

**The Implications of Virginia Licensure Regulations on Teacher Retention in
Lighthouse City Public Schools**

Allison Bennett Foster

Dissertation submitted to the faculty of the
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
In
Educational Leadership and Policy Studies

Travis W. Twiford, Chair
Jerome A. Niles
Richard Salmon
James Roberts
Neil A. Stamm

May 4, 2007
Virginia Beach, Virginia

Key Words: Teacher Retention, Teacher Attrition, Licensure, Teacher Supply and
Demand, Virginia Requirements for Teacher License

Copyright, May, 2007, Allison Bennett Foster
All Rights Reserved

The Implications of Virginia Licensure Regulations on Teacher Retention in Lighthouse City Public Schools

Allison Bennett Foster

(ABSTRACT)

In America, urban school systems have encountered difficulties retaining teachers. The ramification of teacher attrition is that the neediest students are often taught by those with the least educational experience.

The purpose of this study was to determine the implications of Virginia teacher licensure regulations on teacher retention in Lighthouse City Public Schools. The study addressed 4 research questions: (a) What factors influence the retention of teachers in Lighthouse City Public Schools?; (b) Is it possible to predict demographically by race, gender, age, grade level of teaching assignment, or licensure preparation program, which groups or sub-groups of people are more likely or less likely to leave a school system?; (c) Does the licensure preparation program influence retention?; (d) Were the Virginia licensure requirements the reasons cited for the departure of teachers in 2004, 2005, and 2006? The research focused on an urban school system in southeastern Virginia with approximately 33,000 students.

The population was 361 teachers hired for the 2003 school year. A researcher-developed survey was mailed electronically to teachers who were still employed in the system and mailed via the United States Postal Service to teachers who had left the system.

A multiple regression was performed on the demographic data to try to predict teacher retention or attrition. The results of the multiple regression indicated that statistically ($p < .01$)

only the variable of licensure could be a predictor of retention. All of the survey respondents agreed that a strong principal was the key to retention.

Urban school systems are challenged by local standards, state standards, and No Child Left Behind mandates and compounding the difficulties is on-going teacher loss. It is imperative that school system leaders provide new teacher support and time for the inexperienced to learn how to become excellent. Teachers are not expendable; students are at stake.

Contents

Abstract.....	ii
Table of Figures	vii
List of Tables	viii
CHAPTER 1: The Problem	1
1. 1 Problem Statement.....	1
1.2 Overview of Education in the United States.....	2
1.3 Overview of Teacher Quality Requirements	4
1.4 Overview of Virginia Licensure Regulations	9
1.5 Overview of Teacher Recruitment.....	11
1.6 Definitions.....	14
1.7 Significance of the Study	15
1.8 Conceptual Framework.....	16
1.9 Limitations/Delimitations of the Study.....	17
1.10 Summary	18
CHAPTER 2: Literature Review	20
2.1 Historical and Future Perspective	20
2.2 State Policies and Teacher Licensure	21
2.3 Alternate Routes to Licensure.....	29
2.4 Teacher Supply and Demand	39
2.5 Teacher Retention	47
2.6 Summary	49
CHAPTER 3: Methodology.....	57

3.1 Description of Lighthouse City.....	57
3.2 Research Questions.....	58
3.3 Population.....	58
3.4 Data Collection.....	59
3.5 Instrumentation.....	60
3.6 Methods of Analysis.....	61
3.7 Summary.....	64
CHAPTER 4: Findings.....	66
4.1 Overview of the Study.....	66
4.2 Procedures.....	66
4.3 Analysis of Data.....	107
4.4 Conclusion.....	107
4.5 Summary.....	108
CHAPTER 5: Conclusions.....	109
5.1 Overview of the Study.....	109
5.2 Description of the Population.....	111
5.3 Summary of Findings.....	112
5.4 Implications for Practice.....	118
5.5 Limitations.....	121
5.6 Recommendations for Future Study.....	122
5.7 Conclusions.....	123
References.....	127
Appendix A: Major Requirements of Teacher Certification Systems.....	132

Appendix B: Survey Validation Approval Electronic Mail.....	134
Appendix C: Initial Survey	135
Appendix D: Survey Validation Form Number 1	144
Appendix E: Initial Survey Validation Response Percentages	148
Appendix F: Survey Validation Form Number 2	150
Appendix G: Second Survey Validation Response Percentages	152
Appendix H: Institutional Review Board Approval; Research Authorization Committee.....	153
Appendix I: Institutional Review Board Approval.....	155
Appendix J: Institutional Review Board Certificate of Completion.....	157
Appendix K: Teacher Retention Survey, Lighthouse City Public Schools	158
Appendix L: Teacher Participation Letter	168
Appendix M: Survey Responses from Still Employed Teachers.....	170
Appendix N: Survey Responses from Resigned Personnel	180

Table of Figures

<i>Figure 1.</i> August, 2006 Instructional Vacancies	12
<i>Figure 2.</i> Conceptual Model	17
<i>Figure 3.</i> Principal Responses from the University Teacher Preparation Survey	54
<i>Figure 4.</i> Racial Demographics of Continuing Employees	78
<i>Figure 5.</i> Gender of Continuing Employees	79
<i>Figure 6.</i> Ages of Continuing Employees	80
<i>Figure 7.</i> Licensure for Continuing Employees	81
<i>Figure 8.</i> School Assignments for Continuing Employees	82
<i>Figure 9.</i> Gender of Resigned Employees	83
<i>Figure 11.</i> Licensure for Resigned Employees	85
<i>Figure 12.</i> School Assignments for Resigned Employees	86

List of Tables

Table 1. <i>Virginia Praxis Pass Scores Compared to North Carolina, West Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania and the Department of Defense Schools</i>	1
Table 2. <i>White Women, 2003-2006</i>	87
Table 3. <i>Black Women, 2003-2006</i>	89
Table 4. <i>Latina Women, 2003-2006</i>	91
Table 5. <i>White Men, 2003-2006</i>	93
Table 6. <i>Black Men, 2003-2006</i>	95
Table 7. <i>Latino Men, 2003-2006</i>	97
Table 8. <i>Other Men, 2003-2006</i>	99
Table 9. <i>Gender * End Employment Date Crosstabulation</i>	101
Table 10. <i>Age Group * End Employment Date Crosstabulation</i>	102
Table 11. <i>Assignment Level * End Employment Date Crosstabulation</i>	103
Table 12. <i>License Type * End Employment Date Crosstabulation</i>	104
Table 13. <i>Correlations</i>	105

Dedication

To Meghan, whose unwavering love and support kept me believing that this dream was possible. I could not have completed this process without you.

Acknowledgements

Writing a dissertation is, at times, solitary and, at other times, a group effort. In this paper, the underlying theme is support and the consequences to an urban school division when inadequate support is given to new teacher personnel.

I have had great support and advice from many people. I could not have continued this project without the guidance of Dr. Travis Twiford, the chair of my committee, and the heart of the Hampton Roads Center. Dr. Twiford, with his wry humor and knowledge of doctoral procedures, made this journey real. He continually had expectations that needed to be met, and I did not want ever to disappoint him.

Thank you to my committee, who helped and encouraged me while at the same time expanding my topic and research questions. To Dr. Jerome Niles, who agreed to be a part of this process even though it was his last year as the Dean of the School of Liberal Arts at Virginia Polytechnic and State University, I appreciate your time and your assistance. To Dr. Richard Salmon, who agreed to join the already-formed committee and be with us at the end, I appreciate your willingness to become involved. To Dr. James Roberts, who was a wonderful teacher of school finance and a great committee member, I thank you for the topic. Thank you to Dr. Neil Stamm, who continued to encourage me throughout the writing and always was available when I needed help.

Thank you, Dr. Vanessa Whitaker, for pushing me into the doctoral program. There have been times when I wanted to punish you for insisting I become involved, but I have enjoyed the learning and the growth experience.

Thank you, Lisa Frayne, for listening and supporting me always. You are there for me, and I appreciate you.

Thank you, Gayle Phillips, who edited two chapters for me. I appreciate your help.

Thank you, Dr. Daniel Curry-Corcoran, for your advice and help during this final phase of the writing process. Your friendship has been very important to me.

Thank you to a wonderful cohort of new friends. I would not have been able to continue this four year trip without you. We have always been together, and we have endured much. Never did I feel alone. Do not underestimate the healing power of laughter. You are the best!

Thank you to my family and my friends for never doubting that I could do this and to JD for the encouragement through out this process. Your support and love make all things possible. And finally, to Shea, who never left my side.

CHAPTER 1

The Problem

1.1 Problem Statement

For all students in the United States, education is a right provided under the “Reserve Clause” of the 10th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States. In order for each state to be able to ensure that its children receive an education, there must be teachers to instruct the students. Over the last several years, there has been increasing debate concerning the lack of qualified personnel who are able to fill the positions available in school divisions across the country. More and more, states are allowing persons who wish to become teachers to pursue routes to licensure whose requirements are markedly different from traditional preparation programs. Virginia teacher licensure testing requirements are stringent when compared to the passing scores required by its surrounding states.

Table 1. Virginia Praxis Pass Scores Compared to North Carolina, West Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and the Department of Defense Schools

VA	NC	WV	MD	PA	DOD	
178	176	174	177	172	177	Reading
176	173	172	173	173	174	Writing
178	173	172	177	173	175	Math

Do the licensure requirements impact teacher retention in Virginia, or are there other issues which contribute to the departure of teachers from the education profession?

1.2 Overview of Education in the United States

Education in the United States is a state responsibility and a local function as defined by the 10th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States. Primary and secondary education in America is provided by a variety of sources: public schools, private schools, charter schools, religious schools, and people who wish to educate their children in their own homes.

During the 2001-02 school year, there were a total of 91,380 public, primary, and secondary schools and approximately 29,000 private schools reporting students in membership in the United States (United States Department of Education, 2004).

In the public sector, there were 84,919 “regular” schools, 6,133 schools using a curriculum designed for special needs students, and 328 vocational schools (United States Department of Education, 2004). Over the last 50 years, the enrollment in private schools has not changed significantly. The same school year of 2001-02, there were approximately three million teachers in the public school divisions across America. The majority of those teachers were women (75%) and White (84%; U.S. Department of Education, 2004). The 3 million teachers worked with an increasingly diverse population of approximately 47 million learners.

The National Education Association issued its State Rankings and Estimates for the 2004-05 school year. In this paper, it was stated that there were 3,044,012 teachers employed in the United States in the school year 2003-04. The states with the largest population increases from the fall of 2002 to the fall of 2003 were Nevada (4.3%), Arizona (2.5%), Florida (2.3%), and North Carolina (1.9%). Eighteen states and the District of Columbia experienced declines in student enrollment. The highest loss of student enrollment (3.6%) occurred in the District of

Columbia. Other states experiencing declines in student enrollment were North Dakota (1.8%), Vermont (1.6%), Wyoming (1.6%), Montana (1.1%), Maine (1%), and Illinois (1%; 2006).

Public school enrollments were expected to increase by 326,000 students from the 2003-04 school year to 2004-05 school year. Increases in the elementary grades were expected to be 97,030 and approximately 229, 194 for the secondary schools (NEA, 2006). Changes in the public school student populations affect the increased or decreased need for teaching personnel. The National Education Association reported that state education departments expected the need for classroom teachers across the country to increase by 62,000 full-time teaching positions from school year 2003-04 to school year 2004-05. The budgetary implications for school systems dealing with increased student enrollment and increased need for qualified teachers are enormous (NEA, 2006).

Traditionally, public schools have been administered at the local level under state regulations with limited federal involvement. Each of the states has standards by which it licenses teachers and determines which candidates are qualified to be placed in classrooms. Policies are implemented through each state's department of education. Local public schools are administered by a school district, overseen by a school board. The school board members may be elected or appointed by the local governing body. Private schools however, may operate independently or be a part of an association within a group of schools. There is no state or federal governing body which oversees the operation of private schools (United States Department of Education, 2004).

Over the last several years, the United States has adopted a reform agenda regarding school quality. A facet of the reform is that there be excellence in teaching and learning in all public schools across the country (Goals 2000: Educate America Act of 1994, P.L. 103-227).

During the 2000 Presidential election, George W. Bush promised to put education first and leave no child behind (2001). He revealed a list of proposals to increase student achievement and improve teacher quality. In January 2002, President Bush signed into law the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. This federally mandated legislation reauthorized the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and called for high standards aligned with high-stakes testing (National Education Association, 2006). Repeatedly, opponents of the No Child Left Behind Act have maintained that this law is an unfunded mandate with states and localities having to pay increasingly large sums to meet its requirements.

1.3 Overview of Teacher Quality Requirements

There is a debate in the United States concerning teacher quality. Policy makers are concerned with low test scores on standardized tests and want to increase the rigor for becoming certified as a teacher. Three characteristics of a highly qualified teacher have been defined: (a) a bachelor's degree, (b) a full state certification or licensure, and (c) demonstrated competency in the subject matter to which they are assigned to instruct (United States Department of Education, 2004).

Further difficulties in recruiting and retaining teachers occur when discussing the geographical areas which have the greatest need for teachers of very high quality. Poor urban schools with large percentages of students on free or reduced lunch and large minority populations have the greatest difficulties attracting and retaining teachers (United States Department of Education, 2004).

Teacher certification is a state responsibility, and the requirements for licensure vary from state to state. Secondary teachers are the most likely to have majored in the content area they are assigned to teach, whereas elementary teachers are more likely to have majored in

education (United States Department of Education, 2004). In the 2005-06 school year, there were teachers in Virginia who were teaching in out-of-field assignments, meaning content areas for which they were not certified (Virginia Department of Education, 2006). Studies that have examined available indicators of teacher quality such as a) academic ability, b) certification status, and c) subject matter expertise and experience offer mixed findings, suggesting that there is not yet a consensus as to which teacher factors influence student achievement. Prior research focusing on the impact of credentials and pre-service training (e.g., studies to obtain a teaching credential) on the quality of instruction has found inconsistent results regarding the impact of the teaching credentials and small positive effects regarding subject-matter preparation. Hawk, Coble, and Swanson (1985) and Goldhaber and Brewer (2000) found that for secondary school students, mathematics achievement was positively associated with having a teacher who was fully certified in math.

Fetler (1999) found a negative correlation at the school level between mathematics scores and the percentage of teachers with emergency credentials. In an analysis using individual student data, however, Goldhaber and Brewer (2000) found that the performance of high school students on standardized math and science tests did not differ according to whether their teachers held standard or emergency credentials. They found that students of teachers who were uncertified or who held a private school certification in mathematics had somewhat lower achievement levels than students of teachers with a standard, probationary, or emergency certification. Rowan, Correnti, and Miller (2002) found no effect of certification status on achievement growth at the elementary level.

Unfortunately, all credentials are not created equal. Requirements for licensure vary across states, and there is no standard by which to measure credentials nationally. The exception

is National Board Certification, but according to the Director of Staff Development, the numbers of teachers in Lighthouse City Public Schools with this additional credential is less than 50. Paths for acquiring this type of certification vary across states in a number of respects, including the standards for admission into certification programs and the amount of in-classroom experience required. The type of credential a teacher holds is an imperfect measure of the effectiveness of pre-service training.

As part of the No Child Left Behind Act, all teachers in core academic subjects were required to be highly qualified by the end of the 2005-2006 school year. The United States Department of Education defines highly qualified teachers as those who not only possess full state certification but also have solid content knowledge of the subjects they teach (P.L. 105-244). In the fall of 2002, all new elementary teachers had to pass tests in subject knowledge and teaching skills in math, reading, and writing while new middle and high school teachers had to pass tests in subject matter or have the equivalent of an undergraduate degree or advanced certification in their respective fields (Virginia Department of Education, 2002).

The 2002 Title II Survey Verification Report collected data that found that only 23 states had implemented teacher requirements tied to their respective academic content standards for K-12. The Survey Verification Report reveals teacher quality indicators, and this survey is a part of Title II the purpose of which is a quality teacher workforce and high level professional development. All school systems are required to document the number of teachers who are certified to teach in the content areas to which they are assigned as well as any who are not properly assigned. The data for this report are collected by human resources departments in public school systems across the nation, and the data are reported to state departments of education. Individuals in the United States Department of Education compile the data and the

findings are reported to Congress as part of the duties of the Secretary of Education. The 2002 Title II report found that 45 states had developed alternate routes to licensure to bypass some of the burdensome requirements of the traditional system. Many states are relying on teachers who are hired on waivers or provisional licenses and those who lack full certification. This practice has become limited over the last four years because of the requirements of the NCLB statute that requires all teachers be “highly qualified.” In Virginia, exceptions are granted for teachers in critical needs areas such as math and science or in special education because of the difficulty of recruiting and retaining people for those positions.

In 2002, 6% of the nation’s teaching force lacked full certification, and the largest percentage of those teachers were concentrated in high poverty schools and in such content areas as math, science, and special education. In 1998, Congress amended Title II of the Higher Education Act, according to the former Secretary of Education, Rod Paige. A requirement of Title II is to complete three annual reports on teacher preparation. It would seem that with the advent of NCLB, there would have been further amendments to this system.

First, colleges and universities are to report various sets of data to the respective states. These data include pass rates on state certification and licensure examinations of students completing their teacher training programs. Second, states are required to report information to the United States Department of Education including (a) state certification and licensure requirements for completers of traditional and alternate teacher preparation programs; (b) statewide pass rates on the most recent state assessments of graduates of teacher preparation programs, pass rates disaggregated by institution, and quartile rankings of their institutions based on pass rates; (c) the number of teachers on waivers or emergency or temporary licenses; (d) information on teacher standards and their alignment with student standards; and (e) criteria for

identifying low-performing schools of education. The Secretary of Education is to report the findings to Congress as a study of national patterns and the implications for America's future.

States and school districts have been eligible for flexible grants to improve the quality of teachers and principals using research based strategies. Districts must provide evidence of annual progress in ensuring that all teachers teaching in core academic subjects are highly qualified. Additionally, "Troops to Teachers" and "Transition to Teaching" are two examples of alternative routes to licensure for those who began in other careers and decided that they would prefer to become teachers.

Patty Pitts, the Director of Licensure for the Virginia Department of Education, is responsible for issuing teacher licenses and alerting school systems about the individuals who haven't satisfied the testing requirements as a part of the Survey Verification Report for Title II. However, some individuals do not report their scores, and if they leave the profession or do not complete all the requirements for licensure, they do not reveal that information. The Virginia Department of Education does not keep a database of all of the people who have taken the Praxis and been unable to make a passing score. In fact, although a Title II requirement is to report Praxis pass rates for teachers, teachers who do not pass may not report their failure to the state, so the reflection of the 100% pass rate is not accurate. This score does not reflect those who were not able to receive satisfactory scores on the test.

The Lighthouse Public Schools Human Resources Department maintains some data on the people who over three years with a provisional license failed to complete the necessary coursework for licensure or those who could not make the necessary scores on the Praxis to become licensed as a teacher. Is there in fact a teacher shortage across the United States, or have the requirements for teacher licensure become so stringent that alternative routes to teacher

licensure have more appeal for people wanting to enter education? How have the strict regulations for teacher licensure in Virginia affected the supply of a qualified candidate pool?

1.4 Overview of Virginia Licensure Regulations

There are three routes to teacher licensure in the state of Virginia. The first option requires being enrolled in a state-approved teacher preparation program or an alternative state-approved program. The second option is for an individual to move to Virginia with a teaching license from another state if the endorsement areas are comparable and if the same individual completed a four-year teacher preparation program from a regionally accredited college or university. The teaching license held by this person still must be in force when the move to Virginia is made. An emergency or temporary certificate or license is not eligible for reciprocity. The third possibility is an alternative route to licensure. This route is available through the school district in which the individual hopes to become employed and is available through the recommendation of the local school division or non-public school.

A person pursuing the alternative route to teacher licensure can be issued a three-year non-renewable provisional license upon the request of the Virginia employing educational agency if the candidate holds a baccalaureate degree from an accredited college or university and satisfies one or more specific endorsement teaching areas. For example, two of the critical needs areas in public schools are math and science. If an individual has a college degree with a major in mathematics, he may be issued a provisional license, which is good for 3 years.

To be eligible for a 5-year renewable license, the requirements include the Professional Teacher's Assessment and professional studies coursework from an accredited four-year college or university. Depending upon the grade level the individual desires to teach, the necessary coursework requirements may vary. To be an early/primary or elementary school teacher, the

candidate must have taken 3 hours of Human Growth and Development, 6 hours of Curriculum and Instructional Procedures, 6 hours of Reading, and 3 hours of Foundation of Education. In addition, primary Pre-K to Grade 3 and elementary Pre-K to Grade 6 must also take 6 hours of Language Acquisition and Reading.

Middle school teachers must complete 3 semester hours of Language Acquisition and 3 hours of Reading in addition to the 18 semester hours listed above. Special education teachers must complete the 18 hours required for early educators and the elementary requirement of 6 hours of Language Acquisition and Reading.

Those wishing to teach in high school or adult education need to complete 3 hours of Reading in the Content Area but are not required to take Language Acquisition. They are required to take 15 hours of the same coursework as those in early childhood education and elementary education. An additional requirement for those pursuing the alternative licensure route to teaching is that the employing school division also must provide a fully licensed, experienced teacher to be a building mentor for the new hire. The mentorship component is not a requirement for the people pursuing traditional licensure because those people have probably been student teachers.

To pass the Virginia Communication and Literacy Assessment, a person must receive a score of 235 on the Writing test, 235 on the Reading test, and a composite score of 470 overall. Minimum scores for the Praxis II for Virginia, North Carolina, West Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and the Department of Defense Schools reveal that Virginia has the highest passing requirement scores in Reading (178), Writing (176), and Math (178). Of the states listed, Pennsylvania has the lowest Reading passing score (172), and West Virginia has the lowest

passing scores in Writing (172) and Math (172; Virginia Polytechnic and State University, School of Education, 2006).

1.5 Overview of Teacher Recruitment

Do the strict scores in Virginia have an impact on the number of candidates qualified to teach in the state? Have we created a shortage by requiring such stringent licensure regulations? Adequate, qualified teacher supply is mandatory to maintain public education. In the era of strict accountability, our students must exceed their own test scores each year. School districts' test scores are reported in the newspapers and on local television for the public to decide which school divisions are the best in the area. Public education today is a very competitive business. It is incumbent on each school division to recruit the most qualified teachers so that the students continue to progress each year.

School systems across the state must hire new personnel each year, and in Lighthouse City, the recruiters travel to job fairs in Pennsylvania, Delaware, Virginia, West Virginia, and North Carolina to attract teacher candidates. In Virginia Beach, the Human Resource Department hires new teachers from the Philippines. During each recruitment season, Virginia Beach hires 500-700 new teachers. The Recruitment Specialist, Bernard Platt, travels to the Philippines to search for math teachers. In pursuing qualified teachers, he uses Philippines Agency International to locate teachers who are willing to move to the United States to teach mathematics. In the school year 2003-04, 24 foreign math teachers were hired for Virginia Beach (B. Platt, personal communication, May 4, 2006).

As of August 16, 2006, there were 55 unfilled teaching positions for Lighthouse City

Public Schools. This is the largest number in all the Peninsula school districts including Hampton (15), Isle of Wight (10), Suffolk (3), Poquoson (0), and York County (8; Daily Press, August 20, 2006; see Figure 1).




Figure 1. August, 2006 Instructional Vacancies

New teachers in Lighthouse Public Schools reported for work on August 21, 2006. They went to their assigned schools to meet with their principals, grade level leaders, and department heads. On August 22 and 23, they met with their content supervisors. All of those 55 teachers who had not been hired would face more difficult challenges than just the first year of teaching. In a similar way to students who are absent for an important exam review, these teachers missed important information that cannot be made up. In the 2005-06 school year, one of the high schools in Lighthouse City did not hire a Spanish teacher until October. The students had daily substitutes for seven weeks, and the other Spanish teachers in the department took turns writing the lesson plans for the substitute.

When the new teacher arrived, she was desperate to acquire the information she had missed at the beginning of the school year. She had great difficulty with classroom management and in gaining the trust of her students. Almost irreparable damage is done to the new teacher and to the students who miss a structured learning environment. In my experience, teachers often leave the school system because they are often set up to fail. A new German teacher has been assigned to three high schools with a total of five preparations. No amount of support for this new hire can reduce the difficulties she faces in trying to meet the needs of students in three locations. In one school, the work involved in preparing for five different courses is staggering, but to compound the problem by assigning the teacher to three places is tantamount to absurd.

It is not possible to attend the beginning of the year meetings if a teacher does not begin work until October. In late August 2006, the Lighthouse Public Schools Human Resources Department still was attempting to recruit five foreign language teachers and two ESOL teachers for the 2006-07 school year. Each of these subjects is considered a critical needs area, and the vacant positions certainly would be more difficult to fill after the school year begins.

There are four research questions to be addressed in this paper: (a) What factors influence the retention of teachers in Lighthouse City Public Schools?; (b) Is it possible to predict demographically by race, gender, age, grade level teaching assignment, and teacher licensure preparation programs, which groups or sub-groups are more likely or less likely to leave a school system because of teacher licensure regulations?; (c) Does the licensure preparation program influence retention?; (d) Were the Virginia licensure regulations the reasons cited for the departure of teachers in 2004, 2005, and 2006?

Virginia does have high state requirements for the necessary passing Praxis II scores in Reading (178) and Writing (176) and the mandatory passing score in Math (178). A comparison

of state passing rates for the states of Virginia, North Carolina, West Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and the schools in the Department of Defense shows that of teachers obtaining initial licensure, Virginia requires higher scores than do any of the surrounding states (see Table 1). Do the stringent state requirements impact the number of potential applicants for available teaching positions?

For the Lighthouse Human Resources Department, it is necessary to recruit 250-400 new teachers each year. Recruitment has involved attending job fairs in Virginia, North Carolina, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Delaware, West Virginia, and even in Europe. Locating a new group of teachers each year demands that the Human Resource staff search for potential candidates all year long. No longer is there a fall recruiting season, but rather a continuous search for people with a license or the possibility to earn a license willing to come to Lighthouse Public Schools for employment.

