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As the number of alternatively certified teachers entering the teaching workforce continues to grow annually, issues of retention and attrition become heightened when up to one-third of alternatively certified beginning teachers abandon a field they have just entered. Comprehensive induction programs that include a strong mentoring component become even more critical in helping to retain these teachers who are often employed in schools that provide minimal support and mentoring. Online mentoring has been found to be a viable option for beginning teachers who are faculty of schools with limited physical and monetary resources.

This investigation will explore how online mentoring, also known as ementoring, can be integrated with other induction components to deliver an effective induction program for alternatively certified beginning teachers currently teaching in a large urban school district. The investigation will further add to the literature base on effective induction programs, online mentoring, and alternatively certified beginning teachers.

Guiding the evaluation and research methods were the following core research questions:

1. How can ementoring be used to enhance beginning teacher support and the induction process?
2. How can e-mentoring be used in conjunction with face-to-face interactions (meetings and school-based mentoring) to enhance beginning teacher support?

3. What elements of an e-mentoring program promote and/or hinder alternatively certified beginning teachers’ ability to interact, reflect, engage, and implement their learning?

Findings will be useful in helping to better understand the dynamics of mentoring via an on-line forum and maximize the potential of e-mentoring within a comprehensive induction program.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

The first years of a beginning teacher’s career have been found to be the most challenging emotionally, mentally, and physically. The struggles and the conflicts that confront new teachers have been well documented and researched for decades (e.g., Feiman-Nemser, Schwille, Carver, & Yusco, 1999; Kardos & Johnson, 2007; Kauffman, Johnson, Kardos, Liu, & Peske, 2002; Lortie, 1975; Schmidt & Knowles, 1995; Veenman, 1984). Not only are beginning teachers in the midst of pivotal years that determine much of who they become as educators, they are also in precarious positions as to whether they survive and remain in the educational field (Gold, 1996; Rogers & Babinski, 2002). Reports indicate that as many as one-third of beginning teachers quit within the first three years of their careers and only half remain in the field after five years (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2004; Ingersoll, 2002; National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, 2003). Idealistic and unrealistic expectations of themselves and their students soon give way to disillusionment with the realities and demands of classroom life. Lack of basic supplies, poor administrative support, feelings of isolation, low salaries, large class sizes, and students with significant behavior issues are just some of the many reasons many beginning teachers flounder in their initial years with many leaving teaching altogether (Moir & Gless, 2001; Rogers & Babinski, 2002; Stansbury & Zimmerman, 2000; Veenman, 1984).

Years of research attest to the isolation and struggles that beginning teachers experience during their first years, yet education still neglects its most vulnerable—the beginning teacher (Boreen & Niday, 2000; Fulton, Yoon, & Lee, 2005; Gold, 1996; Heider, 2005; Kelley, 2004; Lortie, 1975; Rogers & Babinski, 2002). Few professional positions expect their new hires to work at a level of sustained proficiency, and yet the majority of beginning teachers are not afforded “apprentice status” by their principals or districts. Beginning teachers are assigned full
teaching loads and held to expectations of being accomplished in their planning and management without the benefit of working under the guidance of an experienced teacher or having a reduced workload. It is little wonder that one-third of today’s beginning teachers will no longer be teaching in 2011 given the expectations and pressures they now face as 21st century educators.

The growth of alternatively certified teachers in the workforce has been significant. A recent study by the National Center for Education Information (2006) found there were approximately 50,000 individuals who entered the teaching profession via alternative route (AR) programs out of the 200,000 who graduate from teaching preparation programs annually (Rosenberg, Boyer, Sindelar, & Misra, 2007). Unlike traditional teacher preparation programs, AR programs allow individuals to earn a license to teach without completing a traditional university teacher preparation program. Graduates of AR programs typically have minimal course work and, if required to complete an internship program, have often done so while simultaneously taking courses and holding non-education jobs. Preparation programs for AR exist that are quite rigorous and imitate traditional certification programs, but many AR programs are fast-track, offering certification with little or no pedagogical content as well as little or no subject matter preparation (Humphrey & Wechsler, 2007; Rosenberg et al., 2007). As a result, many AR graduates are ill-prepared to teach the students they will have in their classrooms.

The growing complexity of teaching in today’s educational climate is also a factor in beginning teacher retention. Legislative mandates such as the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) have heightened the expectations that today’s teachers be “highly-qualified” regardless of their preparation routes. Regardless of pathway to teaching, teachers today are expected to
provide quality, differentiated instruction that will not only manifest itself in student learning and achievement but also will produce adequate test results.

Beginning teachers receive little assistance from over-extended veteran teachers and school administrators, which places many AR beginning teachers in vulnerable positions during their first years of teaching. Left to fend on their own, these teachers quickly burn out with feelings of being overwhelmed, isolated, and unsupported (Duke, Karson, & Wheeler, 2006; Rogers & Babinski, 2002). Some beginning AR teachers transfer to other schools and districts that are able to provide them with the support they critically need during those initial years—others, as many as 30%—will abandon a field they have just entered (Ingersoll & Smith, 2003; Jorissen, 2003).

Furthermore, many AR beginning teachers are recruited to teach in urban schools where chronic and persistent shortages of qualified teachers abound (Ingersoll, 2004; Johnson & Kardos, 2008; Jorissen, 2003; Klecka, Clift, & Cheng, 2005; National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, 2003; Stotko, Ingram, & Beaty-O'Ferrall, 2007). Even with financial incentives created to entice beginning teachers to urban schools and teacher recruitment programs such as Teach for America, and Troops to Teachers, Ingersoll (2004) has found, that on the average, over 20% of urban schools’ faculty leave annually. Low salaries, inadequate administrative support, chronic discipline problems, minimal parental support, lack of faculty input concerning school matters, being required to implement a multitude of initiatives and programs to increase student achievement scores, as well as a dearth of basic resources often make working conditions intolerable for urban teaching faculty. These factors in turn create a constant turnover of the veteran teachers, leaving novice teachers few experienced teachers to turn to for advice, support, and mentoring (Ingersoll, 2004; Jonson, 2002; Stotko et al., 2007).
Studies have found that in some urban districts attrition rates can run as high as 50%, not only costing districts millions of dollars annually to recruit and train replacements, but also creating a domino effect adversely affecting student achievement, teacher morale, overall school environment, and further exacerbating the “revolving door” syndrome currently plaguing the educational field (Darling-Hammond, 1997; Ingersoll, 2004; Kapadia, Coca, & Easton, 2007).

Wealthier districts can often entice teachers to leave their low SES, urban schools and transfer to more affluent ones by providing them with higher salaries, smaller class sizes, and well-stocked classrooms. Those that remain stand a greater chance of leaving their schools as well as the teaching profession substantially sooner than those teachers in high SES schools due to being confronted with issues and obstacles that are characteristic of many low SES schools (Colbert & Wolff, 1992; Ng, 2003). Taken together, all of these issues result in making the issue of teacher supply in low SES schools not one of insufficient numbers, but rather a matter of retaining the veteran teaching pool and teachers new to the profession (Ingersoll, 2004).

In addition to the resources high SES districts can offer, many also have the financial resources to provide comprehensive induction programs, trained mentors, and ongoing professional development. And as a result of minimal turnover rates, a faculty of veteran teachers is also available to provide support and mentoring. Unfortunately, many urban schools lack these same resources and are unable to provide the mentoring and induction that is so critical in the first several years of an educator’s teaching career. Fed up with the demands placed upon them with minimal support, many AR teachers in these schools transfer to schools with resources their current ones cannot provide or leave the profession altogether (Duke et al., 2006; Johnson, Kardos, Kauffman, Liu, & Donaldson, 2004; Stotko et al., 2007).
Induction and Mentoring

Quality induction programs have been found to reduce the numbers of beginning teachers leaving the field whether they were prepared by traditional or alternative means (Chubbuck, Clift, Allard, & Quinlan, 2001; Curran, 2002; Duke et al., 2006; Heider, 2005; Kapadia et al., 2007; Kelley, 2004; Moir, 2003; Smith & Ingersoll, 2004; Wong, 2004). Definitions of induction range from Schlechty’s 1985 clinical description of induction as a way “to develop in new members of an occupation those skills, forms of knowledge, attitudes and values that are necessary to effectively carry out their occupational roles” (Schlechty, 1985, p.37) to a more current definition of induction by the Alliance for Excellent Education, “Comprehensive induction is described as a package of supports, development, and standards-based assessments provided to beginning teachers during at least their first two years of full time professional teaching” (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2004, p.11).

Quality comprehensive induction programs have been advocated as an important vehicle for reducing beginning teacher attrition and some research findings suggest this is the case. Studies and analyses conducted by centers such as the National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future (NCTAF), Public Education Network, New Teacher Center (NTC), Alliance for Excellent Education (AEE), and the Center for Teaching Quality (CTQ) as well as prominent researchers in the areas of teacher retention and induction (e.g., Bonnie Billingsley, Sharon Feiman-Nemser, Yvonne Gold, Leslie Huling-Austin, Richard Ingersoll, Ellen Moir, Sandra Odell, Thomas Smith) suggest induction programs, when structured well, can positively influence teacher retention and thus diminish teacher attrition rates. Comprehensive induction programs are comprised of various components such as structured mentoring from well-trained, selected teachers in the same grade or subject area (Curran, 2002; Moir, 2003; Moir & Gless, 2001; Smith & Ingersoll, 2004); time to plan, collaborate, and discuss items with their mentors,
administration, and/or other faculty leaders (Huling-Austin, 1992; Kapadia et al., 2007; Smith & Ingersoll, 2004; Stansbury & Zimmerman, 2000); systemic and sustained professional development tailored to beginning teachers’ needs (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2004; Wong, 2004); participation in a “network of teachers” outside of their school (Kapadia et al., 2007; Kelley, 2004; Smith & Ingersoll, 2004); supportive principals and other school administration (Moir & Gless, 2001; Public Education Network, 2003; Wong, 2004); and ongoing evaluation and standards-based assessment of beginning teachers’ pedagogical skills (Feiman-Nemser, 2001a; Moir, 2003; Stansbury & Zimmerman, 2000).

Of all the numerous components that can make up a comprehensive induction program, mentoring by well-trained mentors plays a predominant role in diminishing beginning teacher attrition (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2004; Boreen & Niday, 2000; Huling-Austin, 1992; Ingersoll & Kralik, 2004; Odell & Ferraro, 1992; Villar & Strong, 2007; White & Mason, 2006). Like induction, countless definitions for mentoring are found in the literature. Both terms have been used interchangeably due to many induction programs across the United States being comprised solely of mentoring. However, mentoring is just one of the many component options of induction programs and the distinction between the two is an important one. For the purpose of this evaluation, mentoring is defined as “a formal coaching relationship in which an experienced teacher gives guidance, support, and feedback to a new teacher” (Center for Teaching Quality, 2005, p.5).

Smith and Ingersoll (2004) found in their extensive analysis of 1999-2000 Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) data along with preliminary data from the 2000-01 Teacher Follow-Up Survey (TFS) that having a mentor in the same field decreased the chances of beginning teachers leaving their school by year’s end (either by transferring to another school or exiting the teaching
profession altogether) by approximately 30%. Furthermore, this percentage increased as other key induction components (e.g., common planning time, collaboration with other teachers in their subject area, seminars for beginning teachers, regular communication with their principal or other administration) were “bundled” along with their in-field mentors (Ingersoll & Kralik, 2004; Smith & Ingersoll, 2004).

Similarly, Ingersoll and Kralik (2004) determined from their value-added analyses of teacher induction that “Collectively, the studies do provide empirical support for the claim that assistance for new teachers and, in particular, mentoring programs have a positive impact on teachers and their retention” (p. 1). Odell and Ferraro’s follow-up survey study (1992) of 141 teachers in their 4th year of teaching found that 96% of the original teachers who participated in a collaborative university/school teacher mentor program their first year of teaching were still actively teaching. Their survey results found that the mentoring beginning teachers received had a positive influence upon their attitudes toward teaching. Furthermore, the participants rated the emotional support they received from their mentor as the most valuable aspect of their mentoring experience followed by support with instructional strategies and securing resources/materials for their classrooms (Odell & Ferraro, 1992).

Kardos (2004) in her survey study of 315 first and second year teachers found that mentoring in general did not have a significant effect on new teachers. However, when beginning teachers were assigned mentors from the same grade level and school and were given opportunities to discuss issues, they were more likely to be satisfied with their jobs and were more likely to remain teaching.

Clearly, mentoring is not a defined science nor is it easily implemented to produce the same effects in all settings. However, decades of mentoring research points to the overall
effectiveness of mentoring in helping to retain our teachers. One thing is certain from studies on mentoring as well as numerous reports produced by NCTAF, NTC, AEE, CTQ, and other foundations as well as research found in handbooks such as the *Teacher Education’s Yearbook on Research on Teacher Induction* is that mentoring is not just happenstance. Mentoring requires planning, funding, buy-in, and training (Moir, 2003; Rainer, 2006; Tellez, 1992). Pressure from administration and/or altruistic motives on the part of the experienced teacher to mentor a beginning teacher does not guarantee that quality mentoring will occur. In many cases, it is only a glorified “buddy system” that is created. As Moir (2003) notes, “In the buddy system model, mentors are neither trained for their new role nor given time to carry out its demands. In other words, new mentors are treated pretty much as new teachers were, allowed to sink or swim, armed with only intuition and good intentions to keep them afloat” (p. 4). Achinstein and Athanases (2006) express similar concerns as to why mentor programs flounder and don’t reach their potential due to a perception “that new teacher mentors come ready made” (p. 8). Mentoring can only be as effective as the mentors involved in the process. Their words serve as a reminder that, even with the best of intentions and plans, those enacting the ideas are key to the process.

Even with recent study findings of substantial returns on induction investment dollars (Villar & Strong, 2007) and the recognition of school districts of the importance of comprehensive induction programs, few are able to provide the funding needed to implement and sustain such programs. Model induction programs such as California’s Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) program, Santa Cruz’s New Teacher Project (SCNTP), and Connecticut’s Beginning Educator Support and Training (BEST) are cost prohibitive for most districts due to average annual costs that range from $5,000 to $7,000 per teacher, per year.
Districts as well as their university partners are searching for ways in which to provide quality induction programs that include strong mentoring components with minimal cost and personnel requirements, but still maintain a level of quality and effectiveness.

**Ementoring**

One promising option that entails substantially less cost than traditional mentoring is ementoring. Also known as cyber mentoring or telementoring, ementoring is defined as a mentoring relationship where the primary form of communication between the mentor and mentee is done via email, website, list serve, discussion board, and/or by some other computer-mediated means (O’Neill as cited in Price & Chen, 2003). More commonly found in the fields of business and engineering with programs such as MentorNet and MentorsOnline, ementoring is a relatively new phenomenon to the educational field (Dockter, Lin, Waterfall, & Muller, 2001; Single & Muller, 2001). Once an anomaly in the area of teacher induction, ementoring and its capabilities in supporting beginning teachers have only recently been focused upon as an effective means of mentoring (Fulton, 2007; Fulton et al., 2005; Merseth, 1990).

Ementoring for beginning teachers had its start with the Beginning Teacher Computer Network (BTCN) begun in 1987 at the Harvard Graduate School of Education. Rather primitive in terms of today’s technology, BTCN used a computer network as means of providing support and mentoring to first year teachers who had received their master’s degrees in education and held permanent teaching credentials in Massachusetts. Merseth’s 1988 study of 39 beginning teachers using the BTCN found this rudimentary network provided beginning teachers emotional support and reduced the feelings of isolation that have been found in numerous studies on beginning teachers (e.g., Boreen & Niday, 2000; Lortie, 1975; Rogers & Babinski, 2002; Veenman, 1984). Merseth’s research on the effectiveness of BTCN as a means of providing
support to beginning teachers helped to establish the positive role computers and technology could play in teacher induction and mentoring (Merseth, 1990, 1991).

As technology advanced into the 1990s, the declining cost of computers as well as public Internet access made what was once a luxury, a norm in society as well as in education. Ementoring was then developed into a viable means of providing support as the Internet and email became routine means of communication.

The Electronic Emissary Project (EEP), an extensive e-mentoring program for students begun in 1993 at the University of Texas, further built upon experiences of BTCN in using computer networks to provide support and mentoring. Still in existence, EEP matches volunteer, subject matter experts around the world with K-12 students. Exchanges are done asynchronously via email and deal with a wide range of topics such as rainforest, acid rain, folktales, AIDS, etc. (Harris, 1994).

Although labeled as a “matching service” and geared for students, the success of the EEP has added greatly to the e-mentoring research base. The successes of EEP have also helped to inform two of the more noted and successful online learning communities based in the United States that currently offer e-mentoring for beginning teachers —Tapped In created by TSI International and the Teachers Learning in Networked Communities (TLINC) program created by the National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future (NCTAF) and funded by AT&T (Fulton et al., 2005).

Tapped In, created in 1997 to provide a web-based learning environment that brings together educators from around the world “to learn, collaborate, share and support one another,” allows mentees to seek out mentors and vice-versa. Tapped In also provides opportunities for veteran and beginning teachers alike to participate in topical discussions and online courses.
Although Tapped In encourages individuals to join, many universities and districts use their platform as a means “to offer high-quality online professional development experiences and support to more teachers cost-effectively.” For a minimal fee, organizations can become “tenants” within the site and have access to the “latest in online technology, along with the online learning strategies and support needed to use online technology effectively” (SRI International, 2007, p.1).

TLINC currently provides support for a limited number of beginning teachers in three geographic regions—Colorado, Memphis, and Seattle and uses the Tapped In platform as a means of support delivery. TLINC, like BTCN was designed specifically to support new teachers (Fulton et al., 2005). The successes and failures of programs such as CKTN, Tapped In, TLINC and others have helped to inform and shape ementoring within the field of education as it is known today.

As more districts face budget cuts and limitations, ementoring is becoming a feasible option for many cash-strapped districts that want to provide their beginning teachers support and mentoring, but are unable to do so due to limited funding and/or lack of mentor teachers. Few would propose that ementoring should replace quality, onsite interactions between school based mentors and mentees, but when faced with monetary and/or physical restrictions, ementoring becomes a practical option in which school districts can provide additional, effective, and quality mentoring to their beginning teachers with minimal cost.

The purpose of this program development and evaluation study is to better understand how a tailored ementoring experience provided support for eight beginning teachers during their first year of teaching. By evaluating and determining what ementoring components were the most and least effective in providing support to the eight beginning teachers, a better
understanding can be gained in how to craft future ementoring programs. Additionally, this study will provide information on how ementoring programs can be used in conjunction with school-based (face-to-face) mentoring to enhance beginning teacher support systems.

**Limitations**

One of the limitations to this study is the dual role I played as researcher and program developer. As the program developer, I was privy to the inner workings and dynamics of the group that I might not have been afforded otherwise. Had I not possessed this duality of roles, my perspective would not have been as wide in scope. However, this wide perspective can also allow certain biases to form. In order to diminish these biases, I used peer debriefing and peer examinations of my findings as well as a reflective journal to capture my thoughts about the processes involved in the creation of the program as well as the findings.

Additionally, the small, contextualized sample of eight alternatively certified, beginning urban teachers limits the generalizability of the findings. Data was collected from only a small group of first year, alternatively certified teachers in one of the largest school districts in Florida, so it would be inappropriate to generalize these findings to all beginning, alternatively certified teachers. However, the findings should provide insight and guidance in helping to create similar ementoring programs for beginning teachers.

**Definition of Terms**

For the purposes of this study, it is useful to have a common understanding of terms that will be used throughout this program evaluation. These definitions are for clarity purposes only and in no manner represent a definitive terminology.

_Ementoring_, synonymous with online mentoring and cyber mentoring, can be a formal or informal mentor relationship that provides mentoring electronically though some form of computer-mediated means such as email, wikis, websites, and other electronic environments.
Ementoring allows the mentee and mentor to communicate and interact in a variety of electronic venues without the deterrent of distance and time limitations due to the 24/7 accessibility computer communications provide.

A multitude of definitions and interpretations exist in the literature for the term induction and the term is often used interchangeably with mentoring. For this study, induction was viewed as a phase that marked a transition from being a student of teaching to that of one being a teacher of students. Although induction can entail several years and phases, the participants in this study were enrolled in a one year, beginning teacher induction program. An induction program will be used to term the formal program of support and professional development the beginning teachers were given over the course of the school year.

Comprehensive induction programs entail a multitude of elements and are not limited to these essential components: structured and regular mentoring experiences with a trained mentor, planned induction programs, reduced teacher workloads that give mentors and mentees time to meet, and communication venues that allow timely exchanges between mentors and mentees. Comprehensive induction programs differ from the more general induction programs found in schools as they entail many more structured components and often receive funding in which to carry out their objectives and sustain the various induction elements.

Pivotal to induction programs whether they are comprehensive or not is the mentoring component. Mentoring, like induction has a plethora of definitions within the literature and is often used synonymously with induction. However, mentoring, a key strategy within induction programs, pairs a beginning teacher with a veteran teacher creating “a formal coaching relationship in which an experienced teacher gives guidance, support, and feedback to a new teacher” (The Southeast Center for Teacher Quality, 2004).
Like the terms mentoring and induction, definitions of alternative certification abound within teacher education literature resulting in varying interpretations of the terminology. Although I used the specific qualifications of the National Center for Alternative Certification to define the program the eight teachers were enrolled in, Adelman’s (1986) definition provides a less detailed definition for the reader, “Alternative certification programs are those teacher preparation programs that enroll noncertified individuals with at least a bachelor’s degree, offering shortcuts, special assistance, or unique curricula leading to eligibility for a standard teaching credential” (p.2).

The term program evaluation will be used as a “diligent investigation of a program’s characteristics and merits” (Fink, 1995, p.2) with the purpose of providing a detailed account of the program’s effectiveness as well as to assess the program’s merit and worth.

The opposite terms synchronously and asynchronously are used in this evaluation to describe how communication occurs in online environments. The term synchronously will be used to describe communication exchanges that occur at the same time. Likewise, the term asynchronously will be used to describe communication exchanges that occurred at different times.

**Overview of Remaining Chapters**

The remainder of this dissertation provides an overview and evaluation of an ementoring program that was created to support eight alternatively certified beginning teachers located in five urban schools during the 2007-08 school year. Chapter 2 examines the literature related to alternative certification, induction, mentoring and ementoring. Chapter 3 provides a detailed description of the ementoring program and its participants. The methodology used to evaluate the program is described in Chapter 4 while the findings of the evaluation are discussed in Chapter 5. Chapter 6 contains recommendations from the program developer. This dissertation
concludes with an afterword in Chapter 7 updating the current context and developments that have occurred since the completion of the program.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of this evaluation study is to determine the effectiveness of a tailored e-mentoring program that was created over the course of a school year for eight alternatively certified beginning teachers in five urban, elementary schools. A review of the literature was conducted to understand what is already known about alternatively certified teachers and the roles induction and mentoring play in providing support to first year teachers. To further understand how mentoring—particularly a customized e-mentoring program—could provide support to alternatively certified urban teachers just beginning their teaching careers, a review of the research was also conducted on literature pertaining to online mentoring.

Definition of Alternative Routes to Certification

There are many definitions as to what constitutes an alternative route (AR) program. Definitions range from the simplistic, “every licensure avenue outside of traditional based college programs” (Cohen-Vogel & Smith, 2007, p. 733) to the more descriptive, “Alternative certification programs are those teacher preparation programs that enroll noncertified individuals with at least a bachelor’s degree, offering shortcuts, special assistance, or unique curricula leading to eligibility for a standard teaching credential” (Adelman, 1986, p.2). For the purposes of this evaluation, the qualifications established by the National Center for Alternative Certification will be used as they better define the nature of the AR program completed by the eight beginning teachers involved in this study and these qualifications include:

- Candidates for these programs pass a rigorous screening process, such as passing tests, interviews, and demonstrated mastery of content.
- The programs are field based and have as the goal a permanent teaching credential.
- The programs include coursework or equivalent experiences in professional education studies while teaching.
Candidates for teaching work closely with trained support providers.

Candidates must meet high standards for completion of programs. (Feistritzer & Cohen, 2000 as cited in McKibbin, 2001)

**History of Alternative Routes to Certification**

Alternative routes to certification (AR) have grown considerably in number and variation since their beginnings in the early 1980s. Created as a means to help increase the teacher applicant pool after reports and studies conducted in the 1980s predicted a looming need for a vast number of quality teachers (Adelman, 1986; Feistritzer, 1994), AR programs allowed individuals with degrees in non-education backgrounds to earn a license to teach without completing a traditional university program. Although New Jersey is credited with enacting legislation for alternative routes in 1984, Virginia laid the foundation for alternative routes in 1982 when they allowed provisional teaching certification to individuals who did not graduate from traditional teacher preparation programs (Dill, 1996; Feistritzer, 1994). The number of AR programs has mushroomed across the country within the past decade for a variety of reasons, including: graduates of traditional teacher preparation programs never joining the teacher workforce, increasing student populations, class-size reduction policies, as well as NCLB’s mandate to have a “highly qualified” teacher in every classroom by the year 2006 (Berry, 2002; Connelly, Sindelar, & Rosenberg, 2004; Darling-Hammond & Berry, 2006; Dill, 1996; Feistritzer, 1994; Ingersoll & Smith, 2003; Rosenberg et al., 2007). What began as the answer to an impending teacher deficit as well as concerns over teacher quality has become an established teacher preparatory industry that has grown to include 48 states as well as the District of Columbia (Adelman, 1986; Feistritzer, 1994; National Center for Education Information, 2006).

A 2006 study conducted by the National Center for Education Information found there are approximately 50,000 individuals who enter the teaching profession via AR programs out of...
the 200,000 who graduate from teaching preparation programs annually, constituting 25% of the annual teaching pool (Rosenberg et al., 2007). In some states such as New Jersey, California and Texas, up to 30% of the teacher workforce is alternatively certified (Boyd, Goldhaber, Lankford, & Wyckoff, 2007). More than one-third of the current state AR programs have been created since 2000 with over 50% of them having been established in the last 15 years. Thus AR programs have created a strong foothold within the educational community in a relatively short amount of time (National Center for Education Information, 2006).

Alternative route programs have also attracted a diverse pool of candidates into the field who might have pursued other career interests. In some cases, alternative routes have been successful in increasing the number of ethnic minorities such as African Americans and Hispanics (Johnson, Birkeland, & Peske, 2005; Rosenberg et al., 2007; Zeichner & Schulte, 2001). Another benefit of ARs is their ability to tap into a cache of subject area expertise by increasing the number of mid-career professionals who have used alternative routes to obtain their teacher certification and enter the teaching workforce (Johnson, Birkeland et al., 2005; Rosenberg et al., 2007).

Statistics show that increasing numbers of alternatively certified teachers have helped fill the high numbers of vacancies in hard-to-staff schools such as those located in rural and urban areas (Ng, 2003; Rosenberg et al., 2007). However, research has also found these beginning teachers are more susceptible to transferring to schools with higher SES student populations or leaving the field within the first three years of their career (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2008; Hanushek, Kain, & Rivkin, 2004; Ng, 2003). Several factors contribute to this phenomena: lower salaries than neighboring high SES districts; inadequate administrative support; chronic discipline problems; minimal parental support; lack of faculty input
concerning school matters; and a dearth of basic resources resulting in working conditions intolerable for urban teaching faculty (Levin & Quinn, 2003; MetLife, 2005). These factors also create a constant turnover of the veteran teaching base, which means novice teachers have few experienced teachers to turn to for advice, support, and mentoring. Stansbury and Zimmerman (2002) warn, “This revolving door creates a permanent core of inexperienced teachers who are learning their craft by, essentially, practicing on the students before them” (p.12). Thus not only are beginning teachers affected by the lack of a skilled, experienced core teaching faculty, but so too are the very students who need them the most.

Further exacerbating the obstacles hard to staff urban schools face, is the expense associated with teacher turnover for these schools. NCTAF’s recent study on attrition costs in five school districts found it costs approximately $8,750 to replace an urban teacher vs. $6,250 to replace nonurban teachers (Barnes, Crowe, & Schaefer, 2007). The difference of $2,500 per teacher, per year can quickly add up and creates stressed financial situations in urban schools trying to recruit, train, and retain an already precarious teacher workforce. Although exact costs are difficult given the associated costs of turnover that cannot be accurately calculated (e.g., student achievement gains, professional development costs, teacher’s knowledge base, societal implications), recent studies estimate the costs incurred by US districts to hire, recruit, train and replace the teachers they lose annually at $2.6 billion to $7.34 billion (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2004; Barnes et al., 2007).

There is some question as to how competent AR teachers are to teach. Proponents of AR programs such as Feistritzer and Finn argue AR programs have not only helped to fill teacher vacancies across the nation, but have also allowed large numbers of individuals into the field with subject area expertise (e.g., math and science) that would be unable to teach otherwise
(Feistritzer, 1993; Finn & Madigan, 2001). Opponents of AR programs, such as Darling-Hammond and Berry, argue that although rigorous AR programs exist, many more exist that are inadequately preparing beginning AR teachers to teach today’s students, and many of these teachers are employed in under-resourced schools found in rural and urban areas. Both Darling-Hammond and Berry argue that low AR program admission requirements coupled with streamlined preparation programs that are found in many AR programs can produce poorly prepared beginning teachers that not only affect student achievement, but also affect retention rates as these teachers are more apt to transfer to schools with higher SES populations or switch to a career unaffiliated with education (Berry, 2001; Darling-Hammond, Holtzman, Gatlin, & Heilig, 2005; Zeichner & Schulte, 2001).

Humphrey and Wechsler (2006) contend that so much variability exists in terms of the structure of AR programs, that it is difficult to draw any conclusions and the debate surrounding AR programs “is based on faulty assumptions about teacher preparation programs of all kinds, whether alternative or traditional” (p. 1). Their study of effective characteristics within seven AR programs found some programs were as demanding in their scope and preparation demands as more traditional preparation programs (Humphrey & Wechsler, 2007). Further analysis of the seven programs by Humphrey, Wechsler, and Hough (2008) found that non-program elements such as adequate supplies and materials, administrative support, collegial atmosphere as well as the personal qualities of each teacher (e.g., being well-educated, having had previous teaching experience) played critical, contributing roles in the overall effectiveness of AR programs (Humphrey, Wechsler, & Hough, 2008). Several components emerged from their study as playing influential roles in creating a successful AR preparation program and mirror findings from similar studies: practical coursework and preparation that focused on applicable strategies.
(Johnson, Birkeland et al., 2005); tailored coursework that prepared graduates to work in urban or low SES schools with low SES populations (Humphrey et al., 2008; Johnson, Birkeland et al., 2005); frequent observations and constructive feedback (Humphrey et al., 2008); and consistent, quality mentoring (Gimbert, Cristol, & Wallace, 2005; Humphrey & Wechsler, 2007; Zeichner & Schulte, 2001). Humphrey and colleagues assert that present and future research should focus on how participants learn, how mentoring components can be strengthened as well as how the programs themselves can be tailored to meet the varying needs of the teachers in training.

School context, often overlooked, is increasingly being found to play an instrumental role in the retention of beginning teachers (Feiman-Nemser, 2001b; Griffin, Kilgore, Winn, & Otis-Wilborn, in press). Hanushek, Kain, and Rivkin’s (2004) study of 375,000 Texas teachers found context to play a determining role as to why teachers of all experience levels stayed within the field, but particularly teachers with 0-5 years of experience. Their study of Texas teachers over the span of 1993-1996 found that while significantly higher salaries might help in keeping teachers from transferring or leaving education, improving the working conditions that are associated with educating low SES populations might be a more feasible solution in helping reduce teacher turnover. These findings further point to context playing a key role in retaining beginning teachers whether they are alternatively or traditionally prepared. Although context cannot be controlled per se, Humphrey, Wechsler, and Hough (2008) remind us that AR programs “can control the support they provide to participants teaching in various contexts” (p. 15) which in turn influences the overall teaching environment. This support manifests itself in various ways: faculty and staff collegiality, strong leadership and administrative support, as well as adequate supplies and materials. The authors contend that these factors alone can affect a teacher’s overall enjoyment of teaching as well as their development. Furthermore, it is these
factors taken together that can have lasting effects on how AR teachers perceive teaching and their initial teaching experiences (Humphrey et al., 2008).

What still remains inconclusive is whether the attrition rates for the beginning alternatively certified teacher population differs from teachers traditionally prepared. This is due in large part to the numerous variabilities within and across AR programs. Nagy and Wang’s study of 142 high school beginning AR teachers found their attrition rate of 13% to mirror that of the national average (Nagy & Wang, 2007). Furthermore, Zeichner and Schulte’s (2001) examination of peer-reviewed literature regarding 21 studies of 13 AR programs found that although retention rates varied within the programs, AR programs in general had comparable or higher retention numbers when compared to traditional programs. However, differences in retention rates between AR and traditional programs surfaced when teachers of particular subjects and grade levels were examined, exposing lower rates of retention for AR teachers versus their traditionally prepared counterparts.

Given that AR programs are now an integral part of education and continue to grow in response to increasing demand, effective ways to develop and retain this specific teacher population need to be examined. Two of the more attractive features found with the majority of AR programs are also viewed by some in education as its limitations—fewer required courses than traditional preparation programs and minimal to no required field experiences which are a norm of traditional teacher preparation (e.g., Humphrey & Wechsler, 2007). Both create streamlined versions of traditional preparation programs which are enticing to working professionals wanting to become teachers. Substantially less time away from their current employment is needed allowing many to obtain their teaching credentials while still working full-time and not sacrificing their income. Although minimal required coursework and little to
no field experiences allows AR students to abbreviate their time obtaining a teaching credential and result in an increased teacher candidate pool, teacher education advocates such as Linda Darling-Hammond, Barnett Berry, and others would argue that minimal teacher preparation coursework and little to no field experiences only produce minimally prepared beginning teachers. They would also maintain that traditional preparation programs along with field experiences are critical in preparing one to be a competent educator (Berry, 2001; Darling-Hammond & Baratz-Snowden, 2007; Darling-Hammond et al., 2005).

As a result, this limited coursework and streamlined field experiences may result in the need for alternatively certified teachers to receive further supports than their traditionally trained counterparts. With research attesting to the positive impact comprehensive induction programs can have on retaining teachers (Ingersoll, 2003; Moir & Gless, 2001; Smith & Ingersoll, 2004), more needs to be done to ensure beginning AR teachers receive these quality induction experiences that support their transition into the teaching field.

**Importance of Induction**

The current educational landscape is one filled with some of the greatest demands on teachers than ever in education’s past. Nowhere is this more evident than with the 21st century beginning teacher. Not only are they expected to work under the numerous tenants and ramifications of NCLB which demands continual student achievement gains regardless of student population and school environment, but dwindling school budgets and continued public scrutiny of teacher quality and student achievement gains place enormous pressures on even the most seasoned of teachers.

