

Clearpath Teaching Solutions

Research Document

The Case for Structured New Teacher Support

Evidence, statistics, and research citations for district leaders and school principals

The problem of new teacher attrition is not a talent problem. It is a support problem. It is solvable with the right investment in structured, evidence-based development.

The Scale of the Problem

New teacher attrition is one of the most persistent and costly challenges in K-12 education. The statistics below reflect the most current available data from peer-reviewed research, government surveys, and education policy institutions.

44%

CAP, 2025

Approximately 44 percent of new teachers leave the profession within their first five years, according to the Center for American Progress (2025).

30%

ERS, 2024

In the 2022 to 2023 school year, 30 percent of teachers with fewer than three years of experience left their school, per Education Resource Strategies analysis of national district data.

85%

Ingersoll et al., 2014

Teacher attrition, not enrollment growth, accounts for approximately 85 to 88 percent of annual teacher demand in the United States (Ingersoll et al., 2014; Darling-Hammond et al., 2018).

\$20K

LPI, 2024

Replacing a teacher costs up to \$20,000 per position in large urban districts when recruitment, hiring, training, and productivity loss are accounted for, with national costs estimated at \$8.5 billion annually (Learning Policy Institute, 2024).

85%

vs

74%

Ingersoll & Strong, 2011

Teachers who participated in structured induction had an 85 percent retention rate after year one, compared to 74 percent for those who did not, from nationally representative survey data.

2.85x

GSE Journal, 2024

Mentored teachers had 2.85 times higher odds of remaining in the profession after five months, with a 27.1 percentage point retention advantage over unmentored peers (Global Synthesis in Education Journal, 2024).

What Structured Coaching Produces for Students

One of the most important questions district leaders ask is whether teacher coaching actually improves outcomes for students. The evidence is clear that structured coaching significantly improves instructional practice, and improved practice produces better student outcomes. The chain of evidence is strong even where direct causal links are still being studied.

**d =
0.49**

*Kraft, Blazar &
Hogan, 2018*

Across 60 studies using causal research designs, teacher coaching produced a pooled effect size of 0.49 standard deviations on instructional practice. This exceeds Hattie's hinge point of 0.40 for meaningful educational impact, making structured coaching one of the most evidence-supported professional development approaches available.

**5 to
10
Years**

*Kraft & Blazar,
Education Next, 2018*

Structured coaching improves a teacher's instructional practice by as much as the difference in effectiveness between a novice and a teacher with five to ten years of classroom experience. This effect is more positive than traditional professional development and most other school-based interventions, including student incentives, merit-based pay, and extended learning time.

**d =
0.18**

*Kraft, Blazar &
Hogan, 2018*

The same meta-analysis found a pooled effect size of 0.18 standard deviations on student academic achievement across 60 causal studies. While modest, this effect is statistically significant and consistent across diverse contexts. Coaching paired with group training produced larger effects on both instruction and student achievement.

**2+
Years**

JREE, 2024

A peer-reviewed study published in the Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness (2024) found statistically significant positive increases in student ELA and math proficiency across three multi-city regions. Gains continued for two years after programming concluded.

**2x the
Impact**

ScienceDirect, 2025

Generic professional development moves the needle a little. Structured coaching moves it twice as far. A meta-analysis of 128 high-quality studies found that general teacher professional development produces an average effect of 0.09 on student achievement. Structured coaching produces 0.18, twice as large, with an even stronger effect of 0.49 on the teacher's actual classroom practice.

The quality and focus of coaching matters more than the number of contact hours. Programs that combine individualized coaching with group training, maintain sustained engagement, and

connect professional learning to observed classroom practice produce the strongest outcomes for both teachers and students. This is exactly how the Clearpath program is designed.

How to Read These Numbers

The five to ten years finding is the most practical way to understand what structured coaching produces. A first-year teacher who receives focused, ongoing coaching develops instructional skills equivalent to those of a five to ten year veteran, in a fraction of the time. That is not a small gain. That is the difference between a classroom that works and one that struggles.

