routines, and Elluminate promote social development and group interaction?

• Management:
  o How does the teacher decide what routines, rules, schedules, timelines, etc. are needed and when they are needed?
  o How does the teacher develop the elements above and do they promote and maintain a climate of fairness and respect?
  o How does the teacher introduce rules and procedures to the students?
  o How did the teacher help the students to internalize them and become self-directed learners?
  o How did the teacher involve the students in the development of the rules and procedures?
  o How does the teacher inform and connect with parents regarding their child?
Appendix K. Induction Attendance Log

Participant Sign-In Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Name (Print)</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
Appendix L. Video Observation Reflection

Video Streaming:
Video: ___________________________ Subject: ___________________________

Viewer of Video: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________

What do you want to learn about (area of focus) as you observed the videos?

What did you learn from observing these clip(s)?

How can you apply this in your instruction?
Appendix M. Teacher Evaluation Form

Teacher Evaluation

NAME: 

DATE: 

SUPERVISOR: 

This performance rubric is to be used with teaching staff with less than three years teaching experience at ___

The following category definitions apply to this performance rubric:

**Distinguished:** The teacher breaks new ground, takes risks, assumes responsibility and demonstrates an extra measure of effort. This is a rating category that is exceptional; it is “visited” but no individual “lives” here.

**Exceeds Expectations:** The teacher consistently demonstrates knowledge and skills greater than the required level as defined.

**Meets Expectations:** The teacher demonstrates working knowledge and skills at the required level as defined.

**Making Progress:** The teacher demonstrates working general knowledge and skills at the required level as defined but needs improvements in some areas. This rating category will be used with new teachers.

**Unsatisfactory:** The teacher fails to demonstrate knowledge and/or skills necessary to the required level as defined.
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### Curriculum & Planning

#### CP1. Plans with knowledge of content and delivery styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Making Progress</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>Distinguished</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher does not plan instruction that demonstrates adequate knowledge of the assigned content area(s), or the teacher is unable to teach content using effective instructional methodology.</td>
<td>The teacher plans instruction based on knowledge of the assigned content area, however, the teacher lacks depth in content knowledge or cannot organize or present content effectively so that students can learn.</td>
<td>The teacher plans instruction that consistently demonstrates knowledge of major concepts in the assigned content area. The teacher also organizes and presents content effectively so that students learn.</td>
<td>The teacher plans instruction that demonstrates a deep knowledge of major concepts, assumptions, debates, processes of inquiry, and ways of knowing that are central to the assigned content area and presents content effectively so that students learn.</td>
<td>The teacher plans instruction that demonstrates a deep knowledge of major concepts, assumptions, debates, processes of inquiry, and ways of knowing that are central to the assigned content area and presents content effectively so that students learn.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CP2. Demonstrates a clear understanding of the curriculum/standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Making Progress</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>Distinguished</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher demonstrates a lack of understanding of PA Academic Standards and Assessment Anchors. Plans do not reflect what students are expected to do and understand for the grade level and content area.</td>
<td>Teacher is beginning to understand PA Academic Standards and Assessment Anchors when planning what to teach. Plans lack appropriate level of rigor for the grade level and content area.</td>
<td>Teacher uses PA Academic Standards and Assessment Anchors when planning what to teach. Lessons contain the appropriate level of rigor for the grade level and content area.</td>
<td>Teacher has a deep understanding of the PA Academic Standards and Assessment Anchors. He/She uses the domain weights to emphasize particular standards throughout the course via live classes. He/She uses knowledge of the vertical articulation across courses in the content area.</td>
<td>Teacher has a deep understanding of the PA Academic Standards and Assessment Anchors. He/She uses the domain weights to emphasize particular standards throughout the course via live classes. He/She uses knowledge of the vertical articulation across courses in the content area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CP3. Makes real world and cross-curricular connections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Making Progress</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>Distinguished</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher does not attempt to connect the assigned content to other content areas or to the real world.</td>
<td>The teacher relates the assigned content to other content areas and/or to the real world. However, connections are usually impromptu and short-term rather than planned.</td>
<td>The teacher relates the assigned content to the real world of students as a normal part of planning and also strives to show connections among areas of the curriculum.</td>
<td>The teacher consistently relates the assigned content area to other content areas and establishes connections between what students are learning and the real world. Students can then</td>
<td>The teacher collaborates with other teachers to bridge the curriculum connections between various content areas. Teacher provides opportunities for students to demonstrate how their learning in the classroom is applicable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Making Progress</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>Distinguished</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN1. Uses higher order thinking skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher does not emphasize and/or encourage students to use higher-order thinking skills and processes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher encourages students to use higher-order thinking skills and processes on a limited basis and demonstrates limited understanding or infrequent use of these strategies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher emphasizes and consistently encourages most groups of students to use higher-order thinking skills and processes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher consistently emphasizes and encourages all students to use a variety of higher-order thinking skills and processes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher challenges students to use higher-order thinking skills and processes and to reflect on how use of these skills increases their depth of knowledge.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN2. Encourages student collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher doesn’t encourage student collaboration and seems unaware of what student collaboration is.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher provides limited opportunities for student collaboration and demonstrates a limited understanding of true collaboration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher consistently provides opportunities for students to collaborate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher emphasizes the benefits of collaboration in various course activities and provides students a framework for effective collaboration. Additionally, the teacher encourages students to seek out collaborative opportunities in other courses and activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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#### IN3. Utilizes available technology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>The teacher does not use accessible technology to enhance student learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making Progress</td>
<td>Teacher uses technology some of the time to enhance student learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td>The teacher routinely uses accessible technology to enhance student learning and support their achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
<td>The teacher uses accessible technology consistently and makes improvements to their teaching as new technologies become available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinguished</td>
<td>Teacher uses technology in innovative ways to enable students to work &quot;outside of the box&quot; to learn and achieve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finds, recommends, and pilots new technologies that will increase student achievement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rating:**

