

Appendix to INTC Data Brief #2

March 2010

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 Appendix provides tables, charts, and analyses of quantitative and qualitative data. All data were reported on the fall 2009 Common Data Elements (CDE) reporting form by the 66 programs that received grant funding in fall 2009.

This Appendix is organized into the following sections:

- Standard 1, Induction Program Leadership, Administration, and Support
- Standard 2, Program Goals and Design
- Standard 5, Mentor Selection and Assignment
- Summer Trainings for Mentors and Novices

The Data Brief is a separate document that provides highlights of this data.

Notes on the data

The fall CDE included multiple-choice, short-response, and extended-response questions. The data in this appendix are from program self-reports only.

The Consortium for Educational Change-Marion encompasses two separate grants and Chicago New Teacher Center #299, Areas 3, 7, 13, 14, & 17 encompasses four separate grants. Each of these programs filled out a single CDE reporting form, so INTC received 62 total CDEs although ISBE provides 66 total grants. For this data brief, INTC is only reporting on the 62 CDEs it received; thus, Chicago New Teacher Center appears as a single program, not four.

In this Appendix, 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 provided some figures but not others. In each table, the total number of programs responding in each category appears in parentheses in the blue header row(s) or blue initial column(s). Overall, the Data Brief reports on 62 programs, of which 35 are single-district and 27 are consortium-based. The 62 programs also represents 36 that were initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (the “continuing programs”) plus 26 that were funded in 2009 (the “new programs”).

STANDARD 1: INDUCTION PROGRAM LEADERSHIP, ADMINISTRATION, AND SUPPORT

Table 1.1. Overall program management/coordination personnel

This table shows the total number of programs that are managed or coordinated by various categories of personnel. The rows divide the programs into district-based and consortium-based programs, subdivided by whether each is run by a single person or a team.

		Full-time coordinator	Building admin	District admin	Classroom teacher	Union personnel	Retired personnel	University faculty	Outside consultant	Other
District-based programs	A single person (15)	5 (33%)	1 (7%)	5 (33%)	1 (7%)	0	1 (7%)	0	0	Part-time program coordinator (2)
	A team, with the following members: (20)	3 (15%)	5 (25%)	17 (85%)	10 (50%)	9 (45%)	1 (5%)	0	3 (15%)	Doctoral students (1), social worker (1), mentors / mentor leader (2), part-time mentor coordinator (2), teacher leaders (1)
Consortium-based programs	A single person (8)	0	1 (13%)	0	0	0	3 (38%)	1 (13%)	0	Part-time coordinator (3)
	A team, with the following members: (17)	2 (12%)	5 (29%)	9 (53%)	5 (29%)	4 (24%)	4 (24%)	4 (24%)	4 (24%)	Part-time coordinator (5); ROE staff (5); ISC staff (1); curriculum coordinator (1); foundation staff (1)

Table 1.2. Overall program management/coordination time

This table shows the minimum, maximum, median, and mode statistics for the percent of time that program coordinators spend on managing the induction/mentoring program. This table does NOT include statistics for programs that are run by teams.

What percent of work time does the program coordinator spend on managing the induction/mentoring program?	
10%	4 programs
20%-25%	5 programs
30%	1 program
40%	2 programs
95%-100%	10 programs

Table 1.3. District administrator involvement

This table shows the level of involvement, for various district-office personnel, in the implementation, coordination, and/or management of the induction and mentoring programs. In each white cell, the first figure is the total number of programs; the number in parentheses provides what percentage, of the total number of district-based or consortium-based programs, falls into each category. Some programs left some parts of this question blank, so the percentages in each row do not always total 100%.

		Very involved	Moderately involved	Minimally involved	Not involved
District-based programs (34)	Superintendents	0	7 (21%)	17 (50%)	9 (26%)
	Curriculum & instruction administration	13 (38%)	9 (26%)	8 (24%)	3 (9%)
	Human resources administration	10 (29%)	10 (29%)	10 (29%)	3 (9%)
	Business/finance administration	0	5 (15%)	19 (56%)	9 (26%)
	Other district administrators	6 (18%)	7 (21%)	3 (9%)	2 (6%)
Consortium-based programs (26)	Superintendents	0	12 (46%)	11 (42%)	3 (12%)
	Curriculum & instruction administration	5 (19%)	9 (35%)	6 (23%)	6 (23%)
	Human resources administration	0	8 (31%)	7 (27%)	11 (42%)
	Business/finance administration	0	6 (23%)	9 (35%)	11 (42%)
	Other district administrators	3 (12%)	3 (12%)	2 (8%)	8 (31%)

“Other district administrators” who are “moderately involved” or “very involved” include: grant specialist/administrator (3); assistant superintendent (2); special services; area officer; director of staff support; new schools designee; site coordinators; mentor coordinators; ELL coordinators.

Table 1.4. Teacher union involvement

This table shows how local teacher unions or associations are involved in the induction and mentoring program. In each white cell, the first figure is the total number of programs; the number in parentheses provides what percentage, of the total number of district-based or consortium-based programs (or of programs initially funded in 2006/2008 or 2009), falls into each category. Programs could check more than one category, so the numbers in parentheses do not total 100%.

