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Abstract

Using grounded theory methodology, this dissertation reports on a study of 12 educators’ experiences as trainers in a state-level policy implementation. Interviews, policy and program documents provide evidence of the trainers enacting intermediary roles in the implementation process, standing as a primary information conduit between the state department of education, which developed the program, and the teachers, who would enact the program.

Two main themes emerged from data analysis. First, the study shows how intermediaries engaging in ongoing knowledge building processes with the state department of education extended the department’s implementation capacity. They used their professional capital (Hargreaves & Fullan, 2012) — a combination of human, social and decisional capital utilizing group commitments and capabilities — and their local knowledge (Kalb, 2006) — insights gained from situated and practical insights into local social relations and institutions — to reach the policy enactors, the teachers. Second, the data indicated the presence of collective trust— the trust that groups have in individuals and other groups— among the trainer group, contributed to their initial successes, which Forsyth, Adams and Hoy (2012) suggest can positively influence school reform.

The study confirms the findings of prior implementation research, that the implementation process is complex and convoluted, yet contributes to the evidence that intermediaries play increasingly more powerful (and possibly more effective) roles in
policy implementation. It also extends collective trust research by its examination of the role of trust, both in relationships among the state trainers, and from the state trainers to other factions involved in the implementation process. The study suggests opportunities for subsequent research concerning intermediaries and expanding trust research to include studies of trust disintegration over time.
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CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Background

Elmore and McLaughlin (1988), writing of educational reform, called it steady work, tracing its recurrent cycle throughout the history of American education. Does our rapidly changing society require such cyclical reform, or are educational reforms so poorly executed that they perpetually fail? Since the former is likely an unanswerable question, the latter—educational policy implementation—became my preliminary research focus. Implementation, an area of policy research widely agreed to begin with the publication of Pressman and Wildavsky’s *Implementation* in 1973, refers broadly to the process by which a policy written becomes a policy enacted.

Implementation is the carrying out of a basic policy decision, usually made in a statute … the implementation process normally runs through a number of stages beginning with the passage of the basic statute, followed by the policy outputs (decisions) of the implementing agencies, the compliance of target groups …, the actual impacts—both intended and unintended—of those outputs, the perceived impacts of agency decisions, and, finally, important revisions (or attempted revisions) in the basic statute (Italics in original; Mazmanian & Sabatier, 1981, pp. 5-6).

Thus, any new educational policy must undergo a complicated process of

---

1 Its full title conveys their point of view and tone: *Implementation: How Great Expectations in Washington Are Dashed in Oakland: Or, Why It’s Amazing That Federal Programs Work at All, This Being a Saga of the Economic Development Administration as Told by Two Sympathetic Observers Who Seek to Build Morals on a Foundation of Ruined Hopes.*
implementation before it reaches the point of “impact”; in education, this most often means teachers and students. Elmore and McLaughlin identified “lags in implementation and performance [as] a central fact of reform” (1988, p. 7, italics mine). Other literature (Cuban, 1998; Farrell, 2000; Finn, Ravitch & Educational Excellence Network, 1996; Ravitch, 2001) confirmed this finding: educational policy implementation, as we know it, is fraught with missteps, miscues, and failures. When I chose to focus my research on policy implementation, I found myself at the origin point for a new policy for Ohio teacher induction, the Ohio Resident Educator Program.

The Ohio Resident Educator Program: In Brief

In his January 2009 “State of the State” Speech, then Governor Ted Strickland declared:

...under my plan, in recognition of the enormous importance of excellent teachers, we will revolutionize teacher preparation and development in Ohio with a residency program. Just as future doctors begin their careers under the watchful eye of an experienced colleague, we will give our new teachers the benefit of thoughtful guidance from an accomplished senior teacher. After a four-year residency, successful candidates will earn their professional teaching license (“Full text,” 2009).

Ohio’s Resident Educator Program rose from former Governor Strickland’s vision for a teacher residency, but its movement into law was hastened by a state budget shortfall and the fact that the previous induction program utilizing Praxis III was an easy target: it was a $4.2 million line item in the Ohio Department of Education’s (ODE) annual budget (OH SubHB 347). The legislation compelled immediate action to address the gap

2 Praxis III is an Educational Testing Service product, a summative assessment — that is, conducted for evaluative purposes — of a classroom teacher’s performance.
of two academic years after the discontinuation of Praxis III and before the Governor’s residency program was to take effect. In the interim, ODE set in place the Transition Resident Educator Program, which required schools to assign their new teachers (to be known as Resident Educators) a certified mentor, that is, one who has completed the required Instructional Mentoring training. Mentors would work with their Resident Educators using a series of formative assessments designed to target specific areas of pedagogical weakness and, during the Transition Resident Educator Program (effective July 1, 2009 – June 30, 2011), sign off on the candidate’s application for professional licensure.

As with any P-12 state level educational policy, the new induction program fell to the Ohio Department of Education for development and implementation. Though assigned to design, disseminate, and enact the new induction policy, ODE was not alone in shaping and bringing about change. Beginning in 2007, when movement toward legislation to end Praxis III began, ODE entered into a contractual relationship with the New Teacher Center (NTC), “a national non-profit dedicated to improving student learning by accelerating the effectiveness of new teachers and school leaders” (“Overview,” 2014). Initially, NTC was to assist ODE in gathering the opinions of state education stakeholders—Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs), regional educational leaders, district and school administrators, and classroom teachers—by organizing two groups: one to study the Pre-Service (or IHE) Connections to ODE (primarily a P-12

3 Formative assessment is the “process of measuring a novice teacher’s professional growth developmentally, not for purposes of evaluation as in summative assessment, but to provide feedback and foster continuing teacher development among novice educators” (Wood & Stanulis, 2010, p. 139).
agency), and the other to study the Induction Process. These groups met through May 2009, when the change lay just over the horizon. In August of 2009, a first cohort of state trainers was appointed to provide all the required training for both the Transition Resident Educator Program and the Resident Educator Program, which would begin in August 2011. Their charge: to deliver the new program to the school and district level mentors who would enact it.

Research Focus

Policy implementation, as defined by Malen (2006), is “a dynamic political process that affects and reflects the relative power of diverse actors and the institutional and environmental forces that condition the play of power” (p. 85). This study of Ohio’s Resident Educator program accounts for one particular faction of actors within the implementation process and explores the power they wield, confronting aspects of the complexity of policy implementation, attempting to expose and explain the policies, people, and places that shape it. This study answers Honig’s call for research that aims to reveal “… the people … that shape how implementation unfolds and provide robust, grounded explanations for how interactions among them help to explain implementation outcomes” (p. 2)

Research Questions

To that end, this study was guided by the following questions:

- Who are the primary actors/factions in this policy implementation? What roles do they fulfill? How do they interact?
- What functions do state trainers undertake in the implementation process? How do they describe the work that they do?
- What internal, institutional, and environmental forces influence the behaviors of
the state trainers as a group?

Organization of the Dissertation

Chapter 1 introduces the study by tracing my movement from the broad topic of education reform to a study of a specific policy implementation. It introduces the Ohio Resident Educator Program, states my research focus and the research questions. It ends with a narrative outline of the organization of the dissertation.

Chapter 2, the review of literature, outlines the history of implementation research from the early 1970s through contemporary concerns, including social capital, trust and intermediaries.

Research Design and Methodology follows in Chapter 3, which first defines the parameters of this study, the three key factions operating in the policy implementation: the state agency, policy entrepreneurs, and intermediaries. It establishes a policy context by examining the argument for teacher induction, then delineates a theoretical frame and a contextual rationale for the methodology. The chapter continues with identification of the grounded theory method and the data sources. It explains my privileged placement in terms of this research. The chapter concludes with an explanation of the data analysis process.

Chapter 4 provides a narrative history of the implementation of the induction policy and program development as it unfolded at the Ohio Department of Education. It traces the progress of the state house bills that mandated the change and early implementation actions at ODE, particularly the selection, training, and credentialing of the state training team. It ends with a discussion of intersecting actors in the policy
Data analysis begins in Chapter 5 examining how the state trainers became intermediaries in this state policy implementation. It begins with a detailed narrative of the credentialing process. The chapter also considers the language the trainers used to describe their work, particularly the metaphorical themes that emerged. It aligns the trainers’ descriptions of their work with Honig’s (2004) intermediary functions.

Chapter 6 continues the data analysis by linking the trainers’ intermediary roles to collective trust theory (Forsyth, Adams & Hoy, 2012). It defines trust and collective trust, identifies contexts affecting trust, presents Forsyth, Adams, and Hoy’s Model for Collective Trust Formation, and proposes a model for Collective Trust Formation among the state trainers. The chapter also considers the characteristics necessary to development of collective trust, the consequences and variations of collective trust, and suggests possible causes of the changes in collective trust over time. It concludes with an explanation of the inherent value of collective trust in policy implementation.

Chapter 7 revisits the findings in Chapters 2 through 6, connecting each to the original research questions and to policy implementation research. It includes a discussion of the limitations and implications of this study and makes suggestions for future research.
CHAPTER 2

Review of Literature

Implementation Research

It is important to situate this study within the body of implementation research as a whole. I draw upon McLaughlin (2006 & 2008) and Honig's (2006) histories of implementation research, summarize the three periods they identified, and cite their recommendations for future research. From those recommendations, I link specific areas of contemporary studies to the topics consequential to this study.

The First Wave

Both Honig (2006) and McLaughlin (1987, 2006 & 2008) divided the history of implementation research into three broad sections. Honig's three waves began in the 1960s; McLaughlin cited the publication of Pressman and Wildavsky's 1973 book, Implementation, as the “birth announcement” for the first generation of implementation research (McLaughlin, 2006, p. 209). Pressman and Wildavsky (1973) noted that much of the research had focused on the end of the process, on the entity ultimately responsible for carrying out policy directives, to the exclusion of other channels through which policy directives run prior to reaching the implementation sites. For Honig, the first wave emerged as a formal field of research in the 1960s (Odden, 1991) with a clear focus on what is implemented. Policy implementation at this time was uniformly top-down in orientation, with the “assumption that policy makers should develop policies for
implementers to carry out and monitor implementers’ compliance” (italics in original, Honig, 2006, p. 5). She cited research from this period (Derthick, 1972; Murphy, 1971; Pressman & Wildavsky, 1984) which logged implementation failures, variously attributed to the conflicting interests of policy makers and implementers or the implementers’ lack of capacity and will. She also concluded that the individual implementer, driven by self-interest, was the most meaningful unit of analysis.

McLaughlin (1987) noted that the first generation of implementation research emerged from the surprise of policy makers and planners who viewed as implementation as transmission and did not anticipate implementation problems. Thus, she exposed the “uncertain relationship between policies and implemented programs” (p. 171) and found this generation of research established an implementation perspective, beginning to show the impact of local factors on responses to policy.

The Second Wave

Honig (2006) marked the second wave of implementation research with a movement from the focus on what policies are implemented, to which policies are implemented over time. Research questions (Farrar & Milsap, 1986; Kirst & Jung, 1980; Knapp, Stearns, Turnbull, David & Peterson, 1991) continued to probe fidelity of policy implementation, but now find that “longitudinal approaches to policy making and policy research could improve implementation” (Honig, 2006, p. 6). Several researchers (Lowi, 1991; Petersen, Rabe & Wong, 1986; Peterson, Rabe & Wong, 1991) forecasted the importance of policy, people and places to the implementation process but Lipsky (1980, 2010) exposed key influencers and added to the policy research vernacular with his
identification of “street-level bureaucrats … public service workers who interact directly with citizens in the course of their jobs, and who have substantial discretion in the execution of their work” (2010, p. 3). In the moment, these street-level bureaucrats (SLBs) have to reconcile workplace demands with their professional and personal beliefs, so that their work “actually constitute[s] the services ‘delivered’ by the government [in that their] individual decisions … become, or add up to, agency policy” (2010, p. 3). The Rand Change Agent Study (Berman & McLaughlin, 1976, 1978) showed that both macro (policy level) and micro (implementation level) influences shape policy implementation, unfolding as a process of ‘mutual adaptation’ as implementers attempt to reconcile policymaker demands with conditions in their microlevel context. As street-level bureaucrats, policy implementers tend to make discretionary decisions as they adapt the desires of policymakers with the demands of the policy enactors.

McLaughlin (1987) saw the second generation of implementation research as a time of negotiation and transformation as researchers “began to unpack implementation processes and zero in on relations between policy and practice” (p. 171), importantly noting that “teachers' responses to planned change efforts may ... represent best efforts to do their job and to provide the best they can for the youngsters in their classrooms” (p. 174). Teacher resistance had begun to draw attention, as many researchers documented instances of teachers’ rejecting policy directives (Berman & McLaughlin, 1977; Cohen, 1991, Cuban, 1993). Resistance was variously defined: either as a psychological deficit in the resistor (Gitlin & Margonis, 1995), as a rejection of control over their instructional practices (Berman & McLaughlin, 1977; Cohen, 1991; Cuban, 1993), or by characterizing
resistance as a sensible response to the instructional climate of the time, revealing the underlying conflict between organizational control and professional autonomy (Bushnell, 2003; Gitlin & Margonis, 1995). Research in this period addressed questions of motivation and commitment and concluded they were reflective of implementers’ assessment of policy value and appropriateness (Ingram, 1977; Majone & Wildavsky, 1977; Ripley & Franklin, 1982). McLaughlin (1987) came to a similar conclusion as Honig’s: that policy implementation success relies on “two broad factors: local capacity and will” (p. 172). The policy itself can address capacity, by providing funds, by offering training or consultants, but “will, or the attitudes, motivation, and beliefs than underlie an implementor’s response to a policy’s goals or strategies, is less amenable to policy intervention” (p. 172).

The Third Wave

The third wave, according to Honig (2006), showed a “growing concern for what works” (p. 7), suitable for a period rife with reforms specifying “who shall teach and what shall be taught and in what manner” (Fuhrman, Clune & Elmore, 1988, p. 239). Federal policies of the period arose largely as responses to scathing reports on American education, like A Nation at Risk (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983). State education agencies’ (SEAs) reform policies tended to focus on curriculum (see Anderson et al, 1987; Knapp et al, 1991, Marsh & Crocker, 1991; Odden & Marsh, 1989), school restructuring, and site-based management initiatives (David, 1989; Malen, Ogawa & Kranz, 1990). The latter two introduced relatively new policy makers to the mix, “whole school reform designers,” including the Coalition for Essential Schools and other
policy entrepreneurs. Honig (2006) noted that lessons from this wave of policy implementation extended past lessons of the conflicting incentives of policy makers and implementers to greater understandings of the significance of policies, people, and places to the implementation process. Research on policy instruments (mandates, incentives, capacity building, and systems change) began to reveal why policies are more or less effective (see Schneider & Ingram, 1990). Other studies showed a wider range of people of consequence to implementation, including SEA leaders and staff who served as designers and implementers of policy (Cohen, 1982; Fuhrman, 1988; Fuhrman et al, 1988). Additionally, examinations of how school-based leaders shaped implementation processes and outcomes emerged (Elmore & McLaughlin, 1988; McLaughlin, 1991a & 1991b; Rosenholtz, 1985). Writing in 1987, McLaughlin charged the third generation of policy implementation with “integrating the macro world of policy makers with the micro world of individual implementors” (p. 171) by “integrating the two communities of discourse [street-level bureaucrats and policymakers] in models that accommodate these multi-level, multi-actor complexities (p. 177). “The supports, incentives, and constraints that influence implementor capacity and implementor motivation reside in the broader system,” (p. 175) therefore, limiting policy evaluation to the implementor level invites misunderstanding of individual choices and actions. McLaughlin insisted that analysis must “reflect the multi-staged, developmental character of the implementation process” (p. 176), and argued in 1991(b) that implementation researchers needed to move toward

---

4 Policy entrepreneurs, as defined by Roberts and King (1991), are those “who work from outside the formal governmental system to introduce, translate and implement innovative ideas into public sector practice” (p. 152). This role will be discussed at length later in this chapter.
elaborating the various conditions that enable effective practice.

Misery Research

The history of implementation research was so fraught with “failed expectations and dashed hopes” that McLaughlin (2006, p. 216) described it as Rothstein\(^5\) (1998) had, calling the first 25 years of implementation studies “misery research.” McLaughlin (2006) noted that though these studies emerged full of tales of failed implementations, they nonetheless provided valuable information about implementation processes, problems, and outcomes, resulting in the “given” that the implementation process is complex, powerful, and multifaceted. The multiple layers of policy implementation exposed through the early research of Pressman and Wildavsky (1973) and others (Bardach, 1977; Berman & McLaughlin, 1978; Elmore, 1979; VanMeter & VanHorn, 1975) showed that the outcomes of even well planned and promising policy initiatives ultimately depend on what the individuals throughout the policy system do. McLaughlin (2008) summarized, “hundreds of implementation studies testify to variation across and within implementing systems and sites and underscored the point that the ‘policy’ that matters is the one enacted within the system, not the one originated outside of it” (p. 77).

Contemporary Concerns


\(^5\) Rothstein called his review of implementation research “misery research, a pathology of social sciences” (p. 62).
previous research on local actors' motivation, attitudes and commitment, saw a need for scholars to pay more attention to the broader social and organizational contexts in which the individual actors operate. To that end, they employed the construct of social capital, a theory originating in sociology (see Coleman, 1988; Dika & Singh, 2002; Goddard, 2003) but applied to social organizations within schools by Knapp (1997), Smylie and Hart (1999) and others (see Forsyth & Adams, 2004; Fukuyama, 2001). Besides the social milieu within schools, McLaughlin (2006) noted that newer research will “explore new agents, agencies and institutional relationships ... to better understand unique and essential contributions of macro and micro elements of the policy system” (p. 220). Among the new organizations to be studied, Honig (2004), Smylie and Evans (2006) and McLaughlin (2006) identified intermediaries, whose work with policy initiatives has been shown to positively influence implementation (see also Berends, Bodily & Kirby, 2002; Finnigan & O'Day, 2003; Pravetti, Derr, Anderson, Trippe & Paschal, 2001), provided they could build and sustain trust. Developing trust depends also upon the intermediaries' sense-making, “whether, and in what ways, implementing agents come to understand their practice” (Spillane, Reiser & Reimer, 2002, p. 387). Sense-making occurs within “thought communities ... aspects of the situation influence what implementing agents notice and how they interpret what they notice” (p. 393). Together, they build knowledge structures or “system learning,” which McLaughlin (2008) wrote raised questions of how the groups throughout the system “learn from experience, acquire and use new knowledge, adapt and sustain positive outcomes” (p. 186). As elements in this study, these subtopics constitute the next areas of this
literature review.

Social Capital.

The Rand Change Agent Study (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978) was among the earliest implementation studies to consider the role of social interactions as instrumental to implementation success. Subsequent studies of educational change and policy implementation (Clune, 1993; Fullan, 2001; Odden, 1991) also stressed the importance of relationships and collaborative interactions. Other research (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978; Hargrove, Graham, Ward, Abernathy, Cunningham & Vaughn, 1983; McLaughlin, 1990b) recognized interactions between and among teachers, school personnel, and external change agents as influential to implementation success. Honig (2006) saw participation in various communities and relationships as essential to implementation. McLaughlin also stressed the importance of social relationships in implementation, explaining that the process of implementation exists within a “societal sector framework,” which allows “researchers to pursue lessons learned about relationships, contexts and outcomes, while also pursuing opportunities associated with new actors and associations created in response to contemporary understanding about policy implementation or revealed by this broader frame” (p. 186). Smylie and Evans (2006) explored the role of social relations in implementation under the theoretical concept of social capital. Though definitions of the term vary, they defined social capital as “the nature and function of social relations and their capacity to support individual and collective development and behavior” (p. 188). Smylie and Evans cited Coleman (1988) as they explained that social capital, created through social interaction, consists of
“intangible and abstract resources derived from interactions among individuals and the social structures that frame them” (p. 189). Coleman, in his seminal study of social capital, found that social capital, weak or strong, results from all social relations. Coleman asserted that strong social capital results from the interconnectedness and closure among group members. The shared status as group members combined with the closed status of the group fosters the development and preservation of shared norms, common expectations, and mutual obligations. Strong social capital affords implementation effective and open channels of communication required to provide all relevant actors the information required to put the new policy into practice. However, Smylie and Evans (2006) cautioned that the social capital in place must be used to reinforce the specific program or policy to be implemented. Smylie & Hart (1999) identified three key components to social capital: social trust; channels of communication; and norms, expectations and sanctions.

**Trust.**

Smylie and Evans (2006) identified the primary component of social capital as social trust, the “confidence in the reliability and integrity of individuals and their social relations” (p. 188). They connected trust with a “predisposition toward cooperation and confidence that individuals have in one another, in leadership, and in the social group” (p. 190. See also Bryk & Schneider, 2002). Trust is a psychological construct, which results in interaction of values, attitudes, moods, and emotions (Jones & George, 1998) and the expectation that tasks will be reliably accomplished (Sitkin and Roth, 1993). Nonaka (1994) argued that interpersonal trust in groups and organizations creates an
atmosphere of knowledge-sharing. Research (Kramer & Tyler, 1996) has found collective trust to be a powerful expectational asset that group members rely upon to enhance cooperation and coordination. Largely dependent upon the perceived intentions of others, trust requires a group willingness to be vulnerable to another party (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000). For this context, Smylie and Evans (2006) drew on Bryk and Schneider's (2002) work to explain that

Trust can also be a function of informal mutual understandings that develop out of sustained interpersonal or working relationships among individuals, each of whom, through assessment of behavior, intentions, and felt obligations, is expected to behave in normatively appropriate ways (p. 190).

In that respect, mutual trust results in synchrony in terms of all groups’ understanding their own and other groups’ expectations and obligations. Whitener and colleagues (1998) noted that collective trust is critical to interdependent situations, where the success of a program depends on two or more groups. In certain implementation systems, intermediaries are one of those groups. McLaughlin (2006) noted intermediaries “require significant levels of trust and mutual understanding” (p. 221).

**Intermediaries**

Though “policymakers think that legislating something to occur is sufficient to cause it to occur,” (Darling-Hammond & Wise, 1981, p. 19) consonant policy implementation is rare in education contexts (Bryk, Sebring, Kerbow, Rollow & Easton, 1998; Kanter, Stein & Jick, 1992; McLaughlin, 1987; Pressman & Wildavsky, 1973). Regardless the agents under study, implementation reflects the agents’ individual contexts and involves processes of sense making, interpreting, bargaining, and exercising discretion (Coburn, 2003; Elmore, 1979; Honig, 2001; McLaughlin, 1987; Spillane, 1998).
Malen (2006) observed that “the ambiguity required for political negotiation of policy purposes and provisions runs counter to the specificity required to give those responsible for implementation clear directions and workable action plans” (pp. 95-96). Clune (1993) called this governance problem “the delivery problem in disguise, since the only way to escape the unmanageability of top-down regulation in a fragmented governance system is to create a customized coherence at the level of local districts and schools” (italics mine, p. 234). McLaughlin (2006) saw intermediaries filling that gap, evidence of response to the lesson that policy makers or reformers distant from implementers did not and could not possess the knowledge necessary to tailor policies to local contexts, or the will to ensure effective implementation. [They serve as] a strategic ‘middle’ operating between the top and the bottom of the implementing system (p. 220).

Honig and Hatch (2004) wrote of bridging and buffering strategies used by schools to manage the external policy demands placed upon them: “Activities ... range from those that invite or increase interaction (bridging) to those that limit it (buffering)” (p. 23). Honig and Hatch noted that in an effort to craft policy coherence, school districts tend not to “go it alone ... studies of organizational-environmental relationships emphasize that environmental or external actors and organizations play enabling or constraining roles in these processes” (p. 25). Several of these enabling (bridging) and constraining (buffering) roles parallel functions Honig (2004) attributed to intermediary organizations. For example, *pulling the environment in* “blur[s] boundaries between the organization and environment,” by involving policy makers and implementors in each other’s work; *shaping the terms of compliance* has organizations altering
“demands/expectations (e.g., laws, regulations, evaluation criteria) to advance goals and strategies;” and adding peripheral structures involves new parties “to interact with policy systems and to carry out particular environmental demands” (Honig & Hatch, p. 24). The value in both constructs (bridging/buffering and intermediary organizations) is consequential increase in implementation capacity, the “variety of supports whose value depends upon what particular people in certain places are trying to and are currently able to accomplish” (Honig, 2006, p. 19) rather than a static set of resources. Intermediaries are ideally situated to provide these customized supports to policy implementation.

