

## Support Proposal

### “Ready, Set, Teach: Tools for Success”

#### New Teacher August Workshop

#### **Executive Summary:**

The Teacher Preparation Initiative (TPI) Support Working Group is proposing the addition of a New Teacher Workshop prior to the start of the 2013-2014 school year. Based on the feedback gathered from the 2012-2013 TPI New Teacher Workshops, the Support Working Group believes the implementation of an additional workshop before the start of the school year will serve to enhance the new teacher orientation to the districts and to the profession. In addition, this early workshop will be a springboard to supporting recent SCSU graduates involved in education who are not necessarily hired within the partner districts. SCSU, in partnership with P-12, is building a menu of opportunities for comprehensive induction and this workshop will be an additional offering to support our graduates and new teachers. For teachers’ classroom practices, most of the studies reviewed showed that “beginning teachers who participated in some kind of induction performed better at various aspects of teaching, such as keeping students on task, developing workable lesson plans, using effective student questioning practices, adjusting classroom activities to meet students’ interests, maintaining a positive classroom atmosphere, and demonstrating successful classroom management” (Ingersoll and Strong, 2011).

This workshop offers a different component to new teacher preparation from that which is already provided within the districts. “By definition, new teachers start off their careers with beginning knowledge and skills and a limited set of experiences” (Goldrick, Osta, & Maddock, 2010). This professional development opportunity will present information and allocate time for new teachers to be more prepared and confident in the beginning of their teaching career. The districts will still have time to address site-specific orientation information, and in most cases, will have more time to cover mandatory district information that may otherwise be condensed due to the

limited time they have with their new teachers at the beginning of the year. Because this workshop will take place in the first week of August, new teachers will not be adding hours to their orientation days and will have several weeks to process and prepare the information they receive at the workshop.

This workshop will increase new teachers' level of preparation, and enhance skill development, focusing on the goal of increasing professional confidence going into the start of school. Through large and small group work, new teachers will focus on classroom management, building relationships with students, professional communication, and breakout sessions geared toward their discipline. The breakout sessions will be facilitated by veteran teachers and SCSU faculty who have already shown interest in assuming roles in supporting the development of new teachers. Through professional networking at this meeting, new teachers will have time to discuss and plan the implementation of material and information received. They will walk away with resources to enhance their classrooms and teaching, and they will be a part of an online teaching support network comprised of new teachers, veteran teachers, and SCSU faculty. According to Ingersoll and Smith, some of the strongest factors positively impacting new teachers include having common planning time with other teachers in the same subject, having regularly scheduled collaboration with other teachers, and being part of an external network of teachers (Ingersoll & Smith, 2004). Not only will this workshop offer an ignition to the new teachers' school years, but it will provide a foundation for communication among partner districts, SCSU graduates, and SCSU faculty. This foundation will be imperative to ensure the sustainability of the support from SCSU to their teacher graduates.

## **Need:**

All of the partner districts have orientation days for new teachers. Those days address critical district procedures and typically focus on district and school policies. While those days are crucial to introducing a new teacher to a district, the proposed workshop will provide tools and strategies with which the new teachers will be able to successfully create a foundation for their first year in their new district. The new teachers will need substantial information to support their start in a new classroom with new students.

The TPI Support working group has already created and provided three new teacher workshops focused around specific needs at key points during the school year for new teachers in the partner districts. With the addition of this first workshop, new teachers will have an opportunity to meet other first year teachers in surrounding districts, professors who have expressed interest in participation from whom they can expect professional support, and other veteran teachers from P-12 with whom they can build a professional network. Participants will set up an online network which they will use throughout the year as a professional learning resource. Additionally, this workshop will set the precedent for what is to be expected in future new teacher workshops throughout the school year. Ultimately, the new teachers will keep returning to the workshops offered for new teachers throughout the year when they experience the value offered at the fall kick-off workshop.

This day will be in addition to or in place of districts' new teacher workshops and the day will take place prior to districts' workshops. The intent of this day is to support what districts and administration are already doing to enhance new teacher preparation and confidence prior to the start of the school year.

