A Plan B Paper submitted to the Department of Curriculum Studies, College of Education, University of Hawaii at Manoa in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education in Curriculum Studies.

Reducing Teacher Turnover by Utilizing a National List of Reasons for Teacher Dissatisfaction

Or How to Keep Teachers from Declaring "Dear Folks, I Quit"

By: Angela J. Lopez
May 2010

Dr. E. Barbara Klemm, Program Advisor
Nichole K. Zirzow, Reader

Chapter 1. Introduction

Every school year brings a new supply and demand for qualified public school teachers in the United States. Educational researchers have been investigating this supply and demand since the late 1920's (Almack, 1970: 51). Educators and researchers agree that the single most important factor in improving any student's performance is the quality of the teacher (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2008: 2), and there is consensus regarding the most common reasons that teachers give for leaving teaching positions. The factors that contribute to high teacher turnover are rooted in the organizational characteristics and conditions of schools (Ingersoll, 2001: 5) and equate to teachers who will only continue teaching if they feel successful based upon support they've received in their jobs – support specific to the grade level or content area and ongoing help from colleagues, administrators and mentors – and if they've been able to work in conditions that enable good teaching (Moore Johnson, et al., 2006: 13).

This study investigates what teachers at my school discuss during team meetings, and the nature as well as frequency of the problems that come up during these meetings. Specifically, the study examines whether the same problems arise in my school's team meetings that have been identified in professional literature as reasons for teacher dissatisfaction that lead to teacher turnover. Purposes for comparing the findings on the content of team meeting discussions with the national findings are to identify and describe problems faced by teachers at my school, and to help illuminate the nature and frequency of these problems.

Literature Review

Beginning in the 1920's and 1930's, researchers noted that turnover in the teaching profession was a significant problem for American schools and estimated that from one fourth to half of all teachers are new to their positions each year (Almack,1970: 62). As early as 1933, researchers acknowledged that a crucial issue in education was the problem of creating and maintaining a stable teacher workforce and that attempts to control the problem of rapid teacher turnover included increasing low salaries and improving poor working conditions (Almack, 1970: 62).

In the mid 1980s, two reports (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983; National Academy of Sciences, 1987) caught national attention by announcing the coming possibility of severe teacher shortages in elementary and secondary schools. At about the same time (and due to a lack of nationally representative data), the U.S. Department of Education's statistical arm, the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), designed the Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) and it's supplement, the Teacher Follow-up Survey (TFS). These surveys comprise the largest and most comprehensive data source available on the staffing, occupational, and organizational aspects of schools in the United States. SASS administers survey questionnaires to a random sample of about 55,000 teachers from all types of schools and from all 50 states. All teachers who left their teaching jobs in the year subsequent to the administration of the initial survey questionnaire were again contacted to obtain information on their departures. This supplemental study, TFS, is the largest and most comprehensive data source on teacher turnover in the U.S (Ingersoll, 2000: 2). SASS and TFS are administered on a regular and ongoing basis. All 9 of the articles chosen for use in this study cite data from the NCES SASS and/or TFS. The articles span 10 years and reference five independent cycles of SASS and supplemental TFS data from NCES: 1987-1989; 1990-1992; 1993-1995; 1999-2001, 2003-2005. The TFS asks teachers to list reasons for their departures from a list provided in the questionnaire, among the reasons listed are: retirement; school staffing action; family or personal; to pursue other job; dissatisfaction. This study focused on the reasons that teachers cite for dissatisfaction.

Prior to SASS and TFS data, studies and reports regarding teacher turnover seemed to be aimed at identifying whether or not there was actually a "teacher shortage" and the impact of the shortage, rather than identifying organizational reasons that teacher turnover is so prominent. In 1998, the Fairfax County School Board Auditor released "A Report on Employee Turnover Patterns in the Fairfax County Public Schools in Relation to National and Regional Trends" which acknowledged the teacher turnover problem and concluded that the teacher turnover rate in Fairfax was nearly 2% higher than the national rate. The authors attributed the discrepancy to the increasing number of employees reaching retirement age (Fairfax County School Board Auditor, 1998: 7). In addition to concluding that retirement was the main cause for teacher turnover, these authors

reported the top reasons for teacher dissatisfaction. Of those teachers who reported a significant level of "dissatisfaction with teaching as a career," the primary reasons cited in 1995 were:

1. Lack of recognition and support from the administration; 29.1%
2. Student discipline problems; 17.9%
3. Poor student motivation to learn; 17.6%
4. Poor salary; 10.7%

(Fairfax County School Board Auditor, 1998: 3)

In 2000 Richard Ingersoll analyzed data from the SASS and TFS and concluded that the problems schools have adequately staffing classrooms with qualified teachers are the result of a "revolving door" through which large numbers of teachers depart for reasons other than retirement, namely job dissatisfaction and pursuit of better jobs or other careers (Ingersoll, 2000: 1). Ingersoll went on to state that the revolving door problem would not be solved until the organizational causes of low teacher retention were addressed. Of the teachers who left their positions because of job dissatisfaction, the most common reasons noted were low salaries; a lack of support from the administration; student discipline problems; lack of student motivation; and lack of influence over school decision making. Moreover, several factors stood out as <u>not</u> serious enough to lead to much turnover: large class sizes; intrusions on classroom time; lack of planning time; and lack of opportunity for professional advancement (Ingersoll, 2000: 9).

A year later, Ingersoll released the findings of another study, noting two reasons directly related to the organizational conditions of teaching that are, together, the most prominent source of turnover. Forty-two percent of all departing teachers reported as a reason either job dissatisfaction or the desire to pursue a better job or career (Ingersoll, 2001: 22). In this study, Ingersoll found that teachers who are dissatisfied and transfer or move to another position in a different school list low salaries, lack of support from the school administration, student discipline problems, and lack of teacher influence over decision making as the primary reasons underlying their move. Similarly, dissatisfaction from teachers who left teaching altogether is most often reported as due to low salaries, lack of support from the school administration, lack of student motivation, and student discipline problems. (Ingersoll, 2001: 22).

A major difference between the 2000 and 2001 documents is that in the latter,

Ingersoll discusses the organization of schools from the perspective that high rates of teacher turnover are an indication of underlying problems in how well a school functions and in the quality and performance of the school community. Ingersoll notes that the results in his second document raise some important questions for educational researchers regarding school community, specifically which schools are more likely to have a positive sense of community and what effect teacher attachment to a school has on school community and performance (Ingersoll, 2001: 25).

In 2003, Ingersoll published another study in which he was able to determine that a strong link exists between participation in induction and mentoring programs for new teachers and their likelihood of moving or leaving after the first year on the job. Induction or mentoring programs in this study were comprised of a minimum of these three components:

1. A helpful mentor from their same field.
2. Common planning time with other teachers in their subject area.
3. Regularly scheduled collaboration with other teachers on issues of instruction.

And a maximum of the above three, combined with five additional components:

4. Participated in a general induction program.
5. Participated in a seminar for beginning teachers.
6. Regular or supportive communication with their principal, other administrators, or department chair.
7. Participated in an external network.
8. A reduced number of course preparations. (p. 20)

In this study, Ingersoll lists the following as the top reasons for dissatisfaction: poor salary, poor administrative support, student discipline problems, lack of faculty influence & autonomy and poor student motivation (Ingersoll, 2003: 16).

The Alliance for Excellent Education, a national education policy and advocacy organization, published a brief in 2005 that is consistent with the aforementioned reasons listed for teacher turnover due to job dissatisfaction: lack of planning time, too heavy a workload, problematic student behavior, and a lack of influence over school policy (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2005: 1). A second brief, published three years later by the same organization cited dissatisfaction with workplace conditions and dissatisfaction

with the support received from administrators as top reasons for teacher turnover (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2008: 2). Both of these articles cited induction programs containing similar components to those noted by Ingersoll in his 2003 study to be keys in teacher success and retention.

The NCES completed a special analysis in 2005 that was conducted for the purpose of providing a foundation for informed discussions of policies intended to address issues related to the teacher workforce. This analysis compared those who joined and left the teacher workforce in 1999-2001 with those same transitions from 1987-89, 1990-92 and 1993-95. One of the primary questions this analysis sought to answer was "Why do teachers leave?" The results of the analysis showed that both teachers who left teaching and teachers who transferred at the end of 1999–2000 reported a lack of planning time, too heavy a workload, too low a salary, and problematic student behavior among their top five sources of dissatisfaction with the school they left (NCES, 2005).

"Why New Teachers Leave… and Why New Teachers Stay", an in-depth look at the supports and types of learning climates that must be in place in schools to foster successful teachers and students, was published in 2006 (Moore Johnson, et al., 2006). Susan Moore Johnson and The Project on The Next Generation of Teachers found that by building a career ladder for classroom teachers, schools could deliver what teachers want and need: 1) a supportive environment while teachers are new and 2) opportunities for professional growth once teachers have more experience. The career ladders prescribed would include the support of school administration and would formalize roles such as mentors, master teachers and curriculum developers (Moore Johnson, et al., 2006: 45). Reasons for dissatisfaction in this study included: lack of administrative support, student discipline problems, class sizes too large, workplace conditions – defined as problems with teaching assignments and problems with supplies and equipment, no opportunity for professional advancement and problems with scheduling time to collaborate (Moore Johnson, et al., 2006: 15, 18).