Comprehensive induction programs can offset the high numbers of beginning teachers that leave the field of teaching within the first five years of their career. Research on induction has found that induction programs, comprised of multiple components can make a difference in
retaining beginning teachers (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2004; American Federation of Teachers, 2001; Odell & Ferraro, 1992; Smith & Ingersoll, 2004). Successful, large scale induction programs such as Connecticut’s Beginning Educator and Support Training (BEST), the Santa Cruz New Teacher Project (SCNTP), California’s Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA), Louisiana’s Teacher Assistance and Assessment Program (LaTAAP) and Framework for Inducting, Retaining, and Supporting Teachers (LaFIRST), and most recently New York City’s $36 million investment to overhaul their induction program and improve teacher mentoring begun in 2004 have all shown how investments of time and continual funding can make a difference in creating and sustaining induction programs that affect teacher retention, teacher quality, and student achievement (Joftus & Maddox-Dolan, 2002; Kapadia et al., 2007; New Teacher Center, 2006; Strong, 2004, 2006). Since their varying inception dates, all six programs have produced significant retention rates within school districts around the country ranging from LaFIRST’s 88% in 2001-2002 to SCNTP’s impressive 89% retention rate for their 1992-1993 cohort six years later. Retention rates such as these lend strong evidence in how well orchestrated induction programs can play integral roles in teacher retention (Alliance for Education, 2004; New Teacher Center, 2006).

At the beginning of the 21st century, a large teacher shortage was forecasted, suggesting that thousands of teachers would be needed as a result of class-size reduction amendments, a wave of teacher retirements, and a continual flow of teachers leaving the field due to unsatisfactory work conditions. Although these factors did and still continue to contribute to the annual number of teachers leaving the field, Ingersoll’s 2003 research on the teacher shortage phenomenon found shortages within the educational field are primarily a result of “pre-retirement teacher turnover,” and not due to increased numbers of retiring teachers or student
enrollment. Ingersoll contends that the issue is better conceptualized as a problem with teacher retention rather than teacher production or supply. For this reason, he argues that merely producing higher numbers of teachers to fill the ranks will only be a short-term solution for a problem that ultimately needs a long-term answer. His report suggests that “schools are not simply victims of inexorable demographic trends and there is a significant role for the management and organization of schools in both the genesis of, and the solution to, school staffing problems” (p. 21). He recommends that “full induction experiences” are one such way in which school districts can play a role in decreasing the numbers of teachers moving to other schools as well as leaving the profession altogether.

This suggestion is further explored in his research surrounding the effects of induction and mentoring on beginning teacher turnover with Smith and Ingersoll’s analysis of 1999-2000 SASS data. Their analysis, involving a sample size of 3,235 beginning teachers, found that comprehensive induction packages played significant roles in diminishing beginning teachers’ intent to leave. With no induction support or program, 40% of the teachers in their analysis abandoned teaching after their initial year. A basic induction package that was received by 56% of the teachers in their sample, consisted of a mentor and supportive communication from their principal or other administrator, and resulted in a 39% loss of the teachers. Their third category of induction packages entailed the basic induction program along with a collaboration component that included common planning time or regularly scheduled time to collaborate with teachers in their grade level/subject area as well as participation in a beginning teacher seminar. Twenty-six percent of the teachers in their study received this induction package and 27% of this group left the field at the end of their first year. Unfortunately, the most effective induction package that resulted in 8% of the new teachers leaving was received by less than 1% of the
teachers in the analysis. This package included the three induction package components along with participation in an external network of teachers, reduced number of preparations, and an assigned teacher’s aide (Smith & Ingersoll, 2004). Not only did a comprehensive induction experience contribute to retaining beginning teachers, but it also helped to retain teachers at their respective schools and reduced the number of transfers to less challenging teaching environments. Smith and Ingersoll’s analysis attests to the positive effects of mentoring and induction on teacher retention and clearly demonstrates the power of these various induction components when combined with one another.

Colbert and Wolff’s (1992) study of a collaborative support program between the Los Angeles Unified School District and California State University also resulted in improved retention rates. This three year study involving 120 urban beginning teachers, 24 lead teachers and two support programs consisting of induction-like components (e.g., cooperative planning, classroom observations, coaching) resulted in a 95% retention rate of the teachers in the study at the end of three years. Given that researchers have found that up to 50% of teachers quit teaching within their first five years (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2004; Ingersoll, 2002; National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future, 2003), these statistics further attest to the importance induction and mentoring programs can have in retaining our newest teachers.

Even with mounting evidence that induction programs when done well can greatly influence the retention rates of beginning teachers, there still exist huge variability in the kinds of induction programs that exist within the US. Exemplary programs such as BEST, SCNTP, BTSA, LaTAAP and LaFIRST have provided the educational community with effective practices, but how each district implements similar components is often at the mercy of the local school district’s budget. Kauffman’s 2007 report for the Education Commission of the States
(ECS) on state mentoring and induction programs revealed large variability exists in the kinds of mentoring and induction programs found within each state. Of the 30 states that have existing induction programs for beginning teachers, programs ranged from Connecticut’s very prescriptive BEST program to Arizona’s general program definition of induction leaving the induction process up to the individual school (Kaufmann, 2007a).

Furthermore, funding of such induction programs varies greatly among and within states which in turn affects program sustainability and effectiveness. Smith’s analysis of state induction policies and funding found that while states may mandate induction, few provide the funding to support these programs (Smith, 2007). Similarly, Berry, Hopkins-Thompson and Hoke’s (2003) study of 10 southeast state induction programs found seven of the ten states involved in their study (Arkansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee) had mandatory induction programs, while only five of the ten states (Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, North Carolina and South Carolina) provided state funding (Berry, Hopkins-Thompson, & Hoke, 2002). Funding amounts also varied—from $500 per teacher in the state of Georgia to nearly $3,000 in North Carolina. Berry and colleagues noted that these amounts were not sufficient to provide teachers with induction programs similar to Connecticut’s BEST or BTSA programs where costs can run upwards of $7,000 per teacher, per year.

Although substantial variation exists among induction programs, decades of research has resulted in key components and shared characteristics of effective induction programs. Some of these components require a greater investment of beliefs and emotions from school personnel. For example, school faculty and administration must buy into the need to mentor new teachers, which in turn creates a supportive and collegial work environment (Brock & Grady, 1998;
In contrast, other key induction components require an investment of time and money such as: release time and/or reduced teaching loads (Arends & Rigazio-DiGilio, 2000; Berry et al., 2002; Gschwend & Moir, 2007; Johnson, 2007); program length of one year to two years beyond the initial induction year (Feiman-Nemser, 2001a; New Teacher Center Research Team, 2006); time to observe other teachers as well as be observed (Berry et al., 2002; Huling-Austin, 1992; Johnson, 2007); use of cohorts (Huling-Austin, 1992); and critical, but constructive assessment of new teachers’ skills (Berry et al., 2002; New Teacher Center Research Team, 2006). However, the investment in providing a quality mentoring experience that entails trained mentors with low mentor to new teacher ratios or substantial release time from regular teaching duties and structured mentoring experiences has been the most notable component of comprehensive induction programs (American Federation of Teachers, 2001; Gschwend & Moir, 2007; Ingersoll & Kralik, 2004; Johnson, 2007; Moir & Gless, 2001; New Teacher Center Research Team, 2006; Wong, 2004). It is this powerful component of induction programs that will be discussed in further detail in the following section.

**The Role of Mentoring**

A foundational component of comprehensive induction programs is mentoring. Often used interchangeably with induction, mentoring is a component of induction and “is a formal coaching relationship in which an experienced teacher gives guidance, support, and feedback to a new teacher.” Induction “goes beyond mentoring to provide an extensive framework of support, professional development, and standards-based assessments and evaluations” (The Southeast Center for Teacher Quality, 2004).

Literature related to mentoring in the early 1980’s noted its unexplored potential in education, particularly for beginning teachers (Feiman-Nemser, 1983; Galvez-Hjornevik, 1986). However, much has changed in the past two decades as mentoring programs have continued to
grow in their popularity with the number of beginning teachers participating in mentoring programs continuing to increase. The most recent statistics from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) reveals that 70.4% of public school teachers (approximately 3.1 million) with less than four’s years of teaching experience had a mentor teacher their first year of teaching during the 2003-04 school year— an increase of almost 7% for the 1999-2000 school year. Furthermore, induction programs experienced similar increases during this same time (National Center for Education Statistics, 2008).

Although these statistics are promising, researchers would agree that definitions and components of mentoring vary greatly among school districts. Thus, the sense of optimism surrounding the increased numbers of teachers receiving mentoring should be tempered. Caution should be used when comparing mentoring programs or making generalized statements attesting to their effectiveness or lack thereof, when so much variation currently exists. Smith and Ingersoll (2004) found induction programs varied greatly in terms of purpose, duration, intensity, and structure making comparisons of programs and specific components such as mentoring, difficult if not impossible. Additionally, great discrepancies exist in states that require mentoring programs and as well as the funding provided to support these programs (SRI International, 2000). Kaufmann’s 2007 report on state induction and mentoring programs found beginning teachers’ participation in mentoring programs was optional in some states and mandatory in others, while compensation ranged from nothing to a high of $6,000 a year. Additionally, programs lasted from two semesters to three years and involved varying fulfillment requirements. Interestingly, 43 states have mentoring policies in place for their beginning teachers, whereas only 30 states have established induction policies and six states have neither (Kaufmann, 2007b). These striking differences in compensation, program length, and program
requirements further reaffirm the idiosyncratic nature of mentoring and induction programs found in US school districts, and reaffirm a need for what Feiman-Nemser labels a “professional learning continuum” (p. 1014). Not only does her proposed continuum entail strong mentoring and induction components but the continuum begins in preservice teacher preparation and continues through the initial years of a teacher’s career (Feiman-Nemser, 2001a).

Ingersoll and Kralik’s (2004) review of induction and mentoring studies found that even with significant differences among the studies they reviewed, “collectively the studies do provide empirical support for the claim that assistance for new teachers and, in particular, mentoring programs have a positive impact on teachers and their retention” (p. 2). Public Education Network’s (PEN) 2002 survey of 200 new teachers found that while only 67% of the teachers surveyed participated in a formal mentoring relationship their first year of teaching, researchers found most of the teachers in the study “benefited from having a mentor” (p.34).

Similar findings attest to the positive effect mentoring can have upon beginning teachers (Odell & Ferraro, 1992; Strong & St. John, 2001). Odell and Ferraro found 96% of the 141 teachers involved in their study were still teaching four years after they had received mentoring during their initial year of teaching (Odell & Ferraro, 1992). Similarly, Strong and St. John examined the effects of mentoring with 59 teachers four years after they had participated in the Santa Cruz New Teacher Project (SCNTP) mentoring program. Although their sample size is relatively small, Strong and St. John found that 94% of their teachers were still teaching seven to eight years after the completion of the program (Strong & St. John, 2001).

Adding to the positive effects mentoring can have on the retention of new teacher is the economic impact of such programs. Villar and Strong’s (2007) recent cost-benefit analysis of mentoring programs found that every dollar invested in a comprehensive mentoring program
resulted in a $1.66 overall rate of return over the course of five years. With conservative estimates placing the costs associated with teacher attrition at $2.4 billion annually, their analysis is not only promising, but timely given the recent economic environment as well as escalating fuel costs that have negatively impacted school districts’ budgets across the nation.

Gold’s (1996) review of the literature on beginning teacher induction categorized the support beginning teachers need falls within the two categories of instructional-related support and psychological support. Instructional-related support includes “assisting the novice with the knowledge, skills, and strategies necessary to be successful in the classroom and school” whereas psychological support entails building “the protégé’s sense of self through confidence building, developing feelings of effectiveness, encouraging positive self-esteem, enhancing self-reliance, and learning how to handle stress” (p. 561). Effective mentoring can provide both even though emotional support provided by mentors is most often cited by mentees as being a critical factor in their ability to survive their initial years as teachers (Holloway, 2001; Odell & Ferraro, 1992), whereas providing instructional support is more often the focus of mentors with their mentees (Feiman-Nemser, Schwille et al., 1999).

Interestingly, PEN’s 2002 survey results reported that many of the teachers in their study did not feel their mentors provided them with specific advice or guidance on how to improve their instructional practices. Instead, they reported that mentors provided more psychological support. Responses such as these give evidence to the fine balancing act that mentors must maintain in order to deliver these two kinds of support that mentees both want and need.

Achinstein and Athanases (2006) along with Feiman-Nemser and her colleagues (1999) suggest mentoring in the 21st century should, “move beyond emotional support and brief technical advice to become truly educative, focused on learning opportunities that move novices’
practice forward and challenge their thinking and practice” (p.9). Mentors have the ability to support beginning teachers in reframing their thinking about students and learning, giving mentoring the capabilities of transforming rather than transferring beginning teacher knowledge.

Feiman-Nemser and her colleagues (1999) stress the need to “move beyond a general recognition that new teachers need support” (p. 4) and create mentoring and induction experiences that not only provide the psychological support that Gold suggests, but to broaden our conceptions of support to include a greater emphasis on instructional support which in turn entails a greater emphasis on accountability and professional development. They warn that “support without development leaves teacher learning to chance” (p. 10) and can render induction and mentoring programs ineffectual in regard to improving the quality of instruction.

**Time and numbers.** Critical to the mentoring relationship is time—time to meet, watch, discuss, and assist. To mentor effectively, mentor teachers and their mentees need time to plan together, observe one another, reflect upon issues, as well as have the time to simply converse and establish a positive mentoring relationship. Research has found that due to the nature of the teaching day, it is often difficult to find sufficient time for mentoring (Ganser, 1995; Johnson, 2007; Johnson, Berg, & Donaldson, 2005; Wildman, Magliaro, Niles, & Niles, 1992). Quite often mentees and mentors are not afforded release time and/or mentor-to-mentee ratios are high, ranging up to 1:15 (SRI International, 2000) making time to meet, confer, and observe limited or at times non-existent. Without a dedicated time to meet on a recurrent basis, mentor/mentee relationships cannot be effectively maintained and are likely to flounder.

**Location, location, location.** Successful mentor/mentee relationships not only need time to meet, but studies have found that location plays a critical role in the relationship. Teaching in the same school and preferably in the same grade level have been found to be instrumental in
creating a coherent and effective mentoring relationship (Johnson, 2007; Public Education Network, 2003; White & Mason, 2006; Wildman et al., 1992). Logistical concerns can often hinder the best of mentoring relationships and ease of mentor accessibility can play pivotal roles in a mentee’s success.

**Culture and collegiality.** School cultures that promote and support mentoring are also foundational in sustaining effective mentoring partnerships. School leadership that values induction and mentoring along with collegial support have been found to play a key role in the retention and induction of new teachers—particularly those in hard to staff schools. MetLife’s 2005 survey of 800 teachers with five years of experience or less, found a strong correlation between quality school relationships (e.g., principal, teaching colleagues, staff) and a teacher’s intent to remain at their particular school. Kapadia, Coca, and Liston’s study of 1,700 Chicago novice teachers resulted in similar findings. Their survey results revealed that “the contextual factors of teacher background and preparation, classroom demands, and school-level features work in concert to influence novices’ teaching experience, and by extension, their likelihood to continue in the profession and remain in the same school” (p.20). These findings led the authors to recommend that for induction programs and their mentoring components to be effective, these contextual elements must be addressed (Kapadia et al., 2007). Moreover, without a school environment that is collegial and conducive to teacher development, the best of mentoring relationships are destined to fail.

**Mentor selection.** Research on mentoring has also revealed several key characteristics of mentors. Moir and Gless (2001) note that mentors need to be critically selected as not all good teachers are good mentors of adults. Selection criteria should include: “strong interpersonal skills, credibility with peers and administrators, a demonstrated curiosity, and eagerness to learn,
respect for multiple perspectives, and outstanding instructional practice” (p. 112). A study by Wildman, Magliaro, Niles, and Niles (1992) of 150 mentor/mentee dyads echoed similar findings, but noted that the “willingness of the experienced teacher to be a mentor” (p. 211) was a paramount characteristic for mentors to possess.

Mentors must possess a willingness and desire to mentor a novice teacher and not be forced into the relationship (Gray & Gray, 1985) as well as not become a mentor simply for monetary reasons as can be the case in certain mentor/mentee relationships. Although adequate mentor compensation is an important component of mentoring programs, when it is the primary motivation on the part of the mentor in participating, the mentee is apt to not be afforded constructive, critical support. Clearly intentions are important when becoming a mentor, but other factors such as those discussed by Moir and Gless play crucial aspects and should not be overlooked when recruiting teachers to become mentors.

**Ongoing mentor training.** Just like mentees, mentors need initial and ongoing training surrounding effective mentoring techniques as well as year-long support. Too often it is assumed that simply due to the definition of their titles that mentors need little training other than an introductory, beginning of the school year workshop. Even when mentors meet critical selection criteria (Moir & Gless, 2001; Wildman et al., 1992), mentors need to receive ongoing training in how to maintain and promote the mentoring relationship (Achinstein & Athanases, 2006; Gray & Gray, 1985; Ingersoll & Kralik, 2004; Johnson, 2007; Johnson, Berg et al., 2005).

Giebelhaus and Bowman’s (2002) examination of the influence of mentor training on preservice teachers found cooperating teachers/mentors who received additional training based on the Praxis III/Pathwise assessment framework resulted in greater reflection, more effective instruction, and more comprehensive planning on the part of the prospective teachers. This study
found significant differences on 11 of the 19 Pathwise criteria, suggesting that systematic training of mentors can positively influence mentees whether they are preservice or in-service teachers.

Furthermore, Evertson and Smithey (2000) experienced similar results in their study of mentor efficacy after mentors were provided year long training with a research-based mentoring program. Their study of 46 mentor-mentee pairs found that the 23 mentors who were provided comprehensive training in how to support and mentor effectively resulted in their mentees being better prepared to instruct and engage students more efficiently than the mentees of mentors within the control group. Treatment group mentors were also found to be more comprehensive in their interactions with their mentees (e.g., asked more probing questions that required greater reflection, applied conferencing strategies) than mentors who did not receive the training.

Additionally, mentors need to stay abreast of research related to effective mentoring. With teaching being so dynamic, it is inevitable that situations will arise that are beyond the initial preparation and training that is typically provided to mentors at the onset of the school year. Ganser (1995) warns that mentor training should not take the route of many teacher professional development programs that are often “front-end loaded,” and place all training and preparation at the beginning of the year rather than providing training throughout the school year. Not only do mentors—experienced and beginners need professional development surrounding mentoring and effective mentoring practices, but professional development needs to be ongoing to ensure that mentors are well prepared (Achinstein & Athanases, 2006).

Clearly, research findings point to the validity and value of mentoring programs (e.g., Achinstein & Athanases, 2006; Boreen & Niday, 2000; Ingersoll & Kralik, 2004; Moir & Gless, 2001). However, it also evident that for such a rather simplistic concept, mentoring is multi-
faceted and complex. Adding to this complexity is the expanding role of technology within mentoring. Known as online mentoring, telementoring, cybermentoring or ementoring, this newer form of mentoring uses technology as a means of delivering mentoring in a variety of ways: email exchanges, online forums, wikis, listservs, etc. Not only is the issue of distance no longer an obstacle by using technology as a means of delivering mentoring, but the constraints of time and fixed schedules are less an issue in a world that is operating 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Mentors are afforded a greater audience by the various online forums available as well as being able to provide mentees mentoring and assistance after school hours. With mentor stipends and salaries as well as other personnel related costs making up the bulk of mentoring budgets, districts across the country are looking for ways in which they can still provide quality mentoring while limiting personnel costs. Ementoring offers one possible approach.

Ementoring

Unmistakably, the Internet has profoundly changed how we communicate, interact, and learn. Nowhere is this more evident than in the field of education. From elementary schools to college and beyond, how and when students learn has taken on entirely different meanings with the proliferation of computers and technological improvements. Educational journals are now filled with terms such as e-learning, distance education, virtual learning, hybrid learning environments, reflecting how the educational landscape has dramatically changed in a relatively short time span. Once viewed as a passing trend, online learning has grown to include substantial numbers of e-learners. The Sloan Consortium’s recent study of 2,500 colleges and universities found that 3.5 million students were taking at least one online course during the fall of 2006 accounting for approximately 20% of all higher education students. This represented a two-fold increase in online students from their initial 2002 study (Allen & Seaman, 2007). These increasing numbers have led to a growing research base on learning communities, which
in turn has led to expanded knowledge within other areas such as online communities, online learning, and ementoring.

As noted previously, ementoring is a relatively new form of mentoring within education. Few would suggest ementoring should replace onsite interactions between school based mentors and mentees. However, ementoring becomes a practical option in which school districts can provide additional, effective, and quality mentoring to their beginning teachers with minimal costs and greater flexibility by reducing the obstacles of time and distance.

Bierema and Merriam (2002) define ementoring as “a computer mediated, mutually beneficial relationship between a mentor and a protégé which provides learning, advising, encouraging, promoting, and modeling, that is often boundaryless, egalitarian, and qualitatively different than traditional face-to-face mentoring” (p.214). Similarly, Single and Miller (2001) describe ementoring as:

A relationship that is established between a more senior individual (mentor) and a lesser skilled individual (protégé), primarily using electronic communications and that is intended to develop and grow the skills, knowledge, confidence, and cultural understanding of the protégé to help him or her succeed, while also assisting in the development of the mentor. (p.108)

Synonymous with terms such as cybermentoring, telementoring, and online mentoring, for conciseness in this literature review, the term ementoring will be used.

Much of the research base surrounding ementoring in education stems from studies of ementoring occurring between teachers and K-12 students (e.g., Asgari & O'Neill, 2004; Harris, Rotenberg, & O'Brysan, 1997; O'Neill & Gomez, 1998) or ementoring in conjunction with pre-service teachers (e.g., Brown & Kysilka, 2005; Price & Chen, 2003; Thoresen, 1997). However, with the proliferation of technology use in society coupled with concerns of beginning teacher retention and continued interest of the mentor’s role in retaining teachers, a growing research base focused solely on the ementoring of beginning teachers is beginning to emerge (e.g.,
Babinski, Jones, & DeWert, 2001; Eisenman & Thornton, 1999; Gareis & Nussbaum-Beach, 2007; Livengood & Moon Merchant, 2004).

Bull, Harris, Lloyd, and Short hinted at the potential use of email as a form of support for beginning teachers in their 1989 article *The Electronic Academical Village*. One of the first journal articles to explain the varied uses of email in educational settings, Bull and colleagues discussed the University of Virginia’s successful use of email as a new means of communication as well as a form of support for student teachers within their teacher education program a mere two decades ago.

The first substantial investigation using ementoring with beginning teachers was Merseth’s study of beginning teachers involved with the Beginning Teacher Computer Network (BTCN) at Harvard University. Her study, which was conducted with 39 beginning teachers, found that computer networks (email) provided substantial emotional support to teachers who were beginning their careers in education. Using process, product, and participation data on the participants, Merseth found that the network not only provided participants with greatly needed emotional support, but also promoted greater reflection on the part of the participants (Merseth, 1990).

**Support via ementoring.** Instructional and emotional support, which are critical components of mentoring, have been found to be key benefits of ementoring. DeWert, Babinski, and Jones’ (2003) study of 12 beginning teachers within a volunteer online community found asynchronous communication via email and threaded discussions to not only be effective in providing emotional support and decreased feelings of isolation, but also provided social, practical, and professional support. Klecka, Clift, and Cheng’s (2004) three year study exploring the possibilities of ementoring during the development of their Novice Teacher Support
Ementoring project found that such a format for mentoring not only provided emotional support to the participating beginning teachers, but also gave them a venue in which to acquire additional resources for their teaching. However, Klecka and her colleagues found that in order for the online community to provide an environment that was viewed as “safe” by the participants and allowed them to communicate openly, trust needed to be established between and among mentors and mentees in order for the ementoring program to be successful in providing support.

Similarly, after examining the content, direction, and function of 526 online exchanges among 13 novice and 11 veteran teachers, Gareis and Nussbaum-Beach (2007) found that not only did the ementoring forum provide emotional support to the novice teachers, but it also allowed mentors and mentees to discuss the professional practices of beginning teachers that included instructional related issues such as planning for instruction and instructional delivery as well as assessment, classroom management, and professionalism.

Interestingly, their analysis on the directions and flow of the postings suggested a more complex communication exchange. Many of the postings were broadcasted to the group rather than discussed in a one-to-one manner as would be predicted given the 13 mentees and 11 mentors were located in different sites across the United States and did not have a previous relationship with one another. Communication exchanges were not only comprised of individual to group, but vice versa as well as one-on-one giving evidence that the online forum “provided a multiplicity of interactions and relationships not characteristic of conventional one-to-one mentoring relationships” (Gareis & Nussbaum-Beach, 2007, p.239).

Thus, this forum not only provided support, but it also stimulated the development of professional relationships among beginning teachers. Despite the small sample size of this study, the amount of data generated and repetitive patterns within the data support the potential
of ementoring in fostering emotional and instructional support as well building online learning communities among new teachers.

**Ementoring and reflection.** Reflection, a foundational skill of effective teachers and a pivotal skill in the development of beginning teachers (Schön, 1988; Zeichner, 1986; Zeichner & Liston, 1987) can be fostered within ementoring relationships. This is particularly true in asynchronous exchanges, where participants are afforded the time to think and respond thoughtfully, unlike face-to-face exchanges that require on-the-spot responses (Palloff & Pratt, 2007).

Ementoring also has potential to contribute to beginning teachers’ development as dialogue opportunities provided online can allow collaborative conversations to emerge. It is within these collaborative conversations that beginning teachers’ thinking can be elevated, particularly when questions and discussions initiated by mentors are carefully scaffolded (Hawkes & Romiszowski, 2001; Whipp, 2003).

A study by Hawkes and Romiszowski (2001) analyzed the discourse among 28 teachers in 10 Chicago urban schools and found teachers’ levels of reflection to be significantly greater online than in face-to-face interactions. Using a seven point reflection rubric based on Simmons, Sparks, Starko, Pasc, Colton, & Grinberg’s (1989) taxonomy for assessing reflective thinking, they analyzed all online and face-to-face communications between the 28 participating teachers. Hawkes and Romiszowski found reflection scores were greater in online forums with reflection being “sporadic at best” when teachers were interacting face-to-face. They suggest that reflection must either be the goal of face-to-face interactions, or it must be planned to be a part of the process. They further suggest that online forums afford participants the time to step away
from the task at hand and give participants time to think and reflect without the pressures of having to respond in the moment.

Similar findings were also discovered in Whipp’s (2003) study of 40 preservice teachers and their exchanges concerning their field experiences in urban schools. Using Hatton and Smith’s (1995) categories of reflective writing, Whipp analyzed the email exchanges among the 40 participants over the course of two semesters. After not observing high levels of reflection within the first semester’s exchanges with the majority of the preservice teachers, the design and level of online support was changed to include greater scaffolding supports (e.g., tailored questioning, increased individual communication). These changes resulted in substantially higher levels of reflective responses than the previous semester’s exchanges. Whipp found the majority of the participants were writing at a level Hatton and Smith categorized as “descriptive reflection,” where they were analyzing reasons particular events and situations within their classrooms and schools were occurring, unlike the previous semester’s responses that entailed more reporting of events. Although neither of these studies (Hatton & Smith, 1995; Whipp, 2003) pertained specifically to novice teachers, their findings hold strong implications in how reflection can be fostered within an ementoring relationship, as well as how structured supports have potential for deepening mentees’ levels of reflection.

**Essential ementoring components.** Although the ementoring literature is in its infancy, several key components have been found to be essential in making ementoring effective and lasting. Not surprisingly, many of these components mirror those in the general mentoring literature. Gentry, Denton, and Kurz’s (2008) recent synthesis of 14 technologically based mentoring studies found: (a) time to access, reflect, and respond to other members and/or facilitator; (b) program structure; (c) trust among members and facilitator/s; and (d) a sense of
community to be critical factors in the success with the majority of the ementoring programs they examined (Gentry, Denton, & Kurz, 2008).

**Time.** TLINC, one of the largest ementoring initiatives to date, involved 734 experienced and beginning teachers, project personnel, technology coordinators and evaluators and spanned two years. A 2007 evaluation of the initiative found time played a critical role within many facets of the project. Not only was time found to be a necessity for facilitators to establish trust and rapport, it was also necessary to create a viable online support system that reflected the participant’s evolving needs. Additionally, beginning teacher’s lack of time was found to negatively impact many of the online interactions. For instance, large cohort numbers (e.g., 30 members) provided a wide range of responses per online cohort, but at the same time provided too many responses for participants to be able to read and respond with great thought and reflection. With so little time, teachers also wanted more “one-stop-shop” kinds of resources that would provide them quick access to specific resources and strategies rather than discussions that were more abstract or academic in nature (Metiri Group, 2007).

**Trust and community.** Trust, a recurrent theme in the induction and mentoring literature, was also found to play a key role in several ementoring projects (Babinski et al., 2001; Klecka et al., 2005; Metiri Group, 2007; Thoresen, 1997). Mentees often noted that ementoring forums allowed them to seek advice from others without being judged as incompetent or ignorant by their school-based colleagues. Furthermore, a sense of community was forged as a result of the online forums and afforded many mentees a safe venue for venting their frustrations regarding particular school situations and personnel without feeling vulnerable or at-risk in looking ill-prepared and inadequate to teach (Babinski et al., 2001; Bierema & Merriam, 2002; Harris & Figg, 2000; Klecka et al., 2005; Metiri Group, 2007; Thoresen, 1997).
Structures and scaffolding. The structure of the ementoring community and the instruction supports provided to teachers have also been found to influence the success of ementoring programs (Palloff & Pratt, 2007; Swan, 2003). Structure entails clear expectations of the participants (Swan, 2003), as well as guidelines that provide the ground rules for member participation and interaction (Palloff & Pratt, 2005). Mentors as facilitators, play crucial roles in establishing the structure of the ementoring venue by making expectations and guidelines clear to the mentees, as well as orchestrating meaningful discussions and activities (Harris & Figg, 2000; Paulus & Scherff, 2008). Ementoring forums cannot be expected to function well under a laissez-faire kind of atmosphere, however Paulus and Scherff (2008) found in their analysis with the online discussion of 15 preservice teachers that too much structure and focus on specific topics stifled the more pressing needs of emotional support and day-to-day survival skills that the teachers wanted and needed. Their results suggest that a balance needs to be found between structure and flexibility when constructing ementoring programs.

Striking a balance. Much has been discovered surrounding the potentials and pitfalls of ementoring in the past two decades. Greater reflection on the part of participants, emotional support, the ability to communicate 24/7, the ability to share resources, are only a few of the numerous benefits of providing mentoring via a technology platform. Conversely, members of the ementoring community can feel disconnected, too readily accessible, as well as frustrated with the lack of physical and verbal clues that online communications can’t provide. Most researchers suggest that ementoring should not be the only form of support first year teachers receive and that face-to-face interactions are a vital part of the support package beginning teachers need and want (Klecka et al., 2005; Price & Chen, 2003). Furthermore, the overall effect of ementoring upon the retention of beginning teachers and student achievement is still
unknown, but as ementoring becomes more commonplace in education, greater knowledge will help inform these growing concerns within education (Gentry et al., 2008).

Kimura (2002) cautions educators who utilize technology that, “no matter what technology we employ, it is still the human experience that is most important. Students learn from teachers, their peers, and knowledge experts. No one learns from a computer” (Kimura, 2002, p.1). Thus, it is imperative to not lose sight of the human element when mentoring online. Ementoring must strike a balance between its utility and effectiveness in conjunction with the people involved in the mentoring relationship.

**Summary**

Some researchers project that half of the teaching workforce will retire between 2000 and 2010 (Johnson, Berg et al., 2005). The current issues of retention, attrition, induction and mentoring will become even more accentuated given these current predictions. The imperative to retain new teachers becomes critical in stabilizing the high percentages that are leaving the field during the first five years of their teaching careers. Compounding this issue is the large number of alternatively certified teachers entering the teaching workforce and the large proportion of this group that are recruited to teach in high need schools. Lack of veteran teachers with high levels of expertise leaves many districts, particularly those located in rural and urban populations, looking for alternative forms of support and mentoring. Further exacerbating the issue of limited teacher expertise are tight budget years that have districts scrambling to find alternative support systems that can be provided cost effectively.

Comprehensive induction programs with strong mentoring components have shown to be effective in retaining new teachers (Fulton et al., 2005; Ingersoll & Kralik, 2004; Smith & Ingersoll, 2004). With the abundant use of technology, ementoring has shown promise as a viable means of mentoring beginning teachers (Brady & Schuck, 2005; DeWert, Babinski, &
Jones, 2003; Merseth, 1990, 1991). However, with its relative infancy as a form of mentoring in education, effective components of ementoring still need further exploration as a means of supporting beginning teachers, particularly those in urban schools.

The available professional literature comes together to demonstrate the complexities involved in creating a meaningful mentoring and induction experience, particularly for teachers who are alternatively certified. We have known for some time that mentoring and induction take many forms. Additionally, we know that mentoring is in many senses an art form and not just a skill or job assignment. But even with all of its complexities and layers, ementoring emerges from the literature as a promising, new alternative means of delivering mentoring to beginning teachers.

The Mentors and Online Support for Teachers program was created as a means of providing a tailored induction program that included face-to-face and online mentoring components to eight alternatively certified teachers. The MOST online component was developed and tailored by the researcher to fit the needs of the eight beginning teachers and was delivered online over the course of the 2007-08 school year.

What follows is a detailed description of the MOST ementoring component along with a program evaluation of the elements within the program that were found to be effective and useful, as well as those that were not effective in providing a quality online mentoring experience. This program evaluation adds to our knowledge of ementoring as a component of induction programs. Additionally, it provides insight into the necessary elements needed to make ementoring a useful means of support for alternatively certified beginning teachers.
The University of Florida Mentors and Online Support for Teachers (MOST)

The University of Florida (UF) Mentors and Online Support for Teachers (MOST) program was created as a means of providing a tailored induction program that included face-to-face and online mentoring components to eight alternatively certified teachers who graduated from the first cohort of the Duval County Transition to Teaching Elementary Education Apprenticeship Program (TTT) program in 2007. These eight beginning alternative route (AR) teachers currently teach in five low SES schools within the Duval County Public School (DCPS) system. The DCPS system, located in Jacksonville, Florida is the one of the largest school systems in the state, operating 160 schools, serving 125,000 students, and employing 8,715 teachers within its 918 square miles (Duval County Public School System, 2008).