**Sense-Making**

Spillane, Reiser and Reimer’s (2002) research focused on “how local [implementation] actors interpret the demands … made upon them” and develop a “theoretically and empirically grounded cognitive framework to characterize sense-making in the implementation process” (p. 388). They noted that most conventional theories assume that implementing agents understand what policymakers are asking them to do and neglect the complex process of sense-making. They explored the mechanisms through which implementers come to understand policy and attempted to connect this understanding to practice. Citing Porac, Thomas & Baden-Fuller (1989), Spillane, Reiser, and Reimer suggested that social norms and organizational structure serve as contexts for implementing agents’ efforts to make sense of policy and to carry out their work. They noted, “Individuals draw on existing reservoirs of individual and collective knowledge to determine what particular policies mean, in order to decide on a
response to policymakers’ recommendations” (p. 406). Hill (2003) suggested that assuring the availability of appropriate intellectual resources (training, print and other resources) can bolster implementers’ capacity for success. Research (Coburn, 2001; Spillane & Zeuli, 1999; Stein & Brown, 1997) has also shown that providing implementers a social context to support productive group sense-making led to more significant engagement with policy ideas. Still other studies (See Gentner, Rattermann, , & Forbus,, 1993; Norman, 1988; White & Frederiksen, 1998) found that the building on the prior knowledge of implementing agents may enable implementing agents to develop understandings that more closely match policymakers’ goals. In terms of sense-making in implementation, the bottom line is this: “Agents will need to make sense of policy … there is a critical need to structure learning opportunities so that stakeholders can construct an interpretation of the policy and its implications for their own behavior” (Steiner, Reiser & Reimer, 2002, p. 418).

Cognitive Interdependence

McLaughlin (2006) found that deep and sustained change resulting from implementation requires coherent and consistent supports within the enacting system, particularly in view of sense-making and cognitive interdependence within the collective. Wegner and his colleagues (Lave & Wegner, 1991; Wegner, Guiliano & Hertel, 1985; Wegner, 1987) posited that group mind manifests itself in the cognitive interdependence of memory processes, suggesting that “people in close relationships enact a single transactive memory system, complete with differentiated responsibility for remembering different portions of common experience” (Weick & Roberts, 1993, p. 358).
Huang (2009) found many studies (Chiu, Hsu, & Wang, 2006; Koskinen, Pihlanto, & Vanharanta, 2003; Renzl, 2008) linked trust to knowledge-sharing in teams and suggested that the presence of trust increased the likelihood and quality of knowledge-sharing. Similarly, Hsu, Ju, Yen, and Chang (2007), and Tiwana and Bush (2005) asserted that trust has a positive influence on knowledge sharing in virtual or real teams. Honig (2003) linked characteristics of organizational learning to collective mind (Wenger, 1998), noting first that it involves “changes in individual activities and the activities or operating assumptions of collectives ... [that] are not simply the sum total of individual learning but a new set of preferences, capabilities, and worldviews” (p. 298). Instead, organizational learning involves continuous inquiry leading to demonstrable improvements in group performance (see Fiol & Lyles, 1985). Research (Leithwood, Aitken, & Jantzi, 2001; Louis, 1998; Zhang, Macpherson, & Jones, 2006) has also shown that individuals within learning organizations share common purposes and knowledge and ultimately decide whether to use new information to improve performance.
CHAPTER 3
Research Design & Methodology

This Study

This study focuses on a specific group of actors—the state trainers—to examine their role in the implementation of this state-level policy. This study concentrates on “the demands specific policies place on implementers; the participants in the implementation and ... orientations toward policy demands” (Honig, 2006, p.2). It addresses the state trainers’ role as implementers, their attitudes and orientations to the policy demands, and the places and contexts that affected what they could and would do. The Ohio Department of Education (ODE) had handed over the implementation to them: the state trainers were responsible for the sole training for the induction program. Though these actors are just one part of the complexity that is policy implementation, exploring their state-assigned (and perceived) roles adds to the theoretical and empirical knowledge base to inform future navigation along what Honig (2006) has called implementation’s messy terrain.

While this project shows policy implementation as a complex, iterative and uncertain process, it also situates the actors within the context of the policy, its people and its places, essential interrelated influences in policy (Odden & Marsh, 1989) since “the benefits or limitations of one dimension cannot be adequately understood separate from the other” (Honig, 2006, p. 19). Initially the state trainers involved the
metamorphosis of Ohio’s Induction Policy seemed to be implementation “actors” (Van Meter & Van Horn, 1975), one cog in a complex system of gears driving the program. However, it became clear the term failed to communicate the importance of their role as a conduit from the state department to the local districts. Teachers have regarded new policies as a top-down endeavor that offered them little communication from the bottom to the top. Elmore (1979) suggested that organizations must understand and use reciprocal authority relations:

Formal authority travels from the top down in organizations, but the informal authority that derives from expertise, skill, and proximity to the essential tasks that an organization performs travels in the opposite direction. Delegated discretion is a way of capitalizing on this reciprocal relationship. For the purposes of implementation, this means that formal authority [ODE], in the form of policy statements, is heavily dependent upon the problem-solving capabilities [of those] further down the chain of authority [the state trainers] (p. 606-607).

Policies perceived by the school districts as originating from outside sources (like this one) risk placing the implementers at the “sharp end of implementation problems” with no sense of ownership (Dyer, 1999, p. 56). So it makes sense that Elmore (1979) also recommended that initiators of policies “galvanize the energy, attention and skills of those affected by it, thereby bringing these resources into a loosely structured bargaining arena,” (p. 611) or risk weak and diffuse policy effects. The group of state trainers had years of experience in new teacher induction. They were familiar faces in their regions, individuals whose connection to the previous program was well known.

The state trainers, by virtue of their expertise, skill, and proximity to the local district personnel who would enact the induction program, had the potential to bridge the gap, influencing the local districts to accept the new policy. In reality, the districts
had no choice; the Resident Educator Program was legislated as the new induction process. However, education reforms are so often thrust upon schools that initial resistance is high and can interfere with the initial stages of implementation. Several studies (Cuban & Usdan, 2003; Muncey & McQuillan, 1998; Rich, 1996) have shown actors undermining new initiatives “through various combinations of neglect, subtle adaptations, overt resistance, and creative defiance” (Malen, 2006, p. 96). Even among strong professional communities⁶, “their shared beliefs can support shared delusions about… entrenched routines [and] generate rigidity about practice, and a ‘one best way’ mentality that resists change” (McLaughlin, 1993, p. 95). By virtue of their understanding of and commitment to the new program, and their desire to break through the initial resistance, the state trainers appeared to be “idea champions” (Daft & Becker, 1978), individuals who promote and mobilize support for an idea, issue, or concept in a larger arena. However, the more I examined the data and the literature, I found “intermediary” to be the most accurate term for their collective role. Honig drew on Berger and Neuhaus (1977) who wrote about “mediating structures,” as “those institutions standing between the individual and his private life and the large institutions of public life” (p. 2) to develop her own definition of intermediaries. She distinguished her intermediaries as “organizations that occupy the space in between at least two other parties... [and] primarily function to mediate or to manage change in both those parties” (emphasis in original; Honig, 2004, p. 67). She held that intermediaries emerged as “distinct

---

⁶ Professional community can refer to, in general, any group of individuals who share a common interest in education, or more specifically, “a school community ... which uses the school's involvement in reform as the basis for teacher commitment and interaction” (Kruse, Louis & Bryk, 1994, p.3).
organizational populations” in education when the demands on schools and districts began to “exceed their capacity for action” (p. 66). These demands—that began with the standards movement, continued through increased student assessment and teacher accountability to developing pools of highly qualified teachers—have motivated school leaders to rely on intermediary organizations to assist with various aspects of implementation. McLaughlin (2006) observed, “Intermediary organizations of various stripes have been created or assigned in response to the disconnections across levels of the implementing policy system and as acknowledgment that local knowledge matters to implementation outcomes” (p. 220). She noted that in light of earlier lessons of “mutual adaptation” (implementers’ modifying policy goals and strategies to fit local conditions),

the development of intermediary organizations in part reflected a view of local adaptation of policy goals and strategies as a positive to be encouraged. In this view policy makers or reformers distant from implementers did not and could not possess the knowledge necessary to tailor politics to local contexts or the will to ensure effective implementation. Intermediaries comprise a strategic “middle,” operating between the top and bottom of the implementing system (p. 220).

While intermediaries need to be members of distinct and separate organizations, I contend that they can be collections of individuals selected to increase the capacity of the implementing organization. In my study, these intermediaries are the state trainers, chosen to increase the implementation capacity of the Ohio Department of Education. Honig asserted that intermediary organizations operate independently of the two parties for whom they intercede. In this study, the intermediaries are a collective of individuals who function as intermediaries, yet lack the organizational independence of Honig’s
intermediary units. Like Honig’s intermediaries, the state lead trainers “provide... value beyond what the parties alone would be able to develop or amass themselves,” yet “depend on [the] parties to perform their essential functions” (p. 67). A fuller exploration of the state trainers as intermediaries appears in Chapter 5.

Policy Context: The Argument for Induction

The state-level policy being implemented, a new program for Ohio teacher induction, while not subject to analysis in this qualitative study, is nonetheless significant to understanding the broader context of the implementation. This research focuses on components of the implementation of the Resident Educator Program, which re-shaped processes for teacher induction in Ohio. Induction programs, or support programs for new teachers, have become common over the past 20 years, in response first to an increased demand for new teachers, then to high rates of teacher attrition (Strong, 2005). The demographic trend known as the baby boom echo7 caused a population swell in American schools from 1985 and through 2007, necessitating the hiring of an estimated 2.2 million teachers. In California alone, school enrollment grew 26% over just 10 years: 1989-1998 (USDOE, 1999). With the increased new teacher population in California, work at the University of California-Santa Cruz with new teachers eventually led to the founding of the New Teacher Center, a national non-profit dedicated to strengthening the practice of new teachers.

The current rationale for teacher induction programs echoes the attrition statistic that half of new teachers leave the profession in their first five years (Darling-Hammond,

---

7 Children of the Baby Boom Generation causing the U.S. public school enrollment to increase exponentially in the same way their parents had during the Baby Boom.
1997; Ingersoll, 2003; Ingersoll & Smith, 2003b), but adds the fact that it takes new teachers several years to develop into effective teachers (Berliner, 2000; Claycomb & Hawley, 2000). With experienced teachers retiring from classrooms in record numbers, the decrease of veteran teachers in classrooms was further exacerbated by a mass exodus of early career teachers: 14 percent by the end of their first year, 33 percent within three years, and almost 50 percent by the five-year mark (Darling-Hammond, 1997; Ingersoll, 2003; Ingersoll & Smith, 2003b). Early departures have been attributed to job dissatisfaction and unsupportive work conditions (Ingersoll, 2001; Johnson, 2004) that research has shown to influence teacher effectiveness, attitudes and behaviors, and their decisions to stay in the field (Bush, 1983). By the 1990s, strong teacher induction correlated to retention more consistently than other factors: the quality of initial teaching experience, prior academic performance, or the quality of previous teacher preparation (Odell, 1990).

Another factor that contributed to the growth of induction programs was increased teacher accountability for student success. Calls for education reform have routinely blamed teachers for a variety of public education’s ills: A Nation at Risk (1983) claimed American teachers were ill-prepared, and nearly 20 years later, the same sentiment was echoed in the re-authorization of Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), No Child Left Behind (2001), which called for educator accountability and required that every class be taught by a “highly-qualified” teacher. Calling for more highly effective teachers in classrooms, the National Commission on Teaching and
Current research holds that new teachers require three-to-seven years to become effective teachers. With almost 50 percent of new teachers [leaving the profession] within their first five years of teaching, schools struggle to develop a strong core of teachers who can positively impact student learning (p. 12).

Evidence has suggested that high-quality mentoring and induction programs improve job satisfaction, teacher retention, teacher effectiveness, and student achievement (Darling-Hammond, 1999; Fletcher, Strong & Villar, 2004; Glazerman et al, 2010; Ingersoll & Smith 2003a; NCTAF, 1996; Odell & Ferraro, 1992; Pearson & Honig, 1992; Smith & Ingersoll, 2004; Strong & St. John, 2001; Wilson, Darling-Hammond & Berry, 2001). The quality of the induction program is crucial: simply assigning mentors to new teachers will not do the job. Mentoring alone has been shown to have little impact on teacher retention (Smith & Ingersoll, 2004). Definitions of high-quality mentoring (Bartell, 2005; Darling-Hammond, 1997; Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Moir, Barlin, Gless & Miles, 2009) vary, yet all agree that induction has to be a system of support. The National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE), in their Discussion Guide on Teacher Induction (2012), defined effective teacher induction as systemic support to new teachers over at least two years, including opportunities for collaboration with peers, regular

---

8 “The National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future (NCTAF) was founded in 1994 to ensure that every child has access to quality teaching in schools organized for success. In partnership with national, state, and local education agencies, NCTAF develops prototypes for innovative teacher preparation, collaborative teaching teams, and strategies to leverage community engagement, sharing the impact of these programs with those who influence education legislation and policy” (“About NCTAF,” 2014).
formative and evaluative assessment of progress based on state teaching standards, and professional development that is tailored to the challenges faced by new teachers (NASBE, p. 3). Currently, over 30 states require some form of induction program for beginning teachers (Goldrick, 2011).

Effective induction has a fiscal incentive. Conservative estimates place the cost of replacing teachers at more than $2.6 billion annually (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2004), motivating policymakers and school leaders to enact policies and allocate resources to address these needs (Carroll & Foster, 2010; Goldrick, 2011). Research has shown high-quality induction helps novice teachers develop into high-quality professionals and cuts attrition rates in half (New Teacher Center, 2007; Villar, 2004). New teachers generally need from three to seven years in the field to reach proficiency and maximize their students’ achievement (Berliner, 2000; Claycomb & Hawley, 2000).

One study (Villar, 2004) has shown that comprehensive induction shortens the time it takes new teachers to perform at the same level as an experienced teacher, based on measuring teacher effectiveness in terms of the gains their students make in annual achievement test scores, gains that represent the value added by their teacher. With an historic number of first-year teachers across the country, more new teachers receive

---

9 A process for measuring a new teacher’s professional growth developmentally, not for evaluation as in summative assessment, but to provide valuable feedback and encourage continuing teacher growth (Wood & Stanulis, 2010)
10 The Department of Labor estimates attrition cost at 30 percent of the leaving employee’s salary. Using national data from NCTAF, the Alliance for Excellent Education estimated that each teacher leaving a school costs the district $12,546 or 30 percent of the average teacher salary in 1999-00 = $41,820. In the 1999–00 school year, approximately 207,370 teachers left the profession, not including retirees. Thus, the number of leaving teachers (207,370) multiplied by the average cost of attrition ($12,546) yields the total cost of attrition: $2.6 billion ($2,601,664,020).
mentoring or induction support than ever before (Wei, Darling-Hammond & Adamson, 2010). Yet, to date, research has not yet determined state-level induction policy’s influence on quality mentoring and induction programs (Johnson, Goldrick & Lasagna, 2010) though a recent review of beginning teacher mentoring (Hirsch, Freitas, Church, & Villar, 2009) suggests that state policy can ensure the support needed to become effective teachers.

Privileged Placement

From 2003-2011, I was an employee of the Ohio Department of Education, thus enabling me, for the new induction program, to observe the policy process from the creation of the regulatory and legislative mandate through initial implementation. As a researcher, I enjoyed a unique and privileged place. The timeline in Figure 1 illustrates the relationship of my employment with the Ohio Department of Education to this research.
From my vantage point, I could provide an analysis of the implementation process to identify both "visible and hidden" participants (Kingdon, 2003) and situate these actors within formal and informal interaction spaces. As an ODE assistant director, I was responsible for managing the state training team and the hundreds of training sessions scheduled across the state. I had participated in the induction team studies from 2007–

![Figure 1: Relationship of Research to Researcher Employment](image)
2009 and led subcommittees responsible for aspects of the development of the Resident Educator Program. I organized the mentor certification process, recruited, and hired a second cohort of state trainers. From 2007 on, I would be observer, actor, mediator, author, trainer, logistical manager— all before I undertook my formal role as researcher in January, 2011\textsuperscript{11}. I entered the research arena with a wealth of insider knowledge.

Though I was ideally positioned for the research, a conflict of interest was clear: my role as a de facto manager of the state training team could irreparably skew my research results. I retired from the ODE at the end of June 2011, after the initial Resident Educator trainings had begun. The State Teachers Retirement System requires a three-month separation period before beginning any new employment and I used those 90 days to dissociate myself with the program. I had no contact with anyone at ODE, NTC or with any of the state trainers. At the end of that period, I began my interviews with the state trainers. Though I was an interested outsider equipped with a copious amount of insider knowledge, I no longer had any power over these individuals; I hoped this would encourage them to speak candidly about their experiences. I already had a multi-dimensional view of the state trainer role, but an accident of fate would add an all-important facet. When one of the state trainers went on medical leave, I was called by the Educational Service Center of Cuyahoga County to serve as a substitute state trainer. I knew the whole program; I had written parts of the new training and could begin immediately. I also knew this engagement would provide me an ultimate insider view.

\footnote{\textsuperscript{11} Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval}
Key Factions in the Policy Implementation

My privileged placement allowed me to see the complex, varied and difficult-to-trace origins of policy (Miskel & Song, 2004), and inside the even more ambiguous process of policy implementation. Honig (2006) suggested that “implementation research should aim to reveal the policies, people and places that shape how implementation unfolds and provide robust grounded explanations for how interactions among them help to explain implementation outcomes” (p. 2). With that in mind, this study explores three key factions operating in the implementation of Ohio’s Resident Educator Program: the state agency (The Ohio Department of Education), a policy entrepreneur (The New Teacher Center), and the intermediaries (the state trainers), and eventually focuses on the latter. A research-based definition of each category begins each sub-section; explanatory narratives pertaining to the faction in this policy implementation follow.

The state agency.

In Ohio, like most American states, state educational law emerges from its state legislature. Early studies (Mazzoni, 1993; James, 1991; Fuhrman, 1994; Rosenthal & Fuhrman, 1983) confirmed the preeminent role of all state legislatures in education policy-making, referring to them as “central system actors” at the forefront of new policies, assuming a leadership role in improving education. Though policies may originate in state legislatures, they must be moved elsewhere for development and implementation. In Ohio, education policies move to the Board of Regents for higher education concerns or to the Ohio Department of Education for preschool through grade
12 matters. State departments of education are acknowledged as key players in education policy, often equal in impact to state legislatures (Hrebenar & Thomas, 1999; Marshall, 1989). State departments of education are widely recognized as institutions who “generate rules, regulations, norms and definitions” (Rowan & Miskel, 1999, p. 359) and it is their institutional scripts that establish “the education policy system’s formal structures of authority, in its embedded habits, routines, and repertoires, and in the explicit and tacit ‘rules of the game’” (Malen, 2006, p. 89). State departments of education seem to be the logical center for educational activity. For example, Timar (1997) argued that “large-scale educational reform is unlikely in the absence of an institutional center to shape policy, aggregate interests, and control and channel conflicts” (p. 235). Though state departments may claim authority over education, their capacity to exercise that authority remains contested. Timar noted that while state departments saw their roles established in law, their bureaucracies became dominated by professional interests, particularly evident in the National Education Association’s use of “state education departments to promote both legislative and administrative agendas” (p. 241). While they retained the role of consolidators of wide-ranging professional interests, post-Sputnik attention to American education brought waves of federal funds to the state departments for disbursement, securing their place in the public education hierarchy. Their relationships to schools would suffer as their role as enforcer for various educational initiatives (and the funds behind them) widened and their regulatory net expanded. However, state departments would be limited by their own lack of capacity, as state legislatures resisted increasing operating costs. Besides not
having adequate human capital in terms of numbers of employees, state departments
could not necessarily retain highly qualified and well-trained staff, since they could earn
substantially higher salaries elsewhere. Timar observed that over time state departments
have “become less coherent and more fragmented as the social, political and cultural
forces that define them are increasingly fragmented” (p. 254). Because state departments
fall prey to political constraints from external sources: changes in governors, the
composition of state boards of education and the membership in the state legislature,
this institutional context weighs heavily on the power, preferences, and incentives of the
policy actors and shapes the adoption and implementation of education policies (Malen,
2006; Ogawa, Sandholtz, Martinez-Flores & Scribner, 2003; Portz, Stein & Jones, 1999;
Rowan & Miskel, 1999).

The Ohio Department of Education.

When the Ohio Department of Education was established as a distinct agency in
1921, it was headed by a single official, the superintendent of public instruction, a
constitutional office appointed by the governor for a four-year term (Coker, 1922). It was
not until 1953 that the State Board of Education (SBOE) was established in the Ohio
Constitution “to ensure that citizens were given a voice in decisions relating to public
education” (SBOE, 2011). In addition to setting policy, directing planning and evaluation
of Ohio schools, the State Board was also empowered to appoint and evaluate the State
Superintendent of Public Instruction. Both the SBOE and the superintendent of public
instruction guide the operations of the Ohio Department of Education (ODE). It falls to
ODE to implement the policies set by the SBOE, to enact elements of the Ohio Revised
Code and Ohio Administrative Code relating to K-12 education, to follow legislative recommendations, and to mete out the state budget allocated to public education.

Essentially, ODE oversees operations of Ohio's preschool through grade 12 schools, public, private and charter: all 614 public school districts, 16 non-public districts and their 3,933 schools (ODE, Fact Sheet, 2012). In addition to its chief-of-staff office and its organizational centers, ODE operates two divisions: the Division of Learning and the Division of Accountability & Quality Schools. Under each division are two centers, under which 17 offices are organized. Its powers are limited, however, by the fact that Ohio is a local control state, giving school districts ultimate control over what takes place in their buildings. Ohioans frequently work local control into the rhetoric of every large-scale meeting as they share the view of “Americans [who] remain deeply committed to localism as a policy principle. Even more than a citizen's race, class, or residence in a city or a suburb, the (often mistaken) belief that local control will be threatened is usually the best predictor of opposition to school ... reform” (Hochschild & Scovronick, 2004, p. 60). Though Ohioans’ will to oppose outside control may be strong, the incentive of federal and state-accessible funds is stronger. Fuhrman & Elmore (1990), in their meta-analysis of local implementation of state educational reforms, observed that in spite of states ... doing little by way of enforcement, many reforms were easily absorbed by local districts. Districts ... often flourish[ed], enjoying the opportunities provided by the state reforms to pursue their own needs. State-local relationships were marked by a net increase in policymaking at each level. The busier states became, the busier local districts became; everyone made more policy, and the arena for governance expanded (p. 82).
As the age of accountability in education dawned, local school districts, overwhelmed by demands to achieve equity and improve student and teacher performance, willingly yielded policy-making discretion to state legislatures and bureaucracies. Localities have considerably less local control over funding, standards, and curricula (Hadderman, 1988; Kirst, 1988).

Ohio law required the Ohio Department of Education to operate at the disposal of the state legislature, and to work at the pleasure of the State Board of Education and the Superintendent of Public Instruction. That meant the ODE was bound to do the bidding of a large non-educator body of legislators and a smaller (primarily non-educator) SBOE. Even the superintendent lacked discretionary power. He or she acted on behalf of both bodies, and could be quickly dispatched with the election of a new governor, who had another education leader in mind. The work of ODE rose and fell with the biennial budget and with the gubernatorial election. Since Ohio is a term-limited state, residents could expect a new governor every four to eight years. From 2003 to 2011, Ohio had three governors and five state superintendents.

The Resident Educator Program, sprung from H.B. 1, fell under the purview of the Division of Learning, the Center for the Teaching Profession, and specifically to the Office of Educator Quality (OEQ). The executive director, the associate director and two assistant directors oversaw a staff of educational consultants, data managers, management analysts, and administrative staff. At the outset of the Transition Resident Educator Program, OEQ's full staff included 30 individuals. In the planning stages, an internal staff of no fewer than eight attended every meeting with stakeholders. As the RE
program grew, the number of trainings and trainers increased, yet the OEQ staff shrunk. By June, 2011, the OEQ staff numbered 22; since that time, eight additional staff members have left.

**The policy entrepreneurs.**

Among the many actors involved in education policy, policy entrepreneurs serve as important members of issue networks: nongovernmental actors but still an integral part of the policymaking process. Roberts and King (1991) defined policy entrepreneurs as those “who work from outside the formal governmental system to introduce, translate and implement innovative ideas into public sector practice” (p. 152). They do not operate alone, but interact both among themselves and with the government actors, making the distinction between “inside and outside government... exceedingly difficult to draw” (Kingdon, 1995, p. 45). Business-savvy policy entrepreneurs “astutely connect policy proposals to pressing problems at opportune moments [and] can be important, arguably decisive players in both macro- and micro- arenas” (Malen, 2006, p. 88). To establish their credibility, policy entrepreneurs invest their time “networking in and around government” (Mintrom, 1997, p. 739). Policy entrepreneurs working at the state level extend their networking across state lines (Kirst, Meister & Rowley, 1984; Walker 1981) to learn details of policy innovations elsewhere, to draw upon other states' experts for testimony, and to acquire strategies for selling a particular policy. Because of their wide swath of networking, policy entrepreneurs are able to differentiate their policy arguments depending upon the audience, while maintaining their credibility.
New Teacher Center.

