

2009 WISCONSIN RESEARCH SEMINAR ON IMPROVING EDUCATOR QUALITY:
IMPROVING PRACTICE AND EXPANDING COLLABORATION
IN CHALLENGING TIMES

June 29-30, 2009

Examination of Induction Support for Permit Teachers, Initial Educators, Initial Administrators
and Mentors in Milwaukee Public Schools.

Melanie Agnew, CESA 2
Melissa Bonds, MPS

Table of Contents

Abstract/3

Introduction/4

Methodology/5-6

Data Collection/6-8

Data Analysis

 Permit Teachers/9-10

 Initial Educators/10-11

 Initial Administrators/11-13

 School-based Mentors/13-15

 Administrator Mentors/15-16

Summary Recommendations/16

Conclusion/16-17

References/18

Abstract

Three Title I Department of Public Instruction teacher induction grants have been implemented in the Milwaukee Public School District for the third consecutive year and include: 1) Teacher Quality (\$265,000), 2) Peer Review & Mentoring (\$25,000) and 3) the Mentoring Funds for Initial Educators. This evaluation has two purposes: 1) to provide policymakers with findings relative to specific challenges faced by educator mentees and the types of mentor support provided and 2) build on successes in programming for induction and mentoring in MPS.

This evaluation consists of interviews with 17 permit teachers, initial educators, initial administrators and their mentors. Although specific recommendations are provided for each subgroup involved in this study, key recommendations center on providing training for assessment and observation tools, differentiating monthly seminars, clear performance expectations for new administrators and, finally, develop systems of accountability to ensure every initial educator receives mentor and induction support. In light of findings and subsequent recommendations, an examination of how school culture institutionalizes mentoring and induction is questioned.

Introduction

Policy frameworks often emerge from the assumption that teacher induction programs have a positive influence on teacher quality and student learning (Strong, 2009) and identify teacher development as key to student success (Moir & Bloom, 2003). Yet the current state of teacher turnover is dangerously high yielding stiff economic and human resource costs to systems of education (Brill, 2008). This rate of teacher turnover continues to jeopardize the potential of our youth and the well being of our schools, and, indeed, our society.

The teacher induction movement in the 80s recognized the importance of teacher induction in the professional development of the teacher (Huling-Austin, 1987). Moreover, the factors influencing teacher attrition identified during this time period are still being addressed today—teacher assignment, retention, working conditions, teacher isolation, status of the teaching profession and the idea that beginning teachers can be influenced by their building administrators (Brill, 2008; Moir & Bloom, 2003; Strong 2008, 2009). Because both the Wisconsin Teacher Induction and Santa Cruz New Teacher Center Model outline program elements that specifically address these challenges, current teacher induction efforts implemented in MPS and supported by Title I funds, therefore, are framed in these two teacher induction models outlined in the Table 1 below.

Table 1 Santa Cruz New Teacher Center and WI Induction Teacher Induction Models

	Personal Support for IEs	District Goals/Individual Learning	Informing Practice	Continued Professional Development
Santa Cruz New Teacher Center	Trained Qualified Mentor (holds appropriate license)	Ongoing Orientation Support Seminars	PDP (situated in tiered licensing)	Support seminars reflecting districts' missions/goals
<i>And</i>	PDP team	State and district policies support	Self-assessment and reflection	
Wisconsin Induction Model	Online access to PDP & resources	school initiatives	Mentor input into formative assessment	

Mentor and induction support for new educators in Milwaukee Public Schools has undoubtedly proved invaluable to new educators across the MPS district. Numerous mentors of new teachers and administrators received mentor training and demonstrated enthusiasm for helping new educators move from protégé to professional.

In lieu of past successes with induction efforts in MPS, evaluations funded by the Department of Public Instruction (DPI), Teacher Education, Professional Development and Licensing (TEPDL) of induction support over the last three year period (Agnew, 2006-2009, unpublished) and a MPS site observation report (Berge, 2009, DPI TEPDL, unpublished) highlight the need to examine the implementation of mentoring and induction efforts. Teacher and administrator mentors who do receive training provided much needed support to initial educators and administrators. Many mentors, however, still do not receive training and countless initial educators are not aware they have a mentor. New educators who do not receive this critical support are in jeopardy of leaving the classroom, the district, and indeed, the field of education. There are 231 schools in the MPS District and countless people involved in the process of institutionalizing induction, all of whom have different but complementary responsibilities: teaching, mentoring, training, assessment, and administration, to name several. This organizational complexity adds to the enormity of the task.