	Unions are not involved	Contracts spell out program requirements	Unions are actively involved	Unions are actively supportive	Unions are resisting the program
District-based programs (34)	3 (9%)	7 (21%)	15 (44%)	29 (85%)	0
Consortium-based programs (26)	8 (31%)	6 (23%)	5 (19%)	16 (62%)	1 (4%)
Initially funded in 2009 (24)	4 (17%)	5 (21%)	8 (33%)	18 (75%)	1 (4%)
Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (36)	7 (19%)	8 (22%)	11 (31%)	26 (72%)	0

Table 1.5. Positive union involvement

These data are from an open-ended question on the fall CDE that asked, “What do you consider successful regarding the teacher union's involvement in the program?” In analyzing the data, INTC grouped similar responses together, and is presenting them in a table format. Most programs reported positive relationships with the unions; the following responses were listed by more than 5 programs.

	Total # of programs	District-based programs (32)	Consortium-based programs (20)	Initially funded in 2009 (21)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (31)
Unions are generally supportive of the entire program.	21	13 (41%)	8 (40%)	10 (48%)	11 (35%)
Program has union representation or leadership at their oversight committee, leadership group, or stakeholder meetings.	10	8 (25%)	2 (10%)	3 (14%)	7 (23%)
The union is very involved in creating and/or running the program.	9	5 (16%)	4 (20%)	5 (24%)	4 (13%)
Program has good communication, often two-way, with the unions.	8	8 (25%)	0	3 (14%)	5 (16%)
Participation in the induction and mentoring program is included in the teacher contract	7	6 (19%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	6 (19%)
Program had union representatives or leadership attend or participate in novice teacher conferences, workshops, or institutes.	7	7 (22%)	0	1 (5%)	6 (19%)

Table 1.6. Challenges in working with unions

These data are from an open-ended question on the fall CDE that asked, “Describe any challenges of working with the teacher union and how you are addressing these challenges.” In analyzing the data, INTC grouped similar responses together, and is presenting them in a table format.

Only a few programs reported problems with their unions; all of the responses are listed below:

	Total # of programs	District-based programs (33)	Consortium-based programs (21)	Initially funded in 2009 (21)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (33)
Unions are negative/skeptical about the induction and mentoring program, they distrust program leadership, and/or they do not support their members participating as mentors or mentees.	4	2 (6%)	2 (10%)	1 (5%)	3 (9%)
The union and program (or district) are engaged in contract disputes (in general, or over particular induction & mentoring issues—such as fair compensation for mentors, and use of retired teachers as mentors.	4	4 (12%)	0	1 (5%)	3 (9%)
Unions originally were unsupportive and/or communication was poor, but relations and support have now improved.	3	2 (6%)	1 (5%)	0	1 (3%)
A large consortium finds it difficult to work with so many individual unions.	1	0	1 (5%)	0	1 (3%)

STANDARD 2: PROGRAM GOALS AND DESIGN

Table 2.1. Program progress since initial funding

This table shows what progress programs have made since they first received funding from ISBE. This table only shows changes; if a program had been ISBE-approved prior to receiving funding, that would not show up on this table. In each white cell, the first figure is the total number of programs; the number in parentheses provides what percentage of the total number of district-based or consortium-based programs made each form of progress.

	District-based programs (35)	Consortium-based programs (26)	Initially funded in 2009 (25)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (36)
Prior to funding, we did not have a formal program.	11 (31%)	14 (54%)	13 (52%)	12 (33%)
We offered more mentor trainings/professional development.	30 (86%)	21 (81%)	19 (76%)	32 (89%)
We made improvements in mentor trainings/professional development.	21 (60%)	20 (77%)	13 (52%)	28 (78%)
We offered more new teacher trainings/professional development.	22 (63%)	23 (88%)	17 (68%)	28 (78%)
We made improvements in new teacher trainings/professional development.	27 (77%)	22 (85%)	17 (68%)	32 (89%)
We offered more administrator trainings/professional development.	24 (69%)	15 (58%)	13 (52%)	26 (72%)
We made improvements in administrator trainings/professional development.	16 (46%)	14 (54%)	10 (40%)	20 (56%)
The program became more structured and/or expectations were clarified.	27 (77%)	22 (85%)	16 (64%)	33 (92%)
We made improvements in mentor/mentee relationship, with more release time, more structure, and/or increased time for mentors and mentees to meet together.	23 (66%)	14 (54%)	11 (44%)	26 (72%)
We made improvements in formative assessment or documentation of new teacher progress.	23 (66%)	18 (69%)	14 (56%)	27 (75%)
We have improved data-driven decision-making about program design and implementation.	21 (60%)	10 (38%)	9 (36%)	22 (61%)
We provided more differentiation in program components (e.g. for 1st year vs. 2nd year teachers).	19 (54%)	13 (50%)	9 (36%)	23 (64%)
We made improvements in program evaluation.	19 (54%)	13 (50%)	8 (32%)	24 (67%)
We created a specific program for second-year teachers.	16 (46%)	14 (54%)	5 (20%)	25 (69%)
Full-release mentors were provided.	13 (37%)	0	4 (16%)	9 (25%)
We made technological improvements (e.g. better program website).	12 (34%)	6 (23%)	3 (12%)	15 (42%)
The program (or programs of component districts) received state approval.	8 (23%)	11 (42%)	4 (16%)	15 (42%)
We saw growth in support/enthusiasm/participation from stakeholders or component districts.	21 (60%)	22 (85%)	13 (52%)	30 (83%)

Table 2.2. Program goals

This table provides the programs' goals. In each white cell, the first figure is the total number of programs; the number in parentheses provides what percentage of the total number of new or continuing programs falls into each category. Programs could check more than one goal, so the numbers in parentheses do not total 100%.