**Points:**

#### IN4. Engaging instruction (maintains high rates of attendance)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Teacher provides instruction. Student attendance in five classes is less than 10% of the students enrolled in the class throughout the course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making Progress</td>
<td>Teacher provides instruction. Student attendance in five classes maintains an average of 10% of the students enrolled in the class throughout the course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td>Teacher provides engaging instruction through various strategies (novelty &amp; variety, choice, authenticity). Student attendance in five classes maintains an average of 20% of the students enrolled in the class throughout the course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
<td>Teacher provides engaging instruction through various strategies (novelty &amp; variety, choice, authenticity). Student attendance in five classes maintains an average of 40% of the students enrolled in the class throughout the course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinguished</td>
<td>Teacher provides engaging instruction through various strategies (novelty &amp; variety, choice, authenticity). Student attendance in five classes maintains an average of 60% of the students enrolled in the class throughout the course.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rating:**

**Points:**

#### IN5. Maintains high quality content in course(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>The teacher neither reviews the content for clarity, spelling, grammar etc. nor ensures that links are in working order throughout the course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making Progress</td>
<td>The teacher reviews the content and seems unaware of issues with clarity, spelling, grammar, etc. in course content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td>The teacher ensures that all links are in working order throughout the course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
<td>The teacher reviews the content of the courses b/c he/she is teaching and makes corrections as needed for issues of clarity, spelling, grammar, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinguished</td>
<td>The teacher reviews the content of the courses b/c he/she is teaching and makes corrections as needed for issues of clarity, spelling, grammar, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, the teacher uses data from assignments and achievement to make recommendations to the curriculum committee about more significant changes.