For teacher induction, New Teacher Center casts itself as the definitive policy entrepreneur, claiming on its website to serve “as the nation’s premier resource for policymakers and education leaders interested in new educator induction and mentoring” (“Policy”). New Teacher Center wears its policy entrepreneur mantle with pride, citing the goal

To inform and support robust policies focused on supporting beginning educators and related issues (such as teaching and learning conditions, evaluation, certification and licensure, and principal development), NTC Policy works at the federal and state level with: education agencies, boards, commissions, committees, study groups and task forces; elected officials (including the U.S. Congress, governors and state legislators); state boards of education; national and state government associations; policy advocacy organizations; teachers unions; institutions of higher education and other education stakeholders (“Policy”).

Founded by teachers in 1988, NTC was a part of the University of California at Santa Cruz and became an independent non-profit in July 2009. According to its website, NTC supports over 6,300 mentors to improve the effectiveness of 26,000 teachers across the country. In addition to Ohio, NTC has worked with educational leaders and policymakers on state policies, regulations, standards, and induction program infrastructure in more than 20 states—including California, Colorado, Connecticut, Illinois, Kentucky, North Carolina, and Oregon. Their record of accomplishment is solid, their press is uniformly positive, and they offer expertise not available elsewhere.

NTC offers comprehensive induction program development, offering on its

12 http://www.newteachercenter.org/
website to design and implement robust teacher induction programs and to build capacity of state and district partners to ensure the long-term sustainability of programs. Further,

   Our capacity building model includes developing the skills and expertise of local leaders and mentors to deliver Mentor Academies, leadership development and ongoing consultancy, thought-partnership and communities of practice. NTC’s partnership roadmap includes five key implementation phases that combine to deliver a sustainable, high-quality teacher induction program (“Induction Program Development”).

   ODE publicized an RFP (request for proposal) to find a contractor for the induction policy program development and only NTC applied. Their services promised to be comprehensive and effective. Figure 2 shows NTC’s five-phase (and minimally four-year) partnership plan that “includes developing the skills and expertise of local leaders and mentors to deliver Mentor Academies, leadership development and ongoing consultancy, thought-partnership and communities of practice” (“Induction Program Development”). Though ODE did have NTC under contract for four years (2007-2011), the deliverables varied from the figure—adjusted to reflect ODE’s needs, and of course, ODE’s budget.
New Teacher Center’s involvement emerged at the earliest stage, as they facilitated the 2007 study teams organized to prepare for a possible new Ohio induction system. Even with the budget line item struck for the multi-million dollar Praxis III exam, there was adequate funding elsewhere in the ODE budget to support NTC’s involvement, at least
through 2010-2011. By the time the actual Resident Educator Program took effect in fall of 2011, NTC’s involvement was nil. A licensing fee had been set and paid for the documents and practices that Ohio retained from NTC’s Instructional Mentoring training. Though NTC’s website refers to its past involvement with Ohio induction, Ohio is not listed among the states and districts “Where We Work.”

**Intermediaries.**

Honig (2004) defined intermediary organizations as “organizations that operate between policymakers and policy implementers to affect changes in roles and practices for both parties” (emphasis in original, p. 65). She drew her definition of intermediary organizations from her comparative case study of four intermediary organizations that helped with collaborative policy implementation in Oakland, California. She collected data on these organizations’ functions and the conditions that affected those functions to better define the nature and scope of intermediary work. She found Oakland’s “intermediary organizations primarily provided new resources—knowledge, political/social ties, and an administrative infrastructure—necessary for implementation but traditionally unavailable from school district central offices” (italics mine, p. 66). McLaughlin (2006) used the term local collaboratives interchangeably with intermediaries and suggested that these “local collaboratives provide a promising and efficient way to provide a range of supportive services ... as ‘knowledge managers,’ conveners and resource brokers (p. 221). They bridge gaps in the policy system utilizing their flexibility, expanded capacity,

---

13 Ohio leveraged Race-to-the-Top funds designated for professional development to support its Resident Educator Program. The goals matched: both sought to improve overall teacher effectiveness.

14 A Honig (2004) term
and ability to manage from the middle.

*The State Trainers.*

From the earliest planning stages, the Ohio Department of Education had intended to use external trainers because (1) it lacked the capacity to cover the training task with its own internal staff, and (2) the training protocol advanced by the New Teacher Center insisted upon it. The process of selecting a state training team began in the accustomed manner: Opportunities for individuals to become involved with the work of the department, including serving on committees, being trainers, nominating outstanding educators for teaching awards were all publicized on the ODE web site and announced through the State Superintendent of Public Instruction’s weekly newsletter. The announcement called for individuals interested in becoming state lead trainers for the upcoming Ohio Resident Educator Program. This request for applications specified non-classroom teachers only, since the anticipated time away from their regular employment would adversely affect student learning. Individuals who had formerly served as Praxis trainers or assessors (who had lost an income source with the discontinuation of Praxis and had been the most vocal objectors to the program change) were emailed directly and invited to apply to become state trainers. Candidates could obtain an application and submit it via email or US mail to the ODE Office of Educator Quality. They were required, also, to have their employers sign a form verifying their supervisor’s consent to the time the candidates would spend outside of their school, district, or office in their capacity as state trainers.

\[15\] [http://education.ohio.gov](http://education.ohio.gov)
A committee comprised of outside stakeholders (Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs), regional educational leaders, district and school administrators, and classroom teachers) and ODE staff (myself included) reviewed the applications, utilizing a scoring rubric, being mindful of representing all 16 regions (an ODE-only geographic designation. See Figure 3, p. 51) and seeking a diverse population of trainers (ODE-code for “include minorities”). In pairs, ODE staff members interviewed the resulting finalists via conference call. I acted as an interviewer, and like my colleagues, used a script, rated the candidates on their response to each question, and suggested either inclusion or dismissal of the candidate. Once offers were sent and accepted, a group of 21 state lead trainers met for two consecutive days of orientation at a meeting site in Columbus. At that time, staff from the ODE outlined to the new trainers the complex system for training and credentialing them, under the direction of the New Teachers Center (NTC).

Theoretical Frame

In its very nature, qualitative research is both interpretative and naturalistic, seeking to understand and explain beliefs and behaviors within the context that they occur. An examination of the state trainers’ roles in the implementation of one state educational policy had a defined context in which I was imbedded, so the naturalistic approach formed the basic conceptual frame of this study. More specifically, the paradigm of constructivism comes into play. Constructivism (Jonassen, 1991) “does not preclude the existence of an external knowledge, it merely claims that each of us constructs our own reality through interpreting perceptual experiences of the external
world” (p. 10). Much of what is known is shared and amended through processes of social interaction. Thus, social constructivism, as Creswell (2007) explained, refers to subjective meanings negotiated socially and historically, not “imprinted on individuals but formed through interactions with others ... and through historical and cultural norms that operate in individuals’ lives” (p. 21). Social constructivism, then, emphasizes “the importance of all aspects of the social context and of interpersonal relations ... including negotiation, collaboration and discussion” (Ernest, 2010, p. 46; See also Crotty, 1998; Lincoln & Guba, 2000). Within the social context exists the self, which according to Holstein and Gubrium (2000), does not simply emerge from social interaction, but from cultural influences and organizational auspices16 which specify [the] possibilities ... each ... [acting as] a social institution with particular ways of doing and framing matters of relevance to the participants. ... As we act and interact within the shadows of these concerns, their working understandings of personal identities supply the interpretive material and general instructions for assembling the selves needed to function in the immediate scheme of things” (p. 13).

Contextual Rationale for Methodology

Though the framework for state trainers’ role in the implementation of this policy was in place, the manner in which trainers enacted their roles relied on the functional selves brought to the collective, where negotiation, collaboration, and discussion would come into play. I set out to create a narrative of the state trainers’ role, using their voices, captured through interviews to provide a holistic account, a multi-layered portrait of the

---

16 Holstein and Gubrium draw on the work of Hughes (1984) who identifies several “going concerns:” the cities in which we live; the companies, schools, or bureaucracies in which we work; the families with whom we reside; the people with whom we socialize.
issue under study (Creswell, 2007). Yet, I had to engage in what Tavory and Timmermans (2009) called “casing,” the process of determining the type of case I had, seeing both its sociological properties and the boundaries of the situation, which involves evaluating empirical phenomena, analyzing data and assessing theoretical knowledge used or generated within the study. So, I began my study unsure of its specific methodology, but found grounded theory to be a good fit. As a qualitative research design, grounded theory allows the researcher to generate a general explanation or theory of a process from the data, from participants’ experience with the process.

Charmaz (2006) delineated characteristics of grounded theory research:

- ... fluid, interactive, and open-ended.
- The research problem informs initial methodological choices for data collection.
- Researchers are part of what they study, not separate from it.
- Grounded theory analysis shapes the conceptual content and direction of the study ...
- Successive levels of abstraction through comparative analysis constitute the core of grounded theory analysis.
- Analytic directions arise from how researchers interact with and interpret their comparisons and emerging analyses rather than from external prescriptions (italics in original, p. 178).

Charmaz (2006) also advocated for a social constructive perspective to grounded theory, explaining that “a constructive approach places priority on the phenomena of study and sees both data and analysis as created from shared experiences and relationships with participants” (p. 130; See also Charmaz, 1990, 2000, 2001; Charmaz & Mitchell, 1996, 2001). Constructivist grounded theory, according to Charmaz (2006) falls within the interpretive approach to qualitative research with flexible guidelines, a focus on theory
developed dependent on the researcher’s view, and a process of uncovering experiences within embedded, hidden networks, situations, and relationships. She appreciated that the role of the researcher in constructivist grounded theory is not minimized, but acknowledged that any conclusions developed by grounded theorists are suggestive, incomplete, and inconclusive (2006). While this appears to be a weakness of the theory, Charmaz (2006) saw it as a method of inciting subsequent studies in which researchers “to establish boundaries of the usefulness of [a particular] grounded theory and, possibly, to ascertain how and where to modify it” (p. 184).

Insider Research

As Charmaz (2006) indicated, grounded theorists are part of what they study, not separate from it. Given my privileged placement (as discussed earlier in this chapter), this case offered me the possibility of capturing social processes as they unfolded, analytically focused on “social processes across time and space, action-oriented analysis and the open-ended meaning of interaction” (Tavory & Timmermans, 2009, p. 246). I had spent two years prior to the study as a participant in the development of the Ohio Resident Educator Program; my interviews with the state trainers began three months after I retired from the Ohio Department of Education. A month after that, I began work as a substitute state trainer; in which, over a period of six weeks, I facilitated eight training sessions with six different co-trainers.

My relationship to this policy implementation makes me to some extent an insider ethnographer, a de facto member of the group, “someone whose biography (gender, race, class, sexual orientation and so on) gives her a lived familiarity with the
group being researched” (Griffith, 1998, p. 361). Like the majority of the state trainers, I was a white, middle-class, straight female, a mid- to late-career English Language Arts educator. I had participated in the previous induction program as a mentor. This broad familiarity and similarity is at once both advantage and disadvantage: it can engender deep, rich descriptions and limit my view. I did benefit from an insider understanding of the origins of the program development that occurred in response to the policy change. Having participated in the creation of many of the program documents, I knew their source, the rationale for their inclusion, and the intent of the authors. Yet Mercer (2007) explained that “what insider researchers gain in terms of ‘their extensive and intimate knowledge of the culture and taken-for-granted understanding of the actors’ may be lost in terms of ‘their myopia and their inability to make the familiar strange’ (Hawkins, 1990, p. 417 as cited in Mercer, p. 7). I found this “taken-for-granted understanding” manifest primarily in the interview transcripts, in the absence of clarifying questions. Where more seasoned interviewers might have probed further, I can be heard frequently agreeing with the state trainers as they spoke, a technique I naively assumed made my interview subjects feel comfortable and accepted. In hindsight, I wonder if I might have silenced their voices. I never asked any of the trainers to explain their responses, but assumed that I understood what they meant. As indicated earlier, I had a history with the state trainers before and during the research and ran the risk of viewing the data myopically, making assumptions, placing my perspective in others’ responses. These dangers are endemic to insider research: failing to ask seemingly obvious questions or to challenge assumptions (Hockey, 1993), failing to raise sensitive topics (Preedy & Riches, 1988), or failing to seek
explanations for shared experiences (Kanuha, 2000). The interview transcripts show me to be guilty on all counts.

I risked informant bias as well: state trainers’ relationships with me could have influenced them to say what I wanted to hear (Mercer, 2007). I realized that early on and elected to make my 90-day work separation (required by State Teachers Retirement System) absolute: I had no contact with my respondents in that period. I hoped they would begin to separate me from the work and realize that I was no longer connected to the program. When I was hired by the Educational Service Center to serve as a substitute trainer, I waited for co-trainers to contact me and allowed them to assign me roles in the training protocol. I wanted to demonstrate clearly that I was in no way their superior, but simply a peer. On nearly every interview recording, I can be heard telling the respondent that I will be asking questions that they may think I know the answers to. “Please answer them anyway because your view is the one the counts here.” Had I conducted follow up interviews, I may have been able to expose the specific biases. Unfortunately, I did not.

Methods and Data Sources

Method

Grounded Theory

This study uses grounded theory to approach the case of Ohio state trainers as intermediaries as a narrative, the story of “constellations of relationships embedded in time and place” (Somers, 1992, p. 601). The narrative itself draws boundaries around this ‘world,’ artificially creating a sense of closure around the ways in which the social world
is experienced and acted upon by the members (See White, 1987 & Ragin, 1992). Glaser and Strauss first wrote of grounded theory in 1967 in their polemical Discovery of Grounded Theory, where they argued that theory needed to be discovered from the data, rather than drive the collection of the data. They proposed that sociologists build theory ‘from the ground up’ using systematic conceptualization, that is, developing codes, categories, and themes inductively rather than imposing predetermined classifications on the data. Later, Strauss (1987; also Strauss & Corbin, 1990) emphasized the need for constantly verifying and modifying concepts regardless of their origin. Charmaz (2006) summarized grounded theory methodology simply: “Seek data, describe observed events, answer fundamental questions about what is happening, then develop theoretical categories to understand it” (p. 25).

This study traces the shared experiences of a group of individuals charged with the implementation of a statewide educational policy in an effort to explore their role and its possible effects. This study examines the state trainers’ roles in the implementation of Ohio’s teacher induction program using a combination of interviews, participant observation, and document study to situate these actors within their social and political contexts (Rowan & Miskel, 1999; Malen, 2006). Its grounded theory design led to the subsequent linking of the data to theories of policy implementation (McLaughlin, 1987 & 2006; Honig, 2006 among others), the use of intermediaries in implementation (Honig, 2004) and collective trust (Forsyth, Adams & Hoy, 2012). The study’s primary data is the interviews with the state trainers, but it also includes field notes on the process and its participants available to me in my role as a substitute.
trainer. Training documents published by New Teacher Center and the Ohio Department of Education, as well as publicly accessible program documents, were also examined. Further discussion of these documents and a table listing the documents follows in this chapter, in the section “Data Sources.”

Participants

The research study was initiated in January 2011, shortly after a second cohort of state lead trainers became credentialed to provide Instructional Mentor training, a key piece of the state’s Resident Educator Program. At that time, the total state lead trainer pool consisted of 36 individuals, all of whom were invited via email to participate in the research (See Appendix A: Email Recruitment Letter). Though initial invitations to participate went out in January, the email indicated that the interviews would be conducted “at a later date.”

The original 21 state lead trainers had emerged from a field of over 100 applicants who responded to ODE recruitment efforts. A selection committee (see Chapter 1) chose the 50 applicants to be interviewed by ODE personnel, who ultimately chose 21. The original 21, eventually called “Cohort 1,” worked the first year of the transition program. Though they had been asked to provide training to approximately 2,400 teachers across the state, the actual training “burden” amounted to almost 6,000. Consequently, the following spring, ODE issued an additional recruitment notice, used the same selection process, and appointed 19 new state trainers, “Cohort 2.” So, by

\[\text{\textsuperscript{17}}\text{To reduce potential conflict-of-interest caused by my employment with ODE, the interviews did not begin until September 2011, three months after my separation from the department.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{18}}\text{Eventually “lead” would be removed from their title to clarify their role as the only trainers.}\]
September 2010, a total of 40 state trainers had been appointed; however, only 36 remained on the roster in January 2011. Since none of the trainers was considered an employee of the Ohio Department of Education, the majority was employed full-time elsewhere. The four who left cited changes in employer demands on their time (three), or resigned without explanation (one). Trainers’ primary employers were divided among educational service centers, institutes of higher education, school districts, and charter schools. Seven of the trainers were retired educators. (See Table 1.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employer</th>
<th>Cohorts 1 &amp; 2</th>
<th>Respondents in Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charter school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Service Center</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None (Retired Educator)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1: Employer Distribution of State Trainers**

Only five of the trainers were male; 31 were female. Three female trainers were African American; the other 33 (male and female) were Caucasian. The trainers represented the 14 of the 16 geographic regions established by ODE. (See Figure 3.) Areas not represented (Regions 7 and 16) were covered by “neighboring” trainers.\(^{19}\)

\(^{19}\) This fact becomes significant when the training workload far outpaces ODE predictions.
ODE claims to make every effort to ensure diversity in its external stakeholder committees, but in my tenure—though we seated over a half-dozen committees—those efforts were limited to ODE staff reaching out through their own networks. Aside from the “public” call for applications—on ODE’s website and in emails to superintendents and heads of professional organizations—little other recruitment occurred. All the committees tended to share similar demographics: primarily white, predominantly female mid- to late-career educators. For this project, this composition did represent in miniature the mentor teacher population, which skews heavily female and mid- to late-career. Interestingly, its African-American trainer percentage (3 of 36 or 8.3%) exceeded the corresponding 5.69% minority teachers in the state, a figure that also includes Latino and Asian teachers. The gender gap among the state trainers was definitely too wide: the state trainers’ five males represent a mere 13.8% of the trainer corps. U.S. Department of
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Education (2012) reported the national teaching population as 24% male\textsuperscript{20}.

The January 2011 recruitment email (see Appendix A: Email Recruitment Letter) went out to each of the 36 state trainers, shortly after I had received Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval of my research. Seventeen replied in the affirmative; of those 17, only 12 followed through to participation in at least one interview. The twelve respondents included one male and 11 female. One of the 11 females was African American. Their employers covered the range of possible employer categories, with the exception of charter school. The respondent group was divided equally between Cohort 1 and Cohort 2, with six participants each. (See Table 1, State Trainer Employer Distribution.)

Procedure

Entry into Field

Understanding comes from immediacy of participation in social actors’ shared worlds (Prus, 1996), which Charmaz (2006) noted has its limitations, “The researcher needs to share some experiences, but not necessarily all viewpoints, with those being studied” (p. 25). As an ODE employee, I had been a part of the field into which the state trainers’ entered. So, I naively expected my re-entry as a researcher to be natural and without conflict. Each of the state trainers had worked with me when I was an assistant director at ODE, though I had only socialized outside of the work context with two of them. Seventeen of the 36 state trainers responded affirmatively immediately upon receipt of the recruitment letter—when I was still employed by the Ohio Department of

Education. However, following my retirement, when subsequent contact was made and the interview appointments were scheduled, only 12 made themselves available for an interview. That could be attributed to my loss of status as a supervisor at ODE; trainers may have felt less obligated to participate or realized that there would be no consequence to non-participation. My temporary status as a substitute trainer may have skewed the sample as well. I co-facilitated with six of the 36 state trainers. Five of those six had agreed to be interviewed and for most of them, we did the interviews after a six-hour day of training, settling at a table at the training site. Our shared trainer role may have contributed to their agreeing to be interviewed.

Interviews

I set up the interviews in one of two modes, face-to-face or via Skype. Interviews ranged in length from 10 minutes\(^1\) to two hours and in each case, a digital audio recording captured the proceedings. A primary purpose of the interview was to articulate the role these actors in the implementation saw themselves holding. Also at issue was the state trainers’ power or perceived power. What was their capacity to exert influence on the policy? Did they have the “skill and will” to use these assets? (See Dahl, 1984; Dahl & Stinebrickner, 2003; Malen, 2006.) To explore this phenomenon, the questions were constructed to be open-ended and non-judgmental. Because the interviews trace work processes that differ for different participants, and focus on concrete instances (e.g., particular training events), additional questions emerged during the interviews (Briggs, 2003).

\(^1\) In this Skype interview, a typically reticent state trainer answered the questions as briefly as possible and looked visibly uncomfortable.
Interview questions.

The intent was to keep the interviews as open-ended as possible, co-constructed by the interviewer and interviewees. Though these questions represent the topics I hoped to broach with the state lead trainers, I began each interview by providing the respondent a copy of the questions listed below. I had hoped this would lend structure to the process; it may have actually confined the interviews to these questions only. Consequently, for better or worse, each individual transcript contains responses to these seven questions:

1. Could you share how you became involved in the Transition Resident Educator Program?
2. How has your perception of what you do evolved during the time you’ve been associated with the program? How did you become involved in this process?
3. How has the policy itself changed across your participation?
4. How were you prepared? How was the initiative deployed?
5. Would you describe what you do as a state lead trainer? Have those strategies changed over time? Where did you learn them? How did you develop them?
6. How much control do you have over how you conduct the training? Can you give me examples of how you’ve shaped it to make it more appropriate for one situation or another?
7. How has the training changed or evolved over time, or has it? Is fidelity to the training protocol important? How much fidelity to the model training has been achieved?

Data sources

Evidentiary adequacy (Erikson, 1986) a central concern for qualitative research, requires both sufficient time in the field and an extensiveness of the body of evidence used as data. As an insider to the policy development, I spent three years within the process at the Ohio Department of Education; I logged 12 months in the field, as an
observer and as a participant. While the interview data consist of only 137 pages of transcriptions, they also include field notes, documents shared by the participants, and program documents amounting to over 1,000 pages. Table 2, which follows, lists the document collections reviewed, their source, and a description of the contents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transition Resident Educator Program Instructional Mentoring: For Mentors Working with Beginning Teachers</td>
<td>©2006, 2009 New Teacher Center</td>
<td>Bound manual for Transition Resident Educator Program, purchase required by all participants (78 pp.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Resident Educator Program Development Committee 2009-2011 Member Binder</td>
<td>Distributed under auspices of both NTC &amp; ODE Some materials ©2008, 2010 New Teacher Center</td>
<td>Distributed empty, this binder grew with materials added at each quarterly meeting. Contains meeting agendas, Power Point slides, resource materials including field test versions of formative assessment tools, ODE program documents, and artifacts from activities conducted in the context of the meetings. (527 pp.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Resident Educator Program: Journey to Excellence Facilitation Manual</td>
<td>Ohio Department of Education</td>
<td>Assembled binder of materials for state trainers’ use in conducting required trainings. Includes facilitation guides, resource documents, Power Point slides, and participant materials. (219 pp.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Documents Reviewed
Documents

Besides interviews, the data in this study include policy and program documents, necessary to establish a broad base of understanding regarding both the policy and the intended implementation process. Before, during, and after examining the interviews, I composed a descriptive narrative of the chronology of the policy—including its history, the program’s development and initial implementation—drawn from both policy documents and observations I had made (See Chapter 4.). Returning to the program documents after a year’s separation allowed me to view them anew. They were no longer my work product; I was less familiar with them. I looked to the documents to refresh my memory regarding training cycles, individual meeting agendas, and for insight as to the policymakers’ intentions for the state trainers. I also examined the documents as representations of dialogue between the extralocal forces (the Ohio Department of Education) and local forces (the state trainer team and the mentors they train).

Interview transcripts

The interview transcripts provided the bulk of the data used in this study. I had recorded the interviews digitally and transcribed them myself since I considered the transcription task an initial and thorough immersion in the data. The 137 total pages of transcripts include interviews ranging in length from only three pages, to one that is 30 pages.

