

INTC Data Brief #1

December 2009

Data Brief #1 prepared by: Patricia Brady

With assistance from: Lara Hebert, Mary Elin Barnish, Jeff Kohmstedt, Chris Murphy-Lucas, Nancy Johnson, Hilarie Welsh
INTC Director: Chris Roegge

This Data Brief, the first of five short reports during FY 2010, is intended to provide a snapshot of data on the 66 ISBE-funded induction and mentoring programs reported on the Common Data Elements (CDE) survey they completed in late Fall 2009. It describes the growth of the funded programs, demographics on novice teachers and mentors within the programs, and publicly-available information on the districts within which the programs operate.

The four remaining data briefs will be organized around the Teacher Induction Program Standards, and will culminate with an end-of-year final report:

- January 29, 2010: Leadership, goals/design, and mentor selection: fall CDE data
Standards 1, 2, and 5, and summary of summer trainings for mentors and novices
- March 31, 2010: Program evaluation/improvement plans and budget analysis: fall CDE data
Standard 9 and plans for improvement for each standard, plus budget analysis
- May 28, 2010: Resources, formative assessment, and mentor/novice interactions: spring CDE data
Standards 3, 7, and 8
- July 30, 2010: Mentor, administrator, and novice trainings: spring CDE data
Standards 4, 6, and 7
- September 30, 2010: Final report
Summary of the preceding 5 data briefs; standard 9; self-ratings for each standard; program summary & impact; plus INTC commentary on program progress to date and policy recommendations

OVERVIEW OF DATA AND ORGANIZATION OF DATA BRIEF

This Data Brief provides data on all programs funded in Fall 2009:

- Novice teacher demographics (from fall 2009 CDE data)
- Mentor demographics (from fall 2009 CDE data)
- Program demographics (from school report card data)

This Data Brief is organized into the following sections:

- **Summary, Trends, and Points of Interest:** Provides highlights of the qualitative and quantitative data from the remainder of the document
- **Quantitative Data 1:** Demographic characteristics of mentors and novices: provides tables summarizing the quantitative data from the CDE
- **Quantitative Data 2:** Demographic characteristics of funded programs: provides tables summarizing publicly-available quantitative data on all districts served by the funded programs
- **Qualitative data:** provides a summary of the three open-ended questions on the CDE which were related to demographics

SUMMARY, TRENDS, AND POINTS OF INTEREST

Beginning Teacher and Mentor Demographics

The expansion from 39 to 66 funded programs has allowed for a 35% growth in the number of first-year teachers being served, a 75% growth in the number of second-year teachers, and a 38% growth in the

number of mentors. The larger increase for second-year teachers suggests that many continuing programs are adding or expanding the second year of their program, and that new teachers are opting to remain in the program for a second year when the program is optional. (Table 1.1)

Elementary teachers remain the largest group served, at 42% of the total; this number is relatively constant across first-year, second-year, and mentor teachers, and from 2008-09 to 2009-10. Senior high teachers are the second largest group, with a slight increase from 2008-09 to 2009-10—due to the increased number of high school districts and Chicago public high schools included under the grants. The total number of mentors specializing in each grade level and academic content area is roughly proportional to the total number of beginning teachers in each of those grade levels and content areas. This suggests that, overall, there are sufficient mentors in each area (although there may be shortages at individual programs). We estimate that the new teachers in the programs currently serve approximately 224,180 students. (Tables 1.2 & 1.3)

Ninety-four percent of mentors in 2009-10 are White, and the percent of White first-year teachers increased from 83% in 2008-09 to 90% in 2009-10. This increase reflects both a 3-point drop in the percentage of Black first-year teachers (from 10% to 7%) and also a change in how racial data are collected; respondents who are marked “Hispanic” in 2008-09 can now select both “Latino” (for ethnicity) and “White” (for race). In 2009-10, 5% of first-year teachers, and 2% of mentors, are classified as Latino. (Tables 1.4 & 1.5)

First-year teachers are more likely to come from university-based teacher education programs than from alternative certification programs (93% vs. 7%). They are likely to be traditional age—in their early 20’s (77%)—and to be hired before the school year began (91%). These percentages are largely unchanged from 2008-09, except that more new teachers in 2009-10 are of non-traditional age (23% in 2009-10 vs. 16% in 2008-09). (Table 1.6)