1.6 Definitions

Praxis - a standardized test administered to those people who wish to become certified to teach across the United States.

Licensure – the certification required in all 50 states for eligibility to teach. In Virginia, teachers with Collegiate Professional Licenses are required to renew the license every five years (Virginia Department of Education, 2006).

Traditional Licensure - the course of study defined by colleges and universities to prepare students for a career in education (Virginia Department of Education, 2006).

Alternate Licensure - persons who would like to teach and who do not have a traditional teaching license may become teachers through another route to licensure. There are many programs available including Teach for America, Transition to Teaching, and Troops to

Teachers. Many states develop their own programs for people who wish to enter the education field from another profession (Ingersoll, 2001).

Critical Needs - the content areas in public education that are the most difficult to fill with certified teaching personnel. These specialties may include math, science, special education, foreign language, and English to Speakers of Other Languages (National Education Association, 2006).

School context - the assignment of a teacher; includes the classroom or lack of an assigned room, the principal and staff, and the work environment.

1.7 Significance of the Study

Since the advent of the No Child Left Behind statute, public education across the United States has faced accountability for students' achievement and teacher quality. States are required to disclose student test scores and file reports concerning the teaching assignments and qualifications of the classroom teachers. Newspaper and television reporters gather information and document the shortcomings and failures of school divisions around the country. All state departments of education have licensure requirements for teachers. Virginia has teacher licensure requirements which are more stringent than many other states. To date, no information has been found to determine if the licensure requirements in Virginia have an impact on teacher supply, and no study of the particular school system of the urban southeastern Virginia City of Lighthouse has been conducted. Do the teacher licensure requirements in the state of Virginia have an impact on the retention of teachers, or are there other factors involved which cause the exodus of teachers at the end of 3 years of employment in this urban school system? The results of this study may help the policymakers in Lighthouse Public Schools to implement procedures

and/or processes to support the new hires and lessen the escalating costs of recruiting new personnel each school year.

1.8 Conceptual Framework

This research study will explore the theory that there is a shortage of teachers in the United States. Further, in Virginia, the rigid standards may exacerbate the problem by requiring one of the highest passing scores on the Praxis test in the nation. The variables identified for the quantitative portion of this study are race, gender, age, grade level teaching assignment, content teaching assignment, and type of teacher licensure preparation program. There will be a survey administered to the 2003 cohort of new hires which will explore further the reasons teachers have for leaving or staying in Lighthouse City Public Schools.

Researchers such as Richard Ingersoll, Linda Darling-Hammond, and Arthur Levine have suggested that there are a myriad of reasons that teachers leave the education profession. Among these reasons are school assignments, lack of administrative or mentorship support, failure to complete licensure requirements, and inadequate preparation for the rigor of public education. Urban school systems are more likely to lose personnel than suburban low-poverty school divisions. The figures in the conceptual model illustrate some of the factors which may contribute to teacher flight from Lighthouse City Public Schools (*see Figure 2*).




Figure 2. Conceptual Model

1.9 Limitations/Delimitations of the Study

This research study will take place in Lighthouse City, Virginia, and will collect data from the Human Resources Department of the Lighthouse Public School Division. Because the location is an urban school system with approximately 32,000 students and 5,000 public school employees, the findings cannot be generalized across larger and smaller school divisions. Additionally, it may be difficult to locate teachers who left in 2004, 2005, and 2006 if they have moved to another city or state. Further, some of the potential candidates may not return the survey or may decide not to tell the truth about themselves and why they chose to leave Lighthouse Public Schools or the education profession.

1.10 Summary

Since the 2001 advent of the No Child Left Behind Public Law 103-227, states and localities across the United States have been required to comply with increasingly difficult standards of accountability regarding public education. Students must achieve higher scores on standardized testing instruments, and the data are reported to state departments of education for national tracking purposes. These test scores are then reported in the media as a way of grading school systems for their successes and or lack of achievement. In addition, standards for teachers have become more difficult. Frequently, states are offering alternate routes to licensure as a way of finding personnel to assume positions in the hardest to fill vacancies in public schools. Those who come from other careers and wish to pursue teaching are able to find employment and then receive the appropriate credentials if they are enrolled in a program such as “Transition to Teaching”.

Virginia has strict passing score requirements for the Praxis II exam compared with the states of Pennsylvania, West Virginia, North Carolina, Delaware, Maryland, and the schools in the Department of Defense. People unable to achieve the required Virginia Praxis score successfully may be able to go to one of the surrounding states and secure employment because of the lower passing score standards.

Recruiting and retaining licensed personnel for all the public schools in the Commonwealth has become a year-round process for human resource departments. In particular, in the Human Resource Department in Lighthouse Public Schools, the coordinators in the elementary and secondary sections spend a large portion of their time traveling to colleges and universities in surrounding states. The coordinators attend recruiting fairs hoping to locate potential teachers to fill the 250-400 vacant positions which occur each school year.

There are four research questions to be answered in this study: (a) What factors influence the retention of teachers in Lighthouse City Public Schools?; (b) Is it possible to predict demographically by race, gender, age, grade level teaching assignment, and teacher licensure preparation program, which groups or sub-groups are more likely or less likely to leave a school system because of licensure regulations?; (c) Does licensure preparation program influence retention?; (d) Were the Virginia licensure regulations the reasons cited for the departure of teachers in 2004, 2005, and 2006?

In pursuing the impact of Virginia licensure requirements on teacher retention, there may be a variety of reasons that people choose to leave the education profession. In particular, many may leave in the first three years because of personal reasons over which a school division has no control.

Furthermore, others may leave because they have felt little support from the administrators at the schools to which they were assigned. Still others may indicate that the rigid standards for acquiring licensure in Virginia have prevented them from making the necessary passing scores on the Praxis exam to be eligible for licensure in the Commonwealth of Virginia. Exploring the survey data of the teachers hired in 2003 may provide essential understandings for an urban school division determined to retain its teachers.

CHAPTER 2

Literature Review

2.1 Historical and Future Perspective

The National Center for Education Statistics under the United States Department of Education published the Thirty-Fourth Edition of the Projections of Education Statistics to 2015 in September 2006. Across the United States, the number of teachers in public elementary and secondary schools rose 27% from 1990 to 2003. By 2015, that number is projected to rise an additional 16%. The number of private school teachers rose 12% from 1990-2003 and is expected to rise another 7% from 2003-2015 (NCES, 2006). Where are these teachers going to come from?

In Virginia, the pupil enrollment projections for K-12 to 2015 indicate that the student population will increase from 5-20% over the next nine years (NCES, 2006). In 1997, there were 1,111,000 students enrolled in Virginia's public schools, and by 2015, the projection is that there will be 1,310,000 public school students in Virginia; the percentage increase is expected to be 18.2% (NCES, 2006). Pre-Kindergarten through eighth grade public school students are projected to increase 10.7%, and secondary school student enrollment is projected to increase 8.1% (NCES, 2006). According to Harry "Bud" Hodgekinson, a demographer for the United States Government, the trend across America is a surge in the K-2 population in public schools (Office of English Language Acquisition Conference, December, 2005). Student increases mean the need for teachers will increase as well.

Each state in the United States has licensure requirements for people who are interested in becoming teachers. Increasingly, people who began careers in other fields are becoming interested in pursuing the teaching profession. Alternate routes to licensure allow these people to

begin teaching careers with a school and classroom assignment while working to obtain the necessary endorsements (Ingersoll, 2002).

The Southeast Center for Teacher Quality (2002) reported that nationally the teacher turnover rate was 13%. Urban high-poverty districts have the largest percentage of teachers teaching in out-of-field assignments. Students in these classes may not have access to a quality education if their teachers are unprepared in course content. In addition, the regulations in the No Child Left Behind Act regarding highly qualified teachers may make it increasingly difficult to recruit teachers certified in their chosen specialties to urban school systems.

The Guilford County, North Carolina school district tried to attract math teachers to its eight lowest performing high schools by offering a \$10,000 signing bonus for the 2006-07 school year. The school district of 70,000 students received a \$2 million grant to accomplish this goal. In addition to the original bonus, if the new math teachers' students increase achievement by one and one half year's growth over one school year, the teacher may be eligible to receive an additional \$4000 bonus. The school district is trying to match the salaries that recent math college graduates would earn in the private sector (Education Week, September, 2006).

This literature review will focus on studies in four areas: (a) state policies regarding teacher licensure, (b) alternate routes to licensure, (c) teacher supply and demand, and d) teacher retention. Each of the sections is a principal facet in trying to understand the teacher issues confronting public education in the United States today.

2.2 State Policies and Teacher Licensure

In 2001, Suzanne M. Wilson, Linda Darling-Hammond, and Barnett Berry published a case study of the efforts of Connecticut to increase the standards for teachers and raise student achievement. Policy makers realized that increasing the levels of teacher certification may have

an impact on students in the classroom. Connecticut educational human resources departments spent ten years searching for qualified teachers who would be able to make a difference in schools across the state. The teachers, the department of education, and elected officials wanted to determine teacher quality. They included a reform of the public school finance system, teacher licensing revisions, teacher and student assessments, and student achievement coupled with teacher salary increases. Student increases in achievement along with high standards included support for teachers. In 1998, Connecticut fourth graders were listed as having the highest scores in the United States on the National Assessment of Educational Progress for reading and mathematics (NAEP) despite the inclusion of low socio-economic status students and English Language Learners.

Additionally, the state's eighth graders were at the top of the nation in scoring at or above the proficiency level in reading. There is still an achievement gap between White, Black, and Hispanic students, but in 1999, they outperformed other eighth graders across the United States (Barron, 1999).

Connecticut's policies concerning teacher licensure, especially for new teachers, were cited as a reason that the students did so well on the state assessments. The National Education Goals Panel stated that the Beginning Educator Support and Training program (BEST), which uses trained mentors for novice teachers, was responsible for the growth of the new teachers in the state and the increase in the student achievement on the state-wide tests (Barron, 1999).

The program assists the mentors helping with the portfolio assessments for the new teachers and also provides assistance to the scorers evaluating the new teacher evidence of accomplishment. The portfolio scorers must be knowledgeable in the Connecticut standards for new teachers. Across the state, Connecticut has trained novice and seasoned teachers. For over

10 years in Connecticut, the lawmakers, the department of education, school systems throughout the state, aligned policies with the same goal. The goal was to increase student academic achievement.

The researchers collected documents including those from the state board of education, and articles from the newspaper. They also collected research previously completed by the Connecticut State Department of Education and outside research by the National Education Goals Panel (Wilson, et. al, 2001). The research included studies and interviews from local and state levels, analysis of student achievement data, interviews with personnel at the Connecticut Department of Education, data from focus groups, interviews with college and university teacher education faculty, and in one urban system in Connecticut, interviews with teachers and administrators. Data were analyzed by developing themes that were supported by evidence (Wilson, et. al, 2001). Finally, the researchers wrote the story of the preceding 20 years in public education in Connecticut.

The era of reform occurred during the years 1974-1983, and Mark Shedd was the person primarily responsible as the Commissioner of Education. He was replaced in 1983 by Gerald Tirozzi, who became the Assistant Secretary of Elementary and Secondary Education during the Clinton Administration. Mark Shedd began as the Commissioner following the 1974 Horton v. Meskill court case that determined the Connecticut funding system for public schools did not allow for a quality education for all the children in the state (Wilson, et. al, 2001).

Through the next 20 years, reform for public school finance and demands for teacher quality resulted in an improved educational system. In writing this case study of one state's educational policy changes, the researchers were very thorough in documenting the evidence of sweeping reform. With student achievement as the force behind all the decisions, the increased

accountability for teachers in Connecticut took place. No changes occurred without teacher support throughout the process. New teachers, despite extra coursework, had to complete portfolios of their own achievement in the classroom, as well as evidence of the gains made by their students. The result was increased achievement for teachers and students alike.

The state of Florida completed an evaluation of its teacher requirements and qualifications in 1995 under the Office of Program Policy Analysis and Government Accountability with James L. Carpenter as the Interim Director. There were three questions to be addressed: (a) How should Florida regulate teachers in order to be certain that they they were professionally qualified and possessed the credentials, knowledge and skills to provide a quality education?; (b) Who should administer the certification?; (c) Had a process been established to assess whether the current Teacher Certification System was effectively meeting its intent?

The Florida Legislature required that the certification system be self supporting, so a \$56 certification application fee was established. In 1995, there were 47 full-time positions in the Bureau of Teacher Certification. Fifty members of the public were surveyed, and 49 of the 50 said that teachers should be regulated. One hundred teachers were given the same survey and 96 agreed that teachers should be regulated. The Accountability Office reviewed the literature by selecting three approaches (a) licensure, (b) certification, and (c) registration. The review of the literature suggested that the difference between licensure and certification was that licensure implies permission, and certification implies qualification. Both licensure and certification require minimum competency or that some degree of requirements have been met. Registration only requires that a name be filed with a regulatory agency.

The evaluation also included which agency should be responsible for the administration of the Teacher Certification System. Florida laws were reviewed as well as the State Board of

Education's rules and available literature. Teachers and members of the public were interviewed. Additionally, education staffs in 16 states and two focus groups were interviewed. The recommendation was that the Department of Education or the Department of Business and Professional Regulation could administer the licenses for teachers, but the Education Agency retained the obligation.

To determine the requirements used by other states for licensure, telephone interviews were held with certification specialists in 15 states. The states were selected by population, demographics, geography, and innovative certification programs. After the literature review and the interviews, it was determined that all the states had educational testing and performance assessment as initial requirements. Of the 15 state certification systems studied, only New York required a master's degree.

Eight of the states that were evaluated incorporated three parts to the certification process: (a) educational requirements, (b) testing, and (c) performance assessments. Florida was beginning to discuss including student achievement as a part of the certification requirement as well as evidence of growth by the teacher with professional development activities attached. However, one of the findings from the study indicated that there was no system for the evaluation of a quality education.

A recommendation from the Accountability Office was to establish a system for the evaluation of the relationship between teacher performance and student performance for beginning certification and for recertification. In the response from the Commissioner of Education, Frank T. Brogan, the Department of Education agreed that they should be responsible for the administration of Florida's teaching licenses and that student learning is the responsibility

of teachers, but the component of student and teacher achievement in the classroom should be studied further.

The evaluation of the Florida Teacher Certification System was very thorough with focus groups, interviews with teachers, the public, other state education agency staffs, and a review of state certification policies. It was interesting that the Commissioner of Education postponed the discussion of the student-teacher achievement by indicating that the recommendation needed further study. Tying teacher performance to student performance carries the threat of salary instability and perhaps the loss of employment. In addition, there is inequity in class assignments, and teachers may argue that certain educators always get the brightest students and thereby the best salaries.

The state of Minnesota and its General Assembly created the Minnesota Board of Teaching in 1973 (Scannell, 1996). The majority of the 11-person board was classroom teachers. Included in the membership are one teacher educator, one school administrator, and three people who are private citizens although two must be former school board members. The board does have its own executive director, but the staff support derives from the Department of Children, Families, and Learning, a separate state agency. The agency assists the board in administering its licensing and teacher education duties (Scannell, 1996).

By 1986, the Board of Teaching pursued higher standards for teachers with research based educational practices by teacher preparation programs and curricula driven by results. The board also consulted with the RAND Center for the Study of the Teaching Profession to create a system for testing the skills of novice teachers (Scannell, 1996).

Following the RAND partnership, the board continued with a revision of traditional teacher preparation programs, including a supervised clinical teaching residency requirement for

a continuing license. Residencies must be driven by the Minnesota standards, must contain an evaluation component, and must provide support for the novice teacher. The change in Minnesota began with the national demand for accountability in education from student achievement to teacher preparation.

In Indiana, a study commission had recommended the creation of a standards board, but the board found the rules difficult to understand and not connected to practice. Some of the regulations had not been amended since the early 1970's (Scannell, 1996). The Indiana Professional Standards Board promoted teaching as a profession and brought together focus groups of educators and citizens to discuss changes that needed to occur in the licensure system for teachers throughout their careers. The IPSB also contacted the legislators, teachers, state education agencies, and representatives from teacher preparation programs to revise the licensure system (Scannell, 1996).

Minnesota and Indiana have added educators to participate in licensure reform. When decisions are to be made the teachers involved in the process can rely on their classroom experience to ensure the accuracy of the discussions with regard to educational reality. Legislators may lack the experience in teaching necessary to make the most informed decisions.

In 2000, using data from a survey of all states-concerning policies, state case study analyses, the 1993-94 Schools and Staffing Survey, and the National Assessment of Educational progress, Linda Darling-Hammond examined the ways that teacher qualifications are related to student achievement along with other school factors. Data were analyzed using qualitative and quantitative methods, and the findings suggested that teacher quality may be related to student academic achievement. The quantitative section of the study revealed that if teachers are certified, their students show improved scores in reading and math. The researcher analyzed the

data before and after controlling for poverty and language. The findings suggested that the states with policies demanding teacher quality may be related to better student performance. The state policies involving teacher licensure, education, hiring and professional development made a difference in the preparation that the teachers brought to the work. The state policy surveys and the state case studies were used to evaluate the policies related to the necessary qualifications of teachers.

For the study by Linda Darling-Hammond, North Carolina and Connecticut showed the most progress in student achievement and the most newly created mandates for educational reform. North Carolina began its reworking of the public education system in the mid 1980s. The state began by increasing the salaries of teachers and making the salaries more equitable. Included in the salary effort were intense recruitments of new personnel, mentoring of novice teachers, and the improvement of teacher education, licensing, and professional development. Because of the educational policy changes, in spite of being a state with sections of high poverty, North Carolina's students have made significant increases on standardized tests in reading and math (Darling-Hammond, 2000).

One of the facets of North Carolina reform was the encouragement for teachers to consider becoming certified with National Board Certification. In 1998, North Carolina had the most Nationally Certified teachers of any state in the United States. In addition, the state was recognized by the National Goals Panel Report for its gains in the mentorship of beginning teachers as well as the increase in student academic achievement (Darling-Hammond, 2000).

The findings of the study suggest that the states most interested in the academic achievement of students refine the regulations regarding the qualifications of its teachers. In addition, support structures must allow the novice teachers time for growth and learning after

they are assigned to a classroom. As Dr. Harry K. Wong often says, “It is not the program or the books that make a difference. The only thing that makes a difference in schools is the teacher in the classroom.”

2.3 Alternate Routes to Licensure

Alternative certification began in the early 1980s as a way of procuring teachers to fill empty classrooms in urban secondary schools, especially in the fields of math and science. In the following years, the critical shortage areas now include English as a Second Language, Special Education, and bilingual Education (NASBE, 1998). Blair and Feistritz reported in 2003 that 46 states and Washington, D.C. have some form of alternate licensure programs targeted at the critical needs areas.

In a study entitled *An Analysis of First Year Experiences in an Alternate Certification Program* (2003), Steven Ilmer, Sharon Elliott, and Jo-Ann Snyder wanted to determine the experiences of beginning teachers in an urban setting without college or university teacher preparation. The work was conducted under the auspices of Wayne State University, Detroit Public Schools, the Michigan Department of Education, and the Detroit Federation of Teachers.

The purpose of the study was to determine teachers’ perceptions of the Limited License to Instruct program during their first year of teaching and their first year of enrollment in the program. The LLI program has similar characteristics to other alternate routes to licensure programs including cohort groups, mentors, alternative-coursework scheduling, online instruction and induction activities. The participants were hired by the Detroit Public School System to be full time teachers and at the same time earn a Master’s of Art in Teaching.

There were 178 teachers involved in the study. The 178 were among a group of 407 first-year teachers hired by the Detroit Schools. Each of the LLI teachers completed one of seven

group interviews conducted by moderators from Wayne State University's Center for Urban Studies. Questions for the group interviews were developed for each area: (a) engagement in the LLI program, (b) online coursework, (c) cohort meetings, (d) support in the schools, and (e) wrap-up. The average length of the interviews was 90 minutes, and each group interview was audio taped. Tapes were transcribed for use in qualitative analysis of the narrative data. From the seven group interviews, 42 separate themes were labeled, coded, and tabulated. From the 42 original themes, 4 elements emerged. The themes became (a) overall/general school support, (b) mentoring, (c) principal support, and (d) parental support.

The findings showed that people had enrolled in the Limited License to Instruct program because of the offer of full-time employment and the chance to earn a master's degree at no personal cost. Two of the most effective parts of the program were the cohort group mentors and the in-school mentors. The cohort mentors modeled lessons, taught strategies, classroom management, problem-solving, and instructional and leadership skills. The LLI teachers depended on the experience of their mentors. The in-school mentors provided information about school-specific issues.

The lowest rated part of the experience for the first-year teachers was the support from the school administrative staff. Although the LLI staff believed they had communicated adequate information about the administrators' roles in the program, many principals were not aware of the expectations for their participation. The responses from the LLI teachers indicated that they had received little or no guidance from the administrative staff at their assigned schools.

Although the group interviews provided information about the Limited License to Instruct program, it might have been more valuable to do a stratified random sample of individual interviews instead. In a group setting, some people never talk while others may be

more vocal or opinionated. The Detroit Public Schools Study is important in that it illustrates that people entering education from other professions and with college or university preparation have many of the same kinds of problems as other new teachers. A major difference in this group is that the new Detroit teachers had two different kinds of mentorship experiences a) one with their cohort, and b) one assigned to them at their individual school site. Each mentor was able to support the new teacher in different ways, and this proved to be very helpful to the study participants.

Jeffrey C. Wayman of the Center for Social Organization of Schools at Johns Hopkins University, Ann M. Foster of Colorado State University, and Carol Wilson of the Colorado Partnership for Educational Renewal conducted a study on the Colorado new licensure option called Teachers in Residence (TIR). This program was enacted by the Colorado State Department of Education to allow non-licensed teachers to work in schools as fully invested first-year teachers while earning a license.

An evaluation was begun through Metro State College, the Colorado Partnership for Educational Renewal, and the Research and Development Center for the Advancement of Student Learning at Colorado State University. Their interest was in the short- and long-term experiences of the participants in the TIR program. The researchers studied one facet of the evaluation that was a comparison of the concerns of traditionally prepared teachers versus those in the alternative licensure program during their first year of teaching.

Participants were 237 first-year teachers who obtained their teacher preparation in traditional teacher university licensure programs in Colorado and 154 first-year teachers in the Metro State College Teachers in Residence program. The TIR teachers had completed a survey in May 2001 at the end of their first year of teaching. The same survey had been given to

traditionally licensed teachers the previous year. Survey items were arranged in groups forming three arenas which measured the types of professional development which might be useful to new teachers (a) effective instruction, (b) classroom environment, and (c) collegial relationships.

T-tests were used to compare item by item concerns for the TIR and traditionally prepared teachers. Odds ratios were then computed by taking the ratio of “concern” responses to the “no concern” responses for the TIR participants and dividing it by the same method for the traditionally prepared teachers. The results indicated that the TIR teachers were 4 times more likely to have concerns about lesson planning than the traditionally prepared teachers. The TIR teachers also indicated concerns about classroom management at a rate of twice that of the other teachers.

The results of this study indicate that all first year teachers rated their work-related concerns similarly. All new teachers have concerns; some have more than others. The TIR teachers, however, had content concerns unlike those with a traditional background. This may be a growing issue because the purpose of alternative routes to licensure is to ensure that there will be a quality workforce available to fill the positions that are vacant in public schools. How will students achieve at the highest level if their teachers do not feel prepared to deliver the content effectively? The alternatively licensed personnel may also leave the profession more quickly than the traditionally prepared teachers thus leaving more vacancies in hard-to-staff locations. A yearly evaluation of the alternative certification programs should be conducted to find if the teachers are being successful and what improvements are necessary to retain the teachers in alternative routes to licensure (Baker & Smith, 1997).

Newport News Public Schools in conjunction with Old Dominion University applied for and received a grant from the United States Department of Education through the No Child Left

Behind legislation (Gimbert, Cristol, Wallace, and Sene, 2005). The grant was awarded partly because the school system served a large population of Black students, a high percentage of whom received free or reduced lunch. Additionally, Newport News employed many teachers with provisional or conditional licensure. It was projected that over the next 4 years, 35% of the employees in the school system in teaching or administration would be eligible for retirement (Gimbert, et al., 2005).

The Darden College of Education at Old Dominion University had a program for alternate licensure called the Career Switcher Program, so the new program with Newport News Public Schools was called Transition to Teaching (T2T). The Transition to Teaching Program had three objectives: (a) to recruit and prepare qualified people to become teachers by meeting the Virginia licensure regulations for school personnel; (b) to provide mentorship support and a cohort experience for the first 3 years; and (c) to collect, analyze, and report the data about this alternate route to licensure.

All candidates had to have a 2.5 grade-point average from an accredited college or university, a bachelor's degree or higher, work related experience in English, math, science and/or social studies, and a qualifying score on the Praxis I series of tests (or SAT score from April 2004) thereby meeting the Virginia Licensure Requirements in reading, writing, and math. The potential candidates also had to have a qualifying score on the Praxis II test and had to meet the requirements for employment as public school personnel (Gimbert, et al., 2005).

The researchers conducted two studies on the Transition to Teaching Program. The research questions for the first study were (a) Does the type of teacher training impact the academic achievement of students in mathematics?; and (b) Does the type of teacher preparation impact the implementation of the process standards delineated by the National Council of

Teachers of Mathematics? Data were collected from the results of the quarterly assessments created by the Math Department of Newport News Public Schools. An analysis of variance was used to compare the assessment scores of the students to the type of teacher training their instructors had received. The results did not reveal a statistically significant difference between the student test scores and the type of professional training the teachers had received (Gimbert, et al., 2005).