Methodology

Focus groups, interviews, thematic analysis of seminar feedback sheets and observation logs are the primary sources of data. Where appropriate, this study also draws on the 2008-2009 DPI Initial Educator surveys as well as the MPS site observation report (Berge, 2009, DPI, TEPDL). Focus groups are seen as valuable tools for exploring how points of view are constructed as well as how they are expressed (Krueger, 1994). One obvious advantage is that the group synergy fosters more creativity and therefore provides for a greater range of thought, ideas, and experiences (Vaughn, Schumm, & Sinagub, 1996). The use of surveys and focus groups together are part of an expanding use of mixed methods in research. Focus groups can be used to come up with hypotheses that can be tested more extensively with surveys (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003).

Individual interviews and focus groups were conducted with permit teachers, initial administrators and their mentors as the primary path to explore their experiences in specific educator induction programs. “The purpose of the qualitative research interview treated here is to obtain descriptions of the lived world of the interviewees with respect to interpretations of the meaning of the described phenomena” (Kvale, 1996, p. 30) and, as such, all individual interviews were open-ended and semi-structured. In this way, it presented a sequence of themes

to be covered but also allowed for “openness to changes of sequence and forms of questions in order to follow up the answers given and the stories told by the subjects” (Kvale, 1996, p. 124).

Data was analyzed to identify specific challenges faced by mentees (permit teachers, initial educators and initial administrators) in MPS classrooms and the ways in which mentors (of initial educators and initial administrator) provided support to help mentees meet these challenges.

The analysis focused on the following questions:

Mentees

1. What are the specific challenges faced by permit teachers, initial educators and initial administrators in their daily practice?
2. What support did mentors provide mentees to help meet these challenges?
3. How can support for permit teachers, initial educators and initial administrators be improved?

Mentors

1. What was the most valuable training provided to mentors of permit teachers, initial educators and initial administrators?
2. How can the mentor training programs be improved?

Data Collection

A total of 17 participants were interviewed (individual and focus groups) in this study including 9 mentees (2 permit teachers, 2 initial educators and 5 initial administrators) and 8 mentors (5 school-based mentors and 3 administrator mentors) with representation across all school levels (K5, K8, High School). The interviews and focus groups took place primarily at MPS district office and were tape recorded with permission from each participant. Other sources of data included a thematic analysis of permit teacher/mentor observation and feedback logs, monthly seminar feedback sheets from initial educators and feedback sheets from school-based mentors. Data is representative of three DPI mentor and induction grants: Teacher Quality, Mentoring Funds for Initial Educators and the Peer Review and Mentoring.

1. Teacher Quality Grant (\$265,000) Table #2

The Teacher Quality grant provided mentor training services for mentors of permit teachers and ongoing orientation, monthly seminars and mentoring for permit teachers. Although

the meeting schedules depended on the individual schedules of participants, permit teachers in this study met weekly with their mentors and received mentoring, ongoing orientation and a standing invitation to attend monthly seminars (optional). Weekly meetings were tailored to meet the individual needs of the permit teachers. Two permit teachers and two mentors of permit teachers were interviewed for this report as well as interviews with 2 initial educators.

The Teacher Quality grant also provided mentor training services for administrators and ongoing orientation, monthly seminars (hot topics) and mentoring for initial administrators. The mentors attended staff development on district initiatives, mentor training on WI Administrator Standards and PI-34 PDP Reviewer Training. Efforts to set up focus groups resulted in a focus group of 2 administrators and an interview with one administrator and a focus group of 4 initial administrators and an interview with one initial administrator.

Initial administrators were provided ongoing orientation and training aligned to their individual needs, monthly seminars on “hot topics” and PDP seminars. Nine initial administrators and eight mentors participated in this grant. From these participants who received support from the Teacher Quality grant, five initial administrators were interviewed (4 in a focus group and 1 individual interview).

Table #2 Teacher Quality Grant

Target Group	Participants	Data Collection
Teachers & Mentors	Teachers	Interviews with 2 permit teachers via school visit Interviews with 2 initial educators Thematic analysis of collaborative mentor logs and monthly orientation feedback forms
	Teacher Mentors	Interviews with 2 mentors of permit teachers Focus group of school-based mentors (3) Thematic analysis of collaborative mentor logs
Initial Administrators & Mentors	Initial Administrators	Interview with 1 initial administrator 1 focus group with initial administrators (4)
	Administrator Mentors	Interview with 1 mentor 1 focus group (2)

2. Mentoring Funds for Initial Educators Table #3

The \$375 Mentoring Funds for Initial Educators (MFIE) provided support through on-

going orientation and monthly seminars by trained, licensed school-based mentors. The aim of this grant was to provide support services for 243 first year initial educators district-wide. Program participants included first and second year initial educators inclusive of teachers, administrators, and pupil services staff. Two initial educators and 6 school-based mentors were interviewed.