Most mentors are full-time teachers or administrators: 81% of the total number of mentors—from 45 programs—fit this category. The biggest changes from 2008-09 are in the number of funded programs using full-release mentors (an increase from 10% to 38% of programs) and retired personnel as mentors (an increase from 7% to 24% of programs)—for at least some part of their mentoring program. (Table 1.7)

The number of teachers hired in 2007 or 2008 who left their initial teaching positions—whether they participated in an induction/mentoring program or not—is almost flat at between 26% and 29% of new hires. However, this apparent consistency masks great internal variation. Of new hires, only a small percentage of those who participated in induction/mentoring programs voluntarily left their districts (6% in 2008-09, 9% in 2007-08); meanwhile, a larger percentage of those who did not have program support chose to voluntarily leave their districts (14% in 2008-09, 19% in 2007-08). On the other hand, program participants were more likely to move within their districts (8% in 2008-09, 9% in 2007-08) or to be released as a result of a reduction in force (RIF) (12% 2008-09, 6% 2007-08), the latter reflecting problems with district finances more than their quality or morale as teachers. One interesting finding is that the percentage of teachers who were asked to leave is nearly identical for those with and without induction/mentoring supports. Programs were also asked about patterns in novice teacher attrition; the top categories were teachers who were not seen as successful (23 programs) and special education teachers (12 programs). (Tables 1.8 & 1.9)

Program Demographics

The number of programs increased 69% from 2008-09 to 2009-10, with an accompanying 49% increase in the number of schools and 75% increase in the number of districts served. Altogether, the current array of programs serves districts which educate 710,522 students. More than half of the programs are run by districts; about a third are run by ROEs or ISCs; much smaller percentages are run by universities or support providers. (Tables 2.1 & 2.2)

The programs serve a diverse group of districts which represent a cross-section of Illinois, from small districts (443 students enrolled) to large districts (40,449 students enrolled). In percentages of White students, low income students, English Language Learners, and students passing standardized tests, the funded program mean is within 3 percentage points of the Illinois state average. Additionally, for each demographic statistic, there is a wide range between the programs' minimum and maximum (e.g. 0.1% White students in one program to 99.7% White students in another program). Other program demographics—including average teacher salary, teacher experience, teachers with master's degrees, and district instructional expense per student—have means close to the state average, and a wide range across the programs from minimum to maximum. (Tables 2.3 thru 2.12)

Qualitative Data

Sixty-five percent of funded programs reported that some of their novice teachers were hired after the school year began. All of them allowed the new hires to participate in the induction and mentoring program, and some provided extra helps including make-up orientation sessions and supplemental assistance.

Programs reported that the economy has had varying impacts on retention. These impacts include: widespread RIFing of new teachers; decreased attrition, or else increased attrition to higher-paying districts; increase in job applicants and a decrease in retirements; and an increase in second-career job applicants. Eight programs reported no impact from the state of the economy.

QUANTITATIVE DATA 1: DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF MENTORS AND NOVICES

Data in this section were provided by programs on their Fall 2009 CDE surveys. No teacher demographics were provided by three programs. These programs did, however, fill out the rest of the CDE survey, and their responses will be included in future data briefs.

The number of individually-funded programs increased to 67 programs in May 2009. However, one program elected to forego extension and continuation grant funding, ending their participation on August 31, 2009. One program encompasses two separate grants and another encompasses four separate grants. Each program filled out a single CDE survey, and these responses were duplicated for each individually funded program to best reflect the ISBE grant funding process.

Total numbers (e.g. of first-year teachers or of mentors) may vary from table to table. This is because incomplete data were received from the programs—some programs provided some figures but not others.

Table 1.1. Total number of participating teachers

The first column shows the total number of teachers in each category, and the second column provides the increase from 2008-09 to 2009-10 in absolute terms and as a percentage. The last three columns divide the total number of 2009-10 teachers into three groups—those in programs initially funded in 2006, 2008, and 2009—and then what percent of the total number of teachers in each category comes from programs initially funded in each of those years.

		Total number of teachers	Increase from 2008-09	Programs initially funded in 2006	Programs initially funded in 2008	Programs initially funded in 2009
2009-10	First-year teachers	2375	616 (35% increase)	461 (19% of total)	1019 (43% of total)	895 (38% of total)
	Second-year teachers	1959	837 (75% increase)	587 (30% of total)	950 (49% of total)	422 (22% of total)
	Mentors	2496	683 (38% increase)	431 (17% of total)	1272 (51% of total)	793 (32% of total)

Table 1.2. Teaching level

Each cell contains the number of teachers—across all responding funded programs—in each category. The number in parentheses provides what percentage, of the total number of teachers in that category, teaches at (or specializes in) each level. The last column provides the approximate number of students served. We performed this rough calculation by multiplying the number of pre-K and elementary teachers by 20, and the number of middle school and junior and senior high school teachers by 80.