The teacher follows through on CC decisions in making the changes.
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### IN6. Constructive learning environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Making Progress</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>Distinguished</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher establishes rules and procedures for the VO or live learner. However, these do not consistently support a constructive, productive learning environment. The teacher communicates clear guidelines and procedures so that learning time is maximized.</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher does not establish rules and procedures for the VO or live learner. The teacher does not adequately monitor students in the VO or live learner and/or respond to inappropriate behavior.</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher proactively addresses problems to promote a constructive, productive learning environment in the VO and live learner. The teacher facilitates student ownership of the learning environment to promote student achievement.</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AS1: Uses various types of assessment (diagnostic, summative, formative)</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Making Progress</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>Distinguished</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher does not use diagnostic assessment data to determine student strengths and weaknesses or to plan for instruction. The teacher does not identify student or class strengths or weaknesses. The teacher does not use formative assessment.</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher uses some diagnostic assessment strategies to identify student strengths and weaknesses and prior knowledge to guide planning for instruction; however, diagnostic assessment is not an integral part of unit planning. The teacher consistently uses a variety of formative assessment.</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher makes diagnostic assessment a systematic component of all instructional units. The teacher uses a variety of formal and informal types of diagnostic assessments to inform planning and teaching. The teacher consistently uses a variety of formative assessment.</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix M. Teacher Evaluation Form Page 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>AS2. Provides meaningful, timely feedback</strong></th>
<th><strong>UNSATISFACTORY</strong></th>
<th><strong>MAKING PROGRESS</strong></th>
<th><strong>MEETS EXPECTATIONS</strong></th>
<th><strong>EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS</strong></th>
<th><strong>Distinguished</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher's feedback routinely takes more than 48 hours and is generic.</td>
<td>The teacher's feedback is consistently provided within 24-48 hours of submission. Feedback given is mostly generic.</td>
<td>The teacher's feedback is specific to the assignment, contains positive/encouraging statements, and consistently provided within 24-48 hours of submission.</td>
<td>The teacher's feedback provides specific actions a student can take to achieve mastery or commentary that indicates how student has achieved mastery, contains positive/encouraging statements, and is consistently provided within 12-24 hours of submission. Feedback provided engages students in a reflective process in thinking about their work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Rating:**
- **Points:**

### AS3. Uses data to plan interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>UNSATISFACTORY</strong></th>
<th><strong>MAKING PROGRESS</strong></th>
<th><strong>MEETS EXPECTATIONS</strong></th>
<th><strong>EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS</strong></th>
<th><strong>DISTINGUISHED</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher does not use assessment data to design or implement appropriate interventions that might enable student improvement.</td>
<td>The teacher uses some assessment data during the learning process to identify student needs; however, the teacher may provide interventions that are limited in scope and not aligned with the data.</td>
<td>The teacher analyzes a variety of assessment data throughout the learning process to measure students' performances. The teacher identifies student needs and provides targeted interventions.</td>
<td>The teacher has established a system for ongoing, timely analysis of a variety of relevant assessment data to measure student performance throughout the learning process. The teacher tracks individual student progress.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Rating:**
- **Points:**
**Student Achievement, Attendance, and Communication**

### SAC1. Mastery rates (80% or above)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making Progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinguished</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The teacher’s P4SILs achieved mastery in less than 25% of their classes.
- The teacher’s P4SILs achieved mastery in more than 25% of their classes.
- The teacher’s P4SILs achieved mastery in more than 50% of their classes.
- The teacher’s P4SILs achieved mastery in more than 70% of their classes.
- The teacher’s P4SILs achieved mastery in more than 80% of their classes.

### SAC2. Pass rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making Progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinguished</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The teacher’s P4SILs earned passing grades in their classes at a rate of less than 50%.
- The teacher’s P4SILs earned passing grades in their classes at a rate of 50% or higher.
- The teacher’s P4SILs earned passing grades in their classes at a rate of 70% or higher.
- The teacher’s P4SILs earned passing grades in their classes at a rate of 80% or higher.