In TIME magazine's "How to Make Great Teachers" solving the supply and demand problem was likened to "filling a bucket with huge hole in the bottom" (Wallis, et al., 2008: 31). School districts across the nation are experimenting with new ways to attract and retain good teachers, including merit pay, signing bonuses, housing

allowances, and additional pay for hard to staff positions in areas that are the most distressed. Merit pay alone already backfired in several locations where it was implemented but in a few locations merit pay combined with several other factors was proven to be quite successful. Some of the components in successful programs included: a careful effort to earn teacher buy-in to the plan, clarity about how it works, multiple ways of measuring merit, rewards for teamwork and school-wide success, and reliable financing. One such model is the Teacher Advancement Program, or TAP, which uses a formula to project student performance based on three or more years of test results and combines that data with teacher performance, which is measured with a combination of structured observations made four to six times a year. The TAP program also includes intensive self-reflection and structured meeting time for teachers. The best TAP teachers can then choose one of three ways to climb the professional ladder: become a mentor to other teachers, become a full-time teacher of teachers, or take the traditional route into administration. The top reasons 'Why Teachers Quit' cited in this article included lack of time to prepare, too heavy a teaching load, class sizes too large, poor salary, student behavior problems, and lack of influence in school (Wallis, et al., 2008: 31).

Significance of Study

As seen in this review of literature, teacher turnover is a problem nationwide. Studies since the 1980s show that the major reasons teachers leave teaching positions are: student discipline problems, lack of recognition and support from school administration, poor salary, lack of influence over school decision making, and poor student motivation to learn. This study investigates whether there are correlations between the aforementioned major reasons; what teachers at my school discuss during team meetings; and how the organizational characteristics and conditions presently in place at this school correspond to what is reported in the literature. Insights gained through this study could be used to improve teaching situations and teacher satisfaction, including decreasing teacher turnover.

Chapter 2. Methods

This study focused on the question "do the same problems arise in my school's team meetings that have been identified in the professional literature as reasons for teacher dissatisfaction that lead to teacher turnover? If so, how often do they arise and how are they addressed during the meetings?" Further details about the team meetings follow.

Setting and Participants

This study was conducted over a two year time period in a public middle school on Kauai in the state of Hawaii. The campus is an open-air facility with separate buildings housing Administration, each grade level, and each elective branch. The staff was comprised of approximately one hundred people, of which about sixty were teachers. The middle school served about one thousand students annually in grades six through eight. During school years 2007-08 and 2008-09 approximately 35% of the student body qualified for free and reduced lunch, about 9% of the total student population qualified for special education and approximately 6% of the total student body were English Language Learners (Hawaii State DOE, 2009). There were three administrators at the school: one Principal and two Vice-Principals. Administration offered their support for this study in the form of authorization to participate in coursework, permission to use this study as evidence for a professional evaluation program, providing access to meeting minutes that were archived on a Lotus Notes database, and supplying detailed data about teacher turnover at the school.

My Role

During the two years of this study, my roles included primary researcher, team leader and science teacher for Team 2. As primary researcher I obtained, examined and coded team meeting minutes for all six teams during school years 2007-08 and 2008-09. I also conducted interviews of the other teachers who were team leaders during the time of this study. I found the frequency, or relative emphasis, for each of the major reasons cited from the aforementioned literature and created codes, which I then correlated to each item in the meeting minutes. This enabled me to study the quality of the team meetings -

as measured by satisfaction, productivity and the focus of the topics discussed - and to determine whether or not the symptoms of teacher dissatisfaction were detected in any of the biweekly team meetings. As team leader, the team meetings of Team 2 were usually held in my classroom and minutes of each team meeting were entered on my teacher computer during the team meeting. During SY07-08, I usually entered the team meeting minutes. During SY08-09 another member of my team input the minutes from the meeting on my computer during the course of our team meetings; even though the documents reflected my name, a team member was entering the minutes on my computer. I, therefore, was not the sole author of the minutes for the data from Team 2 in this study. Meeting minutes are available to all staff members and public requests to read them can be made through the main office at the school.

My motivation to complete this study comes from the fact that I left the profession of teaching for a period of eight years due to dissatisfaction and then returned to teaching. Thus, I was motivated to investigate the primary teacher support system in place at the school where I currently teach.

Organizational Characteristics

Ingersoll noted in his 2003 study that every organization has its own unique set of characteristics that influence the work that takes place there. For teachers, the organizational characteristics or conditions are the internal organization and management of the school (Ingersoll, 2003: 5). At our school, the principal's goals - a major organizational characteristic - are communicated to the entire staff at the beginning of the school year during a "welcome back to school" themed staff meeting and throughout the course of the year during a variety of mandated meetings. Mandated meetings include: one after school meeting per week that rotates between leadership, department or faculty and one meeting each morning of the week for a total of six weekly meetings. The morning meetings are comprised of one grade level cohort meeting (i.e., both seventh grade science teachers); one x-block meeting (each teacher teaches an x-block class which may be a math or reading workshop for students who did not meet standards on the state math and reading test, or is an elective course for students who did meet standards on the state math and reading test); one entire grade level meeting; and two team

meetings. I chose to focus my study on team meetings at our school for the following reasons:

1. As indicated in the educational literature, teachers must be supported in their efforts to teach or they will leave teaching positions or even possibly, the profession. The support in question may be in the form of increased support from school administration, increased salaries (Ingersoll, 2000: 10) or an improved professional culture at the school that allows veteran and novice teachers to collaborate (Moore Johnson, 2006: 21). It is important to note here that teachers of varying experience levels must be encouraged to interact both formally and informally for the collaboration efforts to truly be successful in building a professional culture (Moore Johnson, 2006: 21).
2. At our school, in addition to organizational characteristics and/or conditions already described, a mechanism that is currently in place to support teachers is teams. Each teacher is assigned to a team. There are six teams total; two sixth grade teams, two seventh grade teams and two eighth grade teams. On the student side, the team is made up of half of the students in that grade (approximately 165 students per team). The students on the team are the subjects of the meetings but do not attend the meetings. On the teacher side, the team is made up of at least one math, science, language arts, social studies, special education and elective teacher and is a combination of novice through veteran teachers who collaborate with one another during team meetings. Team meetings are the most frequent meetings, with two team meetings per week.
3. The teachers in attendance at each team meeting teach the same group of students, which allows them to discuss successes and challenges with specific students in a variety of settings. These team meetings also allow team members to discuss rewards for students in the form of honors recognition, as well as to propose and implement plans to support students with problems who are not succeeding as a result of other efforts.

Minutes of Team Meetings

This study examines the minutes from team meetings that were on or near "busy"

times of the school year, i.e. the beginning of the year, when grades for report cards were due at each mid-quarter, quarters' end, and end of each semester (at the end of quarter two, grades for quarter two and semester one were due; at the end of quarter four, grades for quarter four, semester two and the year were due). During these busy times of the school year, decisions about students or groups of students were being discussed and/or enacted by teams. During the targeted times for year one of this study, there were thirty-seven occasions when each team had the opportunity to meet. The average number of team meetings that year was twenty-three. During the targeted times for year two of the study, there were thirty-six occasions when each team had the opportunity to meet and each team met an average of twenty times. Some of the reasons that teams did not meet as scheduled included: team leader absences, team agreements to use meeting time to enter and/or verify grades, special events. During the two-year course of this study, the total number of all team meetings for which there were minutes recorded was two hundred fifty-eight. For a complete listing of the actual dates targeted, see the Target Dates Tables in the Appendix.

Limitations of Study

Several assumptions were made in regards to this study that limit it, to a certain degree. The assumptions made were that:

1. All team meetings took place in some form as set forth by our weekly meeting schedule from Administration, 7:45 to 8:05 a.m. on Tuesdays and Fridays.
2. All team meetings were entered in to the Lotus Notes database as team meeting minutes.
3. Teacher discussions during team meetings were documented accurately.
4. Minutes for each meeting were complete.

An important factor that was not recorded in meeting minutes was the tone of the meetings. Future research could explore the tone of team meetings and the impact that the tone of meetings has on teachers.

Another factor that warrants further investigation is the ability of the team leader to keep the discussion focused on productive topics during team meetings. Future research could explore the impact that the ability of the team leader keeping the discussion

focused on productive topics has on teachers and the quality of the team meetings.

Other factors that could also be considered in regards to attrition rates are the status of the economy and the availability (or lack thereof) of open teaching positions at other schools on Kauai.

One factor that was not documented in any of the meeting minutes but may be worth investigating further was the participation of Team 1 in the AVID Summer Institute during the summer of 2007 and again in the summer of 2008. AVID stands for Advancement Via Individual Determination and the summer institutes are intensive weeklong training sessions for teachers. The summer institutes took place on the mainland, which required the teachers from Team 1 to travel, room and board together for the duration of the weeklong session. During the summer session, teachers were trained in AVID strategies, which were designed to focus on improving the overall academic performance of students. Future research could explore how such a training session could impact a team of teachers as it relates to: skills and instructional strategies learned; increased familiarity with the other teachers on the team and their teaching styles; a decreased need for time spent in team meetings because the aforementioned knowledge base already exists.

The final factor that may be worthy of further research is what teachers would do with their time if they were not scheduled to be in meetings? In the case of Team 1, the team with the lowest number of meeting minutes recorded, one could speculate that they were using the time wisely because they experienced no turnover during the course of this two-year study.