This workshop will also be offered to SCSU graduates who are hired outside of our partner districts and others still seeking employment in an effort to expand our support framework for those who come out of SCSU's teacher preparation programs.

## **Objectives:**

An invitation to the "Ready, Set, Teach: Tools for Success" workshop will be extended to recent SCSU grads from the field of education, and to new teachers in partner districts. In the future, we may be able to reach out to new teachers outside partner districts who are not graduates of SCSU. This

workshop will increase new teachers' level of preparation, and enhance skill development, focusing on the goal of increasing professional confidence going into the start of school.

New Teachers can expect:

- Time to discuss and create a plan for implementation of material and information received
- Resources for their classrooms and school year
- Network development (tech-based network creation)
- Interaction with SCSU faculty and veteran P-12 staff in addition to networking with new teachers and recent grads in the area

### **Methods:**

This will be a one day workshop on SCSU campus two weeks prior to districts' new teacher orientations. SCSU faculty and P-12 veteran teachers will be invited based on interest shown in supporting new teachers, and they will participate in various roles ranging from facilitation of small groups to large group presentations. While the Support Working Group has engaged small numbers of faculty in past workshops, this workshop will kick off a triad of the New Teacher, P-12 Veteran Teacher and SCSU Faculty Member working together. "No point in the continuum has more potential to bring the worlds of the school and the academy together into a true symbiotic partnership than the induction stage" (Howey and Zimpher, 1999). One of the goals of the Support Working Group is to build on these partnerships and extend them to New Teacher Workshops throughout the academic year.

This will be a day where new teachers will have a variety of foci to prepare them with skills and strategies for beginning their school year. Through large and small group work, the following content will be covered:

- Building relationships with students from day one
  - Connecting with students in the classroom
  - Learning students' specific interests and needs
  - Supporting students' activities and interests outside of the classroom

- Classroom management
  - Overall tools that will align with districts' plans/expectations
    - Positive reinforcement
    - Being direct when setting expectations
    - Logical/natural consequences
- Professional communication (students, parents, and colleagues)
  - Dealing with challenging issues (mental illnesses, unusual circumstances, challenging students, etc.)
  - NETiquette
  - Becoming part of the community in which you work
  - Formal meetings (Staff meetings, parent-teacher conferences, IEP meetings, etc.)
- Breakout sessions
  - Sessions could include the following:
    - Locating peer support
    - Due process
    - Content/age group specific work
    - Application of ideas discussed in large groups
    - Preparing for Open House night
    - Creating accommodations for 504s and IEPs

The Support working group, representative of each P-12 Partner District and SCSU, has been planning the New Teacher Workshops and will continue with the planning of this workshop. The working group continues to develop themes based on new teachers' needs, supported by data and continued feedback from attendees and organizers. See attached evaluation reports) In order to ensure a successful turnout, all partner districts will be invited to participate and asked to encourage and support their new teachers in attending this workshop and those that will follow as opportunity allows.

### **Evaluation:**

Feedback will be gathered on the day of the new teacher meeting. Methods may include formative surveys, written responses, and additional informal feedback gathering. Additional feedback will be gathered after the first month of school via an online survey that will be sent to each of the participants. The follow-up survey will ask participants to evaluate the utility and quality of the materials and information provided after they have had time to implement them in their classrooms.

The Support working group will receive the feedback and use it to prepare for future new teacher meetings. The working group will adjust the content offered in order to continually improve the programs provided. This information will also be reported to the SCSU Teacher Education Unit, partner districts, and all stakeholders involved.

### **Sustainability:**

- TPI funds will initially provide compensation for presenters and facilitators, and cover the cost of this workshop.
- This year, new teachers from non- partner districts who are not SCSU graduates will be assessed a small fee to help cover costs of the workshop.
- In following years, sustainability may be achieved by: a small charge to participants, shared resources between P-12 districts and SCSU, and district contributions for funding.

### **Timetable:**

This workshop should take place early in August. The planning should begin by the end of the SCSU spring semester in order to establish more concrete information for districts as well as to ensure facilities for the workshop. Districts need to know about this event early enough to speak about it with new hires in the spring and summer. SCSU graduates should be notified about the meeting prior to graduation in May.