Coding & categorizing documents

I began with open coding, a process which Strauss and Corbin (1990) described as “fractur[ing] the data and allow[ing] one to identify some categories, their properties
and dimensional locations” (p. 97). At each pass through the data, I highlighted, coded, tabbed, and otherwise marked up the transcripts. In most cases, I transferred the corresponding text to categorical tables (See Figure 5 for examples), which included a concordance of metaphors, references to the Ohio Department of Education and the New Teacher Center, and indicators of trust. After a thorough examination of the generated documents, I continued with axial coding, which moves the data “back together in new ways by making connections between a category and its subcategories” (italics in original, Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 97). Finally, I integrated the data by “selecting the core category, systematically relating it to other categories, validating those relationships22, and filling in categories that needed further refinement and development,” a step Strauss & Corbin called “selective coding” (1990, p. 116).

22 I did this by searching for confirming and disconfirming examples.
Data analysis

I attempted to follow the Charmaz’s (2006) advice to grounded theorists as I began the analysis, by “looking for ways to interpret these data, focusing on specific words and phrases to which participants seem to attribute particular meaning, finding taken-for-granted and hidden assumptions of various participants, showing how they are revealed through and affect actions” (p. 21).

Metaphor-Led Discourse Analysis.

From the beginning of the transcription process, I noticed several metaphors and made a mental note to consider that in data analysis. I had found a shared language—words, and phrases—used by the respondents, to which they all seemed to attribute similar meanings (Charmaz, 2006). The more interviews I transcribed, the more I
realized the preponderance of metaphor. The trainers seemed to share a metaphor-rich language, often duplicating each other’s phrasing. Without realizing my strategy had a name, I began combing the transcripts for metaphors, the first step in Cameron’s (2003, 2009) process for Metaphor-Led Discourse Analysis, which follows:

1. Identify linguistic metaphors from transcripts.
2. Code metaphors for features (themes).
3. Examine coded metaphors for patterns or systematicity yielding information about participants’ ideas, attitudes, and values.

Cameron and associates (2009) also suggested establishing trustworthiness by using a cross-rater, which I had done. As an English teacher for over 30 years, I trusted my metaphor identification, but I was not so confident in my metaphor interpretation, realizing my myopic perspective could result in erroneous assumptions. I had catalogued the full list of metaphors in an Excel file and sent them to a second reader: a non-educator, English degreed friend. His first reaction came to me in a text message: “What battle are these people fighting?!” This confirmed my initial observation of conflict themes. I had asked him to review the metaphors and add his thematic interpretation of each metaphor. As he worked on the task, we had two lengthy telephone conversations. Our discussions were our attempt at developing a degree of reliability in our interpretations, as metaphor-led discourse analysis suggests. Cameron and associates (2009) called for an “interpretive process of pattern-finding … [which] provide[s] strong-enough evidence in the data to warrant inferences made about ideas, values, and attitudes (p. 70). The decontextualized metaphors, as I had presented them to the second reader, were insufficient to provide him a full picture of the discourse. I had to
allow him to look for “all possible linguistic metaphors [to ensure]... reliability: checking every word minimizes the risk of missing metaphors; and ... [leaves the data open] theoretical[ly]: in advance of analysis, we don’t know which metaphors might contribute to emergent themes in the interaction” (p. 72). So, I provided him electronic copies of the transcripts (with the names redacted), and in subsequent phone calls, we discussed the metaphoric patterns as we saw them. Together, we grouped them into broad categories.

**Emergent themes.**

The index of metaphors yielded some tentative categories, which directed successive examinations of the data. Repeated references to battle led to exploration of allegiances and the use of sporting metaphors pointed me toward teams. Examining the data for allegiances, I noticed repeated references to the Ohio Department of Education and to New Teacher Center, which was not surprising, given each organization’s role in the policy implementation and potential to influence the way the state trainers enacted their roles. The creation of a database of references to either entity (ODE or NTC) yielded two broad categories: the representation of their role as being “in the middle” and trust. The former sent me to the literature on intermediaries in policy implementation; the latter to trust and collective trust (Forsyth, Adams & Hoy, 2012). Reading respondents’ descriptions of their roles in the implementation led me to Honig’s (2006) study of intermediaries in policy implementation. I drew from her study as well as from McLaughlin (2006) to guide my search for confirming evidence from the interview transcripts and from the policy and program documents to verify their role as intermediaries in this particular implementation. (The results of this process appear in
Chapter 5.) I also uncovered several precepts of collective trust that seemed applicable to the state trainers. Following grounded theory methods, I delineated indicators of collective trust to look for in a re-examination of the data. Table 3 summarizes that process.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Precepts of Collective Trust</th>
<th>Researchers</th>
<th>Indicators in the Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relational trust – the synchrony of each groups’ understanding of its and other groups’ expectations and obligations</td>
<td>Bryk &amp; Schneider, 2002</td>
<td>References to task, job, duties Explication of others’ roles in the implementation Comparative terms between and among groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequences of collective trust – effects on climate/culture, structures and outcomes/behaviors</td>
<td>Bryk &amp; Schneider, 2002</td>
<td>References to specific experiences of state trainers Descriptive terms regarding training climate &amp; culture Discussion of training outcomes and trainer behaviors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust enables cooperation; cooperation also promotes trust.</td>
<td>Cook &amp; Cooper, 2003</td>
<td>References to positive group experiences and outcomes References to the positive actions of specific individuals Inclusion of specific examples of cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdependence – situation where the success of a program depends on two or more groups. One group will want to predict the cooperation, expertise and efficacy of the others.</td>
<td>Whitener, Brodt, Korsgaard &amp; Werner, 1998</td>
<td>References to themselves as a group, with group expectations, roles &amp; responsibilities Use of terms to distinguish themselves from other groups Use of comparative terms between and among groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task ambiguity and functional dependence are positively related to trust.</td>
<td>Costa, 2003</td>
<td>References to confusion or lack of understanding regarding task, job, duties Explication of the team response to the ambiguity Use of comparative terms between and among groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Collective Trust
CHAPTER 4

A Narrative History: Policy & Program Development

Grounded theorists select the scenes they observe and direct their gaze within them (Charmaz, 2006, p. 23).

Rationale

This chapter provides a narrative history of the induction policy change and subsequent program development that took place in the state of Ohio from 2007 through 2011 in an effort to situate the data in the scenes in which it occurred. Charmaz recommended that grounded theorists include these steps in their analysis:

- Attend to actions, processes and words
- Delineate the context, scenes and situations carefully
- Note who did what, when, why and how
- Identify the conditions from which “specific actions, intentions and processes emerge or are muted” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 21).

This continues a narrative begun in Chapter 1, “The Ohio Resident Educator Program: In Brief,” which traces this development from inside the department of education.

Teacher Induction Study Groups

In spring 2007, word reached the ODE that a bill was in legislative committee to

---

23 H.B. No. 347 “To amend section 3319.25; to amend for the purpose of adopting a new section number as indicated in parentheses, section 3319.25 (3319.259); and to enact new section 3319.25 and sections 3319.251 to 3319.258 of the Revised Code and to amend Section 269.10.30 of Am. Sub. H.B. 119 of the 127th General Assembly to replace the Praxis III assessment as a condition for a professional educator license with assessment systems developed by school districts, community schools, STEM schools, and chartered nonpublic schools.”
end the use of Educational Testing Service’s (ETS) Praxis III (PIII) exam to test new teachers. Nearly a third of the staff in the Office of Educator Quality (OEQ), where I worked, was involved with the teacher induction program that culminated with the candidates’ taking the PIII exam. While the executive director of the Center for the Teaching Profession (of which the OEQ is a part) verbally assured the staff that the bill had little chance of passage, she nonetheless initiated the formation of teacher induction study groups, first the Entry Year Program Review Committee which met 2007-2008, and the next academic year, split the group into two committees: the Pre-Service and the Induction Committees, issuing return invitations to some members and adding new members to both. I was a 2008 addition to the Pre-Service Committee, charged with fostering “seamless connections” from teachers’ college/university experience and Ohio induction, whichever form it would take. The Induction Committee was to investigate options for entry year teachers who otherwise would have participating in a single-year mentoring program in preparation for the Praxis III exam.

The Praxis III exam is the third in a series of teacher tests developed by the Educational Testing Service (ETS). The first in the sequence, Praxis I, is a test of basic skills such as reading, writing, and arithmetic, generally required of education majors prior to acceptance into the university program. Praxis II follows: a test of subject matter knowledge and teaching principles. Praxis III is “a system for assessing the teaching skills of beginning teachers that recognizes the complexity of teaching and the primacy of teacher-student interactions in assessing it” (Dwyer, 1998, p. 163). It is an observation and interview-based instrument, which relies on 19 Praxis Criteria organized into four
domains: (a) Organizing Content Knowledge for Student Learning, (b) Creating an Environment for Student Learning, (c) Teaching for Student Learning, and (d) Teacher Professionalism (See Figure 5.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain A: Organizing Content Knowledge for Student Learning</th>
<th>Domain B: Creating an Environment for Student Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Becoming familiar with relevant aspects of students’ background knowledge and experiences.</td>
<td>1. Creating a climate that promotes fairness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Articulating clear learning goals for the lesson that are appropriate to the students.</td>
<td>2. Establishing and maintaining rapport with students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Demonstrating an understanding of the connection between the content that was learned previously, the current content, and the content that remains to be learned in the future.</td>
<td>3. Communicating challenging learning expectations to each student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Creating or selecting teaching methods, learning activities, and instructional materials or other resources that are appropriate to the students and that are aligned with the goals of the lesson.</td>
<td>4. Establishing and maintaining consistent standards of classroom behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Creating or selecting evaluation strategies that are appropriate for the students and that are aligned with the goals of the lesson.</td>
<td>5. Making the physical environment as safe and conducive to learning as possible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain C: Teaching for Student Learning</th>
<th>Domain D: Teacher Professionalism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Making learning goals and instructional procedures clear to students.</td>
<td>1. Reflecting on the extent to which the learning goals were met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Making content comprehensible to students.</td>
<td>2. Demonstrating a sense of efficacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Encouraging students to extend their thinking.</td>
<td>3. Building professional relationships with colleagues to share teaching insights and to coordinate learning activities for students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Monitoring students’ understanding of content through a variety of means, providing feedback to students to assist learning, and adjusting learning activities as the situation demands.</td>
<td>4. Communicating with parents or guardians about student learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Using instructional time effectively.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5: Praxis III Domains & Criteria

The criteria, developed from research, job studies, and a multiple-state validity study, were piloted in the field and refined through five iterations. Dwyer wrote, “The resulting criteria thus represent a vision of teaching that is derived from working closely with teachers themselves … that can be recognized as being relevant to teachers’ own practice and concerns” (p. 172). Though Praxis III scores high marks on utility and credibility (Blanton, Sindelar & Correa, 2006; Rosenberg & Sindelar, 2005), the
reliability of assessors' ratings depends on the comprehensiveness of their training.

Praxis III assessors require extensive training, as do the mentors charged with assisting the entry-year teachers in understanding the 19 criteria and preparing for the assessor's observations. Blanton, Sindelar, and Correa (2006) warned, “Praxis III administration is highly costly and labor-intensive. Training is also costly and … [over time] would need to be repeated for new assessors” (p. 124). Though the theoretical result, a rich portrait of teaching competence, is desirable, the strengths of the Praxis III exam have historically been weighed against the financial bottom line.

According to legislative testimony regarding H.B. No. 347, the primary criticism of the Praxis III exam in Ohio was its high passage rate. The Report on the Quality of Teacher Education in Ohio: 2004-2005 cited Praxis III passage rates of new teachers graduating from all of the 50 Ohio institutions of higher education preparing teachers at 100%! ODE personnel faced legislative queries regarding the value gained from expending millions of state dollars on an exam that everyone passed. Teachers involved with the program in various capacities (most of which were paying positions) rose up to voice their objections. Since the program was nearly 10 years old, the uproar could have been attributed to the fear of change, a common phenomenon ascribed to teachers continually having aspects of educational reform foisted upon them and resisting change because they feel burdened or conflicted by the process (Evans, 1996). However, ODE leadership attributed the groundswell of negativity about this policy change to the most vocal objectors, individuals who stood to lose a supplemental income source. Due to the high

---

24 Based on 2007 Office of Educator Quality phone logs of stakeholder commentary regarding Praxis III
call volume, a meeting was held in which ODE staff was specifically asked not to encourage or participate in negative conversations about the possible change. We were to relate only the fact that there was a bill to that effect in the house and that it was still in committee.

ODE proceeded with its committee work, all the while watching H.B. No. 347’s movement through the legislative process. If H. B. No. 347 were to pass as introduced, the task of assessing teachers’ fitness for Ohio classrooms would fall to school “districts, community schools, STEM schools, and chartered nonpublic schools.” Since Ohio has over 600 school districts, the resulting assessments promised to be wide-ranging and inconsistent. The executive director proceeded as if the responsibility would never actually fall to the districts, but that at some point in the process, a call for consistency would be sounded and that ODE would be assigned the task. She seated a wide range of stakeholders on the Pre-Service Connections and Induction Process committees. For the Ohio Department of Education, in the Center for the Teaching Profession, stakeholders included representatives of the Ohio Board of Regents; the two teachers’ unions, the Ohio Education Association and Ohio Federation of Teachers; public and private institutes of higher education (IHEs); school district and building level administrators across the range of public school types; and employees of educational service centers (ESCs). For this and subsequent uses of the term “stakeholder,” assume the groups include representatives of the gamut of organizations noted.
Legislative & Budget Delays

The original House Bill lingered in the Education Committee and no action was taken during the 127th General Assembly. However, in biennial budget hearings, the line item in the ODE budget for induction was eliminated; the deletion saved $8.7 million, and ended the use of the Praxis III test by June 30, 2009. By the 128th General Assembly, the legislation formerly known as H. B. No. 347 became one very small part of an omnibus bill, H.B. No.1, with provisions affecting various state agencies and amending sections of both the Ohio Administrative Code (OAC) and the Ohio Revised Code (ORC). In it, dozens of sections affected the work of the ODE, including changes to Ohio's teacher licenses and the establishment of the Ohio Teacher Residency Program. The bill was effective July 19, 2009, but allowed for various “provisions effective” dates (Am. Sub H.B. 1; See Appendix C for the full Ohio teacher residency law).

Ohio Revised Code prohibits action on state programs prior to legislative approval, so for ODE, the study group work had to suffice. A few days prior to the meetings at which ODE would to introduce the transition program to the school districts, I was invited to join OEQ leadership in planning the sessions. Documents, distributed at that time and later to the public during the information sessions, suggested that a great deal of work had been taking place behind the scenes.

Initial Resistance

Ohio planned to transition its beginning teachers from the high-stakes summative assessment of Praxis III (discussed earlier) to a system of formative assessment, the essence of the New Teacher Center's Instructional Mentoring™ system.
Assessment or evaluation has two primary functions, formative or summative:

An assessment is defined as serving a formative function when it elicits evidence that yields construct-referenced interpretations that form the basis for successful action in improving performance, whereas summative functions prioritize the consistency of meanings across contexts and individuals (William & Black, 1996, p. 537).

The goal of formative assessment is to provide feedback to spur positive change in the individual being assessed. Colloquially, educators refer to this as ‘assessment for learning.’ Summative assessment seeks to pass judgment, ranking the individual being assessed among his or her peers and in terms of attainment of given criteria, which educators often call ‘assessment of learning.’

So this new-to-Ohio mindset suggested that fostering positive change in new teachers was more important than assigning each of them standardized scores that would be directly comparable among all the state’s new teachers. This ‘sea change’ occurred just seven months after the governor announced his intentions for a teacher residency program—in late July 2009 when the Ohio legislature finally passed its biennium budget. This system, called the Transition Resident Educator Program, addressed the gap of two academic years after the discontinuation of Praxis III and before the Governor’s residency program was to take effect. In the interim, ODE required schools to assign their new teachers (resident educators) a certified mentor, that is, one who has attended a required Instructional Mentoring™ (IM) training. Mentors would work with their resident educators using a series of formative assessments designed to target specific areas of pedagogical weakness for the academic

25 The budget “deadline” in the Ohio legislature is March 30.
year, and for the Transition Resident Educator Program (effective July 1, 2009 – June 30, 2011), sign off on the candidate’s application for professional licensure.

This plan ran into its first resistance at the outset. Since the biennium budget had not been approved in March, as is customary, all new state programs were on hold until budget passage, which did not come until late July, 2009. That resulted in ODE holding information sessions on the Transition Resident Educator Program in mid-August, after many districts had already begun the new school year. This was the earliest local districts learned (officially) that the Praxis III program to which they had grown accustomed had ended. They also learned, albeit in most general terms and in brief, the parameters of the transition program. Local districts could continue to use entry-year coordinators (a term left over from the Praxis III program) to identify potential mentors for resident educators within their districts and then had to see that they participated in the required training, offered regionally in one- or two-day sessions. Additionally, most districts were compelled by existing collective bargaining agreements to compensate their mentors with stipends or additional planning time or both. It fell to the districts to cover the costs in both human capital and fiscal expenditures. No state funds were directly earmarked for this purpose, though under then-Governor Ted Strickland’s Evidence-Based Funding Model, traditional public school districts26 did have professional development funds of approximately $1800 per licensed teacher which could be levied for this purpose. No matter how often ODE personnel intoned the mantra of the $1800 per licensed teacher, the Transition Resident Educator Program could not

26 The term, traditional public schools, signifies the exclusion of all private, community and charter schools from receipt of these professional development funds.
escape being tagged another unfunded mandate. Education reforms from special education mandates to No Child Left Behind (Lingren, 1996; Posner, 1998; Peyser & Costrell, 2004 and many others) have been decried as unfunded mandates, yet they persist.

Attendees at these information sessions (held in hotel ballrooms accommodating 500 or more) responded in a uniformly negative manner, audibly grumbling and frequently interrupting presenters with questions or comments. They bemoaned the last-minute change to the program, and seemed reluctant to listen to explanations regarding the source of the change. This unrest was further aggravated by the high demand for the required Instructional Mentoring™ (IM) training, a package developed with the New Teacher Center (NTC) and licensed to ODE with restrictive training stipulations: NTC would train a team of trainers who would be the only individuals in the state certified to facilitate IM training. Without any lead-time to train and certify the state trainers, the processes for training the training team and for opening initial IM training sessions were collapsed. No matter which ODE staffer explained it— it drew 15-30 minutes of questions at each of the info sessions. Scheduled training sessions were facilitated by NTC staff until the full cadre of state trainers was credentialed. This limited the number of available sessions in the first two months of training when demand from districts scrambling to get on board was the highest. The combination of all of these factors created a groundswell of negativity, which promised to make implementation of the new program difficult.
Selecting, Training & Credentialing the State Training Team

Though the process of selecting a state training team began in the accustomed manner for ODE, the process for training and credentialing the trainers was unlike any previous statewide implementation. As indicated in Chapter 2, The State Trainers, opportunities for individuals to become involved with the work of the department, are announced in the State Superintendent of Public Instruction’s weekly newsletter and publicized on the ODE web site27. The call for state trainer applications requested non-classroom teachers since the anticipated time away from their regular employment would be significant. Personal invitations to apply had been issued via email to individuals who had formerly served as Praxis trainers or assessors (who had been displaced by the discontinuation of the previous program) given their previous teacher induction experience. Candidates could apply via email or US mail to the ODE Office of Educator Quality.

As indicated in the Intermediaries and State Trainers sections of Chapter 2, after the state trainer applications were reviewed and finalists were selected, each candidate was interviewed via conference call. As a result, 21 state lead trainers attended the required orientation meetings in August 2009. For the several state trainers who had served on induction study teams, the presence of NTC was expected, as New Teacher Center had facilitated that work as well. It was clear that NTC had a strong presence in Ohio’s induction policy; their name and logo was featured dominantly in all the meeting materials; the ODE name and logo was added to the bottom of the pages. This was an

27 http://education.ohio.gov
NTC product, an NTC training, licensed for use in the state of Ohio.

Intersections of Actors in the Arena

NTC’s role extended beyond being a mere vendor or contractor: its trademark practices were about to become key features of the Ohio induction program. Both their training and their credentialing protocol for new trainers became a part of the Ohio process. New Teacher Center’s existing IM training was adapted only to reflect Ohio’s Standards for the Teaching Profession and to comply with common attributes of Ohio districts’ collective bargaining agreements.\(^\text{28}\) Though previous ODE training programs had uniformly utilized a Train-the-Trainer model, in which districts sent representatives to large state trainings, and the representatives then returned to their home districts to train the entire staff, this program would not. Instead, every mentor across the state was required to take the IM training from “credentialed” state trainers only. This was at NTC’s insistence, whose program trainings are facilitated only by extensively trained members of their own staff. For the Ohio program, the state trainers (21 the first year; 19 additional the second) underwent the process of earning their credentials by participating in a series of trainings in various capacities (participant, observer, observer/facilitator and facilitator), before being observed and certified as a state trainer by NTC. (A more detailed description of this process appears in Chapter 5, The Credentialing Process.)

To begin the official implementation, the Ohio Department of Education had to

\(^{28}\) I examined the *Transition Resident Educator Program 2009-2011: Instructional Mentoring Facilitation Manual* provided to me by NTC and compared it to the ODE version, *Ohio Resident Educator Program: Journey to Excellence Facilitation Manual.*
schedule the mandatory one- and two-day Instructional Mentoring (IM) trainings regionally across the state. Registration for mentor training was accessible through ODE’s online professional development and technical assistance system, STARS. Additionally schools and districts had to register their beginning teachers, now known as Resident Educators (REs), and specify the assigned mentors’ names on CORE (Connected Ohio Records for Educators). ODE documents circulated at the time made explicit which educators were eligible for the transition program, based primarily on the type of license held, but requirements also specified that resident educators had to be teaching at least .25 FTE (Full-Time Equivalent) in their area of licensure. All these measures would enable ODE’s Office of Educator Licensure to verify that the mentors had been appropriately trained and that the resident educators had in fact participated in Transition Resident Educator Program.

ODE based the Transition Resident Educator Program on NTC’s Instructional Mentoring™ training which used a system of formative assessment, a “process of measuring a novice teacher’s professional growth developmentally, not for purposes of evaluation as in summative assessment, but to provide feedback and foster continuing teacher development among novice educators” (Wood & Stanulis, 2010, p. 139). The transition program used three formative assessment instruments: Professional Goal Setting, Reflection, and the Collaborative Log. ODE leadership had explained the rationale: using three simple tools that would be a part of the teacher residency program to come could lend an air of continuity to the transition. The foundation would be laid in the Transition Resident Educator Program and be built upon in the four-year Resident
Educator Program. However, how the transition program was to be carried out in districts seemed negotiable: no stipulation was made concerning the number of times mentors were to meet with their resident educators, nor was it ever explicitly stated how frequently the formative assessment tools were to be used. Though the Instructional Mentor training clearly focused on a one-to-one mentor/resident educator relationship, this ratio was not required. Several urban districts already had full-time release mentors in place from prior induction programs and continued to use their one-to-many structure for the Transition Resident Educator Program. Additionally, the absence of lead-time prior to the transition program’s initial implementation led the department to make no written requirements for mentor selection. ODE stipulated that mentor selection would be more clearly defined in the full Resident Educator Program, set to begin in the fall of 2011. At ODE’s behest, the state trainers instructed mentors to consider the formative assessment tools used in the mentoring process property of the resident educators. The only verification of the completion of the mentoring—that constituted the Transition Resident Educator Program in full—was the box for the mentor and district superintendent or designee’s signatures on the application for professional licensure.
CHAPTER 5
State Trainers: Becoming Intermediaries in State Policy Implementation

Introduction

This chapter continues the examination of the state trainers’ roles by first detailing the process by which the trainers became credentialed or certified to serve as state trainers. In addition to using trainers’ quotes to support the former, I examine how the state trainers used metaphors to represent themselves and their work, and how these metaphors led to examination of several implementation theories. Each of these theories can be seen within the intermediary role as Honig (2004) defined it; the chapter ends with subsections clarifying the nature and scope of the trainers’ implementation work based on a truncated version of Honig’s (2004) functions of intermediary organizations. What follows results from review of program documents, interviews with trainers, observations of their meetings and their work, knowledge acquired from my time as an ODE employee, and from my temporary engagement as a substitute state trainer.

The Credentialing Process

Cohort 1

The training team met with ODE early in August 2009, for two days of State Lead Trainer Orientation meetings\(^{29}\). Less than a month later, they began the credentialing

\(^{29}\) Some of the details that follow were drawn from materials contained in Transition Resident Educator Program 2009-2011: Instructional Mentoring, a binder prepared by NTC for state lead trainers and ODE personnel.
process: The group reconvened September 8-11, 2009 for four full days of training and two evening “State Trainer Academies.” At these meetings, the New Teacher Center invited ODE staff to participate only in the introductory and announcement portion of the agendas. During the first two days, the state trainers simply participated in the training, alongside other teachers who would serve as mentors in their schools. Two sessions, held simultaneously, were open to additional individuals, to round each session out to 50 participants each. Two NTC staff members facilitated each section and as is typical of NTC events, kept to a tight, activity-filled agenda, allowing limited breaks. During lunch, the four NTC trainers stepped out of the general area to meet (according to their facilitation guide) to debrief, to assure that both training rooms were aligned in terms of content and duration. Both sessions ended at precisely the same time.