For the second question, (Does the type of teacher preparation impact the implementation of the NCTM standards?) data were obtained from 42 classroom observations using a classroom observation instrument provided by Newport News Public Schools. Descriptive analyses were used to examine potential differences between the type of teacher training the participants had received and the NCTM process standards because the sample size was too small for inferential statistics to be used. The findings suggested that the Transition to Teaching teachers used the NCTM process standards more frequently than the teachers who completed a traditional licensure preparation program (Gimbert, et al., 2005).

The second study asked, “Do the students of alternatively prepared teachers gain more or less than the students of the traditionally prepared teachers regarding the evolution of their scores in mathematics?” The test scores included the three quarterly assessments in Algebra I and the end of the year Algebra I Standards of Learning test. The results of the regression analysis showed significant gains in academic achievement by the students whose teachers were in the T2T program versus the students in classes taught by traditionally prepared teachers (Gimbert, et al., 2005).

The implications of these two studies indicate that a partnership between a university and a public school system provides for Pre-K through 20 educational opportunities. The students in

the Transition to Teaching Program had a cohort group, mentorship for 3 years, a chance for full-time employment while earning licensure credentials, professional development classes on the most successful teaching strategies, and a contract to remain in the school system for 3 years. The school system was able to staff the critical needs positions in math and science, and the students of the T2T teachers made progress in math. It would seem that all parties involved received a benefit from this program.

In a national study of alternative teacher preparation programs, Daniel C. Humphrey, Marjorie E. Wechsler, and Heather J. Hough analyzed seven programs. The alternate routes to licensure programs were North Carolina's N.C. Teach (North Carolina Teachers of Excellence for all Children); The Teacher Education Institute in the Elk Grove, California Unified School District; the Milwaukee Metropolitan Teacher Education Program (MMTEP); the Provisional Teacher Program in New Jersey; the New York City Teaching Fellows Program; Teach for America; and the Texas Region XIII Education Service Center's Educator Certification Program.

The focus of the study was to determine the characteristics of effective programs in alternative routes to licensure. Multiple kinds of data collection methods were employed during this study: (a) document review, (b) interviews, (c) surveys of program participants at the beginning of their program and again at the end of their first year of teaching, and (d) a sample of observations of the participants at the beginning and the end of the first year of teaching.

The findings suggested that of all the components studied in the seven programs, the element which made the most difference was the school assignment. If new, alternatively prepared teachers were placed in high-needs, high-poverty schools with marginal leadership, their experiences were extremely difficult and severely impacted their decision to remain in education. The researchers named this component "school context."

N.C. Teach was established in 2000 for mid-career personnel who decided that they wanted to become teachers. The program is administered by the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction and the University of North Carolina Office of the President. Yearly, the program serves 350 people and offers teacher certification in the middle school areas (a) math, (b) science, (c) social studies, and (d) language arts; in the high school areas (a) math, (b) science, (c) social studies, and (d) English; in K-12 (a) Spanish, (b) French, (c) English as a Second Language add-on, and (d) Special Education. Participants in the program attend a summer institute and then are assigned to a teaching position while continuing the necessary coursework for certification. Participants pay regular tuition rates for their required classes.

The Teacher Education Institute in California (TEI) serves approximately 100 participants annually and offers certification in all grades K-12 as well as in all content areas. Elk Grove is in Northern California, and the program is a partnership between the Unified School District of Elk Grove and San Francisco State University. This program uses an apprenticeship model and includes coursework, observations, and student teaching. Internships are with a master teacher for 16 hours weekly in the fall while the student also takes classes 3 days per week. There is a spring internship of 4 days per week. Class work in the spring is 2 days per week. Each internship includes the student being the full-time teacher for 2 weeks. Participants pay approximately \$9000 per year to be in the TEI program.

The Milwaukee alternate route to licensure program is called the Metropolitan Multicultural Teacher Education Project (MMTEP). There is a partnership between the Milwaukee Public Schools, the Milwaukee Teachers' Education Association, the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee School of Education, and the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee Extension. This program is for teacher assistants or paraprofessionals (with a bachelor's degree)

who have worked in the Milwaukee Public School System for at least one year. There are only about 20 people in the program, and the licensure program is for Grades 1-8. The aim of this program is to attract minority teachers who will remain in Milwaukee. Additionally, they want to attract minority teachers for placement in high-poverty areas.

Participants in this program take courses in the summer while teaching summer school. Their continuation in the program depends on the evaluations they receive at the conclusion of the summer-school session. During the following school year, the participants are assigned teaching positions with a trained mentor who visits the class at least once a week. University coursework is also once a week.

The New Jersey Provisional Teacher Program was established in 1984 and was the first such program in the United States. The program was designed to prevent the need to hire emergency teachers and to allow quicker access to public school teaching positions to individuals in other careers. Candidates for this program must have a bachelor's degree and, for secondary school, a major in the content they wish to teach.

The program participants attend a program offered at a regional training center usually operated by a university. The assigned school system provides mentors, supervision, and three evaluations, two that are formative and one that is summative. The prospective teachers pay the mentors \$450 for full-time support during their first 20 teaching days and \$550 more for 30 additional weeks of support. Certification is offered in all grades and contents. During the 2002-03 school year, there were 2700 people in the statewide program.

The Teaching Fellows Program in New York City was begun to fill the empty positions in some of the highest needs schools. This program lasts for 2 years, and in 2003, there were

2600 participants. At the completion of the 2 years, the participants have teaching credentials and a master's degree.

Certification is offered in all grades and content areas, but the administrators are especially mindful of recruiting teachers for Special Education, Bilingual Education, English, math, science, and Spanish. The Teaching Fellows receive a stipend to help with living costs during the initial summer training but are expected to pay \$4000 toward their master's program. This is a reduced tuition rate. Program participants have 2 months of training during the summer, field placement for observation and assisting the teacher, and advisor meetings with classroom strategy components including instruction and management. There are school-based mentors, university mentors, and cohort meetings.

Teach for America recruits new college graduates to serve in hard-to-staff urban schools. The participants attend summer training and a 1 to 2 week orientation to the city and schools to which they will be assigned. There are assigned readings, observations of teachers, and post observations with the teachers they have observed. After the summer training, the TFA participant becomes the assigned teacher in a classroom. During the school year, they (a) receive feedback from the TFA office, (b) meet with other TFA members, (c) participate in coursework for teaching credentials, (d) have course or content learning team meetings focusing on teaching strategies, and (e) take part in other workshops. Those individuals in the Teach for America program sign a contract for a 2-year commitment, and in 2003, there were 1,800 people in the program.

The Texas Region XIII Education Service Center's Educator Certification Program tries to recruit recent college graduates and mid-career individuals for the critical needs areas of bilingual education, Special Education, middle school math and science, high school math and

science, and career and technology education. In the spring, participants take online courses and take part in a 2-week field experience. In order to continue with the program, the prospective teachers must find a job as an intern by October, 1 of the current year. During the intern year, they receive mentorship support by trained teachers assigned to the same school and by field supporters who work in the program. More than 300 people were in the program in 2003 despite the fact that they must pay up to \$5000 for tuition and licensing and testing fees.

Each of the seven alternative routes to licensure the researchers studied had a mentorship component which was crucial to the novice teachers. However, some of the mentors were more effective than others and met with the teachers more often. No amount of support diminished a teaching assignment in a high-needs high-poverty school with ineffective leadership. Some of the quotes from the interviews revealed circumstances of educational malpractice from principals and assistant principals regarding teacher and student safety. Placing new teachers in the most difficult schools with the students who have the highest needs is not an effective use of personnel. Perhaps the teacher salary scale could be amended so that good teachers would receive a supplement for accepting assignments in difficult schools.

2.4 Teacher Supply and Demand

In a research report co-sponsored by the Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy and the Consortium for Policy Research in Education, Richard M. Ingersoll, of the University of Pennsylvania suggested that we, as a nation believe that there is a crisis of vacant teaching positions across the United States, the result of which is that schools are not able to provide students with an ample teaching force. Dr. Ingersoll also says that Americans believe that the cause of the deficit of teachers is retirement. To prove his statements he analyzed the data from

the Schools and Staffing Survey, and the supplement, the Teacher Follow-Up Survey, conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics.

The United States Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics created the Schools and Staffing Survey in 1988 (Haggstrom, 1988). This survey instrument has become the largest data source on the staffing, occupational, and organizational information on the nation's schools, both public and private. The questionnaires measure five policy issues: 1) teacher shortage and demand; 2) characteristics of elementary and secondary teachers; 3) teacher workplace conditions; 4) characteristics of principals; and 5) school programs and policies.

The questionnaire was revised in 2003-04, and now includes items about teachers' career paths, parental involvement, school safety, and informational support for informational literacy (NCES, 2006). The data show that the demand for teachers as increased over the last 20 years, as predicted by the United States Census. Since 1984, the enrollment of students has increased, and the K-12 teaching force has increased as well. However the teaching workforce began to decrease in the 1990's (Gerald & Hussar, 1998; Snyder & Hoffman, 2001).

The demand for teachers has risen, but the data do not indicate that there is a lack of qualified personnel. There are schools which have considerable difficulty finding teachers to fill the vacant positions, but the reason may not be a shortage of teachers. National data on teachers who are licensed, certified, and trained are difficult to find. One of the sources used by Dr. Ingersoll was the Integrated Post-secondary Educational Data System for the National Center for Education Statistics. Data are collected on the numbers of post-secondary degree completions by subject and year.

For the data in the 1998-99 school year there were more than 220,000 students who graduated with degrees in education, both graduate and undergraduate. However, the SASS data

show that of the 220,000 degree recipients, only 86,000 received a teaching position the following year. The question becomes, “What happened to the others?” Many of the respondents to the survey indicated that they needed additional education or that after graduation they changed their minds and decided to pursue another career.

(Henke, et al., 2000).

Although the data from the Schools and Staffing Survey show that there are enough teachers to supply schools, there are limitations to the data collected. There may be an adequate supply of education degree graduates, but they may not cover all of the critical needs areas. Many of the graduates are in elementary education, and the data are not clear on whether there are sufficient numbers of graduates in math, science, and special education.

In the 1999-2000 Schools and Staffing Survey and the Teacher Follow-Up Survey the data indicated that 58% of the nation’s schools reported having some difficulty filling one or more teaching positions in one or more subjects. However, the data also indicated that less than 50% of schools reported having any difficulty at all in filling the vacant positions in any subject.

During the same 1999-2000 school year 54% of the middle and high schools reported having openings for English teachers and approximately 50% reported having some difficulty filling these positions. The reporting middle and high schools also had difficulty filling math and special education positions at 54% and 45% respectively (Ingersoll, 2001).

The United States Department of Education in 2002 estimated that 2.2 million teachers would be required by 2010 to fill the vacancies created by retirements and those leaving the education profession (Howard, 2003). Approximately 15% would be hired in cities with the largest concentrations of poor and minority students. It is estimated that teacher retirement will

create 28% of the vacancies. Over the next decade, approximately 700,000 teachers will be eligible to retire (Lankford, Loeb, & Wykoff, 2002).

According to the data from the National Center for Education Statistics, nearly 33% of the new teachers in the United States leave education within the first three years, and almost 50% depart within the first five years. Urban secondary schools have the responsibility of educating more than 40% of the students with limited English proficiency, 75% of minority students, and 50% of students from low income families (Ingersoll, 1996, 1999, 2002).

Dr. Ingersoll of the University of Pennsylvania has suggested that there is no shortage of teachers, but rather a concern about teacher distribution. He also indicates that the demand for teachers may be caused in part by teachers moving from one location to another. C.E. Feistritzer, in her testimony before the House Committee on Education and Workforce stated that there are people available to join the teaching workforce, but they are not deciding to accept employment in the neediest schools. Many teachers choose to go to suburban districts with little or no poverty statistics, and little staff turnover. Often the applicants become substitutes in the hope that they will have an opportunity to obtain full-time employment as teachers.

School systems with the largest shortages of qualified applicants tend to be those in urban areas. In a survey of 40 of the largest school districts conducted in 2000, almost all needed qualified teachers in the areas of math, science, special education, and bilingual education (Ingersoll, 2002).

Some of the factors which may contribute to the perception that urban schools are challenging are: 1) classroom management difficulties 2) lack of school safety, 3) limited resources and few materials with which to work, 4) lack of parental and community involvement in education, 5) low student attendance, 6) lack of interest on the students' part in education, and

6) high drop-out rates. Further, race and the multicultural composition of urban classrooms may contribute to the perception that White teachers will not succeed in these settings.

Prince (2002) reported that urban schools have the highest percentages of first-year teachers, the highest percentages of teachers with less than five years of teaching experience, and the lowest percentages of veteran, accomplished teachers. Difficulties arise when urban districts have vacancies. The new hires will likely be the teachers with the least experience who are the most likely to leave after a few years, only to be replaced by the teachers with the least experience.

In 2001, the Virginia General Assembly through the House of Delegates passed two bills named House Bill 252 and 1589 respectively. The bills amended the code of Virginia to require the Superintendent of Public Instruction to survey all school divisions annually to identify issues related to the supply and demand of administrative and instructional personnel throughout the state (Virginia Department of Education, 2002). The Virginia Department of Education (VADOE) gathered data from statewide school district superintendents, and published the report on the information from 2001-02. The report is used to identify the critical shortages of teachers and administrators by geographic area, subject area, or school division (VADOE, 2002).

In October, 2001 all 132 of the school district superintendents throughout the state responded to the survey. However, some of the superintendents only responded to some of the items, and did not complete the entire survey instrument. The results of the survey were compiled and analyzed by a firm in Richmond called Research Dimensions, Incorporated (VADOE, 2002).

During the 2001-02 school year the superintendents reported that they employed 88,609 full-time teachers, and 5,627 administrative personnel. There were 26,844 elementary teachers

(Pre-Kindergarten through fifth grade), 5,891 middle school teachers (grades six through eight), 4,137 teachers of math, 1,906 science teachers, 4,526 English teachers, 2,303 foreign language teachers, 4,937 vocational teachers, and 13,183 special education teachers For every full-time teaching position reported, the statewide superintendents also reported teaching positions that were filled with personnel unendorsed for the area to which they were assigned, or that the instructional positions were unfilled (VADOE,2002).

The data indicated that at the high school level the four content areas of English (140), math (183), science (172), and social studies (94) were filled with unendorsed personnel or vacant. In foreign language there were 135 positions filled with unendorsed personnel or unfilled, and in vocational education there were 235 unfilled positions unfilled or filled with unendorsed personnel, the majority of whom were in technology education.

Twenty superintendents reported that more than 10% of the teaching positions in their districts were either filled with unendorsed personnel or vacant. The small school divisions of Sussex, Nottoway and Lunenburg have fewer unendorsed teachers or vacant teaching positions, but their percentages rank the highest in the state at 29.5% (42), 20.4% (43), and 18.6% (29) respectively. In contrast, Fairfax County had 14.1% (2,018) of teaching positions filled with unendorsed personnel or left vacant, but its size precluded it from being one of the highest percentages in the state (VADOE, 2002).

In Virginia a “critical shortage” is defined as an endorsement area for which a school division receives three or fewer applications for a teaching position. In 2004, the definition was expanded to include shortages by subject matter as designated from the top 10 academic disciplines identified in an annual survey of school divisions. The critical shortages for the 2001-02 school year were special education, math, reading specialists, Spanish, earth science and

chemistry, middle school, library media, music education, technology education, and English. The 2001-02 survey data do not indicate that there will be shortages of potential applicants, however. There is predicted to be an abundance of elementary education, health and physical education, history/social science, and computer science teachers. The data also indicate that student enrollment over the next ten years will increase as well (VADOE, 2002).

In 2004, the General Assembly enacted legislation Appropriation Act Item 141B directing local school boards to survey their respective school divisions to identify critical shortages of teachers and administrative personnel by subject matter, and to report the critical shortages to the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the Virginia Retirement System. The reporting requirement for the Virginia Department of Education was January 1, 2005. Data were obtained from an instructional survey to determine qualifications of teachers and administrators sent by the Department of Education to each of Virginia's school division superintendents in December, 2003(VADOE, 2004).

Once again the Richmond firm of Research Dimensions Incorporated gathered and analyzed the data from each of the 132 school division superintendents. The information requested from the school superintendents was based on school reports as of October 1, 2003. Data analysis included rankings for full time teachers, unendorsed teachers, administrators, and the percentages of unendorsed teachers per school division. Rankings were totaled and the resulting sum calculated to determine subject area shortages. Each of the 10 critical shortage areas has more than 500 full time educators. For the 2004-05 school year the critical shortage subject areas were listed as: 1) earth science, 2) special education (learning disabilities, mental retardation, emotional disturbance, severe and profound disabilities, early childhood special education, hearing impaired, visually impaired, and speech and language disorders), 3) career

and technical education (trade and industrial education, technology education, business education, work and family studies, and health occupations education), 4) mathematics, 5) English as a Second Language, 6) Spanish (Pre-Kindergarten- 12th grade), 7) computer sciences, 8) history, 9) social sciences and 10) reading specialists.

The addition to the critical shortage areas of English as a Second Language is reflective of the continued increase in enrollments across Virginia of Pre-Kindergarten through 12th grade students for whom English is not the native language. In Lighthouse City Public Schools the program for English Language Learners has increased from 226 in 2003 to 731 in 2006.

The Virginia State Report Card lists the teacher qualifications. In the 2002-03 data 16.5% of teachers taught classes and did not meet the federal definition of “highly qualified”. Teachers not meeting the highly qualified definition who taught in high poverty schools were 22.9%. Teachers not meeting the highly qualified definition who taught in low poverty schools were 12.6%. In the 2003-04 school year, however, the percentage of teachers not meeting the highly qualified definition was down from the 16.5% in 2002-03 to 5.5%. The teachers not meeting the highly qualified definition who taught in high poverty schools was 7.8% in 2003-04, as opposed to 22.9% the year before. Teachers who were not highly qualified and taught in low poverty schools went from 12.6% in 2002-03, to 3.5% in 2003-04.

For the 2004-05 school year the data show that 4.4% of the teachers who taught in Virginia did not meet the highly qualified definition, significantly down from the 16.5% two years previously. The percentage of teachers who taught with provisional or special education conditional credentials statewide in 2002-03 was 2.3%. The provisionally certified teachers totaled 9.2%, and the special education conditional licensees totaled 2.5%. In 2003-04, 8% of teachers statewide taught with provisional licenses, and 2.1% taught with special education

conditional licenses. During the 2004-05 school year, 7.1% of teachers taught with provisional licenses, and 2.1% taught with special education licenses (VADOE, 2006).

2.5 Teacher Retention

In 2001, Richard Ingersoll, of the University of Pennsylvania identified three reasons why teachers choose not to stay in education. The reasons are: 1) retirement, 2) personal issues, and 3) job dissatisfaction. Viadero (2002) reported that 29% of new hires leave their jobs within the first three years, and 39% leave within the first five years. Unfortunately, teachers who are exiting the profession early seemed to be the ones designated by their administrators as the most promising (Gordon & Maxey, 2000). Sargent (2003) found that the lack of professional development opportunities and inadequate teacher preparation programs combined with school cultures lacking in support systems for novice teachers produce a system of failure rather than success.

School districts are required to locate qualified personnel, and State Departments of Education are responding to the exodus of educators by attempting new recruiting practices, teacher education reform, certification rule changes, and professional development programs for teachers (Darling-Hammond, 1999). Morice and Murray (2003) found that some school districts offer other financial rewards for contract signing such as tax breaks and home buying opportunities.

The purpose of the multi-year study of four Florida school districts was to examine the relationship between the demographics of new teachers and the retention rate of the teachers. The researchers wanted to create a profile of people who are the most at risk for leaving the field of education. They tracked 2,129 new hires in four school districts in Florida during the 2000-01 school year using the variables of age, gender, race, teacher preparation programs, and teaching

assignments. The four school districts were Broward County, Palm Beach County, St. Lucie County, and Okeechobee County. Broward County hired 62% of the people in the study, Palm Beach County hired 25% of the individuals, St. Lucie hired 12% of the sample and Okeechobee County hired 1% of the sample (Watlington, Shockley, Huie, Morris, & Lieberman, 2004).

The variables which were identified in the first year of the new teacher cohort which continued to be significant were out-of-state and out-of-field variables. Teaching out-of-field means teaching in an area in which the teacher does not have certification. Broward County was the only school division which had an alternate route to licensure, so the preparation variable did not prove to be significant when compared to the other types of variables in its sample.

In the second year of the study Broward County retained 88.2% of its teachers, whereas St. Lucie County only retained 52.1% of the new teachers from the first year of the study. By the end of the third year of the study Broward County still retained its teachers at the highest rate of 80.5%, whereas Okeechobee County only retained 48% of its original new hires.

The researchers found that the data indicated the retention rates for the variables of gender, age, race, field placement, and teacher preparation differed when the Okeechobee, Palm Beach, and St. Lucie counties were compared to Broward County. When Broward County was removed from the comparison of the 3rd year sample, race and age became statistically significant variables. The data revealed that Black teachers were more likely to leave than other racial groups, and Latino teachers were more likely to remain than their White counterparts. In Okeechobee, St. Lucie, and Palm Beach Counties older teachers were more likely to be retained than the younger teachers (Watlington, et al., 2004).

The retention rate of new teachers in Broward County far surpassed the other three counties in the study. Examining Broward County's practices with new teachers revealed that

five years previously they had begun a new teacher program called the New Educator Support System (NESS). The school district had invested considerable resources into this program and some of the components were professional development, district wide mentoring, and technical assistance for all novice teachers. Different levels of support were available depending on identified needs and the previous training of the new hires. The researchers decided to investigate the NESS program during the fourth year of the study. They wanted to find if there were other factors involved in Broward County that made them successful at retaining new teachers. Other questions remained as well: “Why do men leave more often in these four counties than women?” “Why do out-of-state individuals leave more often than Florida residents?” By continuing the study the researchers wanted to find more emerging patterns indicating that there are individual characteristics of new teachers that may make them prone to remaining in their positions, or more likely to abandon their jobs. To date those findings have not been published.

2.6 Summary

School districts across the United States lose personnel. It is not uncommon that people move, change careers, or retire. However, massive teacher turnover affects the quality of the education children are able to receive. Having large rates of teacher attrition carries a budgetary implication as well as an instructional implication. The cost of replacing teachers and training them to be successful is high. If Dr. Watlington and the other researchers continue this study, perhaps information will be forthcoming to assist school divisions in creating quality teacher support systems that include the mentorship and professional development. Perhaps administrators will realize that without support systems teacher retention will continue to be an ongoing problem. Teachers are not expendable, nor are they easily replaced.

Teacher transience does not allow for the building of trust and commitment to the school or the students. There is little possibility of developing relationships with colleagues, parents, community members, and students if there is a time limit on the teachers' willingness to remain in the urban setting. The money that a school district invests in professional development for new teachers is lost when the teachers decide to leave after a short time. The continual loss of teaching personnel does not allow for curriculum improvement district wide. New teachers may ask questions that the veteran teachers have not considered. New teacher information is valuable to those who have stayed in one location for a length of time because new teachers view everything differently. Examining structures that have been used over time may yield results that cause improvement. When new teachers abandon the profession we lose a valuable resource. Teacher transience in the urban setting has implications across the school district. The vacant positions must be filled, new individuals must be trained, more costs are incurred, resources and time must be allocated to the new hires, and the cycle begins again.

In 2005, in *The Teacher Educator*, Steve Grineski summarized and analyzed the recommendations developed by the Teaching Commission (2004) in *Teaching at Risk: A Call to Action*. Nineteen commissioners, mostly represented by corporate and governmental sectors, developed the report. Recommendations included teacher performance pay plans, renovating teacher preparation programs, modifying or creating new licensure policies, and increasing the job responsibilities of principals. Louis Gerstner, a former CEO of IBM created and chaired The Teaching Commission. The suggestion has been made that The Teaching Commission does not comprehend the complexities of education and teacher preparation and only operates from a marketplace mentality. The lack of basic understanding of educational processes results in mistaken solution to the problems facing Americas' schools today.

Do the stringent requirements for becoming licensed as a teacher result in the lack of a qualified candidate pool of applicants? Or, are there other issues at work? According to Ruby Payne, education has become a “pass-through” profession? (Personal communication, February, 2006). There was a time when people entered education intending to stay for a career. Now, many young people begin as teachers only to leave after three to five years. Teaching is difficult work, and the accountability movement has made school a stress-filled place. Many factors may contribute to the challenges of urban teaching: school safety, classroom management, limited materials and resources, low parental support, and high student mobility. Perhaps we do not give new teachers the support they require to remain in the profession.

The National Center for Education Statistics in 1997 revealed that teacher transience can have serious consequences for the quality of education for students in urban districts. A summary report issued by the National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future (2003) stated that teacher turnover is highest in low-income urban schools. The turnover rate for teachers in high-poverty schools is almost one third higher than the rate for teachers in other schools (Useem & Nield, 2002). The most serious consequence is the loss of teacher quality and student achievement.

Student academic achievement is dependent on quality teachers and consistency. Teachers who leave for other schools or other professions do not provide the stability that students require to establish a culture of caring and commitment. For urban students the school is often the only place where there is a stable environment in their lives (Payne, 2004). When students are taught by teachers who have the necessary training and credentials, students excel regardless of socio-economic status, cultural background, language, disability, or parental educational background (Darling-Hammond, 2000).

When there are teacher vacancies in urban districts the openings may be filled with substitutes, or teachers with little training in the content they are required to teach. In Lighthouse Public Schools it is not unusual for teachers to have a class overload, meaning that they forego planning time and teach an extra class each day. This may occur because of the lack of teachers in the critical needs areas in the applicant pool. Although the teachers who teach more classes are compensated for the overload, they also have to take the extra work home due to the loss of daily planning time.

In 1999 the Secretary of Education in a report on teacher quality revealed that the highest percentages of teachers with waivers were found in the high poverty urban school districts. With the mandate for the No Child Left Behind law that all teachers be “highly qualified” by the end of the 2005-06 school year, the option of teachers with licensure waivers will cease. The result may be that the students with the highest educational needs will be those with the newest, least prepared teachers. According to Prince (2000), urban schools have the highest rates of first-year teachers, the highest percentages of teachers with less than five years of experience, and the lowest numbers of teachers who are accomplished.