### **Budget will need to consider:**

Possible Parking

Printing of Materials

Food

Presenters' Stipends

Possibility of New Teacher Stipends

## **References**

Ingersoll, R. M., & Strong, M. (2011). The Impact of Induction and Mentoring Programs for Beginning Teachers A Critical Review of the Research. *Review of Educational Research*, 81(2), 201-233.

Goldrick, L., Osta, D., & Maddock, A. (2010). Race to the Top: Phase Two, Teacher Induction and Teaching and Learning Conditions. Policy Brief, New Teacher Center.

Ingersoll, R. M., & Smith, T. M. (2004). Do teacher induction and mentoring matter? *NASSP bulletin*, 88(638), 28-40.

New Teacher Support Pays Off: A Return on Investment for Educators and Kids. (2007). Policy Brief, New Teacher Center.

## Appendix

### Snapshot of Evaluations of 2012-2013 New Teacher Workshops

School of Education

Dr. John Hoover

### Summary of Responses from our Partner District New Teachers

#### October 2012

#### Feedback on Classroom Management and Parent-Teacher Conferencing:

<i>Quality Ratings</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Percent High Quality<sup>1</sup></i>	<i>Percent Selected Highest Rating<sup>2</sup></i>
<b>Classroom Management Table Topics: Facilitator</b>	43	3.51	0.55	100.0	34
<b>Classroom Management Teacher Panel: Teachers on Panel</b>	44	3.43	0.50	100.0	20
<b>Resource: Parent-Teacher Conferencing and Communication: Ability to get resources on website and "Conferencing Tips Sheet"</b>	41	3.34	0.57	93.0	36
<b>Classroom Management Table Topics: Content Discussed</b>	43	3.33	0.64	90.7	39
<b>Classroom Management Table Topics: Networking</b>	43	3.33	0.61	97.7	18
<b>Classroom Management Teacher Panel: Content of Answers</b>	43	3.30	0.46	93.0	30
<b>Resource: "Classroom Management Tips Sheet"</b>	43	3.26	0.58	95.1	41

<i>Utility Ratings</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Percent High Utility<sup>1</sup></i>
Classroom Management Table Topics: Facilitator	43	3.33	0.61	86.0
Classroom Management Table Topics: Content Discussed	43	3.26	0.66	84.1
Resource: Parent-Teacher Conferencing and Communication: Ability to get resources on website and "Conferencing Tips Sheet"	41	3.20	0.71	83.7
Classroom Management Table Topics: Networking	43	3.19	0.70	88.4



Resource: "Classroom Management Tips Sheet"	43	3.09	0.61	93.0
Classroom Management Teacher Panel: Teachers on Panel	43	3.02	0.71	86.0
Classroom Management Teacher Panel: Content of Answers	44	3.00	0.65	87.8

As can be seen from Table 1, all NTW3 sessions or strands were rated well above three on a four-point scale. The proportion rating the presenters or panelists as demonstrating high quality ran from 100% (classroom management facilitator; classroom management panelists) to 93% (parent teacher conferencing website & behavior management—content of answers). It would be very difficult to improve the quality of presentations, given the ceiling effect seen in the ratings.

### Feedback on networking and taking away resources:

<i>Goals</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Percent "Goals Met"<sup>1</sup></i>	<i>Percent Selected Highest Rating<sup>2</sup></i>
The opportunity to informally network (speak with colleagues about personal concerns and professional issues/ meet new people/ pick up existing friendships)	45	3.33	0.60	93.3	40.0
Opportunities to carry ideas and practices back to one's professional life	45	3.31	0.51	93.3	33.3
The motivation to discuss the topics under consideration both formally and informally.	45	3.24	0.57	97.8	31.1
The opportunity to take useful resources away from the conference.	45	3.11	0.61	91.1	22.2

In terms of the a priori goals set by NTW3 developers, all can be considered met with means running from a high of 3.3 to a low (relatively speaking) of 3.1. As can be seen in Table 3, over 90% of candidates agreed that all goals had been met. To add some interpretable variability to the ratings, we also provided the proportion that's elected the highest possible response (i.e., "4"). It appears that the "4" ratings could be utilized to generate improvements for the next NTW. Perhaps a goal could be set to increase the proportion of new teachers that select the highest possible rating.

