



Co-funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union



Project number: 573877-EPP-1-2016-1-IL-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

## ***PROTEACH***

*Promoting teachers' success in their induction period*

ERASMUS+ – EU programme for education, training, youth and sport

Capacity Building in Higher Education

### **Deliverable D3.1.1**

#### **Quality plan**

[Evolving document]

Due date: April 30, 2017

Submission date: April 30, 2018

Project start: October 15<sup>th</sup>, 2016

Duration: 36 months

Beneficiary and staff leading the preparation of this deliverable: Oded Macdossi and Ainat Guberman, MOFET institute; Dalia Imanuel, Beit Berl and the Ministry of Education; Rinat Arviv Elyashiv, Kibbutzim College; Haya Kaplan, Kaye College; Reuma De-Groot, MOFET Institute.

Dissemination Level: PUBLIC

---

Document number:	D3.1.1
Document Title:	Quality plan
Work package type:	WP3– Quality planning monitoring and evaluation
Work package:	WP3.1 – Quality Plan
Document status:	Draft for discussion
Date:	25.4.17
Author(s):	Reuma De-Groot, Dalia Imanuel Einat Guberman

---

#### Abstract

In this document we present the PROTEACH approach to quality planning, monitoring and evaluation. The report is divided into two parts; the first and the main part is a detailed evaluation plan of the MITs implementation; the second part is a report on three questionnaires related to the projects' monitoring for general managerial issues and the success of two study seminars we conducted in the first half of the project. As the implementation of the MIT (Multicultural Induction Team) stands as the principal component of Proteach we had to find appropriate and reliable ways to assess something "fluid" like the execution of an implementation model in 6 different settings (of the 6 colleges participating in the project). To achieve this goal we took a design-based approach for assessing the MITs' work in light of the project's objectives. In this context the project's objectives and the indicators to measure our success as described in the projects' Logical Framework Matrix stand as our first set of criteria.

---

Keyword list:

Design approach, MIT,  
mentors, interns, policy  
makers, school staff

## Table of Contents

Introduction	4
Evaluation plan	5
Evaluation plan for Level 1- Intensive case studies – an intra-institutional perspective	5
Evaluation plan for Level 2 - systemic topics – focus on particular target populations or content questions – an inter-institutional perspective	9
Evaluation plan for Level 3 - Third level – Multiple-case comparative analysis	15
Internal QA <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Questionnaires</li><li>• Project meeting</li></ul>	16
References	16

## Introduction

Considering the complexity of the project and its interdisciplinary essence a quality plan is needed in order to guarantee the relevance of the activities taken, ensuring that the outcomes align with the objectives of the project.

As the implementation of the MIT (Multicultural Induction Team) stands as the principal component of Proteach we had to find appropriate and reliable ways to assess something "fluid" like the execution of an implementation Model in 6 different settings (of the 6 colleges participating in the project). To achieve this goal we took a design based approach for assessing the MITs' work in light of the projects' objectives. In this context the projects objectives and the indicators to measure our success as described in the projects' LFM stands as our first set of criteria.

The PROTEACH project focuses essentially on beginning teachers, in other words, teachers in their practicum (internship) or in their first year of teaching. The project has five main aims: (1) improving the quality of new school and kindergarten teachers; (2) improving their induction process at the school; (3) increasing the retention rate of school and kindergarten teachers in the profession; (4) fostering beginning teachers' initiatives in order to expand their impact in the classroom and in the educational organization; (5) establishing collaboration among academic institutions, schools and the district and local authorities in order to promote the integration of the school and kindergarten teachers who are just starting out in Israel's education system.

Involved in the project are: the faculty of six academic teacher education colleges; the MOFET Institute; the Ministry of Education; local authorities; school management teams; and district inspectors for the schools and kindergartens.