Chapter 3. Findings

Data and Data Coding

As cited by Ingersoll, teachers who left a teaching position are divided into two categories: transfers and leavers (Ingersoll, 2000: 10). Transfers are teachers who transfer or move to a different teaching position. Leavers are teachers who leave the occupation of teaching altogether. Table 1 lists the sixteen reasons cited by teachers for their dissatisfaction, gleaned from all nine articles reported in Chapter 1 (hereafter, Table 1 will be referred to as the "Dear Folks, I Quit" list). All together, these reasons are used a

total of 55 times in these articles. Table 1 shows the frequency, or relative emphasis of each reason, and is reported as N (% total reasons). For example, student discipline 8 (15%) denotes that this reason was cited 8 times, and made up 15%, (or 8 divided by 55) of the total responses. Percentages given in Table 1 are rounded to the nearest whole number. From the reasons, corresponding Reason Given and Minutes Codes were created and used to code minutes from team meetings at the school.

Table 1. The "Dear Folks, I Quit" list: Reasons reported in educational literature for teacher dissatisfaction; includes both transfers and leavers.

Reasons Cited for Teacher Dissatisfaction	Frequency Cited	Reason Given and Minutes Code Used in This Study
Student Discipline Problems	8 (15%)	Student Discipline; SD
Lack of Recognition or Support from Administration	6 (11%)	Lack, Admin; LAd
Poor Salary	6 (11%)	Poor Salary; PS
Inadequate Time to Prepare	5 (9%)	Inadequate Prep Time; IPT
Class Sizes Too Large	5 (9%)	Large Classes; LC
Lack of Influence Over School Decision Making or School Policy	4 (7%)	Lack, School Decisions; LSD
Lack of Student Motivation	4 (7%)	Lack, Student; LSt
Too Heavy a Workload	3 (5%)	Workload Too Heavy; WTH
Working/Workplace Conditions*	3 (5%)	Workplace Conditions; WC
No Opportunity for Professional Advancement	3 (5%)	Professional Advancement; PA
Intrusions on Teaching Time	2 (4%)	Intrusions on Teaching Time; ITT
Lack of Faculty Influence & Autonomy	2 (4%)	Lack, Autonomy; LAut
Problems with Scheduling Time to Collaborate	1 (2%)	Collaboration Time; CT
Lack of Professional Competence of Colleagues	1 (2%)	Colleague Competence; CC
Relationships with Principal, Students and/or Parents	1 (2%)	Relationships; R
Interference in Teaching	1 (2%)	Interference in Teaching; IIT

Total Reasons Given	55 (100%)	

*Includes: facilities in need of repair, problems with teaching assignments, and problems with supplies and/or equipment.

Overall Data for School

This study focused on the question "do the same problems arise in my school's team meetings that have been identified in the professional literature as reasons for teacher dissatisfaction that lead to teacher turnover? If so, how often do they arise and how are they addressed during the meetings?" Table 2 is representative of the quality of team meetings - as measured by satisfaction, productivity and the focus of the topics discussed - and contains explanations for each of the reasons reported in the educational literature for teacher dissatisfaction and corresponding representative comments from meeting minutes for all six teams. The explanations were derived from a combination of the educational literature and the meeting minutes for all six teams. Meeting minutes were coded using terms derived from the educational literature, as shown in Tables 1 and 2. The items in the Representative Comments column include interpretation of the discussion around that item as procedural, a problem, neutral or a solution (where appropriate and context could be derived from the surrounding discussion).

Table 2. Reasons explained with representative comments from the meeting minutes of all six teams

Reason Given and Minutes Code Used in This Study (From Table 1)	**Explanation (Combined from literature and meeting minutes for all six teams)**	**Representative Comments (From meeting minutes for all six teams)**
Student Discipline; SD	Problems with student behavior including the correct procedures for addressing as set forth by school administration	Procedural: "Counselor shared form to keep documentation on kids with problems. Interventions have to be put forth first, before trying to get them services." Perceived as solution: "Discussed nominations of students for honors recognition." Perceived as problem: "Share with Advisory classes; recess downstairs only, elevator off limits, plants/vandalism, eating snack outside of building."

Lack, Admin; LAd	Problems receiving support, recognition or being acknowledged by school administration	Perceived as solution: "…Admin is willing to help set up and attend team assemblies to discuss rules and expectations for luncheon…" Perceived as problem: "Teacher brought up that recognition and praise for suggestions and positive feedback is greatly appreciated and often sorely lacking…"
Poor Salary; PS	Amount of work or effort being put forth is not commensurate with pay	Perceived as solution: "UH Professor has a grant that would like to use with our Service learning/field trip." Perceived as problem: "Classroom supplies, vendor now charges shipping to Hawaii, $200 allotment per teacher."
Inadequate Prep Time; IPT	Not enough time scheduled during regular work day to allow for adequate preparation of lessons, materials, excursions, etc.	Perceived as solution: "teachers meet with KCC professor to incorporate another activity so students can break up into two big groups rather than all going to the lo'i together." Perceived as problem: "concerns for student who speaks no English from China. Are they going to try to get a translator? He is lost. Can we get translation dictionaries for each of his teachers?"
Large Classes; LC	Too many students in one classroom for one teacher to adequately manage while delivering meaningful instruction	Perceived as problem: "talked about the testing schedule and how difficult it is to keep all of the students engaged and quiet for 90 minutes while the class next door is testing at the same time."
Lack, School Decisions; LSD	The ability to influence school policy or decision making	Perceived as solution: "Team shirt design; motorcycle unity design for now." Perceived as problem: "Interdisciplinary unit; can we turn in changes only?"
Lack, Student; LSt	Student(s) being self motivated to complete tasks related to school or school work	Perceived as solution: "Student concern; strategies on helping student be successful and deal with frustrations at school. Perceived as problem: "Big

		discussion on tutoring and after school program, see after school program as a big party room and students will not leave to go to teachers' room to do school work. Many students in after school program have not turned in class work."
Workload Too Heavy; WTH	Too many tasks to complete in the amount of time available	Perceived as solution: "IEP today, teacher 1 will go, Monday, teacher 2 will go to a different IEP, Wednesday, teacher 3 will go to a third IEP." Perceived as problem: "Minutes for team meetings; request that everyone take turns doing them."
Workplace Conditions; WC	A range from facilities in need of repair and problems with teaching assignments to problems with supplies and equipment	"For next year, fix the laminator."
Professional Advancement; PA	Opportunity for promotion in rank or position, ability to move ahead	"Principal want a teacher to the AVID training this summer in Sacramento. Would like a teacher that has not gone yet."
Intrusions on Teaching Time; ITT	Interference during regularly scheduled instruction time	"Excursion to county parks." "Conference week Sept. 15-19, students excused at 11:30 am."
Lack, Autonomy; LAut	The ability to influence the faculty and/or the autonomy to make decisions independent of the rest of the faculty	Perceived as solution: "Team cheer; students need to demonstrate and we need to select one. Perceived as problem: "Team leader came in late because of traffic/accident on west side this morning… so we did email meeting via a different teacher. Everyone responded to email with notes he sent out to team on behalf of team leader."
Collaboration Time; CT	Time scheduled during regular work day, week or year to collaborate with colleagues, or a lack thereof	Perceived as solution: "On time and lock down discussion; should we as a team lock doors when tardy bell rings. Most felt we should first let students succeed with being on time to class, instead of locking them out right away." Perceived as problem: "IDU field trip; teachers will need to use

		planning days for the sub."
Colleague Competence; CC	Interactions with colleagues and their ability to meet an expected or required standard	Perceived as solution: "Kudos to chorus teacher… another awesome program." Perceived as problem: "Coaching form and 'coaches' visit schedule."
Relationships; R	The connections between these groups especially with regard to their ability to communicate or cooperate with one another	"Get signatures on mid-quarter 3 reports" "June 3; yearbooks will be distributed during last period of class." "Parent conference… any word from student's mom?"
Interference in Teaching; IIT	Being required or mandated to teach a certain way or use certain instructional strategies	"Binder review; work on during Advisory. Mandatory for all to have." "Discussed objectives; writing it on the board."

Year One

National vs. School Findings

In contrast to the frequency of problems cited by teachers from national studies (see Table 1), the most commonly discussed items (or uses of the team meeting time) during SY07-08 were Collaboration Time and Workload Too Heavy. These findings are shown in Table 3. Table 3 is a findings comparison between the national studies and the findings for all six teams individually and combined (the sum of the number of discussions about that problem for all six teams). The Problems Identified column contains the national studies findings in order from highest to lowest frequency, as was shown in Table 1. Each of the six Team columns contains the individual findings for that team and shows the frequency, or relative emphasis of each problem, reported as N (% total problems). For example, in the Team 1 column, Student Discipline; SD 18 (21%) denotes that student discipline was discussed 18 times and made up 21% of the total discussions. The Combined Totals column contains the sum of the number of discussions about that problem for all six teams and shows that all together, the problems identified on the national level were topics of discussion 1072 times. For example, Student Discipline; SD 126 (12%) denotes that this problem was discussed a total of 126 times by

all six teams, and made up 12%, (or 126 divided by 1072) of the total discussions. Percentages given in Table 3 are rounded to the nearest whole number.

The row Number of Meetings shows the number of minutes for which each team had minutes recorded. The Number of Positions Turned Over row contains the attrition data provided by the principal for each team and the combined total for the school. An FTE of 1.0 means that the position is full-time while .5 means that the position is only half time.

Teacher Turnover

During the school year 2007-2008, the school experienced turnover in a total of thirteen positions. Of the thirteen, two teachers were not on a team because the positions fell under the category Support Staff, meaning that both teachers had minimal contact with students. After SY07-08, administration determined that all Support Staff needed support and impacts the students and therefore all persons assigned to positions in the category of Support Staff were assigned to teams.