Table #3 Mentoring Funds for Initial Educators

Focus	Participant	Data Collection
Skills / knowledge	Initial educators	2 interviews DPI Initial Educator Survey Monthly Seminar Feedback Forms
Mentor Training	Mentors	2 focus groups with 3 participants each Monthly Seminar Feedback Forms

3. Peer Review & Mentoring Funds (\$25,000)

The Peer Review & Mentoring Grant offered mentor training to teachers in support of initial educators. The service providers included Wisconsin Education Association Professional Development Academy (WEA-PDA) and MPS, both of whom provided workshops designed for school-based mentors as identified in MPS application forms for this grant. A total of 7 training sessions covering a 2-part mentoring program were offered between January, 2009 and May, 2009 with a total of 131 participants. (See table #3 above for mentor participants).

Data Analysis

A constant in the professional practice of initial educators, permit teachers and initial administrators in this study is working through periods of crisis. Each group of mentees expressed a continued reliance on their mentors to provide social and moral support as they are “talked off the ledge” (initial educator interview¹) during these particularly challenging situations. Each mentee/mentor group relied substantially on the emotional support of their mentors. Each group of mentees, however, expressed specific challenges, needs and successes relative to their particular situations. The specifics of each mentee group—permit teachers, initial

¹ Both initial educator interviews did not realize they had a school-based mentor and, subsequently, reference the district mentors when responding to questions and prompts.

educators, initial administrators, school-based mentors and administrator mentors— are described below.

Permit Teachers

The Teacher Quality Grant supported 2 mentors and 17 mentees with a ratio of 1 to 3 and 1 to 14 respectively. Mentors of permit teachers indicated that their mentees struggled with time management, organizational skills, writing IEPs, lesson planning and assessment of learning. Permit teachers are simultaneously working full time and attending a teacher training program and this demanding schedule is oftentimes overwhelming. Permit teachers, it seems, are receiving their “preservice” training while on-the-job.

The IEP presented itself as the biggest challenge. It was reported that at least one institution of higher education has a different IEP format, and therefore different expectations, of the IEP than does MPS. Different formats for the IEP caused confusion and frustration as permit teachers were required to write it one way for their educational requirement and a different way for the school in which they were employed. These additional and perhaps unnecessary requirements reportedly caused confusion for the permit teachers.

Mentors provided differentiated support for the permit teacher depending on their specific needs. As noted in the summary of observation logs (next paragraph), some permit teachers need a high level of support. For those permit teachers requiring high levels of support, mentors meet with them as frequently as their schedules permitted to offer support in writing IEPs, to seek out and provide resources, to identify strategies for classroom management and to offer words of encouragement and emotional support.

Summary of Observation Logs

Mentors of permit teachers were required to log each of their meetings with their permit teachers using the observation and feedback logs. In one such instance, a mentor reported that a permit teacher began this year with a class of 57 special education students. At the persistence of his mentor, the permit teacher reportedly received two additional permit staff and a MRP (most restrictive placement) specialist to help and soon after was reportedly “doing fine”. Yet another permit teacher required much help, experiencing difficulty with classroom management and IEPs, had high absenteeism and, subsequently, will be “excessed” at the end of the semester. One observation by a mentor was noted as follows:

Classroom environment. Lack order. Students are listening to their iPods, texting with cell phones, side conversations, six students are trying to listen; paper on the floor, several students are drinking various beverages. Reflection/acknowledges that classroom management is a big concern; very little teaching taking place.

Permit teachers do, however, experience success in their classrooms. As noted by one mentor, her mentee has "...excellent conceptual knowledge in the Language Arts. Her instruction is appropriate to student stages of development...makes special accommodations and different approaches while teaching the content" (interview). Permit teachers enter the classroom with varying degrees of classroom experience and expertise and, as such, are provided with differentiated levels of support. Initial educators enter the profession with formal training that helps to acclimate them to their new role as classroom teacher. Permit teachers, on the other hand, enter the profession and receive preservice training while on-the-job which makes it critical this population receive support and training specific to their needs as on-the-job learners.