Participant Description

Six of the eight beginning teachers were female with two of those being the only African Americans in the group. The remaining six teachers were Caucasian. The teachers shared a range of ages as well as previous professional backgrounds and experiences. The youngest at 26, held a degree in criminology and was still active in the military as a reserve. The oldest member of the cohort was 53, held an MBA and had over 10 years work experience in human resource management. Participant demographics are reported in Table 1. The only males in the group both had technology backgrounds which interestingly became a “commodity” of sorts as they were able to use their skills in exchange for materials and extra support that were not necessarily given to those without these technological skills and abilities.
Preparation Description

These beginning teachers received preparation as apprentices in the same AR cohort the year prior. This preparation entailed five courses: *Teaching Reading in the Elementary School; Teaching and Learning in Elementary Classrooms; Guided Inquiry in Elementary Education; Practices in Childhood Education*; and *Learning Theory and Assessment*. Syllabi for the five courses are included in Appendix A. These five classes integrated teaching methods, effective practices, classroom management, and lesson planning over the course of a year and were taken while simultaneously completing a yearlong field experience side-by-side with the elementary teacher of record. Throughout their four-day-a-week field experience, a “coach” with 10 years of elementary teaching experience, employed through UF but residing in Jacksonville, provided support to each apprentice via lesson observation, planning, and individual meetings. These coaches spent three days a week in their assigned school.

One day per week was reserved for one of the five classes the prospective teachers were required to take over the course of 12 months. These classes were taught by the coach as well as instructors affiliated with UF and local area universities. Guest speakers were invited throughout the coursework to share their knowledge regarding particular subject areas or topics. Since the TTT program pays apprentices a stipend as well as all tuition and book fees, all apprentices upon graduating from the program and passing of the required state certification exams are obligated to teach for three years in a high-needs school where at least 40% of the students are on free or reduced lunch.

School-Based and District Mentor Support

Although each school offers varying degrees of resources and support (e.g., principal, assistant principal, reading coach), the majority of the teachers did not have consistent or readily available sources to access. All eight beginning teachers were assigned a school-based mentor
by the building administrator for the 2007-08 school year, but as evident from several conversations during the face-to-face meetings and their final interviews, few had contact with their assigned mentors. Two primary reasons cited for this limited contact were lack of time on both the mentees and mentors parts to meet as well as grade level disconnects/differences where the mentor’s location was in a grade level wing or section of the school that wasn’t near the grade level class of the mentee. Both reasons have been found to be common obstacles in establishing and sustaining mentoring relationships and are frequently noted in the mentoring and induction research (e.g., Hudson & Beutel, 2007; Johnson, 2007; Moir, 2003; Rippon & Martin, 2006). An example of this disconnect was evidenced with the assigned mentor of one of the mentees who not only was the assistant principal at her school but was only at the school on a part-time basis. Another example was with an assigned mentor who was in a different grade level and located in a different wing of the school from the mentee. Clearly accessibility is key to mentoring relationships, but when mentors are only available three out of the six hours of school or are located several wings over, the relationship breaks down and mentees are often left to their own devices for obtaining mentoring.

Additionally, qualified mentors are difficult to find at the various schools due to a limited numbers of teachers with the necessary expertise from which to recruit. One of the schools in which two of the beginning teachers were presently teaching had 17 new teachers for the 2005-06 school year, making up over one-third of the teaching staff. Similarly, another school with one of the eight beginning teachers lost 35% of its staff the same year. Recruiting the remaining veteran teachers as mentors to the novice teachers was also problematic. DCPS mentors are currently paid a stipend of $50 a month for their mentoring of TTT graduates. Such minimal
compensation makes the task of finding and matching qualified mentors to mentees even more difficult.

DCPS does provide support in the form of mentor consultants to TTT program graduates who need additional support in the district. These consultants are retired teachers who previously worked in the DCPS system so they are attuned to the specific needs of beginning teachers in Duval County. Interestingly, I was not made aware of this resource until the school year was almost over. When the eight teachers were asked to name their mentor consultant in a post-interview email, only four knew they had a consultant and only three of the eight teachers were able to name the consultants by name (MOST personal communication, April 23, 2008).

Administrative support, most notably in the form of school principals, ranged from being consistently supportive to providing sporadic support in two schools that had five of the eight teachers on its staff. These sentiments were expressed in several interviews as well as within the survey comments written by several of the teachers. With principals playing instrumental roles in creating supportive cultures that foster successful induction programs, their importance can’t be overstated. All too often beginning teachers hesitate to ask for assistance from those who play evaluative roles in their school settings (Single & Single, 2005), and yet these professionals are quite often the very people they should be turning to for support.

The MOST program was created to provide a customized induction program to the eight beginning teachers and to also enhance the varying levels of support found among the five elementary schools. The ementoring component was designed to provide varying levels of instructional as well emotional/psychological support. Both of these types of support have been found to be critical in the first years of a teacher’s career (Feiman-Nemser, 2003; Gold, 1996; Stansbury & Zimmerman, 2000; Yendol-Hoppey & Dana, 2007).
Although numerous benefits of ementoring mirror the benefits of face-to-face mentoring, there are a number of benefits that only ementoring can provide: a greater number of opportunities to interact due to computers being accessible 24 hours a day, 365 days a year (Heider, 2005; O’Neill, Weiler, & Sha, 2003; Price & Chen, 2003); greater opportunities to reflect and respond due to the control of response time in an asynchronous environment (Bierema & Merriam, 2002; Hawkes & Romiszowski, 2001; Tinker, 2001; Whipp, 2003); and a record of the interactions and discussions of the participants for documentation and analysis (O’Neill et al., 2003; Paulus & Scherff, 2008).

Graduates of the TTT program were given the option to use the MOST program as part of their beginning teacher induction requirements for Duval County and also use the sessions as credit towards the University of Florida’s (UF) Master’s degree program. Eight of the 15 original graduates opted to use the two components to meet their beginning teacher requirements instead of participating in the Duval County beginning teacher training, with three of the eight also using their sessions as credit hours. Their decision to use MOST in satisfying their induction requirements was a critical, initial step in establishing buy-in to the ementoring component, a key element needed to establish any successful mentoring relationship (Bierema & Merriam, 2002; Charalambos, Michalinos, & Chamberlain, 2004; Wildman et al., 1992).

When beginning teachers are forced into mentoring relationships due to district requirements, their sense of empowerment and control is greatly diminished. This arrangement further fuels the “power hierarchy” often found within school districts. By giving mentees a choice of mentoring programs, their sense of control over the mentoring arrangement allows them a greater sense of control, empowerment, and equalized decision-making abilities.
A variety of “coaches” provided online mentoring for these eight first year teachers, with the majority of mentoring provided by the MOST site creator. Three experienced teachers with over 30 years of combined teaching and supervisory experience—the UF professor in charge of overseeing UF’s involvement with Duval County’s TTT program, the UF liaison from the 2006-07 school year, and the site’s facilitator/creator (who is also the researcher)—delivered support, guidance, and mentoring primarily via a variety of online communication forums and interactive learning sessions that occurred both in person and online.

Using Moodle, an open source, online course-management system (CMS) created for virtual learning environments and housed on the UF College of Education’s server, the MOST ementoring component was created September, 2007. Historically, the majority of ementoring programs have relied predominantly on email exchanges as a means of providing support and mentoring, but the use of the Moodle CMS offered greater versatility. A CMS “provides an instructor with a set of tools and a framework that allows the relatively easy creation of online course content and the subsequent teaching and management of that course, including various interactions with students taking the course” (Trotter, 2008, p.21), and allows the site to be customized and used in a number of ways that support productive, online interactions. Although there are host of interactive options offered by Moodle’s design, MOST predominantly used Moodle’s forum option as the means of delivering information and providing a platform in which the eight teachers could respond and interact with one another during the monthly sessions. In addition, they could communicate via the several communication options that will be explained in further detail in the following chapters.

Veenman’s (1984) seminal work on the problems and issues faced by beginning teachers served as a guide in creating the online support framework and supportive literature for the
beginning teachers (Boreen & Niday, 2000; Feiman-Nemser, 2001b; Ganser, 1999; Gold, 1996). The topics for the MOST monthly forums were outlined and used as a starting point in creating the site (Boreen & Niday, 2000; Feiman-Nemser, 2001b; Huling-Austin, 1992; Veenman, 1984). Veenman’s analyses of 83 studies published between 1960-1984 on the perceived problems of beginning teachers found that the problems of discipline, student motivation, student individualization, assessment, parental interactions, organization of class work, insufficient or inadequate materials and supplies, and dealing with the individual problems of students were the eight most commonly perceived problems of teachers beginning their teaching careers (Veenman, 1984).

Building on Veenman’s work, researchers such as Feiman-Nemser, Huling-Austin, O’Dell, and others have found these same issues still haunt 21st century beginning teachers (Feiman-Nemser, 2001b; Gold, 1996; Huling-Austin, 1992; Kestner, 1994; Odell & Ferraro, 1992; Stansbury & Zimmerman, 2000). Drawing upon this research as well as research on online communities where trust (Chubbuck et al., 2001; Klecka, 2003; Tinker, 2001), limited group size (Charalambos et al., 2004; Chubbuck et al., 2001), expert pedagogy (Chubbuck et al., 2001; Palloff & Pratt, 2007), safety in being able to discuss sensitive issues (Charalambos et al., 2004; Klecka, 2003; Merseth, 1991), and meaningful activities that encourage reflection and discussion (Chubbuck et al., 2001; Kimball, 1995; Tinker, 2001) are key elements in creating effective online learning environments, the preliminary format of MOST was established.

The MOST site was originally designed using a cluster format where resources were grouped according to their use (e.g., articles, communication, templates). A customizable report option allowed reports to be generated that informed the site facilitator regarding how frequently components were used. These reports provided insight into the beginning teachers’ usage of the
site, as well as the particular resources that were used. As a result, over the course of the year the site was refined and tailored with resources that were more apt to be used.

Monthly interactive sessions were created to build upon the beginning teachers’ knowledge base by having them collect data on their students and classrooms, actively engage in group discussions, and reflect upon a variety of topics and concerns. The initial sessions were created based on Veenman’s research, but as the weeks went on, the remaining sessions were tailored to fit the needs and concerns the participants expressed via online as well as during the face-to-face meetings that occurred monthly. The nine forums included sessions and tasks on: classroom management, communication styles, conducting readers’ workshops, describing their current teaching situation/environment, resolutions and goals, creating effective centers, technology in their schools, and assessment and accountability. See Appendix I for a description of the nine forums.

Due to many of the eight teachers being unable to observe other teachers within their school or district, four of the sessions involved viewing and responding to video clips of effective teaching from the Annenberg Foundation (See www.learner.org). The foundation offers a large video library that includes footage on model teaching in K-12 classrooms as well as teachers reflecting and commenting on their teaching practices.

Similar to ementoring, using video cases as a means of professional development and instruction is a relatively new, but promising practice as a means of support for the beginning teacher (Brophy, 2004; Derry, Siegel, Stampen, & the STEP Research Group, 2002; Segal, Demarest, & Prejean, 2006; Sherin & van Es, 2005). Sherin (2004) notes that not only does the use of video technologies in teacher education afford the viewer the luxury of time to view and reflect upon what they have seen, but videos also provide teachers the means of viewing
alternative teaching strategies as well as a forum in which to “engage in fine-grained analyses of classroom practice” (p.14). Although far from ideal, the videos provided much needed examples of quality teaching geared for specific subjects and grade levels.

While providing instructional support was a key goal with the MOST ementoring component, providing emotional support was just as important. Due to teaching in five different school locations, the beginning teachers could not develop a close-knit cohort which could help provide this support. Keeping these circumstances in mind as well as research findings on the isolation beginning teachers feel as new faculty (Boreen & Niday, 2000; Colbert & Wolff, 1992; Heider, 2005; Huling-Austin, 1992; Rogers & Babinski, 2002), seven public communication venues were created on the MOST site: Announcements; The Teachers' Lounge; Katie and Lisa's Thoughts and Wonderings; The Suggestion Box; Get one, Give one IDEAS!!!; Great Teacher Books to Read!; and Words of Wisdom and Inspiration. The public communication options allowed the participants to interact with each other and with the experienced teachers by posting suggestions, questions, frustrations, joys, and communicate in general. A special communication option, Just-In-Time Mentoring, allowed the beginning teachers to send private, urgent requests for assistance or advice to one of the three experienced teachers mentioned previously. Requests were initially responded to within 48 hours by one of the three and then monitored to ensure the issue was being addressed. Although email was not promoted as a means of communicating with the experienced teachers, it too was used as a communication option and became the default communication option when teachers were pressed for time and needed a quick means of communicating. A sample of the communications options as displayed within the site is included in Appendix B.
Finally, the MOST site served as a resource bank that consisted of multiple resource clusters. Each of the clusters contained links to strategies, websites, and recommended books/articles for subject area lesson plans and strategies, instructional methods and teaching strategies, management help, assessment, parent conferences, and special education. The audio and video library contained video clips and podcasts of effective teaching practices that completed the site by providing real life examples of exemplary teaching practices and techniques. The site was updated and expanded to reflect the needs of the group, as well as to provide easy access to recent issues, trends, and strategies.

Monthly face-to-face meetings allowed the group to meet informally for additional training and professional development that complemented the online component. The two-hour afternoon sessions were conducted by the prior year’s UF liaison and MOST site facilitator, and were held at the Duval County School Board office. Meetings were structured along the lines of the online component where guest speakers, presentations, and activities were based upon the needs and requests of the beginning teachers. The three experienced teachers discussed items to be covered a week or two prior to the monthly meeting with the UF liaison before the program for a particular face-to-face session was finalized. National School Reform Faculty (NSRF) protocols were frequently used to enhance group communication and promote critical and reflective thinking surrounding the various issues and topics discussed. An example of NSRF protocols is included in Appendix C.

Sessions were scheduled for two hours, but many stayed after the conclusion of the sessions to talk with fellow beginning teachers or with the UF liaison and MOST site facilitator. These informal conversations not only provided fellow graduates a chance to directly
communicate with one another, but also allowed the two experienced teachers the opportunity to provide direct assistance, and informed their next steps in planning future online sessions.

Sharon Feiman-Nemser (2001) reminds us that “New teachers have two jobs—they have to teach and they have to learn how to teach” (p.1026). We designed the MOST ementoring program in hopes of easing the beginning teachers’ transition into this paradoxical world.

Rena Palloff, an educational leader in the area of online learning communities reminds us that the elements of creating an effective and supportive online community are rather simple: “honesty; responsiveness; relevance; respect; openness; and empowerment” (Palloff & Pratt, 2007, p.22). As the creator of the MOST ementoring program, it is my hope these six elements were experienced by the eight beginning teachers during the 2007-08 school year as MOST participants.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Initials</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Previous Professional Training/Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candy</td>
<td>CK</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Criminology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Business Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Communications/Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>AP</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Computer Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathi</td>
<td>KZ</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Museum Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opal</td>
<td>OQ</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Legal Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irene</td>
<td>IK</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Construction Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Business Management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 4
PROGRAM EVALUATION METHODS

The purpose of this evaluation is to understand the effectiveness of the MOST e-mentoring program that was created over the course of the 2007-08 school year for eight alternatively certified beginning teachers currently teaching in Jacksonville, Florida. My primary goal as the e-mentoring facilitator was to develop a tailored mentoring experience that provided effective and timely online support to the eight beginning teachers that was fashioned and shaped around their needs. A secondary goal was that MOST would eventually be institutionalized by DCPS and become a viable component of the DCPS beginning teacher induction program for alternatively certified teachers. MOST was developed to provide beginning teachers with a substantive induction option that was geared to their individual needs and classroom situations when compared to the district’s induction program.

Guiding the evaluation and research methods were the following core research questions:

1. How can e-mentoring be used to enhance beginning teacher support and the induction process?

2. How can e-mentoring be used in conjunction with face-to-face interactions (meetings and school based mentoring) to enhance beginning teacher support?

3. What elements of an e-mentoring program promote and/or hinder alternatively certified beginning teachers’ ability to interact, reflect, engage, and implement their learning?

Summative vs. Formative Evaluation

According to Patton (1997), formative evaluations focus on “ways of improving and enhancing programs rather than rendering definitive judgment about effectiveness” (p. 67).

Typical questions surrounding formative evaluations include:

- What are the strengths and weaknesses of the program?
- How can the program be improved?
- What’s working well and what isn’t working well?
• What are the reactions of clients, staff, and others to the program?
• What are their perceptions about what should be changed?  
  (Patton, 1986)

Summative evaluations are aimed at “determining program results and effects, especially for the purposes of making major decisions about program continuation, expansion, reduction, and funding” (p. 44) and ask the questions:

• To what extent did the program achieve its goals?
• Was the program appropriately effective for all beneficiaries?
• What are the program stakeholders’ judgments of program operations, processes, and outcomes?
• What were the important side effects?
• Is the program sustainable and transportable?  
  (Stufflebeam, 2001)

With this terminology in mind, a formative evaluation was chosen over a summative evaluation. Some characteristics of the evaluation lent themselves to a summative form of evaluation as I was also interested in MOST’s overall effectiveness, outcomes, and whether it should be continued as an induction option for future beginning teachers. However, for the overall purpose of this study, a formative evaluation was determined to be the best evaluation option to examine the three research questions.

This program evaluation sought to explore these formative questions by conducting semi-structured participant interviews to capture the teachers’ thoughts on what was most helpful to them, least helpful, improvements that could be made, and what would they like to have seen more of within the MOST eMentoring component. Additionally, surveys were administered to evaluate the effectiveness of both the online and face-to-face MOST components.

Data Collection

Surveys and interviews of the eight teachers at the conclusion of the program in the spring of 2008 were conducted to evaluate MOST’s effectiveness as a means of mentoring support.
Interview questions were created by the researcher so as to capture not only their opinion and insights concerning the MOST ementoring component, but to also provide information on their experiences with the MOST face-to-face component, background information, other forms of mentoring and support they received during the year, and future goals and plans. The teacher interview protocol is included in Appendix D.

Initially, all questions were to be conducted via semi-structured interviews, but due to the number of interview questions as well as some questions lending themselves to a survey format, they were removed from the semi-structured interview protocol. These questions were expanded into 65 questions and divided into six survey categories: (1) Preparation; (2) Support; (3) Teaching Environment; (4) Ability; (5) MOST Online; and (6) MOST Face-to-Face. The survey was created using SurveyMonkey.com, a web-based survey program and administered online during the final face-to-face meeting. Comments could also be made after each section allowing for elaboration of their responses. Survey questions and responses are included in Appendix E.

The UF liaison and UF professor assisted in refining the survey questions prior to administration. Errors such as sampling, coverage, and non-response that can occur when creating and administering surveys (Dillman, 2007) did not pertain due to the small size of the group as well as the web survey’s being administered in person during the final meeting with all of the teachers. However, with the quick creation of the survey, there is a possibility that measurement error could have occurred. Dillman defines measurement error as: “The result of poor question wording or questions being presented in such a way that inaccurate or uninterpretable answers are obtained” (Dillman, p. 11). Questions such as how did the ementoring component “help you become more aware of your teaching style” as well as “help you create effective centers” left defining “teaching style” and “effective” up to each individual
teacher. Similarly, a question pertaining to what extent were “fellow apprentices” a source of support to the beginning teachers could have been interpreted as the group they were a part of last year as an apprentice or as the group of current apprentices currently in their schools. Fortunately, the survey results were not the primary source of data. Survey questions should be reworked for clarity if administered with future programs.

Teacher and administrative interviews were conducted via phone and were typically conducted in the afternoon or evening due to teacher schedules and recorded with a specialized phone conversation recording system. Interviews ranged from 61 minutes to 132 minutes in length. Once the interviews were completed, the tapes were transcribed over the course of several weeks, resulting in 155 pages of transcribed teacher interviews and 85 pages of administrative interviews. Details on individual interview length can be found in Appendix F. I was initially concerned that conducting the interviews by phone might make the teachers hesitant to be open and reflective with their responses. However, quite the opposite occurred. It was evident during the interview process the eight beginning teachers were more willing to talk openly and in some cases “spill the beans” on certain aspects of their training and experiences as novice teachers in Duval County.

Teacher interviews were read three to four times by the researcher during the analysis process. The initial reading of the interviews created the foundational outline which I continually refined as the interviews were reread. A spreadsheet was created with the six interview sections and the names of the eight teachers. When key phrases and patterns emerged via the repeated readings of the transcripts, they were noted in each section as well as which teacher had made that particular comment or noted that particular element. Themes and patterns that emerged are included in Appendix F. In rereading the transcripts and survey results,
comments and elements began to merge and form the numerous themes and sub-themes. Administrative interviews were not analyzed as they were used as a means of providing information about certain program features as well as give the background and experience of the administrator. Online data consisting of activity reports, postings and responses, emails, and a personal journal kept by the researcher during the process provided further data sources that contributed to the validity of the evaluation. Journal excerpts are included in Appendix G.

By using a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods, I was able to gain an understanding of the many facets of MOST; but, in particular, I was able to capture a rich understanding of the effective as well as ineffective elements of the MOST ementoring program. Asking such detailed questions within the interviews as well as using the survey to pull out the more generalized questions about MOST, I was able to gain insights into the strengths and weaknesses of the MOST ementoring components which can inform future ementoring programs. Not only do the findings help to answer the formative questions of how the program can be improved, as well as its strengths and weaknesses; but they also provide summative data that answer the question, “Should this program be continued?”

**Data Analysis**

The key to any meaningful evaluation is knowing the overarching goal of the program being evaluated (Patton, 1986; Weiss, 1972). Patton reminds us: “An evaluation is perceived as valid in a global sense that includes the overall approach used, the stance of the evaluator, the nature of the process, the design, and the way in which results are reported” (Patton, 1986, p. 222). However, without having any formal analysis of the different data sources (e.g., teacher interviews, surveys, journals) gleaned over the course of eight months, an evaluation of the program’s effectiveness would be based primarily on the opinion and perceptions of the researcher. For this reason, an inductive thematic analysis of surveys and interviews of the eight
teachers was chosen as the best means of determining the overall effectiveness of the MOST ementoring component in providing support and mentoring to the beginning teachers.

Thematic analysis, also known as interpretive content analysis (Schwandt, 1997), refers to “the process of making explicit structures and meanings that are embodied in a text” (Gavin, 2006, p. 555). During thematic analysis, data reduction occurs as the data sources are continually re-read and themes and patterns begin to emerge. Data consisted of the eight teacher interview transcripts, surveys, website reports, and the researcher’s journal, with the interview transcripts providing the primary source of data in which the themes were derived.

By using a technique similar to Glaser and Strauss’ constant comparative method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967), the eight interviews and survey results were coded inductively for key ideas and statements. These data segments were then compared to other data segments found within the same interview. This analysis provided the foundational themes from which the final themes ultimately emerged. Relevant segments from each interview were then compared to other teacher interview segments for similar themes and patterns. Themes and patterns became more defined as I interacted with the various data sources (Patton, 2002), resulting in the eight overarching themes of: (1) Essential Elements; (2) Utility; (3) Weaknesses; (4) Time; (5) Technological Aspects; (6) Contradictions; (7) Insights, Recommendations, and Ideas; and (8) Second Year Wishes.

Informed consent of participants as required by the University of Florida’s Institutional Review Board (IRB) and DCPS, was obtained from all participants with a blanket IRB acquired from UF’s Lastinger Center at the beginning of the school year. The IRB consent letter is included in Appendix H. Committed to “transforming schools and school cultures,” the Lastinger Center for Learning is involved in a multitude of initiatives that are embedded within a
number of high-poverty schools in several Florida counties, one of those being Duval County. Two of these schools were the location for the training of the eight apprentices during the 2006-07 school year. (For more information on the Lastinger Center, see http://education.ufl.edu/centers/Lastinger/about.html).

Chapter Five presents the findings of the evaluation. Thematic analysis was used to analyze the data resulting in eight overarching themes: (1) Essential Elements; (2) Utility; (3) Weaknesses; (4) Time; (5) Technological Aspects; (6) Contradictions; (7) Insights, Recommendations and Ideas; and (8) Second Year Wishes. Multiple sub-themes also emerged from the evaluation and are included in the evaluation findings.
CHAPTER 5
EVALUATION FINDINGS

This chapter presents the findings from the survey and interview analysis. Using thematic analysis, eight major themes emerged that responded to the research questions:

1. How can ementoring be used to enhance beginning teacher support and the induction process?
2. How can ementoring be used in conjunction with face-to-face interactions (meetings and school based mentoring) to enhance beginning teacher support?
3. What elements of an ementoring program promote and/or hinder alternatively certified beginning teachers’ ability to interact, reflect, engage, and implement their learning?

The eight major themes were: (1) Essential Elements; (2) Utility; (3) Weaknesses; (4) Time; (5) Technological Aspects; (6) Contradictions; (7) Insights, Recommendations and Ideas; and (8) Second Year Wishes. Numerous sub-themes emerged within the eight overarching themes.

**Essential Elements**

Because the focal point of this evaluation is the extent to which the MOST ementoring component was a viable means of providing support to the eight alternatively certified beginning teachers, as well as determining what components of MOST were the most effective, many of the questions pertained as to how well the site met their needs and expectations as beginning teachers. While all eight beginning teachers noted they would recommend the MOST induction program over the DCPS induction program option, there were certain foundational elements of the MOST online component that played key roles in the utility of the site. Two sub-themes emerged as essential elements: the role of trust and providing meaningful support.

**The Role of Trust**

Critical to creating positive, effective online learning communities is establishing a sense of trust among its members and administrators (Bierema & Merriam, 2002; Klecka, 2003; Klecka, Cheng, & Clift, 2004; Tinker, 2001). I was fortunate that trust within the group was well
established when I met them in September, 2007. Two key elements played critical roles in having established trust among the eight beginning teachers: (1) the group of eight had spent the previous 12 months together as apprentices, and (2) one of the UF liaisons from the year prior was the facilitator of the monthly face-to-face meetings and also interacted with them online within the MOST site as well as via email.

Social presence, defined as “the ability to portray oneself as a ‘real’ person in an online environment” (Palloff & Pratt, 2007, p. 4), becomes a fundamental element in how well individuals interact and establish trust within an online community. Online members who have never met one another previously face an increased sense of “risk” since they must establish rapport with people they don’t know and then be expected to communicate and offer to discuss possibly sensitive issues (Paulus & Scherff, 2008). With the eight teachers’ having spent the year prior together as apprentices, the issue of establishing a social presence was not an issue since they had a year’s worth of past face-to-face interactions to draw upon. Having worked together previously, the eight teachers knew that online personas were in fact a mirror of the person they had known the year prior, thus making interactions online more of a continuance of their past year’s relationships.

When the e-mentoring sessions began in September, trust within the group was shown by several of their comments concerning the support they received from their group members. When asked if she would recommend the MOST induction program to other first year teachers, Candy expressed the importance of the cohort and its ongoing support:

I would say the UF program. I don’t care too much for the Duval program. I went through all the workshops and they...If we had to choose between people that I knew, got along with, worked with for a whole year, why would I not stay with that group of people and get the support and keep it going? And with the Duval County program, you are with a hundred teachers that you don’t know, that you won’t see, that you say you will email, but you won’t. You’ll never see them again. (CK 495-500)
Kathi’s comments in particular were quite poignant:

There is something comforting about seeing people you have worked with for a year. There is a comfort level there. It is always nice to hear what is going on in other schools. Because we did work so closely together for that year, there is a trust there… I don’t have to pretend to be somebody I am not in front of those people. They have seen me, you know, after I got hit by a student last year, they know me well enough to fill in the blanks when I am talking. It is an interesting situation. We function really well as team, some of us better than others. (KZ 692-701)

But even with Kathi’s great sense of trust with her colleagues, she also faced a curious, self-imposed dilemma of being disloyal to her school by talking about the issues she was facing:

Unfortunately I don’t speak to them as often as I would like. It has become a situation where I am not at the school where the majority of them are so communication is difficult, which is ironic since we all have email. I consider them to all be good friends. I know that if I needed something I could contact them but I am so consumed with what is going on in my school that sometimes it seems like it would be… I hate to say disloyal… like to go outside the school to talk about something that isn’t going right. It is sort of an odd mentality, not that the schools are competing against each other, but I don’t know. (KZ 491-498)

No one else expressed this sense of disloyalty related to contacting others outside of their schools. However, Kathi had noted several times during her interview that she had a close relationship with her principal. Perhaps this was the reason for Kathi’s feeling like she would be betraying her principal’s trust by letting others know that things weren’t perfect within her school’s walls. Kathi’s usage of the Just-in-Time Mentoring communication option (which was the sole private communication option besides email) was the highest in the group, which also might be a reflection of her hesitancy to make her concerns public.

The closeness and alliance between Kathi and her principal was not present in the remaining seven teachers with most expressing a sense of negativity toward their principal which created a negative teaching environment overall:

If you’re talking about a positive environment, I don’t think we have a very good one. Yeah, there’s meetings where she’s just been just completely negative, not yelling at us, but not talking in a tone that anyone was to listen to. Just over all not praising the teachers
like as a whole. But, you know, at the beginning of the year she’s all about being positive and then for some reason that just leaves her. (LM 392-406)

It is very difficult working at my school. The atmosphere is a negative from administration down to the students. Teachers are not collaborating or even getting along for that matter. Changes had to be made and people have a hard time accepting them and adapting. There's backbiting, tempers flaring, unprofessional behaviors, laziness and cheating. If it were not for the three year stipulation and the children, I would not want to be a part of this organization. (Survey comment 51-56)

Another example of distrust with the DCPS surfaced after several lengthy emails to Tina in January. I had responded to her over the course of several weeks in a round of emails concerning her principal’s making some sudden, major changes with grade restructuring and curriculum within Tina’s school and grade level. Throughout the preceding months, I had been copying the UF liaison and UF professor with the majority of email responses I made with Tina and the others, but had only recently included the TTT coordinator with email responses so as to help keep her abreast as to the nature of the email exchanges occurring within the group. Although this same person was privy to the interactions on the site, I had not been including her in the majority of email exchanges. Tina quickly expressed her concern about the facilitator being included in the loop for fear that it would come back to her principal:

Also, is there a reason why ______ is being copied on the e-mails? I didn't reply to all in my response to you. I don't want to get into any trouble over all of this. Life in school is tough enough right now with all that is going on!! (TS email correspondence 1-28-08)

Interestingly, this same “us vs. them” mentality surfaced and was expressed by other teachers when we administered the online survey during our last face-to-face meeting. Questions, such as, “Who else is going to see this? Will anyone from the district see what I am writing? etc.” were asked before they proceeded to type in comments in the survey sections. Although I never had the opportunity to find out why some of them felt this way, research on the experiences of first year teachers (e.g., Corcoran, 1981; Flores, 2006; Klecka et al., 2005) finds they feel continually judged on their novice pedagogical skills while being held to the standards
of experienced teachers. Additionally, due to being on annual contract status until their third complete year of satisfactory teaching, many experience feelings of vulnerability as true job security is several years away. Corcoran (1981) explains the situation as:

> What complicates this inevitable shock of not knowing for the beginning teacher is the need to appear competent and confident. Even though one is a beginner, one is also a teacher. Implicit in the role of teacher is the notion of being knowledgeable, a notion that contradicts the very essence of a beginner. (p. 20)

While other fields such as law and medicine are much more understanding of their novices’ limited expertise and allow them to ease into their responsibilities, it is little wonder that education’s reputation of being the “profession that eats its young” (Halford, 1998, p.33) still exists. The vulnerability new teachers felt decades ago is still being experienced by 21st century beginning teachers and is further exacerbated by today’s high-stakes testing climate.

Even as the newcomer to the group, I felt I was able to secure their trust after several months of face-to-face and online interactions. This likely occurred because I could build on the trust already established by the UF liaison as a foundation as well as introducing myself to them in person during individual school visits in September to promote and explain the induction program. The connection to the UF liaison proved invaluable as I was able to bridge my role with hers. This in turn helped create a trusting online environment that was unlike several faced at their schools:

> You can tell in people—like I have spoken or written to you and Laura to discuss things I wouldn’t discuss with other UF people. I think one of the ways that you helped build trust and I am sure you do it with all of them —you’ll send an email and check in. That helped to establish trust. (TS 587-590)

Admittedly, Tina’s openness to assistance, closeness in age, and quick responses to my emails made me feel very at ease in responding to her and made our communication between one another very easy. This sense of trust was further exhibited when, on two different occasions,
two of the teachers called me at home to discuss some issues they were facing at their individual schools.

Although there are several successful ementoring projects that have involved participants that do not have a prior background of working and knowing each other (e.g., MentorNet, Electronic Emissary Project), the trust established within their cohort the previous year was an important and powerful element in making the ementoring sessions and exchanges meaningful and was furthered along by their relationship with the UF liaison. Not only did the liaison’s prior relationship with the group provide a foundation of trust, but our ability to meet with the group face-to-face played an instrumental role in building upon that trust which in turn made the online component that much more effective.

**Providing Meaningful Support**

Replete in the induction literature is the role support plays in providing a comprehensive induction program with effective mentoring. Unfortunately, the literature is also replete in how many mentoring programs do not provide the necessary support beginning teachers need in order to survive and succeed. Although DCPS provided support for the new teachers in the form of an onsite mentor as well as a district mentor consultant, the beginning teachers’ experiences with the mentoring offered to them from their district closely reflected what has been found in the mentoring literature: grade level mismatches, lack of mentor training, mentors’ lack of interest in mentoring, lack of time to meet, inconsistencies, etc. which in turn lend themselves to the feelings of isolation and of being overwhelmed often expressed by beginning teachers (Boreen & Niday, 2000; Rogers & Babinski, 2002).

Research has found part of a beginning teacher’s success can be attributed to the support they receive from fellow teachers, administration, and support staff (Flores & Day, 2006; Kardos & Johnson, 2007). However, collegial support at the majority of the teachers’ school
sites was minimal to lacking altogether. This lack of support ranged from their assigned mentors, to the district’s mentor consultants and even from past and present apprentices who were currently in their school, “Even though there are seven other of us in the school, we don’t really communicate” (OQ 255-256). This same teacher noted how critical support was in a comment made pertaining to her concept of effective mentoring programs, “Support on line. Support from colleagues. Support from mentors like yourself. It’s the support that makes it effective” (OQ 292-293).

It is important to note that only three of the eight noted their assigned on-site mentor as a source of support, while four of the remaining five noted they had forged a mentoring relationship with another source such as a grade level teacher, reading/math coach, or other former apprentice out of necessity. Only one of the eight teachers noted the district’s mentor consultant as a meaningful source of mentoring. The other five that replied expressed a level of confusion as to who and what a mentor consultant was: “I am not sure what you mean by a mentor consultant” (TS email 4/22/08). Kathi further expressed this sense of confusion with the DCPS mentor consultant when I asked questions surrounding her school’s mentor consultant and the services they provided:

I have someone who visits my classroom occasionally from the district office. She has probably spent all of two hours in my classroom during the year. I do not know her official title (I have her card at work), but she has never called herself a mentor consultant. I have never heard of that program. (KZ email 4/22/08)

Also a bit disconcerting was the mentor consultant not getting the observed teacher’s name correct when she did visit their classroom:

I forget her name, ________ maybe. ..It's hard to meet with her since she randomly shows up and then randomly leaves. She usually shows up mid-morning in the middle of a lesson and leaves before the lesson is complete. She does however leave a note. The last one read "You're doing great ________, keep up the good work." Who is ________? (AP email 4/21/08)
Although Adam handled her sporadic visits as well as not knowing his name with humor, clearly her effectiveness as a mentor to him in any capacity was greatly hindered by her inability to connect with him and provide him any meaningful support. From these responses, it is evident DCPS mentor consultants are not necessarily providing the support and mentoring to the levels needed by the beginning teachers. With DCPS investing the time and money to provide mentor consultants to the district’s beginning teachers, it might be wise for the district to reassess the mentor consultants’ roles and responsibilities so as to be more effective in delivering support.