After completing the two-day training, the trainers met that evening from 6 to 9 with NTC facilitators and some of the ODE staff for the first of two State Trainer Academies, where they were introduced to the state trainer role, the facilitation manuals, and the process by which they would become credentialed. That day had had an insular agenda, allowing little time for breaks and no time offsite. After the training day ended around 4 pm, the trainers had a short break and then reported to dinner on site, after which the Academy would begin. The next day, the trainers transitioned from attendees at training to observers: two to four state trainers sat at tables on the perimeter of the training rooms, following along using their facilitation manuals, unwieldy four-inch binders, marking in pencil or highlighter, occasionally adding Post-It note annotations to their facilitation guides. Occasionally an NTC facilitator would stop by to comment on a
piece of the training just completed, to add an insight that missed inclusion in the hundreds of pages of material in the binders. The training day’s end would lead to another shared dinner and another three-hour State Trainer Academy. The fourth and final day of the training experience was extended to include loading state trainers’ vehicles with boxes of training materials for the sessions they would be conducting in their own regions in the weeks to come. Final words from NTC and from ODE staff sent them on their way. The state trainers would each have NTC staff with them for their first trainings in the field, but the final hurdle would be observation and critique from an NTC staff member, visiting them onsite at some future date.

NTC Observations

Some from Cohort 1 regarded the observation process matter-of-factly, like Corinne Bernard who summarized the experience in a few lines:

Well, people from the New Teacher Center in California came and we actually went through the training as we were going to present it, as participants first, so we went through two days as participants and then we went through an additional two days as observers, watching it from the trainer aspect and then we went forth and trained. [Laughs] (October 11, 2011).

Yet, the subsequent observations in the field caused a lot of stress, at least as reported by Melody Stallings (Cohort 1),

... you know there was anxiety with that because you weren’t sure and you heard various stories from other trainers that did not have as positive an experience as I was fortunate enough to have .... I think everyone’s anxiety was really high because we were being observed and then certified (December 13, 2011).

The stress arose from NTC’s careful attention to detail. Their Facilitator’s Guide for Day ____________

---

30 All of the state trainers’ names are pseudonyms.
1 of the Training was 40 single-spaced pages; an additional 102 pages in the manual include Participant Packet, Supplemental Materials, and Overheads\textsuperscript{31}. The facilitation guide included time (both minutes needed and time of day), content, and materials for every section of the training. These pages also included suggested wording and movement about the training room for the facilitators. Samples how the hand-made charts should look and required room arrangements were also supplied (See Figures 6 & 7).

![Figure 6: Model Agenda & Figure. Trainers were expected to alternate marker colors and include the icons.](image)

\textsuperscript{31} New Teacher Center and Ohio Department of Education. (2009). *Instructional mentoring: For mentors working with beginning teachers*. Columbus: Ohio Department of Education. Several pages within contain the footer, © New Teacher Center, 08/08.
Figure 7: Required Room Arrangements

Room Set Up:
- Round tables set in half rounds (aka crescent), 6-8 people per table
- Table for registration — either immediately inside the door or just outside
- 1 materials table and 1 presenters table at front of room

- 1-2 flip charts
- 1 screen
- LCD projector
- DVD player (with sound)

✓ 6' or 8' foot tables seating six people.

✓ 18' Presenter table with 2 chairs for them.

✓ The LCD projector and DVD player up front near the presenters. PLEASE note, the DVD player needs to be connected to sound for the video.

✓ Registration table at front door with 2 chairs.
Trainers in both cohorts spoke of NTC observers recounting all departures from these ‘suggestions’ in debriefing sessions, which followed their observed trainings.

Cohort 2 trainers’ reports on the observations sounded similar. Samantha Truex noted, [With] “the New Teacher Center, you were strictly using their materials. When I trained, I really felt like I needed to follow the script ... exactly” (November 21, 2011). Cecilia Myles (Cohort 2) concurred, “… with the New Teacher Center … there were certain things we had to say and certain ways we had to do things” (October 2, 2011). Asked of her vetting experience Deana Gorton also “Oh, yes. People from the New Teacher Center came in, and observed us, and gave us detailed notes on our training. They were aware of every departure from the script” (December 12, 2011). Only one Cohort 2 trainer, Jillian, said she found the observations helpful:

What was neat about it was that it was obviously nerve-wracking to have somebody sitting at the back of the room taking copious notes [but it helped] knowing that it was going to provide ... room for growth and it wasn’t a “gotcha” (December 13, 2011).

New Teacher Center’s intention was clear, and they articulated their methodology in their 2011 Annual Report which included the statement, “NTC continuously seeks to improve the quality and effectiveness of our work ... [to that end] we defined an impact strategy that helps focus resources and communicate value” (p. 4). Their “impact spectrum ... addresses Program Quality [by asking] Are our clients implementing the program with fidelity? (p. 4, italics mine). Their intent was to deliver a consistent product every time. To this end, they sought cognitive interdependence from their trainers, encouraging them to draw on one another during sessions to assure
inclusion of all content. According to the state trainers, NTC expected them to jump up
to clarify or expand if their colleague had missed any piece of content. At times while
observing state trainers, NTC staff had done exactly that.

With this segued pairing, state trainers grew to rely on one another as they
conducted trainings. As I indicated in Chapter 1 (Cognitive Interdependence), a group
mind results from the cognitive interdependence of “people in close relationships ...
[sharing] responsibility for remembering different portions of common experience”
(Weick & Roberts, 1993, p.358). That was exactly the state trainer experience: their
shared responsibility for the required content took some of the pressure off. Nellie
Vincent (Cohort 1) related how critiques from NTC staff unnerved her, yet working with
her co-trainer helped:

I about croaked with all the times [NTC] kept talking to us about these segues
and I couldn’t quite understand why they were placing so much importance on
that, but then the longer I trained, I realized the importance of that connectivity
and that kind of seamless moving from one topic and one person to another
(November 19, 2011).

NTC’s careful attention to each detail of their training included members of their
organization personally training and credentialing the first cohort of Ohio trainers. The
NTC Facilitation Guide leaves no aspect of the training unarticulated, from assigned
movements and narrative to pre-session “punch lists”— lists of tasks to complete in the
hour preceding each session. Commenting on NTC control, Nicole Tharpe (Cohort 1)
pounded on the table punctuating each word, “I — have — to — say — these —words. ...
NTC wanted you to do it specifically, almost like a memorization” (September 30, 2011),
a scripted performance. Another Cohort 1 trainer, Melody Stallings, spoke of their
anxiety about NTC’s presence, “They were very concerned with our adherence to the content ... it was a bit restrictive but I think it came from a very good place” (December 13, 2011). Nellie Vincent concurred,

They, you know, had a very prescribed kind of format that you felt like you couldn’t vary from it much. I guess when we were first training, the whole idea of trying to keep it the same for everybody that going through, that was probably a good idea (November 19, 2011).

Cohort 2

When the second cohort was hired, the contract between ODE and NTC allowed only for NTC observation of the new hires, and did not include the expense of having NTC conduct their initial training sessions. Though NTC offered a full menu of services (see Figure 2: NTC’s Induction Partnership Roadmap, p. 40), the ODE budget was limited.

Consequently, the process for the second cohort of trainers, credentialed in the fall of 2010, differed from their predecessors in several ways. First, Cohort 2 did not train together, simultaneously. Each was assigned a training session to attend (as a trainee), then another to observe, and another to participate as a co-trainer (See Table 4, Cohort 2 Credentialing Calendar, which follows). Some had already participated in the training during the previous academic year (before being appointed state trainers) and therefore began their process at the observation stage. The complex and convoluted process extended from early August through November 2010.
Second, rather than NTC staff, members of the 2009 state trainer group (Cohort 1), provided Cohort 2 their primary “instruction.” They facilitated the sessions Cohort 2 attended and observed, and Cohort 1 trainers divided up the agenda to assign sections to Cohort 2 (the 2010 appointees). Third, scheduling demands kept Cohort 2 trainers from working with the same members of Cohort 1 or at the same location throughout their credentialing process. This was further complicated by as many as three Cohort 2 trainers sharing the training duties with two Cohort 1 trainers. Intent on providing less of a boot camp experience than Cohort 1 had (and saving the cost of using NTC for the task) ODE management had hoped the differentiated training schedule would yield the
same result—a cohesive, capable training cohort. However, as a group, Cohort 2 experienced a wider range of trainers, shorter periods of co-training, and just enough variation from the mandated facilitation guide to pose a significant problem when NTC made site visits. Over the year’s training, Cohort 1 had made subtle and not-so-subtle changes to their facilitation manuals. Corinne Bernard (Cohort 1) explained, “We had more control with the third party [NTC] out of the picture ... I felt more control than I did previously” (October 11, 2011). Nicole Tharpe (Cohort 1) related why the Cohort 1 trainers began to exercise discretion with the trainings in this way,

> Both ODE and NTC expected the topics to be there, the categories .... That everything was covered. I think that NTC wanted you to do it specifically, almost like a memorization—not quite but almost— where I think ODE felt that everybody was a little bit different and parts of the state were a little bit different and what you needed to do to imbed those principles and those sections was what was most important (September 30, 2011).

The process of credentialing Cohort 2 extended into November, which resulted in Cohort 2 trainers conducting fewer sessions overall than their Cohort 1 colleagues did. This left Cohort 2 far less familiar with the training protocol and markedly less confident about their role in the program. Gorton hinted at evidence of a growing distinction between cohorts, explaining that Cohort 2 never trained without Cohort 1: “I did train in different locations, but never without a partner. In fact, I always trained with a [Cohort 1] trainer” (December 12, 2011). Reinforcing the existing training corps with 19 new trainers (21 + 19 = 40) doubled their training capacity; yet their efficiency did not similarly grow. Mixing Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 trainers proved complicated, as subsequent discussions in Chapter 6, Collective Trust show.
In Our Own Words: Metaphorically Speaking

The words the trainers used to describe their work shed light onto some of the complexities at play in the group. I noted in a section of Chapter 3, Metaphor-Led Discourse Analysis, that the metaphors were the first feature evident in the transcripts. Qualitative researchers often examine their data for metaphors to reduce concepts or ideas to their shared characteristics, corralling what Aubusson (2002) called the “massive untidy mess of information” typical of qualitative data. Schmitt (2005) explained, “Metaphors provide schemes, which bundle together the fullness of details, making them clearer and more manageable” (p. 366). Further, he noted that use and linkage of metaphors indicate what “patterns of thought, perception, communication and action — consistent in themselves — [come] into play” (p. 366).

In the interviews, the state trainers spoke metaphorically, their images relating their patterns of thought, their shared perceptions, their communication style and the actions they undertook in their collective implementation role in the state policy. Their words were strong and emotional. Engaged in a great battle, they fought “opposing forces,” “caught in the crossfire,” either “in the trenches” or on “the front.” Though they “expected some pushback,” they [took] “the hill,” “dragging them [the trainees] in by their ankles,” and “hit it hard.” They had a “shared mission” that extended beyond fighting a battle to providing intellectual or spiritual enlightenment. They shared “a vision” and “the hope that once they hear it, they will also embrace it.” It was “all about the mission,” “we were going to go out into the land” to “be the messenger,” to share “the vision... the big picture.” They hoped their own surprise at believing “as deeply as they
ended up believing,” even to the extreme of noting “it saved my soul” would extend “out in the field” – the battlefield perhaps, or more likely a sporting field, where the trainers saw themselves stepping “up to the plate,” taking control of “how it played out,” to “actually even out the playing field,” inviting school district personnel to “stay in the game or ahead of the game.” They would work “hand in glove,” “watch each other’s back,” realizing “we were both gonna fail” [or succeed] and so “play [it] out as friends.”

The collection of metaphors contained in the above paragraph represents the overall impression both readers gathered from the transcripts as they conducted the metaphor analysis. Table 5, Categories of Metaphoric Meaning, lists the categories under which my second reader and I organized the metaphors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metaphoric Meaning</th>
<th>Number of Instances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animals</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battle/Military/War</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burden</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlightenment</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team/Teamwork</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journey/Navigation</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales/Business/Economy</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Categories of Metaphoric Meaning

Metaphors connect human experience and the imagination, and as used to comprehend organizations, serve to make organizations “compact, intelligible and understood” (Cornelissen, Oswick, Christensen & Phillips, 2008, p. 8). As Lakoff and Johnson (1980) suggested, metaphors constitute the creative expression of preexisting and culturally
shared meanings, and as such, need to be approached without preconceived notions on
the part of the researcher. The extensive use of metaphors in this “organization”
surprised me: All 12 respondents used metaphorical expressions, though their frequency
varied from a low of two instances to a high of 63. (The respondent with the highest
count also had the longest interview transcript.) My second reader and I identified 182
distinct metaphors and observed, as Markova and associates (2007) had, that the group’s
metaphor use displayed their “tensions, contradictions, vagueness and ambiguities as
well as regularities and recurrent themes” (p. 46). I expected to connect to the
experience through the state trainers’ metaphors because we share similar teaching
backgrounds. Like the majority of the state trainers, I was a mid- to late-career English
Language Arts teacher, who had spent my teaching career in a single district. I knew they
would speak of journeys (and they did) and that someone would mention being “in the
trenches,” (she did), but I did not expect the oxymoronic pairing of their two most
prevalent metaphor types: battle images and spiritual enlightenment. Figure 8 illustrates
the primary themes and sample metaphors that emerged; each of these three categories
had 18 to 27 examples in the transcripts.
Three other categories had nine or 10 examples evident in the transcripts: metaphors about perception (10), sports (10), and burden (9). If these predominant metaphors convey the emotional, sensual, and cognitive ideas in the data, a prevalent theme emerged: the state trainers’ commitment to the Resident Educator Program. Much like enlisting in the military, they had committed themselves to this program. Further, like militia, they were willing to fight for their beliefs. They united as a team to present truths about teacher development that they believe with an evangelistic fervor, seeing the trainings as a burden they bore for the sake of “the mission.” The presence of journey or navigation metaphors is not unusual: the facilitation manual for the Resident Educator-1 (RE-1) training employs a thematic metaphor of the mentor acting as navigator to the resident educator. Since several of the trainers were interviewed
immediately after conducting an RE-1 training and all of the trainers had been working to master the RE-1 script, using the journey metaphor not surprising. Judging by their metaphors, it was often difficult to distinguish one speaker from another; however, it was easy to discriminate between Cohorts 1 and 2. As I organized the metaphors by general concepts and themes, the names began to cluster by cohort: Cohort 1 referred to the battle and the mission; Cohort 2 referred only to the mission.

Metaphor analysis served a clarifying purpose by grounding my preliminary ideas about the data around the themes represented in their language. Their metaphorical themes helped me rein in the wide range of possibilities open to theoretical analysis, and focus on two primary theories, intermediary functions in policy implementation and collective trust. As I tentatively explored the theories suggested to me by the metaphorical themes, I began to see the connection of the theories to the ways in which the state trainers described their work. Further research on intermediary functions and collective trust equipped me to code the transcripts according to specific precepts of the theories.

Intermediary Functions of State Trainers

As the state trainers assumed their appointed roles in the implementation of Ohio’s Resident Educator Program, they occupied a position between the state agency and the teachers who enact the policy. They function as intermediaries. Honig wrote of ‘intermediary organizations [that] primarily [provide] new resources—knowledge, political/social ties, and an administrative infrastructure—necessary for implementation but traditionally unavailable from school district central offices” (italics mine, Honig, 2004,
While Honig (2004) summarized the resources brought by intermediary organizations using the broad topics in italics above, I also wanted to find specific terms to collapse each of her 12 intermediary functions to more fully explore the applicability of the term intermediary to the state training corps. Three of these groupings connect to prevalent terms in educational policy implementation research: local knowledge, professional capital, and implementation capacity. The fourth, ongoing knowledge-building processes, combines several information functions crucial to implementation success. (See Figure 9, Honig’s Intermediary Functions, Collapsed.) I discuss each in turn and complement the research with anecdotal evidence gleaned from the data.

![Figure 9: Honig's Intermediary Functions, Collapsed](image)

**Local Knowledge**

What Honig (2004) called “Knowledge of Site and Policy Systems” (p. 73) is the intermediary organization’s response to the need for sites to establish goals and
strategies appropriate to local needs and resources, which I now refer to as local knowledge. Local knowledge, according to Kalb (2006), is embedded knowledge, a set of situated, embodied, and practical insights into dynamic and shifting social relations and institutions ... including all the often hidden divisions, suppressions and misrecognition that such wisdom inheres. It is also suffused by habits, preferences, duties and virtues that stem from its social and practical nature that change if circumstances demand (p. 581).

As indicated in Chapter 3, The State Agency/Ohio Department of Education, Ohio is a local control state in which districts retain discretionary sway in terms of state education policy. For this reason, the value of local knowledge cannot be understated. For Kalb, to see the value in local knowledge is to acknowledge that “the local retains a peculiar force.... [which lies] in the particularity and contingency of the social relationships in which the knowledge is situated, generated, used, put to work” (p. 587). Local knowledge, then, is a commodity acquired over time through socialization; it cannot be taught. The state trainers brought their local knowledge to ODE and utilized their local knowledge in bringing the policy to their localities. Besides their credentialing as state trainers, which they all experienced, the state trainers’ regular employment and prior experiences brought immediate breadth to the collective local knowledge of the state training team. Most of the state trainers were mid-to-late career educators (ranging from 15-25 years’ experience) who had spent nearly all their years in the same district or same geographical area. They were intimately familiar with local mores and conventions. They knew the hidden politics; they understood the local culture. Additionally, their current positions complemented their state trainer roles. Jillian Ragsdale saw it as a natural extension of her
... position as a school improvement coordinator .... It was a natural fit for me to be very knowledgeable about the program and to receive additional training with regards to its procedures, trainings and ... materials for the transition program (December 13, 2011).

Ragsdale and the others brought a wealth of local knowledge to the team, necessary to make implementation the most effective. They knew their audiences and, as Sam Canella explained, identified with them: “I was most of the original audiences . . . because I was so deeply into Praxis ... in my methods class [which] was basically Praxis- and Pathwise-based”(December 12, 2011).

Strunk and Grissom (2010) advocated identifying also “actors and mechanisms that may affect local flexibility” since reaching achievement goals often depends upon swift implementation (p. 390). Given the short timeline of the Transition Resident Educator Program, the move to use state trainers meant utilizing local actors, known to their constituents, accustomed to the local mores, and possessing what the localities did not: access to ODE. Apparently, that insider knowledge was highly desirable. In the era of school report cards delineating local shortcomings to the tax-paying public, localities were motivated to become involved because they saw knowledge as power. Nicole Tharpe explained the huge training demand of the first transition year as “people who had been part of the previous program [not wanting] to be left by the side. [They] wanted to grab part of what was next” (September 30, 2011). Sonja Caulder, a state trainer appointed specifically to cover the training needs of her large, urban district, explained, “[We wanted] to have somebody from [our district] involved so we would know. They [the administration] liked to stay with the game or ahead of the game, so we
would know what was expected” (November 15, 2011). Though districts were compelled to comply, they also wanted to do so. Corinne Bernard added: “In our district it has always been, ever since the Praxis days, [doing] whatever the state training model was … we have tried to model our system after that, so we’re all speaking the same language” (October 11, 2011). Trainers like Caulder and Bernard could immediately assure the cooperation of their districts because their role in the district was to implement the state’s induction program. Perhaps they could pull along neighboring districts as well. Tharpe could affect a wider scope in her role at a multi-county educational service center. Appointing a retired principal (Cecilia Myles) to the training team shed light on a key group of possible resisters: the building and district administrators. The trainings were directed at mentors; rarely were administrators able to attend the sessions. Myles’ experiences led her to observe, “I’m thinking principals and superintendents are out there. . . I think that’s a part that’s just not getting done” (October 2, 2011). She took that feedback to ODE, pressed administrative colleagues to do the same, and administrator involvement was specifically addressed in the implementation process of the full Resident Educator Program. Other trainers leveraged their connections; as Deana Gorton explained, “I have credibility with schools because I am both a state trainer and university faculty” (December 12, 2011). A student teacher supervisor, Gorton had a presence in the area districts and developed relationships with the faculty there. They trusted her; her involvement in the program could have helped her regional contacts to understand and implement the change. Researchers (Gitlin & Margonis, 1995; McLaughlin, 1993; Bailey, 2000; Goodson, Moore & Hargreaves, 2006) have long believed
that substantive change begins with teachers and the efforts expended by teachers increase the likelihood that reform will succeed. The state trainers explained that they possessed a “street cred” that ODE did not. Jillian Ragsdale noted, “I think that it’s credible coming from the state trainers. When you have an outsider, and especially from an organization that um, mandates, I think it can really push people off” (December 13, 2011). Musing about the possibility of ODE using its own team of internal trainers, Sam Canella worded it less delicately, “It would just be ODE forcing something down everybody’s throat” (December 12, 2011).

**Ongoing Knowledge Building Processes**

Honig (2004) saw her intermediary organizations performing four information functions: they held regular meetings, they documented and disseminated information, they provided simplified information about the experience, and they established ongoing knowledge building processes. Intermediary organization meetings help both the localities and the policy agency build their systems knowledge of one another, “establishing knowledge building as an important ongoing process” (p. 74). These face-to-face meetings in Honig’s study were well attended and credited for many of the implementations’ successes; in fact, her informants reported that “missed meetings meant missed opportunities to help chart the course of collaborative policy implementation” (p. 75). Intermediaries’ documentation and implementation reports helped “remind themselves and others where they had been and where they were headed” (p. 75). Intermediaries also bridged knowledge gaps by translating plans into concrete steps that localities had the ability to implement immediately. Honig also noted
that “intermediary organizations helped build central office and site knowledge by creating opportunities for central office administrators and site directors to revisit past decisions and to view implementation as a process of continuous knowledge building” (p. 76). I have distilled these four functions under the category, ongoing knowledge building processes, as each of the information functions serve to increase communication and collaboration between and among the intermediaries, the state department, and the local districts.

It is important to recall that the Resident Educator Program sprung first from a sizeable budget cut at the state level. The intention was always to leverage more local resources because ODE had fewer to offer. This was most evident in the shrinking staff of the Office of Educator Quality, in which the program resided. Consequently, more information was disseminated face-to-face via the state trainers. After the initial information sessions (facilitated by ODE staff over two days in August 2009) and in several information sessions held in August and September of 2010, the training sessions became the primary source of program information. Though the ODE website offered several program documents, none was as informative or as complete as the required Instructional Mentoring™ and Resident Educator training. According to Lizzie Wolff, for the districts, the trainers were teachers’ “first introduction to the program” (December 1, 2011). In the first year of the Transition Resident Educator Program, the state trainers facilitated approximately 120 training sessions and certified nearly 6,000 mentors. It was a daunting task, beyond what the state trainers had been led to expect. Melody Stallings remembered being “blindsided by the number of trainings and the
intensity” (December 13, 2011). It was intense: “Multiply by about a hundred what I thought I was getting into and what I actually ended up doing,” Corinne Bernard recalled (October 11, 2011). There were other unexpected duties: state trainers were required to provide attendance records and evaluations from each session to ODE. But there was still more, Bernard continued, “copying of materials, transporting materials, set up tables, set up chairs ... you know food, you had to make sure that was all accounted for” (October 11, 2011). For the most part, the trainers dealt with what they came to call the concierge duties, but defined their duties in terms of the program information. Nellie Vincent called herself as “a messenger of this information” (November 19, 2011). They all understood their primary role was “rolling out the information,” according to Delia Earle; “We know—we’ve been told—and we know what to share and when to share it and when not to share” (October 13, 2011). Sonja Caulder noted,

[We are] showing them that this is the way to go to support new teachers in a much better way.... They like this a lot better and through our trainings ... they can see that it’s really good, but it’s kind of overwhelming (November 15, 2011).

The trainers realized the message they had to convey was complex, particularly when the four-year residency began, but they also saw it as their duty to simplify the message.

Stallings said,

It’s important to not get so mired in the state requirements ... I try] just to start them thinking about things that they could do with their resident educators, [how to] make things a little bit more manageable, a little bit more organized or [share] resources I’ve found helpful(December 13, 2011).