		Pre-K	Elementary	Middle school / junior high	Senior high school	Other	Total # of teachers	Apx. # of students
2009-10	First-year teachers	75 (3%)	983 (42%)	497 (21%)	787 (34%)	Not a category in 2009-10	2342	123,880
	Second-year teachers	70 (4%)	809 (42%)	452 (24%)	582 (30%)		1913	100,300
	Mentors	52 (2%)	1009 (41%)	613 (25%)	789 (32%)		2463	N/A
2008-09	First-year teachers	58 (4%)	666 (43%)	378 (25%)	435 (28%)	0	1537	79,520
	Mentors	43 (3%)	739 (44%)	404 (24%)	478 (29%)	10 (1%)	1674	N/A

Table 1.3. Content area/subjects taught

Each cell contains the number of teachers—across all responding funded programs—in each category. The number in parentheses provides what percentage, of the total number of teachers in that category, teaches each content area.

		Grade level (e.g. Grade 2)	Special education	ESL / Bilingual	Content area	Special subject (e.g. art, music)	Other (e.g. computer; auto shop; reading specialist)	Total
2009-10	First-year teachers	691 (30%)	385 (17%)	99 (4%)	737 (32%)	294 (13%)	87 (4%)	2293
	Second-year teachers	631 (33%)	261 (14%)	96 (5%)	615 (32%)	238 (12%)	65 (3%)	1906
	Mentors	813 (33%)	355 (15%)	75.5 (3%)	869.5 (36%)	228 (9%)	93 (4%)	2434
2008-09	First-year teachers ¹	600 (39%)	193 (13%)	Not a category in 2008-09	507 (33%)	187 (12%)	48 (3%)	1535
	Mentors	620 (38%)	186 (11%)		560 (34%)	177 (11%)	82 (5%)	1625

¹ The 2008-09 CDE survey did not gather this information for second-year teachers.

Table 1.4. Teacher race

Each cell contains the number of teachers—across all responding funded programs—in each category. The number in parentheses provides what percentage, of the total number of teachers in that category, is of each race.

		White	Black	Hispanic ²	Native Hawaiian / Pacific Islander ³	Asian	Native American	Two or more races	Total
2009-10	First-year teachers	1981 (90%)	148 (7%)	Not a category in 2009-10	9 (0.4%)	18 (1%)	2 (0.1%)	42 (2%)	2200
	Second-year teachers	1680 (88%)	182 (10%)		2 (0.1%)	16 (1%)	1 (0.05%)	33 (2%)	1914
	Mentors	2185 (94%)	125 (5%)		0 (0%)	8 (0.3%)	0 (0%)	14 (0.7%)	2332
2008-09	First-year teachers	1370 (83%)	148 (10%)	89 (5%)	Not a category in 2008-09	19 (1%)	3 (0.1%)	13 (0.7%)	1642
	Mentors	1520 (90%)	118 (10%)	33 (2%)		3 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (0.3%)	1680

Table 1.5. Teacher ethnicity

Each cell contains the number of teachers—across all responding funded programs—in each category. The number in parentheses provides what percentage, of the total number of teachers in that category, is of each ethnicity. Ethnicity data were not gathered for 2008-09

		Latino	Not Latino	Total
2009-10	First-year teachers	118 (5%)	2073 (95%)	2191
	Second-year teachers	76 (4%)	1790 (96%)	1866
	Mentors	45 (2%)	2157 (98%)	2202

Table 1.6. Novice teacher education background, age, when hired

Each cell contains the number of teachers—across all responding funded programs—in each category. The number in parentheses provides what percentage, of the total number of teachers in that category, falls into each type (traditional teacher education or alternative certification; traditional age vs. older; hired before or after school began).

		From traditional teacher-ed programs	From alternative certification programs	Traditional age (early 20s)	Non-traditional age	Hired before school year began	Hired after school year began
2009-10	First-year teachers	2152 (93%)	160 (7%)	1731 (77%)	527 (23%)	2132 (91%)	212 (9%)
2008-09	First-year teachers	1368 (94%)	95 (6%)	1136 (84%)	223 (16%)	1391 (89%)	178 (11%)

² “Hispanic” is no longer a category for 2009-10. State reporting guidelines now ask for ethnicity (Latino/not Latino) to be reported separately from race.