Table 3. Findings comparison for year one, national vs. all six teams

Problems Identified Nationally (In order from highest to lowest frequency, from Table 1)	**Team 1**	**Team 2**	**Team 3**	**Team 4**	**Team 5**	**Team 6**	**School Wide Combined Totals**
Student Discipline (15%); SD	18 (21%)	39 (12%)	18 (10%)	8 (10%)	18 (8%)	25 (13%)	**126 (12%)**
Lack, Admin (11%); LAd	0 (0%)	13 (4%)	4 (2%)	1 (1%)	4 (2%)	2 (1%)	**24 (2%)**
Poor Salary (11%); PS	0 (0%)	11 (4%)	4 (2%)	0 (0%)	5 (2%)	6 (3%)	**26 (2%)**
Inadequate Prep Time (9%); IPT	4 (5%)	33 (11%)	7 (4%)	16 (20%)	24 (11%)	2 (1%)	**86 (8%)**
Large Classes (9%); LC	0 (0%)	6 (2%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	**8 (1%)**
Lack, School Decisions (7%); LSD	0 (0%)	6 (2%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	6 (3%)	3 (2%)	**17 (2%)**
Lack, Student (7%); LSt	21 (24%)	37 (12%)	22 (12%)	7 (9%)	22 (10%)	23 (12%)	**132 (12%)**
Workload Too Heavy (5%); WTH	9 (10%)	29 (9%)	39 (21%)	18 (22%)	25 (12%)	34 (18%)	**154 (14%)**
Workplace Conditions (5%); WC	1 (1%)	21 (7%)	9 (5%)	4 (5%)	19 (9%)	7 (4%)	**61 (6%)**
Professional Advancement (5%); PA	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	1 (>1%)	0 (0%)	**2 (>1%)**
Intrusions on Teaching Time (4%); ITT	6 (7%)	20 (6%)	15 (8%)	3 (4%)	13 (6%)	12 (6%)	**69 (6%)**
Lack, Autonomy (4%); LAut	2 (2%)	7 (2%)	6 (3%)	1 (1%)	3 (1%)	3 (2%)	**22 (2%)**
Collaboration Time (2%); CT	20 (23%)	56 (18%)	36 (20%)	20 (24%)	47 (22%)	40 (21%)	**219 (20%)**
Colleague Competence (2%); CC	0 (0%)	1 (>1%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	5 (2%)	0 (0%)	**7 (1%)**
Relationships (2%); R	5 (6%)	33 (11%)	19 (10%)	2 (2%)	26 (12%)	27 (14%)	**112 (10%)**
Interference in Teaching (2%); IIT	0 (0%)	1 (>1%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5 (3%)	**7 (1%)**
Total Problems Identified	**86 (100%)**	**313 (100%)**	**184 (100%)**	**82 (100%)**	**218 (100%)**	**189 (100%)**	**1072 (100%)**
Number of Meetings	**14**	**31**	**22**	**16**	**30**	**27**	**140**
Number of Positions Turned Over	**0 FTE**	**2.5 FTE**	**1.5 FTE**	**2 FTE**	**4.5 FTE**	**.5 FTE**	**13 FTE***

***2 teachers were not on a team because the positions fell under the category Support Staff, meaning that both teachers had minimal contact with students.

External vs. Internal Factors

Ingersoll stated that for teachers, organizational characteristics at their school are the internal organization and management of the school (Ingersoll, 2003: 5). The teacher workload at any given school then, is a product of the organization and management of that school as mandated by the school administration. Based on the findings for year one SY 07-08 for all six teams, it appears that all teams spent too much time collaborating about the heaviness of the workload. Since the workload was mandated by the school administration, the heaviness of the workload was not within the control of any of the teams (or any of the teams' teacher members). Factors that are not within the control of any of the teams are external factors. Fourteen out of sixteen items on the list of nationally identified problems are external factors.

The two items on the list of nationally identified problems that are within the control of teams are still influenced by school administration, although to a much lesser extent. Those two items are Lack of Student Motivation and Student Discipline. These two items are within the control of teams (or any of the teams' teacher members) because in the majority of classrooms, the individuals present are the teacher and his or her students. The teacher is in charge of engaging and motivating their students to learn while they are in the classroom together and one of the many tasks that make up the occupation of teaching is managing student discipline. Factors that are within the control of teams (or any of the teams' teacher members) are internal factors. During year one of this study, all teams should have been focusing on internal factors, such as successful instructional strategies or struggling students.

Top Four Locally Occurring Problems

Table 4 is a findings comparison between the national frequency and school frequency for the top four locally occurring problems. This table isolates the top four locally occurring problems because: the problems were the same for both years of the study, though occurring in varying frequency; there was a sizable gap between the top four locally occurring problems and the remaining twelve items on the national list; two of the top four problems were internal. The column Top Four Locally Occurring Problems lists the four most frequently occurring problems at the school in order from highest to lowest frequency. The column National Frequency reflects the national

frequency as shown in Table 1. The column School Frequency reflects the Combined Totals for all teams for each problem from Table 3. The column Internal or External Factor shows whether the problem was identified as an external factor (not within the control of teams or any of the teams' teacher members) or an internal factor (within the control of teams or any of the teams' teacher members) for year one of the study.

Collaboration Time was identified as an external factor and had a very low frequency on the national level. It was the most discussed topic of conversation, or use of team meeting time, for year one of the study at the school. Workload Too Heavy was also identified as an external factor and had a low frequency on the national level but it was the second most discussed problem for year one of the study at the school. Lack of Student Motivation was the third most discussed problem, was identified as an internal factor, and arose as a topic of conversation almost twice as frequently at the school level compared to the national level. The fourth most discussed problem was also an internal factor and was the only problem that was less frequent at the school level than at the national level, Student Discipline, and it was only lower at the school level by 3%.

Table 4. Findings comparison for year one, national frequency vs. school frequency for the top four locally occurring problems with internal or external factor identified.

Top Four Locally Occurring Problems (In order from highest to lowest frequency)	**National % Frequency**	**School % Frequency**	**Internal Factor or External Factor**
Collaboration Time; CT	2%	20%	External Factor
Workload Too Heavy; WTH	5%	14%	External Factor
Lack, Student; LSt	7%	12%	Internal Factor
Student Discipline; SD	15%	12%	Internal Factor

Year Two

National vs. School Findings

The findings for the second year of the study were also in contrast to the frequency of problems cited by teachers from national studies (see Table 1). During SY08-09 the most commonly discussed items (or uses of the team meeting time) were Workload Too Heavy and Lack of Student Motivation. These findings are shown in Table 5, a findings comparison between the national studies and the findings for all six teams individually and combined. The Problems Identified column contains the national

studies findings in order from highest to lowest frequency, as was shown in Table 1. Each of the six Team columns contains the individual findings for that team and shows the frequency, or relative emphasis of each problem, reported as N (% total problems). For example, in the Team 1 column, Student Discipline; SD 7 (22%) denotes that student discipline was discussed 7 times and made up 22% of the total discussions. The Combined Totals column contains the sum of the number of discussions for all six teams for that problem and shows that all together, the problems identified on the national level were discussed 801 times. For example, Student Discipline; SD 102 (13%) denotes that this problem was discussed a total of 102 times by all of the teams, and made up 13%, (or 102 divided by 801) of the total problems discussed. Percentages given in Table 5 are rounded to the nearest whole number.

The row, Number of Meetings, shows the number of minutes for which each team had minutes recorded. The Number of Positions Turned over row contains the attrition data provided by the principal for each team and the combined total for the school. An FTE of 1.0 means that the position is full-time while .5 means that the position is only half time.

Teacher Turnover

Only three positions turned over at the end of SY08-09; this was the least amount of turnover since the school opened in SY00-01. Based on the frequency of the items being discussed in all of team meetings, it appears that the workload was twice as heavy in year two of the study (14% in year one vs. 28% in year two) and was being discussed in an attempt to manage it during the majority of team meeting time. Lack of Student Motivation increased as a topic of discussion by 3% from year one to year two. Similarly, Student Discipline increased as a topic of discussion by 1% from year one to year two. Though the student centered topics (internal factors) appeared to increase by only small margins, this shift in focus could represent a significant change in the way teams viewed and handled items within their control and the group with which teachers spent the majority of their work day interacting; their students.