**December 2012**

**Feedback on Break-Out Session Responses**

Table 5. Respondent ratings of the utility of presentations (first session): Reverse order by mean (12/11/12).

<b>First Session <u>Utility</u> Ratings</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Percent High Quality<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Percent Selected Highest Rating<sup>2</sup></b>
Differentiation: Please rate content/discussion	19	3.52	0.51	100	52.6
Managing Caseloads: Please rate content/discussion	10	3.40	0.70	90	50.0
Integrating math and reading into content areas: Please rate content/discussions	5	3.00	0.71	80	20.0
Mean utility ratings	---	3.3	----	90.0	40.9

Table 6. Respondent ratings of the quality of session II presentations: Reverse order by mean (12/11/12).

<b>Second session <u>Quality</u> Ratings</b> (teachers only rated breakouts they attended)	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Percent High Quality<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Percent Selected Highest Rating<sup>2</sup></b>
Working with Students At-risk/diverse learners: Presenters/facilitators	9	4.00	0.00	100	100
Special education and due process: Presenters/facilitators	5	4.00	0.00	100	100
Working with students at-risk/diverse learners: Content of session <sup>1</sup>	10	3.80	0.42	100	80.0

Table 7. Respondent ratings of the utility of session II presentations: Reverse order by mean (12/11/12).

<b><i>Breakout Utility Ratings</i></b> (teachers only rated breakouts they attended)	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b><i>Percent High Quality<sup>1</sup></i></b>	<b><i>Percent Selected Highest Rating<sup>2</sup></i></b>
Special education and due process: Content of session	7	3.57	0.79	85.7	71.4
Working with students at-risk/diverse learners: Content of session	9	3.56	0.73	88.9	66.7

Table 8. Respondent ratings of [quality of] the networking program elements presentations: Reverse order by mean (12/11/12).

<b><i>Networking Quality</i></b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b><i>Percent High Quality<sup>1</sup></i></b>	<b><i>Percent Selected Highest Rating<sup>2</sup></i></b>
Facilitator of session	35	3.80	0.53	94.2	85.7
Networking session <sup>1</sup>	37	3.68	0.58	94.6	72.9
	---	3.7	----	94.4	79.3

Table 9. Respondent ratings of the [utility of] networking program elements presentations: Reverse order by mean (12/11/12).

<i>Networking Utility</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Percent High Quality<sup>1</sup></i>	<i>Percent Selected Highest Rating<sup>2</sup></i>
Networking session	27	3.56	0.70	88.9	66.7

Table 10. Participant ratings of the degree to which goals for sessions were met: Reverse order by mean (12/11/12).

<i>Goals Met</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Percent “Goals Met”<sup>1</sup></i>	<i>Percent Selected Highest Rating</i>
The workshop successfully and effectively provided...					
The opportunity to informally network (speaks with colleagues about personal concerns and professional issues/ meet new people/ pick up existing friendships).	39	3.56	0.68	94.9	64.1
The opportunity to take useful resources away from the day.	39	3.51	0.56	97.4	53.8
Opportunities to carry ideas and practices back to one’s professional life.	39	3.46	0.55	97.4	48.7
The motivation to discuss the topics under consideration both formally and informally	39	3.36	0.71	92.3	46.1
Mean “goals met” values	39	3.5	0.6	95.5	53.2

Table 12. Topics, issues, and suggestions resulting from candidate feedback (reverse order by frequency).