Gold (1996) suggests that beginning teachers need two overarching forms of support in helping to stave off the growing attrition rates of novice teachers: instructional and psychological. Although the MOST ementoring component was far from being perfect and was limited in the kinds of instructional support it could provide electronically, it did provide a viable, consistent means of emotional support and mentoring to the group of eight. Additionally, it helped to fill a void in support that existed among the majority of the beginning teacher cohort. As Tina, a teacher at a school known for its abrasive administration and faculty, stated:

And again, I thank you again for all of your support. All the way down to our conversation the last time we spoke—just being able to talk to someone who wasn’t closely related to me…family or school environment. Like I said, had it not been for UF’s continued support and you guys gave us a lot of support in all areas…it…it would…I don’t know the words to describe it…I have bounced so much stuff off you guys! (TS 809-811)

Certainly ementoring is not to be viewed as the “end all, be all” form of mentoring. However, the ability to ask and provide emotional support 24/7 adds a dimension that other forms of support can’t provide. Clearly, ementoring can be a complementary means of support when sustained, presented, and structured well.
Utility

One of the primary goals of the MOST ementoring component was not only to provide support, but also to make the monthly online discussions and tasks meaningful and utilitarian. Even though I had a rough outline of what I felt was important to have them learn, discuss, and reflect upon within the site based upon real-life experiences as well as from what had been discovered from decades of research on beginning teachers and effective induction programs, too often these goals can be lost in translation when making the transition from face-to-face to online interactions. Fortunately, all eight found varying levels of utility with the monthly sessions and tasks. Additionally, two key elements of the site were highlighted during their interviews as being meaningful and applicable to the realities they were facing as beginning teachers: monthly assignments/tasks and video clips.

Monthly Assignments/Tasks

Even the best of online communities can become a breeding ground for non-constructive discussions and postings without some sort of structure and monitoring (Collison, 2000; Palloff & Pratt, 2001). With this in mind, the MOST monthly themes and related tasks were created to promote reflection, stimulate meaningful conversation, expose the beginning teachers to issues and topics they might otherwise overlook as well as expand their pedagogical knowledge base. When the activities were tailored to reflect the concerns and situations the beginning teachers encountered over the course of the year, the activities were considered more useful by the teachers than if the tasks and activities had been generic in nature.

Although monthly activities ranged from the necessary initial “Introduction Activity” where expectations and guidelines were discussed, others were much more involved as they asked the teachers to think and reflect about certain topics or perspectives such as the second
session that required them to critically examine their communication style within their classrooms. MOST monthly activities and tasks are included in Appendix I.

Two teachers who were employed at one of the schools that had little faculty cohesion expressed appreciation for the utility of the professional learning component within the sessions: “The assignments are good-- they are reflective. They take us into worlds we hadn’t been exposed to” (TS 564-565) and Candy’s comments: “I always took something away from all of them. Everything was useful. I implemented a lot of stuff that I saw” (CK 603-604).

Even Irene, who struggled with the “busyness” of the site, also had positive reflections of the required activities, “Actually, the work you asked us to do was very useful and helpful. For the most part, I think the assignments were consistent with what should be expected of us” (IK 856-857). As well as Adam, who was a bit skeptical of the program initially and the “quiet rebel” within the group, found some value and meaning in what he was asked to do each month, “I thought they were thought provoking, but I am not sure…They all had a practical application…again being hard headed and doing things the way that I tend to…I analyze things and take away from them what I find useful” (AP 897-899).

As described earlier, the MOST site had numerous components (e.g., resource clusters, communications venues). The monthly online sessions comprised approximately 50% of the site and required the teachers to interact and complete various tasks related to that month’s topic. Screen shots of the MOST site are included in Appendix B. Monthly activities and tasks are detailed in Appendix I. Initially, these monthly themes were based upon the research of Veenman’s study of beginning teachers, but as the first initial exchanges occurred over the first weeks of school, we quickly realized that our agenda and ideas of what they needed were not necessarily theirs—at least not our timeline of topics. With this in mind, the UF liaison, UF
professor, and I discussed the situation and decided that I needed to change my approach in the outline of the site. Rather than following the outline of what I thought they needed, I let their needs dictate what the monthly topics and discussions should be as they arose in their correspondence and afternoon MOST monthly face-to-face meetings. Even though some of them were subjects I had originally planned to cover, (e.g., classroom management and assessment), the topics of technology, goals, and communication were added to the site. These additions were based on conversations the UF liaison and I had at our monthly face-to-face meetings and communication exchanges with the eight beginning teachers as well as from the previous year’s coach, who was at several of their schools for the new class of apprentices.

Several of the beginning teachers expressed their appreciation of how the program was tailored to meet their needs as they arose. Kathi, who was initially hesitant and resistant to the program when we first met to discuss the details, turned out to be the strongest advocate for the program:

As far as the induction program, I appreciate the attempt to make it align with what we felt our needs were. There was a lot of give and take with regards to what you all asked us to do and what we were expected to produce. I can appreciate that everything we were asked to produce, had a real world application. I think it is a key thing because our time is so precious. If you are going to spend your time doing something, it might as well be something you can use in the classroom, why waste your time. We can all use more things that will be applicable to the classroom hopefully. I loved the videos that you guys found on line. (KZ 671-681)

According to the participants, this customization differed vastly from the alternative DCPS prescriptive beginning teacher induction program they had the option of taking at the onset of the year. Like many mentoring programs, others dictated the DCPS offerings. In the case of alternatively certified beginning DCPS teachers, their principals decide how long their induction program lasts and what kinds of trainings they would take based upon the interactions and observations of the teachers within the first 45 days of school.
Because Carl struggled with classroom management throughout the year, he had a deeper appreciation for the customization that occurred in adjusting his monthly assignments during the last months of the program. When there was no activity from him on the site for over two months as well as no responses from him after numerous attempts by the UF liaison and myself, we realized we needed to go beyond what we had done in customizing the DCPS induction program initially. Because he had such critical issues confronting him within his classroom, we created alternative assignments that dealt strictly with examining his classroom management.

His appreciation for the customization was expressed during his interview:

I would recommend it because—it wasn’t one size fits all. Like this is a course you need to take. It was ---we are going to design this program to help you all and based on the things you all need. I think it was good to do this program because it was focused on our needs and not just the cookie cutter kind of program that is out there. Which I am sure is good in some situations. You all asked for a lot of input when doing the different activities and that was one of the good things about it. (CB 559-564)

As a result, he had a much more positive experience with MOST and was able to implement and use the alternative assignment as an impetus to critically examine his management skills.

Laura, who was originally enrolled in the DCPS beginning teacher induction program, joined us a month into the program because she wanted a more practical and individualized program:

To be honest, I started with you guys late because I was originally doing the ones with Duval County and I went to four meetings with them. And just from those four meetings…I am so glad that you all had your own thing. I didn’t get anything from it. Like they taught you strategies and you are in a room with 30-40 people in the class. I think it was two hours. I just didn’t get anything from it. Especially with MOST the person to person contact and the Internet—I just think that’s how it should be. Yes, we had more work to do, but that’s how I learn. Going and sitting for two hours like lesson planning…well great. I am not getting anything I can use…I didn’t feel. Going with MOST you have all these resources on the Internet and we are feeding off each other. You are providing us with great articles to read. Then we get to meet face to face…to me that’s how it should be. It shouldn’t be—I have to do this in 2 hours and I am going to talk. And if you have anything to say, then raise your hand. With MOST, you all asked us what we needed, which is the way it should be. (LM 655-665)
Out of the nine topic sessions offered on the site, the monthly topics of management, centers, and assessment were the ones most frequently mentioned in their interviews as being timely and most useful. As could be predicted, management was a crucial topic for many of them. Laura and Carl, who were both teachers at one of the more challenging schools, had this to say about the management session, “I do know at the beginning I was using stuff for management--Behavior Bingo. The management ideas I did use” (LM 782-783). Carl had this comment to make, “Definitely with classroom management—I know that helped. A lot of them were helpful. Anything that dealt with classroom management” (CB 740-741). Similarly, Candy, who was also teaching at a more challenging school with minimal faculty and administrative support, had this to say, “I know the first one I was attracted to was the one on classroom management—I got a lot of ideas on that one” (CK 657-658).

Even with a plethora of research pointing to classroom management as one of the major concerns for beginning teachers, Carl’s comment concerning management was particularly honest and insightful:

I think it is more of an issue that people don’t want to talk about. I don’t know if that makes them feel...cause for me...it makes me feel like I am not a good teacher when I have issues, but at the same time if you don’t talk about it, it will never change or get better. So maybe that’s it. And even seeing other teachers...a lot of the teachers have those same issues and they are experienced. Maybe they just have a better coping mechanism for it. They have some systems that make it easier for them. It’s hard to admit that you aren’t good at something—that you need help with something. I think that is an area that would really be helpful. (CB 701-708)

This comment helped to remind me that the vulnerability beginning teachers feel often inhibits their request for assistance.

Corcoran’s 1981 description of the paradoxical world beginning teachers find themselves in unfortunately still holds true today: “It is as if one is caught in a double bind between the beginner’s feeling of insecurity and tentativeness on the one hand and the teacher’s need to act
decisively and be in control on the other. To admit to not knowing is to risk vulnerability; to pretend to know is to risk error” (Corcoran, 1981, p. 20). Carl’s comment as well as Corcoran’s quote serve as reminders that even with the sense of “facelessness” online communications have, the sense of risk one takes online is no less of a risk than one takes in person.

Not only did the monthly tasks provide the teachers a forum to critically and reflectively think about a number of topics and issues they were confronted with on a daily basis, it also allowed them to make their thoughts and feelings known to a group they were a critical member of for over a year. With a valid sense of isolation as well as a fear of asking questions that on-site colleagues might perceive as naïve or ignorant, tasks were designed to give them the opportunity to bond, discuss, reflect, and tease out their thoughts and feelings within the confines of a trusting space.

**Videos and Video Library**

Like Internet technologies, as video technologies have become more affordable and commonplace, they have been recognized as a viable means of providing a critical snapshot of teaching. Videos and video case studies have been used in teacher education as a means of training, observing, and examining model teachers and effective pedagogy since the 1970’s when they were initially used to examine micro-levels of teaching. Lesson analysis followed within that same decade, but unlike the examination of micro-levels of teaching, videos were used so teachers could examine video clips to identify certain teacher and student behaviors. By the 1980s, the focus shifted from how teachers behave to how teachers think. Video footage of expert teachers as well as video-based cases became effective learning tools in examining the what, how, and why of teachers’ decision making in the classroom (Sherin, 2004). Critical examination of key moments and interactions captured on video footage can occur, making it a powerful tool in which to examine and tease apart what Lee Shulman has labeled as a teacher’s
“wisdom of practice” or otherwise known as why and how expert teachers “do what they do” (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999; Shulman, 1986).

With these benefits in mind, videos of exemplary teaching from the Annenberg Media Learner.org website were utilized with many of the monthly topics and tasks. After several discussions with the UF professor and UF liaison, we quickly realized the beginning teachers’ opportunities to watch other effective teachers in action were very limited, primarily due to a lack of time as well as scheduling conflicts with available faculty at their home schools. The DCPS system had recently cut back on the number of professional development days teachers were allowed to take during the 2007-08 year. Additionally, since some of them were not paired with strong model teachers their apprenticeship year, there was a critical void created from the lack of opportunities to observe effective teaching in action. Fortunately, the Annenberg Foundation through Annenberg Media offered an extensive video library of exemplary educators teaching a variety of subjects in all grade levels at no cost.

All eight teachers mentioned how much they learned from viewing the videos. Candy, who noted several times throughout the year how she didn’t get much modeling the year before and was teaching in a grade level where her fellow teachers did not share or discuss their teaching, found the videos particularly useful:

I really liked the video component. I never knew teachers had videos that were out there like those. I really didn’t know. I would go to the site and see different modeling of things. Since I didn’t see a lot of modeling last year, they were really good to see. Some of the assignments that made you watch videos... I would go to the website and look at the others that were out there. (CK 574-578)

I look at them doing things I need to see how to do. Like doing a read aloud. I didn’t have it last year and I don’t have it this year. So seeing them do it the proper way...they get you thinking about what you are doing and why. And knowing what strategies she is using. I like to analyze what she is doing and why she is doing it. Like trying to figure out what is working and what isn’t. I love watching them! You can ask my husband. I am watching them all the time! (CK 617-622)
Carl also found them helpful in his continual struggles in managing his students:

They were good. They gave me some good ideas on what I could do. Like seeing the way teachers did certain things. They gave me some ideas on what I would do and try in lessons as far as management. The only drawback to them is that their classroom situation/makeup might be different from your own, but other than that, they were useful. (CB 713-716)

The Annenberg videos afforded the beginning teachers the opportunity to replay, slow down, and stop the teaching sequence, which is impossible as a classroom observer or teacher. Although the videos could not replicate their classroom situations and students, they did provide solid examples of effective teaching with a broad range of student populations and subjects. Their requests to have access to the site and view more of the videos once MOST was completed testified to the utility of the videos as a means of exposing them to best teaching practices.

Educational Articles

The quote by Feiman-Nemser (2001), “New teachers have two jobs—they have to teach and they have to learn how to teach” used previously captures the quandary beginning teachers find themselves in the initial years of their teaching careers. Research has found that beginning teachers are so busy being initiated into the realities of teaching that they have minimal time for learning how to teach. Survival is the main goal, not acquiring teacher expertise or knowledge (Feiman-Nemser, Carver, Schwille, & Yusko, 1999; Wang, Odell, & Schwille, 2008). Although internships and apprenticeships help to provide a foundation, the complex pedagogical skills needed as teachers cannot be honed with their time and energies focused on classroom management as well as learning the politics and subtle nuances within their school’s culture. This problem is further exacerbated when support from mentors or colleagues is lacking.

With this in mind, we knew that if we wanted them to read anything pertaining to teaching issues, techniques, or other resources that would aid them in improving their pedagogy as well as think reflectively, the materials would need to be brief, user-friendly, and applicable.
During the January monthly meeting, the UF liaison used two articles from the journal *Educational Leadership* concerning student thinking and authentic questioning as a means to stimulate discussion and critical thinking surrounding both of those issues. Their enthusiasm and comments about the activity and the content of the articles made me realize that this was an avenue in which to expose them to different topics in a meaningful, but non-tedious manner within the MOST site. The articles within *Educational Leadership* are specifically geared toward K–12 educators, cover a wide range of thematic topics over the year, and are limited to 2,500 words, making them very practitioner-oriented. Kathi noted that the practicability of the articles was a welcome change from the more research-oriented articles they had read the year prior during their apprenticeship:

I did like the fact that all the reading was very practical. A lot of readings we did last year were very scholarly and that wasn’t practical for what we were doing. It is different if you are sitting in a reading class that is a true semester long. But when you need the nuts and bolts, that is what you need—the nuts and bolts (KZ 916-920).

Because of their enthusiasm when we used the articles during our January meeting, I decided to integrate additional *Educational Leadership* articles within the March online session. Frustrations with their individual schools’ preparation for the state’s *Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test* (FCAT) that was to take place in the spring of 2008 were the impetus for the March session to discuss the role of accountability and assessment. Many of them were expressing a sense of purposelessness with the tests as well as a sense of misunderstanding of how assessments could be used to help guide their instruction. Second in popularity to the Annenberg videos used on the site, the articles on assessment were mentioned by 50% of the group as one of the most applicable sessions and resources. Laura, in particular, found them very informative and helped to provide her clarity in the differences between formative and summative assessments, “I learned a lot from the articles—especially the assessment articles—I
really didn’t know the difference between formative and summative—this is making sense to me now” (LM 715-717). She further noted the impact of the articles when she stated, “Assessment—that was a big one for me” (LM 812). Although recommendations will be discussed in depth at the conclusion of this evaluation, had I known their appreciation for this type of article as well as the level of reflection and interaction that occurred from their responses, I would have integrated them more within the monthly activities.

Program Weaknesses

Effective program evaluation does not just include examining what worked within a program. Very often the components that are found to be the most helpful in improving the program are the very things that didn’t work well or at all for the program members. As noted previously, the MOST site not only provided the beginning teachers a way to communicate and interact with one another, both formally and informally, it also provided the beginning teachers with resources that included websites, articles, videos, podcasts, templates, and lesson plans. The intent was to provide them a site that would not only provide them support, but also provide them quality resources at their fingertips when they didn’t have the time to search on their own—similar to a “one-stop shop” of teacher resources. The following three sub-themes emerged related to program weaknesses.

Too Much of a Good Thing

Because Moodle is open-source software housed on the UF server, no costs were associated with the technology used within the induction program. However, there was a “cost” involved with using free software—it limited the adjustments I could make to the layout of the site. This led to varying levels of frustration on the teachers’ parts.
The lack of flexibility in the site design was quite an aggravation for some of the teachers, particularly Irene who voiced her frustrations with the site several times during her interview:

The only thing that has been aggravation has been the program site. I have finally figured out why it drives me so nuts. It has very little white space; the eye has to rest in order to focus. When you are looking at old people who have ADHD on some various levels, it is very disconcerting. It is a design issue; it’s the way it is designed. It takes so many layers to get to where your assignment is. There are so many layers. I never… after all these months, I have never learned to know exactly where to go to watch the media stuff, if you want me to watch a video, I have to go back and print the instructions and then read the instructions and go back through the website. At month nine or ten for me to go through and not know automatically where these videos are kept, says to me it is just a cumbersome site. (IK 682-691)

The layout could have been better. You could at the beginning preset the dates for the meetings and then also preset a list of days of when things would be due. If that was in one easy to find--print it out once, stick it in my notebook. That would have made life a whole lot easier. Rather than have to look through all those layers and look it up. (IK 754-757)

Part of her frustration may have stemmed from her preference for face-to-face interactions in general:

I am old. I like being able to look my teachers in the eye and ask questions as they come into my head. Which there is an argument for, but when you are on line and you have to type your questions, you are not going to ask as many. You are probably going to ask more thoughtful ones. (IK 743-746)

But even the group’s youngest, most tech-savvy teacher voiced frustrations with the site:

I think finding links on the site was my biggest issue. There were some links that I spent a good amount of time looking for and called other apprentices to find stuff— that was frustrating as I know I am not a complete ignoramus when it comes to technology. So not begin able to find stuff. It was frustrating. I know it is there, but it wasn’t intuitive. (AP 813-818)

Clearly the ability to have the various online records and usage statistics are vital components to conducting research as well as ascertaining the effectiveness of the site. However, it is disconcerting when members with technology backgrounds experience frustration with what
would seem to be a rather simplistic site. Recommendations addressing this issue will be discussed in Chapter Six.

Palloff and Kent (2007) note in their chapter *Managing the Relationship to Technology* that the ease of a site’s use and its eye appeal are essential course management system components which need to be considered when creating an online community. Candy, like Irene, expressed similar frustrations in how the site was a bit overwhelming when it was initially accessed, “Organize it a bit better. It is just a lot of information on the first page. I know it was in chronological order. Like maybe putting things in folders, narrowing down the topics. Like maybe have four or five folders. When you initially open it, it’s a bit overwhelming” (CK 518-521).

One of the dilemmas I faced when developing the monthly activities and tasks was deciding whether to embed the link within an email or announcement or have them go through the different steps to get to the resource located on the site. Had I sent them the direct link, I would have made the activity less tedious but sacrificed the ability to obtain usage records in doing so. Clearly, the site needed better organization and less “busyness” in order to make the learning platform one that was inviting rather than frustrating. But, by the same token, having records of where, when, and how long the eight teachers were on the site were invaluable and allowed me to have an insider’s view of their activity. Certainly the ability to have the activity records of their work on the site outweighed a certain degree of frustration on their part. However, even though I was constrained by the capabilities of Moodle, there were adjustments that would have lessened the teachers’ sense of frustration, but I discovered them at the end of the program. These adjustments will be discussed in further detail within Chapter Six.
Resources

One of the common misconceptions with online learning is that it takes less time to prepare, deliver, and follow-up with participants than typical face-to-face learning. Ironically, what is made up in travel and distance is lost in the amount of time needed to respond to students on a regular basis, follow up on assignments, and update resources. Palloff and Kent (2007) estimate it takes approximately twice as much time to create and maintain an effective online version of a face-to-face class.

I quickly discovered this as truth as I tried to maintain the resources available as well as update and rotate new ideas and methods into the site. Initially, this wasn’t too difficult to do given that I had a number of resources and websites I had been accumulating for the months preceding the onset of the program. Once the program began, however, time was quickly absorbed in obtaining new resources to keep the site current as well as attend to their requests for ideas and respond in a timely and meaningful matter. As a result of limited time on my end as the e-mentoring facilitator, the priority became responding to their monthly postings, emails, and other more pressing needs. Interestingly, lack of resources on the site was noted by two teachers teaching together at a school they deemed as “non-collegial and unsupportive.” Both Candy and Tina expressed similar frustrations with empty resource links, “I used a lot of the resources and have gone into the content areas. Most of the time I found there wasn’t anything up there” (TS 638-640).

Candy, an “information hound” who was continually looking for resources and had the third highest usage report for the site expressed a greater sense of frustration:

And then I would always check back for the content areas for ideas and there would either be nothing in there, or things wouldn’t change so maybe if you don’t have a lot then don’t post them at all. Just hold off. You think you are going to find a lot in the lesson plans and there’s not. I mean if you don’t have more options, don’t put it up. (CK 521-525)
The remaining six teachers noted during their interviews that they did not use the various resources due to a lack of time, which will be discussed in the following section. Certainly had they had more time in which to look at the various resources, there would have been a greater number voicing their disappointment in not having more resource links available and updated on a regular basis.

**Communication Options**

One of the key words that came out of the interviews when the teachers were asked, “What makes a mentor effective?” was accessibility. One way of providing this was to offer them several communication avenues in which to access myself, the UF liaison and/or the UF professor. Originally, the site offered just three communication options: *Announcements, The Teachers’ Lounge* and *Suggestion Box*. This was later expanded to include five more communication options within the first three months of the MOST website being implemented: *Laura and Lisa's Thoughts and Wonderings* (an online journal of the MOST developer and UF liaison); *Get one, Give one IDEAS!!!* (a posting option for ideas that work in the classroom); *Great Teacher Books to Read!* (a posting of book recommendations); *Words of Wisdom and Inspiration* (quotes by educators and others); and *Just-in-Time Mentoring* (a private communication link directly to the UF teachers. Responses to beginning teachers’ requests and concerns were made within 48 hours). These communication options were added in hopes of categorizing their communications to avoid making any option a “catch all” for all of the communication exchanges among the members as well as to add privacy as was the case of the *Just-in-Time Mentoring* option.

However, it is evident from their responses that there were too many options. The additional choices added to the congestion of the site and resulted in more frustration and may have hampered the teachers’ desire to communicate with others. It was clear email was the
communication option of choice as expressed by Irene and several other teachers, “It was just easy for me to email you from my regular email. So if I needed to ask you a question, I would just go to Outlook. I wouldn’t go through fifteen layers of MOST to find your addresses” (IK 771-773). And as Candy stated, “Email probably would have been better since I have my email on all day and I have to log onto the site to get access to things” (CK 562-563).

Although the site provided them several outlets in which to communicate, three of the teachers suggested having more time to talk and vent during our face-to-face meetings. Interestingly, the quietest and most reserved teacher in the group had this to say about how important it was to have the time to talk with one another:

I think more time for us to talk to each other—vent. That day that we did that thing on the white board. Like we had to cut that conversation short. I just think that sometimes when you hear—especially what other first year teachers are going through the same thing…Like that really opened my eyes. I thought WOW! I am not the only one leaving super late and getting up super early. And that made me feel better about myself….I think more discussion—open discussion that if you get off topic it is okay. But that ties in with time, and that makes it a big issue, but if you could make it three hours. Or between two-three hours. I guess the thing I am saying is that we need more time. I don’t know if that is feasible. (LM 729-742)

Once again, the issue of time and scheduling surfaced as an obstacle in providing more time to interact and communicate in person.

Even with so many communication options, it is clear from Adam’s observations as well as the other teachers’ requests to meet more often and longer that online communications are no substitute for face-to-face interactions:

I have noticed that people hang out after the fact and they are usually just hanging around talking about whatever. Nobody is ever bolting to get out the door. It seems to me that everyone enjoys the open conversation about whatever. You realize you are not the only one dealing with this. You don’t have to think—oh God, that’s just me dealing with this? Cause you don’t get together in another classroom. You can talk to other teachers—but that’s perception and people you have already known each other for a year so you are that much more comfortable with one another. (AP 741-748)
As the literature suggests, ementoring should be viewed as a supplement to face-to-face mentoring and not as a substitution (Brady & Schuck, 2005; Merseth, 1991). Hybrid mentoring programs such as MOST afford participants the 24/7 accessibility online as well as the critical need for regular, personal interactions.

Quite intriguing is the fact that the teachers who most requested more face-to-face time to converse were also the youngest in the group. Being in their 20s, they are of a generation that grew up with technology; and it would seem logical to assume they would be the most comfortable with using technology as a means of communication and possibly have a preference for using technology to communicate over meeting in person. I was expecting their responses to be more like Kathi’s, a 33 year-old female, where distance didn’t play a factor in things, “Really with email and things like that, I don’t ever think I thought of you guys as being that far away” KZ (766-767). With webcams becoming standard features on computers as well as decreasing in price, the possibility of using camera related technologies as a means of communicating should be further explored as a means of meshing both the need to meet in person as well as reaping the benefits of time saved and no travel requirements when using this kind of technology.

**Time**

A recurrent theme that was mentioned in all eight of the interviews was the theme of time—whether it was a lacking of or a need for more. Typical of first year teachers is their misconception of how much time is needed to accomplish all the tasks and jobs required of teachers within and beyond their teaching day. Five of the teachers noted how surprised they were at the amount of work they needed to complete within a school day, which made finding the time to peruse the site for resources less of a priority. Seven of the eight mentioned wanting to look at the site more in-depth, but weren’t able to do so due to a lack of time:
I haven’t gone to them yet, but those emails that you sent…I have an email folder with all of them…That’s another thing—I have all these different things I want to go back to but I didn’t have the time. I did use the T-shirt pattern. I tried…I haven’t had time to peruse through it but I know I did at the beginning and I want to go back. (LM 783-786)

I think a lot of it is due to being a first year teacher and just not having the time to look around. For me, I just felt like I wanted to get through the assignment so I could move on to something else I had to do. (CB 613-615)

Assessment will have an impact with the rubrics and such. I say will. It’s just a matter of having time. (AP 935-936)

Even with an evident lack of time to use the site more extensively during the school year, it is encouraging that several of the teachers requested the ability to log onto the site once the program was over, “All of the resources you all had were good. That’s another question I had—how long will we have access? Because I want to go back and look at things” (LM 716-718).

Even Irene who struggled with site being too distracting requested having access to the site as a second year teacher:

And time, yea time. The one thing is, this is the shame about it…It would be so nice to be a MOST graduate to continue to use the MOST site for at least a year or two because what happened as an apprentice, we get just overwhelmed with good resources of which I don’t have a clue to be able to organize them. You kind of grow. The first thing I learned how to do was to plan a week. Then I got where I could differentiate. So it’s like we are taking baby steps. Might be step number 72 and I am only on step 51…that I realize I really need to go back and check some of those resources because they look pretty cool, but I haven’t needed them until now. (IK 782-790)

As Irene stated, too often beginning teachers receive resources that can’t be used at a particular time due to where they were developmentally as teachers. Her statement captures the juggling act beginning teachers face “having to teach and having to learn how to teach.”

**Earlier Start**

A recurrent suggestion made by several of the teachers was to start MOST earlier in the year. Because it was the initial year for implementing MOST as an alternative induction program, we lost valuable time in the beginning due to having to work out the logistics of the
program as well as having to recruit and persuade members of the original group of 15 beginning teachers to choose our induction program over the district’s. With the first week of school being one of the harshest for beginning teachers, it would be optimal if the MOST ementoring component could begin several weeks before the start of the school year so as to give first year teachers another source of support for such a critical time in their careers. Carl reiterated his appreciation and understanding in having classroom rituals and routines covered and established at the onset of the year by stating, “Maybe make sure it starts at the beginning of the year and making sure that the focus is management and getting the rituals and routines down” (CB 434-435) whereas Kathi stated the need to start earlier with MOST as a means “to give the next group of teachers more time and then maybe they could go deeper into some of the issues people have” (KZ 897-899).

**Technological Aspects**

Regardless of the technological platform or program used, unforeseen problems or glitches can occur if there is an unfamiliarity with the features available within a program. Although all eight of the teachers had a range of basic to advanced technological skills and had used Moodle previously, it was obvious there were misunderstandings and uncertainties as to what some of the features and options of Moodle were capable of accomplishing:

> It takes a 30 minute window to post and it doesn’t post to everybody…I don’t know whose side it is on. Some people’s responses posted and other didn’t. When we posted the rubrics—when I thought I must be the first one to post—it turns out two others had already posted and I never received notification on that. (TS 604-613).

Both of these frustrating circumstances voiced by Tina could have easily been alleviated had I known earlier since there were options that existed within Moodle that could have been activated totally avoiding the issues.

Frustrations with Moodle’s notification system were also voiced by Irene:
I got every posting ever since I signed up. If I had to do again, I wouldn’t do it again; I think that is part of why I got overwhelmed with it. I hadn’t opened my Outlook in maybe 3 days. I had 51 emails of which 27 of them were MOST. (IK 836-838)

Tina voiced the most frustration of the group when it came to responding to the others with the various online forums:

See--I don’t have any problems with the online except the response. Like I said if UF itself--- I know you are limited by the technology platform, but if UF could partner with someone to see the real world response that facilitates online discussion. The current platform does not facilitate that. (TS 601-605)

Although Tina would not be considered as technologically savvy as the two teachers in the group who held degrees in technology related areas, she had received both her bachelor’s and Master’s degrees from the University of Phoenix (UP), a predominantly web-based university. When comparing the capabilities of each to the other, one can understand her source of frustration because Moodle does not offer the technological sophistication of UP.

Although studies are not conclusive, research does indicate that age can influence how well a technology is adapted and utilized (Czaja et al., 2006; Morris & Venkatesh, 2000).

Interestingly, the two teachers who expressed the most frustration with the site had a mean age of 49 years—the oldest in the group. Research related to technology utilization and age has been found to be extremely complicated due to a number of factors (e.g., beliefs, adequate time, training); however, younger computer users are less apt to have anxiety over new technologies and, as a result, be more willing to implement and use them on a regular basis (Czaja et al., 2006; Morris & Venkatesh, 2000).

**Assumptions of Technological Expertise**

One of the assumptions made by the researcher was that the group’s training and experience with using Moodle the year prior was sufficient in knowing how to use the various options and functions within the program. This turned out to be a false assumption. When the
site was introduced at our first face-to-face meeting, all six of the teachers (two teachers joined the group the following month) expressed their comfort and understanding of using the open source software. However, during their interviews, confusion of the program and the site surfaced numerous times indicating that, regardless of their expressed knowledge of the program used, it is in the best interests of the group and its members to provide a refresher course at the initial face-to-face meeting:

I don’t know if this is because I haven’t researched it well or not, I know that sometimes I have to cut and paste the directions out of how you get to something. I don’t know if that is my own not knowing how the system works, like not knowing a way around that. (LM 794-797)

Additionally, each communication option had an explanatory sentence detailing what its purpose was, but there was an expressed confusion as to what their purposes entailed, “Maybe if we understood what their purpose was for? Like we kind of made couple of them teachers’ lounges. Did you see how we did that? We kind of made it a big teachers’ lounge one time!” (CK 530-532). As Candy stated, this confusion resulted in making a communication option become something it wasn’t intended to be.

This confusion was particularly true surrounding the *Just-In-Time Mentoring* option that not only had been discussed at the October face-to-face gathering, but had also been a task to explore during their second online activity: “No. I didn’t use it. I probably would have used email instead. I am not sure I understood what it entailed. Is it going to get to you quicker? For me, if I needed to get a hold of you, I would have done it in a more direct way” (AP 850-851); “Can you tell me what that was…it was secret? I don’t think I did” (LM 791). These comments were rather discouraging as it was hoped that with this communication option being specifically created and designated as a “hot-line” of sorts that it would allow teachers to feel at ease in contacting me, the UF liaison, or UF professor at anytime and not feel hesitant in doing so.
Contradictions

An interesting finding within this evaluation was the manner in which the teachers would often contradict what they wanted and valued with what they actually expressed during their interviews. Several of them noted their appreciation in how MOST was created to match their needs and not the prescriptive program that would have been their option had they taken the DCPS beginning teacher induction program. However, 50% of the beginning teachers noted how they would have liked to have had a calendar with preset dates and assignments. Irene in particular stated:

You could at the beginning preset the dates for the meetings and then also preset a list of days of when things would be due. If that was in one easy to find, print it out once, stick it in my notebook. That would have made life a whole lot easier. Rather than have to look through all those layers and look up. Because for a long time the dates weren’t posted until the task was posted. So it was on a month to month basis so we really couldn’t plan too far ahead. (IK 754-759)

Adam, who suggested that the MOST face-to-face meetings should have allowed for more off the agenda kinds of talks suggested, “I think MOST in general could have been more structured in general—specifically for me—since we have assignments, it would have been beneficial to have had a syllabus like a class” (AP  615-617). Although Adam suggested making things a bit more free flowing when we met in person, his need to have more structure on-line was evident based on the number of late postings he had on the site. He often commented on how he needed to become better with managing due dates for MOST and other activities.

The teachers contradictory comments on appreciating how the “content was geared to what they needed” and yet making statements like “it would have been beneficial to have had a syllabus like a class” leaves the question as to how to provide a balance between the two. Given their desire to have structure, but yet still have a program that is tailored to their needs makes creating such a program a bit difficult. Possible options will be described in the next chapter.
More Time Together, but no Time to Give

Nowhere was this theme of contradiction more evident than when five of the eight teachers suggested in their interviews that the group should have met twice a month, once again reinforcing the premise that technology is not the “end all, be all” it can sometimes be promoted to be. When we initially met with the original six beginning teachers in September of 2007, we discussed times and dates to meet. It was evident from our discussion that there weren’t many options for meeting due to all of the demands they had at their various school sites (e.g., tutoring, grade level planning meetings, professional development). Like many urban school teachers, the demands on their time are often splintered due to the many initiatives they are responsible for carrying out. Three of the five schools (which accounted for 75% of the teachers) in this evaluation were *Reading First* schools and the claims on their time and energies were much greater due to this added title and the programmatic requirements it entailed. Trying to set a predetermined date turned out to be an impossibility with fluctuating schedules; and, as a result, we would set the following month’s meeting date when we met each month face-to-face.