Table 5. Findings comparison for year two, national vs. all six teams

Problems Identified Nationally (In order from highest to lowest frequency, from Table 1)	**Team 1**	**Team 2**	**Team 3**	**Team 4**	**Team 5**	**Team 6**	**School Wide Combined Totals**
Student Discipline (15%); SD	7 (22%)	33 (16%)	13 (10%)	20 (14%)	16 (11%)	13 (9%)	**102 (13%)**
Lack, Admin (11%); LAd	0 (0%)	21 (10%)	0 (0%)	5 (4%)	5 (3%)	2 (1%)	**33 (4%)**
Poor Salary (11%); PS	0 (0%)	2 (1%)	0 (0%)	5 (4%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	**8 (1%)**
Inadequate Prep Time (9%); IPT	5 (16%)	16 (8%)	2 (2%)	7 (5%)	9 (6%)	0 (0%)	**39 (5%)**
Large Classes (9%); LC	0 (0%)	1 (>1%)	0 (0%)	5 (4%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	**7 (1%)**
Lack, School Decisions (7%); LSD	1 (3%)	5 (2%)	4 (3%)	11 (8%)	10 (7%)	5 (4%)	**36 (4%)**
Lack, Student (7%); LSt	7 (22%)	54 (26%)	15 (12%)	20 (14%)	14 (9%)	11 (8%)	**121 (15%)**
Workload Too Heavy (5%); WTH	3 (9%)	28 (13%)	45 (35%)	36 (26%)	31 (21%)	79 (56%)	**222 (28%)**
Workplace Conditions (5%); WC	0 (0%)	1 (>1%)	7 (6%)	1 (1%)	6 (4%)	6 (4%)	**21 (3%)**
Professional Advancement (5%); PA	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	**1 (>1%)**
Intrusions on Teaching Time (4%); ITT	3 (9%)	3 (1%)	7 (6%)	10 (7%)	9 (6%)	6 (4%)	**38 (5%)**
Lack, Autonomy (4%); LAut	0 (0%)	5 (2%)	6 (5%)	6 (4%)	5 (3%)	1 (1%)	**23 (3%)**
Collaboration Time (2%); CT	6 (19%)	22 (11%)	20 (16%)	15 (11%)	26 (17%)	14 (10%)	**103 (13%)**
Colleague Competence (2%); CC	0 (0%)	1 (>1%)	4 (3%)	0 (0%)	3 (2%)	1 (1%)	**9 (1%)**
Relationships (2%); R	0 (0%)	15 (7%)	3 (2%)	0 (0%)	11 (7%)	4 (3%)	**33 (4%)**
Interference in Teaching (2%); IIT	0 (0%)	1 (>1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (3%)	0 (0%)	**5 (1%)**
Total Problems Identified	**32 (100%)**	**208 (100%)**	**127 (100%)**	**141 (100%)**	**151 (100%)**	**142 (100%)**	**801 (100%)**
Number of Meetings	**4**	**27**	**17**	**19**	**27**	**24**	**118**
Number of Positions Turned Over	**0 FTE**	**0 FTE**	**.5 FTE**	**1 FTE**	**1 FTE**	**.5 FTE**	**3 FTE**

Top Four Locally Occurring Problems

Table 6 is a findings comparison between the national frequency and school frequency for the top four locally occurring problems. The column Top Four Locally Occurring Problems lists the four most frequently occurring problems at the school in order from highest to lowest frequency. The column National Frequency reflects the frequency as shown in Table 1. The column School Frequency reflects the Combined Totals for the four problems from Table 3. The column Internal or External Factor shows whether the problem was identified as an external factor (not within the control of teams or any of the teams' teacher members) or an internal factor (within the control of teams or any of the teams' teacher members) for year two of the study.

Workload Too Heavy was identified as an external factor and had a low frequency on the national level. It was the most discussed topic of conversation, or use of team meeting time, for year two of the study at the school. Lack of Student Motivation was the second most discussed problem, was identified as an internal factor, and arose as a topic of conversation just over twice as often at the school level compared to the national level. Collaboration Time was identified as an external factor and had a low frequency on the national level but it was the third most discussed problem for year two of the study at the school. The fourth most discussed problem for both years of the study was an internal factor and was the only problem that was less frequent at the school level than at the national level, Student Discipline. In year one of the study it was lower at the school level than at the national level by 3% and in year two of the study it was lower at the school level than at the nation level by 2%.

Table 6. Findings comparison for year two, national frequency vs. school frequency for the top four locally occurring problems with internal or external factor identified

Top Four Locally Occurring Problems (In order from highest to lowest frequency)	**National % Frequency**	**School % Frequency**	**Internal or External Factor**
Workload Too Heavy; WTH	5%	28%	External Factor
Lack, Student; LSt	7%	15%	Internal Factor
Collaboration Time; CT	2%	13%	External Factor
Student Discipline; SD	15%	13%	Internal Factor

Team Leader Interviews

To further clarify the results found by analyzing the team meeting minutes, interviews were conducted with the teachers who were team leaders during the two school years of this study. Of the seven teachers who served as team leaders during that time period, 100% currently hold the same teaching positions at the school. The team leader for Team 6 declined to be interviewed. For Team 5, there was a change of team leader after the first year of the study. The interview questions were derived from and correlated with the aforementioned Reasons Cited for Dissatisfaction from the "Dear Folks, I Quit" list (see Table 1). For a complete list of interview questions and their correlated reason codes, see the Team Leader Interview Data in the Appendix. When the answers from the team leaders were compared, there was consensus that the workload at the school was too heavy and the majority of team meeting time was spent collaborating in order to reduce the stress felt about that heavy workload. More details about underlying problems and solutions follow.

Roles and Responsibilities

All of the teams split up assignments and responsibilities in an effort to make the workload more manageable. Every team leader gave reminders to team members consistently to keep each member of the team on track and up to date with deadlines from administration, upcoming meetings, and other issues that came up and were pertinent to the team, its' students, or its' teachers.

Collaboration During Team Meetings

Team meeting time was used to collaborate during team meetings, but collaboration was not always positive. In the two cases where the team leaders felt that it was positive, the feeling seemed to come from an attitude that all of the teachers on the team were willing to share with and learn from each other, or the expectation was managed from the beginning of the school year that the student's best interest would be at the forefront of all interactions. From a third team leader's perspective, the collaboration being positive was largely dependent upon whether the members could carry their portion of the workload (as assigned by administration and team) in a positive way and refrain from attacking each other. Lastly, two team leaders reported that being positive was challenging and that in order to accomplish all of the assigned tasks, teachers had to be

reminded of administration's perspective.

Focus on Student Progress

All of the teams discussed students during meeting time with a focus on helping those students who were unmotivated or had discipline problems. In all cases, teachers on the same team compared notes about how particular students were doing in their classes, in certain social settings within classes, and in different environments within classes. Some teams utilized the school's standard procedures for supporting students while other teams were more creative, sometimes practicing goal setting with students or utilizing their own recess time to meet with students as an intervention. There was consensus among team leaders that team meeting time should continue to be used for collaboration. For a complete list of interview questions and answers, see the Team Leader Interview Data in the Appendix.

Data Analysis By Team

In the following discussion, the findings are presented according to team. The findings in this section are shown in Tables 7 through 12 and are findings comparisons between the national studies and the findings from year one and two of the study for each of the six teams. The Problems Identified column contains the national studies findings, if they arose during meetings for that team, in order from highest to lowest frequency (similar to what was shown in Table 1). Underneath each table, the problems that were not discussed for that particular team during either year of the study are noted. Each table contains a Year 1, SY07-08 Column and a Year 2, SY08-09 column. The column for each year contains the individual findings for that team and shows the frequency, or relative emphasis of each problem, reported as N (% total problems). For example, in Table 7 Student Discipline; SD 18 (21%) denotes that this problem was discussed a total of 86 times by Team 1, and made up 21% (or 18 divided by 86) of the total problems discussed. Percentages given in Tables 7 through 12 are rounded to the nearest whole number.

Team 1

Team 1 was the only one of the six teams that did not experience any turnover by the conclusion of either school year of the study. Team 1 also had the fewest number of team meetings for which minutes were recorded (14 in year one and 4 in year two). Although it was not mentioned in any of their minutes, Team 1 participated in AVID Summer Institutes during the summer of 2007 and again in the summer of 2008. These summer institutes were intensive weeklong training sessions for teachers that took place on the mainland and required the teachers from Team 1 to travel, room and board together for the duration of the session. Attending the summer institutes together and working closely with similar strategies likely had a lasting impact on the teachers of Team 1.

Both internal factors, student discipline and lack of student motivation, combined as topics of discussion for a total of 45% in year one and 44% in year two for Team 1. Though they did not meet often during the two year time period of this study, when Team 1 did meet, they spent the majority of their time discussing items within their control and the people with whom they spent the most time interacting; their students. It is interesting to note that Workload Too Heavy was still an issue that was discussed during team meeting time for Team 1, but it came up only about 10% of the time, significantly less than what is shown in the overall results for the entire school (14% in year one and 28% in year two as shown in tables 3 and 5). Based on these findings for Team 1, one could speculate that less time in team meetings translates to more time for the members of Team 1 to address the heaviness of their workload.

Table 7. Team 1 Findings, Extracted from Tables 3 and 5

Problems Identified Nationally (In order from highest to lowest frequency, from Table 1)	**Year 1, SY07-08**	**Year 2, SY08-09**
Student Discipline; SD	18 (21%)	7 (22%)
Inadequate Prep Time; IPT	4 (5%)	5 (16%)
Lack, School Decisions; LSD	0 (0%)	1 (3%)
Lack, Student; LSt	21 (24%)	7 (22%)
Workload Too Heavy; WTH	9 (10%)	3 (9%)
Workplace Conditions; WC	1 (1%)	0 (0%)
Intrusions on Teaching Time; ITT	6 (7%)	3 (9%)

Lack, Autonomy; LAut	2 (2%)	0 (0%)
Collaboration Time; CT	20 (23%)	6 (19%)
Relationships; R	5 (6%)	0 (0%)
Interference in Teaching; IIT	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Total Problems Identified	**86 (100%)**	**32 (100%)**
Number of Meetings	**14**	**4**
Number of Positions Turned Over	**0 FTE**	**0 FTE**

The six nationally identified problems that did not occur during either year of study for Team 1 were: Lack, Admin, LAd; Poor Salary, PS; Large Classes, LC; Professional Advancement, PA; Colleague Competence, CC; Interference in Teaching; IIT.