Caulder used knowledge of her district’s resources to help mentors navigate through the
forms introduced in the Resident Educator-1 training:

[I told them], we can go to our website and pull up almost everything you want to know ….We try to encourage them [not to add to the workload, but] if you already have a form that does this, don’t [worry about this one] (November 15, 2011).

In addition to the hundreds of trainings, the state trainers met in central Ohio for regular State Trainer Academies, a half-dozen scheduled throughout the academic year, where they honed their message, shared feedback with ODE and pushed forward their ideas for change. When they met, “there [was] some discussion; there’ve been some changes. We don’t have a lot of control but we have to keep … to the program, so that everybody’s hearing the same thing,” noted Sonja Caulder (November 15, 2011).

Professional Capital

This third intermediary function, professional capital, relates to several recent studies, which found that external agents’ success relates strongly to their ability to work successfully with schools. Whether as external agents or as intermediaries, research (Berends, Bodily & Kirby, 2006; Finnigan & O’Day, 2003; Kronley & Handley, 2003; Pravetti, Derr, Anderson, Trippe & Paschal, 2011) has indicated these individuals are more likely to promote change if they possess relational skills and are able to cultivate social capital. Agents must be able to establish effective channels of communication among all relevant actors. They must be able to gain access to schools and to build and sustain trust (Smylie & Evans, 2006, p. 197).

Honig saw three distinct functions in this regard: leveraging social and political ties to sites and policy systems, translating site demands into actionable terms and acting as buffers for sites. As they stood between the two entities, Honig’s intermediaries “helped
manage ... long standing tensions between sites and the district central office ... (2004, p. 77). The intermediaries spent their relational capital to intervene, helping “sites translate their implementation experiences into requests to which central office administrators could respond” (p. 77) and open issues up for resolution. Honig’s intermediaries acted as buffers for sites in two ways: by tempering central office non-responsive ness with responsiveness of their own or by protecting the sites from unexpected policy changes by providing advanced warnings of changes to come and explaining the rationale behind them.

**Professional Capital Defined.**

These behaviors extend beyond relational or social capital and more accurately reflect elements of what Hargreaves and Fullan (2012) termed professional capital, a combination of human, social and decisional capital that “harnesses the commitments and capabilities of the many” (p. xi). Like financial capital, professional capital can be accumulated, but it too must be drawn upon and invested if it is to promote any productive activity. Hargreaves and Fullan (2012) defined human capital as “the economically valuable knowledge and skills that could be developed in people—especially through education and training” (p. 80). As widely skilled and well-educated individuals, the state trainers brought a wealth of human capital to the implementation. Smylie and Evans (2006) defined social capital as “the nature and function of social relations and their capacity to support individual and collective development and behavior” (p.188). As a group, intermediaries are valued for their collective social capital, which Hargreaves and Fullan (2012) describe as
how the quantity and quality of interactions and social relationships among people affects their access to knowledge and information; their sense of expectation, obligation, and trust; and how far they are likely to adhere to the same norms or codes of behavior (p. 90).

Hargreaves and Fullan (2012), acknowledging that behavior is influenced by groups much more than by individuals, recommended that “if you want positive change, then get the group to do positive things that will achieve it” (p. 91). It seems precisely the role of the state trainers, to be a positive face of change for the Resident Educator Program. Decisional capital is highly valued at the implementation level since its essence is the ability to make discretionary judgments: the capacity to “make decisions in situations of unavoidable uncertainty when the evidence or the rules aren’t categorically clear” (p. 93). It is “the capital that professionals acquire and accumulate through structured and unstructured experience, practice and reflection—capital that enables them to make wise judgments in circumstances where there is no fixed rule or piece of incontrovertible evidence to guide them” (p. 93-94). Lipsky's (1980, 2010) street-level bureaucrats used decisional capital when they made in-the-moment decisions to reconcile workplace demands with their professional and personal beliefs. Similarly, the act of teaching hones decisional capital, as each day educators make discretionary choices about approaches to individual situations and circumstances based upon their experience and subsequent reflection that enables them to learn not to repeat mistakes.

In handing over the training task to a team of experienced educators, ODE was able to leverage the state trainers’ decisional capital in the field, where it was needed.

*Professional Capital Invested.*

Certainly, the state trainers could and would expend their professional capital to
secure prime sites for training and their human capital to carry out the practicalities of the training; they wanted to provide a functional conduit for ODE programs. In the words of Melody Stallings,

We’re looking to offer service and support to our districts and our schools and the Ohio Department of Education. [Our policy at this ESC] is we don’t say no to ODE or our districts or our schools. We try to make it happen for them so when they pick up the phone, they hear yes (December 13, 2011).

The state trainers used their dual roles as employee/trainer to cultivate positive relationships between the stakeholders in their two worlds. “It’s the relationships you have .... People in our areas know our capacity and our qualities and have confidence in what we’re saying in our message,” clarified Jillian Ragsdale (December 13, 2011). Melody Stallings explained it as a phenomenon developing over time:

I think that as we’ve gone into the residency program and we’ve had an opportunity to build our mentor networks here and ... work through the program that I oversee ... I really do feel I am looked at as a regional resource, not only for [my county] but for [others] as well (December 13, 2011).

These relationships also grow in depth. Stallings continued, “It’s important as state trainers to remain knowledgeable about the requirements ... and to make sure that if something’s not working that it is shared with the powers-that-be in a way that is positive, proactive and collaborative” (December 13, 2011). The state trainers’ professional capital resulted from human capital, which many trainers had developed in their regions, and from social capital that relied heavily on their local knowledge. Dyer (1999), writing of successful policy implementation, suggested that local knowledge could contribute to the sustainability of the policy over time. In her model, the key was
being able to identify the levels of 'local' knowledge to draw on so that implementation is most effective. If actors at these levels have policy input, their expertise can be brought to bear in identifying potential barriers and critical veto points and on legitimate policy strategies .... A sustainable benefit of this approach is that, as actors at various levels are drawn in, their own positive and proactive roles are enhanced in an interlinked process of defining and implementing policy... over time, the flexibility and responsivity of the educational system would develop (p. 59).

Many of the state trainers had participated in the development of the transition program and the Resident Educator Program. Even those who had not, like Nellie Vincent, felt more comfortable offering feedback to the department after becoming a state trainer, which she explained in this way,

I always felt that the ODE staff was always willing to listen to our ideas; whether or not they decided to take them, that was another story. But I felt they were open to listening to things we felt really weren’t going well or things we thought could have been done better. So I appreciated that. I felt like we were really a part of that decision-making which I thought was important (November 19, 2011).

Cecilia Myles, the former principal who brought up the lack of information in the program directed at building administrators, had given feedback to ODE, and had seen them act upon it.

**Professional Capital Challenged.** One particularly memorable request for change in the first year was mentioned by three Cohort 1 trainers, who found the circumstance demeaning, in essence demeaning the professional capital they felt they brought to the program’s implementation. At the request of the New Teacher Center, Melody Stallings and her Cohort 1 co-trainer were gathering suggestions for changes to
the facilitation manual from the other state trainers. Stallings explained how the situation developed,

We were working with the New Teacher Center because we had received changes and suggestions for changes from the other state trainers. Most of the changes they [NTC] were very okay with or we had some good rationale about why those changes should be made or needed to be made .... We had one change with the mentoring language piece, believing it should be placed prior to the mentoring conversations where they see the beginning teacher and the mentor talk and go through this tool. New Teacher Center was very adamant about having it after that conversation. We felt [our move] was a good pre-assessment or preparation for seeing that and framing it (December 13, 2011).

Discussing the same segment of the training, Sam Canella shared his rationale for the change, explaining the confusion he felt the section caused:

I'm all about discovery learning and I think that's what was in NTC's mind, having you discover it, but when you are coming into something as brand new and you don't even have a frame of reference? You're in there flailing around trying to see, trying to figure out what's going on to start with. I mean, with discovery, you have to have [pause] a framework, a shell.... (December 12, 2011).

Canella went on, explaining the burden of trying to convey this new content to the mentors being trained. He seemed to switch into trainer mode, falling into the training script for a moment as he said, [We have to know] “what we are trying to do. What is the language we really want to listen for? And what is the outcome? Now let's see it play out in action. Can you show me the examples?” (December 12, 2011). The skills were entirely new to Ohio mentors and the trainers felt they were simply trying to do the best job teaching the new content. Canella related how they had “massaged” the agenda and the script to reach their audiences:

I think that was the biggest thing. You can't show a conversation, say 'talk about it,' and here's what you just saw. And we start taking about focusing, moving
forward, accountability, everything else. You know, what are you doing? We took it one step further. We announce what’s happening, you know— with the first time there’s clarifying .... We had every table focus on one thing, but it is focusing, and now [they shared with the whole group]. It just made it more interactive, less cumbersome ... (December 12, 2011).

Canella explained why he felt their change to the order had worked and was passionate about making it standard protocol for the training. Relating the story of the conflict to me, Stallings noted that the conversation about this one change extended beyond the conference calls she and her co-trainer had with NTC. NTC had contacted ODE; additional conference calls had taken place between those two parties and finally, all three groups met during the next scheduled State Trainer Academy. The state trainers and ODE personnel met face-to-face; NTC staff joined via conference call. Stallings continued,

I can remember looking at both you and [an ODE associate director, name redacted] and kind of shaking my head and saying after the call, ‘we’re not going to get anywhere with this’.... I think it caused some hard feelings between New Teacher Center and the state trainers. I think it was a defining moment as far as the state trainers and the training went. [After all.] who was responsible for the success of the program that we had seen in Ohio taking root through those trainings? ... The state trainers and ODE (December 13, 2011).

She went on for a few minutes, naming individuals from the state training team and from ODE who had been “responsive and professional,” whose “reputations in education that preceded the program,” people who “never steered me wrong before, they’ve been responsible for great programming and a lot of support for teachers” (December 13, 2011). What she failed to mention was anyone from NTC. The implication was clear: to her, NTC’s stubborn response to their training suggestion was an insult to the
professionalism (professional capital) of the trainers and of ODE. This is particularly significant because Stallings had been selected by NTC to act as a leader among the state trainers, gather their training feedback, and then work to NTC to make revisions. Not only was the proposed revision summarily dismissed, the dismissal took place in front of her peers, the other state trainers.

The state trainers invested their human, social, and decisional capital—or professional capital (Hargreaves and Fullan, 2012)—into the implementation of the Resident Educator Program. The trainers used their human capital, their talents, to conduct mentor trainings. They utilized their social capital to gain access to the district and schools, but also used their conversations and interactions to bring these conversations back to ODE, as Stallings noted. Their decisional capital may be their greatest asset. The state trainers were expected to make decisions in complex situations and “to have competence, judgment, insight, inspiration and the capacity for improvisation …. They exercise their judgments and decisions with collective responsibility, openness to feedback, and willing transparency” (Hargreaves & Fullan, 2012, p.5). Cecilia Myles explained how they improvised during the training, changing information-heavy Day 2, “Sometimes if you see that we really talk to them a lot, we might do an activity or something. [Lizzie] and I did something where we had them... make a poster...just to keep your audience engaged” (October 2, 2011). Sam Canella tackled a potentially prickly situation on the fly, organizing closed trainings—off the books and off the online registration system—for a particularly large district and diocese.

32 Trainings were generally scheduled regionally and open to all eligible teachers via ODE’s online professional development system, STARS.
in his region. “We worked out a deal to do those closed … trainings. Let me tell you what we built from that …” (December 12, 2011). He continued to relate how one of the administrators who had benefitted from the scheduling returned the favor the following fall offering to combine sessions. “She said, ‘we’ll take all the people from everywhere else you can’t get in.’ What a partnership was built before my eyes!” (December 12, 2011).

From the mundane decisions that tweak training agendas to larger scale planning, the state trainers leveraged their decisional capital on behalf of the implementation.

Honig (2004) noted how intermediaries served as translators for sites, managing strained relationships between sites and [bureaucracies], and buffering potential conflicts. The trainers felt that ODE could not have conducted the trainings, which Melody Stallings rationalized in this way,

Had ODE done it as far as an agency … I think there sometime that bias when they hear ODE, they set up a wall, you know, they eye-roll, you know that this is just another initiative, this is going to go away. I think that the relationships [we] had built prior to the trainings helped us with that buy-in …. [We] have that history to speak of, to draw back on, and say, hey you remember this? That was really great … but we need to take that a step further, we need to continue to grow, we need to look at formative assessment …. [Take] a look at the alignment between the programs and the systems that we have in place – the LPDC, the superintendent evaluation, the teacher evaluation, the principal evaluation, Resident Educator Program—all have alignment, with great purpose and intent. Because it works. Because … we looked at it and said, “this works” (December 13, 2011).

Several of the trainers admitted to preserving their own rapport with the mentors by deferring to ODE when criticism grew harsh or questions mounted that threatened to derail the day’s agenda. “Usually one or two people keep asking the questions, which is okay because we encourage them to ask questions,” related Sonja Caulder, “But we’d tell
them to stay tuned to ODE” (November 15, 2011). Interrupting the training with questions or comments was just par for the course to Corinne Bernard, who admitted blaming ODE for murky situations:

I’m okay with [the interruptions] because I would just be honest and say, ‘Here is how it stands right now. I don’t know any of the ins-and-outs behind the scenes. This is the way it stands right now.’ I can market that just fine. I think as state trainers that’s really what we’re doing: we’re marketing the program in a positive way. That’s why it is so incredibly important to me to build the relationships with the people at the trainings, so that they walk away feeling supported, that we are sincere and that this is important (October 11, 2011).

The trainers were engaged in the marketing of the program, setting it up to be seen in the most positive light, and they knew it. In terms of the implementation, “there’s a whole lot riding on the state trainers,” noted Lizzie Wolff, who said we have “the voice of experience and reason” (December 1, 2011). As a collective, the state trainers wielded considerable weight with ODE, which Wolff said could be used in ODE’s favor, or on behalf of districts and schools they represent. She indicated their power exists because ODE knows, “[We] could also band together and say we’re done” (December 1, 2011). Cecilia Myles hinted that with the eventual move away from NTC (in the Resident Educator Program), ODE had ensured the trainers’ future commitment and the program’s success:

We’re not lock-step like we were with the New Teacher Center, where there were certain things we had to say and certain ways we had to do things … I think probably if the New Teacher Center were still involved, to be honest, I’m thinking they would have put us in such a box that you would probably have [trainers] say “I’m done with this” (October 2, 2011).

Given my eight-year tenure at ODE, when I appeared in the field as a substitute
trainer, I was immediately misconstrued as a voice of ODE and faced a barrage of questions. I found myself prefacing every remark with, “As of June 30, 2011,” my last day at ODE. I could no longer speak for the agency but answered as best I could. Knowing no other individual had been given my former role as key contact for the program, I struggled to direct their inquiries to a place where they would find resolution. I pulled up the Resident Educator Program web page and showed them where to send their questions. There was no name, just a link to a Resident Educator email box. “It’s disconcerting not to see a name that you can reach out and touch and have personal contact with,” Lizzie Wolff told me in her interview (December 1, 2011). But in a training session, her spin on the situation was a bit more positive as she stood beside me, and added, “They’re really good about getting back to people and answering questions.”

Increase ODE Capacity

Collaborative education policy designs require the policy move from its origin to the implementation sites, which require site-by-site support (Honig, 2004). The new teacher induction policy and the subsequent Resident Educator Program had been developed with a group of stakeholders that included a third of the state trainers. Since many of the state trainers felt ownership of the policy design, they also felt capable of providing localized support in their role as intermediaries. In her research, Honig (2004) further delineated that support into four intermediary functions, which I collectively refer to as “increase ODE capacity”: providing additions to administrative infrastructure, leveraging site and central office systems for resource allocations, utilizing staff time and adding a layer of standards and accountability. Honig found that capturing the asset of
administrative infrastructure allowed for the appropriate distribution of resources and deployment of staff. It was important to formalize this function to ensure that it did in fact take place. Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) formalized the site-by-site allocations of resources and supports in Honig’s study and served a similar function in the Resident Educator Program. Where the first year of Ohio implementation left Cohort 1 performing several concierge duties in addition to conducting the trainings, the MOUs with designated Educational Service Centers (ESCs) across the state leveraged the ESC’s staff time to perform concierge tasks, to finance the state trainers’ work and travel expenses, and to provide funding for the amenities of the trainings: sites, catering and supplies. Honig’s final function required that intermediary organizations manage “disputes about site-by-site support by developing and maintaining clear standards and accountability processes for the provision of support and by providing regular opportunities to revisit both,” (p. 79) an item also addressed by the MOUs. The Ohio Department of Education wrote the MOUs specifically to address confusions about responsibilities to settle an existing dispute about the obligations of the fiscal-agent ESCs and the state trainers.

All of these functions served to increase the organizational capacity of the Ohio Department of Education. The term capacity building gets a lot of play at the state level, particularly when capacity needs cannot be met within the agency. ODE involves outside stakeholders in all its policy initiatives with the explicit goal of building capacity statewide. For the Transition Resident Educator Program and the Resident Educator Program, the state trainers acted as extensions of ODE within their local regions. The
state trainers, particularly those working for an Educational Service Centers, could essentially imbed the program within their site and complete its administrative tasks using their own staffs. The ancillary concierge duties of scheduling sites, contracting caterers, preparing training materials, sign-in sheets, and nametags could all be handled in house, with the increased benefit of collecting training fees that more than covered their outlay. All of this was articulated in MOUs between ODE and the fiscal agent ESCs and school districts. It began with fall 2010 trainings after a busy 2009-2010 training year led ODE leadership to rethink the original process. For ESCs with their “own” state trainer on staff, this streamlined the process and the trainings were generally well organized and efficiently conducted. All the trainings I facilitated were held in one such ESC. I arrived about 30 to 40 minutes ahead of start time to find the doors unlocked, rooms set up, sign-in sheets laid out and equipment ready. Administrative staff greeted me at the door and told me when the coffee was due to arrive and what time they anticipated lunch arriving. I simply walked in the door, facilitation manual in hand. Clearly, ODE lacked the capacity to complete these tasks across the state, and the trainers who had borne much of this burden in 2009-2010 were overwrought. Nicole Tharpe was one such trainer, covering a 12-county region:

> I [thought] the site would have everything ready and I would . . . then go in and do it. And rather than be a packhorse, did I expect it to have the magnitude it did? No ... I guess I figured more would be done for us (September 30, 2011).

Fortunately, the MOUs changed that. Tharpe described her current role this way,

> Now as a trainer, I train. I get the supplies ready, I make sure that the fiscal agent knows what to order, knows what to do. We go over lists we’ve made to make sure that things are in place (September 30, 2011).
Without the state trainers enacting their intermediary role in this policy implementation, the Resident Educator Program would not exist. They utilized their local knowledge to advance the program. They fostered knowledge-building processes between the localities and ODE. They became the delivery mechanism for the transition program and the information purveyors to the still unfolding teacher residency. They stood between the local sites and ODE, buffering potential conflicts and easing the burden of uncertainty. As I reviewed their intermediary roles and reviewed the data for an explanation for their commitment, one theme emerged, trust.
CHAPTER 6

Collective Trust

Introduction

A careful examination of Honig’s (2004) intermediaries and Hargreaves and Fullans’ (2012) professional capital shows evidence of trust in both theories. Honig (2004) found a primary contribution of intermediaries to policy implementation was the resources they brought to bear, including their political and social ties. Definitions of social capital cited earlier link political and social ties: “the nature and function of social relations and their capacity to support individual and collective development and behavior,” (Smylie & Evans, 2006, p. 188); “intangible and abstract resources derived from interactions among individuals and the social structures that frame them” (Coleman, 1988, as cited in Smylie & Evans, 2006, p. 189). Smylie and Hart (1999) cited three components to social capital: social trust; channels of communication; and norms, expectations and sanctions. Similarly, Putnam (1993, 1995a, 1995b), in his studies of voluntary organizations, saw social capital having three components: networks of civil engagement, norms of reciprocity and trust. Social capital was also identified by Hargreaves and Fullan (2012) as one facet of their “professional capital,” a combination of human, social, and decisional capital. Social capital theory (Stolle, 1998) holds that social capital results from the effects of varied contacts and regular interactions of groups of people “who stand in rather loose contact to one another … [Further,] face-to-face
interaction, positive and repeated cooperation experiences, and exchange within the
group life are necessary preconditions for social capital to thrive and to be productive”
(p. 501).

Trust

Definitions for trust vary, but several come into play in the implementation
literature. Bryk and Schneider (2002), writing of relational trust, noted

Trust can ... be a function of informal mutual understandings that develop out of
sustained interpersonal or working relationships among individuals, each of
whom, through assessment of behavior, intentions, and felt obligations, is
expected to behave in normatively appropriate ways (Bryk & Schneider, 2002, as

Hoy and Kupersmith (1985) in their early study of school trust defined trust as “a
generalized expectancy held by the work group that the word, promises, and written or
oral statement of another individual, group, or organization can be relied upon” (p. 2).

Corinne Bernard, Cohort 1 trainer, speaking of the Resident Educator Program, admitted
to tentatively trusting the Ohio Department of Education:

I guess I am taking [ODE] at their word. I think behind the scenes, everybody
knows that at any moment, for any reason, anything can change. I’m just saying it
out loud. I guess whichever way the wind blows, politically or whatever ... I am
taking them at their word (October 11, 2011).

The state trainers had first to trust the organization, the Ohio Department of Education.
To trust an organization, particularly a bureaucracy, can be challenging. Even the earliest
organizational trust research (Boon & Holmes, 1991; Deutsch, 1958; Lindskold, 1978;
Pilisuk & Skolnick, 1968; Solomon, 1960) has shown that individual perception of
trustworthiness is a historically-dependent process that waxes or wanes over the span of
their cumulative interaction. These studies show “reciprocity in exchange relations enhances trust, while the absence or violation of reciprocity erodes it” (Kramer, 1999, p. 576). It can become a matter of *quid pro quo*—mutual consideration and performance by both parties. In the course of this policy implementation, the state trainers conducted their exchange relations with ODE. When they felt reciprocated, the state trainers trusted ODE and conveyed that trust to their “constituencies,” the individuals they trained. Studying apparel firms in New York City, Uzzi (1997) found that “go-betweens” operating between apparel firms and their vendors were able to connect expectations and opportunities from existing relationships to new ones, “furnishing a basis for trust and subsequent commitments to be offered and discharged” (p. 48). Melody Stallings (as quoted on p. 106) related how the trainers used the relationships they had built to get “buy-in” by carefully tracing the connections between the old and new induction programs, explaining the alignment of the two and conveying the trainers’ belief that it works. Burt and Knez (1995) found that third parties—like these state trainers/intermediaries—become significant conduits of trust because of their ability to dismiss rumors and to clarify trust-relevant information. State trainers shared how a significant portion of the trainings could be taken up by questions. When I conducted trainings, as a known “ODE name,” even more questions emerged. My co-trainers took notes on my responses to use for subsequent trainings and explained to me how this was a regular feature of their quarterly State Trainer Academies, asking questions that arose at trainings and writing down the “official” answers.
Collective Trust

The connections the state trainers had with staff at ODE and the relationships developed among them fostered the growth of collective trust, which Forsyth, Adams & Hoy (2012) defined as a “stable group property rooted in the shared perceptions and affect about the trustworthiness of another group or individual that emerges over time out of multiple social exchanges within the group” (italics mine, p. 22).

The state trainers share several attributes with voluntary associations, participatory organizations composed of members who share similar political and civic values in which they facilitate social connections and cooperation (Anheier & Kendall, 2002). Though political and social scientists (Fukuyama, 1995; Putnam, 2000; Putnam et al, 1993 among others) have decried the current decline in voluntary association memberships, connecting it to a decline in societal trust in general, they once regarded voluntary associations as a part of society’s social infrastructure that “makes the generation of trust possible … that [they] at least makes it easier for trust relations and trusting attitudes to develop and to re-enforce themselves in the population” (Anheier & Kendall, 2002, p. 344).