Although there were some helpful comments made by the mentors of permit teachers as noted above, most entries were not detailed enough to provide information of value that might describe specific challenges and support needed by the permit teacher.

Recommendations

- Work with institutions of higher education to standardize the IEP.
- Differentiate monthly support seminars for permit teachers and initial educators as the needs of permit teachers and initial educators are different relative to preservice training.
- Provide training for mentors in how to record observations on the observation and assessment log so this instrument can be used as a valuable formative assessment tool.

Initial Educators

During the 2008-2009 school year, there were approximately 243 initial educators and 114 school-based mentors. Interviews with two initial educators were conducted. One interview took place at the teacher's school and the other interview took place at MPS district office. Neither of the initial educators knew they had a school-based mentor and, as such, responses to interview questions reflect their experiences with their district mentors. The DPI Licensing and Induction Report (Berge, 2009) and the 2006-07 and 2007-08 Teacher Quality reports (formerly the Quality Educator Professional Development and Retention Grants) had similar findings in that initial educators hired during the school year were not assigned a school-based mentor. The

DPI Licensing and Induction Report (Berge, 2009) indicated that out of the six schools visited, five did not have the position of building mentor identified and subsequently support at the school level fell solely on the district mentors.

For the initial educators in this study, the district mentors provided social and emotional support and the identification and access of much needed resources. The DPI Year 1 Initial Educator Survey showed that 98%, or 56 of 57, respondents indicated they received encouragement and moral support from their mentors. The district mentors also provided support in understanding their respective school's educational plan, helped to locate PDP resources on school's website and provided support in critical reflection of initial educators' goal(s). The initial educators who participated in Title 1 induction support activities in this study identified their greatest challenges to be writing the PDP, abilities and knowledge of instructional strategies and classroom management.

Monthly seminars provided initial educators and permit teachers an opportunity for training and support on specific topics throughout the school year. Topics included communication with parents, classroom management and student engagement, innovative instructional strategies and assessment, differentiating instruction, culturally responsive teaching, student learning outcomes and instructional technology. Generally, most participants of these seminars reported² that the topics were very important and provided relevant and useful information.

Recommendation

- Develop a system of accountability to ensure school-based mentors are identified and initial educators contacted. Make implementation a priority.

Initial Administrators

“Baptism by fire” was the words used by one initial administrator in describing how she became acclimated to her role as a new building administrator. Initial administrators indicated their greatest challenges were anticipating the rhythm of the school year, independently trying to “figure out the right thing to do” and a lack of support system to help them manage themselves and their work. To help identify the natural rhythms of the year, one administrator indicated she would have liked a generic handbook that would “tell us the right way to do this job rather than

² Information gleaned from thematic analysis of monthly seminar feedback sheets.

us trying to figure it out” (initial administrator). Participants indicated it would have been helpful for new administrators to have a “trusted buddy” to test ideas and provide feedback on decision-making.

Managing self, lack of support in program implementation and facilitating difficult conversations (high emotion or conflict heavy) were also areas in which administrators experienced some degree of challenge and in these areas, mentors proved invaluable. An area of particular concern is the expectations and lack of support for administrators in programming. This situation can be especially difficult for administrators who are not supported in this area, fall short of the expectation of programming efforts and are then subsequently blamed for a not meeting the goals of the programs.

It was also reported that some mentoring was not only irrelevant to the administrator’s role, but time spent in “mentoring” was time away from work needing attention. In some instances, gross discrepancies in mentor services provided were reported and the effectiveness of mentorship questioned. This raised the importance of mentor selection, mentor training, role expectations, and, in particular, tracking program progress to ensure mentees are receiving intended services.

Conversely, organizational development and change is one area in which most mentors provided strong, effective support for the new administrators in this study. Administrators used various approaches to organizational development and change relative to their particular school’s needs. Examples include: 1) built leadership team targeting school culture and generated buy-in for standards-based instructional programming; 2) learn to effectively use data to drive instruction; 3) generated teams as mechanisms to support curriculum leaders in viewing the continuum of student learning and 4) aligned PDP goals to schools’ education plan and district initiatives with the idea that this alignment would ensure rationale and purpose are clearly communicated to school membership. Administrators praised their mentors for their expertise in helping them manage organizational development and change.

