International Journal of
Education Policy & Leadership

IJEPL
Volume 20(2)
2024

Teacher Induction Policy Development and Implementation: A Case of Ontario's New Teacher Induction Program (NTIP)

Benjamin Kutsyuruba, *Queen's University*
Lorraine Godden, *Carleton University*
Keith Walker, *University of Saskatchewan*

Abstract

Attrition and turnover among early career teachers (ECTs) have garnered the attention of policymakers and educational leaders across Canada. However, due to provincial/territorial responsibility for education in Canada, teacher induction efforts to keep novice teachers in the profession depend on school system structures and policies specific to given jurisdictions. This article describes an in-depth policy analysis of the development and implementation of Ontario's New Teacher Induction Program (NTIP). Using a policy document analysis methodology, the review of the induction policy mandates, program evaluations, and empirical studies highlights the NTIP's organization and scope, the stakeholders' roles, duties, and responsibilities, the programmatic impacts, and the challenges associated with its implementation. The article concludes with implications for policy development and implementation as well as for the practice of supporting ECTs.

Résumé

L'attrition et le roulement des enseignants en début de carrière (EDC) ont attiré l'attention des décideurs politiques et des responsables de l'éducation à travers le Canada. Cependant, en raison de la responsabilité provinciale/territoriale en matière d'éducation au Canada, les efforts pour maintenir les enseignants novices dans la

Benjamin Kutsyuruba, Lorraine Godden, & Keith Walker. (2024). Teacher Induction Policy Development and Implementation: A Case of Ontario's New Teacher Induction Program (NTIP) *International Journal of Education Policy & Leadership 20*(2). URL: http://journals.sfu.ca/ijepl/index.php/ijepl/article/view/1337 doi:10.22230/ijepl.2024v20n2a1337

SFU
SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE
PDK
PHI DELTA KAPPA International

profession dépendent des structures et politiques des systèmes scolaires propres à chaque juridiction. Cet article décrit une analyse en profondeur de l'élaboration et de la mise en œuvre en Ontario du Programme d'insertion professionnelle du nouveau personnel enseignant (PIPNPE). À l'aide d'une méthodologie d'analyse de documents de politique, un examen des mandats de la politique d'insertion, des évaluations de programme et des études empiriques met en évidence l'organisation et la portée du PIPNPE, les rôles, les devoirs et les responsabilités des parties prenantes, les impacts du programme et les défis associés à sa mise en œuvre. L'article se conclut sur les implications pour l'élaboration et la mise en œuvre de politiques pertinentes ainsi que pour la pratique de soutenir les EDC.

Keywords / Mots cles : attrition, early career teacher (ECT), New Teacher Induction Program (NTIP), policy document analysis / attrition, enseignant en début de carrière (EDC), Programme d'insertion professionnelle du nouveau personnel enseignant (PIPNPE), analyse de documents de politique

Introduction

Addressing teacher attrition, retention, and professional development at the policy level is key to the success of the induction and mentoring efforts. One policy option that is often used to address the problematic high turnover and inadequate preparation of early career teachers (ECTs) is a formal comprehensive induction program during the initial years of teaching (Glazerman, Isenberg, Dolfin, Bleeker, Johnson, Grider, & Jacobus, 2010; Kearney, 2017). However, as Borman and Dowling (2008) note, despite increased research and policy rhetoric to explore the factors that may help retain a greater proportion of the existing teaching force, a more focused and systematic approach to understanding formal policies and interventions is needed. Policymakers who are tasked with creating induction policies with educators, and leaders who are responsible for implementing them, face multiple and difficult decisions regarding their effectiveness and successful outcomes for ECTs (Ingersoll & Strong, 2011). Scholars in teacher education emphasize the importance of continued support for the pre-service teacher socialization and settling in their careers, highlighting the critical role of teacher induction policies (Carver & Feiman-Nemser, 2009; Kane & Francis, 2013). As such, induction is viewed as a developmental phase in the teacher education continuum (pre-service/induction/in-service) (Nishimoto, 2018) and a socialization structure to acculturate new teachers into the profession (Wood & Stanulis, 2009).

While being eager to start their careers after graduating from teacher education programs, in this transition phase ECTs face a gamut of expectations for instruction, student evaluation, and professional learning emanating from school boards, administrators, peers, parents, and students (Guarino, Santibañez, & Daley, 2006; Kelchtermans, 2017; Kyriacou & Kunc, 2007). Their first years of teaching are complexified by obstacles and challenges, reality and culture shock, insufficient time for planning and collaboration, lack of adequate resources and supports, challenging teaching assignments and ever-changing expectations, isolation and egg-crate struc-

tures of schools, intergenerational tensions, demanding workloads and accountability policies, lack of orientation and timely communication, as well as limiting institutional practices and policies (Andrews & Quinn, 2004; Anhorn, 2008; Ingersoll & Strong, 2011; Ryan, von der Embse, Pendergast, Saeki, Segool, & Schwing, 2017). As a result, ECTs experience stress, burnout, emotional exhaustion, and feelings of inadequacy and decreased self-efficacy, and choose to abandon teaching in favour of other professions in their first years of teaching (Moir, Barlin, Gless, & Miles, 2009; Russel, Attoh, Chase, Gong, Kim, & Liggans, 2020; Santoro, 2018). In considering the reasons why many novice teachers are leaving the profession in the first few years and the factors that may keep them in teaching, researchers, policymakers, and educational leaders need to understand what educational systems are doing well and what might be done better at the policy level (Carver & Feiman-Nemser, 2009; Gallant & Riley, 2014). Therefore, increased attention to how induction policies and programs can retain and sustain ECTs as they successfully navigate transition into longevity within the profession is needed (Clandinin, Schaefer, Long, Steeves, McKenzie-Robblee, Pinnegar et al., 2012; Gallant & Riley, 2014).

Across Canada, conclusive statistics on attrition rates are limited, with different studies noting early career attrition rate variance from high to low across provinces and territories (Clandinin et al., 2012; Clark & Antonelli, 2009) and across certain segments of the teaching profession (Karsenti, Collin, Villeneuve, Dumouchel, & Roy, 2008; Valeo & Faez, 2013). Generally, the common view is that attrition across Canada occurs mainly within the first five years (Karsenti & Collin, 2013). To reduce the teacher attrition and turnover, policymakers and leaders across Canada have devoted considerable effort to establish induction and mentoring programs. However, the pan-Canadian landscape for induction policies and mentoring practices is varied and multi-layered. A pan-Canadian document analysis study has revealed four different categories of programs across the provinces and territories: policy-mandated government-funded programs; programs offered by provincial teacher associations, federations, or unions; hybrid programs based upon cooperation between the provincial and territorial governments, teacher associations, universities, First Nations, and local communities; and decentralized models maintained by local school boards/divisions (Kutsyuruba, Godden, Matheson, & Walker, 2016). These findings show that supports in the form of either induction-based programs and policies and/or mentoring-related support exist in all Canadian provinces and territories.

However, only two of the 13 Canadian jurisdictions—Ontario and Northwest Territories—address teacher induction and mentoring at the provincial level through the government mandated programs, while many of the provinces provide support in these areas in a hybrid or collaborative manner. Furthermore, many of the provinces that address teacher induction support and mentoring at a teacher federation or hybrid level, also have some form of decentralized support at the school district level. Such variety of provision is attributed to the absence of a federal bureau of education and provincial/territorial responsibility for education in Canada (as established by Section 93 of the *Constitution Act*). Consequently, with attendant variations in school systems and policies, induction and mentoring policies and programs tend to be decentralized, unequal, and compartmentalized, in a way that lessons learned

from one jurisdiction are not shared with other jurisdictions in their efforts to retain ECTs (Kutsyuruba & Walker, 2017).

Given that the province of Ontario is one of the two Canadian jurisdictions where comprehensive induction programs have been instituted by government structures, the authors chose this location for an in-depth policy analysis. The purpose of this study was to analyze the development and implementation of teacher induction policy in Ontario through the evolution of the New Teacher Induction Program (NTIP). Beginning a brief overview of teacher induction research literature, this article describes the research methodology of policy document analysis and details the authors' approach to conduct a content, context, and outcomes analyses. The findings first focus on the historical and contextual factors and forces that have led to the development of teacher induction policy and programs in Ontario. Then, the article describes the NTIP's organization and mandates, analyzes the scope of the program, and reviews roles, duties, and responsibilities of stakeholders in teacher induction processes. The empirical studies conducted on NTIP are used to analyze its programmatic impacts and challenges associated with NTIP implementation. Furthermore, this article compares the common and unique programmatic aspects of Ontario's NTIP with other jurisdictions across Canada. The article concludes with implications for policy development and implementation and practice of supporting ECTs.