³ This racial category is new for 2009-10.

Table 1.7. Types of mentors

The first row provides the total number of mentors who fit into each category, and the numbers in parentheses provide what percentage, of the total number of mentors, falls into each type. The second and third rows provide the number of programs with mentors of each type, for both 2008-09 and 2009-10; the numbers in parentheses provide what percentage, of the programs which responded to this question, uses each mentor type. Some programs have more than one mentor type.

		Full-time or full-release mentors	Part-time mentors with other, non-teaching duties	Part-time mentors with other teaching duties	Full-time teachers or administrators	Retired personnel	Other
2009-10	Total number of mentors	206 (8%)	10 (0.4%)	188 (8%)	1994 (81%)	68 (3%)	12 (0.5%)
	Number of programs with mentors in this category	24 (38%)	7 (11%)	11 (17%)	45 (71%)	15 (24%)	3 (5%)
2008-09	Number of programs with mentors in this category	4 (10%)	5 (12%)	2 (5%)	26 (63%)	3 (7%)	1 (2%)

Table 1.8. Novice teachers who left their home districts within the first two years of being hired

This table shows the total number of new teachers hired across all of the funded programs, separated into four rows based on whether they were hired in 2008-09 or 2007-08 and whether they participated in an induction/mentoring program. The last four columns provide the total number of new teachers who left the district. The number in parentheses provides what percentage, of the total number of teachers hired who participated (or did not), left under which conditions.

Note: 12 programs (in addition to the three which did not answer any demographics questions) left this question entirely blank, because they had not kept these records, but they indicated that they planned to keep these records in the future.

		Total # of new teachers hired	# who voluntarily left the district	# who moved within the district	# who were RIFed ⁴	# who were asked to leave	Total # who left
Teachers hired in 2008-09	Participated in induction / mentoring program	2314	143 (6%)	186 (8%)	284 (12%)	66 (3%)	679 (29%)
	No program participation	391	53 (14%)	23 (6%)	11 (3%)	17 (4%)	104 (27%)
Teachers hired in 2007-08	Participated in induction / mentoring program	1420	124 (9%)	127 (9%)	79 (6%)	46 (3%)	376 (27%)
	No program participation	327	62 (19%)	6 (2%)	3 (1%)	17 (5%)	88 (27%)

⁴ Programs interpreted this item in various ways. Some listed all teachers who were RIFed, whether or not they were later rehired. Others only listed teachers who were RIFed and not rehired.

Table 1.9. Attrition patterns

Programs reported the following patterns in novice teachers who left their districts. These categories are not mutually exclusive, so some programs selected more than one and others did not note any patterns.

Noted attrition patterns	# of programs
Teachers who were not seen as successful	23
Special education teachers	12
Teachers of various content areas, not including math/science	9
Teachers in high-poverty or high-need schools	8
Math/science teachers	6
ESL/bilingual teachers	3

QUANTITATIVE DATA 2: DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF FUNDED PROGRAMS

Unless otherwise noted, the data for the 66 programs funded for 2009-10 were taken from the Illinois School Report Card, using data from the latest year available. The data on the 39 programs funded for 2008-09 are from the ISBE report card website, using the latest data available at that time.

To calculate statistics (e.g. average per-pupil instructional expenses) for multi-district programs, we computed a weighted average of all of the districts in the program. This was done by multiplying the statistic (e.g. per-pupil instructional expense) from each component district by the district's student enrollment as a consistent reflection of district size. The total for all component districts was then divided by the total student enrollment across all districts in the program. The means and medians provided for the programs as a whole, in Tables 2.4 through 2.12, are also weighted by program size.

Nine funded programs each operate within a limited subset of Chicago SD #299. Where data were available for individual schools (for total student enrollment, % students by race, and % low-income students), we were able to break out the nine Chicago programs separately. So, the data in Tables 2.1 through 2.7 are calculated per program. However, some school report card data (e.g. average instructional expense per pupil; average teacher experience) are only available for entire districts. In tables 2.7 through 2.12, we entered the Chicago data nine times—once for each Chicago program—in calculating the medians; and we used a weighted average of the total student enrollment in each program to calculate the means.