Pupil services administrators do not currently have monthly seminars nor are they invited to attend principal administrator seminars (hot topics). It was suggested that pupil services administrators attend the hot topic seminars designed for the initial principal administrators as participation by both groups would be of benefit to the other. First, some of the seminar topics

for principal administrators would also be relevant for pupil services administrators, like personnel or school budget, for example. Second, the seminars, if attended by both principal and pupil services administrators, would act as a mechanism to gain a shared understanding of their respective roles and expectations.

One pupil services administrator recommended that new administrators in pupil services be aligned with a mentor from pupil services. Currently, this alignment does not exist.

Recommendations

- Identify the “rhythms of the year” so administrators can be proactive (rather than reactive) in their daily practice (via generic administrator handbook, for example).
- Include pupil services administrators to monthly seminars designed for principal administrators or offer differentiated monthly seminar topics for them.
- Develop system of accountability to ensure administrator mentees are receiving intended support.

School-based Mentors

School-based mentors indicated the most valuable training received was learning more about the PDP process and in understanding the mentor role and expectations. Some school-based mentors indicated they did not understand the PDP process until they participated in the April training session and had little understandings of what was expected of them in this new role. It was reported that the mentor training provided mentors with the tools they needed to mentor knowledgeable on the PDP process, but that mentor training be offered after school hours in addition to during the school day as well as earlier in the school year. Mentors reported that the communication of the mentor training and initial educator monthly seminars was noticeably improved this year. Areas in which mentors wanted continued support was PDP training, facilitating critical conversations, classroom management and instructional strategies. Additionally, mentors reported that an overlap of mentors continues to be an issue. Within this school district, it is possible for mentees to be assigned to one or more mentors which may include a district mentor, school-based mentor, higher education mentor and, to add confusion, field supervisors can sometimes mistaken for mentors.

The focus of the mentor training sessions³ was framed specifically on the who, why, what, how and when of mentoring:

- The *Who* of mentor training described the various types of mentees (permit teacher, initial educator, intern teachers), the different types of mentors (school-based and city-wide mentors) and their respective roles. Further discussion focused on the type of support that initial educators need specifically during their first years: personal and emotional, support on specific tasks or problems and development of critical self reflection on teaching skills.
- The *Why* of mentoring focused on the correlation between well designed mentoring programs and increased retention rates, increased efficacy, and improved attitudes and improved instructional skills.
- The *What* of mentoring focused specifically on PI-34 with the PDP, Wisconsin Teaching Standards and Characteristics of a High Performing Urban Classroom.
- The *How* focused on the characteristics of the mentoring relationship, mentoring strategies, communication skills, individual reflection, facilitating reflection and reflective writing/feedback.
- The *When* of mentoring focused on documenting activities and planning.

The feedback sheets from the mentor training sessions were examined to identify key learning. All but a couple of the respondents indicated that the training was very important, that the presenter assisted participants with improving practice and that they are very likely to return to another training session. A thematic analysis of the mentor training feedback sheets indicated that the participants learned most in the area of roles, tools and strategies and also identified needed resources for induction.

Mentors expressed an elation of finally understanding the mentor role supporting the notion that mentor training be offered earlier in the school year. Participants also indicated they gained a deeper understanding of the Portfolio Development Plan (PDP), learned new strategies to gain more information about their schools induction plan and gained clarification on the role and expectations of the mentor. Mentors indicated additional resources would be helpful in

³ Thematic analysis of mentor training feedback sheets was conducted.

facilitating induction plans in their school. Some resources included reading materials (book on urban education, mentoring, induction, and the PDP process) and time for planning meetings, identifying initial educators in the building, recording meetings, creating their own assistive devices (e.g. cheat sheet), and collaborating with city-wide mentors.

It is evident that mentors who do receive training gain valuable knowledge that is likely to increase their effectiveness in, and commitment to, mentoring. However, it is not clear from this report how many school-based mentors have not been identified or have been identified but have not attended the mentor training sessions across the district.

Recommendations

- Develop system of accountability for identifying school-based mentors. Make implementation a priority.
- Offer mentor training sessions earlier in the year and afterschool to maximize attendance.

Administrator Mentors

The Teacher Quality grant supported 8 administrator mentors, three of which were also administrator mentors in the New Leaders Program⁴. The training for these three New Leader administrators specifically focused on student achievement using the framework outlined in *Blended Coaching* (lead author, Gary Bloom). The training for the remaining 5 mentors, along with the 3 New Leader mentors, consisted of attending monthly “hot topic” seminars, conducting learning walks and attending a monthly principle’s institute. Administrator mentors also attended the PDP training sponsored by the DPI. The 8 administrator mentors networked together to share strategies and resources and provided mentees with technical assistance in addressing real-time issues naturally arising from the rhythms of the year.