In order to attain the above goals, support systems called MITs – Multiplayer Induction Teams – were established in the schools or local municipalities and at Teacher Development Centers. Their primary goal is to cater to the needs and difficulties of beginning teachers (BT), encourage integration into the organizational culture, promote new teachers' pedagogical changes and initiatives and increase their involvement and influence in the schools and kindergartens. The project is accompanied by the academic support of the European Union, by way of academic faculties from Austria, Britain, Estonia and Romania. The faculty members come from universities in the EU, share their experience, advice, and, in conjunction with the

faculty members in Israel, examine ideas for strategic action to advance the establishment and enhancement of MITs around the country. Knowledge exchange takes place through reciprocal visits between teachers, decision-makers, pre-service teachers, interns and new teachers involved in the process.

## **Evaluation Plan**

The evaluation plan presented here is based on a design based approach in order to accompany the implementation of the project's goals, and to examine whether there are changes taking place that contribute to their attainment. The evaluation project is being coordinated by MOFET (Mr. Oded Mcdossi) and a steering committee (Dr Dalia Immanuel, Dr Haya Kaplan, Dr Rinat Arviv-Elyashiv, Dr Ainat Guberman).

The project has three levels designed to help build a multidimensional picture of performance:

- Evaluation of the MIT of each college (in the format of an intensive case study with an intra-institutional perspective)
- Systemic topics – focusing on particular populations or content questions across MITs and institutions – an inter-institutional perspective.
- Meta-analysis of MIT models in order to formulate guiding principles for supporting beginning teachers' cohorts through inter-organizational collaboration.

### ***First level: Intensive case studies – an intra-institutional perspective***

Internal evaluation analysis of the MITs in each college will be performed by researchers from the respective college. This will be an inclusive and comprehensive evaluation in the form of a case study (Stake, 2006) relating to all components of the partnerships between the college and the MITs and the various bodies they interact with: the academic institution, the local authority, the district and head offices of the Ministry of Education. This analysis will focus on four parameters according to the CIPP model (Context, Input, Process and Products) proposed by Stufflebean, (2003): (1) The underlying context, rationale and intentions of the MIT; (2) inputs invested in the MIT; (3) processes occurring in the MIT; and (4) contributions and impact following the MIT activities. The proposed components will constitute the outline for formulating

the evaluation questions and the use of quantitative and qualitative tools that will help analyse the data gathered for each of the components, as detailed below.

(1) **Background, context, needs, rationale, and aims underlying the MIT, in relation to the target populations and the particular conditions and ecology of the institutions involved in its establishment.** In this aspect, we suggest that each college provides a rich description of the needs and motives for establishing the MIT, the parties involved in its establishment, and the considerations for doing so: the justifications, rationale and goals that guided the founders, the characteristics of the beginning teachers and the vision and ethos of the institutions involved in the partnership.

Recommended secondary questions for this topic might be:

- 1.a. How do the various bodies (university, college, school, district, local authority) perceive the needs and motivations for establishing the MIT?
- 1.b. Which populations will the MIT serve? How are they connected to the processes of teacher training, internship, induction and retention?
- 1.c. What rationale and goals have been set for the MIT in terms of those involved? What is the connection of these goals to the vision of the organizations (universities / colleges / schools) in the partnership, and to the vision of the national PROTEACH project?
- 1.d. How have the goals been translated into policy and guidelines for execution in practice?

**Tools that might help answer these questions:** in-depth interviews with decision-makers from the academic institutions, the schools and the district. One can also analyse project documents and MIT setup documents formulated by the parties. There can also be focus groups of management staff or representatives of the college unit for internship and induction. Attitude questionnaires can also be used to examine the consensus regarding the goals and their implementation.

(2) **Conditions for the induction of BT and how these conditions are expressed in the MIT in terms of the types of resources invested in it.** This aspect relates to the examination of the ensemble of resources allocated to MIT activities: HR, time, physical resources including work spaces and technological means, support programs and initiatives, teaching-learning instructional material, settings and programs for professional development, etc. The source and method of allocation of these resources should also be examined. The

resources help understand organizational and physical infrastructures that either support or impede the functioning of the MIT.

Recommended secondary questions for this topic might be:

2.a. How do the founders of the MITs perceive the conditions that may help or hinder the establishment of the MIT, how these conditions connect to the types of resources expressed in setting up the MIT in terms of HR, time, physical and technological resources, programs and instructional materials; initiatives that support the setup; settings for professional development, resources, etc.?

