Appendix to INTC Data Brief #6   August 2010

Prepared by: Patricia Brady
With assistance from: Jeff Kohmstedt
INTC Staff: Lara Hebert, Mary Elin Barnish, Chris Murphy-Lucas, Hilarie Welsh, Nancy Johnson, Mike Painter
INTC Director: Chris Roegge

This Appendix provides tables, charts, and analyses of quantitative and qualitative data. All data were reported on the spring 2010 Common Data Elements (CDE) reporting forms by the 64 programs that received grant funding in FY 2010.

This Appendix is organized into the following sections:

· Program self-rankings on the Continuum, Standards 1-9,
· Programs' plans for future improvement, and
· Impact of programs on teacher quality, student achievement, and teacher retention.

Notes on the data
The spring CDE included multiple-choice, short-response, and extended-response open-answer questions. The data in this appendix are from program self-reports only.

Notes on the tables
The tables disaggregate the data in three ways: district-based programs vs. consortium-based programs; programs initially funded in 2009 vs. programs initially funded in 2006 or 2008; and larger programs (serving 75 or more first- and second-year teachers) vs. smaller programs. In each table, the total number of programs responding to the question in each category appears in parentheses in the blue header row.

In each table, the total number of programs responding to the question in each category appears in parentheses in the blue header row. Total numbers (e.g. of district-based programs or consortium-based programs) may vary from table to table. This is because incomplete data were received from the programs—some programs failed to answer certain questions. Also, one program did not provide complete numbers of participating first- and second-year teachers, so it was omitted from the "program size" columns ("75+ beginning teachers" and "<75 beginning teachers").

Nineteen programs volunteered to answer these questions.

For each criterion, programs were asked to rank themselves on a 4-point scale from "establishing" to "systematizing". In order to display the programs' responses numerically in the charts below, these descriptors were each assigned a number:

- Establishing = 1
- Applying = 2
- Integrating = 3
- Systematizing = 4

Thus, the lowest score a criterion could receive is a 1, and the highest is a 4.

Cells were color-coded in order to highlight particularly high and low scores, and to note differences between types of programs (e.g. district-based and consortium-based programs).

- Light shaded cells: cells in two paired, adjoining columns (e.g. district-based and consortium-based programs) differ by at least 0.4
- Dark shaded cells: cells in two paired, adjoining columns differ by least 0.8
- **Red**, large bold font: cells with particularly low scores: under 2.0
- **Blue**, large bold font: cells with particularly high scores: 2.8 or greater

The numerical cutoffs noted above were chosen somewhat arbitrarily in order to highlight the highest and lowest scores, and to highlight scores which show differences between types of programs.

It should be noted that the numbers in this section are based on small sample sizes, especially for certain types of programs (consortium-based; initially funded in 2009; and 75+ beginning teachers). So, differences between numbers in paired, adjoining columns—or particularly high or low numbers—may simply reflect a few outliers and not any real differences between types of programs.

Table 1.1. Program self-rankings for Continuum Standard 1
Each cell displays the mean score for all programs in that category.

	All programs (19)	District-based programs (13)	Consortium-based programs (6)	Initially funded in 2009 (5)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (14)	75+ beginning teachers (4)	<75 beginning teachers (14)
1.1 Program leadership is selected and role is clearly defined to include being responsible for program planning, operation, oversight, and use of data.	2.7	2.7	**2.8**	**2.8**	2.7	**2.8**	2.7
1.2 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders have the time, fiscal resources, and authority to implement and support the program.	2.2	2.1	2.3	2.0	2.2	2.3	2.1
1.3 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders collaborate to create a culture of commitment to beginning teacher induction and improving student achievement.	2.3	2.2	2.5	2.2	2.4	2.3	2.4
1.4 Program leadership engages in initial and ongoing professional development to understand, design, and implement high-quality induction and mentoring.	2.6	2.4	**3.0**	2.4	2.6	2.5	2.6

Table 1.2. Program self-rankings for Continuum Standard 2
Each cell displays the mean score for all programs in that category.