An effect size of 0.49 on instructional practice means that the average coached teacher performs better than approximately 69 percent of teachers who do not receive coaching. An effect size of 0.18 on student achievement means students in classrooms with coached teachers score meaningfully higher than students in classrooms without that support. Across a district with hundreds of new teachers, these effects compound significantly.

These findings come from the most rigorous available research, including randomized control trials and quasi-experimental designs. They represent the evidence base for why structured, ongoing coaching, not one-time workshops, is the professional development model that moves the needle for teachers and students alike.

What the Research Says Works

The evidence on what reduces new teacher attrition is substantial and consistent. The following findings reflect the highest-quality research available, including meta-analyses, longitudinal studies, and nationally representative surveys.

Finding 1: Structured induction significantly reduces early teacher attrition

Multiple meta-analyses and large-scale studies confirm that structured induction programs, those including mentoring, coaching, observation cycles, and ongoing professional learning, consistently reduce new teacher attrition compared to orientation-only approaches.

- A meta-analysis of induction research (Keese et al., 2023) found statistically significant positive effects of formal induction programs on teacher retention, teacher practices, and student achievement across studies published between 2010 and 2019.
- Ingersoll and Strong (2011), in a critical review of the research literature, found that 85 percent of teachers who participated in structured induction stayed in teaching after year one, compared to 74 percent of those who did not, based on nationally representative survey data.
- A 2024 study found that mentored teachers had 2.85 times higher odds of remaining in the profession compared to unmentored peers, with a 27.1 percentage point retention advantage by the fifth month of employment (Global Synthesis in Education Journal, 2024).

Finding 2: The timing and sequencing of support matters critically

Front-loaded professional development, support concentrated at the beginning of the engagement, produces limited retention benefit on its own. Research consistently shows that sustained support through the most challenging developmental stages, including coaching during the habit-formation window, is what moves the retention needle.

- Education Resource Strategies (2024) found that 30 percent of teachers with fewer than three years of experience left their school in the 2022 to 2023 school year, during and after the window when front-loaded orientation support has long since ended.
- Ingersoll and Strong (2011) found that induction programs are most effective when they include multiple components, not just mentorship, but also collaboration time, observation cycles, and access to networks of other new teachers.
- Rumschlag (2017) found that new teacher attrition rates decrease as the number of induction program components increases, with each additional component contributing independently to retention outcomes.

Finding 3: Professional efficacy is the strongest predictor of teacher retention

A teacher's belief in their own capacity to affect student learning, what Albert Bandura (1977, 1997) defined as self-efficacy, is among the strongest predictors of whether teachers stay in the profession. This construct is highly malleable in the early career and directly responsive to the kind of coaching and observation-based support the Clearpath Framework provides.

- Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001) operationalized teacher self-efficacy across three domains: classroom management, instructional strategies, and student engagement, exactly the domains the Clearpath Framework addresses across its four developmental stages.
- Research shows that years of classroom experience, not hours of professional development, predict levels of self-efficacy in classroom management and instruction (Eastern Illinois University, 2023). This finding

underscores the importance of experience-based, coached practice over seat-time PD and why the Clearpath Framework is designed as a one to three year developmental arc.

- Teachers with high professional efficacy are more likely to persist through difficulty, adopt innovative practices, remain in the profession, and serve as mentors to other new teachers, compounding their impact over time (Bandura, 1997; Hong, 2010).

Finding 4: Strong Tier 1 instruction prevents the need for costly interventions and keeps teachers

The Multi-Tiered Systems of Supports (MTSS) framework provides a powerful lens for understanding what happens when new teacher development fails. The AIR Center on MTSS (2021) identifies strong Tier 1 instruction, the universal classroom experience all students participate in, as the foundation of effective MTSS. When Tier 1 fails, the pyramid inverts.