Team 2

In stark contrast to Team 1, Team 2 had the highest number of team meeting minutes recorded with 31 in SY07-08 and 27 in SY08-09. When comparing the findings from year one to year two of the study, Team 2 spent significantly more time collaborating about external factors during year one, including: Poor Salary, Inadequate Prep Time, Large Classes, Workplace Conditions and Intrusions on Teaching Time. This focus on items beyond their control may have been a contributing factor to the turnover of 2.5 positions from Team 2 by the end of SY07-08. These findings suggest that teacher dissatisfaction was apparent and raise the question, could something have been done to prevent the dissatisfaction before it led to turnover?

At the end of SY08-09 Team 2 did not experience turnover in any teaching positions. The focus of 42% of the time spent in team meetings was on internal factors for Team 2 that year (16% Student Discipline and 26% Lack of Student Motivation). This is similar to Team 1 in that Team 2 spent the majority of their time during year two focused on discussing internal factors, or items within their control.

Table 8. Team 2 Findings, Extracted from Tables 3 and 5

Problems Identified Nationally (In order from highest to lowest frequency, from Table 1)	**Year 1, SY07-08**	**Year 2, SY08-09**
Student Discipline; SD	39 (12%)	33 (16%)
Lack, Admin; LAd	13 (4%)	21 (10%)
Poor Salary; PS	11 (4%)	2 (1%)
Inadequate Prep Time; IPT	33 (11%)	16 (8%)
Large Classes; LC	6 (2%)	1 (>1%)
Lack, School Decisions; LSD	6 (2%)	5 (2%)
Lack, Student; LSt	37 (12%)	54 (26%)
Workload Too Heavy; WTH	29 (9%)	28 (13%)
Workplace Conditions; WC	21 (7%)	1 (>1%)
Intrusions on Teaching Time; ITT	20 (6%)	3 (1%)
Lack, Autonomy; LAut	7 (2%)	5 (2%)
Collaboration Time; CT	56 (18%)	22 (11%)
Colleague Competence; CC	1 (>1%)	1 (>1%)
Relationships; R	33 (11%)	15 (7%)
Interference in Teaching; IIT	1 (>1%)	1 (>1%)
Total Problems Identified	**313 (100%)**	**208 (100%)**
Number of Meetings	**31**	**27**

Number of Positions Turned Over	2.5 FTE	0 FTE

The only nationally identified problem that did not occur during either year of study for Team 2 was Professional Advancement; PA.

Team 3

During both years of the study, Team 3 focused on internal factors during team meetings only 22% of the time (Student Discipline 10% and Lack of Student Motivation 12%). Turnover occurred at the end of both school years: in 1.5 positions at the end of SY07-08 and in .5 positions at the end of SY08-09.

During year one of the study, Team 3 discussed every item on the list of nationally identified problems at least once. This was the only time that a team did this for the duration of the study and could represent a lack of focus. Workload Too Heavy was significantly higher than what is shown in the overall results for the entire school: 21% for Team 3 during year one compared with 14% for the entire school. During year two of the study, Workload Too Heavy was significantly higher than all other items discussed for Team 3, as well as being higher than the findings for the school (35% compared with 28% for the entire school, as shown in tables 3 and 5).

Table 9. Team 3 Findings, Extracted from Tables 3 and 5

Problems Identified Nationally (In order from highest to lowest frequency, from Table 1)	**Year 1, SY07-08**	**Year 2, SY08-09**
Student Discipline; SD	18 (10%)	13 (10%)
Lack, Admin; LAd	4 (2%)	0 (0%)
Poor Salary; PS	4 (2%)	0 (0%)
Inadequate Prep Time; IPT	7 (4%)	2 (2%)
Large Classes; LC	1 (1%)	0 (0%)
Lack, School Decisions; LSD	1 (1%)	4 (3%)
Lack, Student; LSt	22 (12%)	15 (12%)
Workload Too Heavy; WTH	39 (21%)	45 (35%)
Workplace Conditions; WC	9 (5%)	7 (6%)
Professional Advancement; PA	1 (1%)	1 (1%)
Intrusions on Teaching Time; ITT	15 (8%)	7 (6%)
Lack, Autonomy; LAut	6 (3%)	6 (5%)
Collaboration Time; CT	36 (20%)	20 (16%)
Colleague Competence; CC	1 (1%)	4 (3%)
Relationships; R	19 (10%)	3 (2%)
Interference in Teaching; IIT	1 (1%)	0 (0%)
Total Problems Identified	**184 (100%)**	**127 (100%)**
Number of Meetings	**22**	**17**
Number of Positions Turned Over	**1.5 FTE**	**.5 FTE**

All nationally identified problems occurred at least once during year one of the study for Team 3.

Team 4

At the conclusion of SY07-08, Team 4 experienced turnover in 2 positions. During that year, Team 4 collaborated the most about external factors, Workload Too Heavy 22% and Inadequate Prep Time 20%. Workload Too Heavy was significantly higher than what is shown in the overall results for the entire school: 22% for Team 4 during year one compared with 14% for the entire school. During year one, Team 4 focused on internal factors for a total of 19% of their total discussions (Student Discipline 10% and Lack of Student Motivation 9%).

The focus of the discussions during team meeting time changed significantly the following year when Workload Too Heavy increased by 4%. Discussions regarding internal factors increased by 9% compared to year one (28% during year two from Student Discipline 14% and Lack of Student Motivation 14%). At the end of year two, turnover occurred in only 1 position.

Table 10. Team 4 Findings, Extracted from Tables 3 and 5

Problems Identified Nationally (In order from highest to lowest frequency, from Table 1)	**Year 1, SY07-08**	**Year 2, SY08-09**
Student Discipline; SD	8 (10%)	20 (14%)
Lack, Admin; LAd	1 (1%)	5 (4%)
Poor Salary; PS	0 (0%)	5 (4%)
Inadequate Prep Time; IPT	16 (20%)	7 (5%)
Large Classes; LC	1 (1%)	5 (4%)
Lack, School Decisions; LSD	1 (1%)	11 (8%)
Lack, Student; LSt	7 (9%)	20 (14%)
Workload Too Heavy; WTH	18 (22%)	36 (26%)
Workplace Conditions; WC	4 (5%)	1 (1%)
Intrusions on Teaching Time; ITT	3 (4%)	10 (7%)
Lack, Autonomy; LAut	1 (1%)	6 (4%)
Collaboration Time; CT	20 (24%)	15 (11%)
Relationships; R	2 (2%)	0 (0%)
Total Problems Identified	**82 (100%)**	**141 (100%)**
Number of Meetings	**16**	**19**
Number of Positions Turned Over	**2 FTE**	**1 FTE**

The three nationally identified problems that did not occur during either year of study for Team 4 were: Professional Advancement, PA; Colleague Competence, CC; Interference in Teaching; IIT.

Team 5

The highest amount of turnover for all teams occurred on Team 5 at the conclusion of year one with turnover in 4.5 positions. Team 5 spent their team meeting time discussing Collaboration Time the most (22% of the total items discussed) and focused on internal factors only 18% of the time (Student Discipline 8% and Lack of Student Motivation 10%). The focus of the discussions during team meeting time changed significantly the following year when a new team leader began leading the meetings. Collaboration Time dropped by 5% and Workload Too Heavy increased as a topic of discussion by 9%. Team 5 focused on internal factors 20% of the time (Student Discipline 11% and Lack of Student Motivation 9%), an increase of 2% from the previous year. Turnover at the close of SY08-09 was experienced in only 1 position for Team 5.

Over the two-year course of the study, Team 5 discussed every item on the list of nationally identified problems at least once. This was different from Team 3 in that Team 3 discussed every item during the course of year one. Team 5 discussing all problems may be attributed to the change of team leader between year one and year two of the study. Again, these findings suggest that teacher dissatisfaction was apparent and raise the question, could something have been done to prevent the dissatisfaction before it led to turnover?

Table 11. Team 5 Findings, Extracted from Tables 3 and 5

Problems Identified Nationally (In order from highest to lowest frequency, from Table 1)	**Year 1, SY07-08**	**Year 2, SY08-09**
Student Discipline; SD	18 (8%)	16 (11%)
Lack, Admin; LAd	4 (2%)	5 (3%)
Poor Salary; PS	5 (2%)	1 (1%)
Inadequate Prep Time; IPT	24 (11%)	9 (6%)
Large Classes; LC	0 (0%)	1 (1%)
Lack, School Decisions; LSD	6 (3%)	10 (7%)
Lack, Student; LSt	22 (10%)	14 (9%)
Workload Too Heavy; WTH	25 (12%)	31 (21%)
Workplace Conditions; WC	19 (9%)	6 (4%)
Professional Advancement; PA	1 (>1%)	0 (0%)
Intrusions on Teaching Time; ITT	13 (6%)	9 (6%)

Lack, Autonomy; LAut	3 (1%)	5 (3%)
Collaboration Time; CT	47 (22%)	26 (17%)
Colleague Competence; CC	5 (2%)	3 (2%)
Relationships; R	26 (12%)	11 (7%)
Interference in Teaching; IIT	0 (0%)	4 (3%)
Total Problems Identified	**218 (100%)**	**151 (100%)**
Number of Meetings	**30**	**27**
Number of Positions Turned Over	**4.5 FTE**	**1 FTE**

All nationally identified problems occurred at least once during the two-year course of the study for Team 5.