	Teacher retention	Improving teacher quality	Raising student achievement	Other
Initially funded in 2009 (25)	22 (88%)	25 (100%)	25 (100%)	Building capacity – 1
Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (39) ¹	39 (100%)	39 (100%)	33 (85%)	Developing teacher leaders – 2; creating a culture of excellence or support – 2; accountability / communicating expectations – 2; establishing a network for mentors/mentees -1; improved school climate – 1; building capacity – 1; assisting component programs and strengthening administrative support – 1

Table 2.3. Program focus: mentoring vs. professional development

This table shows whether programs self-identify as focused on mentoring, professional development, or both. In each white cell, the first figure is the total number of programs; the number in parentheses provides what percentage of the total number of district-based or consortium-based programs falls into each category.

		Mentoring program primarily	Professional development program primarily	Both
District-based programs	Initially funded in 2006 (6)	1 (17%)	0	5 (83%)
	Initially funded in 2008 (14)	3 (21%)	0	11 (79%)
	Initially funded in 2009 (15)	5 (33%)	1 (7%)	9 (60%)
Consortium-based programs	Initially funded in 2006 (3)	2 (67%)	0	1 (33%)
	Initially funded in 2008 (13)	1 (8%)	0	12 (92%)
	Initially funded in 2009 (10)	0	1 (10%)	9 (90%)

¹ The data in this row are from the spring 2009 CDE.

Table 2.4. Program alignment with school and district improvement plans

These data are from an open-ended question on the fall CDE that asked, “In what ways is the program aligned with school and district improvement plans or initiatives?” In analyzing the data, INTC grouped similar responses together and is presenting them in a table format. Four programs left this question blank; none said that there was no alignment. The following responses were listed by at least 5 programs:

	Total # of programs	District-based programs (33)	Consortium-based programs (25)	Initially funded in 2009 (24)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (34)
Topics/strategies from school/district improvement plans (e.g. using data to drive instructional decisions; implementing standards-based curricula; differentiating instruction; diversity; RTI; balanced literacy; Danielson framework) are covered in professional development for novice teachers	20	14 (42%)	6 (24%)	10 (42%)	10 (29%)
Participation in the induction and mentoring program is included in school and district improvement plans	9	3 (9%)	6 (24%)	5 (21%)	4 (12%)
An improvement goal is to hire and retain highly effective teachers, and this is facilitated by the induction and mentoring program	9	5 (15%)	4 (16%)	4 (17%)	5 (15%)
The program aligns with school and district improvement plans and initiatives (no specifics provided)	8	3 (9%)	5 (20%)	5 (21%)	3 (9%)
Improvement plans focus on student engagement and achievement, and the new teacher induction program is needed to achieve this goal	6	3 (9%)	3 (12%)	4 (17%)	2 (6%)
Mentors and program-run professional development help novice teachers learn about school/district initiatives	6	1 (3%)	5 (20%)	2 (8%)	4 (12%)
Representatives from each school or district regularly provide advice on the program based on school/district improvement plans	5	1 (3%)	4 (16%)	1 (4%)	4 (12%)
The program helps new teachers understand the model used by the district’s formal evaluation system (typically the Danielson Framework)	5	3 (9%)	2 (8%)	1 (4%)	4 (12%)
Improvement plans describe the need for professional development and increasing teacher effectiveness, and these are addressed through the program	5	1 (3%)	4 (16%)	3 (13%)	2 (6%)

Table 2.5. Overall program ISBE approval

This table shows whether programs have been approved by ISBE. In each white cell, the first figure is the total number of programs; the number in parentheses provides what percentage of the total number of district-based or consortium-based programs falls into each category.

	District-based programs (34)	Consortium-based programs (25)	Initially funded in 2009 (24)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (35)
Approved	26 (76%)	22 (88%)	15 (63%)	33 (94%)
Not approved	8 (24%)	3 (12%)	9 (38%)	2 (6%)

Table 2.6. Component district program ISBE approval

This table is for multi-district programs only, and shows statistics on whether programs run by their component districts have been approved by ISBE. Programs were asked what percent of their districts have ISBE-approved programs, and this table breaks down the statistics by the year in which each program was initially funded by ISBE.