- Only 80 to 85 percent of students should require Tier 1 instruction alone. When more than 20 percent of students are in Tier 2 or Tier 3 interventions, it is a signal that Tier 1 instruction is not yet effective (AIR, 2021; IRIS Center, Vanderbilt, 2025).
- Instructional Empowerment's research (2025) identifies five warning signs of weak Tier 1 instruction: high percentages of students in interventions, extended time in Tiers 2 and 3, growing achievement gaps, high behavior referrals, and chronic absenteeism. All five are directly connected to underprepared new teachers.
- Teachers frequently cite schoolwide issues, including student behavior and negative school culture, as primary reasons for dissatisfaction and attrition (Boyd et al., 2009). Many of these issues trace directly to weak Tier 1 instruction, which is itself a product of insufficient new teacher preparation and support.
- Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) research shows that proactive, preventive behavior strategies, treating behavior as communication rather than as a discipline problem, significantly reduce classroom disruption and teacher stress. Teachers who develop these strategies early in their developmental arc retain higher confidence and effectiveness through the most challenging stages.

Finding 5: The cost of inaction is measurable and significant

The financial cost of teacher turnover is consistently underestimated because it is distributed across budget lines and measured in outcomes that do not appear on a single spreadsheet row, including reduced student achievement, increased substitute costs, and lower staff morale.

- Replacing a teacher costs up to \$20,000 per position in large urban districts, with national costs estimated at \$8.5 billion annually before accounting for the impact on student outcomes (Learning Policy Institute, 2024; NCTAF, 2007).
- Approximately 85 to 88 percent of annual teacher demand is driven by attrition, not enrollment growth. Recruitment-only strategies cannot solve the retention problem (Ingersoll et al., 2014; Darling-Hammond et al., 2018).
- Schools serving the greatest proportion of students experiencing poverty lost 29 percent of their teachers in 2022 to 2023, compared to 19 percent in low-need schools, demonstrating that teacher attrition is both an equity issue and a resource equity issue (Education Resource Strategies, 2024).

How the Clearpath Framework Responds to the Evidence

The Clearpath Framework is a developmental model that describes a teacher's arc from Emerging to Proficient, a journey that typically unfolds over one to three years, not a single school year. Each stage is defined by observable indicators of teacher development, not by calendar timing. Each stage also addresses a documented gap in standard induction practices.

Stage	What Research Shows Is Missing	How Clearpath Addresses It
01 Classroom Readiness Emerging	New teachers lack practical systems before their first day. Management training is theoretical, not applied.	Practical, applied preparation: routines, environment design, and explicit management frameworks before students arrive.
02 Teaching Instincts Developing	The habit-formation stage is unsupported in most induction programs. Habits form without coaching.	Structured classroom observation and coaching during the highest-risk developmental stage, whenever it occurs for each teacher.
03 Teaching Fluency Practicing	Professional development disconnects from the classroom. No feedback loop connects learning to instructional improvement.	Ongoing coaching cycles that bridge professional learning to observed classroom practice.
04 Professional Efficacy Proficient	Teachers reach milestone points without a clear sense of their own growth or a vision for continued development.	Efficacy-building reflection, data review, and recognition of demonstrated growth at key developmental milestones.

Evidence from Hattie and Marzano

The work of John Hattie and Robert Marzano represents two of the most cited and most respected bodies of research in K-12 education. Their findings provide powerful evidence for the specific design choices embedded in the Clearpath Framework.