	All programs (19)	District-based programs (13)	Consortium-based programs (6)	Initially funded in 2009 (5)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (14)	75+ beginning teachers (4)	<75 beginning teachers (14)
2.1 Program design includes learning outcomes for beginning teacher participants that recognize a continuum of teacher development and a focus on student learning with clearly defined participant expectations for program completion.	2.1	2.1	2.2	1.8	2.2	2.0	2.1
2.2 Program design provides for effective communication among program leadership, mentors, beginning teachers, and site administrators and is consistently integrated into district/school improvement goals and ongoing professional development initiatives.	2.2	2.1	2.3	2.0	2.2	2.3	2.1
2.3 Program design includes high quality mentor selection, training, assessment/evaluation, and ongoing support in a mentor learning community.	2.4	2.3	2.7	2.4	2.4	2.3	2.5
2.4 Program design defines essential activities including beginning teacher formative assessment, written documentation of beginning teacher/mentor work, analysis of beginning teacher instruction and student learning, and professional development for all stakeholders.	2.5	2.4	2.8	2.8	2.4	2.8	2.6
2.5 Program goals and outcomes for teacher development, retention, support, and student learning are reviewed and revised as necessary by designated program leaders and stakeholders based on the analysis of multiple sources of program evaluation data.	1.7	1.7	1.8	1.6	1.8	2.0	1.7

Table 1.3. Program self-rankings for Continuum Standard 3
Each cell displays the mean score for all programs in that category.

	All programs (18)	District-based programs (12)	Consortium-based programs (6)	Initially funded in 2009 (5)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (13)	75+ beginning teachers (4)	<75 beginning teachers (13)
3.1 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders allocate adequate resources to ensure an appropriate distribution of funds to support components defined in the program design and in alignment with district improvement plan.	2.6	**2.8**	2.3	2.4	2.7	2.5	2.6
3.2 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders access and coordinate existing professional development resources to effectively align and coordinate with the induction program.	2.6	2.6	2.7	2.2	**2.8**	**2.8**	2.5
3.3 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders allocate sufficient, sanctioned, protected time for mentoring to foster high quality mentoring for beginning teachers.	2.6	**2.8**	2.2	2.0	**2.8**	2.3	2.6
3.4 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders monitor resource allocations on a regular basis in order to make necessary adjustments as needed during the year.	2.6	2.7	2.3	2.4	2.6	**1.8**	**2.8**
3.5 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders support the development of fiscal reports to document allocations of resources as necessary for accountability and to promote ongoing program improvement.	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.0	2.5	2.0	2.4

Table 1.4. Program self-rankings for Continuum Standard 4

Each cell displays the mean score for all programs in that category.

	All programs (19)	District-based programs (13)	Consortium-based programs (6)	Initially funded in 2009 (5)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (14)	75+ beginning teachers (4)	<75 beginning teachers (14)
4.1 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders collaborate to design effective professional development for site administrators and promote their full involvement in program operations to maximize ongoing program improvement.	1.9	1.8	2.0	1.4	2.1	2.0	1.9
4.2 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders collaborate with site administrators to ensure positive working environments for beginning teachers.	2.1	1.9	2.5	1.6	2.3	2.5	2.1
4.3 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders collaborate with site administrators to foster the development of collaborative learning communities to promote a program of support for all staff.	2.1	1.9	2.3	1.5	2.2	2.8	1.9
4.4 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders support site administrators to provide ongoing high quality communications regarding induction program design and implementation.	2.1	1.8	2.7	1.8	2.2	2.3	2.1
4.5 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders engage with site administrators to ensure positive mentoring experiences and to uphold the relationship between mentor and beginning teacher as confidential.	2.1	2.0	2.2	1.6	2.2	2.0	2.1
4.6 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders collaborate with site administrators to align their work in support of beginning teachers with the standards for administrators.	1.8	1.6	2.2	1.2	2.0	1.5	1.9

Table 1.5. Program self-rankings for Continuum Standard 5
Each cell displays the mean score for all programs in that category.

	All programs (19)	District-based programs (13)	Consortium-based programs (6)	Initially funded in 2009 (5)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (14)	75+ beginning teachers (4)	<75 beginning teachers (14)
5.1 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders are guided by clear, rigorous selection criteria and processes to ensure that beginning teachers will receive high quality mentoring throughout their participation in the induction program.	2.1	**1.8**	**2.8**	**1.8**	2.2	2.0	2.1
5.2 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders ensure that the matching of beginning teachers and mentors is based on multiple relevant factors to establish effective pairing of mentors with beginning teachers.	2.4	2.2	2.7	2.2	2.4	2.0	2.5
5.3 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders define and implement a process to address changes or make necessary adjustments in mentor/beginning teacher matches.	2.2	2.1	2.5	2.2	2.2	2.0	2.3

Table 1.6. Program self-rankings for Continuum Standard 6
Each cell displays the mean score for all programs in that category.