Research on teacher induction and mentoring

In general, teacher induction is viewed as a long-term, comprehensive, coherent, and sustained professional development program or process, organized by a specific jurisdiction to acculturate, train, support, and retain new teachers, and help them develop a lifelong learning program (Wong, 2004). Induction programs orient and acculturate novices into a new school setting either through a formalized approach of a structured programming or a more informal approach of socialization with colleagues (Breaux & Wong, 2003). Most induction processes originate from the desire to support ECTs during the critical phase of transition from teacher education into teaching. However, researchers found that effective teacher induction programs embrace the design that both helps ECTs with their transition into the profession and offers assistance with skill development (Wood & Stanulis, 2009). The latter design feature aims to prevent potential problems and reduce difficulties with instruction and classroom management, and to retain novices in the profession (Anhorn, 2008; Glazerman et al., 2010; Kang & Berliner, 2012; Kearney, 2014; Strong, 2005; Wynn, Carboni, & Patall, 2007).

A systematic review of the literature on teacher induction and mentoring programs revealed that teacher induction supports vary based on the social, economic, cultural, and organizational contextual factors (Kutsyuruba, Walker, & Godden, 2019). The types, structures, and composition of induction support are different across locations and countries, and in some cases even across the countries' constituent jurisdictions (e.g., the United States and Canada) (Goldrick, 2016; Kutsyuruba et al., 2016). Some processes focus on specific topics, such as classroom management or teaching strategies to support ECTs, whereas others devote more time to orientation and professional development (Davis & Higdon, 2008; Ingersoll & Smith, 2004; Kearney, 2014).

Furthermore, scholars found that induction support varies by length; whereas most often programs last for one year, there is evidence of longer supports that extend beyond two and even three years (Goldrick, Osta, Barlin, & Burn, 2012; Kearney, 2014; Kutsyuruba et al., 2016). Variations in induction implementation and teacher experiences are usually related to unique structural, social, and cultural factors, to functional causes, and to particular operationalization considerations in schools (Cherubini, 2009; Jones, 2002), as well as inconsistencies and inherent problems within induction program (Barrett, Solomon, Singer, Portelli, & Mujuwamariya, 2009).

Further variation exists across induction processes based on the inclusion or exclusion of mentoring as a structural programmatic component. Although the terms *induction* and *mentoring* are often used interchangeably, the terms are not synonymous. The term *mentoring* has been regularly defined and described in the literature as involving relationships between the mentor, generally older, more experienced, and wiser person, who provides guidance, instruction, and encouragement to a less experienced mentee/protégé through formal or informal programs (Cumming-Potvin & MacCallum, 2010). Mentorship is based on the idea and belief that educators can learn from one another and have a professional responsibility for the growth and development of their colleagues. As Wong (2004) argues, mentoring is an action, a component of the induction process with the basic function to help a new teacher survive the beginning phase of a teaching career. However, we contend that mentoring is more than just about survival; it is the heart of a successful induction program, the first step that should lead to increased effectiveness in teaching and lifelong learning and flourishing as a professional.

Mentoring of ECTs can be an effective support when used in conjunction with other components of the induction process (Smith & Ingersoll, 2004; Wong, 2004). Hobson, Ashby, Malderez, and Tomlinson (2009) discovered several common findings emerging from research regarding the factors that either positively or negatively impact the mentorship process, relating to contextual support for mentoring, mentor selection, mentoring strategies, and mentor preparation. Most often, failure to appropriately match mentor with mentee, unsuccessful new teacher/mentor dyads, lack of willing and/or able mentors, lack of mentor training, or individual factors (e.g., burnout, lack of professional respect) may result in failed efforts (Benson, 2008; Johnson & Kardos, 2005). Effective mentoring helps establish positive learning environments that supports ECTs' learning and development and fosters their competence and wellbeing (Kutsyuruba et al., 2019; Hobson & Maxwell, 2017; Richter, Kunter, Lüdtke, Klusmann, Anders, & Baumert, 2013)

There is strong evidence across multiple research studies (Darling-Hammond, 2003; Laitsch, 2005; Strong, 2005, 2006) that with induction programs' incorporation of effective mentoring in the early teaching years, they are capable of positively influencing ECT retention and student achievement and reducing the waste of resources and human potential associated with premature departure from the profession. Furthermore, a combination of induction programs and high-quality mentoring programs were found to exert positive impacts through increased teacher effectiveness, higher satisfaction, commitment, improved classroom instruction and student achievement, and retention of ECTs (Glazerman et al., 2010; Guarino et al., 2006;

Henry, Bastian, & Fortner, 2011; Ingersoll & Strong, 2011; Richardson, Glessner, & Tolson, 2010). Yet, despite recognition of the value of mentoring relationships for ECTs in the extant literature, mentoring was not always included within programs of early career support across Canada. Evidence was found of mentoring in the form of separate programs from the induction processes, as well as induction programs that excluded mentoring and induction programs where mentoring was embedded (Kutsyuruba et al., 2016). With this literature review as a background, this article next describes the research methodology and analyzes the development and implementation of the teacher induction policy in the province of Ontario.

Policy document analysis: Methodology and approach

For the purposes of this article, the authors adopted a policy document analysis as a qualitative research method (Cardno, 2018). This methodology combines two concepts: policy analysis and document analysis. Policy analysis is usually defined as the "disciplined application of intellect to policy problems" (Pal, 1987, p. 19). As a qualitative method, document analysis is defined as a systematic procedure for reviewing and evaluating documents that entails finding, selecting, appraising (making sense of), and synthesizing data contained within them (Bowen, 2009). Taken together, policy document analysis is a research tool that investigates the nature of a policy document to look at both what lies behind them and within them; it can be both insightful and useful for policy users and policymakers (Cardno, 2018). This approach is rooted in theoretical frameworks that study policy from three aspects: context, content/text, and consequences/outcomes (Bell & Stevenson, 2006; Busher, 2006; Taylor, Rizvi, Lingard, & Henry, 1997; Pal, 1987).

Using guidelines for content context analysis of documents (Kutsyuruba, 2023; Bryman, 2012; Miller & Alvarado, 2005; Prior, 2012), the authors collected and analyzed publicly available documents, evaluations, and research studies related to the development, implementation, and outcomes of the NTIP and the broader teacher induction policy in Ontario. As part of the policy document analysis, the authors reviewed the program manuals and policy mandates published by the Ontario Ministry of Education (n = 10) and Ontario Federation of Teachers (n = 1), ministry commissioned and funded program evaluations (n = 4), and empirical studies (n = 10) to analyze the NTIP's programmatic impacts and success and challenges associated with its implementation. The following sections first detail the results of the content and context analyses and then present the findings of the outcomes analysis.

Content and context analysis of the teacher induction policy in Ontario

Teacher induction policy in Ontario follows a multi-pronged approach based on the continuum of professional learning for new teachers. The first step entails the initial teacher education carried out through various university programs across the province. The second job-embedded step—the NTIP—builds on and complements the initial teacher education efforts. This induction program provides professional support to help new teachers develop the requisite skills and knowledge to be effective as teachers in Ontario. The third step entails the Teacher Learning and Leadership Program, which is designed to help teachers maintain their standards of excellence

by their continual and active engagement in the pursuit of learning throughout their careers. This article focuses solely on the induction processes. The following subsections describe the historical and contextual background, program organization and mandates, funding, and implementation and evaluation processes.

Historical and contextual background

Before we embark on the analysis of the NTIP programmatic aspects, it is important to understand the social, political, and educational contexts of the induction policy's development in Ontario. In 2005–2006, the Ontario Ministry of Education established the NTIP as its attempt to support the growth and professional development of new teachers. This program replaced the Ontario Teacher Qualifying Test (OTQT), a pencil-and-paper certification test designed to ensure the quality of newly qualified teachers. The earlier approach had been widely criticized as an invalid way to evaluate the preparedness of teacher candidates for certification due to its inability to measure the complexities of teaching (Barrett et al., 2009). This test, mandatory for all new graduates of Ontario Faculties of Education and teachers trained outside of Ontario, lasted for four hours and contained 50 multiple choice and open-ended questions relating to four case studies (Portelli, Solomon, Barrett, Mujawamariya, Pinto, & Singer, 2010). The scope of questions spanned two domains: a) professional knowledge (i.e., curriculum policy, planning and instruction, childhood and adolescent development, classroom management, legislation, and use of technology) and b) teaching practice (i.e., instructional strategies, motivation, diversity and students with special needs, parents and community, and reflections on teaching). Prior to being eliminated by the new Ontario government, OTQT was criticized for its lack of relevance to improvement of classroom performance and oversimplification of the knowledge needed to teach (Portelli et al., 2010)

A new concept—the NTIP—was developed by the Working Table on Teacher Development and recommended to the Education Partnership Table established by the Minister of Education. The representation on the Working Table consisted of key education partners such as the Ontario College of Teachers (OCT), teacher candidates from the province's Faculties of Education, ECTs, teacher federations, parent organizations, and boards of trustees. A range of mentoring demonstration projects were undertaken during 2004–2005 across more than 20 district school boards in Ontario, and the effective practices and lessons learned were synthesized into the NTIP model (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2010f). Based on a comprehensive literature review examining induction in other countries and a pilot project, the final shape and form of the NTIP came into legislation through the passing of the *Student Performance Bill* in June 2006 (Kane, 2010).