	0 districts	1%-25% of districts	26%-50% of districts	51%-75% of districts	76%-99% of districts	100% of districts
Initially funded in 2006 (3)	1 (33%)	0	0	0	0	2 (66%)
Initially funded in 2008 (11)	0	1 (9%)	0	3 (27%)	1 (9%)	6 (55%)
Initially funded in 2009 (9)	1 (11%)	0	1 (11%)	1 (11%)	4 (44%)	2 (22%)

Table 2.7. Communication with administrators and school board members

This table shows how program leadership makes administrators and school board members aware of the induction and mentoring program and how it keeps them informed of related progress and developments. In each white cell, the first figure is the total number of programs; the number in parentheses provides what percentage of the total number of district-based or consortium-based programs uses each means of communication. Programs could check more than one means of communication, so the numbers in parentheses do not total 100%.

		Building administrators	District administrators	School board members
District-based programs (35)	No direct communication takes place	0	0	7 (20%)
	Email	25 (71%)	24 (69%)	6 (17%)
	Newsletter	9 (26%)	9 (26%)	7 (20%)
	Presentations during regularly scheduled meetings	24 (69%)	21 (60%)	19 (54%)
	Meetings scheduled specifically for this purpose	14 (40%)	17 (49%)	5 (14%)
	One-on-one meetings	23 (66%)	14 (40%)	2 (6%)
	Informal communication	28 (80%)	25 (71%)	8 (23%)
	Other: website/online; program handbook; invited to program events	4 (11%)	3 (9%)	2 (6%)
Consortium-based programs (25)	No direct communication takes place	0	0	5 (20%)
	Email	21 (84%)	21 (84%)	0
	Newsletter	5 (20%)	6 (24%)	1 (4%)
	Presentations during regularly scheduled meetings	15 (60%)	14 (56%)	4 (16%)
	Meetings scheduled specifically for this purpose	16 (64%)	17 (68%)	1 (4%)
	One-on-one meetings	18 (72%)	14 (56%)	0
	Informal communication	19 (76%)	18 (72%)	4 (16%)
	Other: workshops, partnership meetings; oversight committee participation	0	1 (4%)	2 (8%)

Initially funded in 2009 (24)	No direct communication takes place	0	0	4 (17%)
	Email	17 (71%)	17 (71%)	4 (17%)
	Newsletter	4 (17%)	4 (17%)	3 (13%)
	Presentations during regularly scheduled meetings	14 (58%)	12 (50%)	10 (42%)
	Meetings scheduled specifically for this purpose	10 (42%)	12 (50%)	1 (4%)
	One-on-one meetings	14 (58%)	10 (42%)	1 (4%)
	Informal communication	18 (75%)	17 (71%)	6 (25%)
Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (36)	No direct communication takes place	0	0	8 (22%)
	Email	30 (83%)	29 (81%)	2 (6%)
	Newsletter	10 (28%)	11 (31%)	5 (14%)
	Presentations during regularly scheduled meetings	23 (64%)	21 (58%)	12 (33%)
	Meetings scheduled specifically for this purpose	20 (56%)	22 (39%)	5 (14%)
	One-on-one meetings	26 (72%)	16 (44%)	1 (3%)
	Informal communication	29 (81%)	26 (72%)	6 (17%)

Table 2.8. Single-tiered vs. multi-tiered mentoring

This table shows whether programs have multi-tiered mentoring programs: programs in which novice teachers are matched with two (or more) mentors, such as a building-level mentor and a district-level mentor. In each white cell, the first figure is the total number of programs; the number in parentheses provides what percentage of the total number of district-based or consortium-based programs uses each means of communication.

	The program is not multi-tiered	Some buildings (or component districts) are single-tiered and some are multi-tiered	The program is multi-tiered for first-year teachers only	The program is multi-tiered for both first- and second-year teachers
District-based programs (35)	24 (69%)	1 (3%)	5 (14%)	5 (14%)
Consortium-based programs (27)	23 (85%)	3 (11%)	0	1 (4%)
Initially funded in 2009 (26)	22 (85%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	2 (8%)
Initially funded in 2008 or 2008 (36)	25 (69%)	3 (12%)	4 (11%)	4 (11%)

Table 2.9. Multi-tiered models

These data are from an open-ended question on the fall CDE that asked, “Please describe the structure and organization of the multi-tiered mentoring program.” In analyzing the data, INTC grouped similar responses together, and is presenting them in a table format.

All of the responses are listed below:

	Total # of programs	District-based programs (35)	Consortium-based programs (27)	Initially funded in 2009 (26)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (36)
New teachers are assigned two mentors: a building-level/operational mentor, and a district-level or full-release mentor/instructional coach	10	9 (26%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	9 (25%)
New teachers are assigned three mentors: building-level / operational mentors; instructional mentors; and coaches/lead teachers, who provide content-area professional development	2	2 (6%)	0	2 (8%)	0
If the official mentor is in another building or teaches a different grade level or content area, a new teacher is assigned a second mentor, often informally	1	0	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	0
In some districts, new teachers have both building mentors and lead mentors; all alternative certification teachers have retired mentors and lead mentors; struggling new teachers can receive up to 12 hours of focused assistance	1	0	1 (4%)	0	1 (3%)

Table 2.10. Induction process elements

This table shows how many programs require various elements as part of the induction process. In each white cell, the first figure is the total number of programs; the number in parentheses provides what percentage of the total number of district-based or consortium-based programs requires each element. Consortium-based programs were asked whether each element is required for the overall program, not for individual districts.