	All programs (18)	District-based programs (13)	Consortium-based programs (5)	Initially funded in 2009 (5)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (13)	75+ beginning teachers (3)	<75 beginning teachers (14)
6.1 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders collaborate to provide foundational training for mentors to develop basic knowledge, skills, and attitudes for quality mentoring.	**2.8**	**2.8**	**2.8**	2.2	**3.1**	2.7	**2.9**
6.2 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders facilitate the development of a professional learning community for mentors to regularly reflect on, improve, and refine their practice.	2.3	2.3	2.4	2.0	2.5	2.3	2.4
6.3 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders collaborate to provide ongoing professional development for mentors to advance induction practice and promote beginning teacher development.	2.3	2.2	2.6	2.0	2.5	2.7	2.3

Table 1.7. Program self-rankings for Continuum Standard 7
Each cell displays the mean score for all programs in that category.

	All programs (19)	District-based programs (13)	Consortium-based programs (6)	Initially funded in 2009 (5)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (14)	75+ beginning teachers (4)	<75 beginning teachers (14)
7.1 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders collaborate to provide beginning teacher orientation to clarify district school and induction programs and ensure high levels of beginning teacher participation.	2.5	2.6	2.3	2.0	2.7	2.0	2.6
7.2 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders collaborate to design and implement formal support of networking opportunities for beginning teachers to ensure their participation in collaborative cultures focused on professional learning and ongoing support.	2.3	2.2	2.3	**1.4**	2.6	2.0	2.3
7.3 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders implement ongoing professional development to ensure high quality beginning teacher development.	2.6	2.5	**2.8**	**1.8**	**2.9**	**2.8**	2.6
7.4 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders provide and support sanctioned time for induction and mentoring processes to ensure sufficient support for high quality professional development experiences for beginning teachers.	2.7	2.7	2.7	**1.8**	**3.0**	2.3	**2.8**

Table 1.8. Program self-rankings for Continuum Standard 8
Each cell displays the mean score for all programs in that category.

	All programs (19)	District-based programs (13)	Consortium-based programs (6)	Initially funded in 2009 (5)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (14)	75+ beginning teachers (4)	<75 beginning teachers (14)
8.1 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders ensure that mentors use formative assessment tools collaboratively with beginning teachers for initial self assessment and development of individual learning plans to guide weekly visits and determine the scope, focus, and content of professional development activities.	2.2	2.3	2.0	**1.8**	2.4	2.0	2.3
8.2 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders ensure that mentors utilize a wide range of formative assessment tools in order to establish multiple measures of teaching from which to promote further professional development.	2.2	2.2	2.0	2.0	2.2	**1.8**	2.4
8.3 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders establish and maintain procedures for documenting confidential use of formative assessment to gather evidence of reflective processes that impact student learning and practice.	2.4	2.3	2.5	**1.6**	2.6	2.5	2.4
8.4 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders develop and follow policy regarding use of formative documentation to protect their use for program purposes only and not for evaluation of beginning teachers or for employment decisions.	2.4	2.4	2.5	2.6	2.4	2.5	2.4

Table 1.9. Program self-rankings for Continuum Standard 9
Each cell displays the mean score for all programs in that category.

	All programs (19)	District-based programs (13)	Consortium-based programs (6)	Initially funded in 2009 (5)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (14)	75+ beginning teachers (4)	<75 beginning teachers (14)
9.1 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders develop and implement an ongoing process for program evaluation based on multiple internal and external sources with formal and informal measures to ensure ongoing program improvement.	2.0	**1.8**	2.3	**1.8**	2.1	2.3	**1.9**
9.2 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders analyze multiple sources of data and share results with stakeholders in a systematic way.	**1.8**	**1.6**	2.3	**1.4**	2.0	2.0	**1.8**
9.3 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders implement a process for mentor accountability in a supportive environment through a defined process of communication and documentation.	2.1	**1.9**	2.3	**1.6**	2.2	**1.8**	2.1
9.4 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders participate in external reviews and statewide data collection designed to examine and improve program quality and effectiveness and to inform policy makers and stakeholders.	2.2	2.0	2.7	**1.8**	2.4	**2.8**	2.1

Table 1.10. Average scores for each standard
Each cell displays the mean score for all programs in that category.