John Hattie — Visible Learning

John Hattie's Visible Learning research is the most comprehensive synthesis of educational research ever conducted. Based on more than 1,400 meta-analyses covering over 80 million students across multiple decades and countries, it identifies the effect size of more than 250 influences on student achievement. Effect sizes above 0.40, Hattie's hinge point, represent educationally meaningful impact.

d = 1.57	Collective Teacher Efficacy <i>Hattie, 2015</i>	The shared belief among teachers that together they can positively affect student outcomes is the single highest-impact influence in Hattie's entire database. It is more than three times the hinge point and nearly twice the effect of feedback. Clearpath is designed to build the individual efficacy that makes collective efficacy possible.
d = 0.90	Teacher Credibility <i>Hattie, 2009</i>	Students' perception that their teacher is trustworthy, competent, and genuinely invested in their learning has one of the largest effect sizes in Hattie's research. Teachers who are well-supported and effective are perceived as credible. Struggling, unsupported teachers lose credibility quickly.
d = 0.73	Feedback <i>Hattie, 2009</i>	Feedback is among the highest-impact instructional influences in Hattie's research. Structured coaching that includes observation and specific, actionable feedback is the delivery mechanism that activates this effect for new teachers in the classroom.
d = 0.75	Teacher Clarity <i>Hattie, 2009</i>	Clearly communicating learning objectives, success criteria, and instructional expectations produces measurable gains in student achievement. This is a learnable skill that develops through coaching and structured practice, not innate ability.

Hattie's central conclusion is that teachers must become evaluators of their own impact, learning to see instruction through students' eyes and adjusting practice based on evidence of learning. This is precisely what the Clearpath coaching model develops across all four stages of the framework.

Robert Marzano — Classroom Instruction That Works

Robert Marzano's research, conducted through meta-analyses of thousands of classroom studies, identifies the specific instructional strategies and classroom management practices that produce the largest gains in

student achievement. His work is among the most widely adopted frameworks for teacher development in K-12 education.

d = 0.90	Classroom Management <i>Marzano, 2003</i>	Effective classroom management reduces disruptive and aggressive behavior with an effect size of 0.90, one of the largest in educational research. Yet Marzano's analysis also shows that most new teachers receive very little practical training in classroom management before entering the classroom.
d = 0.52	Academic Achievement <i>Marzano, 2003</i>	Effective classroom management has a significant positive effect on academic achievement, well above Hattie's hinge point. A well-managed classroom is not just a behavior management win. It is an instructional quality win.
d = 0.59+	High-Yield Strategies <i>Marzano, 2001</i>	Marzano's nine high-yield instructional strategies, including setting objectives, providing feedback, reinforcing effort, and cooperative learning, all exceed the educational hinge point of 0.40. Teachers who learn these strategies through coaching, not just professional development workshops, are more likely to implement them with fidelity.

Marzano's research makes a critical point that directly informs the Clearpath Framework: effective classroom management and effective instruction are not separate competencies. They are deeply interrelated. A teacher who cannot manage their classroom cannot implement high-yield instructional strategies effectively. The Clearpath sequence, beginning with Classroom Readiness and building through Teaching Instincts toward Fluency and Efficacy, reflects this understanding.

The research is clear.

The evidence is in. Structured support works. Is your district delivering it?

Book a free 20-minute discovery conversation at cpteachingsolutions.com

Bibliography

All sources cited in this brief are peer-reviewed, from government agencies, or from established education policy research institutions.

- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191-215.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. W.H. Freeman.
- Barnes, G., Crowe, E., & Schaefer, B. (2007). The cost of teacher turnover in five school districts. NCTAF. Center for American Progress. (2025, December). How to increase the retention of early career teachers. americanprogress.org
- Darling-Hammond, L. et al. (2018). *Empowered educators*. Jossey-Bass.
- Education Resource Strategies. (2024). Examining school-level teacher turnover trends (2021-24). erstrategies.org
- Eells, R.J. (2011). Meta-analysis of the relationship between collective teacher efficacy and student achievement. Ph.D. thesis, Loyola University Chicago.
- Global Synthesis in Education Journal. (2024). Mentorship program effectiveness in early-career teacher retention. gse-journal.net
- Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible Learning: A Synthesis of Over 800 Meta-Analyses Relating to Achievement*. Routledge.
- Hattie, J. (2012). *Visible Learning for Teachers: Maximizing Impact on Learning*. Routledge.
- Hattie, J. (2015). The applicability of Visible Learning to higher education. *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Psychology*, 1(1), 79-91.
- Hattie, J. & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81-112.
- Holzberger, D., Philipp, A. & Kunter, M. (2013). How teachers' self-efficacy is related to instructional quality. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 105(3), 774-786.
- Hong, J. (2010). Pre-service and beginning teachers' professional identity. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26, 1530-1543.
- Ingersoll, R.M. (2001). Teacher turnover and teacher shortages. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38(3), 499-534.
- Ingersoll, R.M. & Strong, M. (2011). The impact of induction and mentoring programs. *Review of Educational Research*, 81(2), 201-233.
- Ingersoll, R.M., Merrill, L. & May, H. (2014). What are the effects of teacher education and preparation on beginning teacher attrition? *Research in Teacher Education*, 3(1), 1-14.
- Keese, J. et al. (2023). A worthwhile endeavor? *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 119.
- Kraft, M.A. & Blazar, D. (2017). Individualized coaching to improve teacher practice. *Educational Policy*, 31(7), 1033-1068.
- Kraft, M.A., Blazar, D., & Hogan, D. (2018). The effect of teacher coaching on instruction and achievement: A meta-analysis of the causal evidence. *Review of Educational Research*, 88(4), 547-588.
- Leading Educators / Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness. (2024). Student ELA and math proficiency outcomes from structured teacher professional learning. jree-journal.org
- ScienceDirect. (2025). (When) do teacher professional development interventions improve student achievement? A meta-analysis of 128 high-quality studies. sciencedirect.com
- Learning Policy Institute. (2024). 2024 update: What's the cost of teacher turnover? learningpolicyinstitute.org
- Lyons, M.E. & Toth, M.D. (2025). What is Tier 1 instruction? *Instructional Empowerment*. instructionalempowerment.com
- Marzano, R.J. (2007). *The Art and Science of Teaching*. ASCD.
- Marzano, R.J., Marzano, J.S., & Pickering, D. (2003). *Classroom Management That Works*. ASCD.
- Marzano, R.J., Pickering, D., & Pollock, J.E. (2001). *Classroom Instruction That Works*. ASCD.
- Marzano, R.J. & Marzano, J.S. (2003). The key to classroom management. *Educational Leadership*, 61(1), 6-13.
- Morin, A. (2026). *Positive behavior strategies: A guide for teachers*. Understood for All, Inc. understood.org
- NCES. (2024). Teacher attrition and mobility: Results from the 2021-22 Teacher Follow-up Survey (NCES 2024-039). U.S. Department of Education.
- Reitman, G.C. & Karge, B.D. (2019). Investing in teacher support leads to teacher retention. *Multicultural Education*, 27(1), 7-18.
- Richter, D. et al. (2021). The role of the mentor in supporting new teachers. *PMC/Frontiers in Education*.
- Rumschlag, K. (2017). Teacher burnout: A quantitative analysis. *International Management Review*, 13(1).
- Taie, S. & Lewis, L. (2023). Teacher attrition and mobility (NCES 2024-039). U.S. Department of Education, NCES.
- Thompson, C.G. & Waxman, H.C. (2022). A worthwhile endeavor? *Teaching and Teacher Education*.
- Tschannen-Moran, M. & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17(7), 783-805.

American Institutes for Research. (2021). Tips for intensifying instruction at Tier 1. air.org

IRIS Center at Peabody College, Vanderbilt University. (2025). What is data-based individualization?
iris.peabody.vanderbilt.edu

Spruell, S. (2024). Flipped MTSS triangle? Branching Minds.

Clearpath Teaching Solutions | cpteachingsolutions.com | Classroom-ready teachers. Retention-ready districts.