Few teachers are excellent the first year they are assigned to the classroom (Wong, 2005). Education is the learning business, and the first year on the job new teachers must acquire the knowledge about school policies and procedures as well as confidence and security in the delivery of instruction to their students. It takes time to become a successful teacher, but those who do not stay in the profession long enough to learn how to master the art of instruction are often replaced by other new teachers who have little experience.

Arthur Levine, former President of the Teacher’s College of Columbia University, recently published his report on Educating School Teachers, under the direction of the Education

Schools Project. This was the second of four reports, the first being Educating School Leaders.

Dr. Levine studied college and university teacher preparation programs across the United States.

Dr. Levine says that too often colleges and universities have low admissions and low graduation standards. In fact, he alleges, that the higher education faculties and staff have no connection to public education and that the students who attend these institutions and graduate wanting to become teachers are ill prepared to face the public school student.

He does, however present a five point plan for the improvement of teacher preparation programs and for changing the policies regarding teacher education. There are 1,206 university based schools of education in the United States (Levine, 2006). There is serious debate in education about whether teaching is a profession similar to law or medicine and university preparation is the key to success, or more similar to journalism, where the best instruction takes place on the job. Because of the division of opinions on the nature of teaching, university programs vary widely in their beliefs as well.

The onset of the No Child Left Behind law has defined “highly qualified” as meaning that teachers have content mastery, but does not specify that these people needed to have attended a university based teacher preparation program. According to the Levine study, 47 states have allowed alternate licensure programs to encourage those wanting to enter education without the university teacher preparation credentials.

This study was conducted with national surveys of education school alumni, principals, education school deans, college and university faculty, site visits to 28 education schools throughout the country, and a large database of student achievement growth, to compare the student achievement to the preparation of the teachers.

Of the alumni surveyed, 62% reported that they were inadequately prepared by their college and university programs for teaching school. Only 46% of the principals surveyed said that the university programs prepared the teachers “well” or “moderately well” in integrating technology into instruction. Further, 42% indicated that the teachers were able to use student performance assessment techniques, 41% said the teachers could implement curriculum standards, and 33% reported that the teachers could manage the classroom.

Of the principals surveyed, 30% indicated that the teachers were able to address the needs of students with disabilities, and a low 16% responded that the teachers could help English Language Learners (Levine, 2006) (see *Figure 3*).




Figure 3. Principal Responses from the University Teacher Preparation Survey

The study found that although 88% of the faculty of the schools of education had taught school at some point in their careers, the students complained that it was not long enough or too long ago to be relevant today. The students also indicated that the classes were often about theory, and had little to do with day to day teaching. They also revealed that there is no continuity between one course and another and no connection between student teaching and the classes to which they had been exposed.

Four schools of education were highlighted as being excellent: Alverno College in Milwaukee, Emporia State University in Kansas, Stanford University's Teacher education Program (STEP), and the Curry School of Education at the University of Virginia. Each is described and its programs are outlined in the study as ones to which other schools of education should aspire.

The Curry School of Education is a five year program, and the entrance requirements are stringent. Students in the school earn a bachelor's degree with a liberal arts major and then a master's degree in teaching. Students complete their general education requirements, a bachelor's degree in an arts and sciences discipline, and then begin to take the requisite education courses. At the completion of their fourth year the students have as many as six field experiences. The fifth year is spent teaching with a faculty advisor and a clinical instructor.

The faculty at the Curry School does extensive research and receives more than \$5 million in grants from the Carnegie Corporation to strengthen its teaching programs. The philosophy is that it takes more than four years to prepare young people to be effective teachers.

The findings from Dr. Arthur Levine's research of college and university teacher preparation programs are that improved teacher education programs and better prepared teachers will impact student achievement. The recommendations are: 1) Change the education schools to

professional schools based on the “best practices” in public education. 2) Make student achievement the first measure of education program success. 3) Make five year programs the standard. 4) Establish quality control with outcomes-based requirements for certification and licensure for both the traditionally prepared educators, and those from alternate routes to licensure.

The implications for schools of education for following the recommendations made by Dr. Arthur Levine would be expensive and time consuming. However, if the stake is student achievement, and that is the focus of all of education, it may be incumbent on college and university teacher preparation programs to remodel their own programs based on these findings and recommendations.

CHAPTER 3

Methodology

3.1 Description of Lighthouse City

Lighthouse City, Virginia is located in southeastern Virginia, also known as the Peninsula, or Tidewater. It is located near the cities of Williamsburg, Hampton, Norfolk, Chesapeake, and Virginia Beach. It is the fourth largest city in Hampton Roads. The Hampton Roads area grew to more than 1.6 million people at a 1.17% rate from the 1990-2000 census data.

Lighthouse City has an ethnic composition of 53.5 % Caucasian, 39.1% African American, 7.4 % other and mixed, and 4.2% with Latino surnames. Sixty-two percent of the residents of the city are between the ages of 18-64 (U.S. Census of Population and Housing, 2000).

Lighthouse Public Schools has a student population of 31,167. The school district employs approximately 5000 people, of whom 2500 are teachers. In the school division are five early childhood centers, 28 elementary schools, eight middle schools, and five high schools. The total enrollment in the elementary schools is 15,924, in the middle schools the enrollment is 7,281, and in the high schools the enrollment is 9,437. The cultural backgrounds of the students in Lighthouse City are Caucasian, 32.8%, Black, 57.4%, Latino, 5.5%, Asian/Pacific Islander, 2.6%, Native American 0.6%, and unspecified, 1.0%.

The average student teacher ratio in elementary school is 20 to 1, in middle school it is 20 to 1, and in high school the student teacher ratio is 22 to 1. In “other” programs, 12.4% of the students are in special education, 4.5% are in the talented and gifted program, 46.5% are economically disadvantaged, and 1.46% of the student population is an English language learner.

The average per pupil expenditure for operations includes regular day school, school food services, summer school, adult education programs, but does not include the costs for facilities, debt service and capital outlay additions. According to the Accounting Supervisor of Lighthouse Public Schools, the average per pupil expenditure Lighthouse City received from the Standards of Quality in fiscal year 2007 is \$5279. Adding all categories and grants, Lighthouse City receives \$6219 per pupil.

According to the Assistant Superintendent for Human Resources, each year Lighthouse Public Schools must recruit from 250-400 new teachers. The Human Resources Personnel Coordinators pursue new teachers on a year-round basis. They make trips to Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, West Virginia, and visit many of the colleges and universities within the state of Virginia. The purpose of this research study is to determine the implications of the Virginia teacher licensure regulations on teacher retention in Lighthouse City Public Schools.

3.2 Research Questions

There are four research questions to be addressed: 1) “What factors influence the retention of teachers in Lighthouse City Public Schools?” 2) “Is it possible to predict demographically by the variables of race, gender, age, grade level teaching assignment, and teacher licensure preparation program which groups or sub-groups of people are more likely or less likely to leave a school system because of teacher licensure regulations?” 3) “Does the licensure preparation program influence retention?” 4) “Were the Virginia licensure regulations the reasons cited for the departure of teachers in 2004, 2005, and 2006?”

3.3 Population

The population in the proposed study originates with the 361 teachers hired for the 2003-04 school year to teach elementary, middle and high school in Lighthouse City. Because of

attrition, there is a decrease in each of the three years from the original number, with the largest percentage occurring at the end of the first year. The large number of people leaving the school division at the end of the third year may be because many did not complete the necessary requirements to be fully licensed to teach in the state of Virginia.

3.4 Data Collection

In order to be able to answer the four research questions a quantitative methods approach will be used for the data collection. Erickson (1986) notes that all methods are fallible, and that it becomes important to use multiple methods to discover participants' meaning structures to view events in as many different ways as possible. The quantitative data will be collected from the cohort of new hires in the 2003 school year from the Human Resources Department of Lighthouse Public Schools. The data will show who left at the end of school years 2003-2004, 2004-2005, and 2005-2006. The data will be compiled with the variables of age, gender, race, level of school taught, and licensure preparation program. Data from the variables listed will be determined by document review. The data will reveal how many left at the end of three years because they did not complete the requirements for licensure in the state of Virginia. How many simply chose to leave the teaching profession without trying to finish their certification? Are there statistically significant differences in the variables of the 2003 cohort of new hires? Additionally, a survey of the 2003 new teacher cohort will be administered electronically to the people still employed in Lighthouse City Public Schools, and a mailed survey will be sent to the last known address of those who are no longer teaching in Lighthouse City Public School to find if the licensure regulations in the state of Virginia impacted the decision to leave (or stay) in Lighthouse City Public Schools. Additionally, survey questions will try to ascertain the factors which influenced the decisions to stay in Lighthouse City Public Schools, or to leave.

3.5 Instrumentation

The Human Resources Department of Lighthouse Public Schools collects data on all people hired to teach in the school system. The data are compiled in a database using an EXCEL spreadsheet. However, all the data received from HR will then be transferred to the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) in order to complete a statistical analysis of the information. Descriptives and inferential statistics will be reported in Chapter IV. The results of the regression analysis will be reported in tables.

The survey questions will be administered electronically and by mail by the researcher to the 2003-06 cohort of new teachers in Lighthouse City. Although the Human Resources Department of Lighthouse Public Schools does send an exit interview to each teacher with the request to complete the form as they leave the school division, the percentage of forms completed and returned is small, and the information gathered is not readily available. All responses will be confidential. The survey will be validated by a group of doctoral students from Virginia Polytechnic and State University. To be considered as a valid survey item each question had to have an 80% agreement rate on clarity, and association with the research questions. Survey responses will be coded, labeled and consolidated into categories by theme. To develop any assertions about the information from the 2003 cohort of new hires, it will be necessary to continually examine the data for confirming and disconfirming evidence. It is critical to examine the data for disconfirming evidence to be sure that the researcher's own opinion is not the theme most often supported. Erickson comments that researchers must continually reexamine the assumptions they bring to a study and be aware of how these understandings may impact their understandings of the realities inherent in any social interaction.

If a profile can be developed of the people most likely to stay and the people most likely to leave, it may be possible to create interview questions to ascertain in which category people fit. The training possibilities for the Human Resources Department, principals, and supervisors who do the hiring for the school division will be greatly enhanced by understanding the necessary question to ask, and to listen carefully to the responses that are given by potential candidates for employment.

3.6 Methods of Analysis

In a quantitative study, the researcher may look for relationships between independent and dependent variables. The relationships may be further studied to determine if one or more of the variables can predict another (Sowell, 2001). Descriptive research is often used in the social sciences. Descriptive research can determine relationships between variables, but not the causes of the relationships. Correlations reveal if the variables are related to one another, and what the strength of the relationship is. However, correlations cannot reveal if one or more of the variables is the cause of an effect on another variable (Sprinthall, Schmutte, & Sirois, 1991).

The quantitative data will be analyzed to assess the possible relationship between the demographic variables and teacher retention. The method of analysis will be multiple regression. There are eight hypotheses to be addressed:

1. The teacher licensure requirements in the state of Virginia do impact the retention of teachers in Lighthouse City Public Schools.
2. The teacher licensure requirements in the state of Virginia do not impact the retention of teachers in Lighthouse City Public Schools.
3. Teacher retention in Lighthouse City Public Schools can be predicted by race, gender, age, grade level teaching assignment, and teacher preparation program.

4. Teacher retention in Lighthouse Public Schools cannot be predicted by race, gender, age, grade level teaching assignment or teacher preparation program.
5. There is a relationship between teacher licensure preparation program and retention in Lighthouse City Public Schools.
6. There is no relationship between teacher licensure preparation program and retention in Lighthouse City Public Schools.
7. Virginia licensure regulations were the reasons cited for the departure of teachers from Lighthouse City Public Schools in 2004, 2005, and 2006.
8. Virginia licensure regulations were not the reasons cited for the departure of teachers from Lighthouse City Public Schools in 2004, 2005, and 2006.

The historical beginnings of regression and correlation analyses date to the work of Francis Galton and Karl Pearson in the late 1800's (Wiggins, 1973). The procedures were used in psychology to try to clarify differences among people by studying naturally occurring relationships between variables. Multiple regression correlation determines the statistical significance of differences among groups of subjects. The general purpose of multiple regression is to learn more about the relationships between several independent variables (or predictor variables) and a dependent or criterion variable. In education, multiple regressions may be used to determine predictors of student academic achievement, equitable compensation for employees or in the case of this proposed research study, the predictors of teacher retention. Multiple regression analysis allows the researcher to ask questions calling for answers involving predictions. The variables used to predict teacher retention in this study are race, gender, age, level (elementary, middle or high school) and type of teacher preparation program, The

individual predictor variables will be combined to form a single predictor variable. In this study there are five independent variables and one dependent variable, called teacher retention.

The correlation between two variables reflects the degree to which the variables are related (Pedhazzer & Schmelkin, 1991). The most often used measure of correlation is the Pearson R . Pearson's R reflects the linear relationship between two variables. The relation between the composite predictor variable and teacher flight is then reflected in the multiple correlation, or R . R ranges from 0 to 1 with 0 indicating no relationship between the variables, and 1 indicating a perfect relationship between the variables. However, by examining R^2 the proportion of variance found between the weighted combinations of predictors is determined. So, $1-R^2$ is the proportion of variance that is not predictable. Each individual variable contributes to the overall correlation by means of its strength of association with teacher retention. The multiple correlation reflects the best way to combine the predictors so that the relation between the composite variable (teacher age, gender, race, teacher preparation program, grade/course taught, and licensure,) and teacher retention is maximized.

All of the teachers in the study will be assigned numbers using a nominal scale. The use of the nominal scale allows the numbers to label categories. For example, the men will be designated with a "1", and the women with a "0", meaning not men. This coding does not imply any weight or significance other than to differentiate between items in a category. "When two categories are used, the nominal measure is called dichotomous" (Grimm, Yarnold, 2005, p.6). Each teacher in the population will be assigned to one category only, and all the teachers will be assigned to the specified categories listed above.

Is it possible to predict using the variables of race, gender, age, grade level taught and type of teacher preparation program which people are more likely or less likely to remain in

Lighthouse Public Schools? Each variable will be given the same weight, and this requires a forced entry. Forced entry means that all predictors are entered into the model in SPSS at the same time (Field, 2005). The researcher does not make any determinations about the order in which the predictors are entered into the model. The variables that have been selected for this proposed study are similar to the variables used in the study of teacher retention in Florida by Watlington (found on page 46). It will be interesting to correlate the Florida results with the results of the Lighthouse City study to see if the predictors of teacher retention remain the same despite the differences in localities.

3.7 Summary

Each school year the elementary and secondary personnel coordinators in the Lighthouse City Human Resources Department spend a large portion of their time and resources searching for new teachers (Assistant Superintendent for Human Resources, Lighthouse City, 2006). The retention of teachers becomes paramount on the list of school division initiatives.

Two sources of data will be accessed from the Human Resources Department of Lighthouse Public Schools regarding the 2003 cohort of people hired as new teachers for the 2003-04 school year. The cohort of new hires continues for three years, and ceases at the end of school year 2005-06. During each of the three years of 2003-04, 2004-05, and 2005-06 some of the original group left the school division. However the largest number of teachers left in June, 2004.

Data will be collected on the variables of race, gender, age, level (elementary, middle or high school) and type of teacher preparation program from the cohort of new hires in the 2003-04 school year. A multiple regression analysis of the variables will be conducted using the statistical computer software SPSS to find if it is possible to predict demographically which

people are more likely to leave Lighthouse City within the first three years of being hired to teach. An electronic and mailed survey will be administered to all of the teachers hired in Lighthouse City Public Schools after July 1, 2003, to begin teaching in the 2003-04 school year. All responses will be confidential.

Finding 250-400 new teachers per year to educate the students in Lighthouse City is a daunting task, and retention of employees should be a priority for the school district. It is far easier to continue to train people who are committed to the education profession than to do one or two professional development sessions which produce few results.

It will be interesting to find if the data from this proposed study reveal that there are procedures that can be implemented to lessen the necessity of hiring 250-400 new teachers per year. And further, that the rigorous licensure regulations in place in Virginia do not affect the supply of teachers, but rather that there are other factors which need to be considered when teachers choose to depart the education profession. Continuing to develop the teacher workforce already employed seems far more preferable than having to search for replacements each year.

CHAPTER 4

Findings

4.1 Overview of the Study

Across the United States, urban school systems struggle to retain new teachers (Recruiting New Teachers, 2002). Lighthouse City Public Schools is no exception. The purpose of this study was to determine the implications of Virginia teacher licensure regulations on teacher retention in Lighthouse City Public Schools. There were four research questions to be answered in this study: 1) What factors influence the retention of teachers in Lighthouse City Public Schools? 2) Is it possible to predict demographically by race, gender, age, grade level teaching assignment, and teacher preparation program which groups or sub-groups are more likely or less likely to leave a school system because of teacher licensure regulations? 3) Does the licensure preparation program influence retention? 4) Were the Virginia licensure regulations the reasons cited for the departure of teachers in 2004, 2005, and 2006?

4.2 Procedures

Research question number two was answered through document review provided by the Human Resources Department of Lighthouse City Public Schools. Research questions one, three and four were answered through an electronic and postal service mailed survey to the 2003 cohort of 361 new teachers hired by Lighthouse City Public Schools.

Of the 361 people hired to begin teaching in 2003, by the end of school year 2006, 197 had resigned. There are today 164 of the 361 original 2003 cohort of new teachers still employed as teachers in Lighthouse City Public Schools. The majority of those hired in 2003 were White women. This is reflective of the teaching profession across the United States (National Education Association, 2006).

A meeting between the researcher and the top personnel in the Human Resources Department of Lighthouse City Public Schools was held to discuss the data needed to complete this study. In December the School Board had questioned the Assistant Superintendent of the Human Resources Department about the increasing number of teacher losses over the past five years. They wanted to know the reasons teachers were choosing to leave and what was being done to encourage them to remain in Lighthouse City.

The Human Resources Department was interested in the proposal for this study since it would not involve additional work for them, and would not be a budgetary item for the school system. The researcher would incur any costs involved, and they would merely supply records they already kept in an EXCEL file.

Dale Margheim, a former doctoral student at Virginia Polytechnic and State University was contacted by electronic mail to seek permission to use the survey validation instrument he created for his dissertation. Permission was granted, and a copy of the electronic mail is seen in Appendix B.

Survey questions were developed early in 2007, and validated the first time by a group of 13 doctoral students from Virginia Polytechnic and State University. The Margheim validation instrument was used for validation purposes. The initial survey and the initial survey validation are seen in Appendices C and D, respectively. The initial survey validation response percentages are found in Appendix E.

The second round of validation by the 13 doctoral students from Virginia Polytechnic and State University was performed. There were six questions which had been re-written from the original 26 questions. The validation of the new questions can be found in Appendices F and G, respectively.

The Institutional Review Board approval from Lighthouse City Public Schools was received in June, 2006, and the Institutional Review Board approval from Virginia Polytechnic and State University was received February 1, 2007. Copies of both letters of approval can be found in Appendices H and I, respectively. The copy of the Institutional Review Board certificate from the completed class is found in Appendix J.

The initial electronic and postal service mailing of the final research survey took place after the IRB approval was received. The final survey is found in Appendix K. The 164 teachers still working in Lighthouse City Public Schools were contacted through the school system intranet web mail system.

Each of the 164 received an individual electronic mail. An introductory letter accompanied the link to the survey explaining the purpose of the electronic mail and a request for participation in the study. The introductory letter is found in Appendix L.

A delivery and read receipt were added to each electronic mailing to ensure that the recipient received and read the electronic mail. The 164 people still employed by Lighthouse City Public Schools were each assigned a number by their name to track their responses to the survey. Included with the survey was an introductory letter informing each recipient of the purpose of the study and to assure them that all responses would be entirely confidential. Each was asked to be candid with every response so that Lighthouse City Public Schools might learn how to better support new teachers. The final survey and the introductory letter are found in Appendices K and L, respectively.

The 197 teachers from the original 361 who had left Lighthouse City Public Schools were mailed a copy of the introductory letter and the survey with a stamped envelope containing the researcher's home address. The surveys were mailed to the last address kept by the Human

Resources Department of Lighthouse City Public Schools. The possibility existed that people had moved and left no forwarding address, but there was no other method by which to contact those no longer employed by the school system. Each group of possible respondents was told that every completed survey received with a name attached would be entered into a drawing for a gift card worth \$50 from Best Buy. The date of the drawing was March 15. It was hoped that this might serve as an enticement to people to complete the survey.

After the initial electronic survey was completed, errors were found by the respondents. The design of the survey was such that the computer software system SurveyMonkey did not allow the respondent to continue answering questions if a question did not apply to the person. For example, in the licensure portion of the survey the question asked if the respondent had been involved in an alternate route to licensure. For the majority of the still employed personnel this question was not possible to answer. The computer program would not allow the respondent to continue, so the survey had to be redesigned to allow for a N/A (not applicable) response. The questions designed for the people who left were removed from the electronic survey to make it a more usable instrument. The initial survey garnered 50 responses.

The second electronic mailing received 70 responses. Of the 120 responses, 5 opted not to participate. With Survey Monkey (the computer survey program) names are listed as participants, and they are checked if they respond. The third time each of the sample population who had not responded was sent a paper copy of the survey by the inter-office mail system. This method resulted in 10 responses. The total number of completed surveys received from the teachers still employed by Lighthouse City Public Schools was 125 out of the possible 164, less the 5 who had chosen not to participate. The still employed personnel response rate was 76 %. The results of the electronic survey are shown in Appendix M.

The initial mailed survey to the 197 teachers who had resigned from Lighthouse City Public Schools resulted in 38 responses the first week, leaving 159 possible respondents. Two were returned for incorrect addresses, and one was returned for lack of postage. Each of the mailed surveys contained a stamped, addressed envelope to be returned to the researcher. The day after the survey was mailed, one of the former teachers called the office of the researcher to ask how her name and address had been obtained and to find out more about the research. She was informed again of the strict confidentiality of the names of the participants, and was told about the Institutional Review Board processes for both Lighthouse City Public Schools and Virginia Polytechnic and State University. She was encouraged to be candid with all of her responses, and once assured of the nature of the research, was very happy to complete the survey and to tell the story of her experiences in the school system.

One week after the initial mailing of the survey 159 surveys were mailed again. Fourteen were returned for incorrect addresses, leaving 145 possible respondents. After the second mailing, 23 surveys were returned completed. After the second mailing the total number of responses was 61. The sixteen returned surveys for incorrect address were entered into Google on the internet to find possible newer addresses.

Each name was located, and several of the names had multiple versions, states and addresses. One of the names had eight locations, but to attempt to locate the possible participants a survey with an addressed, stamped envelope was mailed to each of the listed names, for a total of 43 surveys. Of the 43 mailed 6 were completed and returned, and 37 were returned for incorrect addresses. After the third mailing the number of completed surveys was 67, the returned for incorrect address total was 54.

The fourth mailing resulted in 22 responses, bringing the number of completed surveys from resigned personnel to 89 out of a possible 197. The final percentage of respondents from the resigned group was 45.2% response rate. It may have been that some of the names of the people whose addresses were incorrect were Visiting International Faculty who held visas that only allowed them to remain in the United States for a maximum of three years. There was no designation in the data for VIF teachers, and many of the names were Latino, so it was not possible to discern if they were American citizens. Survey responses for the population of teachers who resigned from Lighthouse City Public Schools are shown in Appendix N.

The survey was designed in several sections. The first section contained questions about demographics of the employed/resigned personnel. The questions included hire date, school assignment, principal's name, and supervisor's name. The second section concerned certification, routes to licensure, completion of licensure regulations, length of time in the school system, preparation for urban school teaching, and whether the teacher licensure preparation program influenced the decision to leave or stay in Lighthouse City Public Schools.

Section three involved questions about mentorship and professional development including whether the teacher had been assigned a mentor by the school or school division, how often they met, the assignment of the mentor (whether the mentor was in the same grade level or content assignment), whether or not the teacher had participated in the Staff Development Pathwise mentorship program, the new teacher's perceptions about the quality of the mentorship experience, and whether or not the new teacher had participated in professional development activities either within the school or in outside activities provided by the school or school division.

Section four concerned questions asking the respondent to evaluate the collaboration with colleagues, the qualities exhibited by the principal and administrative staff, feelings about the teaching profession and a rating scale of school facets such as the principal, central office communication, faculty at the school, support from administration and staff, and mentorship. The final questions concerned an opinion of all the factors which might influence a new teacher's decision to remain in a school system or to leave. The entire survey included 26 questions with spaces to write in more detail if necessary.

Responses from the personnel who have remained employed in Lighthouse City were that the majority hold collegiate professional licensure (82) and are assigned to elementary school (50). Of this group of new teachers, 11 had not participated in a mentorship program, but 117 indicated that they had participated in professional development activities. Of the 125 respondents, 88 replied that they often met with other teachers to share ideas and to have their questions answered. Of the 125 respondents, 44 indicated that their principal was available and helpful, 42 indicated that the principal encouraged cooperation and teamwork, and 53 responded that the principal provided staff development activities for professional growth. When describing the qualities of the principal 38 answered that sometimes there was a general affirmation of good work, 31 said the principal regularly announced commendations for good work, and 31 indicated that it was rare for the principal to give compliments.

When asked to describe their feelings about teaching, 62 marked that they were helping others to succeed, 60 marked that their work is valuable, and 47 indicated that they have too much paperwork. When asked if they have considered leaving education within the next five years, 47 replied in the affirmative, 22 were undecided, and 30 said no.

In the final section of the survey respondents were asked to check all the possible factors which might influence a new teacher's decision to remain in Lighthouse City Public Schools. The largest response (62) was a mentor in the same grade level or content teaching assignment, followed by classroom management classes (48), a strong principal (47), and fewer requirements for summative evaluation (34).