Theme Name	Explanation	Sample Response	N	Percent Code-able Responses
Interaction(s) vital	Participants either praised the opportunities provided to interact <i>informally</i> , suggested that more such opportunities be provided, or voiced both sentiments. The chance to exchange ideas is an essential component of professional development (frequent verbs = talk, share, interact, discuss)	Nice to have time to talk with other teachers in my area about content & struggles/classroom management	13	37.1
Utilitarian “Take-Aways”	Respondents tended to notice and comment when an idea, web site, or material was particularly useful and noted that they could take this idea or material back to their setting	Lots of good suggestions to bring back to class – would have liked even more	6	17.1
Classroom Management	Several new teachers commented on the need for more classroom management activities	Classroom management has become such a huge part of my daily teaching & don’t always have time to focus on some of these things	4	11.4
TOTAL			35	100.0

## February 2013

**Breakout sessions.** The next section of the results section deals with the breakout sessions. Each participant attended one breakout session and provided ratings of the facilitators and the content of the session. Note that we included no utility rating for facilitators. Some sessions included on the data sheet showed no participation—or, at least, no ratings; we did not include these topics in the ratings.

Table 6. Self-reported ratings of the quality of breakout session facilitators, February 19, 2013, New Teacher Workshop (descending order by mean value).

<i>Facilitators Quality Ratings</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Percent High Quality<sup>1</sup></i>	<i>Percent Selected Highest Rating<sup>2</sup></i>
Middle School	5	4.00	0	100	100
English Learner	2	4.00	0	100	100
Chinese immersion	6	4.00	0	100	100
Specialist Facilitator	5	3.80	0.45	100	80
Special Education	4	3.75	0.50	100	75
High School	5	3.60	0.55	100	60
Elementary	8	3.13	0.64	87.5	25
Average quality rating	---	3.75	---	98.2	77.1

Table 7. Self-reported ratings of the quality of [the content of] breakout sessions, February 19, 2013, New Teacher Workshop (descending order by mean value).

<i>Content of Session Quality Ratings</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Percent High Quality<sup>1</sup></i>	<i>Percent Selected Highest Rating<sup>2</sup></i>
Middle School	5	4.00	0	100	100
English Learner	2	4.00	0	100	100
Chinese immersion	6	3.83	0.41	100	83
Specialist Facilitator	5	3.80	0.45	100	80
Special Education	4	3.75	0.50	100	75
High School	5	3.00	1.22	80	40
Elementary	8	2.63	0.52	62.5	0
Average quality rating	---	3.57	---	91.8	68.3

Table 8. Self-reported ratings of the utility of breakout sessions, February 19, 2013, New Teacher Workshop (descending order by mean value).

<i>Content of Session Utility Ratings</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Percent High Quality<sup>1</sup></i>	<i>Percent Selected Highest Rating<sup>2</sup></i>
Middle School	5	4.00	0	100	100
English Learner	2	4.00	0	100	100
Special Education	4	3.50	0.58	100	50
Specialist Facilitator	4	3.50	1.00	75	75
Chinese immersion	6	3.50	0.84	83.3	66.7
High School	5	3.00	1.00	60	40
Elementary	5	2.60	0.55	60	0

Average quality rating	---	3.44	---	82.6	61.7
------------------------	-----	------	-----	------	------

Table 9. Self-reported ratings of “goals met” for breakout sessions, February 19, 2013, New Teacher Workshop (descending order by mean value).

<i>Goals</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Percent “Goals Met”<sup>1</sup></i>	<i>Percent Selected Highest Rating<sup>2</sup></i>
The workshop successfully and effectively provided...					
The opportunity to informally network (speak with colleagues about personal concerns and professional issues/ meet new people/ pick up existing friendships).	33	3.64	0.55	100	66.7
Opportunities to carry ideas and practices back to one’s professional life.	33	3.48	0.57	100	51.5
The opportunity to take useful resources away from the day.	33	3.48	0.57	100	51.5
The motivation to discuss the topics under consideration both formally and informally	32	3.44	0.50	100	43.8
Mean “goals met” values	---	3.51	---	100	53.4

As can be seen from Table 1, all NTW3 sessions or strands were rated well above three on a four-point scale. The proportion rating the presenters or panelists as demonstrating high quality ran from 100% (classroom management facilitator; classroom management panelists) to 93% (parent teacher conferencing website & behavior management—content of answers). It would be very difficult to improve the quality of presentations, given the ceiling effect seen in the ratings.