	All programs (19)	District-based programs (13)	Consortium-based programs (6)	Initially funded in 2009 (5)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (14)	75+ beginning teachers (4)	<75 beginning teachers (14)
Standard 1	2.5	2.4	2.7	2.4	2.5	2.5	2.5
Standard 2	2.2	2.1	2.4	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.2
Standard 3	2.5	2.6	2.4	2.2	2.7	2.3	2.6
Standard 4	2.0	**1.8**	2.3	**1.5**	2.2	2.2	2.0
Standard 5	2.2	2.0	2.7	2.1	2.3	2.0	2.3
Standard 6	2.5	2.4	2.6	2.1	2.7	2.6	2.5
Standard 7	2.5	2.5	2.5	1.8	2.8	2.3	2.6
Standard 8	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.0	2.4	2.2	2.4
Standard 9	2.0	**1.8**	2.4	1.7	2.2	2.2	2.0
Average of all criteria for all standards	2.3	2.2	2.4	2.0	2.4	2.3	2.3

PROGRAMS' PLANS FOR FUTURE IMPROVEMENT

Programs were asked to select two Illinois Induction Program Standards to focus on for next year, and to describe what program improvements they planned to make under those standards. Fifty-eight programs responded to this question, although two of them (Chicago ONS and South Cook ISC) only listed one focal standard each.

Although programs listed the improvements they planned to make for their focal standards, the improvements are not summarized in this data brief: Program comments were either too site-specific and unique to summarize, or they were so general that they were uninteresting.

Table 2.1. Number of programs selecting each standard for improvement

Within each white cell, the first number is the total number of programs selecting each standard; the number in parenthesis is the percent, of the total number of programs in its category, which selected each standard. Each program was encouraged to select two standards for improvement, although two programs only selected one standard each. When the percentages of two paired, adjacent cells (e.g. showing district-based and consortium-based programs) are different by at least 10 percentage points, then the cells are highlighted in a light shade. When the percentages are different by at least 20 percentage points, the cells are highlighted in a darker shade.

One program did not provide the number of new teachers served, so the numbers in the last two columns do not add up to the total in the first column.

Standard	# of programs selecting this standard (58)	# of district-based programs (33)	Consortium-based programs (25)	Initially funded in 2009 (23)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (35)	75+ beginning teachers (21)	<75 beginning teachers (36)
1	6 (10%)	3 (9%)	3 (12%)	4 (17%)	2 (6%)	2 (10%)	4 (11%)
2	17 (29%)	12 (36%)	5 (20%)	7 (30%)	10 (29%)	7 (33%)	10 (28%)
3	5 (9%)	0	5 (20%)	0	5 (14%)	3 (14%)	2 (6%)
4	17 (29%)	11 (33%)	6 (24%)	7 (30%)	10 (29%)	3 (14%)	13 (36%)
5	15 (26%)	7 (21%)	8 (32%)	6 (26%)	9 (26%)	4 (19%)	10 (28%)
6	10 (17%)	7 (21%)	3 (12%)	4 (17%)	6 (17%)	2 (10%)	8 (22%)
7	16 (28%)	10 (30%)	6 (24%)	5 (22%)	11 (31%)	6 (29%)	10 (28%)
8	8 (14%)	4 (12%)	4 (16%)	2 (9%)	6 (17%)	5 (24%)	3 (8%)
9	20 (34%)	11 (33%)	9 (36%)	9 (39%)	11 (31%)	9 (43%)	11 (31%)

IMPACT OF PROGRAMS ON TEACHER QUALITY, STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT, & RETENTION

Table 3.1. Impact of programs on teacher quality
Seven programs indicated that they had data on the impact of their programs on teacher quality, and they responded to three open-ended questions concerning the nature of the data and what they learned from it.

District-based programs: 5; consortia: 2
Programs initially funded in 2008: 6; in 2009: 1
Programs with <75 new teachers: 6; with 75+: 1

Please describe how you measure program impact on teacher quality and what data you have collected.	What, if anything, have you learned about program impact on teacher quality?	What challenges have you encountered with data collection or analysis regarding program impact on teacher quality?
• Surveys (**2 programs**) • Comparison of individual teachers' strengths and weaknesses at the beginning and end of the year, based on the Danielson continuum; data is disaggregated by individual coach, amount of coaching time, and/or types of coaching activities. • Count novice teachers who are now being identified as teacher leaders. • Collaborative assessment logs • Student progress • Comparison of recordings of individual teachers at the beginning of the year and the end of the year • Examine number of teachers who provide evidence of movement forward on the ICTD continuum through the Timsweb documentation.	• The more we are involved with teacher professional development, the easier it has been to identify quality teaching. • Mentors were able to impact teacher development over time • New teachers are developing along the spectrum from novice to expert rapidly.	• It is difficult to measure teacher quality or success because of so many variables (**2 programs**) • We find it is difficult to collect data that is easily analyzed (**2 programs**) • Teacher quality is a difficult area to define (**2 programs**) • It is difficult to analyze and report on data in a timely and meaningful format. • Low return rates on surveys • Continued turnover with school populations • Lack of skill in writing measurable and quality professional growth goals • Some information (e.g. evaluation) is confidential