The survey responses from the resigned personnel indicated that the majority (40) had been assigned to elementary schools, 35 held collegiate professional licenses, and 22 held provisional licenses, followed by 18 with post graduate professional licensure. Of the 32 who were involved in an alternate route to licensure, 25 did not complete the requirements to become fully licensed in Virginia. Twenty five also indicated that they had not remained with LCPS for three years. Twenty four indicated that they were not adequately prepared to teach in an urban school system.

In the mentorship section of the survey 55 replied that they had participated in a mentorship program, 22 replied that they had not, and 12 responded that they did not know there was a mentorship program. The results indicated that of the 89 survey respondents, 34 were not supported by a mentor during their first year of teaching. When asked to rate the quality of the mentorship experience, 19 responded that the mentor was able to answer specific questions and rated the experience as "good", 10 considered the experience "fair", and 15 indicated that the mentorship experience was "poor". Of the 89 respondents 12 indicated that their mentorship experience was "excellent".

When asked if they had participated in professional development activities designed for new teachers, 60 said they had, and 21 said they did not. However when asked if they attended professional development activities offered by the school system, 61 indicated that they had, 12

said they did not, and 10 replied that they did not know there were professional development activities available. In the collaboration with colleagues question 38 replied that they often met with other teachers, 21 replied that they sometimes met with other teachers, and 15 said that only occasionally did they talk to other teachers about their classes.

In the section concerning the qualities of the principal, 44 replied that the principal was available and helpful, 42 replied that the principal was often in the office, 35 answered that the principal acted fairly and made good decisions, and 32 replied that the principal expected the new teacher to know everything they were expected to do. When asked about affirmations for good work, 32 answered that it was rare for the principal to give compliments, and 20 said they never heard of anyone being commended for good work.

Regarding their feelings about teaching, 52 indicated that they were helping others to succeed, 50 replied that their work was valuable, 37 responded that they have too much paperwork, 30 responded that the responsibilities are overwhelming, and 11 said they would not encourage anyone to teach.

When asked if they had considered leaving teaching within the next five years, 65 said yes, 9 were undecided and 10 said no. In the question concerning factors that would be the most valuable to new teachers, all 89 indicated that a strong principal was a key ingredient. The second highest rating at 72 responses was a mentor in the same grade level or content teaching assignment. Of the 89 respondents, 48 considered classroom management classes to be of value, 54 indicated that there should be fewer requirements for summative evaluation, and 44 responded that they would like more staff development activities outside of school.

For the total population of new teachers hired for Lighthouse City Public Schools in 2003 there was a 59% response rate to the survey (214 out of 361). Survey responses revealed other

information. The reasons cited the most often for the departure of teachers was the school assignment, and in particular, the principal. Of the 89 responses, 38 people answered in much greater detail than the survey requirements, and one requested a phone call for further information. The 38 surveys contained stories of teaching experiences documenting why working in LCPS was difficult. Of the 38, 17 had not been assigned a mentor, and 9 others had mentors who they reported were of no value. The nine former teachers who revealed that their ineffective mentors did not meet with them except for once or twice during the year also reported that their mentors were not in the same grade level or content area, and were unable to answer any but the most basic questions about classroom management.

When asked to check all of the choices in the survey for important considerations for new teachers, all 89 selected a strong principal. In describing the principal, one former LCPS teacher wrote:

“In 29 years of teaching I have never been subjected to a more self-absorbed or self serving principal. She never spoke to me the entire year. I never saw her anywhere but in the office. I knew in January of that year I had to leave, and I took a large pay cut when I found another job. It was worth it.”

The reasons given for the departure of personnel varied from the transfer of a spouse or significant other to the desire to leave education. One respondent wrote that although she had a great principal and a valuable mentor, the climate of:

“constant testing, local standards, state standards, national standards, and the push for excellent test scores did not coincide with her philosophy of education. I consider myself to be very creative, but I could not be the robot teacher delivering facts, facts, and more facts. I came to teaching from another profession, and thought I had something of

importance to offer my students, but I could not exist in that atmosphere.” cited by the survey respondent mentioned above.

There are some incidents over which school systems have no control. Even the best mentors and the greatest principals cannot lessen the impact of continual assessment expected by the requirements of the Virginia Standards of Learning and the No Child Left Behind Act.

The former teacher who requested a phone call for further information is a resident of Washington State now. She had moved to Lighthouse City to be near her fiancé who was stationed at the local Air Force Base. She obtained employment as a second grade teacher having had previous experience teaching in very diverse schools. Her first day at her new school was the week before students arrived. At her initial meeting with one of the teachers on her grade level she was told, “Do not think you can yell at these kids because you are White and they are Black.” She was shocked that someone would assume she would behave in that manner, and replied, “I do not yell at any children. I do not believe that is the right way to treat people.” She continued to discuss in detail the climate of racism apparent between the teachers on the second grade “team”, against the newcomer who happened to be of another race. She was warned that the parents would have their children removed from her class, and that the students would not respond to her. One of the second grade teachers had been assigned as her mentor, and she realized that it would be an untenable situation. She talked to the principal who was Black, and was assigned a different mentor. The new mentor was kind and tried to be helpful, but because she was in a different grade level, the help was only general in nature.

On another occasion she was eating lunch with a group of teachers when someone at her grade level walked into the room and ordered her to “Get out of my seat.” She replied that she had no idea she was sitting in the wrong place, and the other teacher raised her voice and one

again said, “I told you to get out of my seat!” She was embarrassed and moved to another chair, and never ate with those teachers again.

When asked why she didn’t talk to the principal, she responded that the principal was having trouble with those teachers as well, and she was afraid that if she complained her life would have been even more difficult than it already was. She reiterated that she admired and supported her principal and assistant principal, both of whom were Black, and that she had not expected this virulent form of racism to be so blatant between teachers and supposed colleagues. She did say that all of the ugly behavior took place in her classroom or in one of the other teachers’ rooms, but never in public. She did get married that year, and her grade level gave her a lovely wedding present. However, every time she uses it she has very mixed feelings about the gift. Publicly the teachers were always kind, but privately they were very mean.

When asked if she was still teaching the answer was “no.” She now works for a youth orchestra, and is not sure she will ever be a teacher again. She also said she loved the students in her class, and with them she had had a wonderful year. However, the bitterness of the other teachers made her wonder if all the schools in Lighthouse City were the same way.

Only one respondent reported being unable to pass the Praxis II exam. He moved to North Carolina and secured employment as a teacher because the licensure requirements were less strict than those in Virginia. Only two people reported that Virginia licensure regulations were the reason they had left Lighthouse City Public Schools, and both of those former teachers were from Pennsylvania.

The EXCEL data received from the Human Resources Department of Lighthouse City Public Schools were sorted by race, gender, age, grade level taught, and teacher preparation

program for both groups of teachers. All ages of the 361 teachers had to be computed from their birthdates in order to place them in categories for SPSS.

Data from the teachers still employed by Lighthouse City Public Schools is as follows:

Of the 164 continuing employees 124 are White, 34 are Black, 6 are Latino, and zero are “Other”

(See *Figure 4*).




Figure 4. Racial Demographics of Continuing Employees

There were 136 women and 28 men in the sample of 164 teachers still employed with Lighthouse City Public Schools (See *Figure 5*).




Figure 5. Gender of Continuing Employees

White women ages 21-30 equal 37; 23 are 31-40; 25 are 41-50; 15 are 51-60; and 2 are 61-70. White men from 21-30 were 5; from 31-40 there were 6; from 41-50, there were 8; and from 51-60, there were 3. No White men were ages 61-70. Black women from 21-30 were 9; from 31-40 there were 8; from 41-50 there were 5; from 51-60 there were 5; and one Black woman was from 61-70. Black men from 21-30 were 2; 31-40 were 2; there were no Black men from 41-50; none from 51-60, 2 were from 61-70; and none were 71-80. Latina women from 21-30 were 1; from 31-40 were 2; from 41-50, 3; and none in the other age groups. There weren't any Latino men (See *Figure 6*).




Figure 6. Ages of Continuing Employees

There were 157 teachers with licensure from traditional teacher preparation programs, 7 with provisional or conditional licenses (See Figure 7).




Figure 7. Licensure for Continuing Employees

Of the 164, 88 teach in elementary school, 36 teach in middle school, and 40 teach in high school (See Figure 8).




Figure 8. School Assignments for Continuing Employees

For the group of resigned personnel there were 143 women, and 44 men (See Figure 9).




Figure 9. Gender of Resigned Employees

Of the 197 who resigned from 2004-2006, there are 32 White women ages 21-30; 26 are from 31-40; 29 are 41-50; 6 are 51-60; and 6 are 61-70. One White woman was aged 72. The White men 21-30 were 8, 31-40, 10, 41-50, 9, 51-60, 8, and there is 1 White man aged 61-70. There were 14 Black women aged 21-30; 12 were from 31-40; 13 were from 41-50; and 2 were from 51-60.

For the Black men, 1 was from 21-30; 1 was from 31-40; 2 were from 41-50; no men were from 51-60; and in the 61-70 category, there were 2. For the Latina women, 1 was from 21-30; 2 were from 31-40; 3 were from 41-50; and there weren't any Latina women either in the 51-60 or 61-70 categories. There was only 1 Latino man in the 41-50 category, and 1 "Other" in the 41-50 (See *Figure 10.*)




Figure 10. Ages of Resigned Employees

Ninety-six came from traditional teacher licensure programs, 100 taught with Provisional licensure, and one taught with Conditional licensure (See Figure 11).




Figure 11. Licensure for Resigned Employees

Ninety -five taught in elementary school, 47 taught in middle school, and 55 taught in high school (See Figure 12).




Figure 12. School Assignments for Resigned Employees

The two groups of teachers are similar. Each has a majority of White women. The number of men is also similar. Most of the teachers in each group were assigned to elementary schools. There is little similarity in licensure, however. Of those still employed three have conditional licenses, whereas one who resigned had a conditional license. Fifty percent of those who resigned held provisional licenses (See *Figure 11*).

Tables 2 through 8 demonstrate the demographic data by race, age, gender, teacher licensure preparation program, and school assignment.

Table 2. *White Women, 2003-2006*

	Total	Total Left	Total Stayed	% Stayed	2003 Left	2003 Stayed	% Stayed	2004 Left	2004 Stayed	% Stayed
N	200	98	102	51%	12	188	83%	41	147	78%
Age										
(21-30)	69	32	37	54%	3	66	79%	8	58	88%
(31-40)	49	26	23	47%	5	44	83%	13	30	68%
(41-50)	54	29	25	46%	4	50	83%	15	35	70%
(51-60)	21	6	15	71%	0	21	94%	3	18	86%
(61-70)	7	5	2	29%	0	7	67%	1	6	86%
License										
PGP	48	20	28	58%	1	47	85%	7	40	85%
CP	103	31	72	70%	1	102	89%	12	90	88%
P	49	47	2	4%	10	39	41%	22	17	44%
School										
E	136	64	72	53%	6	130	83%	28	102	79%
M	23	13	10	43%	1	22	71%	5	17	77%
H	41	21	20	49%	5	36	86%	8	28	78%

(table continues)

Table 2. *White Women, 2003-2006 (continued)*

	Total	Total Left	Total Stayed	% Stayed	2005 Left	2005 Stayed	% Stayed	2006 Left	2006 Stayed	% Stayed
N	200	98	102	51%	26	121	82%	19	102	84%
Age										
(21-30)	69	32	37	54%	12	46	79%	9	37	80%
(31-40)	49	26	23	47%	5	25	83%	2	23	92%
(41-50)	54	29	25	46%	6	29	83%	4	25	86%
(51-60)	21	6	15	71%	1	17	94%	2	15	88%
(61-70)	7	5	2	29%	2	4	67%	2	2	50%
License										
PGP	48	20	28	58%	6	34	85%	6	28	82%
CP	103	31	72	70%	10	80	89%	8	72	90%
P	49	47	2	4%	10	7	41%	5	2	29%
School										
E	136	64	72	53%	17	85	83%	13	72	85%
M	23	13	10	43%	5	12	71%	2	10	83%
H	41	21	20	49%	4	24	86%	4	20	83%

Table 3. *Black Women, 2003-2006*

	Total	Total Left	Total Stayed	% Stayed	2003 Left	2003 Stayed	% Stayed	2004 Left	2004 Stayed	% Stayed
N	69	41	28	41%	3	66	96%	12	54	82%
Age										
(21-30)	23	14	9	39%	0	23	100%	1	22	96%
(31-40)	20	12	8	40%	1	19	95%	5	14	74%
(41-50)	18	13	5	28%	2	16	89%	5	11	69%
(51-60)	7	2	5	71%	0	7	100%	1	6	86%
(61-70)	1	0	1	100%	0	1	100%	0	1	100%
License										
PGP	22	11	11	50%	0	22	100%	2	20	91%
CP	21	7	14	67%	1	20	95%	1	19	95%
P	26	23	3	12%	2	24	92%	9	15	63%
School										
E	32	21	11	34%	3	29	91%	7	22	76%
M	22	14	8	36%	0	22	100%	5	17	77%
H	15	6	9	60%	0	15	100%	0	15	100%

(table continues)

Table 3. *Black Women, 2003-2006 (continued)*

	Total	Total Left	Total Stayed	% Stayed	2005 Left	2005 Stayed	% Stayed	2006 Left	2006 Stayed	% Stayed
N	69	41	28	41%	10	44	82%	16	28	64%
Age										
(21-30)	23	14	9	39%	5	17	77%	8	9	53%
(31-40)	20	12	8	40%	2	12	86%	4	8	67%
(41-50)	18	13	5	28%	3	8	73%	3	5	63%
(51-60)	7	2	5	71%	0	6	100%	1	5	83%
(61-70)	1	0	1	100%	0	1	100%	0	1	100%
License										
PGP	22	11	11	50%	4	16	80%	5	11	69%
CP	21	7	14	67%	3	16	84%	2	14	88%
P	26	23	3	12%	3	12	80%	9	3	25%
School										
E	32	21	11	34%	5	17	77%	6	11	65%
M	22	14	8	36%	2	15	88%	7	8	53%
H	15	6	9	60%	3	12	80%	3	9	75%

Table 4. *Latina Women, 2003-2006*

	Total	Total Left	Total Stayed	% Stayed	2003 Left	2003 Stayed	% Stayed	2004 Left	2004 Stayed	% Stayed
N	10	4	6	60%	0	10	100%	1	9	90%
Age										
(21-30)	2	1	1	50%	0	2	100%	0	2	100%
(31-40)	4	2	2	50%	0	4	100%	1	3	75%
(41-50)	4	1	3	75%	0	4	100%	0	4	100%
(51-60)	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%
(61-70)	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%
License										
PGP	1	1	0	100%	0	1	100%	0	1	100%
CP	5	1	4	80%	0	5	100%	0	5	100%
P	4	2	2	50%	0	4	100%	1	3	75%
School										
E	4	2	2	50%	0	4	100%	1	3	75%
M	4	0	4	100%	0	4	100%	0	4	100%
H	2	2	0	0%	0	2	100%	0	2	100%

(table continues)

Table 4. *Latina Women, 2003-2006 (continued)*

	Total	Total Left	Total Stayed	% Stayed	2005 Left	2005 Stayed	% Stayed	2006 Left	2006 Stayed	% Stayed
N	10	4	6	60%	2	7	78%	1	6	86%
Age										
(21-30)	2	1	1	50%	1	1	50%	0	1	100%
(31-40)	4	2	2	50%	1	2	67%	0	2	100%
(41-50)	4	1	3	75%	0	4	100%	1	3	75%
(51-60)	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%
(61-70)	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%
License										
PGP	1	1	0	100%	0	1	100%	1	0	0%
CP	5	1	4	80%	1	4	80%	0	4	100%
P	4	2	2	50%	1	2	67%	0	2	100%
School										
E	4	2	2	50%	0	3	100%	1	2	67%
M	4	0	4	100%	0	4	100%	0	4	100%
H	2	2	0	0%	2	0	0%	0	0	0%

Table 5. *White Men, 2003-2006*

	Total	Total Left	Total Stayed	% Stayed	2003 Left	2003 Stayed	% Stayed	2004 Left	2004 Stayed	% Stayed
N	58	36	22	38%	4	54	93%	12	42	78%
Age										
(21-30)	13	8	5	38%	0	13	100%	3	10	77%
(31-40)	16	10	6	38%	1	15	94%	2	13	87%
(41-50)	17	9	8	47%	0	17	100%	3	14	82%
(51-60)	11	8	3	27%	3	8	73%	3	5	63%
(61-70)	1	1	0	0%	0	1	100%	1	0	0%
License										
PGP	20	5	15	75%	0	20	100%	2	18	90%
CP	21	14	7	33%	0	21	100%	3	17	81%
P	17	17	0	0%	4	13	77%	7	6	46%
School										
E	19	13	6	32%	1	18	95%	3	15	83%
M	11	7	4	36%	1	10	91%	3	7	70%
H	28	16	12	43%	2	26	93%	6	20	77%

(table continues)

Table 5. *White Men, 2003-2006 (continued)*

	Total	Total Left	Total Stayed	% Stayed	2005 Left	2005 Stayed	% Stayed	2006 Left	2006 Stayed	% Stayed
N	58	36	22	38%	12	30	71%	8	22	73%
Age										
(21-30)	13	8	5	38%	2	8	80%	3	5	63%
(31-40)	16	10	6	38%	6	7	54%	2	6	75%
(41-50)	17	9	8	47%	3	11	79%	2	8	80%
(51-60)	11	8	3	27%	1	4	80%	1	3	75%
(61-70)	1	1	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%
License										
PGP	20	5	15	75%	2	16	89%	1	15	94%
CP	21	14	7	33%	7	10	59%	4	7	64%
P	17	17	0	0%	3	3	50%	3	0	0%
School										
E	19	13	6	32%	7	8	53%	2	6	75%
M	11	7	4	36%	1	6	86%	2	4	68%
H	28	16	12	43%	4	16	80%	4	12	75%

Table 6. *Black Men, 2003-2006*

	Total	Total Left	Total Stayed	% Stayed	2003 Left	2003 Stayed	% Stayed	2004 Left	2004 Stayed	% Stayed
N	12	6	6	50%	0	12	100%	4	8	67%
Age										
(21-30)	3	1	2	50%	0	3	100%	1	2	67%
(31-40)	3	1	2	50%	0	3	100%	1	2	67%
(41-50)	2	2	0	0%	0	2	0%	1	1	50%
(51-60)	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%
(61-70)	4	2	2	50%	0	4	100%	1	3	75%
License										
PGP	2	0	2	100%	0	2	100%	0	2	100%
CP	4	0	4	100%	0	4	100%	0	4	100%
P	6	6	0	0%	0	6	0%	4	2	33%
School										
E	3	1	2	67%	0	3	100%	1	2	67%
M	7	4	3	43%	0	7	100%	2	5	71%
H	2	1	1	50%	0	1	100%	1	0	100%

(table continues)

Table 6. *Black Men, 2003-2006 (continued)*

	Total	Total Left	Total Stayed	% Stayed	2005 Left	2005 Stayed	% Stayed	2006 Left	2006 Stayed	% Stayed
N	12	6	6	50%	0	8	100%	2	6	75%
Age										
(21-30)	3	1	2	50%	0	2	100%	0	2	100%
(31-40)	3	1	2	50%	0	2	100%	0	2	100%
(41-50)	2	2	0	0%	0	1	100%	1	0	0%
(51-60)	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%
(61-70)	4	2	2	50%	0	3	100%	1	2	68%
License										
PGP	2	0	2	100%	0	2	100%	0	2	100%
CP	4	0	4	100%	0	4	100%	0	4	100%
P	6	6	0	0%	0	2	100%	2	0	0%
School										
E	3	1	2	67%	0	2	100%	0	2	100%
M	7	4	3	43%	0	5	100%	2	3	60%
H	2	1	1	50%	1	0	100%	1	0	0%

Table 7. *Latino Men, 2003-2006*

	Total	Total Left	Total Stayed	% Stayed	2003 Left	2003 Stayed	% Stayed	2004 Left	2004 Stayed	% Stayed
N	1	1	0	0%	0	1	100%	1	0	0%
Age										
(21-30)	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%
(31-40)	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%
(41-50)	1	1	0	0%	0	1	100%	1	0	0%
(51-60)	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%
(61-70)	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%
License										
PGP	1	1	0	0%	0	1	100%	1	0	0%
CP	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%
P	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%
School										
E	1	1	0	0%	0	1	100%	1	0	0%
M	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%
H	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%

(table continues)

Table 7. *Latino Men, 2003-2006 (continued)*

	Total	Total Left	Total Stayed	% Stayed	2005 Left	2005 Stayed	% Stayed	2006 Left	2006 Stayed	% Stayed
N	1	1	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%
Age										
(21-30)	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%
(31-40)	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%
(41-50)	1	1	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%
(51-60)	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%
(61-70)	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%
License										
PGP	1	1	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%
CP	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%
P	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%
School										
E	1	1	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%
M	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%
H	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%

Table 8. *Other Men, 2003-2006*

	Total	Total Left	Total Stayed	% Stayed	2003 Left	2003 Stayed	% Stayed	2004 Left	2004 Stayed	% Stayed
N	1	1	0	0%	0	1	100%	0	1	100%
Age										
(21-30)	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%
(31-40)	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%
(41-50)	1	1	0	0%	0	1	100%	0	1	100%
(51-60)	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%
(61-70)	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%
License										
PGP	1	1	0	0%	0	1	100%	0	1	100%
CP	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%
P	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%
School										
E	1	1	0	0%	0	1	100%	0	1	100%
M	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%
H	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0%		0	0%

(table continues)

Table 8. *Other Men, 2003-2006 (continued)*

	Total	Total Left	Total Stayed	% Stayed	2005 Left	2005 Stayed	% Stayed	2006 Left	2006 Stayed	% Stayed
N	1	1	0	0%	1	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Age										
(21-30)	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%
(31-40)	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%
(41-50)	1	1	0	0%	1	0	0%	0	0	0%
(51-60)	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%
(61-70)	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%
License										
PGP	1	1	0	0%	1	0	0%	0	0	0%
CP	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%
P	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%
School										
E	1	1	0	0%	1	0	0%	0	0	0%
M	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%
H	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%

A crosstabulation analysis of data was performed using the computer program SPSS to answer research question number two, “Is it possible to predict demographically by the variables of race, gender, age, grade level teaching assignment and teacher licensure preparation program which groups or sub-groups are more likely or less likely to leave a school system because of teacher licensure regulations?”

*Table 9. Gender * End Employment Date Crosstabulation*

Gender	Count			End Employment Date			
	N	% Stayed	Presently Employed	2003 Resigned	2004 Resigned	2005 Resigned	2006 Resigned
Male	72	39%	28	4	17	13	10
Female	289	47%	136	17	58	38	40
Total	361	45%	164	21	75	51	50

The results for the “end employment date” crosstabulation are that of the 72 men hired to teach in Lighthouse City Public Schools in 2003 by the end of 2006 38.8% (28) remained employed by the school system.

Table 10. *Age Group * End Employment Date Crosstabulation*

Age Group	Count			End Employment Date			
	N	% Stayed	Presently Employed	2003 Resigned	2004 Resigned	2005 Resigned	2006 Resigned
21-30	109	42%	46	4	19	19	21
31-40	112	46%	52	6	26	19	9
41-50	72	49%	35	5	13	8	11
51-60	52	46%	24	6	13	3	6
61-70	15	47%	7	0	3	2	3
71-80	1	0%	0	0	1	0	0
Total	361	45%	164	21	75	51	50

The age group employment date indicates that there are more teachers aged 31-40 (112) than any other group. The teachers in the age group 41-50 are the most likely to have remained in the school system at 46.4%. In each of the age groups with more than one person, less than 50% of the teachers stayed.

Table 11. *Assignment Level * End Employment Date Crosstabulation*

Assignment Level	Count			End Employment Date			
	N	% Stayed	Presently Employed	2003 Resigned	2004 Resigned	2005 Resigned	2006 Resigned
21-30	183	48%	88	10	43	20	22
31-40	83	43%	36	3	17	14	13
41-50	95	42%	40	8	15	17	15
Total	361	45%	164	21	75	51	50

The grade level teaching assignment for employees is almost equally divided between elementary (183) and secondary school (178). Of the elementary teachers, 48% remained employed by the school system. The middle school teachers remained at 57% . The high school teachers stayed at 42%. The percentage of elementary teachers who remain employed in Lighthouse City Public Schools is higher at 48% than either the middle school or the high school (43% and 42% respectively).

Table 12. License Type * End Employment Date Crosstabulation

License Type	Count			End Employment Date			
	N	% Stayed	Presently Employed	2003 Resigned	2004 Resigned	2005 Resigned	2006 Resigned
Post Graduate Professional	87	53%	46	1	13	13	14
Collegiate Professional	164	66%	109	2	18	20	15
Provisional	106	6%	6	18	44	18	20
Conditional	4	75%	3	0	0	0	1
Total	361	45%	164	21	75	51	50

The license type for the still employed personnel indicate that the majority who remain employed hold collegiate professional licenses at 66% (109 divided by 164), with the post graduate professional licenses in the second highest category at 53% (46 divided by 87), and only nine people with provisional or conditional licenses at 8% (9 divided by 110).

Table 13. *Correlations*

		Gender	Race	Age Group	License Type	End Employment Date	Start Employment Year	Assignment Level
Gender	Pearson Correlation	1	.072	-.140**	-.015	-.057	^a	-.218**
	Significance	-	.170	.008	.780	.276	-	.000
	N	361	361	361	361	361	361	361
Race	Pearson Correlation	.072	1	-.045	.058	.071	^a	.052
	Significance	.170	-	.394	.271	.180	-	.326
	N	361	361	361	361	361	361	361
Age Group	Pearson Correlation	-.140**	-.045	1	-.114*	-.066	^a	.051
	Significance	.008	.394	-	.031	.211	-	.335
	N	361	361	361	361	361	361	361
License Type	Pearson Correlation	-.015	.058	-.114*	1	.211**	^a	.024
	Significance	.780	.271	.031	-	.000	-	.646
	N	361	361	361	361	361	361	361
End Employment Date	Pearson Correlation	-.057	.071	-.066	.211**	1	^a	.071
	Significance	.276	.180	.211	.000	-	-	.176
	N	361	361	361	361	361	361	361
Start Employment Year	Pearson Correlation	^a	^a	^a	^a	^a	^a	^a
	Significance	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	N	361	361	361	361	361	361	361
Assignment Level	Pearson Correlation	-.218**	.052	.051	.024	.071	^a	1
	Significance	.000	.326	.335	.646	.176	-	-
	N	361	361	361	361	361	361	361

^aCannot be computed because at least one of the variables is constant.