Team 6

Team 6 experienced the lowest amount of turnover of all teams (while still experiencing some turnover) for both school years with .5 positions turning over at the conclusion of each year. During SY07-08, Team 6 focused their team meeting time on internal factors 25% of the time (Student Discipline 13% and Lack of Student Motivation 12%). They also emphasized the external factors Collaboration Time 21%, Workload Too Heavy 18% and Relationships 14%. During year two, Team 6 shifted the focus of their discussions significantly and the external factor Workload Too Heavy shot up to 56%, twice the amount in the findings for the school (as shown in table 5). Collaboration Time dropped to 10% and internal factors decreased to 17%. Based on these findings, it appears that Team 6 spent more time trying to manage the heaviness of their workload and less time addressing the internal factors within their control.

Table 12. Team 6 Findings, Extracted from Tables 3 and 5

Problems Identified Nationally (In order from highest to lowest frequency, from Table 1)	**Year 1, SY07-08**	**Year 2, SY08-09**
Student Discipline; SD	25 (13%)	13 (9%)
Lack, Admin; LAd	2 (1%)	2 (1%)
Poor Salary; PS	6 (3%)	0 (0%)
Inadequate Prep Time; IPT	2 (1%)	0 (0%)
Lack, School Decisions; LSD	3 (2%)	5 (4%)
Lack, Student; LSt	23 (12%)	11 (8%)
Workload Too Heavy; WTH	34 (18%)	79 (56%)
Workplace Conditions; WC	7 (4%)	6 (4%)
Intrusions on Teaching Time; ITT	12 (6%)	6 (4%)
Lack, Autonomy; LAut	3 (2%)	1 (1%)
Collaboration Time; CT	40 (21%)	14 (10%)
Colleague Competence; CC	0 (0%)	1 (1%)
Relationships; R	27 (14%)	4 (3%)
Interference in Teaching; IIT	5 (3%)	0 (0%)
Total Problems Identified	**189 (100%)**	**142 (100%)**
Number of Meetings	**27**	**24**
Number of Positions Turned Over	**.5 FTE**	**.5 FTE**

The two nationally identified problems that did not occur during either year of study for Team 6 were: Large Classes, LC and Professional Advancement, PA.

Chapter 4. Conclusions and Recommendations

This study investigated what teachers at my school discussed during team meetings, and the nature as well as frequency of the problems that came up during these meetings. Specifically, the study examined whether the same problems arose in my school's team meetings that have been identified in the professional literature as reasons for teacher dissatisfaction that led to teacher turnover. Purposes for comparing the findings on the content of team meeting discussions with the national findings were to identify and describe problems faced by teachers at my school, and to help illuminate the nature and frequency of these problems.

Conclusions

Underlying this study was the question "do the same problems arise in my school's team meetings that have been identified in the professional literature as reasons for teacher dissatisfaction that lead to teacher turnover?" The answer is yes because all sixteen problems that were identified by teachers (see the "Dear Folks, I Quit" list, Table 1) for dissatisfaction leading to turnover on the national level came up during biweekly team meetings at the school. No additional items came up that were outside of the "Dear Folks, I Quit" list of problems identified nationally. Discussion of the dissatisfaction topics varied by team and by year. In the case of Team 5, the only team that had a change of team leader between year one and year two of the study, the discussion of dissatisfaction topics also varied according to team leader. The derived national list of problems therefore was applicable for examining the content of team meeting discussions at my school.

This study contributed an additional insight into research available on the nature of problems faced by teachers by disaggregating the national list of problems cited into two categories: internal and external problems. Internal problems are those within the control of the teams (or any of the teams' teacher members). External problems are those not within the control of any of the teams (or any of the teams' teacher members).

Internal Problems

Two internal problems, Student Discipline and Lack of Student Motivation, arose

during team meetings. School administration still influences these two items, although to a much lesser extent than the other fourteen external problems on the list. These two items occur with high frequency at both the national level and the school level. These findings point to the need and the opportunity for teachers to work as a team with administration to address and/or mitigate these problems.

During the course of this two-year study, successful solutions for the internal problems Student Discipline and Lack of Student Motivation included: administration having a set of procedures in place for teachers and teams to follow, administration's support of teachers and teams working on developing plans and/or goal setting with students, administration's support of teams requiring students to meet with teams during lunch or recess time as an intervention.

External Factors

Fourteen problems were identified as external because they were not within the control of any of the teams (or any of the teams' teacher members). Two external factors problems arose during team meetings at my school with higher frequency than at the national level:

- Workload Too Heavy (National 5%; School Range 9% to 50%) occurred with a much higher frequency on the school level than on the national level. Although the workload at a school is mandated by the school administration, this study clearly identified workload as a problem that should be addressed by teachers and school administrators working together to create a professional culture that allows for teachers to have input in creating a workload that is manageable.
- Collaboration Time as a problem or use of team meeting time was also much higher on the school level than on the national level (National 2 %; School Range 10% to 24%). The educational literature indicates that it is important for teachers to collaborate. Based on findings of this study, teams that are empowered with the ability to determine whether or not they need to meet – like Team 1 – appear to have had lower teacher turnover (see Tables 3, 5 and 7). These findings support teachers and school administrators working together to create a professional culture that empowers teams to determine whether there is a need to

meet, identify problems and act on them, or not to meet so that collaboration time does not create or add to a heavy workload.

Findings of this study, although not definitive, suggest the need for additional studies to determine whether and how external factors correlate with high teacher turnover. Further, this study raises the question if teachers and school administrators work together to address or resolve external concerns, could they reduce teacher turnover?

Recommendations

This study contributed a compiled list of problems identified by teachers as dissatisfactions and reasons for leaving the teaching profession that were reported in various educational publications. This derived list, the "Dear Folks, I Quit" list, (see Table 1) was used successfully to identify the problems that arose during team meetings held over the course of two years in the school studied. The list proved complete; no additional teacher dissatisfaction problems were identified. Further research is needed to determine the completeness and appropriateness of the "Dear Folks, I Quit" list for analysis of team meetings at schools elsewhere. If the list was used elsewhere and additions were needed, others are certainly welcome to add to it.

Further study is also needed on how the "Dear Folks, I Quit" list could be used by teachers and administrators to make them aware of problems and provide a basis for the creation of a professional culture where team leaders and teacher team members made aware of the items on this list and their designation as internal or external factors would be given the opportunity to: focus on internal factors, work together on external factors, and help create a professional culture where their input is valued and their workload is manageable.

This study, and the recommended further studies based on findings of this study, could lead to improved teaching situations, a higher level of teacher satisfaction, and therefore contribute to decreasing teacher turnover.

References

Alliance for Excellent Education. (2005). *Teacher attrition: A costly loss to the nation and to the states.* Washington, DC: Author.

Alliance for Excellent Education. (2008). *What Keeps Good Teachers in the Classroom? Understanding and Reducing Teacher Turnover.* Washington, DC: Author.

Almack, J.C. (1933 reprinted 1970). *Modern School Administration, Its Problems and Progress.* Boston, MA: Ayer.

Fairfax County School Board Auditor. (1998). *A Report on Employee Turnover Patterns in the Fairfax County Public Schools in Relation to National and Regional Trends.* Retrieved December 1, 2008 from Fairfax County Public Schools Website: http://www.fcps.edu/schlbd/reports/School%20Board%20Auditor%20Reports/A%20Report%20of%20Employee%20Turnover%20Patterns%20in%20FCPS%20in%20Relation%20to%20National%20and%20Regional%20Trends%20-%20Nov.%2016,%201998.pdf.

Hawaii State Department of Education. (2009). *Chiefess Kamakahelei Middle Trend Report Educational and Fiscal Accountability School Report for School Year 2008-2009.* Retrieved March 4, 2010 from http://165.248.6.166/data/school.asp?schoolcode=448.

Ingersoll, R.M. (2000). *Turnover Among Mathematics and Science Teachers in the U.S.* Retrieved December 1, 2008 from US Department of Education: www.ed.gov/inits/Math/glenn/Ingersollp.doc.

Ingersoll, R.M. (2001). *Teacher Turnover, Teacher Shortages, and the Organization of Schools.* Retrieved December 2, 2008 from UW Departments Web Server: depts.washington.edu/ctpmail/PDFs/Turnover-Ing-01-2001.pdf

Ingersoll, R.M. (2003). *Is There Really A Teacher Shortage?* Retrieved December 4,

2008 from UW Departments Web Server: depts.washington.edu/ctpmail/PDFs/Shortage-RI-09-2003.pdf.

Moore Johnson, S., Baldacci, L., Nelson, F.H., & Donaldson, M.L. (2006). *Why New Teachers Leave... and Why New Teachers Stay.* American Educator, 30(2), Retrieved June 14, 2009 from http://archive.aft.org/pubs-reports/american_educator/issues/summer06/index.htm

National Academy of Sciences. (1987). *Toward Understanding Teacher Supply and Demand*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2005). *Special Analysis 2005 Mobility in the Teacher Workforce.* Retrieved June 14, 2009 from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/2005/analysis/sa09.asp.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Wallis, C., Healy, R., Hylton, H., & Klarreich, K. (2008). *How to Make Great Teachers.* TIME, 171, No.8, 28-34.