### SAC3. Improvement in benchmark scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making Progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinguished</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The teacher’s P4SIL benchmark scores (CDT or Study Island) have not increased based on scheduled assessments. Fewer than 75% of the teacher’s P4SILs completed the.
- The teacher’s P4SIL benchmark scores (CDT or Study Island) have increased based on scheduled assessments but have not met pre-determined targets.
- The teacher’s P4SIL benchmark scores (CDT or Study Island) have increased based on scheduled assessments and have met pre-determined targets.
- In excess of 80% of the teacher’s P4SILs have scored Proficient or above on the scheduled benchmarks (CDT or Study Island).
- All 100% of the teacher’s P4SILs
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark exams.</th>
<th>In excess of 75% of the teacher's P4SLs completed the benchmark exams in a timely manner.</th>
<th>In excess of 80% of the teacher's P4SLs completed the benchmark exams in a timely manner.</th>
<th>In excess of 85% of the teacher's P4SLs completed the benchmark exams in a timely manner.</th>
<th>completed the benchmark exams in a timely manner.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rating:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SAC 4. P4SL attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>☐ UNSATISFACTORY</th>
<th>☐ MAKING PROGRESS</th>
<th>☐ MEETS EXPECTATIONS</th>
<th>☐ EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS</th>
<th>☐ DISTINGUISHED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More than 25% of the teacher's P4SLs received a truancy notification exceeding a warning letter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher made no contact with his/her P4SLs and/or their parents for the purpose of improving attendance and reducing truancy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer than 25% of the teacher's P4SLs received some form of truancy notification exceeding a warning letter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher made limited contact with his/her P4SLs and/or their parents for the purpose of improving attendance and reducing truancy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer than 15% of the teacher's P4SLs received any form of truancy notification and the truancy notification was no higher than a warning letter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher made regular contact with his/her P4SLs and/or their parents for the purpose of improving attendance and reducing truancy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer than 10% of the teacher's P4SLs received any form of truancy notification and the truancy notification was no higher than a warning letter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher made consistent contact with his/her P4SLs and/or their parents for the purpose of improving attendance and reducing truancy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher's extensive and direct contact resulted in none of the of the teacher's P4SLs receiving any form of truancy notification.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rating:                                                                                     Points:   

### SAC 5. Constructive contact with P4SLs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>☐ UNSATISFACTORY</th>
<th>☐ MAKING PROGRESS</th>
<th>☐ MEETS EXPECTATIONS</th>
<th>☐ EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS</th>
<th>☐ DISTINGUISHED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher does not make constructive contact with his/her P4SLs or does so less than monthly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher does not make constructive contact with his/her P4SLs' parents or does so less than once per grading period.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher does not document P4SL and parent contact.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher makes constructive contact with his/her P4SLs less than bi-weekly but more often than monthly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher makes constructive contact with his/her P4SLs' parents less than monthly but at least once during each grading period.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher communicates with his/her P4SLs and their parents primarily through &quot;parent&quot; emails.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher makes constructive contact with his/her P4SLs at least bi-weekly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher makes constructive contact with his/her P4SLs' parents at least monthly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher's methods and frequency of P4SL contact have had a measurable impact upon the attitude, motivation, and achievement of his/her P4SLs and parents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher makes constructive contact with his/her P4SLs at least weekly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher makes constructive contact with his/her P4SLs' parents at least bi-weekly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher's methods and frequency of P4SL contact have had a significant impact upon the attitude, motivation, and achievement of the P4SL and demonstrates that she made a connection with the P4SL and parents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher makes constructive contact with his/her P4SLs more often than once per week.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher makes constructive contact with his/her P4SLs' parents more often than bi-weekly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher's methods and frequency of P4SL contact have had a distinct and profound impact upon the attitude, motivation, and achievement of the P4SL and demonstrates that she made a connection with the P4SL and parents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rating:                                                                                     Points:   