* p < 0.05, two-tailed. ** p < 0.01, two-tailed.

The dependent variable is the “end employment date” and is compared to the independent variables of race, gender, age, grade level teaching assignment and teacher preparation program for the population of 361 teachers. The variable of gender has a statistically significant negative correlation to age group at $-.140^{**}$ indicating correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed), and a statistically significant negative correlation with assignment level at $-.218^{**}$, at the .01(2-tailed) level of significance.

The variable of race shows no statistically significant correlation to the variables of age, gender, grade level teaching assignment or licensure. The variable of age has a negative correlation with gender at $-.104^{**}$ and with license type at $-.114^{*}$. Age and gender are statistically significantly correlated at the 0.01 level, and age and license type are negatively correlated at the 0.05 level.

License type is statistically significant at the 0.01 level with a positive correlation of $.211^{**}$ to the variable of “end employment date” (the dependent variable). License type is negatively correlated at the 0.05 level with age group ($-.114^{*}$).

Assignment level is negatively correlated at the 0.01 level ($-.218^{**}$) with gender for assignment level 1 (elementary).

All of the variables of race, gender, age, level of assignment and teacher preparation program were entered into SPSS. By percentages, there were 19.9% (72) men hired to be teachers in Lighthouse City Public Schools in 2003, and 80.1% (289) women. By percentages, there were 73.1% (264) White teachers hired in 2003, 22.7% (82) Black teachers hired, 3% (11) Latino, and 1.1% (4) “unspecified” hired in 2003.

4.3 Analysis of Data

Survey data from the teachers who chose to remain employed with Lighthouse City Public Schools revealed that relationships with their principals and other faculty members were valuable to their work environments. Meetings with other teachers and the professional development opportunities contributed to their satisfaction with their schools and their careers. The survey data received from the teachers who had resigned from Lighthouse City Public Schools revealed that they had not made the connections at the schools to which they were assigned, and survey responses revealed a sense of isolation from colleagues. Additionally, 17 of those who had resigned had no mentorship, or had a mentor who was not available or helpful to them. The former teachers reported having had one meeting each semester. Of the 38 people who wrote stories in addition to answering the survey questions, 20 reported that their mentor was unable to answer any but the most basic questions about policies and procedures, and little about classroom management. The name of the mentor was not asked on the survey, so it was not possible to find more information about the mentor relationships.

The multiple regression analysis revealed that teacher licensure preparation program was the variable most likely to predict “end employment date”, although there were negative correlations between gender and age group.

4.4 Conclusion

This study focused on teacher retention in Lighthouse City Public Schools, and in particular, whether the Virginia teacher licensure regulations impacted retention. Results from the survey of the population of 361 new teachers hired for Lighthouse City Public Schools in 2003 revealed that the Virginia licensure regulations did not impact the decision of teachers about whether to stay in LCPS or to leave, but the numbers in Table 13, p.92, indicate otherwise.

The second research question asked if it was possible to predict demographically by the variables of race, gender, age, level of assignment and teacher preparation program which groups or sub-groups were more likely or less likely to remain in a school system. The results of the statistical analysis showed that the most important predictor was teacher licensure preparation program. Of the sample of 361 teachers hired in 2003, 197 had resigned which was 55% of the new hires.

4.5 Summary

Teacher retention is necessary to provide education to students in the 21st century. Accountability standards across states and nationally require excellence in the classroom for all who attend school. School systems across the United States and in particular, urban school systems, have encountered difficulty retaining new personnel.

In Virginia the teacher licensure requirements are rigorous, and there are now many kinds of alternate routes to licensure to entice people from other professions into becoming teachers. The results of this study, however, indicate that it is the teachers with provisional licenses who are the most likely to leave Lighthouse City Public Schools, and not the teachers from a traditional teacher preparation program.

If teacher retention is to be the focus of Lighthouse City Public Schools, there are measures which can be institutionalized to provide the support for new teachers that might encourage them to remain. These measures will be discussed in Chapter 5.

CHAPTER 5

Conclusions

5.1 Overview of the Study

Increasingly in urban school systems across the United States, teacher retention has become an issue of great importance. Teacher attrition has resulted in the neediest students being assigned to the least prepared and least experienced teachers (Ingersoll, 2002). In Virginia, the teacher licensure requirements are stricter than any of its surrounding states. Obtaining teaching credentials in Virginia require that the potential candidates receive high scores on the PRAXIS II examinations. If candidates do not make the proper scores, they may go to North Carolina or Maryland, for example, and find employment there, where the licensure demands are not as stringent.

There were four research questions addressed in this study: 1) What factors influence the retention of teachers in Lighthouse City Public Schools? 2) Is it possible to predict demographically by race, gender, age, grade level teaching assignment, and teacher licensure preparation program which groups or sub-groups are more likely or less likely to leave a school system because of teacher licensure regulations? 3) Does the licensure preparation program influence retention? 4) Were the Virginia licensure regulations the reasons cited for the departure of teachers in school years 2004, 2005, and 2006?

The purpose of this study was to determine the implications of Virginia teacher licensure regulations on teacher retention in Lighthouse City Public Schools. A survey was created to be sent to the 361 group of new teacher hires in 2003. The results of the survey would determine if teacher preparation program or Virginia licensure regulations affected teacher retention. Further, the demographic variables of race, gender, age, grade level teaching assignment and teacher

licensure preparation program were analyzed to find if it was possible to predict which groups or sub-groups of teachers would remain or depart from Lighthouse City Public Schools.

Urban school systems in Virginia face continual recruiting efforts to hire new personnel yearly to replace those who decide to leave. Often, the new hires are on provisional licenses and they begin new jobs having to take classes to become certified in the state with a three year time limit on their licenses. Learning how to teach while attending classes adds a burden to new employees, and may result in early departure before the three year time limit has passed.

School districts have begun to focus on the development and support of newly hired teachers in order to retain employees. Examples of the types of support offered by school systems include mentorship, orientation, professional development classes, tuition reimbursement for college classes and comprehensive programs called “induction” (Ingersoll & Kralik, 2004). Ingersoll and Kralik have documented that there is a strong link between the high attrition rates of new teachers and the teacher shortage issue which is a concern especially for urban school districts.

Historical factors influence the demographics of teaching. Teaching has been viewed as an occupation of lateral movements (Biklen, 1985). These lateral movements have been described as movement from one school to another or leaving teaching for reasons other than retirement (Ingersoll, 2003). In addition, Biklen (1985) and other researchers (Apple, 1982; Goodlad, 1990) describe the teaching profession as dominated by female laborers. This study reveals a consistent pattern with the historical perspective. The data revealed that the majority of the cohort of new teacher hires in 2003 were women. Whether teaching is dominated by women because of sexist practices or related to recruitment and promotion or a tendency by society to view women’s work as less significant, the historical perspective remains. Tennessee Tomorrow,

Inc.'s (2002) findings indicate that school context determines attrition. Those teachers who are happy with their school assignment tend to stay longer.

5.2 Description of the Population

There were two groups of teachers in the population in this study. The teachers who decided to remain in Lighthouse City Public Schools totaled 164, and the people who left Lighthouse City Public Schools totaled 197. The population total was 361, after removing guidance counselors, librarians and assistant principals from the original 376.

Electronic and mailed surveys were sent to 361 teachers. There was a 45.2% response rate from the teachers who had resigned, and a 75.7% response rate from the teachers still employed with Lighthouse City Public Schools. There was a 59% response rate to the survey (214 out of 361).

A regression analysis was conducted with the use of the computer software program SPSS. The entire original population of 361 cases was entered into the program to answer research question number two. Would it be possible to use demographic variables to predict who would leave and who would stay in Lighthouse City Public Schools?

There were four null hypotheses to be addressed:

- The Virginia licensure regulations do not impact the retention of teachers in Lighthouse City Public Schools.
- Teacher retention in Lighthouse City Public Schools cannot be predicted by race, gender, grade level teaching assignment and teacher preparation program.
- There is no relationship between teacher licensure preparation and retention in Lighthouse City Public Schools.

- The Virginia licensure regulations were not the reason cited for the departure of teachers from Lighthouse City Public Schools in 2004, 2005, and 2006.

5.3 Summary of Findings

- Finding 1: Virginia teacher licensure regulations do not impact the retention of teachers in Lighthouse City Public Schools.
- Null hypothesis number one is accepted.

Sargent (2003) found that inadequate teacher licensure preparation programs were one of the three factors causing new teachers to abandon education. Though only two former teachers indicated that the Virginia licensure regulations were the cause of them leaving Lighthouse City Public Schools, the results of the correlation analysis showed that there was statistical significance between teacher licensure preparation program and the teachers who had resigned. Self reported data may be an indicator of the incongruity between the statistical analysis and the survey responses.

- Finding 2: It is not possible to predict by the variables of race, age, gender or grade level of teaching assignment which groups or sub-groups are more likely or less likely to leave a school system.
- Null hypothesis number two is accepted.

The only variable to have $p < .01$ statistical significance from the multiple regression analysis of the data was the variable of licensure. From this population of teachers it is not possible to predict by race, gender, age, or grade level of teaching assignment which groups or sub-groups are more likely or less likely to leave a school system. The two groups of teachers were demographically very similar. The difference between the groups was licensure.

Even though teachers did not mark that licensure was a reason they decided to leave, those who left were more likely to have come from an alternate route to licensure rather than the traditional teacher preparation program. There was a statistically significant correlation between teacher licensure preparation program and the teachers who chose to leave Lighthouse City Public Schools. The data analysis from SPSS revealed that licensure was the only predictor of teacher flight.

Baker and Smith (1997) indicated that programs allowing alternate routes to licensure should be evaluated on a yearly basis to determine if the alternate routes programs are successful in supporting and retaining teachers. The data in this study reveal that it is the teacher from the non-traditional licensure preparation program who is the most likely to leave education.

- Finding 3: The teacher licensure program does influence retention in Lighthouse City Public Schools.
- The third null hypothesis is not accepted.

The teachers most likely to leave Lighthouse City Public Schools were those from alternate routes to licensure as found in the multiple regression analysis. In the study conducted by Jeffrey C. Wayman, Ann M. Foster, and Carol Wilson of an alternate route to licensure in Colorado, the concerns of traditionally prepared and alternatively prepared new teachers were analyzed to find if there were differences. The teachers who participated in alternate routes programs were more likely to have content and classroom management concerns than those who had completed a traditional licensure program. They also found that the teachers from alternate routes to licensure had more concerns about teaching overall than those from traditional programs and were the teachers most likely to leave education. The findings in this study coincide with the previous research.

- Finding 4: Fifty percent of the teachers who resigned held provisional licenses.
- Null hypothesis number three is not accepted. There is definitely a relationship between teacher licensure preparation program and retention in Lighthouse City Public Schools.

The teachers who decided not to remain were more likely to have been provisionally or conditionally licensed than those with post graduate or collegiate professional licenses. The teacher licensure preparation program does influence retention in Lighthouse City Public Schools. Teachers who are employed with alternate routes to licensure leave more frequently than those with traditional teacher licensure. Though Virginia has high expectations for test scores on licensure examinations, teachers did not indicate that this was a consideration when they chose to depart the school system.

- Finding 5: the Virginia licensure regulations were not the reasons cited for the departure of teachers in 2004, 2005, and 2006.
- Null hypothesis number four is accepted.

Based on the responses of the resigned personnel the implications may be that those who come to education from the alternate routes to licensure are not adequately prepared for the difficulties of urban teaching. Since Lighthouse City hired so many provisionally licensed teachers (See Table 12, p. 91), the Virginia teacher licensure regulations may not ensure that Virginia's schools have quality educators. For those with provisional licensure, perhaps the combination of new teaching assignments compounded with the necessity of more coursework is too much for the new teachers who are at times without support. The fourth null hypothesis was found to be correct because only two of the 89 survey respondents from the pool of resigned

teachers indicated that Virginia licensure regulations were the reason they had to leave Lighthouse City Public Schools.

Survey responses revealed further information and additional findings.

- Finding 6: Effective mentors are a key factor in the retention of new teachers.

There were 89 respondents to the survey of resigned personnel and 38 people answered in much greater detail than the survey requirements. The 38 surveys contained stories of teaching experiences documenting why working in LCPS was difficult. Of the 38, 17 had not been assigned a mentor, and 9 others had mentors who they reported were of no value. The nine revealed that their ineffective mentors did not meet with them except for once or twice during the year, they were not in the same grade level or content area, and were unable to answer any but the most basic questions about classroom management. Ineffective mentors left the teachers feeling isolated and unsure of where to go for help. Repeatedly in the surveys the respondents indicated that they had not received adequate support during their time in Lighthouse City Public Schools. The survey results from the resigned personnel indicate that inadequate mentorship contributed to the decision to leave Lighthouse City Public Schools, agreeing with the recommendations of the researchers Baker & Smith (1997).

However, for the still employed teachers, 85 had participated in a mentorship program either at their assigned school or in the school system program. Of the 85 participants in the mentorship programs, 40 rated their experience as excellent.

- Finding 7: Professional development and collaboration are important factors in teacher retention in Lighthouse City Public Schools.

One of the most often cited issues of importance in this survey was the communication with other teachers, and the resulting support. Teachers are social creatures. They are

surrounded by students, and the need not to feel isolated from other adults is paramount to success in the classroom. The survey results from the teachers still employed in Lighthouse City revealed that of the 120 who responded to the question about collaboration with colleagues, 88 indicated that they often met with other teachers to share questions and ideas. One responded that there was no communication with teachers in school. In answering the question concerning professional development activities, 117 indicated that they had participated in activities designed for new teachers and 119 answered that they took advantage of as many opportunities as they could. When asked to detail reasons to remain in LCPS, relationships with colleagues (94) were cited as well as opportunities for professional growth (86). In Linda Darling-Hammond's study of student achievement in Connecticut and North Carolina (2002), the efforts made by both states with regard to professional development and support of new teacher personnel were two of the reasons cited for the increase in teacher preparedness and increased student achievement in reading and math.

- Finding 8: Secondary teachers left Lighthouse City Public Schools more often at 57.2% than their elementary colleagues at 52%.

The data from the Tennessee Tomorrow, Inc.'s study in 2002 of school context factors indicate that middle school teachers were less satisfied with their school assignments than their elementary colleagues, and left teaching more frequently. The survey questions did not ask for job satisfaction ratings, but the analysis of the variables of leavers and stayers with regard to grade level teaching assignment revealed that secondary teachers were more likely to leave than elementary teachers, thus agreeing with the Tennessee study.

- Finding 9: More teachers left Lighthouse City Public Schools at 55% in three years than the national average of 50% over five years.

Previous studies have shown that as many as 50% of new teachers leave education within the first five years of employment (Ingersoll & Kralik, 2004, Haftner & Owings, 1991). In this study 55% of the new teachers hired for Lighthouse City Public Schools had left the school system by the end of school year 2006. The results of this study indicate that what researchers have found previously with regard to teacher attrition is even more profound in Lighthouse City Public Schools.

The reasons given for the departure of personnel varied from the transfer of a spouse or significant other to the desire to leave education.

- Finding 10: The accountability movement in education as a result of the No Child Left Behind mandates may increase teacher attrition.

One respondent wrote that although she had a great principal and a valuable mentor, the climate of:

“constant testing, local standards, state standards, national standards, and the push for excellent test scores did not coincide with her philosophy of education. I consider myself to be very creative, but I could not be the robot teacher delivering facts, facts, and more facts. I came to teaching from another profession, and thought I had something of importance to offer my students, but I could not exist in that atmosphere.”

There are some incidents over which school systems have no control. Even the best mentors and the greatest principals cannot lessen the impact of continual assessment expected by the requirements of the Virginia Standards of Learning and the No Child Left Behind Act.

- Finding 11: Lighthouse City Public Schools employees encounter racism inside the schoolhouse.

The former teacher who requested a phone call for further information is a resident of Washington State now (as reported in Chapter 4). She does not have good memories of her year in Lighthouse City. The racism she experienced from her colleagues during her time in LCPS has made her consider whether other teachers across the school system had faced the same behaviors at their schools.

- Finding 12: Teachers have too much paperwork, and the job responsibilities are overwhelming.

In 2001 Richard Ingersoll identified three reasons teachers choose not to stay in education. The reasons are: 1) retirement, 2) personal issues, and 3) job dissatisfaction. The results of this survey indicate that the still employed teachers (87) and the resigned teachers (67) believed that the paperwork was too much and the job responsibilities were overwhelming. Of the employed personnel who responded (118), 47 indicated that they have considered leaving teaching within the next five years.

5.4 Implications for Practice

This study analyzes data from the 361 new teachers hired for Lighthouse City Public Schools in 2003. Based on the findings of this investigation, the following implications for practice are recommended:

- Continue to monitor the changes in licensure regulations and the resulting impact on teacher retention to find if there is a correlation.

The results of this study indicate that although the Virginia licensure regulations did not influence teacher retention in the 2003 population of new hires for Lighthouse City Public Schools, more people with provisional licensure resigned than any other types of licensure.

- Disaggregate the data on all new teacher hires to determine if the variables of race, gender, age, grade level or content teaching assignment and teacher licensure preparation program impact teacher retention in Lighthouse City Public Schools.

The results of this study indicate that licensure is the only variable which predicts retention, but further investigation is warranted.

- Increase the support systems for all new teachers, but especially for those teachers with provisional licenses.

It is the teachers with the provisional licenses who are the least likely to remain in Lighthouse City Public Schools, and the teachers who need additional support to be successful.

- Create a system-wide induction program, recruiting new mentors and maximizing the training for new mentors.
- Increase the pool of mentors to involve all grade levels and all subject areas.
- Include observations and evaluations as a part of the mentorship protocol.
- Examine school systems with successful induction programs for attracting and retaining new school employees.

The research for this study found that an example of a successful induction program is in Broward County, Florida. Their teacher retention rate is over 80% after three years.

The survey responses for this study revealed that new teachers considered professional development to be an integral part of becoming acclimated to the education profession.

- Offer focused professional development opportunities for new teachers.
- Design the professional development activities calendar to be flexible in times and dates to accommodate new teacher schedules.

- Begin communicating with new teacher hires in the summer before they report to work to offer optional professional development activities.
- Upon signing a contract, issue all new employees an electronic mail address to be able to communicate with them before school starts.
- Communicate electronically on the school system intranet, by inter-office mail to all sites, and in the school division newspaper where, when, and for whom all professional development activities are offered.
- Conduct a personal exit interview with anyone who returns their “intent” forms indicating that they will leave the school system; charge Human Resources with the exit interviews and the data collection.

The teachers who resigned from Lighthouse City Public Schools revealed a number of areas inside the school system which need improvement. Acknowledging a source of important information with a personal interview will add insight into school system processes.

- Offer peer observations to new teachers with effective teachers in the same grade level or content teaching assignment.

The availability of master teachers to new personnel will enhance the understanding of teaching and enable the new personnel to find increased connections and support.

- Conduct a program evaluation on the present diversity initiative in LCPS to determine its effectiveness.
- Increase the staff development opportunities in working with diverse groups of people to include race, class, and educational backgrounds.
- Create a LCPS handbook for all new employees with explicit directions and advice for first year teachers.

Provide examples of the paperwork that is expected and suggestions for completion. Monitor the amount of paperwork assigned to new teachers, and utilize the school system available technology to lessen some of the requirements. The survey results indicated that the still employed and resigned teachers believed that teaching involved too much paperwork.

- Provide a list of LCPS teacher experts in each school for new teachers to contact for questions or help.

The survey responses indicated that for many of the teachers who left Lighthouse City Public Schools, the availability of an excellent mentor or advisor may have resulted in a different decision.

5.5 Limitations

Although the employees still teaching in the school system responded to the survey in large numbers, it was difficult to find those who had left the system as long ago as 2003. Several teachers who had resigned wrote long stories about their experiences, however, and revealed much more than was asked by the survey questions. Additionally, the survey is self-reported data, and as such it is possible to withhold information. Interviews with those who wrote their stories might reveal even more information about their experiences in Lighthouse City Public Schools.

To prevent having to re-mail surveys, all mailed surveys should have been coded with an identification number. There was no indication on the survey for names to be written in order to ensure confidentiality, but a number would have made it easier to track the teachers who had responded. In addition, two surveys should have been created; each tailored to fit the group which would respond. It was confusing for the respondents to have to skip successive questions because the question did not apply to their licensure or teacher licensure preparation program. \

5.6 Recommendations for Future Study

- Continue to study the alternative routes to licensure to determine if there is a successful model being implemented in urban school districts with evidence of teacher retention over time.
- Continue to investigate the relationship between alternate routes to licensure and teacher attrition, in particular in Lighthouse City Public Schools.
- Expand the study to encompass alternate routes to licensure/teacher attrition in surrounding urban school districts to determine if the teacher loss ratios are equivalent.
- Examine the individual schools in Lighthouse City Public Schools to find if the teacher losses are more prevalent in some locations than others.
- Conduct a study on teachers' satisfaction with their work environment and the possible impact on the decision to remain in education or to leave.
- Conduct qualitative research with teachers who have decided to leave Lighthouse City Public Schools to find if there are consistent themes emerging from their reasons for departure.
- Conduct a program evaluation of the mentorship model in Lighthouse City Public Schools to determine what processes need to be implemented to lessen the number of teacher losses.
- Conduct a cost-benefit analysis to determine if the current mentorship model for new teachers justifies the cost of the program.
- Conduct focus groups with new teachers as they are experiencing their first year in Lighthouse City Public Schools to determine if immediate solutions to problems can be found.

- Conduct a program evaluation of racial and ethnic issues in Lighthouse City Public Schools.
- Expand the program evaluation and the focus groups to include all the schools in Lighthouse City.

In Lighthouse City Public Schools the new teachers meet as a group two weeks before students arrive. One day is designated to be with the Human Resources Benefits Specialists to fill out forms, and one day is with content supervisors to learn all they need to learn about the subject(s) they have been assigned to teach. In addition, new teachers may be assigned a mentor who may not be familiar with the grade level or content the new teachers are supposed to deliver. This is clearly not adequate support for new teachers.

The difficulties encountered by new teachers who have graduated from a traditional teacher preparation program are many, but they have had the advantage of student teaching and observations to begin to learn how to educate young people.

5.7 Conclusions

Educational researchers have focused on the difficulties of teacher retention in urban, public schools. Increasingly researchers are interested in knowing what kind of new teacher induction programs are effective in making a difference for new employees.

Other researchers have tried to determine if it was possible to use demographic variables to predict the teachers most likely to leave a school division. In the study conducted by Dr. Watlington (2001) and his colleagues of four counties in Florida and the issue of teacher retention, demographic variables were studied to determine if it was possible to create a profile of those who were the most likely to leave their school systems. The variables they found to be significant continued to be out-of-state and out-of field placements. For this study only the

variable of licensure was the determining factor of teacher attrition. Of the four counties studied, Broward County retained 88.2% of its teachers in the second year of the three year study. At the end of the third year Broward County continued to retain 80.5% of its teachers. Upon further investigation it was found that Broward County had implemented a new teacher induction program that was proving to be highly effective in retaining personnel. The quality of the mentorship and professional development programs for its employees was found to be the reason that new teachers tended to remain in that district. There was greater understanding of curricular issues, reflection, management, and the district policy about mentor selection was a vital element in the induction process.

Teacher retention is a problem in many school systems in this country, and of critical importance in urban schools. More and more alternative routes to licensure are becoming available to attract people from other professions to education. At present, 46 states and Washington D.C. have some form of alternate route to licensure (Blair & Feistritz, 2003). However, the results of this study indicate that it is the people from the alternate routes who are the most likely to leave. Few educational issues have received more attention of late than the possible failure to ensure that the nation has a quality teaching force. As a result, politicians, district administrators, and principals have sought to increase standards related to teacher education and certification (Ingersoll, 1999). New initiatives and programs have begun to entice other professionals into education.

Having alternate routes to licensure is one way to ensure that the nation's public schools have a supply of teachers, but if these are the teachers most likely to leave a school system, what other steps need to be taken? Perhaps it is necessary to examine the mentorship components and the processes by which teachers are selected to become mentors for new employees. There is a

stipend included in becoming a mentor, but there are also expectations of the mentor/mentee relationship. Having a mentor who is not assigned to the same grade level or content area diminishes the possibility of specific help. The mentor could be useful in a general way, however, and certainly with classroom management suggestions, organization of lessons, the classroom environment and instructional strategies across the curriculum. A mentor in the same grade level or content teaching assignment would be more valuable in answering specific content questions and implementation of the curriculum. In addition, the mentor would also be able to answer the general questions about teaching.

When teachers leave a school system new people must be located, hired, and trained. Those costs are considerable, and having to hire 250-400 new teachers per year results in increasingly large amounts of money having to be directed to the Human Resources Department for teacher recruitment. People do not stay in schools with no support, little communication, and marginal leadership.

Pervasive throughout the research on teacher departure and from my own research it is apparent that one theme continually emerges. That theme is support. No new employees arrive knowing all about the jobs they are entering. Organizations systematically have orientation programs to answer questions and explain how business is conducted.

Good teachers provide their students with supportive interventions if they are not succeeding in class. It is an expectation of the school system that they stay after school and offer help to the students. New teachers require the same type of support. It is difficult to teach and learn to teach at the same time. Few beginning teachers are really excellent. It takes time to understand the processes and procedures in education. Teaching is a complex business, and a good mentor could make the difference between a teacher's decision to leave or to stay.