As a mandatory program, originally NTIP was offered to all new teachers certified by the OCT who had been hired into permanent positions (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2010a). Funded by the Ministry of Education, this province-wide initiative was designed as a step in a continuum of professional learning for teachers to support effective teaching, learning, and assessment practices. The NTIP required that all Ontario publicly funded district school boards offered the NTIP to their ECTs. The program provided a full year of professional support facilitating the new teachers'

continuous development of the requisite skills and knowledge; thus, the program aimed to support teachers' increased success in Ontario and help them achieve high levels of student performance.

In 2010, the program underwent significant revisions in terms of scope and participant eligibility. This revision was based on the ongoing research and feedback that resulted from consultation with educational partners, including teachers' federations, board personnel, a focus group of second-year teachers and from the evaluation of the NTIP (Kane, 2010). The long-term occasional (LTO) teachers in their first long-term assignment of 97 or more consecutive school days as a substitute for the same teacher were then included in the induction elements of NTIP. Furthermore, the program was amended in 2010 to allow district school boards to allocate their NTIP funding for the support of second-year teachers in either category (permanent or LTO). This related to the evaluation findings (Kane, 2010), which indicated that teachers in their second year can more readily identify and implement strategies to improve proficiency more quickly.

Since its inception, approximately 8000 newly hired teachers have accessed NTIP supports each year. Annually, the total number of teachers (including second-year participants and mentors) who take part in NTIP has exceeded 18,000 (Strachan, Creery, & Nemes, 2017). More recently, the program scope has expanded to teachers in their first five years who fall outside of the NTIP required definition. The inclusion of these teachers as eligible to participate in any of the NTIP induction elements was designed to provide boards with flexibility to respond to local hiring realities and potentially to support ECTs for a greater length of time. Under this change, district school boards may decide to include an entire category of NTIP eligible teachers or base the supports they offer on a case-by-case basis (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2019a). Accordingly, a broader spectrum of teachers is now eligible to participate in the program, including beginning daily occasional teachers, beginning short- and long-term occasional teachers (any duration of assignment), beginning continuing education teachers, beginning permanent hires past year one, and mentors supporting any beginning teacher (e.g., teacher candidates, occasional teachers). Furthermore, the associate teachers hosting a teacher-candidate from teacher education programs in Ontario were included, as were teachers who mentor Indigenous language educators. The authors deem these changes to be in line with the recent labour conditions (original surplus that has been replaced by the shortage of teachers in some areas, and the increased demand for occasional teaching; CBC, 2024) and programmatic recognition of the importance of aligning supports to evaluation thresholds for the success of new teachers.

Program organization and mandates

At its inception, the program consisted of the following induction elements: a) orientation for all new teachers to the school and school board, b) mentoring for new teachers by experienced teachers, and c) professional development and training in major policies and strategies of the ministry, classroom management, communication skills, and instructional approaches (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2010b). Following several evaluation and longitudinal studies, and using a learning journey as a metaphor,

the program has continuously evolved. The ministry revised the wording of the latter component first to "professional development appropriate to the individual needs of new teachers" (Strachan et al., 2017, p. 247) and then to "professional learning relevant to the individual needs of new teachers" (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2019a, p. 4).

There are four espoused goals of the NTIP program. Explained from the perspective of an ECT; these goals are as follows (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2019a, p. 3):

- *Confidence:* I can do it … I have the supports to be a successful teacher;
- *Efficacy:* My teaching makes a difference in the lives and learning of every single student;
- *Instructional Practice:* I am able to respond to the diverse learning needs of my students with an array of effective instructional strategies;
- *Commitment to Continuous Learning:* I want to continue learning and growing as a professional in collaboration with my students, colleagues, administration, parents/guardians, and school community.

Taken together, the induction elements of orientation, mentoring, and ongoing professional learning provide a web of personalized support for ECTs and directly support the key goals of NTIP. Along with the goals, the NTIP outlines four core goal areas or factors that make a difference in the growth of new teachers: a) mentoring web, b) differentiated learning, c) principal encouragement, and d) school culture. Furthermore, as noted in program documents, the ultimate outcome of the NTIP has been to improve student wellbeing and learning (Strachan et al., 2017).

There are several mandates for participation in the program. As per Ontario's legislation, all publicly funded school boards are required to offer the program, and all new teachers are required to participate. For the purposes of the program, new teachers are defined as all teachers, including those trained out of province, certified by the Ontario College of Teachers, who have been newly hired into full-time or part-time permanent positions by a school board, school authority, or provincial school to teach for the first time in Ontario. Regardless of their experience, the Ministry requires that all new teachers receive an orientation. All new teachers in a permanent position who have never taught before, whether trained in or outside of Ontario, must receive orientation, mentoring, and professional development/training supports.

School boards are to include their beginning LTO teachers in the three induction elements of the NTIP and, at the board's discretion, may include second-year teachers and/or beginning full-time continuing education teachers in the induction elements of the NTIP.

The program aims to help ECTs ease into the profession and provide them with a mentor to help guide them in the right direction. The mentor provides ongoing support to enable the mentee (ECT) to improve his or her skills and confidence through participation in an effective professional and confidential relationship (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2010a). The relationship was envisioned to be a supportive one, based on trust and confidentiality, with the mentor acting as a role model, coach, and advisor to the new teacher, sharing his or her experience and knowledge about teaching on an ongoing basis. Components of mentoring are offered in ways appropriate to the needs of the teachers, such as classroom observation, common planning time, professional dialogue with colleagues/mentors, online conferencing, in-service sessions, and shared professional development for new teachers

and mentors. Together, the mentor and the ECT determine the mentee's individual needs and complete the Individual NTIP Strategy Form, which is revised throughout the year as their needs change. The onus is on school principals to ensure that there are opportunities for new teachers to improve their skills and confidence through participation in an effective professional mentoring relationship, in part, through the provision of adequate release time.

In conjunction with the orientation, mentoring, and professional development and training elements of the NTIP, the performance appraisal process for new teachers was designed to support and promote the continued growth and development of new teachers. New permanent teacher hires are evaluated two times during their first 12 months of employment through the Teacher Performance Appraisal process. All ECTs in the induction program are evaluated by their school principal two times during their first 12 months of employment through the Teacher Performance Appraisal (TPA) process. Appraisals focus on eight of the competency statements, related to three domains: commitment to pupils and pupil learning, professional knowledge, and teaching practice (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2010b). Teacher Performance Appraisal outcomes include Satisfactory, Development Needed, or Unsatisfactory. Rating options include Satisfactory or Development Needed in the first appraisal; Satisfactory, Development Needed, or Unsatisfactory in the second appraisal; and Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory in a third appraisal (if needed). Completing two evaluations with a Satisfactory rating indicates successful completion of NTIP, a note of which appears on the teacher's certificate of qualification and registration (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2010a). In instances where a teacher's performance appraisal results in a Development Needed or Unsatisfactory rating, additional appraisals are required to be conducted by the principal. If a new teacher's performance is rated as Unsatisfactory and has not improved to a Satisfactory rating, and after steps have been taken to provide support (e.g., an Improvement Plan that identifies very specific areas in which the teacher must improve in order to move forward successfully), the result will be a recommendation by the principal for termination of the teacher's employment (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2010b). It is also worth noting that while the NTIP includes teacher performance appraisal by the principal, the mentoring process is designed to be a non-evaluative process, distinct and separate from the teacher performance appraisal.

Induction program funding

Initially, the Ministry provided funding of approximately $15 million annually to support the province's approximately 10,000 new teachers. Since then, on average, 13.7 million annually has been allocated to support the NTIP. Through the Grants for Student Needs (GSN), as part of the Qualifications and Experience Grant, the Ministry has provided each of the province's 72 district school boards with a $50,000 base amount, with an additional, proportional "per-new-teacher" amount determined by the number of teachers hired for NTIP implementation in the board. This additional per-participant amount fluctuates each year based on the number of new hires; on average, this amount constitutes approximately $1200–1500 per new teacher hire. The Province also provides this proportional funding to school au-

thorities, which are geographically isolated or hospital schools. The funds can be used for salaries for board staff to oversee and coordinate NTIP, release time for NTIP required and eligible teachers, release time for mentors, and resources for professional learning. More recently, the ministry has revised its policy to expand the use of program funds to include more beginning teachers in the NTIP (see Ontario Ministry of Education, 2019a). In addition to funding, the Ministry of Education aims to foster the capacity building for mentorship and educator development within school boards by providing the following (Strachan et al., 2017):

- Facilitating professional learning for mentors and board teams;
- Creating and disseminating resources for boards to adopt and adapt in their support of mentorship (e.g., *Mentoring for All* e-book, online mentoring modules in Adobe Spark, Adobe Connect learning sessions); and
- Developing tools to monitor implementation of NTIP via triangulation of data in order to measure impact and inform evolution of the program at both a provincial and district level (e.g., NTIP longitudinal research, board visits, Board Survey Tool, NTIP plans/final reports).