Table 2.1. Program size

The 2009-10 data are self-reported from the CDEs and only include the schools and districts which the programs are specifically working with. For 2008-09, the number of districts is self-reported by the programs, while the number of schools is taken from the online school report cards and includes all schools within the specified districts.

	2008-09	2009-10	% increase from 2008-09 to 2009-10
Number of programs	39	66	69%
Total # of schools served	998	1,484	49%
Total # of schools which currently have new teachers	Not collected in 2008-09	1,194	N/A
Total # of districts served	204	356	75%
Total # of districts which currently have new teachers:	Not collected in 2008-09	307	N/A

Table 2.2. Program leadership/ownership

This table lists the number of programs which are run by districts, ROEs, universities, or other consortia. The number in parentheses provides what percentage, of the total number of programs, falls into each category.

	Run by district	Run by ROE or ISC	Run by university	Run by support provider
2009-10	37 (56%)	22 (33%)	4 (6%)	3 (5%)
2008-09	23 (59%)	12 (31%)	3 (8%)	1 (3%)

Table 2.3. Student enrollment

This table provides the total student enrollment in all districts served by each program (or, for Chicago programs, the total student enrollment in all schools served by each program).

	Minimum	Maximum	Median	Mean	Total students
2009-10	443 (one program)	40,449 (one program)	8,300	10,765	710,522
2008-09	529 (one program)	33,929 (one program)	10,676	11,969	466,794

Table 2.4. Student race: Black, Hispanic, Asian, Native American, and multi-race

This table provides the program-wide racial percentages of students within all component districts (or, for Chicago programs, the average percentages in schools served by each program.) The Illinois state average is 53.3% White students, 19% Black students, 20.8% Hispanic students, 4.1% Asian students, 0.2% Native American students, and 2.5% multi-racial students.

	Minimum	Maximum	Median	Mean
White	0.1% (one program)	98.7% (one program)	61.7%	53.6%
Black	0.1% (one program)	98.9% (one program)	8.8%	23.8%
Hispanic	0.1% (one program)	84.6% (one program)	7.9%	16.3%
Asian	0% (two programs)	16.4% (one program)	1.2%	3.1%
Native	0% (8 programs)	0.3% (6 programs)	0.2%	0.2%
Multi-race	0% (9 programs)	8.6% (one program)	3.2%	3.1%

Table 2.5. Student income

This table provides the program-wide percentage of low income students within all component districts (or, for Chicago programs, the average percentage of low income students in schools served by each program.) The Illinois state average is 43% low-income students.

	Minimum	Maximum	Median	Mean
2009-2010	7.8% (one program)	94.8% (one program)	44.4%	45.6%
2008-2009	5% (one program)	91% (one program)	39%	44.8%

Table 2.6. English Language Learners

This table provides the program-wide percentage of students classified as Limited English Proficient within all component districts (or, for Chicago programs, the average percentage of LEP students in schools served by each program.) The Illinois state average is 8% LEP students.

	Minimum	Maximum	Median	Mean
2009-2010	0% (6 programs)	36.7% (one program)	3.3%	6.1%
2008-2009	These data are not available for 2008-09			

Table 2.7. Standardized tests

This table provides the program-wide percentage of students passing (meeting or exceeding state standards) standardized tests in all component districts. The Illinois state average is 75.5%. Data were not available for two programs: BHS ROE #28 and DuPage ROE #19.

	Minimum	Maximum	Median	Mean
2009-2010	26% (one program)	91.3% (one program)	74%	72.2%
2008-2009	50% (one program)	91% (two programs)	74%	72%

Table 2.8. Teacher salary

This table provides the program-wide average salary of teachers employed by component districts. The Illinois state average is \$61,402.

	Minimum	Maximum	Median	Mean
2009-2010	\$42,340 (one program)	\$90,100 (one program)	\$56,832	\$59,607
2008-2009	\$40,900 (one program)	\$72,100 (one program)	\$53,500	\$55,277

Table 2.9. Teacher experience

This table provides the program-wide average teacher experience of teachers employed by component districts. The Illinois state average is 12.5 years.

	Minimum	Maximum	Median	Mean
2009-2010	6.0 (one program)	17.7 (one program)	12.7	12.7
2008-2009	6.6 (one program)	16.8 (one program)	13.2	13.3

Table 2.10. Teachers with master's degrees

This table provides the program-wide percentage of teachers with master's degrees employed by component districts. The Illinois state average is 55.8%.