2.b. How were the resources allocated and which internal/external bodies were involved/partnered directly or indirectly in their allocation?

2.c. What elements of the resources presented were drivers of change or hindrances to setting up additional MITs in the activities of the academic institutions?

2.d. What is perceived as the most essential prerequisite conditions for setting up new MITs in the future?

**Tools that might help answer these questions:** in-depth interviews with decision-makers; Observations in the academic and school spaces that either manifest conditions the MIT has to address, or results of decisions made by the MIT; analysis of documents and meeting minutes connected to the decision-making processes and the shaping of policies for the MITs.

(3) **Analysis of interactions at the MITs, and coping with difficulties.** This aspect relates to the core of the MITs and is linked to the learning communities of the MIT. This is the place to relate to the content of the meetings, the types of discourse, modes of action, handling of incidents, events and dilemmas, ethical aspects of mentors and co-teachers, peer relations, and relations with various partners in the MITs.

Recommended secondary questions for this topic might be:

3.a. How can we characterise the interactions in the MIT in the mentor-co-teacher, mentor-mentee, mentor-new teacher relations?

3.b. What types of contents, events, and problems are discussed in the MITs? What is the role of the parties in the process (interns, new teachers, mentors and co-teachers, peer teachers, academic counsellors, principals, etc.)?

3.c. What is helpful or unhelpful in practice for the development of initiatives?



3.d What is the connection between the processes occurring in the MIT and those occurring in the school and academic systems?

**Tools that might help answer these questions:** open-ended and semi-structured observations of MIT encounters; in-depth interviews with partners; product analysis; documentation or feedback and reflection products about the encounters as perceived by those involved; in-depth focus groups in terms of the processes carried out, including reference to ethical and other issues.

**(4) How do those involved in the MITs (new teachers, mentors and officials at the school, the college and the local authority) perceive the contribution of the MITs to the induction of BT and their performance efficacy, the sense of positioning and autonomy in teaching?**

Recommended secondary questions for this topic might be:

4.a How do those involved in the MIT perceive its contribution to and impact on its defined goals? How are these reflected with regard to the contribution to new teachers in the context of fostering performance and the sense of self- efficacy, positioning, and autonomy?

4.b How do the bodies involved perceive the impact of mentor teachers and co-teachers, alongside the involvement and impact of workshop facilitators and additional entities within and outside the schools?

4.c How do those involved perceive the contribution to the schools, the academic institutions and the partners? What changes, if any, occur regarding the promotion of ongoing accompaniment and induction of new teachers in the work of the academic institution?

4.d What contribution and impact can be attributed to the promotion of pedagogical initiatives in the classroom and at the school?

4.e What contributions should be preserved over time and in other MITs across the country?

4.f What recommendations for improvements are suggested by those involved in the MITs?

**Tools that might help answer these questions:** in-depth interviews with the partners and those involved in the MITs; questionnaires on the perception of efficacy, positioning and autonomy; observations of MIT sessions; focus groups of MIT partners, etc.

Each institution will construct its own internal evaluation format according to the number of MITs, staff size, resources at their disposal and existing data. The internal evaluation setup should combine quantitative and qualitative research methods and provide a broad and full picture of what is happening in the MIT. In order to maintain the thread between the evaluation

reports of each college, it has been agreed that the following uniform tools will be used for each MIT: a quantitative questionnaire to evaluate interns and new teachers' attitudes; a questionnaire to evaluate mentors/co-teachers' attitudes, an interview to evaluate new teachers and mentors/co-teachers, and interviews with officials. These tools will be detailed later in the section dealing with evaluation of the systemic topics. Colleges may also choose to have the evaluation teams use observations, analysis of curricula and additional documents that might be relevant for the core issues in the report. Each college will produce an annual report consisting of the findings that emerge from the research tools and documents.