	District-based programs (35)	Consortium-based programs (26)	Initially funded in 2009 (25)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (36)
Mentors observing beginning teachers	35 (100%)	26 (100%)	25 (100%)	36 (100%)
Beginning teachers observing mentors or other experienced teachers	30 (86%)	18 (69%)	22 (88%)	26 (72%)
Paired mentor/beginning teacher face-to-face meetings	32 (91%)	26 (100%)	23 (92%)	35 (97%)
Small group sessions (e.g. lesson study, book study, PLC)	22 (63%)	13 (50%)	13 (52%)	22 (61%)
Professional growth plan / individual induction plan	23 (66%)	19 (73%)	17 (68%)	25 (69%)
Videoconferencing: program participants are videotaped in the practice of teaching for later reflection/discussion with others	6 (17%)	3 (11%)	4 (16%)	5 (14%)
E-mentoring: online discussions, blogs, video or text-chat for beginning teacher and veteran teacher interactions (not including informal use of email)	5 (14%)	6 (23%)	5 (20%)	6 (17%)

STANDARD 5: MENTOR SELECTION AND ASSIGNMENT

Note: 3 programs left most of this section blank.

Table 3.1. Defining process and criteria for mentor selection and assignment

This table shows whether the process for selecting and matching mentors is defined at the program level, district level, or building level. In each white cell, the first figure is the total number of programs; the number in parentheses provides what percentage of the total number of district-based or consortium-based programs fits each criterion.

Which level (program, district, building) defines the following:	District-based programs (35)		Consortium-based programs (24)		
	Program level	Building level	Program level	District level	Building level
Mentor selection process and criteria	26 (74%)	9 (26%)	4 (17%)	11 (46%)	9 (38%)
Process for assigning mentors to beginning teachers	23 (66%)	12 (34%)	4 (17%)	9 (38%)	11 (46%)
Criteria for matching mentors with beginning teachers	27 (77%)	8 (23%)	9 (38%)	10 (42%)	5 (21%)

Table 3.2. Mentor selection criteria

This table shows which criteria are used for selecting mentors. This table shows only the programs that define the criteria at the program level—most of which are district-based programs.

	Initially funded in 2009 (9)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (20)
Administrator recommendations	8 (89%)	18 (90%)
Current Standard Teaching Certificate	8 (89%)	17 (85%)
Availability and willingness to serve	7 (78%)	19 (95%)
Personality characteristic	7 (78%)	16 (80%)
Completion of mentor training	6 (67%)	18 (90%)
Tenured in the district	4 (44%)	11 (55%)
Outstanding teaching evaluations	5 (56%)	8 (40%)
Five or more years of teaching experience	3 (33%)	8 (40%)
Evaluations of mentoring practice from previous years as a mentor	1 (11%)	6 (30%)
Master's degree or higher	2 (22%)	2 (10%)

Table 3.3. Mentor selection personnel

This table shows which personnel select mentors for each program. Programs noted whether selection was made by individuals or committee; they then noted all personnel involved. Even when programs noted that individuals did the selection, they sometimes checked several different individuals—suggesting that different roles were involved, but that they did not work collaboratively. This table shows only the programs that define the selection process at the program level.

	Initially funded in 2009		Initially funded in 2006 or 2008	
	Selected by committee (6)	Selected by individuals (2)	Selected by committee (16)	Selected by individuals (5)
Building administrator	4 (67%)	1 (50%)	12 (75%)	5 (100%)
District administrator	5 (83%)	1 (50%)	11 (69%)	2 (40%)
Program coordinator	1 (17%)	1 (50%)	13 (81%)	0
Mentor coordinator	2 (33%)	0	7 (44%)	1 (20%)
Department head	2 (33%)	0	5 (31%)	0
Union leadership	0	0	5 (31%)	0
Other	Site coordinator; fellow teachers	0	Current mentors/leaders; teacher leaders; university staff; other committees	

Table 3.4. Mentor assignment personnel

This table shows which personnel, for each program, assign or match mentors to work with individual beginning teachers. If selection is made by committee, programs checked all personnel involved. This table shows only the programs that define the matching process at the program level.

	Initially funded in 2009		Initially funded in 2006 or 2008	
	Selected by committee (6)	Selected by individuals (3)	Selected by committee (9)	Selected by individuals (7)
Building administrator	5 (83%)	1 (33%)	7 (78%)	6 (86%)
District administrator	6 (100%)	1 (33%)	4 (44%)	1 (14%)
Program coordinator	1 (17%)	0	7 (78%)	2 (29%)
Mentor coordinator	2 (33%)	1 (33%)	5 (56%)	1 (14%)
Department head	1 (17%)	0	1 (11%)	0
Union leadership	0	0	1 (11%)	0
Other	Site coordinators		Mentors; university alumni	

Table 3.5. Criteria for matching mentors and novices

This table shows which criteria are used by the programs in matching mentors to work with individual novice teachers. This table shows only the programs that define the matching process at the program level.