These trust relationships (collective trust) serve as a social lubricant (Stolle, 1998), making “a variety of forms of social interaction and cooperation possible in a wider community or region … one of the main indicators of social capital” (p. 503). Collective trust arises from multiple exchanges among group members in which perceptions of others are shared, consciously and subconsciously, verbally and non-verbally. These shared trust beliefs provoke the group’s willingness to put themselves collectively at risk
to another group or individual. Forsyth, Adams and Hoy (2012), find collective trust to be “an especially useful construct for studying organizations composed of interdependent groups” (p. 26) and so I apply it to this study of the state trainers. Figure 10 depicts the Forsyth, Adams, and Hoy (2012) model of collective trust development, which links to organizational and trust theory (p. 25). An adaptation of their model of collective trust development, reflecting insights gained from interviews with the state trainers, appears as Figure 11. A more fulsome explanation follows the figures.
Figure 10: Forsyth, Adams & Hoy (2012, p. 25) Model of Collective Trust Formation and Its Consequences
Figure 11: Development of Collective Trust among State Trainers
Forsyth, Adams, and Hoy (2012) saw their collective trust model as at its core “the social construction of shared belief within interdependent groups of an organization” (p. 24). Collective trust emerges from repeated verbal and non-verbal exchanges among group members, who consciously and unconsciously share their perceptions of other groups. Forsyth, Adams, and Hoy (2012) hold that three contexts affect the development of collective trust: external, internal, and task context.

**Contexts Affecting Collective Trust**

**External Context**

Each individual brings his/her own external context to the collective. Forsyth, Adams, and Hoy (2012) define external context as “the sum of environmental forces that have shaped and continue to shape the values, attitudes and expectations of individual group members” (p. 27). Research (Earle & Cvetkovich, 1995; Northcraft, Polzer, Neal & Kramer, 1995) has shown, the greater the disparities in values, worldviews, and background experience among group members, the less likely they are to develop trust. In Figure 11, I highlight three external context descriptors shared by the state trainers, which affect their values, attitudes, and expectations: they are all experienced teachers or administrators, who have worked with previous induction programs and have forged positive professional relationships in their regions.

The development of collective trust occurs within Cohort 1 as they begin their credentialing process as state trainers. The state trainer group, particularly the first cohort, shared similar educational experiences and career trajectories. Most spent at least 15 years in the classroom and then moved up to building, central office, or
educational service center administrative positions. Though only three from Cohort 1 held full-time higher education positions, several of the others had served as adjunct instructors. A third of Cohort 1 had been working with teacher induction through every Ohio iteration, dating back over 10 years. They shared a belief in the importance of teacher induction and a commitment to the Ohio programs. In their separate regions, the state trainers had already forged positive professional relationships with fellow educators, which contributed to the success of the program. It was definitely more effective than sending out a corps of ODE staff, Melody Stallings explained,

> Only because I think you had those people that people knew from the region and so they identified with them for whatever reason and mostly that identification was very positive. As I said, those are the people that have accomplished some really wonderful things (December 13, 2011).

She went on to identify members of Cohort 1 by name, and noted,

> Those were people that had outstanding reputations, that had worked in LPDC, that had worked in the Entry Year Program ... with Praxis III. It helped to have people that were involved in that as assessors, as coordinators. But for us to say—“this is how far we’ve come”... it helped give credibility (December 13, 2011).

Besides mutual admiration for one another, Cohort 1 had, as Sam Canella tells it, “camaraderie, a level of respect that was achieved by everybody” (December 12, 2011).

Groups with converging values have a greater likelihood for developing collective trust. Cohort 1 valued the mentor role in teacher induction, speaking of their own mentors and mentoring experiences in respondent interviews and while conducting trainings. Their personal enthusiasm for the Ohio training and the program it represented extended to evangelistic proportions, speaking in metaphors of spiritual enlightenment. That is not to say that their language did not infiltrate Cohort 2. Trainers
from both cohorts employed the same vernacular, calling themselves “messengers” with “a mission to accomplish.” Lizzie Wolff, a Cohort 2 trainer saw herself so integral to the mission, that in interviews, she consistently referred to herself and ODE as “we.” She reminisced about her early experiences with induction programs, “…When I first came into this work 11 years ago, there was a similar type of network and it saved my soul” (December 1, 2011). Extending the preaching metaphor, Delia Earle (Cohort 2) admitted they had “the hope that once they hear it, they will also embrace it” (October 13, 2011).

Yet only Cohort 1 can be credibly aligned to characteristics of voluntary associations, which Anheier and Kendall (2002) wrote made “the generation of trust possible, [making] it easier for trust relationship and trusting attitudes to develop” (p. 344) in that their affiliation with the Resident Educator Program was unpaid. Though Cohort 1 underwent a selection process, they were nonetheless volunteers. Sam Canella, explaining that Cohort 1 knew they would not be paid for their services, said,

> It wasn’t money then, it was about this mission...it took me awhile to see where the hell we were going but once I did, I’m going, “This is what I have been preaching!” So that mission and that camaraderie did pull us together to want things to be better (December 12, 2011).

### Internal Context

Internal context, or the organizational conditions of groups, can include the structure and leadership of an organization, as well as its history and its goals. Forsyth, Adams and Hoy (2012) define internal context as

> the sum of forces within the organization that shape the values, attitudes, and expectations of individuals and groups within the organization. These include existing group beliefs about the trustworthiness of other individuals and groups.
whose cooperation is necessary, inside and outside the organization (p. 27).

In Figure 11, I include three organizational conditions that characterized Cohort 1’s experience: *simultaneous credentialing, sequestering* and *shared experiences*. If the bond of collective trust developed among Cohort 1 because of these three factors, their absence may have led to the disintegration of collective trust when the team expanded to include Cohort 2.

Cohort 1 gathered for four consecutive days to earn their credential as state trainers. Each trainer was introduced to the New Teacher Center Instructional Mentoring™ training using an identical protocol, guided by NTC’s own trainers. Every activity, paper, and word was synchronized. Misunderstandings were clarified quickly during a pair of State Trainer Academies, held during two evenings of the four-day stay at a central Ohio hotel. To facilitate the intense schedule, three meals a day were provided for the state trainers, essentially sequestering them within the hotel for the full four days. Training began promptly at 8:30 am each day and ended at 4:30 pm. Dinner began by 5:15 pm to allow for a 6:00 pm start for the academies, which ended at 9:00 pm. Several of the state trainers met afterwards. In Sam Canella’s words:

> Yeah, I think we were almost in basic training and . . . a bunch of us spent time at the bar at night trying to figure this out; we’d talk. And you know there was some self-teaching that happened after the sessions because we knew at the end of the week, we were going to go out into the land (December 12, 2011).

This trainer “boot camp” fostered relationships among the group, many of whom were strangers to one another until that week. As Canella explained,

> Did you know you could get that same caliber of group together to believe as
deeply as they ended up believing and advancing so far forward in a collaborative nature? . . . I knew [Melody]. She was the only person I knew in that whole room (December 12, 2011).

New Teacher Center intended to cultivate connections among the state trainers, particularly to guard their brand. The prescriptive Facilitation Guides and copyrighted training materials attest to the import to NTC of “fidelity to the model,” a phrase so often used in training that 11 of 12 respondents discussed it at length during their interviews. New Teacher Center products and activities hint at the creation of a shared identity which organizational researchers Nahapiet and Ghoshal (1998) believed resulted from ongoing creation and negotiation of shared understandings. While NTC was not necessarily open to negotiating their brand, they repeatedly engaged the trainers in storytelling, relating the trainers’ experiences to the precepts of the NTC training. Nahapiet and Ghoshal (1998) cite Brown and Deguid (1991) who described this as process as allowing “an individual rep [to] contribute to the construction and development of his or her own identity as a rep and reciprocally to the construction and development of the community of reps in which he or she works” (p. 68). As state trainers shared stories they intended to use in trainings, NTC facilitators repeated them to the group, carefully tailoring the retelling to represent more accurately the New Teacher Center brand.

Forsyth, Adams and Hoy (2012) found “incongruent expectations and orientations” (p. 56) less likely to engender collective trust. Cohort 1 shared many such experiences. At the outset, they had been led to believe that they would be responsible to train at most 2,400 mentors statewide. The actual training burden was over twice that,
leaving some trainers holding sessions four days a week and others crisscrossing the state to gather materials or help colleagues in busier areas. Trainers also had a long list of concierge duties to complete prior to the sessions: scheduling training sites and caterers, ordering training manuals, duplicating materials, plus preparing sign-in sheets and nametags. Afterward, the trainers had to submit attendance rosters and evaluation surveys to ODE. Melody Stallings held trainings primarily in the ESC where she worked, which meant she had support staff to complete many of the concierge and administrative duties. Yet she was caught off-guard: “My expectation from what I was told was that the trainings would go no further than really November, [perhaps wrap up in the] end of October or early November” (December 13, 2011) The reality?

I did trainings up until ... my co-trainer and myself kind of took a mandatory break in February! I think in the first year — we figured it out — we trained, I think ... between a thousand and twelve-hundred mentors through our ESC alone (December 13, 2011).

Nicole Tharpe admitted she was not prepared for the magnitude ... [for] the training, to actually suck the life out of you for a couple years, involving the amount of time it did to prepare, to get all the parts and pieces. By that I mean from running off your own materials to finding your own place to have it, the behind-the-scenes work (September 30, 2011).

That initial year of training left Cohort 1 with a backlog of shared experiences, many negative, which rather than discouraging the formation of collective trust served to cement their bond. Research on school trust (Bryk & Schneider, 2002; Forsyth, Adams & Hoy, 2012) has shown that adverse social and economic conditions, commonly regarded as external barriers to trust, can serve to unite the internal group as it develops processes to connect and unify. “As long as internal conditions support cooperative and
interdependent transactions among school members, collective trust can exist” (Forsyth, Adams & Hoy, p. 56). The fact that Cohort 1 was not paid that first year received relatively little mention considering all that was expected of that group. Just two respondents spoke of it and their words hint at the group cohesion that developed in spite of adverse circumstances. “I still remember the day [ODE associate director/name redacted] stood up to say, ‘Some of you thought maybe this was a paid position, but I’m sorry it isn’t,’” Sam Canella recalled. “But everybody stayed in the room! That said something about us that day. So it wasn’t the money then, it was about this mission” (December 12, 2011). Nellie Vincent’s view was a bit more pragmatic, “Somebody reminded me when I was training, ‘You know you guys worked the whole first year for nothing.’ And I don’t like to be reminded of that” (November 19, 2011). However, as she continued, she sounded a lot like Canella:

The first group did that because we’re dedicated professionals …. [We] helped forge something new and I don’t think any of us got involved in it for the money to begin with …. We've invested so much of our personal time and you know, blood, sweat and tears because it’s something we believed in (November 19, 2011).

Task Context

The task context affects the social construction of collective trust whether the task is simple or complex. Teaching has often been described as complex (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005), resisting cookie-cutter formulas for success. It has never been predictable in terms of its process. Education does not operate like a manufacturing plant, “taking in standard raw material; enacting an invariable and simple, linear, standard process; and finally emitting a standard product” (Forsyth, Adams, Hoy, 2012,
In fact, it is more so the opposite: working with nonstandard materials, using nonstandard processes, education most reliably produces a nonstandard product. Though many tacitly agree with that reality, we are well into the age of accountability, where absence of a standard product indicates organizational failure. The arguably complex task of implementing a new state program through its training requires collective trust to function well. Developing that trust in the midst of staggering variability requires strong leadership, utilizing formal controls which make expectations explicit, and as Das and Teng (1998) indicated, includes policies, procedures, rules, hierarchy, forms, direct supervision and evaluation. The state trainer's task context included providing Instructional Mentoring and Resident Educator training plus duties above and beyond, such as the concierge duties associated with each training session. As the program moved from its transition version to the Resident Educator Program, it proliferated its document store: it had program standards, task matrices for district personnel, handbooks and training manuals aplenty. The first cohort of state trainers began under rigid oversight from the New Teacher Center. The original training, Instructional Mentoring™ was a New Teacher Center product, refined over many years and packaged for identical use, regardless its setting. The New Teacher Center, as the contracted vendor, agreed to facilitate the process of transitioning to the Ohio Resident Educator Program. In the bargain, they advanced their own product, and the accompanying training protocol. The original cohort of trainers first participated in  

---

ODE had secured the inclusion of its own Standards for Ohio Educators, but little else in the IM training was changed.
Instructional Mentoring™ (IM) training, led by NTC personnel. There was little room for variation from the routine, but the trainers seemed to cling to the training protocol, as it provided a “predictable and secure environment” in which, “control constrains uncertainty” (Forsyth, Adams & Hoy, 2012, p. 110). As noted previously, this was standard operating procedure for NTC who fiercely guarded their product, expected full adherence to their protocol, and soundly rejected requests for change.

Melody Stallings explained that Cohort 1 felt entrusted with the policy deployment from the outset, and credited her Catholic school education for her ability to “follow things to the letter.” But she was not alone. She continued,

I really feel that first cohort of trainers ... even though we were kind of blinded by the number of trainings and the intensity; that was a group that I really saw gel very quickly into this community of leaders .... So I think it was the message that we had to have this fidelity to the training that was not due to any strong-arm tactics by ODE, but by really feeling we were a part of something important that was coming down the pike. We were building this foundation ... (December 13, 2011).

Similarly, Sonja Caulder noted, “We don’t have a lot of control, but we have to keep it to the program so everybody’s hearing the same thing” (November 15, 2011). Nicole Tharpe admitted she tends not to make changes “because I figure that I’m an employee and I’ve been told to do this, this and this... [I might give more time] but I would never leave anything out all the way” (September 30, 2011).

The Cohort 1 Bond: The Development of Collective Trust

Their nearly identical external contexts and shared internal and task contexts brought Cohort 1 together, but does not adequately explain the development of collective trust among them. Their socialization over the course of the first year, through the
hundred plus training sessions and regular State Trainer Academies, led to collective trust—in ODE, yes—but more powerfully in themselves as a group. The state trainers risked their professional reputations to complete their training task, which they regarded as a shared commitment. Consequently, Cohort 1 trainers readily offered themselves as substitutes even in locations far outside their assigned regions. They would crisscross the state to meet one another simply to pass on needed training materials. They responded to panicky late-night emails and texts with needed documents, or assurances that they did indeed have the required posters made or supplies purchased. High levels of interdependence correspond with risk, which feeds the need for collective trust.

Public schools—comprised of several interdependent factions: faculty, administration, students, staff, parents, and community—add to the complexity and unpredictability of the whole (Bryk & Schneider, 2002). Similarly, the interdependent factions in policy implementation, by virtue of their number, composition, locality, and diversity, add to the complexity and unpredictability of the implementation process. If collective trust is a factor in successful functioning of discrete social entities, like the state trainers, it becomes important to understand how collective trust develops and what factors contribute to its disintegration, a phenomenon not considered in the models offered in Figures 10 and 11. Bryk and Schneider (2002) suggested trust originates in the “dynamic interplay among four considerations: respect, competence, personal regard for others, and integrity” (p. 23). Cohort 1 trainers frequently spoke of their same cohort colleagues using terms that indicate the presence of each of these attributes.
Respect

Cohort 1 spoke of respect for one another, from their assigned training partner to the group as a whole. Corinne Bernard noted, “I was paired with somebody I have incredible respect for and felt honored and privileged, sincerely honored and privileged to be able to work with this person” (October 11, 2011). Sam Canella observed, in “… that first group in particular, there was camaraderie, a level of respect that was achieved by everybody” (December 12, 2011). They respected one another, but also felt that members of their cohort were respected by educators in the field: “We had people that had reputations in education that preceded this program … I think that made a world of difference. When people saw them in training, they thought, You know what? They’ve never steered me wrong before” (Melody Stallings, December 13, 2011).

Competence

The trainers in the first cohort saw each other as competent and felt the time they spent co-training added to their collective competence. “You learn so much and you take things from what other people share and do,” Corinne Bernard observed (October 11, 2011). Sam Canella related how training content was often a topic of conversation, “So there really was ongoing discussion about how to make things better” (December 12, 2011). Others heaped praise on specific trainers, calling her “fabulous” or him “such a natural.”

Cohort 1 also recognized the competence of the New Teacher Center: “I was very impressed by the caliber of the trainers from the New Teacher Center. It seemed to me from the very beginning that what they did was kind of tried and true” (Melody
Despite subsequent struggles with New Teacher Center over the rigid training protocol, Cohort 1 trainers, even Melody Stallings, who confronted NTC on behalf of her trainer colleagues, spoke positively of the organization: “I learned a lot from those folks ... with them keeping that tight a rein .... I learned a lot from them and wouldn't have wanted to miss that opportunity either” (Melody Stallings, December 13, 2011). Corinne Bernard took time to elaborate about the conflict and to commend the trainers’ collective competence:

All anybody wanted to change in the first place was the strategies or maybe the order. NOT the core, NOT the message, NOT the nuts and bolts. So in this way, we are given just a little more latitude to do that without New Teacher Center on board. And if you can do that, then you can adjust to your audience, to your own personal style, without compromising the fidelity of the training itself (October 11, 2011).

Cohort 1 trainers also credited the competence of ODE: “I think [our success] was due in large part not only to the state trainers, but also to the Ohio Department of Education. We had a huge amount of support, support that you don't necessarily see in other programs” (Melody Stallings, December 13, 2011). Nellie Vincent observed, “I always felt that the ODE staff was always willing to listen to our ideas... they were open to listening to things” (November 19, 2011).

Personal Regard for Others

The state trainers frequently acknowledged their “wonderful working relationship,” speaking of working “together, hand in glove, doing exactly what we’re supposed to be doing” (Sam Canella, December 12, 2011). Even as trainers intentionally departed from the NTC protocol, they still held each other in high regard. Nellie Vincent
admitted, “We do things a little bit differently; however, I thought they’ve all been very positive and all been very good” (November 19, 2011). Their personal regard extended also to the mentors that they trained. Corinne Bernard spoke at length of the atmosphere she tried to create in the room, “So we’re going to put some flowers around, [add] some homey touches so you feel comfortable and you feel welcome here and know we were expecting you” (October 11, 2011). She explained the importance of welcoming the teacher trainees,

The more it looks like we were expecting you to come, [that you] weren’t an afterthought. [It says] I didn’t come here grudgingly. I came here excited to be with you today. That’s why it’s so incredibly important to me to build the relationships with the people at the trainings, so that they walk away feeling supported, that we are sincere, and that this is important (October 11, 2011).

Integrity

Cohort 1 viewed one another as principled, intelligent, and trustworthy individuals. It is significant, also, that they believed in the integrity of the induction policy, the Resident Educator program, and its training protocol. Sonja Caulder tracked it back to their earliest days together, “I think, again, it’s back to all of us sharing our experiences, saying, ‘Yeah, that is right. I never thought of it that way’” (November 15, 2011). Rather than dispute one another, they were open to each other’s ideas. They also were open to learning from the New Teacher Center: “I couldn’t quite understand why they were placing so much importance on [this or]that, but then the longer I trained, I realized the important of that connectivity …” (Nellie Vincent, November, 2011).

Each Cohort 1 trainer spoke of fidelity to the message. Nellie Vincent noted, “[We] understood the importance, of the integrity of everybody getting the same thing ....
The integrity of the protocol is extremely important.” When sharing how her co-trainer had tweaked the protocol, she explained, “There were a few things that he just kind of integrated and embedded into that training that didn’t change the integrity, but just added a few things” (November 19, 2011). Melody Stallings spoke about negotiating about changes: “It’s always with an understanding we have to keep the fidelity of the program across the region and that becomes more important than any one idea ... being accepted by everybody” (December 13, 2011).

Collective Trust: Consequences and Variations

Rather than insist that the presence of collective trust has a causal relation to various outcomes or behaviors, Forsyth, Adams and Hoy (2012) preferred to use the term consequences to refer to “conditions that appear to emerge in the presence of collective trust” (p. 78). They list 10 possible consequences in their school-based model (see Figure 10). My data and the previous discussion suggest these five apply to intermediaries: collaboration, authentic interaction, collegial behavior, collective efficacy, and professionalism (see Figure 11). It is important to note that these consequences of trust, which Stolle (1998) suggested could “be used to achieve groups’ purposes more efficiently and easily” (p. 500), changed over time. The following sections examine the variations in collective trust and propose possible causes.

Trust Grows

According to Stolle (1998), membership in voluntary associations could “facilitate the learning of cooperative attitudes and behavior, including reciprocity” (p. 500). Membership in voluntary associations increased face-to-face interactions and therefore
created an ideal setting for the development of in-group trust. Cohort 1 trainers volunteered for the state trainer team, knowing there would be no payment for their services. A relatively homogenous group, they shared extensive educational experience and prior involvement with teacher induction. They had been early adopters of previous teacher induction programs, and heavily involved with the former program when they signed on to promote the Transition Resident Educator Program. They were trained simultaneously during a single week in 2009, spending the week together in a hotel. In addition to four full training days, they were required to attend two “Trainer Academies” of three hours each on two of the four evenings. Their meals were provided, so there was no need to leave the premises. They were thrust into numerous face-to-face exchanges and created other opportunities on their own. Trainers shared how they voluntarily spent additional time puzzling through the training in the late evenings. The hours they spent together that first week were but a taste of the training year that followed. Their recollections from the interviews speak to the burden of the workload and the camaraderie that developed. Their collective trust grew.

The state trainers became a part of a horizontal network (Putnam, 1993), where each shared the same role and same level of power and influence, which promised similar experiences and reciprocity. Vertical networks, with their concomitant hierarchical struggles, often failed to sustain social trust or cooperation, which Putnam attributed to “vertical flows of information [that] are less reliable than horizontal flows (p. 174). Similarly, Stolle (1998) hypothesized that “associations with a high proportion of people doing voluntary work for the group are more effective in promoting generalized trust
than associations with a less engaged or more passive membership” (p. 502). This theory becomes significant when payment per training commences with the addition of the second cohort of trainers.

**Trust Wanes**

While the data in this study suggest the presence of collective trust—at least among Cohort 1 trainers—the group cohesiveness, sense of commitment, and efficient functionality tended to disappear over time. As noted earlier, for various reasons, ODE management changed the credentialing process in the second year. Each Cohort 2 trainer followed a separate path to credentialing, possibly paired with one other Cohort 2 trainer, but for the most part, attending trainings separate from his or her cohort group. Cohort 1 regarded their own cohesiveness as a group as “divine intervention” (Sam Canella, December 12, 2011) and regarded Cohort 2 with suspicion. As stated previously, Cohort 1 had the shared recollection and experience of shared burdens (a grossly underestimated and unpaid training task, a rigid training protocol) and collective struggles with NTC over fidelity to their training. After all, a Cohort 1 trainer admitted, “We have that history to speak of” (Sam Canella, December 12, 2011). To the original cohort, the newcomers were “people that haven’t been through the battles we have! How can they possibly understand what we’ve been through and how we’ve seen this transformation occur? Somebody new coming in can’t be on the same page” (Nellie Vincent, November 19, 2011).

Collective trust among Cohort 1 allowed them to meet the extensive training demand, but their Cohort 1 bond proved deleterious to collective trust within the whole
group once the second cohort of state trainers arrived. Cohort 1 trainers believed they shared a completeness or wholeness lacking in Cohort 2. Each of the six Cohort 1 trainers spoke of it; Sam Canella traced it back to the first week of training for Cohort 1:

You know there was some self-teaching that happened after the sessions because we knew at the end of the week, we were going to go out into the land. Better have a clear understanding. So, I think that was the missing ingredient and maybe that's why that same level of commitment and collegiality isn't there (December 12, 2011).

Nellie Vincent credited it to the frenetic pace of the entire first year, and their sacrifice as a group:

...we helped to forge something new and I don't think any of us got involved with it for the money to begin with. You know we saw it as a professional opportunity. But because we did that, because we sort of did some sacrificing and then later we were able to get some sort of payment to help us with the time we were spending. That's something somebody new can't be on the same page as we are because we've invested so much of our personal time ... (November 19, 2011).

Cohort 2 reaped the benefits of Cohort 1’s difficult year. The memorandum of understanding that relieved the state trainers of the concierge duties of the first year and ensured a per diem payment for trainings in the second and subsequent years resulted from the negative experiences of Cohort 1 trainers. Cohort 1 remarks illustrate palpable resentment toward Cohort 2. Sam Canella admitted, after relating stories of several Cohort 2 trainer gaffes, “I don’t know that you could get a group [like us] together a second time and I think I’m validating that by looking at Cohort 2”(December 12, 2011).

Stolle’s (1998) voluntary organization research showed that “members who recently joined are the ones who trust significantly less, and some members who joined for longer periods are more trusting in a generalized sense” (p. 511-512). Beyond the
simple length-of-membership difference was the way in which Cohort 2 entered the state trainer team. When Cohort 1 was empowered by ODE to oversee the simultaneous yet separate training of the newcomers, it drove a wedge of distinction between the two cohorts. This conversation with Cohort 2 trainer Deana Gorton sheds more light on the perceived differences:

DG: “I did train in different locations, but never without a partner. In fact, I always trained with an older trainer.”
LO: “You mean a trainer from Cohort 1?”
DG: “Yes … as a Cohort 2 trainer, I didn’t ever really get to work with another Cohort 2 trainer. There is definitely a difference.”
LO: “… is there a hierarchy of sorts?”
DG: “Oh, yes, I think so. Cohort 1 is much more assertive.”
LO: “Do you mean they take liberties?”
DG: “Well, from what I’ve heard, everybody moves a little bit from the script.”
LO: “Do you think you’ve influenced how the training has taken shape?
DG: “No. Cohort 1 has. It’s hard to tell if we [Cohort 2] have any impact” (December 12, 2011).