The recommended structure of the evaluation report should include the following sections:

1. An introduction describing the background, needs and the performance goals for the formative evaluation of the MIT
2. A brief literature review of the systems supporting interns and new teachers (BT in this report)
3. Presentation of the goals of the evaluation
4. Presentation of the main evaluation questions
5. Methodology (evaluation approach, site description, population, tools and procedures, data processing, limitations and difficulties that arose during the process).
6. Presentation of the findings in relation to the four points of the CIPP model (Context, Input, Process and Products)
7. Discussion and recommendations
8. References
9. Appendices

***Second level – systemic topics – focus on particular target populations or content questions – an inter-institutional perspective***

This level of the evaluation will not focus on the specific context of each college, but rather is intended to expand the view colleges, while focusing on a specific issue or population. This phase will be carried out parallel to the internal evaluation at each college (phase one) and will focus on three main populations:

1. Interns and first year teachers
2. Mentors and co-teachers
3. Officials and decision-makers connected to MIT activities or to the induction process

The division into evaluation teams for each of these populations is based on the areas of interest of the PROTEACH team members and each team will have a team leader.

**Table 1: Details of team leaders and members for each research team (partial list)**

<b>Population to be evaluated</b>	<b>Evaluating team</b>
New teachers (interns and first year teachers)	Dr Haya Kaplan (team leader), Dr Walleed Dallasheh (Sakhnin), Kibbutzim College team, Talpiot College team, Dr Orit Dahan (Beit Berl)
Mentors and co-teachers	Dr Rinat Arbiv-Elyashiv (team leader), Dr Dafna Hammer (Kibbutzim) Dr Avigail Zabari, Idit Pasternak, Dr Racheli Holtzblatt (Talpiot), Dr Ihab Zubidat (Saknin), Kaye College team.
Officials involved in either the MITs or the induction process	Dr Dalia Immanuel (team leader), Dr Walleed Dallasheh (Sakhnin), Kaye College team, Dr Rivi Carmel, Oded Mcdossi

Details of the tools and procedures for each research population are given below.

### **1. New teachers (interns and first-year teachers)**

The aim of the research on the interns and first-year teachers is to examine the induction process and the quality of the integration of teachers into schools, while comparing them to the conventional models of internship on the academic campuses. The research tools are based mainly on questionnaires delivered at the beginning of the year (November-February) and at the end of the year (May-June). At each college, the tools are to be given to the interns in the MIT model and to a parallel comparison group that is not part of the MIT. In addition, there will be in-depth interviews with four interns and four first-year teachers from the MITs. These will be conducted at the beginning of the year. In addition, two out of the four interns and two out of the four first-year teachers will be interviewed twice – once at the beginning and once at the end of the year.

Components of the questionnaire (dependent variables) to be examined regarding interns and first-year teachers

A quantitative questionnaire will focus on the following topics:

- Motivations for going into teaching
- Self-efficacy in teaching, organization, and Addressing students' needs
- Quality of integration into the school or the kindergarten (involvement, belonging and support from the organization)
- Contribution of the MIT's or the supporting workshop
- Characteristics of the new teachers

A qualitative questionnaire will focus on the following topics:

- The experience of entering teaching
- Induction into the school
- Quality of the connection with the mentor or co-teacher

Below are some potential core research questions to be analysed by the team focusing on new teachers:

- ❖ What are the differences in the motivation for teaching and feelings of self-efficacy of new teachers in MITs compared with other models of training (training in the format of a workshop at the college as opposed to training in the MIT)?
- ❖ What are the differences in integration into the schools among MIT new teachers compared with other models of training (training in the format of a workshop at the college as opposed to training in the MIT)?
- ❖ What correlations are there, if any, between the motivation to integrate into teaching and the quality of the integration into the schools among new teachers?

## **2. Mentors and co-teachers**

The aim for this team is to provide a broad picture of this particular population that has thus far not been the object of significant research. The team will describe the motives for becoming a mentor, the emphases conveyed during the mentoring process, and the contribution of the mentoring to the professional development of the mentee teacher. As far as possible, attention should be paid to comparing between mentors working within the MITs and those working outside them. The research setup for this purpose combines a quantitative questionnaire to be delivered towards the end of the year and interviews with mentors and co-teachers to be conducted at the beginning and the end of the year. The quantitative questionnaire will be

delivered to all the mentors affiliated with the colleges' training models so that lessons can be learned about the connection between the mentoring role and the training model.