District school boards are accountable for funds provided to implement the NTIP; wherewith, they are required to submit an NTIP Final Report (including a detailed accounting statement) to the Ministry of Education every year. They are also required to annually submit data to the ministry through the estimates, revised estimates, and financial statements process. Ministry also controls the implementation of the program by making monitoring visits to ensure program and funding compliance.

Process of implementation

Although, the NTIP is designed as primarily a school-based program, its implementation is not unilateral; it occurs at district school board and individual school levels. At the school board level, a superintendent is designated with responsibility for program oversight. This superintendent may assign an NTIP coordinator role to a current or retired board employee and may allocate up to $50,000 in salary to support this role (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2019a). In addition, the school board must establish an NTIP steering committee to coordinate board-wide supports, policies, procedures, and program review to help schools implement the NTIP and build capacity. Other responsibilities may include the development of a process for mentor selection, matching, and exit strategy, and training principals to deliver school orientation programs. It is strongly recommended that this steering committee include all appropriate stakeholders in the NTIP process, such as local federation affiliates, new teachers, mentors, principals, faculty of education representatives, and other staff and community partners, including Indigenous communities and partners. District school boards are responsible for identifying teachers, who are NTIP required (first year permanent hires) and NTIP eligible (any teacher in their first five years who falls outside of the NTIP required definition) to participate in the program (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2019a).

At the school level, NTIP implementation depends on principals who exercise a critical role as catalysts for professional development. Principals are responsible for selecting the teaching assignments for new teachers, wherefor considering how these might support the new teachers to successfully improve student learning and link to

teachers' qualifications and strengths. Principals must foster a culture where new teachers are supported and not isolated in their respective schools and ensure that new teachers have access to required resources and are supported with student assessments (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2010d). Principals work closely with the new teacher on the Individual NTIP Strategy Form; this serves as a vehicle for discussion and learning, records the participation and completion of induction elements, and is non-evaluative. Principals are also expected to develop other leaders in their schools by working closely with and relying on experienced teachers who serve as mentors. As indicated, mentoring for new teachers is non-evaluative and provides a wide range of benefits, not only to new teachers, but also to the more experienced mentor-teachers. Principals must also complete teacher performance appraisals (TPA) for their new teachers, including classroom observations, appraisal meetings, rating and summative reporting, and additional support depending on the outcome of the appraisal (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2010e).

Jointly, district school boards and principals are responsible for providing all new teachers with a process that orientates them to working in education in Ontario, their district school board, their school, and the classroom where they predominantly work. Reporting of the completion of the program is also a joint venture; wherein the NTIP Strategy Form is signed by the principal once new teachers receive two satisfactory performance rating and is forwarded to the designated NTIP superintendent. The designated NTIP superintendent submits the names of all new teachers who have completed NTIP to the Ontario College of Teachers within 60 calendar days of the new teacher's second satisfactory performance rating.

Program evaluation

The Professionalism, Teaching Policy and Standards Branch (PTPSB) of the Ministry developed a range of streamlined survey instruments for individual district school boards to adapt and use to undertake their own optional measurement of the NTIP program. School boards are not required to share any internal data gathered with the PTPSB, and so any measurements of impact of the NTIP program are held within each district school board. In addition to providing this option for district school boards, the PTPSB has worked in collaboration with external researchers (e.g., Kane, 2010; Frank, Zorzi, McGinnis-Dunphy, Dourado, Dare, Van den Daele, Brooker, 2020, 2021) and school board NTIP teams to collect and analyze qualitative and quantitative data, which is used to measure the impact of NTIP, directly inform program design, and support new teachers (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2019b).

Outcomes analysis of the teacher induction policy in Ontario

Based on the ministry reports, empirical studies, and internal and external program evaluations, the results of the outcomes policy analysis of the teacher induction efforts in Ontario are presented in the following sections: a) program development and implementation, b) NTIP impact, and c) challenges of implementation.

Program development and implementation

Several key underlying assumptions guided Ontario's NTIP program development

and implementation. The design of Ontario's NTIP assumed that a systematic process of induction, mentoring, and professional development would accelerate the new teachers' progress toward the level of experienced classroom teachers (Kane & Francis, 2013). This assumption was firmly rooted in research that positioned a combination of induction, mentoring, and professional development as the most effective approach to increasing teacher effectiveness and student learning (Glazerman et al., 2010; Guarino et al., 2006; Ingersoll & Strong, 2011). As Cherubini (2010) notes, the establishment of the NTIP mandate to increase teacher quality and improve teacher performance in Ontario is traced to the government reforms that underscored the significance of public accountability (see Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008).

Another assumption evident in the program development was sustained learning. Feiman-Nemser (2001) argued for the need to develop a continuum to strengthen and sustain teaching, especially during the critical formative stages. In a similar vein, the structure of the Ontario's induction policy was based on the notion of a continuum (both explicitly stated and implicitly embedded); whereas preservice teacher education served as the initial step only in the process of becoming a teacher, and that continued professional learning through induction was deemed to be critical to support teaching and learning in Ontario's schools (Kane & Francis, 2013). Provision of an increased continuum of support for all new teachers has been evident in the extension of supports to the second-year teachers and long-term occasional teachers (Kane, 2010) and in the most recent the expansion to address opportunity gaps by providing boards with the flexibility to support any new teacher within their first five years of employment (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2019a).

The espoused goals of NTIP include the development of new teachers' confidence, efficacy, instructional practice, and commitment to continuous learning, with the ultimate aim of equipping new teachers to improve their students' wellbeing and learning. There is evidence that learning has not only been embedded into the program for its participants (predominantly new teachers), but also into the policymakers and program coordinators. In fact, Strachan et al. (2017) call policy development a complex, messy, and iterative learning journey, with NTIP continuing to evolve by seeking to meet the diverse needs of new teachers in Ontario and being responsive to the changing educational landscape. In this regard, the NTIP has seen the evolution of several programmatic goals (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2019a). The focus on core content topics and a checklist of prescribed learning have given way to voice, choice, and agency—an authentic learning responsive to teachers' contexts, experiences, assignment, and learning goals. The focus on structure (e.g., mentoring match, training, principal engagement) evolved to the focus on relationships within the mentoring web, foundational skills, trust, and principal encouragement. Finally, moving away from "NTIP for some," the program's focus became on inclusion of as many new teachers in their first five years as possible. In line with this, the program has addressed the Calls to Action of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) ensuring educators have training on the integration of Indigenous knowledge and teaching methods into the classroom (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2019a).

Importantly, the NTIP policy incorporated a multi-level implementation strategy. This assumed that every board's local context and circumstances were unique. As

observed by Cherubini (2010), the NTIP policy was designed to address the profound challenges presented to new teachers by offering some district and predominantly school-based supports, including mentors, to assist new teachers' transition and negotiation of their professional roles and responsibilities. While leadership at the board level was considered instrumental for the successful implementation of NTIP in schools (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2019a), it was on the shoulders of school principal where most of the implementing duties have rested. Cherubini (2010) noted that according to NTIP policy, school principals have 10 key responsibilities in the delivery of the program, significantly more than any other stakeholders. Research has shown direct and indirect impacts of the principals' practices on the effective outcomes of teacher induction and mentoring programs and ultimately, teacher retention, and development (Kutsyuruba & Walker, 2020). Indeed, school principals are instrumental in establishing learning and implementation opportunities for induction and mentoring to flourish (Gunn & McRae, 2021). Coburn (2005) suggests that principals have direct and indirect influence on ECTs by their actions and beliefs related to district and government policies. Principal engagement is critical for induction and mentoring programs as their effectiveness depends on a school's context and alignment with vision, instructional focus, and the priorities set by the school administrator (Moir et al., 2009). When principals build up the school culture, exhibit supportive and shared leadership, create the opportunity for shared values and vision, and promote professional relationships among ECTs and experienced teachers, then morale improves and ECTs' self-concept is strengthened (Cherian & Daniel, 2008; Wood, 2005; Wynn et al., 2007).