Table 3.2. Impact of programs on student achievement
Three programs indicated that they had data on program impact on student achievement, and they responded to three open-ended questions concerning the nature of the data and what they learned from it.

District-based programs: 2; consortia: 1
Programs initially funded in 2006: 1; in 2008: 2
Programs with <75 new teachers: 3

Please describe how you measure program impact on student achievement and what data you have collected.	What, if anything, have you learned about program impact on student achievement?	What challenges have you encountered with data collection or analysis regarding program impact on student achievement?
• Formative assessment data (Think Link) • Evaluation form • MAP scores from beginning of the year to the end of the year • End of the year teacher survey • Data retreats are planned for summer, and teachers are invited	• Mentor teachers and new teachers are learning "best practice" together. They are reporting data about how this is increasing student achievement levels. • We believe there is more impact on student achievement than what has been reported. • We have learned that quality teachers produce more highly achieving students.	• Analysis takes too much time. • We the need to increase teacher understanding about how to use and analyze data. • Many variables impact student achievement; it's a challenge to isolate just one. • Human development cannot always be put into numbers

Table 3.3. Impact of programs on teacher retention
20 programs indicated that they had data on the impact of their programs on teacher retention, and they
responded to three open-ended questions concerning the nature of the data and what they learned from it.

District-based programs: 11; consortia: 9
Programs initially funded in 2006: 2; in 2008: 14; in 2009: 4
Programs with <75 new teachers: 10; with 75+: 9

Please describe how you measure program impact on teacher retention and what data you have collected.	What, if anything, have you learned about program impact on teacher retention?	What challenges have you encountered with data collection or analysis regarding program impact on teacher retention?
• Retention records, sometimes including whether teachers are dismissed or choose to leave, often including baseline and/or longitudinal data (**13 programs**) • Surveys (**2 programs**) • Exit surveys/interviews with teachers who leave (**2 programs**) • We compare professional development seminar attendance with whether teachers are re-hired or not. • We have an evidence of completion process that documents participation in the program. • Interviews and conversations with teachers • Weekly collaborative assessment logs and progress • Teacher report documents • Evaluations from our workshops • Interviews with administrators and participants • Formal evaluation data • Anecdotal reports	• The program has increased teacher retention (**6 programs**) • Some novice teachers should not be teaching despite participation in the program (**2 programs**) • New teachers who reach program completion benchmarks are our stronger teachers. • Challenges come when the building administrator is not in support with our program and the culture of the building is negative • Teachers who felt supported and had a positive mentoring relationship were more likely to return to their position. • We have had turnover with teachers involved in this program. • Teachers who completed the mentor program fully, were retained/rehired; those who did not take the program seriously or do not complete all aspects are ones who do not stay in the district. • A one to one mentor is extremely effective. • Teachers often choose to leave their jobs due to other factors beyond the program's control. • Our mentoring program has been successful in being able to retain new teachers by providing just in time support targeted at the challenges of that specific teacher. • There has been a reduction in the number of new teachers released based on performance. • New teachers feel supported which has created an improved professionalism • Many new teachers have shared that without a mentor, they would be lost, although none have shared that they would leave the field.	• It's difficult to analyze data because of the high percentage of new teachers being RIFed for funding reasons—and some of the teachers may be called back later (**9 programs**) • The FY10 grant does not allow an external evaluator, so our data are less consistent and cannot be analyzed at the same level of depth (**2 programs**) • We are not sure if the data is completely honest in their true evaluation of themselves and our impact. • We have not developed any data collection instrument that we can use with our districts. • Human Resources is slow in turning data over to us. • Coming up with what data to collect and the tool to do which • Valid data is difficult to obtain when there are so many other factors affecting the retention of new teachers. • Without the original funding proposed, we were unable to develop comprehensive data collection systems • The challenge is to keep up with the clerical demands for each mentees electronic folder. Therefore, we are looking at implementing TIMSweb for next year to assist us with record keeping.