### **Components of the questionnaire examining mentors and co-teachers**

The quantitative questionnaire will focus on the following topics:

- Motives for choosing the role of mentor
- Focal points and emphases during the mentoring of new teachers
- The extent to which meetings are organized
- The contribution of the mentoring to the mentor teacher

The qualitative questionnaire will focus on the following topics:

- The decision to become a mentor
- Content of the meetings with the new teachers
- Identifying difficulties and achievements
- Perception of the contribution of the MIT

Below are some potential core research questions to be analysed by the team focusing on the mentor teachers:

- ❖ What are the motives for choosing to become a mentor and how, if at all, does mentoring contribute to the teachers' professional development?
- ❖ What differences, if any, exist between the emphases that mentors use while mentoring MIT new teachers – comparing with different models of training?

### **3. Officials and decision-makers in the MITs**

The aim for this team is to examine the involvement of entities within the school management, the local authority, the district and head offices of the Ministry of Education and the academic institution that have an impact on the activities of the MITs at the schools. The research setup is based on interviews to be conducted mid-year (April-May) with a number of officials at different levels. Below is a list of officials to be interviewed:

- a. Principals of schools with an MIT
- b. General inspector

- c. Local authority representative (branch, department or administration head)
- d. Head of the unit for internship and induction into teaching
- e. College presidents (3 out of 6)
- f. Referent district inspectors
- g. Head offices of the Ministry of Education – Dr Sara Zilbershtroum and Mr Eyal Ram
- h. PROTEACH project director - Dr Reuma De-Groot

### Research tools

A qualitative questionnaire focusing on decision-makers' attitudes regarding the following:

- Optimal induction of new teachers
- Perception of the goals of MITs
- Perception of the impact of MITs on the integration of new teachers into schools
- Involvement in MIT activities

As part of the research setup for this team, the responsibility for the interviews at the schools, local authorities, ministry inspectorate, and the academic institution (not including college presidents) lies with the evaluation units of each college. The interviews with the college presidents and project headquarters staff are the responsibility of the MOFET Institute.

Table 2 presents a summary of research setup for evaluating new teachers, mentors and officials. For each group, the tools, number of questionnaires and scheduling are provided.

**Table 2: Research setup for evaluation of interns and mentors, detailing: research tools, number of questionnaires and schedules for delivery**

Group	Population	Sub-population	Tool	Quantity (no. of questionnaires/interviews)	Delivery date
New teachers	Interns	MITs and non-MITs	Questionnaires (digital/physical)	distributed to everyone	Pre: (Jan-Feb) Post: (May-June)
	First-year teachers	MITs and non-MITs	Questionnaires (digital/physical)	distributed to everyone	Pre: Jan-Feb Post: (May-June) (with at least 3 months between pre and post)
	*Interns	MITs	Interviews / focus group	4 (two of which also in post)	Pre: (Jan-Feb) Post: (May-June)
	*First-year teachers	MITs	Interviews / focus group	4 (two of which also in post)	Pre: (Jan-Feb) Post: (May-June)
Mentors	Mentor teachers	MITs and non-MITs	Questionnaires (digital/physical)	questionnaires	Once only – (April-May)
	Co-teachers	MITs and non-MITs	Questionnaires (digital/physical)	questionnaires	Once only – (April-May)
	*Mentor teachers	MITs	Interviews / focus group	4 (two of which also in post)	Pre: (Jan-Feb) Post: (May-June)
	*Co-teachers	MITs	Interviews / focus group	4 (two of which also in post)	Pre: (Jan-Feb) Post: (May-June)
Officials	*Principals involved in MITs	Selected MIT	interviews	1-2	Once only – (April-May)
	*General inspector	Selected MIT	interviews	1	Once only – (April-May)
	Local authority rep. (branch, dept., or administration head)	Selected MIT	interviews	1-2	Once only – (April-May)
	*Head of internship and induction	At the college	interviews	1	Once only – (April-May)
* The asterisk signifies interviews that all the MITs must conduct					

## **General procedures for gathering and analyzing data**

The data gathered for phase two will be coordinated by MOFET which will build the tools and deliver them to the research units at the colleges.