	Initially funded in 2009 (13)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (24)
Grade level and/or subject area match	13 (100%)	21 (88%)
Physical proximity	9 (69%)	20 (83%)
Personality type match	6 (46%)	13 (54%)
Mentor requests match	3 (23%)	7 (29%)
Beginning teacher requests match	1 (8%)	3 (13%)

Table 3.6. Challenges matching mentors to novice teachers

These data are from an open-ended question on the fall CDE that asked 1) how successful the mentor/novice matches were, and 2) what challenges programs faced in matching mentors with individual novice teachers. Most programs indicated that the matches were very successful, without providing details, so this table only presents the challenges. In analyzing the data, INTC grouped similar responses together and is presenting them in a table format.

	Total # of programs	District-based programs (17)	Consortium-based programs (7)	Initially funded in 2009 (10)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (4)
Challenges involving unsuccessful matches					
Program had only one or two unsuccessful pairings, and these were easily adjusted or new mentors were assigned	7	6 (35%)	1 (14%)	1 (10%)	6 (43%)
Program had five personality conflicts in 18 months, but districts have “no fault divorce” procedures so that new matches can be made quickly	1	0	1 (14%)	0	1 (7%)
General challenges in making appropriate matches					
Because of small districts, large number of new teachers, or mentor demographics, the match is often not perfect or mentors are assigned more than the usual number of new teachers	5	5 (29%)	0	2 (20%)	3 (21%)
Program was challenged to match special area teachers (e.g. music; special education; secondary math; ELL) to those in same content area	4	4 (24%)	0	0	4 (29%)
In small/rural districts, or districts with great geographic area, some buildings don’t have any trained mentors, so novice teachers have mentors in different buildings	3	1 (6%)	2 (29%)	2 (20%)	1 (7%)
Some novice teachers are assigned mentors with different content areas or grade levels	2	0	2 (29%)	1 (10%)	1 (7%)
Other challenges, each reported by only one program: Lack of teachers qualified to be mentors; difficulty finding mentors for new teachers who work in multiple buildings; when novices change schools, they are assigned a new mentor					
Challenges for programs with full-time (full-release or retired) mentors					
Challenges, each reported by only one program: Difficulty ensuring that mentors aren’t assigned to work in too many buildings; difficulty having lead mentor skilled to work with all areas; all mentors have elementary backgrounds, but novice teachers are PK-12; if new teachers are hired late, it’s difficult to get a good match; it’s hard to find enough mentors in the right content areas and levels because novice teacher content areas and levels change each year.					

Table 3.7. Mentor selection and assignment for second-tier mentors in multi-tiered programs

Multi-tiered programs only were asked about their second-tier mentors (e.g. instructional coaches, curriculum specialists, or district lead mentors, who are assigned to novice teachers in addition to building-level mentors). The following chart shows all responses that were mentioned, in open-ended questions, by at least two multi-tiered programs. Not all multi-tier programs responded to each question.

Open-ended question from CDE	Number of programs providing each response
Who selects the second-tier mentors?	4 – District administrators/district office 2 – Program director / administrator
Who sets the criteria for selection?	3 – District / district administration 2 – District office and union 2 – Steering committee
What are the criteria for selection?	5 – Years of experience (from 4-10) 4 – Leadership skills and/or experience 3 – Knowledgeable (e.g. content area; instructional practice) 3 – Interpersonal / communication skills; ability to work collaboratively 3 – Mentoring experience/expertise 2 – Tenure 2 – Excellent evaluations 2 – Technologically literate 2 – Master’s degree or National Board Certification
Who matches or assigns these mentors to work with individual new teachers?	3 – Program director / administrator / coordinator 2 – Building administrator
What criteria are used for assigning these mentors to work with individual new teachers?	8 – Grade and/or subject area match

STANDARDS 6 AND 7: SUMMER TRAININGS FOR MENTORS AND NOVICES

Note: This section contains data on summer trainings only, from June 1 to September 30, 2009. The remainder of Standards 6 and 7 will be covered in a subsequent data brief.

Table 4.1. Summer training for new teachers

This table shows the number of programs that provided summer training / orientation / professional development for novice teachers between June 1 and September 30, 2009. The data are divided between district-based and consortium-based programs, and between first- and second-year teachers. Columns one and three provide the total number of programs with first- or second-year teachers. Columns two and four provide the total number of programs that offer summer training to first- or second-year teachers, and the number in parentheses shows what percent of programs that serve first- or second-year teachers provided them with summer training.

	# of programs with 1 st -year teachers	# of programs offering summer training to 1 st -year teachers	# of programs with 2 nd -year teachers	# of programs offering summer training to 2 nd -year teachers
District-based programs	35	33 (94%)	27	14 (52%)
Consortium-based programs	27	22 (81%)	26	3 (12%)
Initially funded in 2009	26	23 (88%)	17	1 (6%)
Initially funded in 2006 or 2008	36	32 (89%)	36	16 (44%)

Table 4.2. Length of summer training for first-year teachers

This table shows the number of hours of training / orientation / professional development that were offered to first-year teachers between June 1 and September 30, 2009. To calculate the statistics, all answers of “0” were omitted. Data are divided between district-based and consortium-based programs; between professional development specifically for first-year teachers, and professional development open to first-year teachers but not specifically for them; and between required and optional hours. Programs were instructed to not double-count hours; for example, if a program put on a two-hour workshop three times, each time for a different group of new teachers, it would count as two hours, not six.