Contradicting their requests to meet longer and more often were statements that they didn’t have the time to look at the various resources on the site and wanted to look at them later once they had more time. Quite often the same teacher who would make a statement such as “I didn’t have the time to look at them” when referring to looking at the different websites, books, and video suggestions would counter it with a comment such as, “I think it might be helpful to meet more often…maybe meet 4-6 pm two times a month.” Further examination of this contradiction in request for meeting more often, but not having enough time to look at resources online led to the hypothesis they are still developing an understanding of the demands placed on their time as beginning teachers as well as still learning how to juggle and prioritize the different demands on their time and energy.
Insights, Recommendations, and Ideas

Quite often in education, the best teacher is the teacher’s students. Their insights as learners are invaluable and can provide an understanding into how things can be improved for the next class of students. This certainly was the case with the insights and recommendations made by the eight beginning teachers. Each of the interviewees was asked for recommendations and things they would change with both the MOST induction program as a whole as well as specifically with the ementoring component. The following sections are their suggestions in guiding future versions of MOST: differentiation, audio and video-taping of teachers, and coordinating online and face-to-face themes.

Differentiation

Several of the teachers provided some very thoughtful suggestions that would greatly enhance MOST as an effective means of ementoring as well as a beginning teacher induction program. One of these suggestions was to differentiate activities and sources for primary and upper grades. Kathi, one of two kindergarten teachers in the group, voiced this need more strongly than the others because so many of the online resources were geared more for upper elementary, “It is hard to say because our perceptions of what we need are so different. In a perfect world maybe they could have two running simultaneously, a primary and upper level, if they had enough participants, focusing on the needs of those teachers” (KZ 945-947). Although Tina didn’t note this need during her interview, she did make requests for resources that were kindergarten specific throughout the year on the MOST site and via email. A survey comment echoed similar feelings, “I have greatly enjoyed the video streaming and have found a majority of the assignments to be beneficial. In the future I would suggest having a primary and upper-level component that would be more tailored to our needs” (Survey response). Given that there
are distinct skills in each grade that cannot always be generalized, their request is a valid one and one that will be addressed in further detail within the researcher’s recommendations.

**Audio Taping**

Because communication plays such a key role in creating an effective teaching environment and establishing rapport with students, I created their second session to involve examining their communication styles as educators. Teachers were asked to record a 30-minute interval of their instruction and interactions with their students and then respond to several reflective questions about what they noticed once they listened to the tape.

Out of the nine sessions, this one caused the greatest inconvenience to the teachers and the lowest initial participation rate. Only 50% of the teachers completed the task on time, with the others not turning their tapes in and responding until months later. Even with the responses of the other teachers being quite reflective, since the activity received so much resistance, I had listed it as a possible component to drop from the program. However, one of the four teachers who was late with the assignment made this insightful comment making me rethink that decision for next year’s program:

> With the video you can see and hear yourself. I watched myself…but listening to myself—I was like wow! This is what I sound like. Whereas I think watching myself—I would be busy watching myself and not listening to myself. For me, I was watching my body language. I was looking at certain things and I don’t think I was paying attention to what I was saying. So you may want to keep both. (LM 875-882)

Her comment provided a perspective that made me re-analyze the exercise’s goal and the issues surrounding the resistance it received. After talking to the teachers who struggled to complete the assignment during a monthly face-to-face meeting, their lack of completing it on time was due mostly in part to not having the recording technology available at their school site and not an issue of thinking the exercise was inapplicable.
**Videotaping**

Due to a lack of time as well as scheduling conflicts, videotaping their instruction and classrooms was an option, and I was only able to film four of the eight teachers in the spring of 2008. One of the teachers found the exercise particularly useful, even though she hesitated in viewing her tape once it was completed, “It would be interesting to tape the apprentices at the end so they have…I find it very good to have a reflection piece to see that things weren’t as bad as I thought they were” (LM 742-744). She further recommended that it become “more mandatory than not” for the next group of inductees.

Optimally, it would be best to have the teachers record their voices as well as videotape their instruction and classrooms both in the fall and the spring of the school year. These tasks could be integrated within the monthly online assignments, not only providing them a record of their teaching, but also as an effective means of sharing their classroom interactions, as well as showing growth and reflection upon their growing pedagogical skills. One of the additions that will be discussed in the recommendations is crafting a reflective assignment involving videotapes of their instruction in the fall and spring of the school year.

**Coordinating Face-to-Face and Online Themes**

One of the design issues that the UF liaison and I struggled with throughout the year was coordinating our monthly meetings and online themes so they would be more complementary and not as disjointed as they seemed at times. Candy pointed this out in her interview:

> Sometimes I think the face to face wasn’t in line with what we were doing online. I don’t know if that was a big deal, but maybe make this huge focus for the whole month--combine and make it similar. It was hard to keep things straight at times. Like if we did something on communication, make the focus the same on both. Like have articles on communication, discussion on communication, have the online concerned with communication… (CK 483-488)
Once again, Candy’s point is an issue of gaining in one area only to lose out in another.

Because we wanted to provide them a tailored induction program, often what was an issue or concern that was covered online was replaced by a more urgent need or request for information by the time our afternoon meetings were held.

Furthermore, given the late start of MOST in September, we were limited in the amount of time and sessions we had available to feasibly cover important topics, concerns, and subjects. The UF liaison and I discussed their requests as well as issues/concerns that arose from the time of our previous meetings on a regular basis. These discussions helped to prioritize their needs and whether those needs would be best addressed face-to-face or online.

2nd Year Wishes

All too frequently, induction programs are only funded to provide support the first year of a teacher’s career. Ideally, effective induction programs should last several years, gradually weaning beginning teachers of their different supports as they become more seasoned (Scherer, 1999). Unfortunately, many are left to their own devices in maintaining their first year support system or cultivating a new one from the second year onward. In particular, beginning urban teachers face the most difficulty in maintaining their first year support systems when high turnover rates within their schools leave them with few experienced teachers to turn to for advice and guidance (Joftus & Maddox-Dolan, 2002).

With such a positive response to MOST, all of the beginning teachers were asked if they would like to continue with a scaled down version of the program during the 2008-09 school year. All eight expressed an interest in maintaining at least online communications with the other teachers. Similar comments to Opal’s, “I would love to be part of the program still. At least the communication aspect of it” (OQ 512-513), were made by the teachers and several expressed a desire to also meet in person along with online interactions:
I feel we need to still get together. Even if there aren’t tasks or a purpose to meet, just to sort of reconnect and recharge, it helps you to remember why you are doing it and that the grass isn’t always greener…there is a common thread that exists among the people who have made this choice. And there is something unique about what we have all gone through. Have a Wiki—we used this for our reading classroom. It’s a happy medium. It doesn’t have to be on an organized site. (LM 1007-1012)

Whatever they provide, I am up for that. Even the online. I would use the just in time mentoring. I would even meet once a month. (CK 707-709)

Interestingly, the majority clearly suggested that whatever program or program component was offered to them, that it be optional and not mandatory as they had just experienced for the 2008-08 year. Comments such as, “I wouldn’t be opposed to an open ended arrangement. I would much rather have the choice to participate and not be mandated” as well as “have some sort of open forum type of thing” were indicative of their desire to have flexibility in their participation.

Also of interest was Adam’s comment of having the opportunity to interact with the next year’s first year teachers online and provide them support:

I guess if you let us on to the site with the apprentices, we could provide feedback or links. We could still post on the forums, but not be required to do anything, but there would be an opportunity there. Maybe no one would do anything but there would be an opportunity there. Maybe we could put profiles up there about ourselves so the apprentices could see that that would be a good person to contact for their particular situation and then make yourself available and we could communicate in that sense. (AP 982-988)

Although I would like to think their enthusiasm to maintain communication among each other was a result of the ementoring forum provided to them, Laura’s reminder of the close-knit relationship that existed among the group prior to their involvement with MOST reinforced how critical group cohesion played in contributing to MOST’s effectiveness:

Especially our group of apprentices--we were so close anyway…We were close all through last year and I think because time does slip away from us that I think after this year, we will start losing touch with each other especially the ones that aren’t at ____. So, I think just having a place for us to meet and vent that we were doing at the beginning of the MOST sessions. Just to have that. That would be good. (LM 927-932)
This is not to say that cohesion cannot be created, but the pre-existing bond among the eight teachers certainly provided a strong foundation that played a pivotal role in MOST’s ementoring success.

**Closing Comments**

Inherent with any new program is a level of risk that what is created will not meet the planned goals and objectives. When the UF liaison and I set out to design MOST as an alternative induction program, we had hoped it would be successful in meeting their needs as beginning alternatively certified teachers. Although we may not have obtained all of the original goals we set out to achieve at the onset of the program, I do feel my primary goal of developing a tailored mentoring experience that provided quality and timely online support to the eight beginning teachers was reached. Their comments below further testify to how MOST provided them the support they needed as beginning teachers:

I think it was very successful, I am glad I did it, I am glad it was offered to us…Even you and Laura—I know you were aware of what we were doing, just having that support and attaching a face to it, you guys listening to us and saying you are going to be okay and you will survive. Just having that constant…it was something I looked forward to and can’t imagine how crazy it was for you to adjust your life to and it is something I will miss next year. LM 753-758

I just think it is better. I didn’t like going to the Duval one. After you went to the session you had a month to post something on their website—a reflection or whatever. I liked it better that I did it with you guys. LM 670-672

I have to say that honestly that one of the best things they did this year was to provide this support. Like I said…if it hadn’t been for you, Laura, and Lauren, I don’t know where I would be. TS 794-796

My secondary goal of having MOST become a required component of the alternatively certified beginning teacher induction program remains to be seen. However, regardless of its institutionalization, there are numerous recommendations for the improvement of the ementoring
component so as to become a viable induction program DCPS can offer its beginning teachers. These recommendations will be discussed in the following chapter.
CHAPTER 6
REFLECTIONS FROM THE PROGRAM DEVELOPER

In 1981, the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (JCSEE) called for evaluations to be held to certain standards due to the increased specialization of evaluation research (Patton, 1982; Stufflebeam, 2001). Prior to this, “methodological rigor was the primary, often the only, criterion by which evaluations were judged” (Patton, p. 15). Practicality, feasibility, and utility were not focused upon and as a result, completed program evaluations with their suggestions and findings were often not implemented. Large investments of time and money quite often were for naught as evaluations findings were ignored once the evaluation cycle had been completed. Recognizing the complexity of program evaluations as well as a need for “standards to guide professional practice” (Patton, p.16), the committee determined evaluations not only needed to be appropriate and accurate but also feasible and useful. Chapter Five findings, in conjunction with the following program recommendations, attend to these four features.

Although the sample size used in this study was small (N=8), its findings have implications for creating future online mentoring programs in supporting beginning teachers, particularly those that are alternatively certified as well as refining the online component of the DCPS induction program for future use within Duval County. Additionally, the findings have implications for school-based personnel, district personnel, university partners, and other members of the research community.

To ensure the success and longevity of such a program in the future, two things must occur: (1) funding must be obtained to pay program facilitators and (2) improvements need to be made to the program.
Need for Funding

The ementoring component of the 2007-08 MOST induction program was a result of a doctoral student creating an online environment that would be a source for her study. Due to this fact, all time involved with its creation and maintenance was of no cost to DCPS. Similarly, the face-to-face facilitator also volunteered her time and energies in providing continued support to the group of eight she had worked with previously during the 2006-07 school year.

If DCPS is committed in continuing the program to provide support to their TTT alternatively certified teachers, it is essential they acquire funding to pay facilitator/s to continue MOST both with an ementoring and face-to-face medium of delivery. Since a substantial framework has been established with MOST during the past school year, energies would be aimed at maintaining and improving what is already established rather than creating new ementoring and face-to-face components.

One of the more critical aspects of the MOST site that was neglected due to lack of time on the ementoring facilitator’s part, was that of updating resources on a regular basis. With the plethora of resources that exist due to the conveniences of the Internet, lack of pertinent resources is not an issue, but time to sort through resources, write inviting descriptions, and then time to upload the information to the site is. Funding the ementoring facilitator position would allow the facilitator time to devote in obtaining and updating new site resources that include video clips, websites, and teacher-friendly articles such as those found in journals such as *Educational Leadership*.

The time required by the ementoring and face-to-face facilitators to maintain the level of the program as it stands now would be approximately 15-25 hours per week (5-10 hours per week for the face-to-face and 10-15 hours per week for the ementoring component). However, with the recommendations that follow, it would be more realistic to increase this amount to an
average of 25-30 hours per week for the combined components to improve the overall effectiveness of the program. Ten hours would be dedicated to face-to-face component and between 15-20 hours for the online component per week. These numbers are averages with some weeks requiring more planning and work than others. This estimate includes time for filming eight-ten teachers twice per school year, along with the time needed to attend monthly meetings in Jacksonville.

Need for Improvements

Recommendations are a result of the analysis findings discussed in the previous chapter and also stem from administrative interviews, the researcher’s reflective journal, and from conversations with the eight teachers, UF liaison, UF professor, and apprentice coach over the course of the 2007-08 school year. Many of the suggested improvements are minor and their cost is negligible. The timing of their implementation, however, is critical and for that reason a Phased Implementation Program is recommended.

Implementation Phase I: Prior to Start of Program

Conduct apprentice graduate needs assessment survey. During the final month of their apprenticeship, TTT apprentices should complete a brief survey of needs based on their experiences over the prior eight months. This survey should then be re-administered in September once they have graduated and become official teachers of record. Both survey results would provide insights into their perceived needs as beginning teachers and allow for any changes in their needs once they have begun the school year. These results should then be used to help structure the initial development of the e-mentoring component as well as the MOST induction program overall. Surveys could be created using free survey software such as Survey Monkey or Poll Daddy and could be administered online at the participants’ convenience.
Meet with administrative staff, principals, and beginning teachers. One of the critical aspects discovered during the process of creating MOST as well as via the different teacher interviews was the need for the MOST ementoring and face-to-face facilitators to meet with the different parties (e.g., administrative, principal, and teachers) involved with MOST prior to its implementation. Issues and various miscommunications could have possibly been avoided had conversations occurred before MOST started in the fall of 2007.

Conduct administrative meetings. A preliminary meeting conducted by the MOST ementor and face-to-face facilitators should be held along with the TTT coordinator, apprentice coach, and any other UF or DCPS affiliated positions the summer prior to the school year. Program goals and objectives as well as district requirements should be discussed to inform the ementoring component as well as MOST induction program as a whole. Decisions should be made on how teachers would be held accountable for their participation as well as the quality of work expected from the teachers. With three of the eight teachers voicing complaints during their interviews on how others were allowed time extensions on different assignments, clearly stated expectations at the onset of the program could have deterred the number of requests for deadline extensions. Additionally, district requirements and expectations regarding their attendance both online and face-to-face should be discussed at this preliminary meeting to ensure fairness and equity of treatment of the beginning teachers involved in the program.

Conduct principal meetings. An initial meeting with the various school principals needs to occur within the first month of the program’s implementation in order for the facilitator to gain an understanding of the needs and possible concerns the principals have with their new teachers. With a school’s leadership playing a decisive role in a beginning teacher’s first year (Kardos & Johnson, 2007; Youngs, 2007), insights from the various principals would be
extremely advantageous in shaping the ementoring component—particularly at the onset of the program. Furthermore, establishing rapport with the principals might induce them to communicate more frequently and openly with the ementoring facilitator, thus helping her to assist the teachers in more meaningful ways.

**Conduct teacher meetings.** It would also be beneficial to conduct a meeting with the beginning teachers prior to the commencement of the school year. Teacher expectations, support needs, and any additional concerns they might have as beginning teachers would be discussed at this time. Efforts should be made to use their concerns and ideas as a preliminary framework from which to start the MOST website in August. It would also be helpful to have the new beginning teachers meet with past apprentices so as to reacquaint them with one another, and to allow them to ask questions regarding what to expect their first year as beginning teachers who shared a common preparation program.

**Create resource lending library.** With the overwhelming positive response to the Annenberg video clips, it would be beneficial to create a small lending library of DVDs that demonstrate best teaching practices particularly for kindergarten and first grades as these grades were difficult in obtaining appropriate grade level resources. Three of the eight beginning teachers taught in the primary grades; they suggested that materials specific to their grade level be made available to future MOST participants. Several publishers such as Stenhouse, Heinemann, and Scholastic offer numerous affordable DVDs that demonstrate best teaching practices for reading, writing, and math. DVDs could be exchanged during face-to-face meetings allowing an expansion of grade level and subject specific resources available to the teachers.
Creating a library of professional resources for all grade levels and subjects that would be available for check-out during the monthly meetings would also be desirable. Although book recommendations were often made on the site, the majority of teachers were unable to locate the suggested resources at their school libraries. Furthermore, few wanted to purchase a resource when they had already committed substantial amounts of their own monies to supply their classrooms. Nowhere was this financial commitment more evident when five teachers noted during an NSRF activity how much they had spent of their own money to supply their classrooms with adequate materials. Three of those five also purchased their own copiers out of frustration in not being able to copy materials for their students. Publishers such as those mentioned above as well as Corwin Press, Maupin House, and others have a multitude of print resources for all grade levels and subject matters and can often be purchased at discounted rates.

Condense resources. With 88% of the teachers involved in the study expressing varying levels of frustration with the site, it is evident that the site needs to be revamped to not be as congested or confusing to the user. Many of the frustrations expressed with the site stemmed from the busyness of the site in general. Four of the eight communication options could either be collapsed into an existing communication option or removed completely. For example, Great Teacher Books to Read! and The Suggestion Box could easily be integrated within The Teacher’s Lounge or Announcements communication forums. Words of Wisdom and Inspiration should be removed as access and utility records show they were not utilized. Out of the 98 access records for Laura and Lisa’s Wonderings, only 12 were made by the teachers. Similarly, the Words of Wisdom option was accessed five out of 67 times for a teacher participant usage rate of 7%. Other sections could be minimized or collapsed in order to make the site more appealing.

Although the MOST site is constrained by the fixed features of Moodle, as stated in the previous
chapter, steps can be taken to reduce the amount seen on any given active page viewed by a participant.

**Determine if statistical ability outweighs accessibility.** A determination needs to be made whether Moodle’s data and statistical capabilities are worth the multiple steps needed to access the various monthly tasks and resources and results in access records. Three of the eight teachers (38%) specifically mentioned how the numerous steps needed to access different parts of the site were a source of frustration for them and acted more of deterrent in having them respond. Seventy-five percent of the teachers noted the site was too complex in general. Although teachers had the ability to receive emails notifying them of recent postings allowing them to avoid logging on to the site to get the information, monthly activities and other MOST resources required them to log on and go through various steps to gain access to the activities and tasks. These steps provided insightful data into the utility and overall activity within the site. A sample of activity reports are included in Appendix J. However, the UF facilitator along with other administrative personnel need to determine whether the cost of frustration on the teacher’s part is worth the program’s ability to maintain records of activity.

**Schedule synchronous sessions.** Synchronous sessions should be planned periodically, if not regularly within the site to stimulate greater collaboration and deeper discussion of topics and concerns. With the MOST site being totally asynchronous, participants were afforded the ability to work online at any point within a 24-hour span. Although this is one of the benefits of online forums, it does keep group participants from interacting with a sense of intimacy just as they would in person. Requests from five of the eight teachers to meet more than once a month for the monthly face-to-face meetings attests to their need to have more direct contact. Synchronous sessions would create a viable alternative in meeting an additional time each month. Chat
sessions within the site could be established with designated chat dates and times which would
require that all participants be present online simulating face-to-face interactions.

Another possible option that would allow participants to interact synchronously and
collaboratively as well as provide usage data is to create a wiki. Wikis allow anyone to add or
edit the content within a particular web space. Additionally, each page has a page history which
allows one to see who made changes to the page, when they were made, as well as what was
changed. By using a wiki, chat sessions could be geared toward conversation-type postings and
allow for more collaborative, team-oriented kinds of interactions. If implemented, attendance
requirements would need to be clarified at the onset so as to not be confused with the
asynchronous activities that are the predominant form of interaction within the MOST site.

**Create reflective activities.** Examination of the teachers’ responses for the various
monthly tasks found that the majority were not highly reflective and often were short responses
that involved simple descriptions or affirmations. Few beginning teachers appear to have the
skills or background to reflect in great detail, so the facilitator often plays a critical role in
stimulating reflective thoughts and questions among the group members. Lack of time hampered
the facilitator from responding more frequently and more thoughtfully. Again, funding the
facilitator’s position would help to alleviate this as a paid facilitator would have more time to
respond to the teachers’ questions and responses. Reflective questioning techniques could be
utilized and thus elicit more reflective responses.

Additionally, monthly tasks could include more thought-provoking exercises that require
deeper interaction by fellow members. Several of the monthly tasks asked teachers to: “Review
each member’s posting and make a connection with at least two other members. Your connection
should be based on what you learned by reading their posting.” With no guidelines or scoring
system such as a rubric to help guide and promote their thinking, responses were limited in their level of reflection. The ementoring and face-to-face facilitators as well as the UF professor prompted teachers by asking them to “explain things a bit more” or by asking the question, “Why?” but more in-depth interactions could possibly have produced a higher level of reflection on the teachers’ part.

**Increase number of management discussions and tasks.** Findings from the interviews, site access records, and email exchanges show that the topic of classroom management to be a continual, albeit decreasing topic of concern throughout the school year. More integration of management techniques and tips should be made beyond the monthly theme so as to build upon the beginning teachers’ management skills and increase their understanding of classroom management. With almost all of the teachers (88%) expressing the management of their classrooms as an ongoing issue, the topic of classroom management should be revisited several times throughout the year not only to provide them ongoing support, but to also reinforce the concept that classroom management is an ongoing skill that needs continual refining.

**Coordinate face-to-face meetings with monthly assignments.** Efforts should be made to have the MOST face-to-face topics and monthly online themes and tasks complement one another as a mismatch of the two components was viewed as a negative by three of the teachers. By having both coincide theme-wise, concepts, skills, and ideas are reinforced making teachers’ learning more relevant and useful. Activities can be bridged allowing tasks to be assigned online with showcasing final products in person during the monthly face-to-face meetings.

**Differentiate tasks.** Monthly online resources and tasks should greater reflect the grade differences among the beginning teachers. Although many activities can be generalized across all grade levels, resources need to be obtained that better reflect grade level differences and areas
of concentration. With the likelihood that future MOST participants will be teachers of varying grade levels and subject areas, efforts should be made in acquiring resources that reflect this variability. As noted previously, an abundance of free resources are available online, but time is needed in order to locate, screen, write descriptions, and upload them to the site.

**Conduct Moodle and MOST site training.** Formal training on using Moodle would be highly beneficial to the e-mentoring facilitator as well as MOST participants. Although Moodle is a user-friendly program and is relatively easy to understand, it is evident the program had features that if utilized, would have minimized the frustration of the teachers. An example of this was a “window diminishing” feature that wasn’t discovered until the end of the program. Even if the site is pared down with the number of resources it currently has, such a simple step as collapsing the various windows would have made the site more enticing and less overwhelming to the participants. With almost all of the teachers expressing some level of frustration with the site and five of the teachers noting their skills with Moodle were not as extensive as they initially expressed, Moodle training is highly recommended.

**Implementation Phase II: During Program**

**Clarify teacher expectations.** Once the MOST site is introduced and initially utilized by the teachers, group expectations need to be reiterated and possibly refined by the facilitator. Lack of established deadlines and interaction expectations meant that reminders and nudges like the ones below had to be sent out several times over the course of the year:

This email also serves as a “gentle nudge” as there are several of you that haven’t been posting by the different session’s due dates. I have hesitated in sending this, but I feel like I need to for several reasons:

We really want this program to work in providing you support your first year of teaching. But so much of its success depends on the interactions that you all have with one another both face to face as well as online. Because the group is so small, everyone is a bit more dependent on the other members’ responses. When only 3 or 4 people are responding
during a session, it really hinders how we think about things and how much we grow. (Email from ementoring facilitator, 11/1/07)

This last point is one that we have mentioned before and we hate that we have to bring the same points up again 4 months later. We are really concerned about the number of late assignments, recent quality of some of the online assignments, and the lack of notification to us if you are unable to complete an online assignment. (MOST announcement from ementoring facilitator, 3/3/08)

By not having established written guidelines, the ementoring facilitator had to take on the additional role of the “jovial nag”-- a term coined by Harris and Figg (2000). The time spent on sending reminders could have been much better spent on providing support and might have been avoided had there been established guidelines and expectations of quality provided at the beginning of the program. Suggestions from the administration and principal meetings that occur prior to implementation should also be used to guide the development of online and face-to-face expectations.

**Create progress rubric.** Progress rubrics tailored to online interactions and responses can aid in determining the quality of task responses, timeliness of site interactions and can act as a periodic guide for teachers to self-monitor their online roles. With the majority of induction programs (including DCPS) graded as pass/fail and not A, B, C, etc., borderline performance by participants that minimally meets the requirements of passing the program often results. It would be helpful to assess participants’ interactions and timeliness of online assignments with a rubric scoring system several times throughout the nine months of the program. The ementoring coordinator could do this scoring as well as the individual teacher using self-administered rubrics. By using rubrics as a scoring system, the quality of the interactions could be guided and would also alleviate the need for the ementoring coordinator to send reminders for participants to complete or post tasks in a timely fashion.
Establish informal correspondence. Informal correspondence via email and phone can be helpful in maintaining open lines of communication in an unstructured, casual capacity. Although this might be considered above and beyond the call of duty on the facilitator’s part, it was found to be highly beneficial in helping to build rapport and trust with the beginning teachers and provided them with another means of support during the 2007-08 year. Three of the teachers noted “accessibility” was a key trait in being an effective mentor. Two teachers in particular noted the availability of the facilitator and liaison by email and phone as critical in their feeling supported as beginning teachers. Sending informal, occasional emails “just to check in” can help lessen the unintentional formality that sometimes occurs within online environments. Giving the beginning teachers a direct phone number to the facilitator is also recommended as a means of building trust and providing them a sense of security in knowing they can contact the facilitator directly and privately should the need arise.

Implementation Phase III: End of Program

Conduct teacher and principal interviews. Efforts should be made to conduct exit interviews with all of the beginning teachers involved in the MOST induction program. Their thoughts and insights are invaluable in helping to assess the utility of the program as well as determine areas in need of improvement. Principals of schools that employed the beginning teachers should also be interviewed in order to get their evaluation of MOST’s effectiveness in providing support to their schools’ TTT beginning teachers. However, as noted in Phase I, communication should be established with principals at the beginning of the year in order to create rapport as well as establish a relationship that promotes a common mission.

Overall recommendations

Limit group size. With apprentice class size varying from year to year, group size cannot always be guaranteed to be small in number. In the case that an apprentice class is greater than
10 in number, it would be wise to divide the larger group into two smaller groups so as to maintain a level of closeness and familiarity among the teachers. If two or more groups are created, it would allow the teachers to be divided by primary and upper grades so as to make the support differentiated and pertinent to their grade level needs.

**Videotape all teachers.** Teachers should have the opportunity to view themselves “in action” during the school year so as to not only have a record of themselves teaching, but to also allow them a chance to view their strengths, weaknesses, and growth. Minimally, all of the teachers should be filmed at least once during the school year. Optimally, filming should occur twice—once in September and again in May providing several months in between filming sessions to hone their pedagogical skills as beginning teachers. Although only half of the teachers were able to be filmed due to scheduling issues, they found the taping of their teaching to be helpful and insightful with one of the teachers stating that it shouldn’t be an option but rather “it should be something that should be more mandatory than not” (KZ 722-723). Tapes would be viewed by the both the teacher and ementoring facilitator for reflective discussion on what is observed within the tapes and hopefully result in constructive dialogue that would improve areas of weakness or concern by either the teacher or facilitator.

**Continue to examine similar programs.** The ementoring facilitator should continue to research and examine successful online communities and ementoring programs that are specific in providing support and mentoring to beginning and novice teachers. With the growing number of online communities and the increasing role ementoring is taking within induction programs, a knowledge base of best practices has been formed and is continually being expanded. Regularly revisiting this growing knowledge base will only improve the program as it exists now.
Add technological enhancements. Technological advancements often make what was once viewed as a luxury, an attainable, commonplace technological tool. One such example of this is cyber-coaching or bug-in-ear (BIE) technology. Cyber-coaching uses “advanced online and mobile technology to deliver immediate feedback to practitioners in real-time” (Rock, in press). By using such a technology, the e-mentoring program could be taken a step further in providing effective and low-cost mentoring and coaching in real-time without the need to have the mentor/coach on-site. The technology infrastructure needed would incur initial start up costs (approximately $200 for technology components: video camera, microphone, and earpiece bug), but could be maintained for a minimal investment thereafter.

Additionally, webcams could also provide a means of synchronous communication between teachers, MOST facilitators, coaches and others. Now standard on most laptops and many desktop computers, webcams would allow participants to interact with one another in real-time meshing the need to meet in person while eliminating distance and travel time.

Insulate hybrid induction program from budget cuts. Although technology is seen as an attractive method in delivering support in an economical way, providing support via online methods is not recommended as the sole means of beginning teacher support and mentoring. Maintaining a hybrid design that infuses face-to-face with online interactions as a beginning teacher induction program is highly advised as a critical means of induction support for beginning teachers. The temptation by districts to reduce mentoring and induction programs so the least expensive component is the only component of their induction program becomes a reality for many beginning teachers. With economic downturns, school districts are often the first to feel the results of diminished state and local budgets. Excess programs not deemed essential to the day-to-day operations of schools are often the first to be reduced or eliminated.
completely. The allure of minimal cost and maximum coverage that online programs provide should not lessen the necessity of hybrid induction programs—even in lean budget years. Responses from this study strongly indicate that both the face-to-face and online mentoring components were effective and needed in conjunction with one another in order to deliver a quality mentoring experience to the beginning teachers. The MOST induction program would not have delivered the same results had it been comprised of only one component. Both quality face-to-face and online mentoring and support should be given priority and be maintained as a means of support for beginning teachers.

**Conclusion**

When asked if they would recommend MOST to future beginning teachers, it is evident from the responses of the eight teachers that MOST was successful in providing a tailored, mentoring program that delivered emotional and instructional support. All eight of the beginning teachers who participated in MOST were rehired for the 2008-09 school year. The remaining seven within the original 15 of the cohort did not fare as well, with only four of those teachers being rehired for the 2008-09 school year. Although personal characteristics such as drive and determination certainly play into one’s success, I would hope the eight teachers’ participation in MOST as well as the mentoring they received both online and face-to-face played a role in their development as beginning teachers and as a result, contributed to their being rehired for the 2008-09 year.

The MOST induction program appears to be a viable alternative to the DCPS beginning teacher induction program. Ideally, it should be an option made available to all future TTT apprentices who graduate and go on to become DCPS first year teachers. With their unique experiences as apprentices, both the online and face-to-face components provide a unique form of support and mentoring that complements their skills and knowledge as newly minted
alternatively certified educators. MOST is a wise investment in helping to retain not only alternatively certified beginning urban teachers, but beginning teachers in general and truly a worthwhile endeavor DCPS should preserve.
The purpose of this evaluation was to determine the effectiveness and utility of a tailored ementoring program that was created over the course of a school year for eight alternatively certified beginning teachers in urban, elementary schools. All too often, induction programs along with their mentoring components are typically the first programs to receive decreased funding or eliminated altogether when there are dips in the economy.

This is currently the case within Duval County as well as with the remaining 66 counties in Florida. At the time of this writing, the state of Florida was facing its third consecutive year of a sliding economy. Significant declines in the Florida housing market and historically high gas prices directly impacted Florida’s tourism market resulting in a staggering $1.8 billion drop in the state coffers for the 2007-08 budget year (Dunkelberger, 2008). Public services which include public schools are often on the top of the list when cutbacks need to be made.

The DCPS system is no exception. For the past five years, DCPS has hired between 1200 – 1500 new teachers every school year and typically hires 600-800 new teachers at the beginning of the school year. A hiring freeze in 2008 resulted in the county only hiring 500 teachers at the beginning of 2008-09 school year. It remains to be seen how many will ultimately be hired over the course of the year, although it is unlikely the numbers will be in line with those of past years.

Hiring freezes of this magnitude have multiple ramifications—not only do past and present apprentice graduates face the possibility of not being hired upon the completion of their apprenticeship due to limited vacancies, but existing school faculty are stretched thin when added responsibilities are given to them due to having less personnel at their various school sites to carry out normal school duties. Thus, mentoring of new faculty becomes even more challenging with mentors having much less time and energy to devote to their mentees. As a
result, we need to ask ourselves how do we make a case for mentoring and induction programs when faced with tight budget years? Are there steps that can be taken to make mentoring and induction “non-negotiable” within districts so they are insulated from budget cuts that cannot be scaled down or removed altogether? These questions must be addressed if mentoring and induction programs are to gain any foothold within school districts as lean and robust budget years can be expected over the course of time.

The researcher’s goal of having MOST adopted by DCPS as an induction program for future TTT first year teachers looked quite feasible when MOST ended in May. Discussions had been held in making MOST required for the 2008-09 beginning teachers who had been apprentices during the 2007-08 school year. Three months later, hiring freezes made this scenario questionable.

Currently, the second cohort of apprentices who graduated during the 2007-08 are enrolled in MOST and are using the induction program to fulfill their induction requirements. Although the program was handed over in its entirety (online and face-to-face) to two former DCPS teachers to implement, the ementoring component has yet to be utilized by this second group of beginning teachers.

The issue of time cannot be understated in this evaluation. With beginning teachers’ time being pulled on from all directions and people their first year, how do we construct ementoring programs that are worthwhile and demand attention, but don’t drain teachers of their energy and command too much of their time? Do we have them “make time” by placing requirements and stipulations on their level of interaction and responses? Do we risk “turning them off” by doing such things? The concept and use of time are still major issues within the field of online learning.
and many online communities are still grappling with the concerns of time just as we did with MOST.

Adding to the complexities and obstacles faced by DCPS beginning teachers is the district’s policy that requires new teachers to stay at their schools for a minimum of three years provided there are openings and teachers’ contracts have been renewed. Created as a means to stabilize the teaching faculty at schools, particularly those in hard-to-staff areas, this policy can be counterproductive if teachers who are not a good fit for the school have to remain for an additional two years making the relationship strained and the novice teacher’s foray into education a negative experience. With the initial experiences of beginning teachers setting the tone and trajectory for their education careers, this is a risky policy that should be reexamined.