- Questionnaires – it is the responsibility of MOFET to examine the validity and reliability of the data and the concurrence of the data files from all the colleges. At the end of the questionnaire data gathering, all the questionnaire envelopes or digital questionnaires will be entered into a single file for the purposes of the analysis of data from all the colleges. At the same time, each college will receive a file containing the data gathered by that college.
- Interviews – the recordings of the interviews will be sent to MOFET for transcription. After transcription, each college will receive a file with its transcribed interviews.

## **Ethics**

The steering committee of the Unit for Evaluation will submit a request for ethical approval to the Ethics board of the MOFET Institute.

## ***Third level – Multiple-case comparative analysis***

The third phase of the evaluation is based on a multiple case analysis. The purpose of this phase is to serve as an overall framework tracing the progress of the project and comparatively analyzing the evaluation findings from each college about the MITs for which they are responsible. The work of the integrating evaluation team will enable a broad description of the project's features, relating to the differences between the colleges and the models each one has developed. The reports will make it possible to steer the project towards achieving its main goals and to summarize the evaluation activity. The integrating team will use the findings both of the focus teams (phase two) and the internal evaluations of the MITs (phase one).

Below are some questions that might guide this phase of the evaluation:

- ❖ What can be learned from the MIT model and does this model cope successfully with the challenges of new teacher induction?
- ❖ Does the MIT activity reflect the features of learning communities, and if so – how?
- ❖ What can be learned from the partnerships between academic institutions and the field about improving the induction processes of new teachers?

The structure of the summative report has yet to be finalized.



## Internal QA

### Questioners

Three questionnaires were distributed among all project teams with the purpose of assessing the quality of the international workshops (in Tallinn, Israel and Exeter). The questionnaires address organizational aspects (the extent to which people were ready for the meetings – aware of their planned contents, versed in the materials, etc.), and content-related aspects (compliant with the project's objectives, activities underway, enlightening in what respects to teachers' professional development, etc.). The analysis of the questionnaires received is underway. [Links to questionnaires...](#)

### Project meetings

To assure timely submission and quality of all deliverables/reports, mutual engagement and collaborative work of all players in the Partner Country (Israel), we scheduled 3-hour monthly meetings for the Israeli teams' members. In the meetings, partners are asked to report and jointly reflect on the work done in order to verify accomplishment of plans, discuss corrective actions as needed, etc. To ensure the quality/value and effectiveness of this process, different templates have been prepared to guide the form and content of the partners' monthly reports. The commitment shown so far by the partners to timely comply with these requests has been more than satisfactory and there is a clear trend of improvement in this process. [Links to templates...](#)

## References

- Stake, R. (2006). *Multiple Case Study Analysis*. NY: The Guilford Press.
- Stufflebean, D. (2003). The CIPP Model for Evaluation in T., Kellaghan & D., Stufflebean (Eds.). *International Handbook of Education Evaluation*, Cardrecht: Springer, pp. 31-62.

**Annex 1 –**

Questionnaires to distribute for different target populations:

The questionnaires for mentors can be downloaded from the website here: <http://www.proteach-project.org/node/217>

Questions to school staff and policy makers can be downloading from this link <http://www.proteach-project.org/node/220>

**Evaluation of Interns and Beginning Teachers  
Questionnaire - Start of school-year**

Interns and beginning teachers -

This year you'll be participating in a special framework that was created with the support of the EC funding (under Erasmus+ program) for better integration of schools and HEI's within the induction process in Israel. This framework is called MIT - Multiplayer Induction Team where we have an attempt to promote mutual discussions and joint work of school members, beginning teachers, interns and representatives from the colleges, during induction in schools. We'd like to receive your opinion on the MIT framework and your induction process at school and within your college, so we can make improvements where necessary. We'll appreciate your answers to the following questions.

We plan to administer a similar questionnaire at the end of the year as well, and to compare between the replies of each respondent. To do so, we will need a means of recognizing the respondents. Therefore, you are kindly requested to write the last five digits of your I.D. number. We undertake that everything you write will remain confidential. The information will be used solely for the purposes of internal learning.