Though Virginia has strict regulations for the licensure of teachers, those regulations were not the reasons cited for the departure of teachers from Lighthouse City Public Schools. Researchers have shown that “school context” is the most likely reason that teachers leave education and the teachers revealed that same information through the surveys. School context includes the school population, the faculty and staff, and the administration. Teachers who did not like their school assignment were much more likely to list many reasons why they decided to leave the school system.

Human Resources Departments should examine the requests for transfer forms and the resignation forms to find if there is a pattern from certain schools over time. There are resources in the school system that could be used to provide mentorship to all who need the support. Aligning the correct mentors with teachers is critical, however. Teachers should be matched with advisors at the same grade level or content area who have experienced the rigors of assessment and accountability. It is certainly less expensive to retain personnel than to locate yearly replacements.

References

- Apple, M.W. (1982). Study backs induction schools to help new teachers stay teachers. Washington, D.C: *Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development*.
- Baker, D. P., & Smith, T. (1997). Teacher turnover and teacher quality: Refocusing the issue. *Teachers College Record*, 99(1), 29-35.
- Biklen, S.K. (1985). Can elementary school teaching be a career? A search for new ways of understanding women's work. *Issues in Education*, 3(3), 215-231.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2005). The new teacher education: For better or worse? *Educational Researcher*, 34(6), 3-17.
- Council of Great City Schools (CGCS). (2002). Foundations for success: case studies of how school systems improve student achievement. Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation. Retrieved April 3, 2007 from <http://www.cgcs.org/reports>
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of state policy evidence. *Educational Policy Analysis Archives*, 8(1).
- Earley, P. (2000). Finding the culprit: Federal policy and teacher education. *Educational Policy*, 14(1), 25-39.
- Erickson, F. (1986). Qualitative methods in research on teaching. In M.Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd Edition), pp. 119-161. New York: MacMillan.
- Feistritzer, C. E. (1998). *Teacher preparation and classroom size reduction. Testimony before the House Committee on Education and Workforce*. Retrieved May, 2006, from <http://www.ncei.com/>
- Feller, B. (2006, September 19) Who's Teaching the Teachers? *Daily Press*, A3.
- Fetler, M. (1999). High School Characteristics and Mathematics Test Results. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 7(9).
- Field, A. (2005). *Discovering Statistics Using SPSS*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Forrest, A. (2006, August 19) Area Schools Hiring Push, *Daily Press*, C1. Gerald, D., & Hussar, W. (1998). *Projections of Education Statistics to 2008*. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics.

- Gimbert, B., Cristol, D., Wallace, D., & Sene, A. M. (2005). A Case Study of a CompetencyDriven Alternative Route to Teacher Licensure in an Urban "Hard to Staff" School System. *Action in Teacher Education*, 27(1), 53-71.
- Goldhaber, D., & Brewer, D. (2000). Does Teacher Certification Matter? High School Certification Status and Student Achievement. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 22, 129-145.
- Goodlad, J.I. (1983). Teaching: An endangered profession. *Teachers College Record*, 84 (3), 575-578.
- Grimm, L.G., & Yarnold, P.R., (2005). *Reading and Understanding Multivariate Statistics* (10th ed.). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Hafner, A., & Owings, J. (1991). *Careers in teaching: following members of the high school class of 1972 in and out of teaching*. (National Center for Education Statistics Report No. 91-470). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.
- Hawk, P., Coble, C., & Swanson, M. (1985). Certification: It Does Matter? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 36(3), 13-15.
- Henke, R., Koppich, J., & Knapp, M. (2001). *Revisiting what states are doing to improve the quality of teaching: An update on patterns and trends*. University of Washington: Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy.
- Henke R., Chen, X., & Geis, S. (2000). *Progress through the teacher pipeline: 1992-93 college graduates and elementary/secondary school teaching as of 1997*. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Holmes, B. J. (2001). Understanding the pros and cons of alternative routes to teacher certification. *Teaching and Change*, 8(4), 317-330.
- Humphrey, D.C., Wechsler, M.E., Hough, H.J., Characteristics of effective alternative teacher certification programs, *Teachers College Record*, Volume 110, 4, 2008,p.-, Retrieved from <http://www.tcrecord.org> ID Number 12613, 10/4/2006
- Ilmer, S. Elliott, S. & Snyder, J., (2005), Analysis of urban teachers 1st year experiences in an alternative certification program, *Action in Teacher Education*, 27 (1), 3-14.
- Ingersoll, R. (2001, Fall). Teacher Turnover and Teacher Shortage: An Organizational Analysis. *American education research journal*, 38(3), 499-534.
- Ingersoll, R. M. (1997). Teacher turnover and teacher quality: The recurring myth of teacher shortages. *Teacher College Record*, 99(1), 41-44.

- Ingersoll, R.M. and Kralik, J.M. (2004). *The impact of mentoring on teacher retention: What the research says*. Retrieved, March 15, 2007, from <http://www.ecs.org/clearinghouse/50/36/5036.htm>
- Jacobson. L., (2006, September 20), N.C. District Lures New Math Teachers With \$10,000 Bonus, *Education Week*, 14.
- Johnson, S. M., Kirkland, S. E., & Peske, H. G. (2005). Life in the fast track: How states seek to balance incentives and quality in alternative teacher certification programs. *Educational Policy*, 19(1), 63-89.
- Lauer, P. (2006). *An education research primer: How to understand, evaluate, and use it* (1st ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Krejcie, R.V., and Morgan, D.W. (1970), Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurements*, 30, 607-610.
- National Education Association (2003, August 27). *Despite Long Hours, Low Pay, Teachers Love their profession*. Retrieved July 20, 2006, from <http://www.nea.org/newsreleases/2003/nr030827.html?mode=print>
- National Education Association (2006). *State Rankings and Estimates, 2004-05*. Retrieved July 21, 2006, from <http://www.nea.org/edstats/index.html>
- National Education Association (2006, May 2). *National Teacher Day Spotlights Key Issues Facing Profession*. Retrieved July 20, 2006, from <http://nea.org/newsreleases/2006/nr060502.html?mode=print>
- Office of Program Policy Analysis and Government Accountability (1995). *Review of Florida's Teacher Certification System, Administered by the Department of Education*, Retrieved July 2, 2006, from <http://newfirtsearch.oclc.org.ezproxy.lib.vt.edu>
- Patton, M. Q., (2002) *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage
- Pedhazur, E.J., & L.P. Schmelkin (1991). *Measurement, Design, and Analysis: An Integrated Approach*. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Prince, C. D. (2002). The challenges of attracting good teachers and principals to struggling schools. *American Association of School Administrators*, Retrieved May, 2006, from <http://www.aasa.org>
- P.L. 107-110 (2002). *No Child Left Behind Act: Reauthorization of the elementary and secondary act*. Retrieved May, 2006, from <http://www.ed.gov>

- Recruiting New Teachers, Inc. (2000). *A guide to developing teacher induction programs*. Belmont, MA: Author.
- Rowan, B., Correnti, R., & Miller, R. (2002). What Large Scale Survey Research Tells Us About Teacher Effects on Student Achievement: Insights From the Prospects Study of Elementary Schools. *Teachers College Record*, 104, 1525-1567.
- Scannell, M, Wain, J., New models for state licensing of professional educators. Phi Delta Kappan, Retrieved May, 2006 from <http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?index=11&sid=1&srchmode=1&vinst=PROD&fmt=3&st...>
- Schlechy, P., and Vance, V. (1983). Recruitment, selection, and retention: the shape of the teaching force. *The Elementary School Journal*, 83(4), 469-87.
- Schlechy, P.C. and Victor, S.V., (1981). Do academically able teachers leave education? The North Carolina Case. *Phi Delta Kappan*, October, 1981.
- Sowell, E.J. (2001). *Educational Research: an integrative introduction*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Sprinthall, R.C., Schmutte, G.T. & Sirois, L. (1991). *Understanding educational research*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Summary report (2003). *No dream denied: A pledge to America's children*. New York: U.S.Government Printing Office (1997).
- U.S. Department of Educational Statistics (America's teachers: Profile of a profession ed.). Washington, D.C.:
- Useem, B., & Nield, R. C. (2002). Teacher staffing in the school district of Philadelphia. *A Report to the Community: Philadelphia Education Fund*
- Virginia Department of Education (2004). *State of Virginia Teacher Shortage Areas for 2004-05 School Year*. Retrieved July 15, 2006, from <http://www.vdoe.pen.k12.va.us>
- Virginia Department of Education (2002, November). *Report on Supply and Demand of Instructional Personnel in Virginia: 2001-02*. Retrieved July 15, 2006, from <http://www.vdoe.pen.k12.va.us>
- Watlington, E. J., Shockley, R., Huie, K. K., Morris, J. D., & Lieberman, M. (2004, Summer). Variables Associated With Teacher Retention: A Multi-Year Study. *The Teacher Educator*, 40(1), 56-66.
- Wayman, J. C., Foster, A. M., Wilson, C., & Mantle-Bromley, C., A comparison of the professional concerns of traditionally and alternatively prepared teachers, *The High School Journal*; Feb/Mar 2003; 86 (3) Educational Periodicals p.35-40.

Wong, H.K., & Wong, R.T. (1999). *The first days of school*, Mountain View, CA.: Harry K. Wong Publications, Inc.

Zeichner, K. (2003). The adequacies and inadequacies of three current strategies to recruit, prepare, and retain the best teachers for all students. *Teachers College Record*, 105(3), 490-515.

APPENDIX A

Major Requirements of Teacher Certification Systems

State	Educational (Minimum Requirements)	Testing (Types of Required Tests)	Teacher Centered Performance Assessments
Arizona	master's degree or 40 semester hours beyond a bachelor's degree	basic skills	
California	bachelor's degree and 30 semester units	basic skills subject matter	
Florida	bachelor's degree and GPA requirement	basic Skills subject matter Professional Knowledge Program	classroom observation in Beginning Teacher Program
Georgia	bachelor's degree	subject matter	
Illinois	bachelor's degree	basic skills subject matter	
Kentucky	bachelor's degree GPA requirement	basic skills subject matter Professional Knowledge Program	classroom observation in Beginning Teacher Program
Louisiana	bachelor's degree GPA requirement	basic skills subject matter Professional Knowledge Program	classroom observation in Beginning Teacher Program
New Jersey	bachelor's degree	basic skills subject matter Professional Knowledge Program	classroom observation in Beginning Teacher Program
New York	master's degree	basic skills subject matter Professional Knowledge Program	classroom observation in Beginning Teacher Program
North Carolina	bachelor's degree	subject matter Professional Knowledge Program	classroom observation in Beginning Teacher Program
Ohio	bachelor's degree	basic skills subject matter Professional Knowledge	

		Program	
Oklahoma	bachelor's degree	subject matter	classroom observation in Beginning Teacher Program
Oregon	bachelor's degree and 45 quarter hours	basic skills subject matter Professional Knowledge Program	
South Carolina	bachelor's degree	basic skills Professional Knowledge Program	
Tennessee	bachelor's degree	basic skills subject matter Professional Knowledge Program	classroom observation in Beginning Teacher Program
Virginia	bachelor's degree	basic skills subject matter Professional Knowledge Program	

APPENDIX B

Survey Validation Approval Electronic Mail

From: Dale Margheim [mailto:margheim@mail.mcps.org]

Sent: Tuesday, December 19, 2006 4:10 PM

To: Allison Foster

Subject: RE: Survey Protocol

Allison, permission is granted for you to use the survey instrument as a model and/or my content validity tables and procedures for your study. (You will find that content validity studies will become a big part of your work.) Please just cite appropriately and let me know when you finish so I can read your work.

Best wishes,

Dale E. Margheim, Ed.D.

Principal

Falling Branch Elementary School

735 Falling Branch Rd.

Christiansburg, VA 24073

540.381.6145

540.381.6148 (FAX)

APPENDIX C

Initial Survey

Date of hire _____

Date of last work day _____ (n/a)

School _____

Principal _____

Supervisor _____

I. Certification and Licensure

1. What was your level of certification when you began teaching in NNPS?
 - a. Collegiate Professional
 - b. Provisional licensure
 - c. Post Graduate Professional
 - d. Provisional
 - e. Other _____
2. How did you obtain licensure?
 - a. a traditional teacher preparation program
 - b. an alternate route to licensure
3. If you were involved in an alternate route to licensure, did you complete all of the requirements to become fully licensed?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No

4. If you did not complete all of the Virginia licensure regulations, please select **ALL** of the following reasons you did not.
 - a. I could not pass the Praxis exam.
 - b. I did not finish the necessary coursework.
 - c. Lack of knowledge about the necessary requirements.
 - d. Lack of time.
 - e. Lack of money.
 - f. Lack of support from administrators.
 - g. Lack of support from teachers.
 - h. Lack of interest. (I am not going to remain in teaching).
 - i. Other (Please be specific).
5. If you were provisionally licensed, did you remain for the entire three years of your license?
 - a. Yes.
 - b. No.
6. If you were provisionally licensed, did you participate in the Praxis preparation classes offered through Newport News Public Schools?
 - a. Yes.
 - b. No.
 - a. I did not know there were classes offered for Praxis preparation.
7. Have the Virginia teacher licensure regulations influenced your decision to leave NNPS?
 - a. Yes.
 - b. No.

- c. I don't know anything about the Virginia teacher licensure regulations.

II. Mentorship

8. Did you participate in a mentorship program?

- a. Yes.
- b. No.
- c. I did not know there was a mentorship program.

9. How often did you meet with your mentor?

- a. Once a week.
- b. Once every two weeks.
- c. Once a month.
- d. Once every nine weeks.
- e. Once a semester.
- f. Never.

10. How would you rate the quality of your mentorship experience?

- a. Excellent. My mentor was very valuable to me.
- b. Good. My mentor was able to help me with specific questions.
- c. Fair. My mentor answered questions, but we did not meet often.
- d. Poor. My mentor was unsure of how to help me.
- e. Non-existent. I never had a mentor.

III. Professional Development/ Collaboration

11. Did you participate in professional development activities designed for new teachers?

- a. Yes.
- b. No.

- c. I didn't know there were professional development activities designed for new teachers.

12. My professional development points exceeded the minimum requirements.

- a. I took advantage of as many opportunities as I could.
- b. I did not attend professional development classes.
- c. I did not know any professional activities were offered.

13. Collaboration among my colleagues has been beneficial to me.

- a. I often met with other teachers and shared ideas and questions.
- b. Sometimes I would meet with other teachers to discuss the students.
- c. Occasionally I would talk to other teachers about lessons.
- d. I rarely talked to other teachers about my classes.
- e. I did not talk to anyone at school.

IV. School Leadership

14. My principal: (please select all answers that apply).

- a. Was available and helpful to me.
- b. Was seldom available and not helpful to me.
- c. Acted fairly and made good decisions for the school.
- d. Did not act fairly and did not make good decisions for the school.
- e. Encouraged cooperation and teamwork.
- f. Discouraged me from forming relationships with other faculty members.
- g. Was always open to new suggestions and ideas.
- h. Only liked to do things one way.
- i. Was often in classrooms.

- j. Was often in the office.
 - k. Provided staff development activities for professional growth.
 - l. Did not provide any professional development activities to me.
 - m. Understood the challenges of being a new teacher.
 - n. Expected me to know everything I was supposed to do.
 - o. Was a good role model for me.
 - p. Was distant and unavailable.
15. The administration at my school was supportive and encouraging to the new teachers.
- a. I could always talk to them about my problems and concerns.
 - b. I was able to make appointments for specific issues.
 - c. I did not talk to them often.
 - d. I never saw them outside of the office.
16. The principal acted like the instructional leader in the building.
- a. The principal was always in and out of the classrooms.
 - b. The principal was often in the classrooms.
 - c. The principal was rarely in the classrooms.
 - d. I never saw the principal in any classroom.
17. The staff at my school received affirmations of good work either in writing or verbally from the principal.
- a. The principal regularly announced who was to be commended for a good job.
 - b. Sometimes the principal mentioned a general affirmation of good work.
 - c. It was rare for the principal to compliment the teachers for good work.
 - d. I never heard anyone get commended for good work.

V. Teacher Retention

18. I am committed to teaching as a career.

- a. Yes. I like my job.
- b. No. I do not like my job.
- c. Maybe. I don't know yet.

19. I would encourage others to become teachers. (Please select all that apply).

- a. I am rewarded every day.
- b. I feel that I am helping others to succeed.
- c. My work is valuable.
- d. The job is too hard.
- e. There is too much to do, and the responsibilities are overwhelming.
- f. I have too much paperwork.
- g. I would not encourage anyone to teach.

20. I intend to remain in teaching at least five years.

- a. Yes.
- b. No.
- c. I haven't decided.

VI. Teacher Attrition/Retention

21. Please select **ALL** of the reasons that may have influenced your decision to leave NNPS.

- a. I didn't like my principal.
- b. I was given difficult classes.
- c. I was assigned to teach classes I am not qualified to teach.
- d. I was assigned to more than one school.

- e. I had three or more preparations.
- f. My principal did not support me.
- g. My lead teacher did not support me.
- h. The teachers did not support me on my team.
- i. The teachers did not support me in my department.
- j. My supervisor did not support me.
- k. I was unprepared for the difficulties of teaching in public school.
- l. I decided to go back to school.
- m. I got a teaching job in another state.
- n. I got a teaching job in another city in Virginia.
- o. My spouse was transferred.
- p. I did not like NNPS.
- q. I got a job outside of education.
- r. Other (Please be specific).

22. Please rate the following components from low (1) to high (5).

- a. Support from your administrators.
- b. Support from teachers.
- c. Support from your department.
- d. Communication with your administrators.
- e. Communication with other teachers.
- f. Communication within your department.
- g. Communication with your principal.
- h. Communication with your supervisor.

- i. Communication from central office.
- j. Staff development activities at school.
- k. Staff development activities outside of school.
- l. Mentorship program.

23. In your opinion, what factors would be the most **valuable** to new teachers? Please select **ALL** that apply.

- a. A mentor in the same grade level or content assignment.
- b. A strong principal.
- c. Staff development activities outside of the school.
- d. Assignment in one location.
- e. Classroom management classes.
- f. Instructional leadership from the administrators and/or lead teachers.
- g. An easy to implement curriculum.
- h. Instruction on grade level SOL requirements.
- i. Fewer requirements for summative evaluation.
- j. Peer observations.
- k. Classes on lesson design.
- l. Classes on alternative assessment strategies.
- m. Other (Please be specific).

24. If you left NNPS, in your opinion, what factors might have changed your mind? Please select **ALL** that apply.

- a. A different content teaching assignment.
- b. A different school.

- c. A different principal.
- d. More support from other teachers.
- e. Mentorship support.
- f. A different mentor.
- g. A traditional teacher licensure preparation program.
- h. Support with classroom management strategies.
- i. Classes on instructional strategies for the curriculum.
- j. Classes on effective lesson design.
- k. More practical staff development activities.
- l. Fewer faculty meetings.
- m. Opportunities to observe master teachers.
- n. Help with the paperwork.
- o. Techniques for successful parent conferences.
- p. A school handbook detailing the rules, procedures, and requirements.
- q. Already created tests and quizzes for my curriculum.
- r. Other (Please be specific).
- s. Nothing would have kept me from leaving NNPS.

25. Are there any other factors that would have prevented you from leaving Newport News Public Schools? Please include as many factors as possible.

26. What factors have contributed to your decision to stay in Newport News Public Schools? Please include as many as possible.

APPENDIX D

Survey Validation Form Number 1

Research Questions

1. What factors influence the retention of teachers in Lighthouse City Public Schools?
2. Does the licensure preparation program influence retention?
3. Were the Virginia licensure regulations the reasons cited for the departure of teachers in 2004, 2005, and 2006?

Association Ratings

1= very weak; 2= weak; 3= strong; 4= very strong

Clarity

1= very unclear; delete; 2= somewhat clear, revise; 3= clear; leave as written

Please write any suggestions for improvement on this paper.

Survey Questions	R. Question			Association				Clarity		
1. What was your level of certification when you began teaching in Lighthouse City Public Schools?	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
2. How did you obtain licensure?	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
3. If you were involved in an alternate route to licensure, did you complete all of the requirements to become fully licensed?	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	1	2	3

4. If you did not complete all of the Virginia licensure regulations, please select ALL of the following reasons you did not. 1 2 3 1 2 3 4 1 2 3
5. If you were provisionally licensed, did you remain for the entire three years of your license? 1 2 3 1 2 3 4 1 2 3
6. If you were provisionally licensed, did you participate in the Praxis preparation classes offered through Lighthouse City Public Schools? 1 2 3 1 2 3 4 1 2 3
7. Have the Virginia licensure regulations influenced your decision to leave Lighthouse City Public Schools? 1 2 3 1 2 3 4 1 2 3
8. Did you participate in a mentorship program? 1 2 3 1 2 3 4 1 2 3
9. How often did you meet with your mentor? 1 2 3 1 2 3 4 1 2 3
10. How would you rate the quality of your mentorship experience? 1 2 3 1 2 3 4 1 2 3
11. Did you participate in professional development activities designed for new teachers? 1 2 3 1 2 3 4 1 2 3
12. My professional development points exceeded the minimum requirements. 1 2 3 1 2 3 4 1 2 3

13. Collaboration among my colleagues has (has not) been beneficial to me. 1 2 3 1 2 3 4 1 2 3
14. My principal. 1 2 3 1 2 3 4 1 2 3
15. The administration at my school was supportive and encouraging to new teachers. 1 2 3 1 2 3 4 1 2 3
16. The principal was the instructional leader in the building. 1 2 3 1 2 3 4 1 2 3
17. The staff at my school regularly received verbal or written affirmations of good work. 1 2 3 1 2 3 4 1 2 3
18. I am committed to teaching as a career. 1 2 3 1 2 3 4 1 2 3
19. I would encourage others to become teachers. 1 2 3 1 2 3 4 1 2 3
20. I intend to remain in teaching at least five years. 1 2 3 1 2 3 4 1 2 3
21. Please select ALL of the reasons that might have influenced your decision to leave Lighthouse City Public Schools. 1 2 3 1 2 3 4 1 2 3
22. Please rate the following components from low (1) to high (5). 1 2 3 1 2 3 4 1 2 3
23. In your opinion, which factors would be the most **valuable** to new teachers? 1 2 3 1 2 3 4 1 2 3
24. If you left Lighthouse City Public Schools, which factors might have changed your 1 2 3 1 2 3 4 1 2 3
-

mind?

Please select ALL that apply.

25. Are there any other factors which would have 1 2 3 1 2 3 4 1 2 3
prevented your departure from Lighthouse
City Public Schools?

26. What factors have contributed to your 1 2 3 1 2 3 4 1 2 3
decision to stay in Lighthouse City Public
Schools?

APPENDIX E

Initial Survey Validation Response Percentages

Questions	Clarity	Association	Research Question
1	Deleted and moved to the demographics section of the survey.		
2	85%	92%	92%
3	92%	92%	80%
4	100%	92%	85%
5	85%	85%	85%
6	Re-written.		
7	100%	100%	80%
8	Re-written.		
9	Rewritten.		
10	85%	92%	92%
11	92%	85%	85%
12	Rewritten.		
13	80%	85%	100%
14	85%	80%	85%
15	85%	92%	92%
16	Rewritten.		
17	Rewritten.		

18	Rewritten.		
19	Rewritten.		
20	Rewritten.		
21	92%	92%	92%
22	Rewritten.		
23	92%	92%	80%
24	92%	85%	80%
25	100%	92%	92%
26	100%	92%	100%

APPENDIX F

Survey Validation Form Number 2

Research Questions

1. What factors influence the retention of teachers in Lighthouse City Public Schools?
2. Does the licensure preparation program influence retention?
3. Were the Virginia licensure regulations the reasons cited for the departure of teachers in 2004, 2005, and 2006?

Association Ratings

1= very weak; 2= weak; 3= strong; 4= very strong

Clarity

1= very unclear; delete; 2= somewhat clear, revise; 3= clear; leave as written

Please write any suggestions for improvement on this paper.

Survey Questions	R. Questions			Association				Clarity		
6. If you were provisionally licensed, in your opinion, were you adequately prepared to teach in an urban school system?	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
8. Did you participate in a mentorship program at your school?	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
9. If you participated in the Pathwise program or had a mentor at your school,	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	1	2	3

how often did you and your mentor meet?				
12. I attended professional development activities offered by the school system.	1 2 3	1 2 3 4	1 2 3	
16. My principal: (Please check all that apply).	1 2 3	1 2 3 4	1 2 3	
17. The faculty and staff at my school(s) regularly received affirmations of good work either verbally or in writing.	1 2 3	1 2 3 4	1 2 3	
18. I plan to teach until retirement.	1 2 3	1 2 3 4	1 2 3	
19. My feelings about teaching are:	1 2 3	1 2 3 4	1 2 3	
20. I have considered leaving teaching within five years.	1 2 3	1 2 3 4	1 2 3	
	1 2 3	1 2 3 4	1 2 3	
22. Please rate the following factors from low (1) to high (5).				

APPENDIX G

Second Survey Validation Response Percentages

Questions	Research	Association	Clarity
	Question		
6	85%	100%	80%
8	80%	100%	92%
9	91%	92%	85%
12	92%	85%	92%
16	100%	85%	92%
17	100%	85%	100%
18	Deleted		
19	92%	80%	85%
20	80%	92%	85%
22	80%	85%	100%

APPENDIX H

Institutional Review Board Approval
Research Authorization Committee
12465 WARWICK BOULEVARD
XXXXXXXX, VIRGINIA 23606

June 15, 2006

Ms. Allison Foster

163 Shenandoah Road

Hampton, Virginia 23661

Dear Ms. Foster:

The Research and Authorization Committee has met and reviewed your application to conduct the study entitled The Impact of Virginia Licensure Regulations on Teacher Retention in XXXXX Public Schools.