This page provides a structured evaluation form for teachers, including criteria for benchmark exams and attendance, as well as constructive contact with P4SLs. The form is organized into sections with detailed criteria for each category, including ratings and points for each level of performance.
**Professional Growth and Professionalism**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PGP1. Grows through participation in professional learning opportunities</th>
<th>rating</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This teacher does not participate in professional learning opportunities to enhance content knowledge and instructional skills. The teacher is not engaged in job-embedded learning for professional growth or does not integrate professional learning into daily practice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This teacher engages in some professional learning activities, however, participation may be limited to activities articulated by the school or those required as PDE minimums. The teacher engages in job-embedded learning opportunities and successfully integrates some learning into practice. The teacher sometimes shares what she has learned with colleagues but does not do so on a regular basis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This teacher believes in a continuum of improvement and participates in professional learning opportunities beyond the required minimum in order to enhance content knowledge and instructional skill and to keep current in the assigned content area. The teacher demonstrates the techniques and skills she has learned in professional development training and successfully integrates most learning into daily practice. The teacher shares what she has learned with colleagues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This teacher believes in a continuum of improvement and frequently and regularly participates in professional learning opportunities beyond the required minimum in order to enhance content knowledge and instructional skill and to keep current in the assigned content area. The teacher regularly demonstrates the techniques and skills she has learned in professional development training and successfully integrates most learning into daily practice. The teacher regularly shares what she has learned with colleagues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This teacher is a life-long learner, keeping abreast of changes in the field. The teacher continually enhances content knowledge and instructional skills and is considered by colleagues to be a resilient expert in a particular field of study. The teacher models the techniques and skills she has learned in professional growth training as an example for others to emulate. The teacher develops professional development in order to share what she has learned with colleagues in a community of learning for practice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### PGP2. Customer Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Making Progress</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>Distinguished</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher is unresponsive to customer requests or concerns. The teacher is unable to resolve the to customer requests or concerns. The teacher does not request assistance in resolving customer requests or concerns when it is beyond the scope of his/her knowledge or position. The teacher does not communicate with or build relationships with students, families, and community members.</td>
<td>The teacher responds positively to customer requests or concerns. The teacher is able to satisfactorily resolve the to customer requests or concerns in most cases. The teacher requests assistance in resolving customer requests or concerns when it is beyond the scope of his/her knowledge or position. The teacher interacts with students, family, or community members; however, the teacher limits most contact to academic or discipline related and is unsure how to build relationships.</td>
<td>The teacher responds positively to customer requests or concerns. The teacher is able to satisfactorily resolve the to customer requests or concerns. The teacher interacts with students, families, and community members in order to support student learning and well being. The teacher interacts with students, families, and community members in a positive and professional manner.</td>
<td>The teacher goes above and beyond his/her normal job requirements to address customer requests or concerns. The teacher is able to satisfactorily resolve the to customer requests or concerns. The teacher interacts with students, families, and community members in order to support student learning and well being. The teacher interacts with students, families, and community members in a consistently positive and professional manner.</td>
<td>The teacher identifies organizational and systemic barriers to providing quality customer service and develops appropriate solutions. The teacher establishes and maintains ongoing, cooperative partnerships with students, families and the community to support student learning and well being. The community and family involvement and support become an established part of the learning environment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rating:**

**Points:**

### PGP3. Supports School’s Vision and Mission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Making Progress</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>Distinguished</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher is not familiar the school’s vision and mission or the teacher does not support their accomplishment through the performance of his/her duties.</td>
<td>The teacher is aware of the school’s vision and mission and has a basic understanding of how they influence the operation of the school and student achievement; however, the teacher only participates in vision and mission implementation as required by the school. The teacher understands the school’s vision and mission. The teacher participates in school vision and mission implementation in order to assist with student achievement and to move the school forward.</td>
<td>The teacher thoroughly understands the school’s vision and mission. The teacher takes an active role in school vision and mission implementation in order to assist with student achievement and to move the school forward.</td>
<td>The teacher has an in-depth, comprehensive understanding of the vision and mission. This understanding guides the teacher’s classroom instruction. The teacher assumes a leadership role in accomplishment of the school’s vision and mission.</td>
<td>The teacher has an in-depth, comprehensive understanding of the vision and mission. This understanding guides the teacher’s classroom instruction. The teacher assumes a leadership role in accomplishment of the school’s vision and mission.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rating:**