Appendix

Target Dates Table for SY07-08

Targeted Busy Times, SY07-08	**Targeted Dates** Total number of meeting opportunities was 37 (if met every time)
Beginning of Year	8/3, 8/6, 8/10
Mid-Q1	8/20, 8/24, 8/27
End Q1	9/21, 9/24, 9/28
Begin Q2	10/8, 10/15, 10/19 (10/12 was a PC* day)
Mid-Q2	11/2, 11/5, 11/9
End Q2/Semester 1	12/7, 12/10, 12/14, 12/17 (12/21 was 1st day of Winter Break)
Begin Q3/Semester 2	1/18, 1/25, 1/28 (all other dates were teacher work day, holiday or waiver day)
Mid-Q3	2/1, 2/4, 2/8
End Q3	3/10, 3/14
Begin Q4	3/31, 4/4, 4/7
Mid-Q4	4/21, 4/25, 4/28
End Q4/Semester 2/Year	5/19, 5/23, 5/30, 6/2

*PC is Professional Collaboration

Target Dates Table for SY08-09

Target Busy Times, SY08-09	**Targeted Dates** Total number of meeting opportunities was 36 (if met every time)
Beginning of Year	8/1, 8/5, 8/8, 8/12
Mid-Q1	8/22, 8/26, 8/29
End Q1	9/26, 9/30
Begin Q2	10/14, 10/21, 10/24 (10/17 was Institute* day)
Mid-Q2	11/14, 11/18, 11/20 for 8B and 11/21 for all others
End Q2/Semester 1	12/9, 12/12, 12/16
Begin Q3/Semester 2	1/20, 1/23
Mid-Q3	1/30, 2/3, 2/6
End Q3	3/13, 3/17, 3/20
Begin Q4	4/7, 4/14, 4/17 (4/10 was a Holiday)
Mid-Q4	5/1, 5/5, 5/8
End Q4/Semester 2/Year	5/22, 5/26, 5/29, 6/2

*Institute Day is a union meeting day

Interview Question, (Correlated Reason Codes)
1. How did you become team leader for your team? (LAd, LAut)
2. Were you given specific tasks that you were to accomplish as team leader? (LAd, IPT, LAut)
3. When you became team leader, were you given the autonomy to determine whether or not you met, or to meet via email as a team? (LAd, WTH, LAut)
4. When you conducted) your team meetings, do (or did) you always begin the same way, i.e. a TRIBES activity or other “ice breaker”? (IPT, WTH, CT, R)
5. Do (or did) you structure your meetings in a particular fashion, i.e. send out an agenda or have an agenda on hand to follow? (IPT, WTH, LAut, CT)
6. During your meetings, do (or did) you split up assignments among team members? (IPT, WTH, CT)

7. During your meetings, do (or did) you give reminders about deadlines (I.e., things that needed to be turned in to admin, inputting grades, etc.)? (IPT, WTH, CT)
8. When your team was collaborating during team meetings about IDU's or service learning projects, was the collaboration positive from everyone present? (IPT, WTH, CT, R)
8a. If not, how was the negativity dealt with? (WTH, CT, R)
9. When you were discussing students during your meetings, was your focus to help provide support for the students who were unmotivated or had discipline problems? (SD, IPT, LSt, CT)

10. In your opinion, as (or having been) a team leader, what is (or would be) the best use of team meeting time? (LAd, IPT, LSD, WTH, LAut, CT)
Minutes code used during this study with correlated reason given, from Table 1: LAd = Lack, Admin; LAut = Lack, Autonomy; IPT = Inadequate Prep Time; WTH = Workload Too Heavy; CT = Collaboration Time; R = Relationships; SD = Student Discipline; LSt = Lack, Student Motivation; LSD = Lack, School Decisions.

Team 1	Team 3	Team 4	Team 5, 07-08
When former team leader left, was next in line based on years at school.	Asked by former team leader when they left	When former team leader left, was next in line based on years at school.	Team leader retired, no one else wanted position, team pursued.
Not by admin, previous team leader left a binder and their definition.	Not really, principal indicated at luncheon	From principal; disseminate info, conduct team meetings, ensure teachers are communicating with each other.	From principal; PO's, hold team meetings, attend leadership meetings, represent team and not self, handle principal requests between team and admin, disseminate info.
Not necessarily. Did and still does determine necessity of meeting. Often decides to meet via email.	No, told what days to hold meetings	No. 1st communities formed were teams, met daily.	Decided as a team, not individually.
No, let's get started.	Varied depending on needs and time	No, let's get started.	Yes, TRIBES activity.
Not sent out because if hand out, no one pays attention. Agenda in mind.	Yes, emailed when could, on hand or in mind	Yes, same agenda; old business, new business and student concerns in that order.	Always an agenda, tried to write or email but time often too short.
Yes, break it up into parts so can be managed as a team and people volunteer.	Yes, members were good about sharing workload as a team	Yes, ask for volunteers over the course of or throughout year.	Yes, shared responsibilities because more hands means less work.

Yes, email because there is so much to get done.	Yes, verbal, email, note, discuss because the workload is heavy which makes people easily forget and because doing so seems to make the workload feel less heavy.	Yes, verbal in person, email because the workload is heavy and sometimes clarification is needed. Gives opportunity for discussion and a lot of clarification.	Yes, verbally pertinent during meetings. Otherwise via email because the workload is so heavy that people forget and we are helping each other relieve stress by doing so.
Yes.	Varied depending on members.	Pretty much.	No.
Colleagues being willing to share with and learn from each other.	Discussed importance of everyone pulling their own weight in a positive way. No attacking each other. If negativity persisted, pulled aside as team lead to discuss 1 on 1.	Expectations clear, keeping students best interest at forefront.	Tried to be respectful of feelings. Provided admin's perspective.
Yes, get to the bottom of the problem and help by writing plans and/or goals for students. Students also write their own goals.	Yes, talk as a team and use RFA's.	Yes, compare notes and try to determine triggers for students, report to counselor. If student beyond that, would meet as a team with student during recess.	Yes, compare notes and discuss next steps; CSSS or counselors, RFA's. If these failed, teacher intervention.

Reminders from admin, authority to meet or not, authority to switch meeting via email, move IDU's and Service Learning Projects to back burner.	Sharing strategies. Leader should have the authority to cancel meeting.	Ideal as structured. Works well to accomplish what needs to be done due to other meetings. Short meetings are ok.	Housekeeping via email. Student concerns first in meetings, collaborate and be consistent in strategies and techniques. Get everyone on board with successful strategies and techniques because it helps students.
IDU = Interdisciplinary Unit.	RFA = Request For Assistance. Form required to be completed and submitted to grade level counselor if a student was having problems in more than one class.		

Team 5, 08-09
Volunteered.
No, read through contract, team leader luncheon was told which days to meet, followed lead of others. Serve as a go between for admin and teachers.
No.
Sometimes a TRIBES activity, sometimes just get started.
No, either have a list of items to discuss in mind or cancel the meeting.
Yes, volunteer for IEPs and other meetings but not for minutes, current leader handles this.

Yes, verbal and email. Depends on the deadline, more important ones reminding so that people don't get into trouble with admin.
No.
Bring up positives and offer different perspectives.
Yes, compare notes, RFA's, share successes in classrooms.

Reduced to once per week due to furloughs which helps. Like afternoon meetings better because not so rushed, feels pressured and unfinished now in the mornings. Structure is ok, some collaboration time is important.

Background: Teacher turnover is a national problem and has been investigated on the national level since the 1920's. This study compares the reasons teachers give for leaving teaching positions from data collected nationwide with local data.

Purpose: To examine whether the same problems that arise on the local level have been identified in the professional literature as reasons for teacher dissatisfaction that lead to teacher turnover.

Research Design: Correlational

Setting: A public middle school on the island of Kauai in the state of Hawaii during school years 2007-08 and 2008-09.

Study Sample: School staff size approximately 100, of which about 60 were teachers; approximately 1000 students served annually in grades 6 through 8; during the years of the study about 35% of the total student body qualified for free and reduced lunch, approximately 9% of the total student population qualified for special education services; about 6% of the total student body were English Language Learners.

Data Collection and Analysis: A national list of reasons, entitled the "Dear Folks, I Quit" list, which teachers give for leaving teaching positions was compiled from the National Center for Education Statistics, Schools and Staffing Survey and its supplement, the Teacher Follow-up Survey, as well as from the professional literature. Team meeting minutes from the school were examined and coded for all teams during the years of the study. Team leaders during the years of the study were also interviewed. The frequency, or relative emphasis, for each of the major reasons cited from the "Dear Folks, I Quit" list were correlated to each item in the meeting minutes to determine whether or not the symptoms of teacher dissatisfaction were detected in any of the biweekly team meetings.

Findings: All of the problems from the "Dear Folks, I Quit" list of reasons for teacher dissatisfaction leading to teacher turnover were identified by teachers at the school during biweekly team meetings. No additional items came up that were outside of the list of problems identified nationally. Discussion of the dissatisfaction topics varied by team and by year. In the case of the only team that had a change of team leader between year one and year two of the study, the discussion of dissatisfaction topics also varied according to team leader. The derived national list of problems therefore was applicable for examining the content of team meeting discussions at the school. The study contributed an additional insight into research available on the nature of problems faced by teachers by disaggregating the "Dear Folks, I Quit" list into two categories: internal and external problems. Internal problems are those within the control of the teams (or any of the teams" teacher members). External problems are those not within the control of any of the teams (or any of the teams" teacher members).

Conclusion: Findings of this study, although not definitive, suggest the need for additional studies to determine whether and how external factors correlate with high teacher turnover. Further, this study raises the question if teachers and school administrators work together to address or resolve external concerns, could they reduce teacher turnover?

Citation: Lopez, A.J. "Reducing Teacher Turnover by Utilizing a National List of Reasons for Teacher Dissatisfaction or How to Keep Teachers from Declaring 'Dear Folks, I Quit'". University of Hawaii at Manoa, College of Education, Department of Curriculum Studies. Honolulu, Hawaii, 2010.