All of these issues compound the complexities surrounding effective mentoring and induction programs for DCPS. However, many of the questions asked in this chapter pertain to districts across the United States and not just those in Florida. If mentoring and induction programs are to sustain the potential they have exhibited in countless studies, more needs to be done in creating, providing, and maintaining effective mentoring and induction programs particularly during restricted budget years.

**Closing comments.** Patton (2002) wisely reminds us of the importance of implementing evaluation findings, but even more important, the human element inherent in all programs:

> The primary criterion for judging such evaluations is the extent to which intended users actually use the findings for decision making and program improvement. The methodological implication of this criterion is that the intended users must value the findings and find them credible. They must be interested in the stories, experiences, and perceptions of the program participants behind simply knowing how many came into the program, how many completed it, and how many did what afterward. (p.10)

As the e-mentoring facilitator and evaluator, it is my hope that this program evaluation will not only put a face on findings that are too often lost in statistical analysis, but more importantly,
broaden our understanding of the positive influence ementoring can have upon beginning teachers, particularly those who teach in our most challenging schools.
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SYLLABUS

Required Text

Goals/Course Description
This course will survey basic psychological principles, techniques, and research in the behavioral, developmental, and cognitive areas of education. The course is designed for graduates who have a minimal background in psychology. The goal of this course is to help students learn about fundamental themes in Educational Psychology. We will accomplish this goal by talking, reading, and writing about the research presented in your textbook and in the on-line materials. There will be an emphasis on core areas of Developmental, Behavioral, and Cognitive Psychology. We will also discuss individual differences, assessment, and standardized testing.

About Your Text
Your text is an important learning instrument. The majority of exam questions will be drawn from your text; as such, all material in your text is fair game for exams, unless otherwise specified. This includes information that we may not have covered in a lecture or information that was only briefly covered. So, it is important that you thoroughly read all assigned chapters.

About Lecture
It is not my objective to cover all of the material in the text during the on-line lectures. Rather, I will focus on major themes in each chapter. I will use these lectures to clarify theories presented in the text. Your questions and participation in our discussion section of the course are always welcome.
COURSE REQUIREMENTS AND GRADING

Grading will be based on Group Pushing the Envelope Reports, your individual discussion contribution, and 2 exams.

Pushing the Envelope Reports
Each week, all groups in the course will be responsible for answering questions that we have developed to extend the text/lecture or will post a question about educational psychology that is beyond the scope of the lecture or textbook (e.g., we can’t find the answer in either of those sources). In either case, each group will research their question and attempt to provide an answer. These reports are limited to a single-spaced page of text. Each week I will select the most compelling reports and will incorporate those into the course on-line discussion.

Online Discussion
Each week you will write a short paragraph adding to our discussion of the theory and research presented in class. I will provide more detail about specific topics as we progress through the course.

Exams
There will be two online exams. The exams will be multiple-choice. Each exam is worth 50 points each for a total of 100 points.

Grading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pushing the Envelope Reports (7 @ 10pts each)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online discussion (30 pts)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exams (2 @ 50 pts each)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grades
Grades will be based on the following cutoffs:
90 - 100% = A range
80 - 89% = B range
70 - 79% = C range
60 - 69% = D range
less than 60% = E
POLICIES AND EXPECTATIONS

Academic Dishonesty:
Cheating or plagiarism in any academic setting is unacceptable. According to the University’s Academic Honesty Guidelines (http://www.dso.ufl.edu/STG/stgfront.html): Plagiarism is defined as: “The attempt to represent the work of another as the product of one's own thought, whether the work is published or unpublished, or simply the work of a fellow student.” Cheating is defined as: “The improper taking or tendering of any information or material which shall be used to determine academic credit.” Please see the website for procedures that will be followed if cheating or plagiarism is suspected. Upon suspicion of academic dishonesty, you will need to meet with me and the Chair of the Educational Psychology Department to discuss the consequences of your actions. This isn’t a fun meeting for either party, so please don’t put yourself in that position.

Accommodating Students with Disabilities:
Students requesting classroom accommodation must first register with the Dean of Students Office. The Dean of Students Office will provide documentation to the student who must then provide this documentation to the Instructor when requesting accommodation.

Course Incompletes:
A grade of Incomplete “I” will only be given in extreme circumstances (e.g., illness) and must be pre-approved by the instructor. If approved, a contract will be drawn up with the student specifying assignments and due dates. According to the University, all incomplete work must be completed by the following semester or you will receive a punitive incomplete (e.g., the same as an “E”).
# Tentative Course Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Welcome to Class: Ed Psych: General</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 1</td>
<td>Introductions, syllabus, &amp; introduction to Educational Psychology</td>
<td>Syllabus &amp; Ch 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Historical perspectives/ perspectives on teaching/ Research used in Ed Psych.</td>
<td>Lecture Ch 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Psychological Approaches to Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2</td>
<td>Developmental</td>
<td>Ch 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ch 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 3</td>
<td>Behavioral</td>
<td>Ch 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 4</td>
<td>General Cognitive Themes</td>
<td>Ch 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Exam I</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Practical Issues in Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 5</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Ch 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 6</td>
<td>Individual differences (Intelligence/Exceptional)</td>
<td>Ch 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ch 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 7</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Ch 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 8</td>
<td>Standardized Testing</td>
<td>Ch 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Exam II/ Lesson Plan is Due</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This is a tentative schedule. Lectures, exam dates, and assigned readings are subject to change.
Course Description: This course addresses Competency 2: Foundations of Research-Based Practices. The major emphasis of the course is placed on current theories, methods, and materials used in reading/literacy instruction. Lecture, discussion, videos, simulated teaching, and fieldwork compose different course activities.


Course Objectives:

Competency 2: Foundations of Research-Based Practices

Understands the principles of scientifically based reading research as the foundation of comprehensive instruction that synchronizes and scaffolds each of the major components of the reading process toward student mastery.

Specific Indicator A: Phonemic Awareness

- Identify explicit, systematic instructional plans for scaffolding development of phonemic analysis of the sounds of words (e.g., phonemic blending, segmentation, etc.)

Specific Indicator B: Phonics

- Identify explicit, systematic instructional plans for scaffolding development from emergent through advanced phonics with words from both informal and academic language (e.g., orthographic skills, phonetic and structural analysis: rules, patterns, and generalizations)

Specific Indicator C: Fluency

- Identify explicit, systematic instructional plans for scaffolding fluency development and reading endurance (e.g., rereading, self-timing, independent reading material, reader’s theater, etc.)

Specific Indicator D: Vocabulary

- Identify explicit, systematic instructional plans for scaffolding vocabulary and
concept development (e.g., common morphological roots, morphemic analysis, system of word relationships, semantic mapping, semantic analysis, analogies, etc.)

Specific Indicator E: Comprehension
- Identify explicit, systematic instructional plans for scaffolding development of comprehension skills and cognition (e.g., key questioning strategies such as reciprocal teaching, analysis of relevance of details, prediction; “think-aloud” strategies, sentence manipulation, paraphrasing, etc.)

Specific Indicator F: Integration of the major reading components
- Identify comprehensive instructional plans that synchronize the major reading components (e.g., a lesson plan: structural analysis, morphemic analysis, reciprocal teaching, rereading, etc.)
- Identify explicit, systematic instructional plan for scaffolding content area vocabulary development and reading skills (e.g., morphemic analysis, semantic analysis, reciprocal teaching, writing to learn, etc.)
- Identify resources and research-based practices that create both language-rich and print-rich environments (e.g., large and diverse classroom libraries; questioning the author; interactive response to authentic reading and writing tasks, etc.)
- Identify research-based guidelines and selection tools for choosing literature and expository text appropriate to students’ interests and independent reading proficiency.

Accomplished Practices

Assessment (1) The pre-professional teacher collects and uses data gathered from a variety of sources. These sources include both traditional and alternate assessment strategies. Furthermore, the teacher can identify and match the students’ instructional plans with their cognitive, social, linguistic, cultural, emotional, and physical needs.
1.1 Demonstrates knowledge of traditional and alternative assessment strategies appropriate to all students.
1.2 Employs and alters a variety of assessment strategies congruent with instructional goals to determine PK-12 students’ learning.
1.3 Interprets data from various alternative and traditional assessments, including FCAT results.
1.4 Modifies instruction based on assessed student performance in relation to student’s diverse needs.

Diversity (5) The pre-professional teacher establishes a comfortable environment, which accepts and fosters diversity. The teacher must demonstrate knowledge and awareness of varied cultures and linguistic backgrounds. The teacher creates a climate of openness, inquiry, and support by practicing strategies such as acceptance, tolerance, resolution, and mediation.
5.1 Knows how race, ethnicity, gender, socio-economic status, language, and special need variables affect all PK-12 student learning
5.2 Demonstrates a repertoire of teaching techniques and strategies, including materials selection to effectively instruct all PK-12 students.

Dake-Patrick Syllabus
5.3 Shows sensitivity, acceptance and value of all PK-12 students from diverse backgrounds (race, ethnicity, gender, socio-economic status, language, and special need).

Planning (10) Recognizing the importance of setting high expectations for all students, the pre-professional teacher works with other professions to design learning experiences that meet students' needs and interests. The teacher candidate continually seeks advice/information from appropriate resources (including feedback), interprets the information, and modifies her/his plans appropriately. Planned instruction incorporates a creative environment and utilizes varied and motivational strategies and multiple resources for providing comprehensible instruction for all students. Upon reflection, the teacher continuously refines outcome assessment and learning experiences.

10.1 Knows the principles for developing effective lesson plans that meet PK-12 students' diverse needs.
10.3 Includes multiple resources and strategies in planning comprehensible instruction that meet PK-12 students' diverse needs.

Course Requirements:

Readings: You are required to read all assigned readings thoroughly. Come to class prepared to discuss the readings and participate fully in class activities. Each week you should come to class prepared with at least 2 questions, thoughts or comments from the set of readings for that week. Your participation constitutes an important part of your learning in this class. (10%)

Simulated Teaching & Demo: You will plan and teach one reading mini-lesson in class using a strategy from the CORE book approved by the instructor. This lesson will be coordinated with a lesson you will teach in your own classroom. You will demonstrate the lesson in class and in your classroom and write a summative reflection paper on your experience in completing the project. (20%)

Game: With a partner, you will develop a game that can be used in the classroom to enhance students' development of a particular reading skill. (15%)

Literacy Program Observation & Report: Conduct at least 3 first-hand observations and write a critique of reading/literacy instruction in an elementary classroom using the information you have gleaned from course readings and class discussions. (15%)
Children's Book Review: Prior to that class you will need to read 7 children's books. You are free to choose any children's books that you would like to read....single sitting read-alouds, fiction, nonfiction .... you may choose a theme or a genre.... We will share the books you read and your ideas for use in the classroom. (20%)

- Title and Author
- Synopsis of book—one paragraph
- Ideas for use in the classroom:
  - grade level
  - content areas
  - Describe 3 activities using this book that create an approach to learning that is interdisciplinary and that integrates multiple subject areas. For example, how could you use a Fairy Tale to connect to art, math, social studies, science, etc.

Final Exam: There will be a final exam to measure your understanding of the six indicators of Competency 2: Foundations of Research-Based Practices. (20%)

Grading Scale: [Insert grading scale]

Course Outline:

Week 1: Reading and Learning to Read:
- This lesson helps participants improve their understanding of how learning to read is a continuous process. Florida's goal is to ensure that all educators be informed about the ongoing nature of reading instruction. This lesson is designed to provide participants with a review of key research and theory on effective beginning reading instruction and the factors that influence students' reading development. This section meets Foundations of Research-Based Practices Indicator F: Integration of the major reading components
- Readings: Fang, pp. 3-10
- CORE: Chapters 1 and 2

Week 2: Exemplary Reading Instruction
- Review of the research into exemplary reading instruction and helping participants translate research-based principles into sound classroom practice is the objective of lesson 3. Educators will learn more about key state and national reading initiatives and how they impact their professional lives. This section continues to meet Indicator F for Competency 2.
- Readings: Fang Section X, Articles I & III

Week 3: Promoting Emergent Literacy & Language and Print-Rich Environments
- This lesson is designed to help educators develop print-rich environments that are...
likely to encourage and motivate students to read and to love reading. The course provides reading participants with opportunities to explore descriptions, look at examples, visit websites, and see resources that are blueprints to making literacy rich classrooms. This section is another part of meeting Indicator F for Competency 2.

- Readings: CORE: Chapters 3 & 5

Week 4: Phonological and Phonemic Awareness
- These lessons are designed to expose educators to research-based strategies that engage students in phonological and phonemic awareness and help them develop the skills necessary to effectively decode text. This section will give participants the necessary knowledge for identifying explicit instructional techniques and ways to scaffold student learning. This meets Indicators A & B of Competency 2.
- Readings: Fang Section III- Article I pp. 69-79
- CORE: Chapter 7

Week 5: Developing Fluency
- In this lesson, educators will learn how fluency affects comprehension and investigate various strategies for assessing and encouraging fluency development. This lesson meets Indicator C: Fluency.
- Readings: Fang pages 101-111.
- CORE: Ch. 11

Week 6: Phonics and Advanced Word Study
- In this lesson, educators will learn how phonics and word study affects the process of learning to read and will investigate various strategies for implementing effective techniques for teaching. This lesson meets Indicator B of Competency 2.
- Readings: CORE Chapters 8-10

Week 7: Strengthening Vocabulary Development
- In these lessons, educators will find information about teaching vocabulary, teaching students how to learn new words, and how to assess students’ vocabulary development. The goal of vocabulary instruction is for students to learn how to learn new words. This lesson meets Indicator D: Vocabulary.
- Readings: Fang pages 112-120
- CORE: Chapters 14-15

Week 8 & 9: Scaffolding Students' Comprehension and Guiding Students Toward Independence in Reading
- In this lesson, educators will understand how comprehension is the ultimate goal
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of reading and review explicit instructional techniques for developing and supporting ongoing improvement in students’ comprehension of various text types. This meets Indicator F: Comprehension.

- Readings: Fang pages 121-130
- CORE: Chapters 16-18

Week 10: Bringing Students and Text Together
- This lesson is designed to offer an array of activities to identify student interests in order to inspire student motivation, and identify key factors that will enhance student-text interactions by providing resources and strategies that will increase student achievement. Meeting students' interests is a foundational practice under Indicator F of Competency 2.

Week 11: Instruction for Struggling Readers and Non-native Speakers of English
- The ideas and activities presented in this lesson are designed to familiarize educators with strategies that support literacy learning for struggling readers and non-native speakers of English. Educators will become familiar with how to address the particular strengths, weaknesses, and challenges brought by struggling readers and ESOL students to the classroom. Both general and specific guidelines will be proposed for teaching students of diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds.
- Readings: Fang Section VI- Articles I & II; Section VII- Article II
- CORE: Chapter 4

Week 12: Assessment
- Assessment informs the teacher about what to plan for instruction. Assessing students' reading development and using data to plan for instruction is a complex, involved, and ongoing process. Effective teachers base their instruction on students' needs. This meets Indicator F of Competency 2.
- Readings: Fang Section IX, Articles I & II
- CORE: Chapter 21

Week 13: Independent Study.

Week 14: [Blank]
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Important Course Information

Preparation of Assignments: Substance is the primary criterion for evaluating all written work in this course. That is, what you say is the most important factor. However, how you say it and the style of your written work are also important considerations in evaluating course assignments. In other words, things such as grammar, punctuation, spelling, neatness, coherence, and adherence to assignment guidelines will affect your grade. As a prospective reading/literacy teacher, you are expected to demonstrate high levels of literacy in your own work. If written composition is a difficult area for you, please meet with me individually for assistance. All written work must be typed and double-spaced in 12-point font, unless otherwise noted.

Professionalism: In this course, you are expected to conduct yourself in a professional manner. Behaviors unbecoming prospective teachers will not be tolerated. Please note the following expectations:

- Actively listen when others are speaking or presenting;
- Be prepared for class and on time;
- Communication is crucial. If you will miss class, be late, or need to leave early, it is courteous and professional to communicate these needs with me ahead of time;
- Please turn off cell phones and keep them in your bag during class;
- You are responsible for obtaining any missed work or information;
- You must be actively engaged in class discussions, presentations, lectures, and activities;
- Use group work time effectively and efficiently;
- Student grades are confidential; please respect others' right to privacy.

As a prospective teacher, your first responsibility is to your students and their learning. To meet this responsibility adequately requires planning ahead, extensive time commitment, and personal accountability. Therefore, the following policies will apply:

Attendance: Absence diminishes the quality of this class for you and for others and disrespects the teaching and learning; therefore, full attendance and punctuality are required. Unexcused absences, tardiness, and early departure will affect your final grade. Points will be deducted as follows: 3 points per absence; 1 point per tardy. Excused absence requires prior approval from the instructor and documentation such as a doctor's note, etc. In case of an emergency, written documentation must be furnished at the time you return to class. You must sign the attendance sheet each day at the beginning of the class; otherwise you will be counted absent. If you arrive late, it is your responsibility to make sure your name gets on the attendance list. You are entering into a profession that has zero tolerance for teacher tardiness and little tolerance for multiple absences.

Late Work: In order to be fair to all students, any work that is turned in late will lose 5 of the full points automatically. Any work that is not completed at the beginning of the class in which it is due, is being completed during that class, or is turned in handwritten
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(unless it is an in-class task) will be considered late. Be sure to make an extra copy of each assignment for yourself before turning it in so as to guard against its possible loss.

The Honor Code: We, the members of the University of Florida community, pledge to hold ourselves and our peers to the highest standards of honesty and integrity.

The following pledge is either required or implied on all work submitted for credits by students at the university, upon registration in any UF course: “I understand that the University of Florida expects its students to be honest in all their academic work. I agree to adhere to this commitment to academic honesty and understand that my failure to comply with this commitment may result in disciplinary action up to and including expulsion from the University. On my honor, I have neither given nor received unauthorized aid in doing this assignment.” Further information is located in the Student Guide at www.dso.ufl.edu/stg/ and is set forth in the Florida Administrative Code. Cheating, plagiarism or knowingly furnishing false information are examples of dishonesty and will result in failing this course.

Policy on Instructional Modifications: Students with disabilities, who need reasonable modifications to complete assignments successfully and otherwise satisfy course criteria, are encouraged to meet with the instructor as early in the course as possible to identify and plan specific accommodations. Students WILL be asked to supply a letter from the Office for Students with Disabilities to assist in planning accommodations.

*The instructor may adjust assignments and due dates as class progresses to meet the individual needs of each class.
## Schedule of Topics

The following schedule is offered as a guide. Changes may occur as the course progresses and adjustments need to be made regarding topics and/or readings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Session</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Session 1</td>
<td>Course Syllabus and Requirements</td>
<td>CORE: Chapters 1 and 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 27</td>
<td>Reading and Learning to Read</td>
<td>Fang: pp. 3-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 2</td>
<td>HOLIDAY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 3</td>
<td>Exemplary Reading Instruction</td>
<td>Fang: Section X, Articles I &amp; III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 4</td>
<td>Fostering Emergent Lit &amp; Language</td>
<td>CORE: Chapters 3 &amp; 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 17</td>
<td>Print-Rich Environments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 5</td>
<td>Phonological and Phonemic Awareness</td>
<td>CORE: Chapter 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 24</td>
<td><strong>Demonstrations</strong></td>
<td>Fang: Section III- Article I pp. 69-79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 6</td>
<td>Developing Fluency</td>
<td>CORE: Chapter 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1</td>
<td><strong>Demonstrations</strong></td>
<td>Fang: pp. 101-111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 7</td>
<td>Phonics and Advanced Word Study</td>
<td>CORE: Chapters 8-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 8</td>
<td><strong>Demonstrations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 8</td>
<td>Scaffolding Students’ Comprehension</td>
<td>CORE: Chapters 6-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 15</td>
<td><strong>Demonstrations</strong></td>
<td>Fang: pp. 121-130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 9</td>
<td>Comprehension Continued</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 22</td>
<td><strong>Demonstrations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 29</td>
<td><strong>Demonstrations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 11</td>
<td>Instruction for Struggling Readers and Non-Native Speakers of English</td>
<td>CORE: Chapter 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 5</td>
<td><strong>Demonstrations</strong></td>
<td>Fang: Section VI, Articles I &amp; II; Section VII, Art. II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 12</td>
<td>HOLIDAY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 13</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>CORE: Chapter 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 14</td>
<td>Independent Study</td>
<td>Work on group projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 26</td>
<td></td>
<td>Study for Final Exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 15</td>
<td>Final Exam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 3</td>
<td><strong>Group Presentations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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T. Course Goals
This course provides apprentice teachers the opportunity to understand the components of powerful teaching and professional development at both the theoretical and practical levels. The goal is to help apprentice teachers interested in becoming educators acquire the knowledge, skills, and abilities needed to become successful classroom teachers. Through an in-depth reading and analysis of the literature as well as engaging in a supervised field experience, we will deepen our understanding of the following strands:

Strand #1 - Diversity
This strand focuses on the pre-professional teacher establishing a comfortable environment which accepts and fosters diversity. The teacher must demonstrate knowledge and awareness of varied cultures. The teacher creates a climate of openness, inquiry, and support by practicing strategies such as acceptance, tolerance, resolution, and mediation.

Strand #2 - Pedagogy
This strand focuses on the theories, science and ideas behind current educational practices. This strand should answer the question, “How did education get to where it is today?”

Strand #3 - Classroom Management
This strand develops an understanding of how to effectively establish and maintain a safe, orderly, and productive learning environment in the classroom. This strand will consist of practices and procedures that teachers use to obtain this goal.

Strand #4 - Planning
This strand develops an understanding of the importance of setting high expectations for all students and designing a learning experience that meets student’s needs and interests. This strand will emphasize continually seeking advice/information from appropriate resources including feedback. Planned instruction will incorporate a creative environment and utilize varied and motivational strategies and multiple resources for providing comprehensible instruction for all students.

Strand #5 - Continuous Improvement
This strand develops a realization that as an apprentice teacher is in the initial stages of a life-long learning process, self-reflection and the advice of experienced teachers
are the key components in continuous improvement. The focus will be on meeting the
goals of a personal professional development plan.

Strand #6 - Assessment
This strand develops the understanding of how to collect and use data gathered from
a variety of sources. These sources will include both traditional and alternative
strategies. The teacher will develop an understanding of how to identify, and match
the student's instructional plan with their cognitive, social, linguistic, cultural,
emotional, and physical needs.

II. Readings

Required Readings:
Wong, H. & Wong, R. (1998). How to be an Effective Teacher in the First Days of
Supervision and Curriculum Development.
Process, Inc.

Recommended Readings:
Elementary Teachers. Pearson Education.

Principals to Lead Schools That are Successful With Racially Diverse
Independence through Student-owned Strategies: second edition. Dubuque:
Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.

III. Course Assignments

1. Weekly Two-Way Notebook

Each week, beginning with the second week of the course, every learner will hand in or email
a journal that: 1) records information collected in your classroom 2) reflects on your
teaching 3) shows engagement entries between student and mentor 4) records your
teaching experience and, 5) records critical incidents, informal observation notes, shared
feelings, and self-assessments. The weekly journal entries should be divided between the
five areas. This can also be a place where you can practice and enhance your creative
writing skills. Remember, our expectations for ourselves should be the same as for our students. Every week the instructor will collect all of the class journals for review.

2. Class Participation
   It is our belief that we learn best when we function as a community of mutually respectful learners and inquirers. We expect that each of us will contribute to our own learning as well as to that of others within our learning community. In keeping with these beliefs, we will attempt to provide multiple opportunities for large group and small group interaction throughout the course. Therefore, both your attendance as well as your willingness to become engaged with others are important tools for enhancing everyone’s learning. We realize that not everyone has the same level of comfort in verbally participating in class and, therefore, judge quality and appropriateness of participation as well as quantity. Because much of the important learning in this class results from dialogue with our community of learners and that experience can’t be made up, more than 2 absences will result in remediation by the UF supervisor.

3. Observations
   Apprentices will be observed four times each semester by the University Coach. Initially, those observations may involve working with individual students or small groups of students. At least two of the observations will be of the apprentice teaching a lesson to an entire class. Apprentices will also be observed two times each semester by the mentor teacher.

4. Portfolio
   The University of Florida’s College of Education Apprenticeship promotes the development of educators who demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions (K, S, & D) necessary to promote the learning of all students within diverse settings. These K, S, and D’s are outlined in the 12 Florida Accomplished Practices. The Pre-professional Portfolio is the primary forum for documenting progress towards attaining these accomplished practices and is the type of authentic assessment that will allow the apprentices to illustrate their job-embedded learning with multiple forms of evidence and connected reflections. This electronic portfolio will allow the emerging practitioner to make meaning of his/her teaching experiences, evaluate what he/she has learned, and apply new professional K, S, & D to engage in ongoing improvement of their educational practices. The portfolio will be a work-in-progress chronicling the development of the pre-professional across the apprenticeship experience. Multiple pieces of evidence (such as lesson plans, videos, student work, communication with parents, brochures from workshops, etc.) representative of different experiences must be included in the different areas of competency within the portfolio. Each piece of evidence must be accompanied by a reflection in the form of a rationale statement that explains why the evidence was chosen to be included in the portfolio and how it serves as evidence of one of the areas of competency. The Professional Portfolio is divided into 13 sections representing each of the 12 Accomplished Practices and Competency 2 of the Reading Endorsement.
Important Notes

Assignments
Please do your assignments carefully and on time. If you are having difficulty meeting assignment time lines, please contact the instructor prior to the due date.

Instructional Modifications
Students with disabilities, who need reasonable modifications to complete tasks successfully and otherwise satisfy course criteria, are encouraged to meet with the instructor as early in the course as possible and to identify and plan specific accommodations. Student will be asked to supply a letter from the Office for Students with Disabilities to assist in planning modifications.

Student Conduct Code
The University of Florida has a student conduct code that states that all work that you submit is your own work. In collaborative tasks you must participate equally with other members of the group. By signing up for this course and reading this syllabus you agree to the University of Florida Student Code. You promise not to cheat or plagiarize and to inform the instructor if you become aware of dishonest behavior on the part of other students in the class. Failure to comply with the academic honesty guidelines 6C1-4.017, F.A.C. is a violation of the University of Florida Student Conduct Code and may result in expulsion or any lesser sanction. In this class be especially careful that you do not plagiarize by copying work from the Internet without properly crediting the author.

The syllabus is subject to change throughout the year.

Thursday, August 23rd - First day of class
- Introductions, ice breakers
- Read cloud and journal writing
- Chalk talk for positives, questions and challenges of first couple of weeks
- What went into preparing a classroom for students?
- Review of syllabus, checklist and handbook
- Discuss "The Coaching Cycle"- what it will look like and what our individual roles will be.

Homework (all due 8/30): begin two-way notebook, bring a copy of your mentor teacher's classroom management plan-AP 5,9,11, read Culturally Responsive Classroom Management and More article and complete 4 A's, introductory parent letter, CCL article, get data from your school to start the coaching cycle.

Thursday, August 30th - Classroom Management
- Share excerpts from two-way journals/ + and deltas of week
- Protocol to share out about classroom management article
- Share classroom management plans and work cooperatively to add to the current management plans they are using.
- Watch 1st Wong video
- Go over a class profile assignment
- Go over CCL article

Homework (due 9/6): two-way notebook, create your own classroom management plan, classroom management reading, (due 9/13) begin class profile AP- 5,7,10, 12,

Thursday, September 6th - Classroom Management/Planning
- Share excerpts from two-way journals
- Read Aloud
- Whip about last week's reading
- Small group share about your personal classroom management plans
- Work on the different aspects of planning a lesson, Bloom’s Taxonomy, go over Pathwise lesson plans and how to use them (prepare for your first lesson)
- Look at school data and create a pre-test

Homework (due 9/13): two-way notebook, class profile, rough draft of first lesson plan, read out of Wong book, pre-test results

Thursday, September 13th - Classroom Management/Planning/Educational Jargon
- Share class profiles and go over student interest inventory assignment
- Education Acronyms
- Modeling using "fish bowl" how to revise a lesson and small group work on revising 1st lesson plans
- Sign up for 1st observation date
- Discuss Wong reading and watch part of the video
- Go over pre-test and plan a lesson

Homework (due 9/20): two-way notebook, (due 9/27) student interest inventory, read from Wong book, finalize and email 1st lesson plan, bring a copy of your grade level S.S. Standards

Thursday, September 20th - Sunshine State Standards/ Classroom Management
- Guest speaker- Behavior Resources Teacher (classroom management)
- Guest speaker- Standards Coach
- Discuss and look at grade level standards
- Discuss emergency sub plans assignment
- Observe a model lesson
- Debrief- How to change and adapt the lesson to fit our classroom
Homework (due 9/27): two-way notebook, student interest inventory, (due 10/4)
emergency sub plans, Special Voices reading, finish Wong book, implement coaching
cycle lesson into your classroom and bring student evidence for the following class

Thursday, September 27th - ESE Overview - Meet at Rufus E. Payne 9:30

  - Share student interest inventories
  - ABC's of ESE
  - Discussion on what inclusion is and what it looks like in your classroom
  - Discuss "Differentiated Instruction" and what this means for you and your
students
  - Guest Speaker - Inclusion Coach
  - Discuss RIA day the following week
  - Share evidence from coaching cycle lesson and discuss where we go from
there

Homework (due 10/4): two-way notebooks, emergency sub plans, read articles
on inclusion, read from D. I. book

Thursday, October 4th - Research in Action Day (MLK)

  - Set ground rules and specific best practices to observe (focus also around
inclusion models and student accommodations)
  - Morning classroom observations
  - Debriefing lunch with classroom teachers
• Afternoon classroom observations
• Whole group debriefing
• Turn in emergency sub plans
• Sign up for 2nd observation

Homework (due 10/11): two-way notebooks, read from Ruby Payne text and complete 4 A's, research 1 professional organization

Thursday, October 11th - Professional Organizations/Teaching in an Urban Setting/ Portfolio Day

• Share out about the professional organizations researched
• Debrief Ruby Payne reading using the 4A’s
• Portfolio Introduction at the Schultz Center 1:00-3:00

Homework (due 10/18): two-way notebook, read from Ruby Payne text, read from D.I. book

Thursday, October 18th - Differentiated Instruction

• Guest Speaker Differentiated Instruction- Katie
• Sign up for RIA day
• Plan the next lesson for coaching cycle

Homework (due 10/25): two-way notebook, read from Ruby Payne text, read D.I. book
Thursday, October 25th - RIA Day Rufus E. Payne

- Set ground rules for observations
- Morning observations
- Debriefing lunch
- Afternoon observations
- Debrief
- Sign up for 3rd & 4th observations

Homework (due 11/1): two-way notebook, finish Ruby Payne text, read from D.I. text, implement lesson in your classroom (coaching cycle), bring student data to class

Thursday, November 1st - Differentiated Instruction/Social Studies

- Differentiated Instruction and how to use it with a Social Studies curriculum (Katie & Diane)
- Review student data (coaching cycle)

Homework (due 11/8): two-way notebook, read from D.I. text, read S.S. articles

Thursday, November 8th - Differentiated Instruction/Social Studies

- Guest speakers (TBA)
- Sign up for 3rd RIA day

Homework (due 11/15): two-way notebook, finish D.I. text, read S.S. articles
Thursday, November 15th - RIA day (Long Branch)
  • Set ground rules and best practices to observe
  • Morning classroom observations
  • Debriefing lunch with classroom teachers
  • TBA

Homework: Take a break for Thanksgiving!

Thursday, November 22nd - No Class Thanksgiving Day

Thursday, November 29th - Last Class (TBA)
APPENDIX B
SCREEN SHOTS
The University of Florida (UF) Mentors and Online Support for Teachers program (MOST) was created as a means of providing online support and mentoring to alternatively certified teachers who graduated from the Duval County Transition to Teaching Elementary Education Apprenticeship Program (TTT) program in 2007 and currently teach in Jacksonville, Florida. We believe these teachers can and will make a difference in the lives of Duval County students.
Teaching Elementary Education Apprenticeship Program (TTT) program in 2007 and currently teach in Jacksonville, Florida. We believe these teachers can and will make a difference to the children in Duval County.

Communication Options

- Announcements
- Katie and Lisa's Thoughts and Wonderings
- The Teachers' Lounge
- The Suggestion Box
- Got one, Give one IDEAS!!!
- Great Teacher Books to Read!
- Words of Wisdom and Inspiration
- Just-In-Time Mentoring

MOST Learning Community Resources

- Calendar
- MOST Member Directory
- Doing What Works - DOE site to help use research in the classroom
- Teachers' links to cool stuff like Rubistar
- NSRF Protocols
- Lesson Plans

1 Articles

- Article Choice 1 for January Writing
Easy As Pie Menu

4 Video and Audio Library

   Reading
     Writing and Reading
     Math
   Science
     Social Studies
     Listening and Speaking
   Classroom Management
   Infusing Technology with Other Subjects
     NCLE—The Good, The Bad, The Ugly
     Students with Disabilities
     The Education Podcast Network

5 Subject Area Resources

Do you have a website, strategy, book, or some other resource that would be a great addition to one of these subject areas? Send your recommendation to Lisa at langley@ufl.edu

   Reading
     Language Arts
     Math
   Science
     Social Studies
     Art and Others
6 Subject Area Lesson Plans and Articles

Have a great lesson plan that you want to share? Pick the subject area and then post as you would a regular forum. Be sure to include the grade level when you post.

- Reading
  - Language Arts
  - Math
  - Science
  - Social Studies
  - Art and Others

7 Special Education

- Students with Disabilities
- Gifted and Talented Students
- English Language Learners
- Inclusion

8 Management Help

- Behavior Management
  - Classroom Management
  - Classroom Management Overview
  - Behavior Bingo
  - Time Management

9 Instructional Methods and Teaching Strategies
Session 9 April 1st - May 4th
The Home Stretch

One of the goals of the MOST online component was to expose you to a variety of teaching strategies and techniques in a variety of subjects. Since we are winding things down with MOST (as well as running out of time!), this session you get to choose the subject you would like to learn more about in helping you to teach your students more effectively.

We’ll also be sending out a survey in the next week for you to complete. Once we have finalized the questions, we’ll send directions and a link to you all.

Session 9 Task 1: Your Choice
Session 9 Task 2: Interviews and Surveys
Chalk Talk

Originally developed by Hilton Smith, Foxfire Fund; adapted for the NSRF by Marylyn Wentworth.

Chalk Talk is a silent way to do reflection, generate ideas, check on learning, develop projects or solve problems. It can be used productively with any group—students, faculty, workshop participants, committees. Because it is done completely in silence, it gives groups a change of pace and encourages thoughtful contemplation. It can be an unforgettable experience. Middle Level students absolutely love it—it’s the quietest they’ll ever be!