**Points:**
### PGP4. Collaborates with peers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UNSATISFACTORY</th>
<th>MAKING PROGRESS</th>
<th>MEETS EXPECTATIONS</th>
<th>EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS</th>
<th>DISTINGUISHED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher is not a team player and prefers to work alone.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher makes no attempt at problem solving.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher's actions require other staff members to assume additional responsibilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher participates as a team member and in team decision-making and problem solving when required to do so.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher shares information with other team members when requested.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher participates as a team member and in team decision-making and problem solving.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher shares information with other team members that will assist the team in being more efficient and providing better service to students and their families.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher demonstrates a positive rapport with co-workers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher participates as a team member and in team decision-making and problem solving and will take on a leadership role when needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher proactively shares information with other team members that will assist the team in being more efficient and providing better service to students and their families because she understands the benefit to the customers of doing so.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher demonstrates a positive rapport with co-workers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rating:**

**Points:**

### PGP5. Teacher expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UNSATISFACTORY</th>
<th>MAKING PROGRESS</th>
<th>MEETS EXPECTATIONS</th>
<th>EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS</th>
<th>DISTINGUISHED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher does not comply with the attendance policy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher does not comply with the work schedule.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher is often late.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher often misses deadlines.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher complies with the attendance policy and the work schedule but works only the minimum required hours; the teacher is a “dock walker.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher has been late occasionally.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher meets most deadlines.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher meets required deadlines.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher has an excellent record of attendance and on-time record.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher submits work ahead of deadlines and never needs to be reminded of due dates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher has an excellent record of attendance and on-time record.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher inspires others to improve their attendance and punctuality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher helps others develop systems for time and workload management so that they are better able to meet deadlines.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rating:**

**Points:**
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EVALUATION SUMMARY

Check one:
☐ Mid-year evaluation
☐ End-of-year evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Category</th>
<th>Category points</th>
<th>Converted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum &amp; Planning</td>
<td>out of 12</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>out of 24</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>out of 12</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Achievement, Attendance, and Communication</td>
<td>out of 20</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Growth and Professionalism</td>
<td>out of 20</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Points</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>out of 71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Semi-Annual Performance Evaluation
☐ Distinguished (61-71 points)
☐ Exceeds Expectations (47-60 points)
☐ Meets Expectations (32-46 points)
☐ Making Progress (21-31 points)
☐ Unsatisfactory (0-20 points)

SUPERVISOR’S SUMMARY COMMENTS:

SUPERVISOR’S SIGNATURE: ___________________________ DATE: ________________

TEACHER’S SIGNATURE: ___________________________ DATE: ________________

(Signature acknowledges that employee has read the evaluation and has been given an opportunity to discuss it with the evaluating supervisor.)
VITA

Rose M. Marsh

Education:
St. Thomas University, St. Paul, Minnesota, (1988), Master of Arts
Morningside College, Sioux City, Iowa (1986). Bachelor of Science

Teaching:
CCIU: Chester County Intermediate Unit: (2010-Current)
CCIU: Middle College High School: (2003-2004)
West Chester University, Adjunct Professor: (2001-2006)
West Chester University, PT3 and P3 (2001-2003)
Duluth Public Schools, MN (1987-2001)

Professional Societies:
ISTE; ASCD; iNACOL; CEC

Publications:
WCUPT3 Site http://www.wcupt3.org - Designed, managed, created and implemented WCUPT3
Jonny J. Appleseed Program and Manual - created and sold, Program for doing MN Special Education Due Process Forms. 1987

Major Presentations:
AECT Convention - Louisville, Kentucky 10.2009
iNACOL Convention – Austin, Texas 11.2009
ASCD Conference on Teaching and Learning, New Mexico 03.2003
Florida Educational Technology Conference, Orlando, FL 03.2002
P16 Winter Retreat, Philadelphia, PA 12.2001
PT3 Conference, Washington, DC 08.2001
Higher Education Conference, Minneapolis, MN 02.2001
Teacher Education Mini Congress (UMD), Duluth, MN 12.2001
TIES 2000 Visions, Duluth, MN 11.2000