I am pleased to inform you that the committee has approved your request with the following stipulations:

- No reference to XXXXXX Public Schools should be made in your report without written permission from the chair person of the research Authorization Committee.

- Upon completion of your study, you may be asked to present your findings to a group of
XXXXXX Public Schools educators.

- Please send a final copy of your project to the Research Authorization Committee.

I wish you much success on your dissertation. Your topic is of great interest to

XXXXXX Public Schools. Please contact me at 591-4547 or neil.stamm@nn.k12.va.us if you
have any questions.

Sincerely,

Neil A. Stamm, Ed. D.

Research Authorization Committee Chair

cc: Mr. Eddie Antoine, Assistant Superintendent, Human Resources

APPENDIX I

Virginia Polytechnic and State University Institutional Review Board Approval

DATE: February 1, 2007 FWA00000572(expires 7/20/07)

IRB # is IRB00000667.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Travis W. Twiford

Allison Foster

FROM: David M. Moore

SUBJECT: IRB Exempt Approval: "The Implications of Virginia Licensure Regulations on Teacher Retention in Newport News Public Schools" , IRB # 07-047

I have reviewed your request to the IRB for exemption for the above referenced project. I concur that

the research falls within the exempt status. Approval is granted effective as of February 1, 2007.

As an investigator of human subjects, your responsibilities include the following:

1. Report promptly proposed changes in previously approved human subject research activities to the IRB, including changes to your study forms, procedures and investigators, regardless of how minor. The proposed changes must not be initiated without IRB review and approval, except where necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to the subjects.


2. Report promptly to the IRB any injuries or other unanticipated or adverse events involving risks or harms to human research subjects or others.

cc: File

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE UNIVERSITY AND STATE
UNIVERSITY

APPENDIX J

Virginia Tech Institutional Review Board Certificate of Completion



APPENDIX K

Teacher Retention Survey, Lighthouse City Public Schools

Date of hire _____

Date of last work day _____ (N/A)

School (s) _____

Principal (s) _____

Supervisor _____

What was your level of certification when you began teaching in LCPS? (Please check).

- a. ___ Collegiate Professional.
- b. ___ Provisional licensure.
- c. ___ Post Graduate Professional.
- d. ___ Conditional (Special Education).
- e. ___ Conditional (Transition to Teaching).
- f. ___ Other _____

I. Certification and Licensure

1. How did you obtain licensure?

- a. ___ A traditional teacher preparation program.
- b. ___ An alternate route to licensure.
- c. ___ A career switcher program.
- d. ___ Other _____.

2. If you were involved in an alternate route to licensure, did you complete all of the requirements to become fully licensed?

- a. ___ Yes.

b. ___No.

3. If you did not complete all of the Virginia licensure regulations, please check ALL of the following reasons you did not.

a. ___I could not pass the Praxis I exam.

b. ___I could not pass the Praxis II exam.

c. ___ I did not finish the necessary coursework.

d. ___Lack of knowledge about the necessary requirements.

e. ___Lack of time.

f. ___Lack of money.

g. ___Lack of support from administrators.

h. ___Lack of support from teachers.

i. ___Lack of interest. (I am not going to remain in teaching).

j. ___Other (Please be specific). _____

4. If you were provisionally licensed, did you remain for the entire three years of your license?

a. ___Yes.

b. ___No.

5. If you were provisionally licensed, in your opinion, were you adequately prepared to teach in an urban school system?

a. ___Yes.

b. ___No.

6. Have the Virginia teacher licensure regulations influenced your decision to leave Lighthouse City Public Schools?

- a. Yes.
- b. No.
- c. I don't know anything about the Virginia teacher licensure regulations.

7. Did your teacher preparation program have any influence on your decision to leave Lighthouse City Public Schools?

- a. Yes.
- b. No.

8. Did your teacher licensure preparation program influence your decision to stay in Lighthouse City Public Schools?

- a. Yes.
- b. No.

II. Mentorship

9. Did you participate in a mentorship program at your school?

- a. Yes.
- b. No.
- c. I did not know there was a mentorship program.

10. Did you participate in the Pathwise Mentorship Program?

- a. Yes.
- b. No.
- c. I did not know about the Pathwise program.

11. If you did participate in a mentorship program either at your school or in the Pathwise Program, how often did you and your mentor meet?

- a. Once a week.

- b. ___ Once every two weeks.
- c. ___ Once a month.
- d. ___ Once every nine weeks.
- e. ___ Once a semester.
- f. ___ Never.

12. How would you rate the quality of your mentorship experience?

- a. ___ Excellent. My mentor was very valuable to me.
- b. ___ Good. My mentor was able to help me with specific questions.
- c. ___ Fair. My mentor answered questions, but we did not meet often.
- d. ___ Poor. My mentor was unsure of how to help me.
- e. ___ Non-existent. I never had a mentor.

III. Professional Development/Collaboration

13. Did you participate in professional development activities designed for new teachers?

- a. ___ Yes.
- b. ___ No.
- c. ___ I didn't know there were professional development activities designed for new teachers.

14. I attended professional development workshops or in-services offered by my school system.

- a. ___ I took advantage of as many opportunities as I could.
- b. ___ I did not attend any professional development activities.
- c. ___ I did not know any professional development activities were offered.

15. Collaboration with my colleagues has been beneficial to me.

- a. ___ I often met with other teachers to share questions and ideas.
- b. ___ Sometimes, I would meet with other teachers to discuss the students.
- c. ___ Occasionally, I would talk to other teachers about lessons.
- d. ___ I rarely talked to other teachers about my classes.
- e. ___ I did not talk to anyone at school.

IV. School Leadership

16. My principal(s): (Please check ALL that apply)

- a. ___ was available and helpful to me.
- b. ___ was seldom available and not helpful to me.
- c. ___ acted fairly, and made good decisions for the school.
- d. ___ did not act fairly, and did not make good decisions for the school.
- e. ___ encouraged cooperation and teamwork.
- f. ___ discouraged me from forming relationships with other faculty members.
- g. ___ was always open to new suggestions and ideas.
- h. ___ only liked to do things one way.
- i. ___ was often in classrooms.
- j. ___ was often in the office.
- k. ___ provided staff development activities for professional growth.
- l. ___ did not offer any professional development activities to me.
- m. ___ understood the challenges of being a new teacher.
- n. ___ expected me to already know everything I was supposed to do.
- o. ___ was a good role model for me.

p. ___ was distant and unavailable.

17. The administration at my school was supportive and encouraging to new teachers.

Please check ALL that apply.

- a. ___ I could always talk to them about my problems and concerns.
- b. ___ They were accessible to me.
- c. ___ I was able to make appointments for specific issues.
- d. ___ They responded to me in a timely manner.
- e. ___ I did not talk to them often.
- f. ___ I never saw them outside of the office.

18. The faculty and staff at my school regularly received affirmations of good work, either verbally or in writing.

- a. ___The principal regularly announced commendations for good work.
- b. ___Sometimes the principal mentioned a general affirmation of good work.
- c. ___It was rare for the principal to give compliments.
- d. ___I never heard of anyone being commended for good work.

V. Teacher Retention

19. My feelings about teaching are: (Please check ALL that apply)

- a. ___I am rewarded every day.
- b. ___I feel that I am helping others to succeed.
- c. ___My work is valuable.
- d. ___The job is too hard.
- e. ___There is too much to do, and the responsibilities are overwhelming.
- f. ___I have too much paperwork.

g. ___ I would not encourage anyone to teach.

20. I have considered leaving teaching within the next five years.

a. ___ Yes.

b. ___ No.

c. I haven't decided.

VI. Teacher Attrition/Retention

21. Please check ALL of the reasons that may have influenced your decision to leave LCPS.

a. ___ I didn't like my principal.

b. ___ I was given difficult classes.

c. ___ I was assigned to teach classes I am not qualified to teach.

d. ___ I was assigned to more than one school.

e. ___ I had three or more preparations.

f. ___ I was not supported by my principal.

g. ___ I was not supported by my lead teacher.

h. ___ I was not supported by the teachers on my team.

i. ___ I was not supported by the teachers in my department.

j. ___ I was not supported by my supervisor.

k. ___ I was unprepared for the difficulties of teaching in an urban public school.

l. ___ I decided to go back to school.

m. ___ I got a teaching job in another state.

n. ___ I got a teaching job in another city in Virginia.

o. ___ My spouse/significant other was transferred.

- p. ___ I did not like LCPS.
- q. ___ I got a job outside of education.
- r. ___ I wanted to stay at home with my child(ren).
- s. ___ Other (Please be specific). _____

22. Please rate the following factors from low (1) to high (5).

- a. ___ Support from your administrators.
- b. ___ Support from teachers.
- c. ___ Support from your department.
- d. ___ Communication with your administrators.
- e. ___ Communication with other teachers.
- f. ___ Communication within your department.
- g. ___ Communication with your principal.
- h. ___ Communication with your supervisor.
- i. ___ Communication from central office.
- j. ___ Staff development activities at school.
- k. ___ Staff development activities outside of school.
- l. ___ School mentorship program.
- m. ___ Pathwise Mentorship Program.

23. In your opinion, what factors would be the most valuable to new teachers? Please

check ALL that apply.

- a. ___ A mentor in the same grade level or content assignment.
- b. ___ A strong principal.
- c. ___ Staff development activities outside of the school.

- d. ___Assignment in one location.
- e. ___Classroom management classes.
- f. ___Instructional leadership from the administrators and/or lead teachers.
- g. ___An easy to implement curriculum.
- h. ___Instruction on grade level SOL requirements.
- i. ___Fewer requirements for summative evaluation.
- j. ___Peer observations.
- k. ___Classes on lesson design.
- l. ___Classes on alternative assessment strategies.
- m. ___Classes on differentiated instruction.
- n. ___Classes on teaching English Language Learners.
- o. ___Classes on teaching students with disabilities.
- p. ___Other (Please be specific).

24. In your opinion, if you decided to leave LCPS, what factors would have changed your mind? Please check ALL that apply.

- a. ___A different content teaching assignment.
- b. ___A different school.
- c. ___A different principal.
- d. ___ More support from other teachers.
- e. ___ Mentorship support.
- f. ___A traditional teacher licensure preparation program.
- g. ___ Support with classroom management strategies.
- h. ___Classes on curriculum instructional strategies.

- i. ___ Classes on lesson design strategies.
- j. ___ More practical staff development activities.
- k. ___ Fewer faculty meetings.
- l. ___ Opportunities to observe master teachers.
- m. ___ Support with school paperwork assignments.
- n. ___ Techniques for successful parent conferences.
- o. ___ A school handbook outlining all the required responsibilities and due dates.
- p. ___ Standardized tests and quizzes to be administered to students.

25. Are there any other factors which would have prevented you from leaving Lighthouse City Public Schools? Please include as many as possible.

26. What factors have contributed to your decision to stay in Lighthouse City? Please include as many as possible.

Thank you for your participation in this research. With your help we will continue to improve Lighthouse City Public Lighthouse Public Schools.

APPENDIX L

Teacher Participation Letter

Dear Teacher,

My name is Allison Foster, and I am a doctoral student at Virginia Tech in the field of Education Leadership and Policy Studies. My dissertation involves a study of the factors impacting new teacher retention in Lighthouse City.

New teacher retention is a concern for school systems across the country, and also in Lighthouse City. Since you were hired as a new teacher in 2003, your participation in this research will assist LCPS in determining factors that most impact teacher retention. I understand that your time is valuable, so all I request is that you complete this fifteen minute survey concerning your experiences as a new teacher in this school system.

Your participation is voluntary, and your responses will be confidential. Please be candid with all of your answers. When the study is completed and the responses have been analyzed, I would be happy to share the results with you. If you would like a summary of the findings, please e-mail me at afoster29@cox.net, and write the words “Summary of Teacher Retention Results” in the subject line. Thank you for your time and participation in this study.

Sincerely,

Allison Foster

Supervisor, ESOL/Foreign Language

Lighthouse City Public Schools

- *When your completed survey is received, your name will be entered into a drawing for a \$50.00 Best Buy gift certificate. The drawing will take place on **March 15.***

APPENDIX M

Survey Responses from Still-Employed Teachers

Date of Hire (2003)	Response Total
July	84
August	33
September	2
October	2
November	3
December	1

School Assignment

Total Respondents	125
(skipped this question)	0
Pre-K	15
elementary	50
middle	29
high	31

Please write the name(s) of your principal(s).

Total Respondents	125
(skipped this question)	0

Please write the name of your supervisor(s).

Total Respondents	124
(skipped this question)	1

What was your level of certification when you began working in Lighthouse City Public Schools?

Total Respondents	125
(skipped this question)	0
Collegiate Professional	82
Provisional Licensure	6
Post Graduate Professional	28
Conditional (Special Education)	6
Conditional (Transition to Teaching)	3
Other (please specify)	

How did you obtain licensure?

Total Respondents	125
(skipped this question)	0
A traditional teacher preparation program.	110
An alternate route to licensure.	6
A career switcher program.	3
Other (please specify)	

If you were involved in an alternate route to licensure did you complete all of the requirements to become fully licensed?

Total Respondents	119
(skipped this question)	6
Yes.	12
No.	

If you were provisionally licensed did you remain for the entire three years of your license?

Total Respondents	12
-------------------	----

(skipped this question)	113
Yes.	12
No.	

If you were provisionally licensed in your opinion were you adequately prepared to teach in an urban school system?

Total Respondents	12
(skipped this question)	113
Yes.	8
No.	4
N/A.	113

Did your teacher licensure program influence your decision to stay in Lighthouse City Public Schools?

Total Respondents	125
(skipped this question)	0
Yes.	18
No.	58
N/A.	31

Did you participate in a mentorship program at your school?

Total Respondents	107
(skipped this question)	18
Yes.	85
No.	29
I didn't know there was a mentorship program.	11

Did you participate in the Pathwise Mentorship program?

Total Respondents	125
(skipped this question)	0
Yes.	55
No.	39
I didn't know there was a Pathwise Mentorship program.	6

If you did participate in a mentorship program either at your school or in the Pathwise Program how often did you and your mentor meet?

Total Respondents	100
(skipped this question)	25
Once a week.	46
Once every 2 weeks.	34
Once a month.	29
Once every 9 weeks.	10
Once a semester.	3
Never.	3
Other (please specify)	

How would you rate the quality of your mentorship experience?

Total Respondents	125
(skipped this question)	0
Excellent.	40
Good. My mentor was able to help me if I had specific questions.	19
Fair. My mentor answered questions.	7
Poor. My mentor was unsure of how to help me.	15
Non-existent. I never had a mentor.	29

Other (please specify)

Did you participate in professional development activities designed for new teachers?

Total Respondents	110
(skipped this question)	15
Yes.	117
No.	4
I didn't know there were professional development activities designed for new teachers.	2
Other (please specify)	2

I attended professional development workshops or in-services offered by my school system.

Total Respondents	125
(skipped this question)	0
I took advantage of as many opportunities as I could.	119
I did not attend any professional development activities.	2
I did not know anything was offered.	0
Other (please specify)	4

Collaboration with my colleagues has been beneficial to me.

Total Respondents	125
(skipped this question)	0
I often met with other teachers to share questions and ideas.	88

Sometimes I met with other teachers to discuss	
the students.	21
Occasionally I would talk to other teachers about	
my classes.	7
I did not talk to anyone at school.	1
Other (please specify)	3

My principal(s): Please check ALL that apply.

Total Respondents	120
(skipped this question)	5
was available and helpful to me.	44
was seldom available and not helpful to me.	6
acted fairly	35
encouraged cooperation and teamwork.	42
discouraged me from forming relationships with	
other faculty members.	0
was always open to new suggestions and ideas.	33
only liked to do things one way.	5
was often in classrooms.	29
was often in the office.	42
provided staff development activities for	
professional growth.	53
did not offer any professional development	
activities to me.	1
understood the challenges of being a new	
teacher.	37
expected me to know everything I was supposed	
to do.	14

was a good role model for me.	27
was distant and unavailable.	6

The administration at my school(s) was supportive and encouraging to new teachers. Please check ALL that apply.

Total Respondents	118
(skipped this question)	7
I could always talk to them about my problems and concerns.	33
They were accessible to me.	56
I was able to make appointments for specific issues.	45
They responded to me in a timely manner.	45
I did not talk to them often.	34
I never saw them outside of the office.	5
Other (please specify)	6

The faculty and staff at my school(s) regularly received affirmations of good work either verbally or in writing.

Total Respondents	118
(skipped this question)	7
The principal regularly announced commendations for good work.	31
Sometimes the principal mentioned a general affirmation of good work.	38
It was rare for the principal to give compliments.	31
I never heard of anyone being commended for good work.	12
Other (please specify)	1

My feelings about teaching are: (Please select ALL that apply)

Total Respondents	113
(skipped this question)	12
I am rewarded every day.	34
I feel that I am helping others to succeed.	62
My work is valuable.	60
The job is too hard.	8
There is too much to do and the responsibilities are overwhelming.	30
I have too much paperwork.	47
I would not encourage anyone to teach.	21
Other (please specify)	17

I have considered leaving teaching within the next 5 years.

Total Respondents	118
(skipped this question)	7
Yes.	47
No.	30
I haven't decided.	22
Other (please specify)	19

Please rate the following factors from low (1) to high (5).

Total Respondents	118					
(skipped this question)	7					
	Really	So-	Very	Response		
	Low	Low	So	Good	Average	
Support from your administrators.	4	24	28	21	15	3.48

Support from other teachers.	0	9	15	34	34	4.23
Support from your department.	1	14	16	36	25	4.04
Communication with your administrators.	2	16	29	29	16	3.52
Communication with other teachers.	0	1	17	51	23	4.14
Communication within your department.	1	13	16	36	26	4.07
Communication with your principal.	3	13	35	25	16	3.52
Communication with your supervisor.	3	10	22	38	19	3.65
Communication from central office.	21	20	27	19	5	2.8
Staff development activities at school.	7	6	29	30	20	3.54
Staff development activities outside of school.	5	18	30	33	6	3.29
School mentorship program.	3	24	25	28	12	3.19
Pathwise mentorship program.	14	15	31	27	5	2.84

In your opinion what factors would be the most valuable to new teachers? Please select ALL that apply.

Total Respondents	92
(skipped this question)	33
A mentor in the same grade level or content assignment.	62
A strong principal.	47
Staff development activities outside of the school.	24
Being assigned to one location.	33
Having a room.	37
Classroom management classes.	48
Instructional leadership from the administrators and/or lead teachers.	28
An easy to implement curriculum.	41
Instruction on grade level SOL requirements.	31

Fewer requirements for summative evaluation.	34
Peer observations.	28
Classes on lesson design.	27
Classes on alternate assessment strategies.	26
Classes on differentiated instruction.	30
Classes on teaching English Language Learners.	17
Classes on teaching students with disabilities.	25
Other (please specify)	21

What factors have contributed to your decision to remain in Lighthouse City Public Schools? Please list as many as you can.

Total Respondents	58
(skipped this question)	33

What factors have contributed to your decision to remain in Lighthouse City Public Schools? Please list as many as you can.

Total Respondents	91
(skipped this question)	34

APPENDIX N

Survey Responses from Resigned Personnel

Date of Hire (2003)	Response Total
July	47
August	33
September	2
October	2
November	3
December	2

School Assignment	
Total Respondents	89
(skipped this question)	0
Pre-K	8
elementary	40
middle	19
high	22

Please write the name(s) of your principal(s).

Total Respondents	89
(skipped this question)	0

Please write the name of your supervisor(s).

Total Respondents	88
(skipped this question)	1

What was your level of certification when you began working in NNPS?

Total Respondents	89
(skipped this question)	0
Collegiate Professional	35
Provisional Licensure	22
Post Graduate Professional	18
Conditional (Special Education)	1
Conditional (Transition to Teaching)	4
Other (please specify)	5

How did you obtain licensure?

Total Respondents	89
(skipped this question)	0
A traditional teacher preparation program.	53
An alternate route to licensure.	22
A career switcher program.	5
Other (please specify)	6

If you were involved in an alternate route to licensure did you complete all of the requirements to become fully licensed?

Total Respondents	86
(skipped this question)	3
Yes.	7
No.	25

If you were provisionally licensed did you remain for the entire three years of your license?

Total Respondents	32
(skipped this question)	57
Yes.	8
No.	25

If you were provisionally licensed in your opinion were you adequately prepared to teach in an urban school system?

Total Respondents	33
(skipped this question)	56
Yes.	9
No.	24
N/A.	

Did your teacher licensure program influence your decision to stay in Newport News Schools?

Total Respondents	33
(skipped this question)	56
Yes.	
No.	
N/A.	89

Did you participate in a mentorship program at your school?

Total Respondents	89
(skipped this question)	
Yes.	55
No.	22
I didn't know there was a mentorship program.	12

Did you participate in the Pathwise Mentorship program?

Total Respondents	89
(skipped this question)	0
Yes.	45
No.	30
I didn't know there was a Pathwise Mentorship program.	11

If you did participate in a mentorship program either at your school or in the Pathwise Program how often did you and your mentor meet?

Total Respondents	86
(skipped this question)	3
Once a week.	20
Once every 2 weeks.	10
Once a month.	9
Once every 9 weeks.	5
Once a semester.	2
Never.	22
Other (please specify)	14

How would you rate the quality of your mentorship experience?

Total Respondents	82
(skipped this question)	7
Excellent. My mentor was very valuable to me.	12
Good. My mentor was able to help me if I had specific questions.	19

Fair. My mentor answered questions.	10
Poor. My mentor was unsure of how to help me.	15
Non-existent. I never had a mentor.	22
Other (please specify)	11

Did you participate in professional development activities designed for new teachers?

Total Respondents	89
(skipped this question)	0
Yes.	60
No.	21
I didn't know there were professional development activities designed for new teachers.	2
Other (please specify)	2

I attended professional development workshops or in-services offered by my school system.

Total Respondents	85
(skipped this question)	4
I took advantage of as many opportunities as I could.	61
I did not attend any professional development activities.	12
I did not know anything was offered.	10
Other (please specify)	3

Collaboration with my colleagues has been beneficial to me.

Total Respondents	86
(skipped this question)	3
I often met with other teachers to share questions and ideas.	38
Sometimes, I met with other teachers to discuss the students.	21
Occasionally, I would talk to other teachers about my classes.	15
I did not talk to anyone at school.	8
Other (please specify)	3

My principal(s): Please check ALL that apply.

Total Respondents	85
(skipped this question)	4
was available and helpful to me.	44
was seldom available and not helpful to me.	6
acted fairly, and made good decisions.	35
encouraged cooperation and teamwork.	30
discouraged me from forming relationships with other faculty members.	0
was always open to new suggestions and ideas.	23
only liked to do things one way.	15
was often in classrooms.	19
was often in the office.	42
provided staff development activities for professional growth.	28

did not offer any professional development activities to me.	1
understood the challenges of being a new teacher.	27
expected me to know everything I was supposed to do.	32
was a good role model for me.	27
was distant and unavailable.	26

The administration at my school(s) was supportive and encouraging to new teachers. Please check ALL that apply.

Total Respondents	78
(skipped this question)	11
I could always talk to them about my problems and concerns.	33
They were accessible to me.	26
I was able to make appointments for specific issues.	46
They responded to me in a timely manner.	35
I did not talk to them often.	14
I never saw them outside of the office.	23
Other (please specify)	6

The faculty and staff at my school(s) regularly received affirmations of good work either verbally or in writing.

Total Respondents	89
(skipped this question)	0
The principal regularly announced commendations for good work.	11

Sometimes the principal mentioned a general affirmation of good work.	18
It was rare for the principal to give compliments.	32
I never heard of anyone being commended for good work.	20
Other (please specify)	8

My feelings about teaching are: (Please select ALL that apply)

Total Respondents	89
(skipped this question)	0
I am rewarded every day.	24
I feel that I am helping others to succeed.	52
My work is valuable.	50
The job is too hard.	8
There is too much to do and the responsibilities are overwhelming	30
I have too much paperwork.	37
I would not encourage anyone to teach.	11
Other (please specify)	15

I have considered leaving teaching within the next 5 years.

Total Respondents	86
(skipped this question)	3
Yes.	65
No.	10
I haven't decided.	9
Other (please specify)	

Please rate the following factors from low (1) to high (5).

						Response Average
	Really Low	Low	So- So	Good	Very Good	
Total Respondents	84					
(skipped this question)	5					
Support from your administrators.	2	6	20	19	9	3.48
Support from other teachers.	0	3	5	24	24	4.23
Support from your department.	1	4	6	26	19	4.04
Communication with your administrators.	2	6	19	19	10	3.52
Communication with other teachers.	0	1	7	31	17	4.14
Communication within your department.	1	3	6	26	19	4.07
Communication with your principal.	3	7	15	20	11	3.52
Communication with your supervisor.	3	4	12	29	9	3.65
Communication from central office.	11	10	17	13	4	2.8
Staff development activities at school.	2	5	20	20	10	3.54
Staff development activities outside of school.	3	8	19	22	4	3.29
School mentorship program.	3	14	15	19	6	3.19
Pathwise mentorship program.	14	9	11	18	5	2.84

In your opinion what factors would be the most valuable to new teachers? Please select ALL that apply.

Total Respondents	56
(skipped this question)	33
A mentor in the same grade level or content assignment.	62
A strong principal.	89
Staff development activities outside of the	44

school.	
Being assigned to one location.	33
Having a room.	37
Classroom management classes.	48
Instructional leadership from the administrators and/or lead teachers.	38
An easy to implement curriculum.	41
Instruction on grade level SOL requirements.	31
Fewer requirements for summative evaluation.	54
Peer observations.	38
Classes on lesson design.	17
Classes on alternate assessment strategies.	22
Classes on differentiated instruction.	30
Classes on teaching English Language Learners.	17
Classes on teaching students with disabilities.	25
Other (please specify)	11

In your opinion what factors would be the most valuable to new teachers?

Total Respondents	89
(skipped this question)	0