Two programs indicated on a separate question that they did offer summer training, but left this question blank. Note: every program that provides “additional professional development” also provides professional development specifically for first-year teachers, except for one single-district program initially funded in 2009.

		Professional development specifically for 1 st -year teachers			Additional professional development, attended by 1 st -year teachers, paid for using induction funds		
		Required hours	Optional hours only	Optional hours in addition to req.	Required hours	Optional hours only	Optional hours in addition to req.
District-based programs (33)	# of programs	29 (88%)	2 (6%)	3 (9%)	10 (30%)	5 (15%)	3 (9%)
	Minimum	8	6	6	6	3	7
	Maximum	41.5	21	32	40	102	32
	Median	16	n/a	n/a	20	n/a	n/a
	Mean	19.9	n/a	n/a	19.2	n/a	n/a
Consortium-based programs (22)	# of programs	19 (86%)	3 (14%)	3 (14%)	5 (23%)	4 (18%)	1 (5%)
	Minimum	2	6	15	3	6	218
	Maximum	28	62	28	60	75	n/a
	Median	8	n/a	n/a	12	n/a	n/a
	Mean	8.9	n/a	n/a	21.4	n/a	n/a
Initially funded in 2009 (23)	# of programs	19 (83%)	2 (9%)	3 (13%)	8 (35%)	2 (9%)	2 (9%)
	Minimum	3	6	8	3	8	8
	Maximum	40	21	32	40	24	32
	Median	12	n/a	n/a	13	n/a	n/a
	Mean	15	n/a	n/a	18	n/a	n/a
Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (32)	# of programs	29 (91%)	3 (9%)	3 (9%)	7 (22%)	2 (6%)	7 (22%)
	Minimum	2	6	6	3	7	3
	Maximum	41.5	62	18	60	218	102
	Median	15	n/a	n/a	12	n/a	21
	Mean	16	n/a	n/a	20	n/a	36

Table 4.3. Summer training materials for first-year teachers

This chart lists the number of programs reporting use of each type of material in trainings / orientations / professional development for first-year teachers. All trainings occurred between June 1 and September 30, 2009. In each white cell, the first figure is the total number of programs; the number in parentheses provides what percentage of the total number of district-based or consortium-based programs uses each type of material.

Note: This table only provides data on programs initially funded in 2009. Programs initially funded in 2006 or 2008 provided materials on a previous CDE only. The results are not directly comparable because different the CDEs covered different time periods, and the multiple-choice questions provided different response choices.

	District-based programs (13)	Consortium-based programs (10)
Presenters prepared own materials	11 (85%)	8 (80%)
Charlotte Danielson Framework	9 (69%)	2 (20%)
Harry and Rosemary Wong's <i>First Days of School</i>	7 (54%)	8 (80%)
New Teacher Center (NTC) or Consortium for Educational Change (CEC) materials	4 (31%)	2 (20%)
Induction for the 21 st Century Educator (ICE21) materials	1 (8%)	7 (70%)
Other prepared materials	2 (15%)	5 (50%)

Table 4.4. Summer training content for first-year teachers

This chart lists the number of programs reporting that they cover each content area during first-year teacher trainings or professional development. All trainings occurred between June 1 and September 30, 2009. In each white cell, the first figure is the total number of programs; the number in parentheses provides what percentage of the total number of district-based or consortium-based programs uses each type of material.

Note: This table only provides data on programs initially funded in 2009. Programs initially funded in 2006 or 2008 provided materials on a previous CDE only. The results are not directly comparable because different the CDEs covered different time periods, and the multiple-choice questions provided different response choices.

	# of district-based programs (13)	# of consortium-based programs (11)
Illinois Professional Teaching Standards	11 (85%)	9 (82%)
Induction program expectations	11 (85%)	9 (82%)
Classroom management / environment	10 (77%)	9 (82%)
General instruction / teaching strategies / pedagogy (e.g. cooperative learning)	10 (77%)	8 (73%)
Working with parents, administrators, and/or the community	10 (77%)	6 (54%)
School/district policies and procedures (e.g. handbook, expectations, resources, etc.)	10 (77%)	3 (27%)
Illinois Learning Standards / content area standards	9 (69%)	6 (54%)
Lesson/unit planning/curriculum	8 (62%)	6 (54%)
Differentiating instruction	8 (62%)	3 (27%)
Content-area-specific teaching strategies/pedagogy	6 (47%)	2 (18%)
Special education / inclusion, RTI, social-emotional learning	6 (47%)	1 (9%)
Working with diverse populations and/or English Language Learners	5 (38%)	0
Formative and summative assessment methods/strategies	4 (31%)	5 (45%)
Analysis of student work	4 (31%)	3 (27%)
Child development, psychology, learning styles, and/or learning theory	4 (31%)	3 (27%)
Legal issues for teachers	4 (31%)	2 (18%)

Table 4.5. Length of summer mentor training

This table shows the number of hours of training or professional development that were offered to mentors between June 1 and September 30, 2009. To calculate the statistics, all answers of “0” were omitted. Data are divided between district-based and consortium-based programs; between initial trainings, and ongoing professional development; and between required and optional hours. Programs were instructed to not double-count hours; for example, if a program put on a two-hour workshop three times, each time for a different group of mentors, it would count as two hours, not six.