In addition, policy development and implementation efforts have been significantly backed by provincial mandate and the financial support to school boards and schools. Writing over a decade ago, Cherubini (2010) noted that the ministry's commitment to a provincial teacher induction program was praiseworthy, as was the financial investment that they made to implement the program across the province. Kearney (2014) found that internationally, the effectiveness and success of induction programs depended on such factors as institutional commitment through funding, resourcing, and partnerships. Dedicated funding from the government agencies to districts, along with quality standards, protected time and mentor training, was considered a key factor in effective induction and mentoring support for new teachers in the United States (Goldrick, 2016). Within the Canadian context, funding has been an important factor to the longevity of the induction program, as was demonstrated by the dissolution of the Beginning Teacher Induction Program (BTIP) in New Brunswick, a model program for Ontario's NTIP; this dissolution was due to lack of government funding (Kutsyuruba et al., 2016).

Impact of NTIP

A variety of studies, including longitudinal projects, have sought to examine and evaluate the NTIP program (Barrett et al., 2009; Frank et al., 2020, 2021; Glassford & Salinitri, 2007; Kane, 2010; Ontario College of Teachers, 2011; Salinitri, Howitt, & Donohoo, 2007). Barrett et al. (2009) noted that it is crucial to examine whether or not the stated aims of a program are actually reflected in the procedures associated

with the program. This is because it is often the case that policies developed at the government level have unexpected consequences within schools. To address this, the four core measures of growth were developed for the NTIP. Again, these measures assess growth in line with the program's goals: *confidence*, feeling they have the supports they need to be a successful teacher; *efficacy*, believing that they can help all students learn; *commitment to continuous learning*, having a desire and willingness to improve their teaching; and *instructional practice*, having a strong repertoire of teaching skills. Based on the first longitudinal studies on NTIP (Kane, 2010), new teachers, mentors, principals, and school board contacts perceived the NTIP had been a necessary and worthwhile initiative that made significant progress toward meeting the goals of promoting teacher excellence by contributing to professional growth. Over the three annual cycles, this study found evidence that new teachers' experiences of the NTIP were generally positive and that their participation in the NTIP had impacted their professional practice by contributing to their professional growth, increasing their confidence, enriching job satisfaction, and enhancing their sense of belonging and value.

Subsequent longitudinal research conducted by Frank & Associates from 2012 to 2015 showed that NTIP had been effective in all four core goal areas. Similar to the previous study by Kane (2010), authors found reports of meaningful and sustained improvement in ECTs confidence, efficacy, instructional practice, and commitment to ongoing learning. More recently, Frank et al. (2020) completed the year four report from a five-year longitudinal study (2016–2021) of the NTIP that explored Ontario new teachers' learning journeys. The four core measures of growth were assessed through a retrospective baseline approach, wherein participants were provided with a set of statements and asked to indicate how true each statement was for them a) in the past month, and b) when they first started teaching in Ontario. The change in confidence was statistically significant for all groups except the long-term occasional teachers with NTIP, and the growth in efficacy scores were statistically significant for teachers with permanent assignments, and teachers with daily occasional assignments. Key findings showed an increase in confidence with strongest growth in new teachers who had opportunities to observe colleagues teach followed by discussion and access to a choice of learning opportunities. Furthermore, Frank et al. (2021) found that COVID-19 pandemic may have changed teachers' specific learning needs, yet mentorship and support from others through NTIP remained most helpful to beginning teachers who have permanent assignments and LTO assignments. Furthermore, in year five, Frank et al. (2021) found that teachers' growth in confidence was strongest in teachers who had accessed a higher number of supports, such as having a choice of learning opportunities, and opportunities to connect with other new teachers, to take part in an in-person Community of Practice, to observe a colleague teach, or have a colleague observe them teach.

One of the most amplified messages across all studies indicated that mentoring was one of the most influential components of NTIP (e.g., Kane, 2010; Frank et al., 2020, 2021; Ontario College of Teachers 2011). Kane (2010) found that mentoring emerged as the most influential component of the NTIP in terms of both the ECTs' experience and perceived impact on professional practice. Having an assigned men-

tor provided the ECTs with an identified person whom they could contact regarding questions and challenges they may encounter on day-to-day basis. In other words, the mentor was their "go-to" person who was able to direct them elsewhere if necessary, to address the question or concern. However, as Kane (2010) was quick to also point out, mentoring does not work in isolation but was an integral component of the combination of NTIP supports. Mentoring has been considered at the heart of NTIP (Strachan et al., 2017); whereas mentorship provided ECTs with a web of personalized supports directly aligned with NTIP goals. It was not having an assigned mentor that was linked to growth, but the fact of being mentored and accessing five to seven different mentoring web supports (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2022). As Glassford and Salinitri (2007) argued, high-quality mentoring within a properly funded and permanent new-teacher induction program offered the promise of more effective teaching and higher levels of student achievement.

More recently, Frank et al. (2020) noted that the most helpful supports accessed by ECTs included mentorship and/or support from colleagues who provided helpful information, advice, resources, and relevant learning opportunities. Moreover, mentoring supports from colleagues were considered particularly important during the COVID-19 crisis (Frank et al., 2021).Teachers who had informal mentorship from colleagues and had opportunities to have a colleague observe them teaching followed by discussion that tended to have slightly stronger growth in their commitment to lifelong learning. As Hobson et al. (2009) found, ECT mentoring had great potential to produce a range of benefits for mentees, mentors, and schools. However, they also found that the success of mentoring programs and mentoring relationships were influenced by a range of contextual factors. Mentoring was more likely to be effective where teacher-mentors were provided with additional release or non-contact time to help them prepare for and undertake the mentoring role (Hobson et al., 2009). It is possible to make parallels between the value of mentorship for participants and the commitment to provision of release time for mentors and ECTs and mentor training afforded within the NTIP policies. Moreover, evidence shows the program's intention to develop teachers who receive support and mentorship via NTIP into future mentors for the next generation of new hires and ultimately of the students they will teach (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2019a).

In addition, Frank et al. (2020, 2021) found that teachers who had opportunities to have a colleague observe them teach, followed by discussion and/or had a choice of learning opportunities, tended to have slightly stronger growth in instructional practice. The findings of Frank et al.'s evaluation align to broader literature underpinning the value of peer support (Kutsyuruba et al., 2016), instruction in effective classroom management and teaching techniques (Anhorn, 2008; Wynn et al., 2007), and teacher efficacy (Haggarty, Postlethwaite, Diment, & Ellins, 2011).

The impact that teachers have on the quality of teaching and learning has been indicated in international research (e.g., Cochran-Smith, 2003; Darling-Hammond, 2001; 2003). While many factors influence student learning, what teachers know and are able to do in the classroom has been felt to be the most important contributor (Timperly, Wilson, Barrar, & Fung, 2007). Recognition of the limitations of initial teacher education programs to fully prepare new teachers for the reality of twentieth-

century classrooms, has given rise to many ministries of education, professional bodies, and district school boards implementing mentoring and induction programs to support new teachers through a prolonged period of further learning and development (Anthony, Haig, & Kane, 2011; Ingersoll & Kralik, 2004). Ontario is not an exclusion in this matter.

Through NTIP, the Ministry stated that new teachers should receive a continuum of support throughout their first year of teaching and highlighted that to be most consequential and effective, professional development, training, and resources should contain appropriate content to meet the specific and diverse needs of the new teacher (Ministry of Education, 2010c). Evidence shows that the learner was at the centre of the induction elements of the NTIP. As the most logical category of participants, this included new teachers. However, NTIP learners also included associate teachers, mentors, principals, board staff, and many other colleagues. New teachers become reflective thinkers and co-learners if mentoring environment are based on collegial relationships and collaboration (Kochan & Trimble, 2000). Induction programs are also meaningful when they are constructed by each learner, based on their real-world learning needs. Through NTIP, powerful learning designs like mentorship deprivatize instruction, foster collaboration, and support educator leadership via the intentional sharing of knowledge and practice between colleagues, and as such, NTIP serves as an example of collaborative professionalism in action (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2019a). With respect to their own professionalism, teachers have been found to be less concerned with the specifics of government policy and much more concerned with the nature of reform implementation as it occurs within their particular contexts (Directions Evidence and Policy Research Group, 2014).

In their outline of the professional development core content and tools to support NTIP, the Ministry determined the link between professional learning for teachers and student success. To achieve the greatest effect, professional learning should be "clearly focussed, practical, guided by research, and shared among educators in a supportive, risk-free learning community" (Ministry of Education, 2010c, p. 3). In addition, professional learning should be viewed as a career-long process, entrenched into the culture of a school, and is frequently evaluated and embedded into all future planning (Ministry of Education, 2010c). Finally, professional learning should relate purposefully to school and board goals, and to the Ontario curriculum. This requires schools and district school boards to link professional learning and development activities to their own priorities as well as Ministry initiatives and policy mandates.