	Minimum	Maximum	Median	Mean
2009-2010	26.3% (one program)	76.8% (one program)	54.1%	53.7%
2008-2009	29% (one program)	74% (one program)	54%	50%

Table 2.11. Teacher race

This table provides the program-wide racial percentage of teachers employed by component districts in 2009-10. The Illinois state average is 85.1% White, 8.3% Black, 5% Hispanic, 1.4% Asian, and 0.2% Native American.

	Minimum	Maximum	Median	Mean
White	49.9% (one program)	100% (one program)	94.0%	87.0%
Black	0% (10 programs)	30.9% (one program)	1.3%	7.3%
Hispanic	0 (6 programs)	15.1% (one program)	1.6%	4.5%
Asian	0 (8 programs)	3.7 (one program)	0.7%	1.1%
Native	0 (46 programs)	0.8% (one program)	0%	0.1%

Table 2.12. Instructional expense

This table provides the program-wide average instructional expense per student in component districts. The Illinois state average is \$6,103 (for fiscal year 2007-08).

	Minimum	Maximum	Median	Mean
2009-2010	\$4,409 (one program)	\$9,500 (one program)	\$5,656	\$5,845
2008-2009	\$3,819 (one program)	\$6,658 (one program)	\$5,220	\$5,207

QUALITATIVE DATA

Note: In this section, we are using “districts” as shorthand for “district-based programs”. So, the first item under “Late hires” reads “41 programs (23 districts, 18 consortia)”. This means that of 41 programs, 23 were based in single districts and 18 were run by consortia.

Late Hires

Forty-one programs (23 districts, 18 consortia) reported that some of their novice teachers were hired after the initial new teacher orientation and all planned to allow these late hires to participate in the program, in the following ways:

- New hires receive make-up orientation sessions (often 1-on-1, often provided by the mentor, mentor coordinator, or building administrator) – 15 programs (8 districts, 7 consortia)
- Mentors are assigned right away; otherwise, new hires pick up the program midstream – 11 programs (4 districts, 7 consortia)
- Late hires receive extra assistance, such as co-teaching, as needed – 7 programs (4 districts, 3 consortia)
- If novices are hired very late, they may be assigned a mentor for their first (partial) year and then they participate in the full program the following year as a first-year teacher – 1 program (1 consortium)

Novice Teachers with Previous Experience

Twenty-seven programs (19 districts, 9 consortia) reported that some of their novice teachers had previous experience in other schools or districts, but still participated in the program in the following ways:

- Thirteen programs (8 districts, 5 consortia) provided differentiated or truncated programming for teachers with experience, while 6 programs (2 districts, 4 consortia) had experienced teachers participating in the same program and workshops as first-year teachers with no experience, and 2 programs (1 district, 1 consortium) allowed teachers with experience to participate in certain aspects of the program only.
- Five programs (2 districts, 3 consortia) reported that participating teachers all had less than 2 years of experience in other schools or districts.

The survey did not ask what funding paid for these teachers’ participation, although 8 programs volunteered that they were using district or other funds. Future CDEs will ask about funding sources for these teachers.

Impact of the Economy on Teacher Retention and Attrition

Sixteen programs (9 district, 7 consortia; in addition to the 15 programs who omitted answering the question) reported experiencing no impact; other programs reported the following impacts:

- Ten programs (2 districts, 8 consortia) reported that fewer teachers than usual left the district, because they had fewer employment options elsewhere. Meanwhile, seven programs (1 district, 6 consortia) reported that teachers left their district for better-paying jobs elsewhere, and 3 programs (2 districts, 1 consortium) reported that teachers left to work in more stable districts which were not RIFing new teachers.
- Seven programs (3 districts, 4 consortia) reported widespread RIFing of new teachers, and 5 programs (1 district, 4 consortia) found that most of their RIFed teachers were able to be re-hired, thanks to retirements, district analysis of staffing needs, or restoration of state funding.
- Finding a job, for a new teacher, may be much more difficult. Four programs (3 districts, 1 consortium) reported that veteran teachers are delaying retirement. Four programs (4 districts) reported that more experienced teachers, who were displaced from previous jobs, are applying for vacancies. Three programs (all consortia) reported an increase in job applications, and 1 program (a district) noted that more people are coming into teaching as a second career because they lost their previous jobs.
- Eight programs (2 districts, 6 consortia) volunteered a prediction that the economy will have a larger impact on them next year.