**Thank you very much for your cooperation,**

**The Evaluation Team of the Incubators for Beginning Teachers Induction**

If you have any questions or comments about this questionnaire, please contact the following people:

<b>Beit Berl</b>	<b>Gordon</b>	<b>Kibbutzim</b>	<b>Sakhnin</b>	<b>Kaye</b>	<b>Talpiot</b>
Name					
email					

The five last digits of your I.D. number (including the control digit)

For example, if your I.D. number is 097511142, please write only 11142

--	--	--	--	--

**A. Choosing to become a teacher, and activity in the school**

**People invest in their work for different reasons. To what extent do the following items match your feelings towards your teaching work?**

	Not at all	To some extent	To a medium extent	To a large extent	To a very large extent
1. Teaching is interesting and challenges me	1	2	3	4	5
2. Teaching gives me great satisfaction	1	2	3	4	5
3. I enjoy the relations with my students	1	2	3	4	5
4. Teaching lets me nurture in my students values which are important to me	1	2	3	4	5
5. Teaching lets me fulfil my particular skills and abilities	1	2	3	4	5
6. Teaching helps me develop in new directions	1	2	3	4	5
7. It's important to me to keep up to date on teaching methods and new study subjects	1	2	3	4	5
8. Teaching gives me opportunities to advance my career	1	2	3	4	5
9. Teaching grants me social status and prestige	1	2	3	4	5
10. Teaching gives me economic and occupational security	1	2	3	4	5
11. Sometimes I feel that I'm wasted in teaching	1	2	3	4	5
12. It happens sometimes that I don't feel like going to school	1	2	3	4	5
13. Teaching is exhausting	1	2	3	4	5

**Following are various statements expressing thoughts and emotions regarding your experiences while teaching. Please note the degree to which each one describes you.**

	Not at all	To some extent	To a medium extent	To a large extent	To a very large extent
14. It's easy for me to perform school tasks (special duties, meetings etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
15. I'm able to advance pedagogic initiatives at school and in the community	1	2	3	4	5
16. I'm concerned about interaction with parents	1	2	3	4	5
17. I find it hard to translate the curriculum's objectives into proper lesson-plans	1	2	3	4	5
18. Sometimes I feel that even if I make an effort - I won't be a huge success in teaching	1	2	3	4	5
19. I have strong self-esteem as a professional up-to-date teacher in the disciplines I teach	1	2	3	4	5
20. At staff meetings I'm able to contribute and advance my special ideas	1	2	3	4	5
21. Very often it's hard for me to respond to the needs of all the pupils	1	2	3	4	5
22. Generally I can't change decisions which the school administration made	1	2	3	4	5
23. I find coping with discipline problems difficult	1	2	3	4	5
24. I'm able to provide response to pupils with special needs	1	2	3	4	5
25. I have the capacity to advance my pupils' achievements	1	2	3	4	5
26. I'm capable of responding well to my pupils' needs	1	2	3	4	5
27. I'm sure that I can cope with tough teaching tasks	1	2	3	4	5
28. Very often I have doubts about my ability to be a good teacher	1	2	3	4	5

The statements below relate to various aspects of your activity at school. Please note the extent to which you agree with each statement.

	Not at all	To some extent	To a medium extent	To a large extent	To a very large extent
29. Senior teachers at school invite me to work with them collaboratively	1	2	3	4	5
30. I feel lonely in the staffroom at school	1	2	3	4	5
31. School gives me a place to express my skills and capacities	1	2	3	4	5
32. When I need help, there's always someone from the teaching staff I can turn to	1	2	3	4	5
33. I feel a sense of belonging to the school	1	2	3	4	5
34. At school I can speak freely about what I really think	1	2	3	4	5
35. I want to continue teaching at my school in the future	1	2	3	4	5
36. Veteran colleagues share their professional experience with me	1	2	3	4	5
37. I feel involved and that I contribute to school	1	2	3	4	5
38. School lets me express my set of values	1	2	3	4	5
39. I receive recognition and obtain the trust of my senior colleagues	1	2	3	4	5

**B. The workshop in the MIT, the teacher mentor, and the school's management**

The following statements relate to activity in the workshop, and to assistance help from the accompanying teacher, the mentor, and the school's management. Please note the extent to which you agree with each statement.