Format
Time: Varies according to need; can be from 5 minutes to an hour.
Materials: Chalk board and chalk or paper roll on the wall and markers.

Process
1. The facilitator explains VERY BRIEFLY that chalk talk is a silent activity. No one may talk at all and anyone may add to the chalk talk as they please. You can comment on other people’s ideas simply by drawing a connecting line to the comment. It can also be very effective to say nothing at all except to put finger to lips in a gesture of silence and simply begin with #2.

2. The facilitator writes a relevant question in a circle on the board.
   Sample questions:
   • What did you learn today?
   • So What? or Now What?
   • What do you think about social responsibility and schooling?
   • How can we involve the community in the school, and the school in community?
   • How can we keep the noise level down in this room?
   • What do you want to tell the scheduling committee?
   • What do you know about Croatia?
   • How are decimals used in the world?

3. The facilitator either hands a piece of chalk to everyone, or places many pieces of chalk at the board and hands several pieces to people at random.

4. People write as they feel moved. There are likely to be long silences—that is natural, so allow plenty of wait time before deciding it is over.

5. How the facilitator chooses to interact with the Chalk Talk influences its outcome. The facilitator can stand back and let it unfold or expand thinking by:
   • circling other interesting ideas, thereby inviting comments to broaden
   • writing questions about a participant comment

Protocols are most powerful and effective when used within an ongoing professional learning community such as a Critical Friends Group® and facilitated by a skilled coach. To learn more about professional learning communities and seminars for new or experienced coaches, please visit the National School Reform Faculty website at www.nsfharmony.org
• adding his/her own reflections or ideas
• connecting two interesting ideas/comments together with a line and adding a question mark.

Actively interacting invites participants to do the same kinds of expansions. A Chalk Talk can be an uncomplicated silent reflection or a spirited, but silent, exchange of ideas. It has been known to solve vexing problems, surprise everyone with how much is collectively known about something, get an entire project planned, or give a committee everything it needs to know without any verbal sparring.

6. When it’s done, it’s done.
North, South, East and West: Compass Points
An Exercise in Understanding Preferences in Group Work

Developed in the field by educators affiliated with NSRF

Similar to the Myers-Briggs Personality Inventory, this exercise uses a set of preferences which relate not to individual but to group behaviors, helping us to understand how preferences affect our group work.

1. The room is set up with four signs on each wall — North, South, East and West.

2. Participants are invited to go to the ‘direction’ of their choice. No one is only one “direction,” but everyone can choose one as their pre-dominant one.

3. Each “direction” answers the five questions on a sheet of newsprint. When complete, they report back to the whole group.

4. Processing can include:
   - Note the distribution among the “directions”; what might it mean?
   - What is the best combination for a group to have? Does it matter?
   - How can you avoid being driven crazy by another “direction”?
   - How might you use this exercise with others? Students?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acting — “Let’s do it;” Likes to act, try things, plunge in.</td>
<td>Paying attention to detail — likes to know the who, what, when, where and why before acting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North</th>
<th>East</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speculating — likes to look at the big picture and the possibilities before acting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>South</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caring – likes to know that everyone’s feelings have been taken into consideration and that their voices have been heard before acting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Protocol are most powerful and effective when used within an ongoing professional learning community such as a Critical Friends Group® and facilitated by a skilled coach. To learn more about professional learning communities and seminars for new or experienced coaches, please visit the National School Reform Faculty website at www.nsfharmony.org.
North, South, East and West

Decide which of the four “directions” most closely describes your personal style. Then spend 15 minutes answering the following questions as a group.

1. What are the strengths of your style? (4 adjectives)

2. What are the limitations of your style? (4 adjectives)

3. What style do you find most difficult to work with and why?

4. What do people from the other “directions” or styles need to know about you so you can work together effectively?

5. What do you value about the other three styles?

Protocols are most powerful and effective when used within an ongoing professional learning community such as a Critical Friends Group® and facilitated by a skilled coach. To learn more about professional learning communities and seminars for new or experienced coaches, please visit the National School Reform Faculty website at www.northamory.org.
Thank you again for agreeing to be interviewed today ___________. I just wanted to ask you a few questions about your background and training as well as information on the UF induction program and mentoring that you have received this year as a beginning teacher. I’ll be recording our conversation as well as taking abbreviated notes while we speak. Please feel free to not respond to any of the questions as well as to ask for any clarification.

******

**Background Information**

What is your previous career background?

What did you receive your bachelor’s degree in?

Where did you receive your degree?

Why did you go into teaching?

How did you find out about the apprentice program?

What class did you find to be the most meaningful in terms of your preparation last year?

Least helpful?

**Current Teaching Information**

What grade are you teaching in this school year?

How many students are currently in your classroom?

Was this your first choice of grade level to teach?

What do you like about this grade level? Dislike?

If not, what grade level would you like to be teaching? Why?

Thinking back to the beginning of the year—what was your biggest concern about this school year?

Is ____________ still a concern for you?

What are your strengths as a new teacher?

What do you feel are your weaknesses?
What has been your biggest surprise as a new teacher?

What is one word you would use to describe your current teaching situation right now?

What was your proudest moment this year?

Does reflection play a role in your life as a beginning teacher? If so, how? Probe about time to reflect, impact, beginning year vs. now, etc)

Do you feel there is an atmosphere of trust and mutual respect in your school?

Mentor and Support Received First Year

Who is your current on-site mentor?

What is his/her teaching assignment? Is he/she at your school?

How much time did she/he spend with you during preplanning in helping you prepare for your 1st year?

Did she/he provide you with any materials/resources to start your 1st year?

How often do you communicate with him/her?

How often has he/she observed your teaching?

Who do you turn to for teaching advice?

How often do you get to meet, plan, or collaborate with teachers in your grade level?

Have you had the opportunity to meet, plan and or teach with special education teachers?

How big of a role has the apprentice cohort played a role in providing you support this year?

How different would this 1st year been without the various supports you have received?

Did you ever experience feelings of isolation as a new teacher?

What helped to lessen these feelings?

Did you ever feel overwhelmed as a new teacher?

What helped to lessen these feelings?

Were having adequate supplies, materials, resources ever a problem for you this 1st year?
If you were a mentor to a beginning teacher next year, what advice would you give them?

MOST

What makes an effective mentoring program?

What makes an effective induction program?

What did you like about the MOST F2F meetings?

What could we have done to make the MOST F2F meetings better?

What was the most useful component of them?

Least useful component?

What do you wish we had done more of face to face?

Would you recommend MOST to other beginning teachers or would you tell them to take the Duval County program? Combination?

Do you feel that the distance between Duval and Gainesville affected how MOST worked (or didn’t work)?

MOST online

What could we have done to make the MOST online component better?

What was the most useful component of the online component?

Least useful component?

There are several resource clusters on the site, which was the most useful to you?

There are several communication choices on the site, one of which was just in time mentoring—did you use this? If not, why? Did you use email for this instead?

When announcements were sent out notifying you of helpful websites, did you investigate the site and/or use the site? Why or why not?

Did you take advantage of the subscription service, where updates were sent to your email address so you didn’t have to log on to MOST to be able to read those updates?

How much of what was on the site was something you already knew about as far as a resource/website?
What would you change about the site?

If you had technical difficulties, were they easily resolved?

Where did you mostly complete the MOST online assignments? Home, school or both equally?

Do you feel the monthly activities helped your teaching and were useful?
If not, why?

How would you have done things differently if you were designing/planning MOST?

How effective were the video clips in helping you see expert teachers think about their teaching?

Did you feel that having 3-4 weeks was long enough to respond?

Do you think there were too many assignments, too little? Just right?

What do you wish we had done more of online?

Was there any particular online component that made a difference for you as a beginning teacher?

The Future

Knowing now what you didn’t know then, what will you do differently next year as a 2nd year teaching?

Do you think you will remain in teaching?

In the field of education? In 5 years, 10 years?

What grade level/s would you like to teach next? Why?

Would you like to have a similar, but not as rigorous program next year to help provide you support? Maybe just have the communications options available on MOST for 2nd year teachers?

If you could tell the Duval County School Board one thing about being a beginning teacher in Duval County, what would you tell them?

Do you have any comments or questions that you would like to add or ask?
1. Introduction

The questions on this survey deal with your preparation, support, and abilities as a beginning teacher. We’ll be using the information gathered from the surveys to help refine and shape the MOST induction program for future participants so please be as reflective and honest as possible. Also, please be feel free to comment in the comment boxes.
### 2. Preparation

1. To what extent do you feel the training and instruction you received last year as an apprentice prepared you to do the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>Not prepared at all</th>
<th>Somewhat prepared</th>
<th>Well prepared</th>
<th>Highly prepared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teach students overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach in an urban school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach students with disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work and communicate with parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create effective lessons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapt curriculum to meet the needs of your students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess your students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handle a range of classroom management situations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Please include any comments you have about your preparation as an apprentice.
### 3. Support

1. To what extent are the following a source of support to you as a beginning teacher?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>No support</th>
<th>Minimal support</th>
<th>Average support</th>
<th>A great deal of support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your assigned mentor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your assistant principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your fellow apprentices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your fellow grade level teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other teachers at your school that are not on your grade level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duval County School Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOST online component</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOST face to face component</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane, Katie and Lisa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Please include any comments you have about support you have or have not received.
### 4. Teaching Environment

1. **How dissatisfied or satisfied are you with the following aspects of your current school/teaching situation?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Very dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat dissatisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Highly satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Availability of curriculum materials for your classroom and students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support systems such as speech, Target team, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Please include any comments you have about your working environment.**
### 5. Ability

#### 1. How would you rate your abilities in the following areas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ability</th>
<th>Minimal ability</th>
<th>Average ability</th>
<th>Above average ability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To manage your class at the beginning of the year</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To manage your class currently</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To analyze the needs of your students</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To recognize a student with a learning disability</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To differentiate instruction for your students</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To teach reading</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To teach math</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To teach writing</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To teach science</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To teach social studies</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2. Please include any comments you have about your abilities as a teacher and how they have changed over the course of the school year.
6. MOST Online Component

Please think only about the ONLINE COMPONENT when answering the questions on this page.

1. To what extent did you feel MOST online component helped you to do the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Help you to be reflective about your teaching?</th>
<th>No help at all</th>
<th>Minimal help</th>
<th>Average amount of help</th>
<th>Extremely helpful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Become more aware of your teaching style?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Become more aware of your communication style?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach students overall?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach reading?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach math?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach in an urban school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach students with disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work and communicate with parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create effective centers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess your students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handle a range of classroom management situations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Become a better teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn how to juggle all of the demands placed on a beginning teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Please include any comments you have about the MOST online component.
7. MOST Face-to-face Component

Please think only about the FACE-TO-FACE COMPONENT when answering the questions on this page.

1. To what extent did you feel MOST face-to-face component helped you to do the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No help at all</th>
<th>Minimal help</th>
<th>Average amount of help</th>
<th>Extremely helpful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helped you to be reflective about your teaching</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Become more aware of your teaching style</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Become more aware of your communication style</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach students overall</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach reading</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach math</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach in an urban school</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach students with disabilities</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work and communicate with parents</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create effective centers</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess your students</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handle a range of classroom management situations</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Become a better teacher</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn how to juggle all of the demands placed on a beginning teacher</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Please include here any comments you have about the MOST face-to-face component.
### Survey Responses

#### Page Preparation

5. To what extent do you feel the training and instruction you received last year as an apprentice prepared you to do the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not prepared at all</th>
<th>Somewhat prepared</th>
<th>Well prepared</th>
<th>Highly prepared</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teach students overall</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>12.5% (1)</td>
<td>37.5% (3)</td>
<td>50.0% (4)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach in an urban school</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>12.5% (1)</td>
<td>25.0% (2)</td>
<td>62.5% (5)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach students with disabilities</td>
<td>37.5% (3)</td>
<td>62.5% (5)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work and communicate with parents</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>50.0% (4)</td>
<td>37.5% (3)</td>
<td>12.5% (1)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create effective lessons</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>50.0% (4)</td>
<td>50.0% (4)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt curricula to meet the needs of your students</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>25.0% (2)</td>
<td>50.0% (4)</td>
<td>25.0% (2)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess your students</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>62.5% (5)</td>
<td>12.5% (1)</td>
<td>16.7% (1)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handle a range of classroom management situations</td>
<td>12.5% (1)</td>
<td>25.0% (2)</td>
<td>37.5% (3)</td>
<td>25.0% (2)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Page Support

5. To what extent are the following a source of support to you this year as a beginning teacher?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No support</th>
<th>Minimal support</th>
<th>Average support</th>
<th>A great deal of support</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your assigned mentor</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>37.5% (3)</td>
<td>25.0% (2)</td>
<td>37.5% (3)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your principal</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>25.0% (2)</td>
<td>50.0% (4)</td>
<td>25.0% (2)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your assistant principal</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>50.0% (4)</td>
<td>33.3% (3)</td>
<td>16.7% (1)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your fellow apprentices</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>14.3% (1)</td>
<td>25.0% (2)</td>
<td>50.0% (4)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your fellow grades/level teachers</td>
<td>25.0% (2)</td>
<td>12.5% (1)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>62.5% (5)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other teachers at your school that are not on your grade level</td>
<td>37.5% (3)</td>
<td>25.0% (2)</td>
<td>12.5% (1)</td>
<td>25.0% (2)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean County Board (OCE)</td>
<td>25.0% (2)</td>
<td>42.5% (5)</td>
<td>12.5% (1)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOST online component</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>42.5% (5)</td>
<td>37.5% (3)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOST face to face component</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>25.0% (2)</td>
<td>50.0% (4)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance, Video and Live</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>12.5% (1)</td>
<td>62.5% (5)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Unanswered questions: 0*
### Survey Responses

#### Teaching Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Availability of classroom materials for your classroom and students</td>
<td>0.0% (3)</td>
<td>12.5% (1)</td>
<td>25.5% (2)</td>
<td>20.0% (0)</td>
<td>25.5% (2)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>12.5% (1)</td>
<td>12.5% (1)</td>
<td>25.5% (2)</td>
<td>20.0% (0)</td>
<td>25.5% (2)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental support</td>
<td>62.5% (5)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>25.5% (2)</td>
<td>20.0% (0)</td>
<td>25.5% (2)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload</td>
<td>50.0% (4)</td>
<td>12.5% (1)</td>
<td>25.5% (2)</td>
<td>20.0% (0)</td>
<td>25.5% (2)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School policies</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>37.5% (3)</td>
<td>25.5% (2)</td>
<td>20.0% (0)</td>
<td>37.5% (3)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student discipline</td>
<td>50.0% (4)</td>
<td>12.5% (1)</td>
<td>25.5% (2)</td>
<td>20.0% (0)</td>
<td>25.5% (2)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with colleagues</td>
<td>25.5% (2)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>12.5% (1)</td>
<td>25.5% (2)</td>
<td>20.0% (0)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support systems within your school such as technology, etc.</td>
<td>12.5% (1)</td>
<td>37.5% (3)</td>
<td>25.5% (2)</td>
<td>20.0% (0)</td>
<td>25.5% (2)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support systems outside your school such as those such as PTA contacts, etc.</td>
<td>25.5% (2)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>50.0% (4)</td>
<td>12.5% (1)</td>
<td>12.5% (1)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School environment</td>
<td>25.5% (2)</td>
<td>25.5% (2)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>12.5% (1)</td>
<td>37.5% (3)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Ability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Minimal ability</th>
<th>Average ability</th>
<th>Above average ability</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teach reading</td>
<td>12.5% (1)</td>
<td>37.5% (3)</td>
<td>25.5% (2)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach math</td>
<td>12.5% (1)</td>
<td>37.5% (3)</td>
<td>25.5% (2)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach science</td>
<td>12.5% (1)</td>
<td>37.5% (3)</td>
<td>25.5% (2)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach social studies</td>
<td>25.0% (2)</td>
<td>25.0% (2)</td>
<td>25.0% (2)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Survey Responses

#### Question 5: To what extent did you find IRIS-IT online component helped you to do the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>No help at all</th>
<th>Minimal help</th>
<th>Some help</th>
<th>Extensive help</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reflective teaching about your teaching</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>55.5% (22)</td>
<td>44.4% (18)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Become more aware of your teaching style</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>60.0% (3)</td>
<td>39.5% (3)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Become more aware of your communication style</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>63.5% (2)</td>
<td>36.5% (1)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach students overall</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>60.0% (1)</td>
<td>40.0% (1)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach reading</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>100% (1)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach math</td>
<td>12.5% (1)</td>
<td>25.0% (2)</td>
<td>12.5% (1)</td>
<td>50.0% (4)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach in an urban school</td>
<td>25.0% (2)</td>
<td>37.5% (3)</td>
<td>8.0% (0)</td>
<td>30.0% (2)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach students with disabilities</td>
<td>12.5% (1)</td>
<td>25.0% (2)</td>
<td>12.5% (1)</td>
<td>50.0% (4)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work and communicate with parents</td>
<td>25.0% (2)</td>
<td>25.0% (2)</td>
<td>4.0% (0)</td>
<td>30.0% (2)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create effective centers</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>63.5% (2)</td>
<td>36.5% (1)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist your students</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>37.5% (3)</td>
<td>62.5% (2)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage classroom management situations</td>
<td>12.5% (1)</td>
<td>25.0% (2)</td>
<td>12.5% (1)</td>
<td>50.0% (4)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Become a better teacher</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>62.5% (2)</td>
<td>37.5% (3)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MOST Survey Result Comments

Please include any comments you have about your preparation as an apprentice.

- My preparation as an apprentice was paramount in the successes that I've had this year as a first year teacher. I cannot imagine walking into a classroom with no experience. The apprenticeship laid the foundation and made me think long and hard about my long term goals as an educator. It definitely sets you on the right path and provides support for your career. I would recommend it to anyone willing to learn. Thu, 5/1/08 5:53 PM

- Being exposed to more school environments would have been highly beneficial. Wed, 4/9/08 2:14 PM

- Unfortunately I did not see my teacher use the guidance programs available to her, which has left me to learn on my own this past year. It would have been beneficial to sit-in on a MRT or TARGET meeting. Wed, 4/9/08 2:00 PM

- There were numerous areas that I was ill prepared for this year. These areas included Target Team, behavior interventions, parent-teacher conferences, IEP’s MRT meetings, etc. Wed, 4/9/08 2:00 PM

Please include any comments you have about support you have or have not received.

- Of course we are always more interested in those things that are not required of us. I am disappointed with my school based support. I am not sure who is to blame. I do not know what I would have done without my fellow past apprentices, new apprentices and UF support in general. Katie and Lisa have been a tremendous help. They are so giving of their time and talent. I wish there were teachers at my school like them. The opportunity for continued learning has been very beneficial and a good alternative to the traditional DCPS TIP program. Thu, 5/1/08 5:57 PM

- MOST would benefit from a more regimented structure paralleling a traditional online course. I.e. a syllabus Wed, 4/9/08 2:17 PM

- Administration is rarely available to teachers at our school even though they constantly tout they have an open door policy. There is also no follow thru on what they have committed to do even though they write it down. My fellow grade level teachers have provided absolutely no support this year. The support I have received inside the school has come from other grade levels. The school board through its public comments and actions reveals that it does not support its teachers. From having to pay for everyday supplies out our salaries to failure to address consistent student behavior problems at the school level. They have been more concerned with Supt. Wise and their own images rather than addressing the real problems in Duval County Schools.
Please include any comments you have about your working environment.

- It is very difficult working at my school. The atmosphere is a negative from administration down to the students. Teachers are not collaborating or even getting along for that matter. Changes had to be made and people have a hard time accepting them and adapting. There's backbiting, tempers flaring, unprofessional behaviors, laziness and cheating. If it were not for the three year stipulation and the children, I would not want to be a part of this organization. Thu, 5/1/08 6:00 PM

- Most of the items are directly attributable to the climate of change we are involved in.
  Wed, 4/9/08 2:11 PM

- My main concern this year has been that the majority of the focus of our resources (both staff and financial) have gone to grades 3 - 5. I feel as though some of the discipline problems that I have had could have been tempered early-on if I had had the support that I needed. This goes both ways - I did not always ask for support because I knew that the emphasis was on the upper grades.

Please include any comments you have about your abilities as a teacher and how they have changed over the course of the school year.

- I don't think my classroom management has improved this year. If anything, it's become worse due to the frequent incoming and outgoing of students. I felt like I was teaching rituals and routines all year as if it were week one. Thu, 5/1/08 6:04 PM

- My ability as a math teacher would improve drastically if I had a curriculum to work with other than Math Investigations, the students would really benefit from practice sessions.
  Wed, 4/9/08 2:19 PM

- I am an ELA teacher so I do not teach science, SS, or math.
  Wed, 4/9/08 2:07 PM

Please include any comments you have about the MOST online component.

- I don't recall having a focused session on the items marked 'minimal help'. I can use help with assessments and teaching math especially. I don't remember going in depth about parent communication.
  Thu, 5/1/08 6:08 PM

- I have greatly enjoyed the video streaming and have found a majority of the assignments to be beneficial. In the future I would suggest having a primary and upper-level component that would be more tailored to our needs.

Please include here any comments you have about the MOST face-to-face component.

- I always learned something new at our face to face sessions and appreciated the feedback after observations.
  Thu, 5/1/08 6:10 PM
I have enjoyed having the opportunity to discuss issues with a group of like-minded professionals. Our conversations have been a great reminder that we are all in very similar situations and that we may not be the only ones dealing with these situations (which is how it sometimes feels).

Source: http://www.surveymonkey.com/sr.aspx?sm=qz4WtIvLbtR2aNB0f3V11XeIOGmjk_2ftNpoO03HKrKK0_3d
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background Information</th>
<th>Carl</th>
<th>Cathy</th>
<th>Irene</th>
<th>Kathi</th>
<th>Laura</th>
<th>Opal</th>
<th>Tina</th>
<th>Adam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Comm</td>
<td>Criminology</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Museum</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Legal studies</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Computer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mgt.</td>
<td>Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade teaching</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of kids</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19/19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20/20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons to go into teaching:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>always wanted to teach</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others told them to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching was a calling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summers off</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give back to community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatives in teaching</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most helpful--reading class</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least helpful--psychology/assess</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Teaching</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of work--didn’t realize</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESE teacher no support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In grade they chose</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>no--but like</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wish to remain in grade</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wish to loop with kids</td>
<td>Carl</td>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td>Irene</td>
<td>Kathi</td>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>Opal</td>
<td>Tina</td>
<td>Adam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre--adjective</th>
<th>Carl</th>
<th>Cathy</th>
<th>Irene</th>
<th>Kathi</th>
<th>Laura</th>
<th>Opal</th>
<th>Tina</th>
<th>Adam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>overwhelmed</td>
<td>frustrated</td>
<td>intense</td>
<td>hectic</td>
<td>overwhelmed</td>
<td>exhausted</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post-adjective</th>
<th>Carl</th>
<th>Cathy</th>
<th>Irene</th>
<th>Kathi</th>
<th>Laura</th>
<th>Opal</th>
<th>Tina</th>
<th>Adam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>overwhelmed</td>
<td></td>
<td>excellent</td>
<td>fulfilling</td>
<td></td>
<td>overwhelmed</td>
<td>exhausted</td>
<td>efficient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cliquey environment</th>
<th>Carl</th>
<th>Cathy</th>
<th>Irene</th>
<th>Kathi</th>
<th>Laura</th>
<th>Opal</th>
<th>Tina</th>
<th>Adam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have to know politics--covert</th>
<th>Carl</th>
<th>Cathy</th>
<th>Irene</th>
<th>Kathi</th>
<th>Laura</th>
<th>Opal</th>
<th>Tina</th>
<th>Adam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lack of professionalism</th>
<th>Carl</th>
<th>Cathy</th>
<th>Irene</th>
<th>Kathi</th>
<th>Laura</th>
<th>Opal</th>
<th>Tina</th>
<th>Adam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pressure of Title I school/Reading 1st</th>
<th>Carl</th>
<th>Cathy</th>
<th>Irene</th>
<th>Kathi</th>
<th>Laura</th>
<th>Opal</th>
<th>Tina</th>
<th>Adam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last minute/unplanned things occur</th>
<th>Carl</th>
<th>Cathy</th>
<th>Irene</th>
<th>Kathi</th>
<th>Laura</th>
<th>Opal</th>
<th>Tina</th>
<th>Adam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mentoring and Support

Mentor consultants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assigned mentor no help</th>
<th>Carl</th>
<th>Cathy</th>
<th>Irene</th>
<th>Kathi</th>
<th>Laura</th>
<th>Opal</th>
<th>Tina</th>
<th>Adam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentor help at beginning of year</th>
<th>Carl</th>
<th>Cathy</th>
<th>Irene</th>
<th>Kathi</th>
<th>Laura</th>
<th>Opal</th>
<th>Tina</th>
<th>Adam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collaboration with others--more of talking than planning</th>
<th>Carl</th>
<th>Cathy</th>
<th>Irene</th>
<th>Kathi</th>
<th>Laura</th>
<th>Opal</th>
<th>Tina</th>
<th>Adam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confusion of mentors/switched</th>
<th>Carl</th>
<th>Cathy</th>
<th>Irene</th>
<th>Kathi</th>
<th>Laura</th>
<th>Opal</th>
<th>Tina</th>
<th>Adam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Forms of support:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Carl</th>
<th>Cathy</th>
<th>Irene</th>
<th>Kathi</th>
<th>Laura</th>
<th>Opal</th>
<th>Tina</th>
<th>Adam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lauren</th>
<th>Carl</th>
<th>Cathy</th>
<th>Irene</th>
<th>Kathi</th>
<th>Laura</th>
<th>Opal</th>
<th>Tina</th>
<th>Adam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard/Reading/Writing Coaches</th>
<th>Carl</th>
<th>Cathy</th>
<th>Irene</th>
<th>Kathi</th>
<th>Laura</th>
<th>Opal</th>
<th>Tina</th>
<th>Adam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apprentice group</th>
<th>Carl</th>
<th>Cathy</th>
<th>Irene</th>
<th>Kathi</th>
<th>Laura</th>
<th>Opal</th>
<th>Tina</th>
<th>Adam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aide</th>
<th>Carl</th>
<th>Cathy</th>
<th>Irene</th>
<th>Kathi</th>
<th>Laura</th>
<th>Opal</th>
<th>Tina</th>
<th>Adam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carl</td>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td>Irene</td>
<td>Kathi</td>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>Opal</td>
<td>Tina</td>
<td>Adam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie, Lisa and Diane</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other apprentice</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assigned Mentor</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor Consultant</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Mgt--weakness</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Default mentor</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of collegiality</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What makes good mentor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F2F</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet more often</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chance to talk more freely</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to share was important</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't stick to 2 hour--allow to go over</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles were useful</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt rushed at times</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having known the group for year</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>closeness allowed for risk taking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOST online</td>
<td>Carl</td>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td>Irene</td>
<td>Kathi</td>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>Opal</td>
<td>Tina</td>
<td>Adam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website too busy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too many layers to go through</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Videos were helpful and caused reflection</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technology not smooth and seamless--spotty notificaion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>too many communication options</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content areas were empty at times</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cut stuff out of site</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replying to others seemed forced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irritation of people not posting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Most helpful component</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Videos</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested to have access later</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need time to go through resource look over during the summer</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carl</td>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td>Irene</td>
<td>Kathi</td>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>Opal</td>
<td>Tina</td>
<td>Adam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailored to their needs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any problems were easily resolved</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Websites were useful and new</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed assignments at home</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance of Linda and me no issue</td>
<td>50/50</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like email notices and used</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 weeks adequate time</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>too long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignments were meaningful</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would help to be grade level specific</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to start earlier</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of support</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Log Access Total</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just in Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calendar</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Future Wants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to have a mini course on how to use Moodle even though they used it before</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to be more strict from begin</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Carl</th>
<th>Cathy</th>
<th>Irene</th>
<th>Kathi</th>
<th>Laura</th>
<th>Opal</th>
<th>Tina</th>
<th>Adam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>management wise</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training on ESOL, ethics, inclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication negatives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element of distrust</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we vs. them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disgruntlement of people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>getting more time to respond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCPS is out of touch with realities</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal--lack of communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of communication within school</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESE support lacking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Misc.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeness of group</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental support lacking</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only one was online kind of learner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bought their own copier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serendipitous found out about</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprentice program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assigned additional duties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>during 1st year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carl</td>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td>Irene</td>
<td>Kathi</td>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>Opal</td>
<td>Tina</td>
<td>Adam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview page length</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview time</td>
<td>61 min</td>
<td>76 min</td>
<td>91 min</td>
<td>132 min</td>
<td>82 min</td>
<td>62 min</td>
<td>111 min</td>
<td>105 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wish list</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More training in writing</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More training in math</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would recommend MOST</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G
JOURNAL EXCERPTS

11/18/07
Trying to figure out when to post something that goes to the entire group or not. Example of Opal’s rules—there were too many and most started with the word no. I don’t want the group to think that her ideas were not addressed but I also didn’t want to embarrass her. Trying to convey my thought and feelings online is also hard—feel like what I would say in person wouldn’t have to be so guarded as when I type them up—constantly having to reread and rewrite what I wrote since I am not sure how it will be taken by the person reading it on the other end.

12/1/07
I am realizing how much time it takes to write things that convey the correct meaning. I will spend twice as much time to get my thoughts down so I don’t come across the wrong way. It is very difficult to do at times. Wish I felt more in sync with the group. I often feel like an outsider—haven’t figured out how to fit in. I don’t know if it is more of me feeling like that or just they are too busy to notice a lack of communication with me.

12/14/07
We had our Christmas gathering at Tree Fire Grill this past Tuesday. It was a nice gathering. Tina, Carl, and Opal were unable to make it. I hear from Tina and Opal—but not from Carl—he rarely makes contact anymore. I am worried about him. Trying to figure out how much information to give them without pissing them off. Since they didn’t seem to want more books, I have been busy reading them myself and scanning what I think they might want to save them some time. I can’t tell if they are helpful or not. District people think they have been helpful, but in reality they haven’t—case of Adam and books being put on his desk. Perception is Reality
You can lead a horse to water but you can’t make him drink

12/15/07
I used the report status today to see if they were visiting different parts of the site. It is so frustrating in that the things I have taken the time to hunt down write up and post aren’t being used. I often wonder if I were _____, would they respond better to what I have put up there?

12/16/07
What I would do differently:
Make sessions 1 month or 3 weeks in length
Use videos as primary source of teaching
Set up the site from the get go
Concentrate more on communication area—seems to be the most utilized area.

1-10-07
Trying to figure out when to prompt and prod the teachers is difficult at times to do. Walking a fine line between being a pain in the ass and a concerned facilitator.
I am worried about Carl—he seems so disconnected from the group. I don’t know how or if I should reach out to him.

1-13-07
Can’t tell if teachers are just so overwhelmed with things right now that they aren’t posting or that they have gotten more comfortable with their jobs. Or they just don’t feel that the site is useful-- which concerns me.
I haven’t been responding to them due to Jake being so sick. I am worried about Carl—haven’t heard from him or Candy. Candy I figure is just busy---she has been on the site a bit makes me feel like she is okay. I sent an email to both and haven’t received any word from them.

2-2-08
A new year. We had our 1st meeting of the new year on Wednesday. I brought along a lot of stuff to share as I am not usually able to due to time running out. I also taped the meeting. I realize after listening to it that I didn’t explain things as thoroughly as I needed to—I left out directions that they might be able to figure out, but I don’t know if they will. They are a tough group to read.
Linda felt the meeting went well. I didn’t feel like that. I always feel my communication style with adults is not as good as it should be. I don’t know what has happened since I came up here--I always seem to get more nervous than I should—I stumble for words and forget to tell them things. I also sped up my talk—I was worried about eating up too much of Linda’s time.

We finally heard from Carl—
He is struggling.
Not sure he is going to make it.

2-10-08
Things have gone from bad to worse with Carl. Linda and I went to visit him the day we had our face to face meeting. We even bought him the supplies for a strategy Elaine wanted him to try, but he still doesn't get it even with all of the help that has been given to him. It is very frustrating—we don’t understand the hesitancy in taking us up on our offer to help.
Learned helplessness? Survival. Woe is me. Surrender. All seem to be themes as to what he going thru right now.
His kids are suffering due to no learning going on. I wonder when he gave up on himself?
I am surprised he is letting the learning of his kids go the wayside. Not good-- as they need all of the help they can get.

2-14-08
Carl hasn’t been on the site since January. No one has heard from him. I am very worried about his kids. It’s a wasted year for them.
Tina asked at the meeting why I was cc’ing Melinda. I could tell she felt uncomfortable with me doing so even though we need to include Melinda in the loop. Trying to find this balance of keeping everyone informed but allow them a safe space to interact is hard. Where to draw the line?
2-17-08
Learning to post and not put too much info up on the site has also been a balancing act—posted a site for award maker certificates—had a variety for all kinds of things—I have to do this “sell job” to convince them to go on but at the same time I want them to make connections and make the leaps they need to—Well Candy did! I only put up a basic bit of info—she went on the site and noted that they could use the certificates for things other than just academics. So glad to see she picked up on that!
I am worried that some of them haven’t been on the site in a long time---the reports are very helpful.

It has been so frustrating not getting email responses from them. I sent a request to them for their new email addresses since their district changed theirs. Only 1—Laura responded.

2-27-08
We had our Feb meeting on Wednesday. I am shocked still that so many of them come in late or don’t give notification about things. Irene came in an hour late, Shelly was 45 minutes late, and Candy was about 30 minutes late. No reasons-- just late. Opal and Carl didn’t show. We later found out that Candy had to take her daughter to the hospital. No word from Carl at all. I think he has just quit and not told anyone.

The group needed to bring in a book to discuss how they would create centers. This assignment had been postponed. I sent out several reminders—Tina and Laura didn’t bring anything. I realize now that we should have put in place expectations with online and F2F. It’s been frustrating.
Also, had an observation appointment with Adam at 12:30. I show up and it turns out it is lunch for his kids—had to wait a good 30 minutes in my car. Little miffed about him not letting me know beforehand.
I am surprised at their general lack of other people’s time.
Candy is having to go away for 6 weeks—hasn’t approached us on getting the assignments beforehand. Lack of responsibility.

3-2-08
What is so interesting is that the person who I thought was going to make things the toughest for me has turned out to be one of the ones I look forward to talking with the most. The first meeting we had with them, Kathi was kind of snappy and confrontational. Now, it is more supportive and encouraging. I don’t know if this is because she has had a chance to get to know me and where I am coming from or because we both have children who are in the same age range. She had the chance to meet Jake at our Christmas gathering, and so I wonder if that helped to make the connection? Either way, I am just glad it has happened. Rapport has been key in this.