Challenges of implementing NTIP

Along with the positive outcomes of teacher induction policies, challenges and limitations have been noted. Writing at the outset of NTIP's history, Glassford and Salinitri (2007) note that one of the most significant challenges faced by any new program implementation is whether it will stand the test of time. It is fair to say that over a decade after its inception, the NTIP exists in a modified, evolved form, albeit the program faces new (and old) challenges. Strachan et al. (2017) describe these challenges of implementation as the "stones in our shoes" (p. 263). These and other authors (e.g., Broad & Muling, 2017) mention that since the initial implementation, there

have been multiple changes in Ontario's system of education that have affected NTIP, including a blended, jagged, and protracted path to permanent teaching, regulations that limited ECTs entry into profession (e.g., the only recently repealed Regulation 274/12 that guarded hiring process by seniority and time in occasional teaching); in addition, we might also mention modifications to initial teacher education programs. More recently, longitudinal research has revealed significant opportunity gaps, in terms of lack of formal mentorship and access to relevant professional learning, for daily occasional teachers and LTO teachers for whom assignments have not met the previous criteria for NTIP support (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2019a).

In 2007, Glassford and Salinitri raised a number of concerns about the program's long-term viability including the maintenance of effective mentoring, the tension for school administration between supporting new teacher development and measuring performance, sustainability of funding, and the development of new teachers' skills including confidence and efficacy, both of which are challenging to measure. Barrett et al. (2009) sought to examine any hidden curriculum within NTIP and concluded that NTIP's original goals of: a) orientation to a new school and school board, b) mentoring by experienced teachers, and c) professional development and training, whilst highly functional and pragmatic, were also laudable. For these authors, some problematic aspects of the program included the lack of opportunity to explore fully the different underlying philosophical and pedagogical assumptions and goals of classroom management and the role of school administrators in selecting mentors or acting as mentor and the tensions of performance management of new teachers. Given that over a decade has passed since these studies, it is warranted that further examination of NTIP should seek to uncover how effectively school boards have been managing these tensions and are finding ways to efficiently reconcile the needs of all concerned with supporting ECTs including teacher educators, school administrators, and the larger school communities.

Several studies have identified potential areas for the improvement of the effectiveness of NTIP, including the need to pay more attention to the role of the principal who was deemed largely responsible for the pairing of mentors and mentees (e.g., Barrett et al., 2009; Glassford & Salinitri, 2007). However, the NTIP policy also positioned school principals within an evaluative capacity, as responsible to conduct two performance appraisals in the first 12 months after the ECT begins teaching (Cherian & Daniel, 2008). Viewing this as "high-stakes evaluation process since the principal has the authority to recommend termination of the new teacher's employment," Cherubini (2010, p. 25) ponders if indeed the induction policy in Ontario had created the necessary conditions for new teachers to flourish. Key in this regard was the principal's role in relationship building and maintenance of trust that have been at the core of this mentoring for all approach (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2019a). Scholars (Hobson & Malderez, 2013) have termed this potential role conflict as "judgementoring." However, as noted in recent studies (Frank et al., 2020), principal encouragement has emerged as a key factor in the growth of ECTs. New teachers, who highlighted the important role their principal played in their development, were found to trust their principal and felt they could speak openly about their learning without the worry of being judged. In other words, an evaluative role

has not seemed to have interfered with the overall supportive perceptions of a principal within the induction policy. Interestingly, Kearney (2014) found similar sentiments in countries with effective induction programs, noting that it is the preparation, support, and evaluation of their teachers that are essential to program success to properly acculturate their teachers into the profession.

Finally, challenges faced within the school board included scheduling times for mentors and new teachers to meet, how to give meaningful feedback, and finding ways to support daily occasional teachers. The role of effective feedback was important for new teachers' continued development, but it was not without risk. This was due to overlaps with evaluation of performance. Cameron (2007) highlighted how the process by which new teachers are evaluated can be contentious, possibly due to teachers being seen as autonomous professionals operating in a "culture of individualism" (Fullan & Hargreaves, 2000, p. 51). Teaching has been seen as an isolating profession where teachers work alone in their classrooms (Feiman-Nemser, 2006). This remains an ongoing challenge for the NTIP program.

Conclusions and implications

Based on a policy document analysis, the authors offer several implications for policy development and implementation and practice of supporting ECTs at macro and micro levels and conclude with questions worth further examination relevant to the policy. At a macro level, it is interesting that the longitudinal study over the past four years explains some of the recent evolution experienced by NTIP. It is also true that while well incentivized and supported from central authority, the NTIP has been grassroots in its implementation with numerous local initiatives and improvisations to match the particularities of challenges the local needs. The changes made have been in response to the case study examples, where the NTIP has been most effective, and the appreciation of the Ministry for this is highly supportive. There has been opportunity for feedback, and this has been a critical factor for administrators and receivers of NTIP in terms of appreciating the nuances and adjustments to the NTIP as it continues.

Certainly, several initiatives were also found to be efficacious at the micro level. The mentoring web constitutes one example of where scope was given for more collaborative forms of mentorship. We would also remind readers of the insights and implications that allowed for differentiated and situated learning that considered the needs of new teachers as learners, and the need for understanding adult learning theory. This flexibility, toleration of ambiguity, and operation of principle of subsidiarity were noted strengths of NTIP. The role of the school principal was central to the successful operationalization of NTIP. Despite the ever-increasing demands on their time and priorities, the NTIP has recognized the important influence that principals have in facilitating ECT success. As one considers the pressures that accompany the ever-intensifying principalship role and, in particular, the challenges for neophyte principals who must contend with so many daunting tasks, the effectiveness of this involvement and its sustainability might be examined further. The adequacy of incentives, resources and reinforcements of these investments will certainly need to be renewed, over time and in specific circumstances. Of course, we know

that any initiative will be hosted by the culture into which it fits. Renewed attention to internal integration and external adaptations that predispose each school culture to NTIP goals and values will be critical. Purpose drift, goal displacement, and situations where NTIP experiences are not positive may contribute to a less conducive set of taken-for-granted assumptions, making NTIP success more challenging. On the other hand, a NTIP-welcoming school culture with stories that accentuate the purpose and benefits of NTIP implementation and the positive experiences of ECT will aid in the continuing success of the initiatives. The NTIP is a collaborative enterprise, requiring mindsets that are growth-oriented, flexible, and foresighted, and that appreciate the value of lifelong learning through early teacher habit formation. It seems obvious that collective effort and shared leadership will be major factors within each school for the NTIP to succeed.

Whereas we often observed that the concept of induction has an ad hoc or temporary connotation, it is also our view that the formation of organizational practices associated with the program (both those elements that are tightly and loosely coupled) afford highly habituated community of practices; furthermore, they help develop natural supports and give rise to appropriate adaptations over time (as well and within particular circumstances). As one stands back and examines the NTIP initiative, policymakers from other jurisdictions might notice that this was a multipronged approach based on view of professional learning for new teachers that was relationally rich and characterized by balanced incentives, resources, defined parameters, accountability, and flexibility. The NTIP initiative was built in a fashion that was designed to complement teacher education efforts and was cognizant of the requisite skills and knowledge associated with teacher effectiveness, beyond pre-service education. The policies, ongoing commitment to the program, and thoughtful design to establish and maintain successive teacher excellence by their active engagement in learning their profession is laudable. To allow, through research, tinkering, adjustments, and adaptations over time reflects a larger commitment to system learning and resilience. To boldly institute the NTIP as for everyone and require the involvement of multiple levels of actors, who both take responsibility and observe the positive benefits, indeed stands out as a wise induction policy.

References

Andrews, B.D., & Quinn, R.J. (2004). First-year teaching assignments: A descriptive analysis. *The Clearing House, 78*(2), 78–83.

Anhorn, R. (2008). The profession that eats its young. *The Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin, 74*(3), 15–26.

Anthony, G.J., Haig, M., & Kane, R.G. (2011). The power of 'object' to influence teacher induction outcomes. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 27*(5), 861–870.

Barrett, S.E., Solomon, R.P., Singer, J., Portelli, J.P., & Mujuwamariya, D. (2009). The hidden curriculum of a teacher induction program: Ontario teacher educators' perspectives. *Canadian Journal of Education, 32*(4), 677–702.

Bell, L., & Stevenson, H. (2006). *Education policy: Process, themes and impact*. London, UK: Routledge.

Benson, M.A. (2008). Effective mentoring for new music teachers: An analysis of the mentoring programs for new music teachers as described in the literature. *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education, 26*(2), 42–49. doi:10.1177/8755123308317953

Borman, G.D., & Dowling, N.M. (2008). Teacher attrition and retention: A meta-analytic and narrative review of the research. *Review of Educational Research, 78*(3), 367–409.