	Not at	To	To a	To a	To a
--	--------	----	------	------	------

	all	some extent	medium extent	large extent	very large extent
40. My peers at the workshop are my good friends	1	2	3	4	5
41. I feel comfortable sharing my difficulties and experiences with my peers at the workshop	1	2	3	4	5
42. At the workshop, I receive professional tools for teaching	1	2	3	4	5
43. The workshop helps in my induction process	1	2	3	4	5
44. The workshop helps me to learn about what the school expects of me	1	2	3	4	5
45. The workshop enables me to advance initiatives at school	1	2	3	4	5
46. The workshop encourages me to reflect on my teaching	1	2	3	4	5
47. The workshop is my professional community	1	2	3	4	5
48. The meetings with the teacher mentor help me in my teaching	1	2	3	4	5
49. The meetings with the teacher mentor help me develop my special direction	1	2	3	4	5
50. Mentoring helps me have a sense of belonging to the school	1	2	3	4	5
51. I tend to share my experiences and difficulties with my mentor	1	2	3	4	5
52. Beginning teachers at my school receive a clear explanation on school procedures and routines	1	2	3	4	5
53. At my school, people relate to interns and new teachers with respect and professional esteem	1	2	3	4	5
54. Members of the school administration helped me in the induction process	1	2	3	4	5
55. The workshop facilitator enriches my theoretical and	1	2	3	4	5

conceptual knowledge about teaching					
56. The workshop facilitator helps me develop tools for coping with difficulties in my work	1	2	3	4	5
57. The workshop facilitator lets me develop my unique direction	1	2	3	4	5
58. The college prepared me well for the reality I encountered at school	1	2	3	4	5
59. The school's MIT helps me in the induction process and in my inclusion in school	1	2	3	4	5
60. I feel that school and the college 'speak the same language'	1	2	3	4	5
61. I would warmly recommend to new teachers that they take part in MIT	1	2	3	4	5
62. The teacher mentor is involved in processes taking place in the MIT's	1	2	3	4	5
63. I'm satisfied with my induction process at school	1	2	3	4	5

**64. What are the chief difficulties you're coping with today as a teacher?**


**65. Has the incubator been helpful in your inclusion in teaching? If so, please explain how.**


**66. Do you have suggestions for improving the incubator and/or the process of induction to teaching? (If this is not applicable, please continue to section C)**


**C. Background information**

**Personal**

1. **Gender:** (1) Male (2) Female
2. **Year of birth** \_\_\_\_\_
3. **Education:** (1) Studying for a B.A. (2) B.A. (3) Studying for an M.A. (4) Have an undergraduate or tertiary degree
4. **Ethnic affiliation:** (1) Arab (2) Jewish

**Studies at the College**

5. **Age-group level you were trained for:** (1) kindergarten (2) primary (3) secondary
6. **Type of education:** (1) regular (2) special (3) integrated
7. **Supervision:** (1) State-Jewish (2) Religious–Jewish (3) State-Arab (4) Other \_\_\_\_\_
8. **Area of studies 1:** [a closed list to choose from]
9. **Area of studies 2:** [a closed list to choose from]

**The school where you teach**

10. **Your status at the school where you teach:** (a) intern (b) beginning teacher
11. **Teaching seniority, in years (including the current year):** \_\_\_\_\_
12. **Seniority at your current school, in years (including the current year):** \_\_\_\_\_
13. **The age-group level where you teach:** (1) kindergarten (2) primary (3) secondary
14. **Type of education:** (1) regular (2) special (3) integrated
15. **Supervision:** (1) State-Jewish (2) Religious–Jewish (3) State-Arab (4) Other \_\_\_\_\_
16. **Main teaching area:** [a closed list to choose from]
17. **Other teaching area:** [a closed list to choose from]
18. **Scope of your position at the school: (number of hours per week)**
19. **Your role at the school: (please circle all relevant options)**  
 (1) subject teacher (2) home-room teacher (3) coordinator (4) Other \_\_\_\_\_
20. **How often do you meet with your mentor?**
  - a. More than once a week, and whenever I need it
  - b. Once a week, the time and day aren't fixed
  - c. Once a week, at a time and day fixed in advance



- d. Once every two weeks
- e. Once a month