		Initial training		Ongoing professional development	
		Required hours	Optional hours	Required hours	Optional hours
District-based programs (34)	# of programs	30 (88%)	6 (18%)	20 (59%)	5 (15%)
	Minimum	1	1.5	1	2
	Maximum	50	48	114	29
	Median	12	8	9	8
	Mean	15	17	19	11
Consortium-based programs (27)	# of programs	25 (93%)	8 (30%)	16 (47%)	9 (33%)
	Minimum	3	2	2	2.5
	Maximum	36	45	24	45
	Median	16	3	3	4
	Mean	17	9	7	9
Initially funded in 2009 (25)	# of programs	23 (92%)	4 (16%)	14 (56%)	5 (20%)
	Minimum	3	3	2	2
	Maximum	50	24	36	6
	Median	18	n/a	10	4
	Mean	18	n/a	13	4
Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (36)	# of programs	32 (89%)	10 (28%)	22 (61%)	9 (25%)
	Minimum	1	1.5	1	2.5
	Maximum	36	48	114	45
	Median	14	3	5	5
	Mean	15	12	14	13

Table 4.6. Summer training materials for mentors

This chart lists the number of programs reporting use of each type of material in either initial trainings or ongoing professional development for mentors. All trainings occurred between June 1 and September 30, 2009. In each white cell, the first figure is the total number of programs; the number in parentheses provides what percentage of the total number of district-based or consortium-based programs uses each type of material.

Note: This table only provides data on programs initially funded in 2009. Programs initially funded in 2006 or 2008 provided materials on a previous CDE only. The results are not directly comparable because different the CDEs covered different time periods, and the multiple-choice questions provided different response choices.

	# of district-based programs (15)	# of consortium-based programs (11)
Presenters prepared own materials	9 (60%)	4 (36%)
Charlotte Danielson Framework	10 (66%)	4 (36%)
New Teacher Center (NTC) or Consortium for Educational Change (CEC) materials	9 (60%)	1 (9%)
Cognitive Coaching	7 (47%)	2 (18%)
Induction for the 21 st Century Educator (ICE21) materials	5 (33%)	10 (90%)
Other prepared materials	2 (13%)	1 (9%)

Table 4.7. Summer training content for mentors

This chart lists the number of programs reporting that they cover each content area during mentor teacher trainings or professional development. All trainings occurred between June 1 and September 30, 2009. In each white cell, the first figure is the total number of programs; the number in parentheses provides what percentage, of the total number of district-based or consortium-based programs, covers each content area. The data are divided between content covered during initial training and that covered in ongoing professional development.

Note: This table only provides data on programs initially funded in 2009. Programs initially funded in 2006 or 2008 provided materials on a previous CDE only. The results are not directly comparable because different the CDEs covered different time periods, and the multiple-choice questions provided different response choices.

	District-based programs		Consortium-based programs	
	Covered in initial training (15)	Covered in ongoing PD (12)	Covered in initial training (11)	Covered in ongoing PD (8)
Stages or continuum of beginning teacher development	14 (93%)	8 (67%)	11 (100%)	4 (50%)
Establishing trust / relationship building between mentor and mentee	14 (93%)	8 (67%)	10 (91%)	5 (63%)
Keeping records	13 (87%)	11 (92%)	10 (91%)	7 (88%)
Mentor language, roles, and relationship development	13 (87%)	8 (67%)	11 (100%)	5 (63%)
Induction (in general—theories, definitions, "Moving Toward..." document, etc.)	13 (87%)	8 (67%)	11 (100%)	3 (38%)
Program specific expectations for mentoring	13 (87%)	7 (58%)	10 (91%)	5 (63%)
Conferencing and feedback skills	12 (80%)	11 (92%)	10 (91%)	6 (75%)
Illinois Professional Teaching Standards, Illinois Learning Standards, or content area Standards	12 (80%)	10 (83%)	10 (91%)	7 (88%)
Communicating with building administration	12 (80%)	10 (83%)	10 (91%)	6 (75%)
Working with adult learners	12 (80%)	8 (67%)	10 (91%)	3 (38%)
Mentoring vs. evaluation	12 (80%)	9 (75%)	11 (100%)	5 (63%)
Induction and mentoring research	12 (80%)	6 (50%)	11 (100%)	3 (38%)
State context (approved induction programs)	9 (69%)	4 (33%)	11 (100%)	3 (38%)
Observation strategies and tools	8 (62%)	11 (92%)	9 (82%)	5 (63%)
Analyzing student work to improve instruction	5 (38%)	10 (83%)	4 (36%)	5 (45%)