The monthly “hot topic” seminars specifically addressed immediate issues focusing on “what’s new and due” for the initial administrators. The initial administrators and their mentors completed a learning walk exercise following each hot topic seminar noting observations related to student engagement. The mentors and their mentees also attended the monthly principal’s institute with a focus on effective instruction and observation and feedback.

The administrator mentors identified 2 significant challenges of initial administrators in

⁴ New Leaders for New Schools provides a pathway for current and former educators to become outstanding principals of urban public schools.

their first year as a building administrator. First, mentors indicated that mentees have difficulty finding time to meet with their mentors. They indicated the best time to meet was the lunch hour and after school and, on one some occasions, before the school day began. Second, the mentors indicated that the district expectations for 1st and 2nd year initial administrators are vague. There is confusion on the part of the initial administrator as to what might constitute evidence for their performance. The administrator performance rubric is reported to be loosely written resulting in ambiguous performance indicators. The mentors in this study did not feel they were able to assist the initial administrator in meeting standards of evaluation as the supervisor and mentor often had different performance expectations for the initial administrator. Thus, the end-of-year performance evaluation is a major concern for initial administrators in this study.

Mentors provided support to initial administrators in 4 distinct areas: 1) emotional and moral support, 2) the PDP process, 3) technical assistance (staffing, budgets, schedules, reports, relationships, and communication) and 4) context or school-specific issues.

Recommendations

- Provide clear expectations for initial administrators early in the year so role and job functions are clear and to allow for better assessment of performance.

Summary of Recommendations

The 10 recommendations specific to each sub-group can be grouped into 4 main recommendations as follows:

1. Provide training/instruction on the use of planning and assessment tools like the IEP for permit teachers and the observation logs for mentors.
2. Differentiate monthly support seminars for permit teachers and pupil services administrators and schedule seminars so they better accommodate the schedules of potential attendees.
3. Provide initial administrators with clear description of the major job functions in a fiscal timeline.
4. Develop systems of accountability to ensure every MPS initial educator receives mentor and induction support.

Conclusion

The mentor and induction efforts in MPS over the last few years have yielded some positive results. It is clear that those mentors and new educators who receive mentor training and other forms of induction support are committed, passionate and eager to be a part of a dynamic educational system. Teacher and administrator mentors who do receive training are providing much needed support to initial educators and administrators. New teachers and administrators who are mentored are more likely to be retained adding continuity and expertise to the district thereby systematically improving student learning. Teachers and administrators, however, who do not receive this critical support, are in greater jeopardy of leaving the classroom, the district, and indeed, the field of education. It is therefore recommended that future studies examine how school culture institutionalizes mentoring and induction as a way of ensuring every new educator receives induction support. An examination of the end-to-end implementation of induction in several key schools will specifically identify areas of implementation in which induction efforts have derailed. Identifying specific points of derailment will inform new implementation plans and increase the likelihood that every initial educator receives mentor and induction support. Successful results can generate greater involvement thereby increasing the demand for strong mentor and induction support system-wide.

REFERENCES

- Brill, S., (2008). Stopping the Revolving Door: Increasing Teacher Retention. *Politics & Policy*. *Politics & Policy*, 36(5).
- Creswell, J. (2003). *Research Design: Qualitative Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Huling-Austin, L. (1987). Teacher Induction. In Douglas M. Brooks (ed) *Teacher in Induction: A New Beginning* (pp. 3-23). Association of Teacher Educators. Reston, Virginia.
- Krueger, R. (1994). *Focus Groups: A Practical Guide for Applied Research*. (2nd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE
- Kvale, S. (1996). *Interviews: An Introduction to Qualitative Research Interviewing*. Thousands Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Moir, E. & Bloom, G. (2003). Fostering Leadership Through Mentoring. *Educational Leadership*, May, (58-60)
- Patton, M. (2002). *Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods*. (3rd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE
- Strong, M. (2005). Mentoring New Teachers to Increase Retention: A Look at the Research. *New Teacher Center at the University of California, Santa Cruz*. December
- Tashakkori & Teddlie (1998). *Mixed Methodology: Combining Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*, Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE
- Vaughn, S., Schumm, J. S., & Sinagub, J. (1996). *Focus group interviews in education and psychology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.