Kind of like fishing when posting something—you don’t want to give them too much you hope they will take the bait and make their own connections. Example of Candy and certificate maker.
Also, when I ask them to do something, try to give them a reason for doing so. Trying to write things that won’t tick them off is so time consuming!
I have spent hours today writing things that I don’t want to upset them with.

3-16-08
I have a question. Our assignments seem to be getting longer and longer. I have only done Task 1 and 2 and have been at this 3 1/2 hours. Are these assignments to accommodate the people who want Masters credit? The Duval Tip program doesn’t require this level of participation and this could be one of the reasons why not all of the former apprentices are not taking part in the UF Tip program. While I value the information gained in these assignments, I still don’t feel they address my grade level’s needs. How do I accurately respond to material that is solely geared to grades 3-5?

I just received this from Tina and it has taken me a good 45 minutes to respond to her without ticking her off. Communicating online is exhausting at times!

3-21-08
Tina called me the other night and we spoke for about an hour. This was a huge step for this program I feel. And a huge step for my relationship with them. It was more of a call out of frustration and venting than anything. We met today to talk about the group and research questions to ask. The question of if they will be honest with us when we are doing our interviews came up. I think they will be—I think they are all pretty forthright with us at this point.

3-22-08
Finally heard back from Carl—felt like I was a parent having to chastise him about not communicating with us when he should have. I ended up sending a 2nd email because I felt guilty and that I didn’t really address his needs. He wants to make up things. I am trying to be supportive, but all I really want to do is ask him “Do you really want to do this?” “Do you see yourself doing this for the next several years at this same school?” But I don’t feel like I can ask him without being rude. Don’t know if he wants to face reality or not.
APPENDIX H
IRB CONSENT LETTER

Dear Potential Participant:

The Lastinger Center for Learning is very interested in documenting the development of our efforts in our partner schools. We want to learn how this work may have impacted your perspectives on teaching and learning. The purpose of this letter is to secure your consent for participation in the collection of materials that will help us understand more about these two areas. The following types of documentation may be collected:

- **Meeting Notes and documents** — Since this is a year long professional development effort centered on regular collaborative meetings with your colleagues, the majority of information will come directly out of documents from those activities. This study is not intended to be any additional work for you. We are just seeking to collect materials from meetings that your group has already determined to be helpful in your professional development efforts. For example in the case of Teacher Fellows, if you complete a monthly action plan, that may be collected with your permission. For the apprentices, if you complete a portfolio, feedback forms, lesson plans, and other related materials, those may be collected with your permission. For Ready Schools teachers, this may include agendas from your learning community meetings or any documents that you collaboratively analyze.

- **Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) observations** — We want to be able to see how working with your colleagues to enhance your learning impacts your classroom teaching. The CLASS is an observation tool that will analyze your interactions with your students in ways that promote their achievement. It is not an evaluative instrument, and all results will be shared with you to provide feedback about your teaching.

- **School Culture survey** — Should your school group consent to document the changes at the school level through the use of a survey, we request that those results be available for use in this study. The surveys are confidential and will only be reported as total school results, not in terms of individual teachers.

- **Interviews** — It may also be helpful to include your perspectives and impressions through 30-60 minute interviews. Should you agree to participate in an interview, we would protect your confidentiality to the fullest extent required by the IRB.

- **Observations** — If you are engaging in some peer, coach, or facilitator observations, we may request your permission to collect any field notes that have already been compiled. Observations may also be conducted of the professional development sessions and learning community meetings that take place at your school site.

The activities suggested above are strictly voluntary. You will not be compensated for your participation in this study. Non-participation or denied consent to collect any of the evidence listed above will not affect your participation in the Florida Teachers Fellows program.
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the Apprenticeship, or the Ready Schools initiative in any way. In addition, you may request at any time that your data not be included for this study. A team consisting of university faculty, Lastinger Center personnel, and doctoral students will have access to the data so that we can collaborate to document and evaluate the program. Your identity will be protected through the use of pseudonyms, and your confidentiality will be protected to the full extent provided by law. I do not perceive that there are any risks for your participation in the study. In fact, teachers generally enjoy the opportunity to reflect on their own learning and experiences and have a voice in program development.

Please sign and return to me this copy of the letter. A second copy is for your records. If you have any questions about the study or the procedures for data collection, please contact me (392-0726, ext. 295 or adamsa@ufl.edu). If you have any questions about the rights of research participants, you can contact the University of Florida Institutional Review Board Office, P. O. Box 112250, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida 32611.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Alyson Adams, Principal Investigator
Program Director, Lastinger Center for Learning

I have read the procedure described above for the study of documentation and evaluation of the Teacher Fellowship, Apprenticeship program, and Ready Schools initiative. I agree to participate and I have received a copy of this description.

_________________________   _________________________
Signature of participant       Date
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Session 1 September 24th – October 5th
What are we all doing here and just what does MOST stand for?

Session 1 Task 1: Introduction Activity
General Introduction

Welcome to the MOST site! (Mentoring and Online Support for new Teachers) We are really looking forward to creating a positive, professional online learning community. Please take a few moments to review all the resources that can be found on this site. You will find a lot of helpful information such as technical tutorials, software downloads, and many other resources. If you are a new to this learning environment, make sure to watch all of the technical tutorials to learn how to navigate through this site. Keep in mind this site is a work in progress. Helpful and exciting new components will be added on a regular basis—we’ve only just begun! Look for lesson plans, video clips on teaching strategies, articles on a variety of topics such as discipline, effective parent conferences, etc.

Netiquette Guidelines
Topic 1: Expectations

As you can see, each MOST session runs approximately every 2 weeks. Due to holidays and breaks, you may notice some sessions are a bit longer. Sessions begin on a Monday and end on a Friday with a weekend in between. As the moderators of the site, we will have sessions posted the Sunday before they begin. We know your schedules are hectic, but please pay attention to the posting dates as they are critical in allowing the other members time to reflect and respond in a meaningful manner.

Topic 2: Quality Online Discussion

Engaging in a quality online discussion is a skill that develops over time. Although this is not online class, it is online forum that is one component of your requirements as a beginning teacher for Duval County School System. Your participation is needed not only to fulfill your obligations of this program option, but more importantly, your participation is greatly needed to help us think more deeply about this school year and what it means to be a first year teacher.

Topic 3: It’s not just what you say, but how you say it…

What is a meaningful response? A meaningful response is one that shows reflection, connection, and possibly further exploration. A posting of “I agree with Harry’s insights” is an example of how not to respond. We want this forum to be meaningful for everyone and not just a requirement to fulfill as a beginning teacher. It is our hope that by your participation in this learning community and monthly meetings that you will grow professionally as a beginning
Session 1 Task 1 Introduction Activity
This goal of this task is to give our group an idea of what your current teaching environment is like. Create a single posting with the following information ->

Introduction Activity Directions:

1. Write 3-4 paragraphs describing your classroom and teaching experience thus far and be sure to include:
   • school you are teaching in this year
   • grade level you are teaching
   • number of students you are teaching
   • something that you have been surprised by as a new teacher
   • something you are struggling with as a new teacher
2. As a beginning teacher, what are some of your personal goals this year as you begin your new career? Post 2 or 3.
3. You should post your description and goals by September 30th so that everyone will have adequate time to review and respond.
4. On or before October 5th, review each member’s posting and make a connection with at least 2 other members. Your connection should be based on what you learned by reading their posting.

Session 1 Task 2: Communication Options Activity

1. As you can see, there are a variety of communication methods that are tailored for your communication needs. Explore the M.O.S.T. Communication menu at the top of the page. By October 5th.
   • View the announcement box for any upcoming news and assignment information.
   • Visit the Teachers’ Lounge and post a “rant, rave, or sigh.”
   • Visit the Suggestion Box and post one suggestion.
   • Visit the Just-in-Time Mentoring section. Think about something you could use a little help or advice with currently and submit a brief description of your concern, question, etc. (This is a private posting and will not be seen by other members of the learning community)

Session 2 October 8-19th
Communication is the key

Most of us have probably heard the phrase "Communication is key" at some point in our lives. When we take the time to reflect upon our relationships with family, friends, co-workers, etc. we can see how critical the role good communication plays in making those relationships work well. Just as good communication is critical in our adult relationships it is as equally important with our students.
Think about your communication style. Does it seem to be working with your students?

This online session, we want you to take some time to think about the communication in your classroom with your students.

**Session 2 Task 1: Classroom Communication**

The goal of this task is for you to critically and reflectively look at your communication with your students.

You will either need a tape recorder or digital recorder for this session’s task. Tape a 30 minute interval of your classroom “in action” as far as verbal communication goes. Pick a time when you have at least 50% of your class—the more students the better as it is a better reflection of the realities of your classroom. Place the recorder in an area where it will pick up your voice as well as your students. You will probably want to do a test run to make sure you are can hear yourself interacting with the students.

Listen to at least 15 minutes of the tape. Reflect on what you discovered about how you communicate with your students.

Create a **single** posting with the following information. Post it as: Session 2—Communication

1. Write 2-3 paragraphs on what you noticed about your communication style after listening and reflecting upon what you heard. Some things to help guide your thinking:
   - What is the first thing you notice about your communication style?
   - How well do you hear your students? Do you really listen to what they are saying? Do you give your students enough wait time before responding to them?
   - What is your tone of voice like? Do you notice if it changes for certain students? If so, why do you think that happens?
   - What is your speed like? Do you have a tendency to talk fast in certain situations?
   - Did you find anything surprising by doing this activity?
   - How can you use what you discovered to improve the communication with your students?

2. You should post your response by **October 14th** so that everyone will have adequate time to review and respond.

3. **On or before October 19th**, review each member’s posting and make a connection with at least two other members. Your connection should be based on what you learned by reading their posting.

4. Turn your tape in at our next face-to-face meeting. (Since we are accountable to the Duval County School System, we have to collect any artifacts of your work so you can receive credit for participating in the UF induction program)
Session 2 Task 2

Drawing on my fine command of language, I said nothing.

--Robert Benchley

Reflect upon the quote above by Benchley.

How can you apply his quote to your classroom and your interactions with your students? What role does silence play in our classrooms? Can we use silence as a means of communication? And if so, how can we use silence effectively?

1. Post a reaction/response to the quote by October 19th and post it as: Session 2—Silence

Session 3 October 22nd - November 2nd
Hearing our Students' Voices

Hearing our Students

Many of us savor the chance to read aloud a favorite book of our own or of our students. Read alouds are not only a great way to introduce good literature but they can be a powerful teaching tool. Katherine Bomer’s fifth-grade class showcases techniques for involving all students in a classroom read-aloud by modeling, supporting and encouraging conversations among her students. Bomer, a primary and intermediate teacher in New York, Indiana, and Texas, worked for five years at the Teachers College Reading and Writing Project along with Lucy Calkins.

This session, we want you to see how silence and conversation with a read aloud can create powerful classroom instruction.

Session 3 Task 1

The goal of this week’s session is to see how read alouds can be used as an effective teaching strategy to help give voice to all of your students. View Voices in the Classroom #2 video clip.

- To view the clip, go to the Video and Audio Library resource cluster found on the MOST site.
- Click on the Reading link.
- Go to the Teachers and Students in Action section and click on the link at the end of the paragraph.
- Watch the video clip and create a single posting with answering the questions below and post it as: Session 3—Powerful Conversations.
- What do you notice about Katherine Bomer’s routine for reading aloud?
- What do you think makes the way Katherine Bomer conducts her read-aloud so powerful?
• What are some of the questioning techniques you observed that she uses to stimulate conversation amongst her students and enhance their comprehension?
• What do you notice about how she incorporates silence into her lesson?
• Even though none of us are teaching 5th grade this year, how can you build in similar structures/opportunities to allow for meaningful conversations between and amongst our students?
• Was there an “Aha Moment” for you when you watched this clip?

2. Post your response by October 28th

3. On or before November 2nd, review each member’s posting and make a connection with at least one other member. Your connection should be based on what you learned by reading their posting.

Session 3 Task 2

Post your daily schedule so we can see what our different schedules are like for a typical school day on or before November 2nd.

Post what your reading block entails within your daily schedule. What do you feel most comfortable with in your reading block? What do you find yourself struggling with? Is there anything you would like to change to make it more effective for your students?

Session 4 November 5th - 30th

Classroom Management

As you all know, good management skills are critical in having a well run class. By now you have experienced how good time management, behavior management, and classroom management can make the difference in having a really good day, a so-so day, or a day you would rather forget.

As your students become more comfortable with you and the classroom, they begin to push their boundaries and as a result, you might find that what worked one month ago is not longer as effective with your students. Sometimes you just need to do some tweaking with your management plan, other times, you need to implement something totally new.

This 4th session involves examining your management plan as well as implementing a new management strategy. Because this session involves more time and reflection, we will be extending the dates so the session will run from November 2nd through November 30th. (You have until December 7th to post the log of your 2-3 week strategy experiment to give you some flexibility in implementing it as well as due to the holidays). We’ll be sending out a new MOST calendar once we have adjusted the calendar dates.
Session 4 Task 1
Post your current management plan—What rules do you have posted? What are the consequences if a student doesn’t follow your plan? etc…by November 18th.

- What is making it effective with your students? Is there anything you feel needs improving?
- What is the biggest management issue you are confronted with currently?
- By November 30th, review each member’s plan. Pick 1 and respond to their current plan by asking a question or posting a comment.

Session 4 Task 2: Classroom Management Strategies and Techniques
The goal of this session is to have you really think about how your management plan is working for you and your students. Go to the Light Bridge Management page that can be found in the classroom management link in the MOST video library to access the various management modules.

1. View the intro and 3 lesson video clips (use the tabs at the top of the site’s page—they are really short—2-3 minutes each) for the Foundations of Classroom Management and Non-Verbal Classroom Management modules by November 11th:
   - Foundations of Classroom Management (Establishing Rules and Expectations, Communicating Respectfully and Empowering Students)
   - Non-Verbal Classroom Management (Written Posted Directions, Non-Verbal Signals, It’s Time to Raise Hands)

2. Answer the questions below by November 18th and post them as: Session 4—Management
   - Are you currently using the strategies/techniques that were in the various clips? If so, what are they and how are they working for you and your students?
   - How are you using non-verbal signals as a form of classroom management? Do you feel it/they is/are effective? Why or why not?
   - How does Jessica Culter allow her students to be a part of the process and give them a voice in the Establishing Rules video clip?
   - What made Rima Meechan’s teacher-student conference so powerful in the Empowering Students video clip?
   - Was there an “Aha Moment” for you when you watched these clips?

The Managing Conflict module has some good techniques that could be adapted for use at the elementary level. This module is optional.

Session 4 Task 3: Strategy Experiment
Pick one of the strategies that you viewed from the management module video clips and implement it for 10-15 consecutive days, keeping a log on what you notice with the strategy. (These are just some “starter” ideas on what to think about/write about: Why did you choose this strategy over the others? How easy or hard was it to implement? What worked well? What didn’t? How did you have to adapt the strategy to fit the needs of your classroom? How successful was it? What could you have done differently? Will you maintain it?, etc…) Be sure to let us know the strategy or technique you are using. Post your thoughts by December 7th.
**Session 5 December 3rd - 31st**  
**New Year's Resolutions and Goals**

Now that the end of 2007 is upon us and 2008 is right around the corner, we wanted this session to be one of reflection. Many of us set New Year’s resolutions with the beginning of a new year. For this session, we want you to think back over the past several months as well as to the goals you set for yourselves in terms of planning, student learning, and engaging practice (look back to the form Katie had you complete and submit in October). Are you where you want to be with things? If not, are you close to what you envisioned? What will it take to get you where you want to be? What has been the biggest obstacle to achieving your goals?

**Session 5 Task 1: Goals for the Spring**

This session involves setting personal and professional goals for the remainder of the school year. What are some of the things you would like to accomplish for yourself as an educator? What would you like to accomplish in terms of your students? Lastly, with so many demands on your time, what are some things that you would like to accomplish for yourself that aren’t related to teaching, students, or your school? List 3 goals and how you will accomplish them for each of the areas. See the template below this link. Post them by December 31st.

Session 5 Task 1: Goals for the Spring Template

**Session 6 January 1st - 30th**  
**Creating Fun and Effective Learning Centers**

**Fun and Effective Centers**

Centers or learning stations can be an effective way to teach and reinforce skills for all subjects with a variety of instructional methods.

This 6th session will hopefully add to your knowledge of centers so you can start creating and implementing your own successfully. Alternatively, if you are already utilizing centers, this session will help you build upon what you already have in place.

Helpful Hints on Introducing Centers

- **Introducing Centers**

  Teaching children procedures and routines for using centers responsibly

  If you teach children younger than third grade, you will need to go slower with this process, and do tons of modeling to show what you expect. If you teach third grade or older, your students should be entering their fourth year of reading groups and should know the basic process- they just need to learn YOUR routines:
Start with independent work. Give a 20 minute assignment the students can work on without assistance and explain that they cannot talk or ask for help because they are practicing for reading groups.

Once they've got that down, work on partner reading (if your kids will be doing that during group rotations) and then centers. Explain where centers are kept, used, and clean up procedures.

Be extremely detailed and assume they have no knowledge of centers. For example, if you have a sandwich bag with pieces in it for one of your centers, model putting the bag back and ask if you forgot anything. Someone will notice you did not shut the bag, and can explain to the class why it is so important to always close the bag. If you skip this step, you will pay for it later. I have taken the lazy way out before and been very upset when materials were not used properly, because I had no one to blame but myself- I never took the time to teach the kids how to take care of it.

Introduce each center individually. This takes forever but will save you from having to answer the same questions repeatedly. It will take several days, and it will leave the kids dying to try them out! In HeadStart, we called this the Guided Discovery process. Think about it as guiding them through the proper way to discover and explore the materials, since you'll be teaching reading groups later and won't be able to do this for each child while they're at centers.

When they have seen each center, tell them it is finally time to try them out with your monitoring. Explain that when they use centers, you will be teaching small groups, and you will not be able to help them. Tell them that because they are still learning, for the rest of the week (or so), you will be walking around to answer questions, but once small groups start, that's it. Allow the whole class to go to centers simultaneously so that you can give your full attention to monitoring. Look to see if the materials are being used correctly, and if the children are on task.

Once they've demonstrated their abilities to use centers, discuss procedures for when they have questions at centers (and independent work) but you are teaching small group. As a class, we decided that our rule would be to 1) re-read the directions to yourself, 2) ask your partner or someone near you in a whisper voice, 3) if you still don't understand, just do the best you can. That was our center mantra. I repeatedly emphasized that it was okay if they were not using the center exactly as the directions said (our centers are very open-ended)- as long as they were working and practicing literacy skills, they were doing the right thing. That's the truth- if they are reading and writing, then they are making good use of their time, as far as I'm concerned.

Next, have half the class practice centers and the other half practice independent work, with NO QUESTIONS or help from you. After 20 minutes, discuss how that worked and reinforce your rules. Have the class switch, again with no questions. Debrief again, and thank them for working so independently. Tell them you think they are ready for small groups and you believe you can trust them to stay on task, work quietly, and respect small
groups. You may want to do just one group a day at first so that you can monitor centers and independent work more closely.

It's important for your students to understand how precious your reading group time is-you absolutely cannot afford to discipline the class when you are teaching reading. You wouldn't tolerate it during whole class instruction, so don't allow it during small groups, either. My class knew that every time I had to interrupt my small group to speak to someone else, I noted it on my clipboard, and after 3 chances, that person could not go to centers for a week. If they could not stay on task during independent work, they would have to sit by themselves, by me, or lose privileges in the classroom. This was seldom a problem, and when I was able to meet with 3 twenty-minute small groups without having to discipline anyone, they would be thanked profusely for their maturity and I might even give them a token of appreciation, such as 5 extra minutes of recess, or partner reading outdoors. I think mutual respect is what sometimes inspires kids to basically stay on task.

Really Good Sites on Centers

For some basic information on the who/what/where/ and why of centers, these 2 sites are good places to start:

http://www.mspowell.com/centers.html

http://www.teachingheart.net/LC.htm

Some other good sites to visit that have free downloads that can easily be adapted for different grades and different subjects are:

Teresa Wilson’s Center Page
Lots of different center ideas with ready to go directions and activities
http://staffweb.peoriaud.k12.az.us/Teresa_Wilson/literacy_centers.htm

Ms. Powell’s Math Tub Page
http://mspowell.com/otherwebpages/centerpics6.htm

Card Games for Math Centers

Card Mats for Math Skills
http://www.theschoolbell.com/Links/math/number_families/main/cards.html

Number Family Tubs

Pictures of Centers
http://mspowell.com/otherwebpages/centerpics.htm
Session 6 Task 1—Creating fun and effective learning centers

The goal of this month’s session is to provide you with an overview of how to create and implement centers within a classroom using a picture book as the foundation. View the video clip Story-Based Centers to learn more.

1. To view the clip, go to the Video and Audio Library resource cluster found on the MOST site.
   - Click on the Math link.
   - Go to the Teaching Math K-4 Video Library section and click on the link at the end of the paragraph.
   - Scroll down to #40 Story-Based Centers from the library.

2. Watch the video clip Story-Based Centers and create a single posting by answering the questions below and post it as: Session 6—Effective Centers by January 20th
   - How did Ms. Bewley design her centers and their activities? (What was her thinking process in designing them?)
   - What do you notice about Ms. Bewley’s communication style? How does this influence her students and their learning?
   - What do you notice about her management/organization of the eight centers? How does this increase their effectiveness?
   - How would her students' learning be affected if the activities she had were not open-ended?
   - How does she integrate assessment into her centers?
   - What is your biggest concern/struggle when planning for a center/s?
   - Was there an “Aha Moment” for you when you watched this clip?

3. On or before January 28th, review each member’s posting and make a connection with at least one other member. Your connection should be based on what you learned by reading their posting.

Session 6 Task 2

Select a picture book that that you could build several centers around that use math, reading, listening, and writing skills. Create at least one center that you can bring and share with the group when we meet in January.

It doesn't have to be perfect. Our face-to-face meeting will be a night of tweaking, learning, and sharing what we know about centers. (If you have time to create more, please bring those too.)

Bring a tentative plan on how you will implement your picture book centers. For some help with this, see the 2 links below this one on the main page.

Some things to include in your plan might be:
   - What is the overarching goal that you want to accomplish with each center?
How many students will be at a center at one time?
How will you manage your students?
What will your roll be? (will you be a "station" or will you be roaming?)
How will you introduce your centers?
What role will assessment play in your centers?
Will there be a culminating activity?
How much time will students have in the centers before rotating?
How will you manage students that finish sooner than expected or students that don't finish the center's activity? etc...

If you need some suggestions on book that are math related, email Lisa for titles.

Session 7 February 1st - 24th
Technology in the Schools

One of the most important things to know about your school is the people who are in charge of its resources and what exactly those resources are. Too often, you find out after the fact that a particular book or piece of technology that could have taken your good lesson to a higher level was right “in your own backyard.”

Because technology plays such an important role in our lives and can make quite a difference in the learning experiences of your students (as well as being one of the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices), we wanted this session to be one centered around the technology available to you in your particular school.

This session you will need to play a little bit of a detective to find out what technological resources your school has for its teachers and students. Your keen detective abilities might even earn you a prize or two at our next monthly meeting! Many schools house their “technological offerings” in the media center so there is some system in place for checking equipment in and out. Others have a technology representative who is in charge of all technology and some schools use a combination of both.

Find out what the situation is for your particular school and spend a bit of time with the person in charge of your school's technology to complete both tasks for this month. Post both by Sunday, February 24th.

Session 7 Task 1

Once you find out who is in charge of the technology at your school, take an informal inventory of what your school has in technology resources. You can use the attached technology inventory form or type up your discoveries and post them to the site by February 24th. Label this posting: Session 7 Task 1: Technology- “your school’s name”
Technology Inventory

Session 7 Task 2

The goal of this second session is to find out more about the technology budget and procedures that are in place at your school. You may need to ask more than one person for the answers. Answer the questions below and post them to the site by February the 24th. Label this posting Session 7 Task 2.

1. Who is in charge of the technology at your school?
2. What is the policy for checking equipment out at your school? (How long are items allowed to be checked out?)
3. Who decides on what to purchase? Do you think this is a fair system? If not, how would you change the system? Are teachers’ requests given priority?
4. How much is the budget to purchase new technology? Where does the money to purchase technology mostly come from? How often are new items purchased?
5. What technology do you currently use? If you didn’t have this technology available, how would it affect your teaching/or lesson?
6. If you could order one item to add to your schools collection, what would you purchase? Why would you want to buy it?
7. What is the most popular technology item used in your school? Why do you think it is so popular?
8. Did you discover an item that you would like to use now from this activity?
9. Was there any surprising you discovered from this activity?
10. What was the oldest piece of technology that your school still has?
11. What was the strangest piece of technology that your school had?
12. On a scale of 1-10 with 10 being the highest, how would you rate what your school has as far as technology offerings for the students and teachers?

Session 8 March 1st - 30th
Assessment and Accountability

One can hardly pick up an educational magazine today or read an educational newsletter without coming across an article about high-stakes testing or assessment. Since the inception of NCLB, assessment and testing have become controversial buzzwords in education and society.
As beginning teachers it is very easy to become overwhelmed with the amount of testing and preparation that today’s schools are required to do. But is testing a "bad" thing? Can we use all of the preparation that goes into tests such as the FCAT in productive ways? If so, how can we?

This session we’ll be reading and discussing the role of assessment in your classrooms and our schools—the good, the bad, and the stuff in-between.

Session 8 Task 1
Perspectives on Assessment
The goal of this task is to have you see one educator’s path in learning about assessment and its role in her classrooms over the years as well as the role formative assessment plays in our own classrooms. We’ll be discussing both articles more in depth when we meet in April.

- Go to the Article Resource Cluster located under MOST resources located at the top of the site. Click on the PDF files labeled Learning to Love Assessment by Tomlinson and The Best Value in Formative Assessment by Chappuis & Chappuis to download them both.
- After reading both articles, answer the “4-A” questions below for one and a 1 sentence reaction to the other and post your responses as: Session 8 Task 1—Assessment Articles. (Be sure to let us know which article you chose as your “4-A” article). Post by March 23rd.

4-A Questions

- What Assumptions does/do the author/s hold about assessment?
- What do you Agree with in the text?
- What do you want to Argue with in the text?
- What parts of the text do you want to Aspire to?

Reaction sentence to the 2nd article:

Session 8 Task 2
The Role of Assessment and Accountability in Our Classrooms

The goal of this task is to provide an overview of assessment, standards, and outcomes and how they can be used effectively with our students. View the video clip Assessment and Accountability to learn more. Some questions to keep in mind and guide you as you are watching:

- How do standards and benchmarks inform assessment?
- What role can students play in their assessment?
- How can teachers prepare for high-stakes tests?
- How does assessment focus instruction?
a. To view the clip, go to the Video and Audio Library resource cluster found on the MOST site.

b. Click on the Reading link.

c. Go to the Teaching Reading Grades 3-5 Workshop section and click on the link for Teaching Reading Grades 3-5 Workshop.

d. Scroll down to Workshop 8 and view: Assessment and Accountability from the library.

e. Watch the video clip and create a single posting by answering the questions below and post it as: Session 8 Task 2—Assessment Clip by March 23rd

f. On or before March 30th, review each member’s posting and make a connection with at least one other member.

Consider what you have learned about assessment practices from Professor Au's comments, the classroom examples, and activities in this video session. Using what you have learned from the clip as well as your own experiences, answer the questions below and post them to the site by March 23rd and respond to another member's posting by March 30th.

- What do you wish you had known more about in terms of assessment/testing when you first began the school year?
- What are the challenges you face in implementing effective classroom assessment?
- What has been your biggest surprise in terms of testing and assessment this year?
- After watching the video clip, which classroom assessment practices most reflect what you do or would like to do?
- Is it possible to mesh testing preparation with the school’s curriculum and your instructional goals? Why or why not?
- Was there an “Aha or Whoa” moment when viewing this clip?

Current practices

- How do you currently provide feedback to your students on their reading and writing? What would you like to improve with this system?
- How do you determine your students’ vocabulary strengths and weaknesses?
- Describe your classroom routines that you currently have in place to assure ongoing assessment of reading and writing(e.g., How do you decide which students to assess?).
- How have you documented your students’ growth in reading and writing throughout the year? How do you use this information to guide the instruction for your students?
Session 8 Task 3
Create Your Own Rubric

Rubrics can be great assessment tools to use with your students. They not only help students to better understand your expectations of their work but how their work is graded since they clearly define the quality of work expected. Additionally, students can help you design the rubric to be used in scoring their work giving them a voice in the assessment process as well as making the process a bit more concrete for them.

For this task, you get to create and use your own rubric using RubiStar-- a free online tool that helps you to make quality rubrics.

Access the site by going to the MOST site and looking under MOST Learning Community Resources

1. Click on the link: 4Teachers- links to cool stuff like RubiStar

2. Click on the RubiStar link. You’ll need to register in order to have access to the site. This will also allow you to save your work.

3. Once on the site, click on Create Rubric tab located at the top (right hand side)

4. Scroll through the different topics and subjects and find one that fits your subject matter needs/assignment that you want to grade your students on. If you don’t like what you see, you can also build a rubric from scratch—just scroll down to the bottom of the page and follow those directions.

5. Follow the directions on the page. Be sure to submit your work in case you run over the 40 minutes. (If you have the technology, this would be a great project to do with your class using a projector).

6. **Save a copy** to your files so you can post it to the MOST site by **March 30th** as well as print out a hard copy for you to use with your students. Scroll down to the bottom of the page of your finished rubric for these options and directions.

7. Use the rubric for a class or individual student/s assignment.

8. Bring a copy of the scored rubric/s and assignment (if it is a hard copy assignment) to discuss at our April meeting. We’ll be sharing how effective it was in assessing your students and the assignment they had.

Session 9 April 1st- May 4th
The Home Stretch

One of the goals of the MOST online component was to expose you to a variety of teaching strategies and techniques in a variety of subjects. Since we are winding things down with MOST (as well as running out of time!) this session you get to choose the subject you would like to learn more about in helping you to teach your students more effectively.
We’ll also be sending out a survey in the next week for you to complete. Once we have finalized the questions, we’ll send directions and a link to you all.

**Session 9 Task 1**

**Your Choice**

1. Using the MOST video library, choose a subject from the list below that you would like to learn more about.
   - Writing
   - Math
   - Science
   - Social Studies

2. Once you have picked a subject, click on the link depending on the area you have chosen:
   - Writing and Reading-- Inside Writing Communities, Grades 3-5
   - Math-- Teaching Math K-4 Video Library
   - Science --Teaching Science K-8 Video Library

3. Watch the video clip of your choice and create a single posting with answering the questions below and post it as: Session 9—the subject of the video you chose and its title
   - In one or two sentences, explain what the video clip was about.
   - What were three things you noticed in this clip that made his/her teaching effective?
   - What did you notice about the teacher’s classroom management?
   - Was there anything you would change to improve the lesson?
   - How did this teacher differentiate instruction for his/her students?
   - How were the students assessed?
   - Was there an “Aha Moment/Whoa Moment” for you when you watched this clip?
   - How can you use what you viewed with your current teaching situation?

4. Post your response by April 27th

5. On or before May 4th, review each member’s posting and make a connection with at least one other member.

**Session 9 Task 2**

**Interviews and Surveys**

Be sure to let Lisa know several dates and times that she can interview you by phone during the dates of April 1st - April 13th. The interviews will last between 45 minutes to an hour and can be conducted as late as 10 pm.

We'll be completing the surveys during our April meeting in Jacksonville.
Activity Report: Total Views
Activity Report: Location Access
## MOST Learning Community: All participants, Wednesday, 10 October 2007 (Server's local time)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>IP Address</th>
<th>Full name</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wed 10 Oct 2007, 10:01 PM</td>
<td>71.203.167.163</td>
<td>BENJAMIN STRADLEY</td>
<td>forum view discussion</td>
<td>Training For Learning Schedule Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed 10 Oct 2007, 10:11 PM</td>
<td>71.203.167.163</td>
<td>BENJAMIN STRADLEY</td>
<td>forum add post</td>
<td>Training For Learning Schedule Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed 10 Oct 2007, 10:08 PM</td>
<td>71.203.167.163</td>
<td>BENJAMIN STRADLEY</td>
<td>forum view discussion</td>
<td>Training For Learning Schedule Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed 10 Oct 2007, 10:07 PM</td>
<td>71.203.167.163</td>
<td>BENJAMIN STRADLEY</td>
<td>forum view forum</td>
<td>The Discussion Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed 10 Oct 2007, 10:07 PM</td>
<td>71.203.167.163</td>
<td>BENJAMIN STRADLEY</td>
<td>forum view discussion</td>
<td>The Discussion Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed 10 Oct 2007, 10:07 PM</td>
<td>71.203.167.163</td>
<td>BENJAMIN STRADLEY</td>
<td>forum view discussion</td>
<td>The Discussion Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed 10 Oct 2007, 10:07 PM</td>
<td>71.203.167.163</td>
<td>BENJAMIN STRADLEY</td>
<td>forum view discussion</td>
<td>The Discussion Board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Displaying 54 records
Activity Report:
MOST Website Usage—January 21-May 26, 2008
Total views and posts
Activity Report:
MOST Website Usage—February 18-July, 28, 2008
Activity Report:
MOST Website Usage—February 18-July, 28, 2008
Total teacher views and posts
Activity Report:
MOST Website Usage—February 18-July, 28, 2008
Total views and posts
REFERENCES


Berry, B. (2001). No shortcuts to preparing good teachers. Educational Leadership, 58(8), 32.


235


BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Lisa K. Langley was born in Key West, Florida in 1966. A fourth generation conch, she grew up in Key West and graduated from Key West High School in 1984. Upon graduating from Appalachian State University in 1987 with a BSBA in Hospitality Management, she worked in San Juan, Puerto Rico and Durham, NC as an executive floor manager. After receiving her Master’s in Education from the University of Florida in 1992, Lisa returned to Key West to teach as a fourth/fifth grade reading teacher and media specialist at Gerald Adams Elementary until 2002. During this time, she was awarded the Monroe County Sallie Mae Beginning Teacher of the Year Award, Gerald Adams’ Teacher of the Year Award, as well as numerous grants for school projects and initiatives.

A recipient of a Florida Leadership in Inquiry and Teacher Education (FLITE) Fellowship, she returned to the University of Florida in 2002 to pursue her Doctorate in Education. During her doctoral program, she was a research assistant for the Center on Personnel Studies in Special Education (COPSSE) and the National Center to Inform Policy and Practice in Special Education (NCIPP).

Lisa is currently the project specialist for the Lastinger Center for Learning. Her research interests include teacher professional development, alternatively certified teachers, e-mentoring, mentoring, and beginning teacher induction.

Lisa is married to Marty Goodkind. They have a three year old son, Jacob and reside in Gainesville, Florida.