Samantha Truex, also Cohort 2, considering whether she was in fact an actor in this induction policy implementation, dismissed the question with a quick, “Cohort 1 definitely [was]. For Cohort 2, a lot of it was in place when we came on board” (November 21, 2011). The outlier from Cohort 2 was Lizzie Wolff, who by virtue of her ubiquitous presence in many Office of Educator Quality programs had been on the perimeter of the developing residency since 2007. Her responses read much like Cohort 1’s, and she explained her Cohort 1 colleagues’ resistance to adding new people to the training corps in this way:

Having not been there from the beginning, they might feel you can’t bring them up to speed fast enough. I think they could also be very protective of their role as
state trainer. I can understand that, I just can’t 100% agree that as the group dwindles or whatever that [state trainers] can continue to be the sole face of the program (December 1, 2011).

Though the size and complexity of the state trainer organization increased, this alone may have had little to do with the decline of collective trust. Managerial decisions made by ODE drew clear lines of distinction between the two cohorts by changing the credentialing protocol and by introducing payment per training. Cohort 1 had shared simultaneous credentialing that created an extended period of face-to-face exchanges among the group. Additionally they had each borne their part of the collective training burden, which far exceeded original estimates, without payment. Though Cohort 1 welcomed the $300 per training day honorarium, they resented that Cohort 2 received payment without similarly “suffering” as they had. Additional events that occurred during the third year constituted social changes for the state trainer group.

**Effects of Social Change**

I interviewed the state trainers at the outset of year three: two years of the Transition Resident Educator Program had been completed, and it was the first year of the official Ohio Resident Educator Program. Change was in the air: there were significant staff changes at ODE; the newest training (Resident Educator-1) was only one component of as-yet-undefined body of Ohio residency training for mentors; and among the training corps, rumors of trainers threatening to quit or actually quitting revealed a volatile, contentious environment.
Changes in Staff at ODE.

At the state level, three senior staff members (including me) had retired from the Office of Educator Quality; no one had assumed my former role and state trainers did not have a single point of contact at ODE for matters they had previously brought to me. The trainers found this troublesome. Sam Canella called “the layers” the problem and the “lack of delineation of who’s who in the layers.” After “hitting it hard” in August 2011, he thought they had “knocked the socks off of things,” meaning they had met the training demands. Yet an ESC manager demanded more. “My problem was—who, who was in charge?” Canella did not know where to turn at ODE. He acknowledged that he knew rumors of his dissatisfaction had reached ODE. “Nobody asked me what the problem was and that disappointed me. I wasn’t going to call people up and start being this obstinate ...” his voice trailed off before he took a deep breath and finished his thought, “Nobody ever asked what the problem was” (December 12, 2011). Formerly empowered and enthusiastic, relishing in his role in the Resident Educator program, Canella was disillusioned and removed from his intermediary role. Later in the interview, I learned that Canella was regularly traveling out of state for weeks at a time to care for an ailing parent, which may have contributed to his frustration.

Future Aspects of the Program Remained Undefined.

Though they were still mastering the newest required training (Resident Educator-1), state trainers knew that a new training loomed somewhere on the horizon for the second year of the four-year residency, as it did for all subsequent years. They also were told that the program would culminate in a summative assessment as mandated by
Ohio Revised Code. The legislation that had effectively ended Praxis III called for a substitute assessment. (See Appendix C: Ohio Revised Code 3301-24-04 Teacher residency.) However, ODE was parsing out as little information as possible about the rest of the Resident Educator Program. Corinne Bernard explained,

It's people not knowing what the summative assessment is. . .they are beside themselves that there is this invisible unknown assessment out there that they’re supposed to be preparing their resident educator for, but we have no clue what it is. There is so much out there that is nebulous, that is up for interpretation by whatever lens somebody’s got on at the moment, that isn't really clear cut for everybody (October 11, 2011).

She and other trainers conveyed this frustration to ODE at the State Trainers Academies, but failed to secure additional information. Lizzie Wolff concurred,

It’s hard not to have it all laid out. I’m very linear. At the same time, with so many internal factors impacting this it’s hard to [pause] it’s way beyond putting out three years in one. I respect that we get input and that we work to build upon what we’ve done in the first year [pause] I do worry that it would get [pause] because we are a local decision kind of state, local authority and stuff, it will get watered down to the point it won't be effective (December 1, 2011).

Contention and Unrest among Trainers.

With questions about leadership at ODE and a lack of clarity about subsequent years of the residency, trainers from both cohorts had resigned and rumors to that effect spread quickly. Sam Canella's name had come up as having resigned and I asked him about it before we began the interview questions. “I don't think I resigned from this,” he began. Those few words unleashed expression of his deep dissatisfaction. Canella explained that many of his issues resulted from “too many cooks in the kitchen,” “power struggles and non-collaborative personalities.” After several minutes’ explanation, the
situation became clear: Canella explained that he was “caught in the crossfire” between “opposing forces,” an ESC manager and one of his co-trainers (a Cohort 2 trainer). Generally, the ESC manager performs the concierge duties only, securing a training site and catering services and printing and distributing materials. In this case, his ESC manager demanded a certain number of trainings, refused to arrange them outside of her remotely-located ESC, sending a barrage of emails to that effect. Emails were followed by contentious phone calls. He reminisced about the days when this was “better than ice cream,” [Cohort 1’s first year] and asserted it’s now “nothing but a headache.” He went on to compare the conflicts to every war he could think of from world wars to Star Wars, but insisted that he wasn’t being overly sensitive: “I have been around a long time, but I have never seen a couple months like this in my life.” Additionally, the Cohort 2 co-trainer with whom he was assigned to work had sown many seeds of unrest with his continual complaining, about everything—from admitting a couple unregistered mentors at the door to the absence of bottled water. “So he’s raising hell,” Canella related, And then the coffee would be late, then the cookies were wrong and it was a real study in the negative. I mean I went into this like I did in the first two years, yet I was always off guard because something was always wrong [pause] minute to minute [pause] And he’s mad about the salary! He doesn’t like 300 bucks a day! It just went on and on (December 12, 2011).

Concerning that situation, one of the last things Canella said was that at least one trainer had quit because of the aforementioned trainer’s “help.” He would likely be another casualty: “You know I’m no youngster. I’ve been through the hoops and I guess here is where I was getting discouraged through all of this” (December 12, 2011).
Searching for Explanations

Threats to Collective Trust: Ambiguity and Lack of Oversight

Research from McEvily, Perrone and Zaheer (2003) suggested collective trust among the state trainers could be threatened by the continuing ambiguity, for managing “interdependence among individuals, units and activities in the face of behavioral uncertainties constitutes a key organizational challenge” (italics mine, p. 92). The task that was once perceived as clearly delineated had grown increasingly nebulous. The Transition Resident Educator Program had begun with a specific training protocol, manuals, and materials. The four-year Resident Educator Program was being developed a year at a time, if the materials released by ODE were any indication. State trainers noted their discomfort with not knowing and the difficulty of carrying out their task without access to the full four-year plan.

What the Resident Educator Program lacked was direct supervision and evaluation. Neither the ODE nor the team of trainers could hope to conduct genuine oversight of the program: In Ohio’s 88 counties, there are 617 public school districts, not including private, parochial and charter schools. Corinne Bernard (Cohort 1 trainer) envisioned appropriate oversight:

If they can support and if they can make sure that they can put it into place—but I have no assurance that this is going to happen—but if they put in place some kind of checks and balances that would make districts accountable for following the processes and really stepping up to the plate and doing what they’re saying they’re going to do, not just saying it but actually doing what they say they’re doing, I think it will be phenomenal and the change they will bring about will be incredible (October 11, 2011).
An Issue of Control

If formal controls, like those suggested by Corinne Bernard, are impossible or improbable to achieve (as seems to be the case due to the Resident Educator Program’s lack of capacity), trust is likely to decrease. Informal controls can achieve the same end of sustained collective trust by using focused norms to influence behavior. Forsyth, Adams and Hoy (2012) listed examples of social control mechanisms: recruitment, selection, socialization, training, and leader persuasion (p. 110), all of which contribute to norm formation and thus, establish some level of social control and help foster trust (Das & Teng, 1998). These social control mechanisms seem to have fostered a great deal of trust among Cohort 1 trainers; yet they did not have a similar effect among Cohort 2. Though their recruitment process was virtually identical to Cohort 1’s, Cohort 2’s credentialing process (socialization and training), progressed along individual timelines, and did not bring the new trainers to a single location for an extended period. Their commitment to the project and to each other was markedly different. No natural leaders emerged from Cohort 2 and both cohorts explicitly and tacitly acknowledged their differences. In this regard, voluntary association/trust research is of little help. According to Stolle (1998), “We do not know whether trust and cooperative attitudes increase linearly with the length of time spent in any type of association or whether they are a function of a particular type of involvement or a special type of group” (p. 499).

Charging the state trainer group with such a complex task in policy implementation requires significant support. Forsyth, Adams and Hoy (2012) recommend that complex tasks require strong leadership, leaders who use a combination
of social controls and trust:

Effective leaders will emphasize socialization to a common mission and goals, preferring soft means such as persuasion to shape culture, and for the most part, avoid forms of control based on unnecessary behavioral constraint. They will build trust by acting in ways that reveal them as trustworthy … [demonstrating] benevolence, honesty, openness, reliability and competence (p. 111).

The preceding quotation suggests effective leaders would acknowledge the intermediary role, while emphasizing the shared mission, and honor the professional capital brought to bear by the intermediaries, avoiding unnecessarily restrictive control. Perhaps the collective trust could have been maintained with strong, effective leaders. Early in the implementation, Cohort 1 regarded themselves as co-leaders (with the Ohio Department of Education) in a great mission; Cohort 2 looked to Cohort 1 (possibly begrudgingly) for leadership. By the end of this study, the state trainers indicated ambiguity in both leadership and task.

The Inherent Value Yet Delicate Nature of Collective Trust

Lessons learned from voluntary association research help identify the probable source of the initial trust among the state trainers. Putnam (1995a) found association members to be more trusting than the rest of the population, quite possibly because more trusting people self-select into voluntary associations. Recruitment of volunteers as the initial training team set them on course to develop collective trust and benefit from its consequences. However, trust was a delicate construct, subject to variation with the addition of new members and introduction of social change.

Forsyth, Adams, and Hoy (2012) concluded their book, Collective Trust, with the recommendation that trust be the “linchpin of reform diffusion” with the recognition
that reform is “a process affected by dynamic relationships” (p. 153). They suggested the route to school reform and improvement runs through collective trust. The study left the state trainers midway through a six-year implementation process. In the earliest stages, as they set the Transition Resident Educator Program in place, they developed a high level of collective trust, which served them well: they trained record numbers of teachers and set a foundation for acceptance of the four-year Resident Educator Program still under development. Yet, change on many fronts began to erode the collegiality and trust. That is not to say that the state trainers failed in their implementation mission. Their trainings transformed Ohio teacher induction from a system relying on a single summative assessment and loosely defined mentor support, to a multi-year system of formative assessment with clearly delineated mentor roles and responsibilities. The domains and criteria language of Praxis III has been replaced with Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession and the Resident Educator’s “Journey to Excellence.”

The state trainer team saw the increased capacity they lent to the department of education as their primary intermediary function. They not only completed the pragmatic task of facilitating training sessions in their regions, but they also invested their professional capital by acting as policy advocates across the state. They were spin-doctors, carefully tailoring their responses to negativity and potential misunderstandings, positively spinning them in favor of the new policy. They were anything but disingenuous: they truly believed in the induction policy change and their words revealed their near evangelistic commitment to the residency program.

It is impossible to read the state trainers’ stories and not see their inexplicable
commitment, a factor that cannot be created or controlled. As the Cohort 1 trainers tell it, this policy change touched them deeply and motivated them to take unpaid positions in addition to their regular employment that left them exhausted and overwhelmed.

Perhaps Corinne Bernard spoke for the team when she expressed her great hopes for the residency program:

And it may actually, if it were done correctly and standardized enough, it may actually level the playing field in terms of how well our teachers are equipped to go into the classroom. In other words, you would have more of a consistent quality of teacher no matter where they are teaching, rather than providing all of this extra training in a district that can afford it and a district that can’t afford it doesn’t get anything. If we’re providing this all across the state for four years in a consistent manner, who knows what that might do for the achievement of all kids? (October 11, 2011).
CHAPTER 7
Conclusions and Implications

While numerous studies (Chrispeels, 1997; Firestone, 1989; Malen & Hart, 1987; Wong, 1986) confirm the complex nature of policy implementation, Malen (2006) argued that bringing the reality of its “messy process marked by combinations of contests, contingencies, and disruptions that cannot be fully anticipated let alone readily controlled” (p. 99) is an important service. Also, Malen acknowledged that

In-depth treatments of how political exchanges carried out in state education agencies are relatively scarce … such gaps in research skew our explanations of policy dilution by placing primary responsibility for those patterns on service providers and their immediate supervisors. A more fulsome exploration might expose how actors throughout the system affect policy implementation not only by the initiatives they authorize and the political games they play to enact policy but also by the roles they assume or avoid during implementation. Such an enhancement might unveil opportunities to enhance policy development and to revive more empirically balanced understandings of actor roles and responsibilities (p. 102, italics mine).

While this research shows policy implementation as a complex, iterative and uncertain process, it also situates the actors within the context of the policy, its people and its places, essential interrelated influences in policy (Odden & Marsh, 1989) since “the benefits or limitations of one dimension cannot be adequately understood separate from the other” (Honig, 2006, p. 19). In that way, it addresses the first research question: Who are the primary actors/factions in this policy implementation? What roles do they fulfill? How do
they interact?

The implementation study presented here is fundamentally a social one, exploring the relationships among three primary factions: the state agency, the policy entrepreneur, and the intermediaries, while focusing on the intermediaries. It answers the second research question—What functions do state trainers undertake in the implementation process? How do they describe the work that they do? — by identifying them as intermediaries who occupy the position between the policy source (policymakers, policy developers, and policy entrepreneurs) and the district and school personnel who enact the policy.

While Honig’s (2004) definition of intermediaries applied to intermediary organizations, this study finds that individuals sharing the intermediary role enact similar functions. Intermediaries employ local knowledge (Kalb, 2006), facilitate ongoing knowledge building processes, wield professional capital (Hargreaves & Fullan, 2012), and increase capacity to facilitate implementation. In these ways, this study shows intermediaries to be a powerful tool in bridging the gap between state education agencies and the schools and districts they serve.

Tracing the development and erosion of collective trust addresses issues in the third research question, What internal, institutional and environmental forces influence the behaviors of the state trainers as a group? This study suggests that the development of collective trust (Forsyth, Adams & Hoy, 2012) among the first cohort of state trainers supported and enhanced their intermediary functions, enabling them to leverage their professional capital in the interest of the policy implementation. Unfortunately, the addition of a second cohort of state trainers the following year saw the erosion of
collective trust, as the group fell prey to effects of social change, ambiguity, lack of oversight and issues of control (Forsyth, Adams & Hoy, 2012; Putnam, 1995a; Stolle, 1998).

This study has its limitations. While this policy implementation study sheds light on “how policy exchanges are carried out in state education agencies” (Malen, 2006, p. 102), it relies on a relatively small number (12) of informants and the interpretation of a researcher often situated inside the policy being studied. The strength of my multiple perspectives of the policy implementation (observer, actor, mediator, author, trainer, logistical manager, and researcher) could be simultaneously undermined by my myopic view.

While this study suggests that intermediaries can function effectively in statewide policy implementation, it is still a cautionary tale. State agencies have to be willing to hand off some of their long-held roles to intermediaries, to trust the intermediaries to use their professional capital to provide a consistent program across the state as they convey the policy to the enactors. Similarly, the state agency must be willing to take part in developing ongoing knowledge building processes, to strengthen the intermediary role and to empower the teachers charged with enacting the policy. To effectively bridge the gap between the policy developers (the state agency) and the policy enactors (the teachers) requires the intermediaries to have firm connections on either side. The state agency must respond in kind, enabling the intermediaries to perform each of their intermediary functions. Similarly, the intermediaries have to be viewed as such by the policy enactors, who tend to trust individuals possessing local
knowledge and professional capital.

Though these intermediaries were shown to have collective trust (Forsyth, Adams & Hoy, 2012) as evidenced by their mutual respect, shared competence, personal regard for others and integrity, it may have resulted in part to engaging volunteers, who in general have trusting natures (Putnam, 1995a). And, if their intermediary success rested in any part on their collective trust, which degraded over time, what steps might be taken to preserve the trust? While it is not possible in large-scale policy implementation to limit the size and complexity of the group, efforts could be made to mitigate social change and volatility. This quantitative study of collective trust among intermediaries barely scratches the surface of over 30 years of studies of collective trust in schools (Bryk & Schneider, 2002; Cook & Cooper, 2003; Costa, 2003; Hoy & Kupersmith, 1985; Whitener, Brodt, Korsgaard & Werner, 1998 and others). Expanding that body of research to include the operation of collective trust in other educational groups could provide insights into consonant policy implementation. Certainly several areas of collective trust await qualitative examination, but for policy implementation research, it is important to consider how organizational structures influence collective trust, how organizations can create and support collective trust, and how they can retain and rejuvenate collective trust over time.
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Appendix A: Email Recruitment Letter

January 15, 2011

To the state trainers:

Each of you knows me in my role as an assistant director in the Office of Educator Quality at the Ohio Department of Education (ODE). However, I am emailing you today as a doctoral student at Ohio State University. As part of my PhD work with Professor Jan Nespor, I am studying the development and implementation of Transition Resident Educator Program.

Please understand that in spite of my work with the Ohio Department of Education, this research is entirely separate from that role. The products of this research will not be shared with the Department of Education. None of the electronic communications related to this research will originate at ODE; please do not use my ODE email address when communicating with me regarding this project.

As part of my research, I would like to interview you for around 45-60 minutes about your views on the program, and your role and experience working with it. The questions will focus on your work as a state trainer in the Ohio Department of Education Transition Resident Educator Program. The interviews are semi-structured, which means I have a list of topics – how did you become involved, what has your role been, how has the program changed across the course of your work with it, and so on – but the exact order and form of the question will vary depending on what you've done and how you respond. The semi-structured format also means that you should feel free to introduce topics that are relevant to the issue that I may not have thought of.

I would like to conduct these interviews face-to-face – I will meet you at a time and place that is convenient for you – but if a face-to-face meeting is not possible, we could talk via Skype or through some other electronic medium. The interviews will be digitally recorded, and I will transcribe them into text, substituting code numbers or pseudonyms for names that might identify you as the speaker. Only I and my supervising professor will have access to these transcripts, although I may quote passages from them in my dissertation or other publications. Only the researchers will have access to the digital files, which will be kept on secure media for at least two years, and destroyed (erased) upon completion of the study.
You can stop the interview at any point and you don't have to answer any question that you don't wish to answer. There is no penalty for withdrawing from the interview – or for refusing to do it in the first place. Your decision to participate in the interview will have no impact on your relationship with me in my role with the Ohio Department of Education or with your work you may do with or for the ODE. None of this research will be conducted from ODE or during my ODE work hours. If you have questions about the interview or the research please ask at any point. I do not intend to deal with any topics that would be controversial or outside legitimate public interest.

If after the interview I need to ask further questions to clarify something said during the interview, I would like permission to contact you by telephone. This follow-up session should be brief and you may elect not to participate beyond the original interview.

I intend to attribute your words by general position (e.g., college professor, Educational Service Center employee, full-time release mentor, retired teacher) and pseudonym. Keep in mind that even masking identities in these ways may not prevent your close associates from guessing your identity. I will not confirm nor deny any such guesses. When I refer to published, publicly accessible material, the offices and organizations mentioned in those documents will be named.

Contact information:
Lorie Owens
614-886-3030
owens.836@buckeyemail.osu.edu

Dr. Jan Nespor
614-688-3084
nespor.2@osu.edu

For questions about your rights as a participant in this study or to discuss other study-related concerns or complaints with someone who is not part of the research team, you may contact Ms. Sandra Meadows in the Office of Responsible Research Practices at 1-800-678-6251.

I will go over this information with you again at the time of the interview, give you a chance to ask questions or for clarification (you may of course email or call me at any time with questions).

If you consent to participate in the interviews, your typed name in the signature blank and originating from your personal email will be equivalent to a manually-signed document. Your signature below indicates acknowledgment of the above and consent to participate in the research.

____________________________  ______________________________
Signature                                     Date
Appendix B: Ohio Revised Code 3301-24-04 Teacher residency

(A) Resident educators

(1) Candidates for the resident educator program shall hold a resident educator license issued pursuant to rule 3301-24-18 of the Administrative Code or an alternative resident educator license issued pursuant to rules 3301-24-19 to 3301-24-22 of the Administrative Code.

(2) Beginning July 1, 2011, any individual who is employed under a resident educator license or alternative resident educator license and who meets eligibility criteria established by the Ohio department of education (education.ohio.gov) shall be required to successfully complete a resident educator program consistent with standards established by the Ohio department of education (education.ohio.gov).

(3) Any initial licensure applicant who has completed at least two years of teaching in another state as a participant in the teach for America program shall be credited by the state board of education as having completed two years of the teacher residency program. Out-of-state applicants with fewer than three years of experience in their area of preparation shall be required to complete a resident educator program pursuant to the requirements of this rule, and those out-of-state applicants who have completed one or two years of teaching in another state shall be credited by the state board of education as having completed the equivalent number of years of the teacher residency program.
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(B) Resident educator program

(1) A resident educator program shall include a performance-based assessment of the resident educator as prescribed by the state board of education, and a formal program of support, which shall include mentoring to foster professional growth of the candidate that is congruent with the required performance-based assessment.

(2) Beginning July 1, 2011, school districts, chartered community schools, and chartered non-public schools shall be required to provide a resident educator program that includes a formal structured program of support, which shall include mentoring, and the performance-based assessment as described in this rule.

(3) Candidates shall be deemed to have met the requirements for a professional educator license upon documentation of the successful completion of the resident educator program.

(C) Resident educator support

(1) A formal program of support for resident educators shall consist of four academic years; if, however, a teacher is employed on a date after the school year begins, the resident educator program for that candidate shall consist of a minimum of one-hundred twenty school days for each of the four years.

(2) Residency support for the beginning teacher shall include mentoring provided on an ongoing basis that is both congruent with the required performance-based assessment and consistent with standards established by the Ohio department of education (education.ohio.gov).

(D) Resident educator performance assessment
(1) The performance-based assessment of resident educators pursuant to this rule shall be administered under the authority of the state board of education.

(2) The performance-based assessment of the resident educator shall be administered during the third or fourth year of teaching. Passage of the assessment results in eligibility for the professional educator license.

(a) If the resident educator does not pass the assessment, the individual shall be required to retake the deficient portions of the assessment.

(b) Individuals who had only one opportunity to pass the performance-based assessment during the life of the resident educator license or alternative resident educator license shall be issued a one-year extension of the resident educator license or alternative resident educator license during which the individual shall be required to retake the deficient portions of the assessment.

(c) Failure to pass the deficient portions of the performance-based assessment while teaching under a one-year extension of the resident educator license or alternative resident educator license shall result in ineligibility for a professional educator license or any additional extension of the resident educator license or alternative resident educator license for a minimum of one year. The resident educator shall be required to complete additional coursework, supervised field experiences, and/or clinical experiences as designated by a college or university approved for educator preparation.

(d) Upon the recommendation of the college or university and re-employment of the individual as a teacher, an additional one-year extension of the resident educator license or alternative resident educator license may be issued, and the individual shall be
required to retake and pass the deficient portions of the performance-based assessment in order to qualify for a professional educator license.

(e) Continued failure to pass the deficient portions of the performance-based assessment shall result in a repeat of the process described in paragraphs (D)(2)(c) to (D)(2)(d) of this rule.

(3) Candidates who fail to pass the resident educator performance-based assessment may appeal to the state board of education pursuant to procedures established by the Ohio department of education (education.ohio.gov).

Effective: 10/28/2011
R.C. 119.032 review dates: 10/28/2016
Promulgated Under: 119.03
Statutory Authority: 3301.07, 3319.22
Rule Amplifies: 3319.22, 3319.223