Bowen, G.A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal, 9*(2), 27–40. doi:10.3316/qrj0902027

Breaux, A.L., & Wong, H.K. (2003). *New teacher induction: How to train, support and retain good teachers.* Mountain View, CA: Harry K. Wong Publications.

Broad, K., & Muhling, S. (2017). Voices of hope: Sustaining learning and optimism through a protracted and jagged entry to the teaching profession in Ontario. In B. Kutsyuruba & K.D. Walker (Eds.), *The bliss and blisters of early career teaching: A pan-Canadian perspective* (pp. 139–153). Burlington, ON: Word & Deed.

Bryman, A. (2012). *Social research methods*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Busher, H. (2006). *Understanding educational leadership: People, power and culture*. New York, NY: Open University Press.

Cardno, C. (2018). Policy document analysis: A practical educational leadership tool and a qualitative research method. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice, 24*(4), 623–640. doi:10.14527/kuey.2018.016

Carver, C.L., & Feiman-Nemser, S. (2009). Using policy to improve teacher induction: Critical elements and missing pieces. *Education Policy*, *23*(2), 295–328.

CBC News. (2024, January 8). *Substitute teacher and EA shortage hurting students learning, safety: Ontario Principals' Council.* https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/toronto/gta-ontario-school-staff-shortages-1.7077530 [May 23, 2024].

Cherian, F., & Daniel, Y. (2008). Principal leadership in new teacher induction: Becoming agents of change. *International Journal of Education Policy and Leadership, 3*(2), 1–11.

Cherubini, L. (2009). New teachers' perceptions of induction: Insights into principled practices. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 33*(2), 185–198.

Cherubini, L. (2010). An analysis of the implications between the theoretical framework and the policy context of provincial education policy in Ontario. *Journal of Contemporary Issues in Education, 5*(1), 20–33.

Clandinin, D.J., Schaefer, L., Long, J.S., Steeves, et al. (2012). *Early career teacher attrition: Problems, possibilities, potentials*. Centre for Research for Teacher Education and Development, University of Alberta.

Clark, R., & Antonelli, F. (2009). *Why teachers leave: Results of an Ontario Survey 2006-08*. Toronto, ON: Ontario Teachers' Federation.

Coburn, C.E. (2005). Shaping teacher sense-making: School leaders and the enactment of reading policy. *Educational Policy, 19*, 476–509.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2003). Teaching quality matters. *Journal of Teacher Education, 54*(2), 95–99.

Cumming-Potvin, W.M., & MacCallum, J.A. (2010). Intergenerational practice: Mentoring and social capital for twenty-first century communities of practice. *McGill Journal of Education, 45*(2), 305–323.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2001). The challenge of staffing our schools. *Educational leadership, 58*(8), 12–17.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2003). Keeping good teachers: Why it matters, what leaders can do. *Educational Leadership, 60*(8), 6–13.

Davis, B., & Higdon, K. (2008). The effects of mentoring/induction support on beginning teachers' practices in early elementary classrooms (K-3). *Journal of Research in Childhood Education, 22*(3), 261–274.

Directions Evidence and Policy Research Group. (2014). *The Elementary Teachers' Federation of Ontario (ETFO) teacher workload and professionalism study*. Toronto, ON: Elementary Teachers' Federation of Ontario.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (2001). From preparation to practice: Designing a continuum to strengthen and sustain teaching. *Teachers College Record*, *103,* 1013–1055.

Frank & Associates. (2015). *Longitudinal evaluation of Ontario's New Teacher Induction Program (NTIP): NTIP reflections Year 3 Final Report*. Toronto, ON: CFA.

Frank, C., Zorzi, R., McGinnis-Dunphy, M., Dourado, L., Dare, L. Van den Daele, G., Brooker, A-S. (2020). *Beginning teachers' learning journeys: Longitudinal study year 4 report*. Toronto, ON: Christine Frank & Associates/Cathexis Consulting Inc.

Frank, C., Zorzi, R., McGinnis-Dunphy, M., Dourado, L., Dare, L. Van den Daele, G., Brooker, A-S. (2021). *Beginning teachers' learning journeys: Longitudinal study year 5 report*. Toronto, ON: Christine Frank & Associates/Cathexis Consulting Inc.

Fullan, M., & Hargreaves, A. (2000). Mentoring in the new millennium. *Theory Into Practice*, *39*(1), 50–56.

Gallant, A., & Riley, P. (2014). Early career teacher attrition: new thoughts on an intractable problem. *Teacher Development, 18*(4), 562–580. doi:10.1080/13664530.2014.945129

Glassford, L.A., & Salinitri, G. (2007). Designing a successful new teacher induction program: An assessment of the Ontario experience, 2003–2006. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy, 60* (March 11), 1–34.

Glazerman, S., Isenberg, E., Dolfin, S., Bleeker, M., Johnson, A., Grider, M., & Jacobus, M. (2010). *Impacts of comprehensive teacher induction: Final results from a randomized controlled study (NCEE 2010-4027)*. National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.

Goldrick, L. (2016). *Support from the start: A 50-state review of policies on new educator induction and mentoring*. Santa Cruz, CA: New Teacher Center.

Goldrick, L., Osta, D., Barlin, D., & Burn, J. (2012). *Review of state policies on teacher induction*. Santa Cruz, CA: New Teacher Center.

Guarino, C. M., Santibañez, L., & Daley, G. A. (2006). Teacher recruitment and retention: A review of the recent empirical literature. *Review of Educational Research, 76*(2), 173–208. doi:10.3102/00346543076002173

Gunn, T. M., & McRae, P. A. (2021). Better understanding the professional and personal factors that influence beginning teacher retention in one Canadian province. *International Journal of Educational Research Open, 2*(2), 1–14. doi:10.1016/j.ijedro.2021.100073

Haggarty, L., Postlethwaite, K., Diment, K., & Ellins, J. (2011). Improving the learning of newly qualified teachers in the induction year. *British Educational Research Journal, 37*(6), 935–954.

Henry, G.T., Bastian, K.C., & Fortner, C.K. (2011). Stayers and leavers: Early-career teacher effectiveness and attrition. *Educational Researcher, 40*(6), 271–280.

Hobson, A.J., Ashby, P., Malderez, A., & Tomlinson, P.D. (2009). Mentoring beginning teachers: What we know and what we don't. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 25*(1), 207–216. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2008.09.001

Hobson, A.J., & Malderez, A. (2013). Judgementoring and other threats to realizing the potential of school-based mentoring in teacher education. *International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching in Education, 2(*2), 89–108. doi:10.1108/IJMCE-03-2013-0019

Hobson, A.J., & Maxwell, B. (2017). Supporting and inhibiting the well-being of early career secondary school teachers: Extending self-determination theory. *British Educational Research Journal, 43*(1), 168–191. doi:10.1002/berj.3261

Ingersoll, R. M., & Kralik, J. (2004). The impact of mentoring on teacher retention: What the research says. *Teaching Quality*, 1–23.

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

Ingersoll, R.M., & Strong, M. (2011). The impact of induction and mentoring programs for beginning teachers: A critical review of the research. *Review of Education Research, 81*(2), 201–233.

Johnson, S.M., & Kardos, S.M. (2005). Bridging the generation gap. *Educational Leadership, 62*(8), 8–14.

Jones, M. (2002). Qualified to become good teachers: A case study of ten newly qualified teachers during their year of induction. *Journal of In-Service Education, 28*(3), 509–526.

Kane, R.G. (2010). *NTIP Evaluation Final Report – Executive Summary (Cycle III)*. Toronto, ON: Ministry of Education of Ontario. http://cal2.edu.gov.on.ca/may2010/NTIP_Evaluation_Report_2010.pdf [December 12, 2014].

Kane, R.G., & Francis, A. (2013). Preparing teachers for professional learning: Is there a future for teacher education in new teacher induction? *Teacher Development, 17*(3), 362–379. doi:10.1080/13664530.2013.813763

Kang, S., & Berliner, D.C. (2012). Characteristics of teacher induction programs and turnover rates of beginning teachers. *The Teacher Educator, 47*(4), 268–282. doi:10.1080/08878730.2012.707758

Karsenti, T., & Collin, S. (2013). Why are new teachers leaving the profession? Results of a Canada-wide survey. *Education, 3*(3), 141–149. doi:10.5923/j.edu.20130303.01

Karsenti, T., Collin, S., Villeneuve, S., Dumouchel, G., & Roy, N. (2008). *Why are new French immersion and French as a second language teachers leaving the profession? Results of a Canada-wide survey*. Ottawa, ON: Canadian Association of Immersion Teachers.

Kearney, S. (2014). Understanding beginning teacher induction: A contextualized examination of best practice. *Cogent Education, 1*(967477), 1–15. doi:10.1080/2331186X.2014.967477

Kearney, S. (2017). Beginning teacher induction in secondary schools: A best practice case study. *Issues in Educational Research, 27*(4), 784–802.

Kelchtermans, G. (2017). "Should I stay or should I go?": Unpacking teacher attrition/retention as an educational issue. *Teachers and Teaching, 23*(8), 961–977. doi:10.1080/13540602.2017.1379793

Kochan, F.K., & Trimble, S.B. (2000). From mentoring to co-mentoring: Establishing collaborative relationships. *Theory into Practice, 39*(1), 20–28.

Kutsyuruba, B. (2023). Document analysis. In J. Okoko, S. Tunison, & K. D. Walker (Eds.), *Varieties of qualitative research methods* (pp. 139–146). Dordrecht, NETH: Springer. doi:10.1007/978-3-031-04394-9_23

Kutsyuruba, B., & Walker, K.D. (Eds.) (2017). *The bliss and blisters of early career teaching: A pan-Canadian perspective*. Burlington, ON: Word & Deed.

Kutsyuruba, B., Godden, L., Matheson, I., & Walker, K.D. (2016). *Pan-Canadian document analysis study: Understanding the role of teacher induction and mentoring programs in teacher attrition and retention*. Kingston, ON: Queen's University.

Kutsyuruba, B., Walker, K.D., & Godden, L. (2019). Contextual factors in early career teaching: A systematic review of international research on teacher induction and mentoring programs. *Journal of Global Education and Research, 3*(2), 85-123. doi:10.5038/2577-509X.3.2.1057

Kutsyuruba, B., & Walker, K. D. (2020, April 30). The role of school principal in induction and mentoring of early career teachers. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education*, 1-27. doi:10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.013.659

Kyriacou, C., & Kunc, R. (2007). Beginning teachers' expectations of teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 23*(8), 1246–1257. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2006.06.002

Laitsch, D. (2005). The effect of new teacher induction programs on teacher migration and attrition. *Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 3*(5). www.ascd.org/publications/researchbrief/v3n05/toc.aspx [February 2, 2014].

Miller, F.A., & Alvarado, K. (2005). Incorporating documents into qualitative nursing research. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship, 37*(4), 348–353.

Moir, E., Barlin, D., Gless, J., & Miles, J. (2009). *New teacher mentoring: Hopes and promise for improving teacher effectiveness*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

Nishimoto, M.C. (2018). The importance of teacher induction for improving teaching and learning. In G.E. Hall, L.F. Quinn, & D.M. Gollnick (Eds.), *The Wiley handbook of teaching and learning* (pp. 447–471). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley. doi:10.1002/9781118955901.ch19

Ontario College of Teachers. (2011). *Transition to teaching 2010: Early-career teachers in Ontario schools*. Toronto, ON: Ontario College of Teachers.

Ontario Ministry of Education. (2010a). *New Teacher Induction Program: Induction elements manual*. Queen's Printer for Ontario. http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/teacher/pdfs/NTIP-English_Elements-september2010.pdf [March 12, 2014].

Ontario Ministry of Education. (2010b). *Teacher performance appraisal: Tsechnical requirements manual*. http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/teacher/NTIPPrincipal.pdf [March 12, 2014].

Ontario Ministry of Education. (2010c). *Compliation of professional development core content to support the New Teacher Induction Program (NTIP): A resource for board NTIP teams*. http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/teacher/NTIPCore.pdf [March 12, 2014].

Ontario Ministry of Education. (2010d). *Partnering for success, getting the most from Ontario's New Teacher Induction Program: A resource book for principals*. Queen's Printer for Ontario.

Ontario Ministry of Education. (2010e). *Teacher performance appraisal: Technical requirements manual*. http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/teacher/pdfs/TPA_Manual_English_september2010l.pdf [March 12, 2014].

Ontario Ministry of Education. (2010f). *New Teacher Induction Program: Induction elements manual (2010)*. https://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/teacher/pdfs/NTIP-English_Elements-september2010.pdf [March 12, 2014]

Ontario Ministry of Education. (2019a). *New Teacher Induction Program: Induction elements manual* (2019). http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/teacher/pdfs/NTIPInductionElements2019.pdf [June 21, 2021].

Ontario Ministry of Education. (2019b). *NTIP survey tool for boards: companion guide*. https://spark.adobe.com/page/1J9QBDCPQgD3z/ [June 21, 2021].

Ontario Ministry of Education. (2019c). *New Teacher Induction Program goals*. https://spark.adobe.com/page/81JFq3TwRGdrs/#new-teacher-induction-program-goals [June 21, 2021].

Ontario Ministry of Education. (2022). New Teacher Induction Program: Induction elements manual (2021). https://files.ontario.ca/edu-ntip-inductions-manual-en-2022-08-02.pdf [June 12, 2023].

Pal, L. (1987). *Public policy analysis: An introduction*. Toronto, ON: Methuen Publications.

Portelli, J.P., Solomon, P., Barrett, S., Mujawamariya, D., Pinto, L.E., & Singer, J. (2010). *Stakeholders' perspectives on induction for new teachers: Critical analysis of teacher testing and mentorship*. Toronto, ON: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Prior, L. (2012). The role of documents in social research. In S. Delamont (Ed.), *Handbook of qualitative research in education* (pp. 426–438). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Richardson, R.C., Glessner, L.L., & Tolson, H. (2010). Stopping the leak: Retaining beginning teachers. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 32*(2), 1–8.

Richter, D., Kunter, M., Lüdtke, O., Klusmann, U., Anders, Y., & Baumert, J. (2013). How different mentoring approaches affect beginning teachers' development in the first years of practice. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 36*, 166–177. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2013.07.012

Russell, M.B., Attoh, P. A., Chase, T., Gong, T., Kim, J., & Liggans, G.L. (2020). Examining Burnout and the relationships between job characteristics, engagement, and turnover intention among U.S. educators. *Sage Open, 10*(4), 1–15. doi:10.1177/2158244020972361

Ryan, S.V., von der Embse, N.P., Pendergast, L.L., Saeki, E., Segool, N., & Schwing, S. (2017). Leaving the teaching profession: The role of teacher stress and educational accountability policies on turnover intent. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 66*, 1–11. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2017.03.016

Salinitri, G., Howitt, C., & Donohoo, J. (2007). *The New Teacher Induction Program: A case study on the its effect on new teachers and their mentors* [Conference paper]. The International Study Association on Teachers and Teaching, St. Catherines, Ontario, Canada.

Santoro, D.A. (2018). *Demoralized: Why teachers leave the profession they love and how they can stay*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

Smith, T.M., & Ingersoll, R.M. (2004). What are the effects of induction and mentoring on beginning teacher turnover? *American Educational Research Journal, 41*(3), 681–714.

Strachan, J., Creery, K., & Nemes, A. (2017). Ontario's New Teacher Induction Program: Our continuing learning journey. In B. Kutsyuruba & K.D. Walker (Eds.), *The bliss and blisters of early career teaching: A pan-Canadian perspective* (pp. 247–266). Burlington, ON: Word & Deed.

Strong, M. (2005). Teacher induction, mentoring, and retention: A summary of the research. *The New Educator, 1*(3), 181–198. doi:10.1080/154768.80590966295

Strong, M. (2006). Does new teacher support affect student achievement? *New Teacher Center at University of California Research Brief, 6*(1), 7. www.newteachercenter.org

Taylor, S., Rizvi, F., Lingard, B., & Henry, M. (1997). *Education policy and the politics of change*. London, UK: Routledge.

Timperly, H., Wilson, A., Barrar, H., & Fung, I. (2007). *Teacher professional learning and development: best evidence synthesis iteration [BES]*. Wellington, NZ: New Zealand Ministry of Education.

Valeo, A., & Faez, F. (2013). Career development and professional attrition of novice ESL teachers of adults. *TESL Canada Journal, 31*(1), 1–19.

Wahlstrom, K.L. & Louis, K.S. (2008). How teachers experience principal leadership: The roles of professional community, trust, efficacy, and shared responsibility. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 44*(4), 458–495.

Wong, H.K. (2004). Induction programs that keep new teachers teaching and improving. *NASSP Bulletin, 88*(638), 41–58.

Wood, A. (2005). The importance of principals: Site administrators' roles in novice teacher induction. *American Secondary Education, 33*(2), 39–62.

Wood, A.L., & Stanulis, R.N. (2009). Quality teacher induction: "Fourth-wave"(1997–2006) induction programs. *The New Educator, 5*(1), 1–23.

Wynn, S.R., Carboni, L.W., & Patall, E.A. (2007). Beginning teachers' perceptions of mentoring, climate, and leadership: Promoting retention through a learning communities perspective. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 6*(3), 209–229. doi:10.1080/15700760701263790