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 Data Brief, the second of five short reports during FY 2010, is intended to provide a snapshot of data on the 66 induction and mentoring programs that received funding in fall 2009. It describes program leadership, program goals, mentor selection and assignment, and summer trainings for mentor and novices.

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

· April 30, 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:   Resources, formative assessment, and mentor/novice interactions: spring CDE data
                        Standards 3, 7, and 8
· July 30:   Mentor, administrator, and novice trainings: spring CDE data
                        Standards 4, 6, and 7
· September 30:   Final report
                        Summary of the preceding five 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 highlights of data obtained from the fall 2009 Common Data Elements (CDE) reporting form by the 66 programs that received grant funding in fall 2009. This Data Brief 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
· Standards 6 and 7, Summer Trainings for Mentors and Novices

An accompanying Appendix, which is available in a separate document, provides tables, charts, and analyses of quantitative and qualitative data.

The fall CDE included multiple-choice, short-response, and extended-response questions. The information in this brief is based on 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 provided 66[1] 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 the Appendix, total numbers (e.g. of district-based programs or of consortium-based programs) may vary from table to table. This is because incomplete data were received from the programs—some programs

---

[1] One previously-funded program declined to seek continuation funding in August 2009, so it did not complete the fall 2009 CDE.

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, this 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

Program management. Forty-three percent of single-district programs and 32% of consortium-based programs are coordinated or managed by a single person. In district-based programs, this person is most likely to be a full-time program coordinator or a district administrator; in consortium-based programs, this person is more likely retired or a part-time coordinator. The remaining programs are coordinated by teams, which can include a wide range of personnel: building and district administrators, classroom teachers, union personnel (more common for district-based programs), full- or part-time coordinators, outside consultants, and—for consortium-based programs—university faculty, ROE staff, and retired personnel. (Tables 1.1 & 1.2[2])

Administrator involvement. District administrators range from being not involved to being very involved in the implementation, coordination, and management of the programs. Sixty percent of curriculum and instruction administrators were rated as moderately or very involved, while most other district-based administrators were rated as not involved or minimally involved (67% of superintendents, 52% of human resources administration, and 80% of business/finance administration). (Table 1.3)

Union involvement. Forty-four percent of district-based programs rated their unions as being actively involved, and 85% rated their unions as actively supportive. The figures are significantly lower for consortium-based programs: 19% and 62% respectively. This may reflect the difficulties of working with multiple unions, or lack of prior established relationships between program coordinators and in-district unions. Active union involvement is roughly the same for programs initially funded in 2006 or 2008 ("continuing programs") than for programs initially funded in 2009 ("new programs"): 31% to 33%. Only one program, a consortium initially funded in 2009, reported that unions are resisting the program. Qualitative data describe the many successes in working with the unions (including good communication, eight programs; inclusion of the program in teacher contracts, seven programs; and union participation in leadership groups, 10 programs), as well as the limited number of challenges (including contract disputes, four programs; and union distrust of program leadership, four programs). Three programs reported that unions were initially unsupportive but that communication and relationships have since improved. (Tables 1.4, 1.5, & 1.6)

---

[2] All tables referenced in this document are in the Data Brief #2 Appendix, a separate document.

STANDARD 2: PROGRAM GOALS AND DESIGN

Program progress since initial funding. Prior to receiving ISBE funding, 31% of district-based programs—and 52% of consortium-based programs—did not exist. Half (50%) of programs initially funded in 2009, and 33% of programs initially funded in 2006 or 2008, did not exist prior to receiving ISBE funding.

ISBE funding allowed programs to add or improve a wide range of elements. More than 75% of reporting programs were able to:
- offer more mentor trainings and professional development
- improve new teacher trainings
- make the program more structured and clarifying expectations.

At least 50% of district-based or consortium-based programs also reported adding:
- more or improved administrator professional development
- improved mentor professional development
- more novice teacher professional development
- a specific program for second-year teachers
- improvements in the mentor/mentee relationship
- more differentiation in program components
- improvements in formative assessment
- improvements in program evaluation and data-driven decision-making.

(Table 2.1)

Program goals and focus. Programs were asked whether their goals were teacher retention, improving teacher quality, and raising student achievement. All programs funded in 2009 held the last two goals, but three did not state teacher retention as a goal. All programs funded in 2006 or 2008 held the first two goals, but six did not state student achievement as a goal.

Programs were also asked whether they focused on mentoring, professional development, or both. District-based programs that were initially funded in 2006 were more likely to select "both" than those initially funded in 2008 or 2009 (83%, 79%, and 60%, respectively). Consortium-based programs did not show a similar pattern, with more than 90% of programs initially funded in 2008 or 2009 selecting "both". (Tables 2.2 & 2.3)

Alignment with school/district improvement plans. Programs were asked how they were aligned with school or district improvement plans. No program indicated a lack of alignment. The most popular means for alignment include:
- Topics from improvement plans are covered in professional development for novice teachers (20 programs).
- Participation in the induction and mentoring program is included in improvement plans (9 programs).
- An improvement goal is to hire and retain highly effective teachers; this is facilitated by the program (9 programs).

(Table 2.4)

ISBE approval. Induction programs must be approved by ISBE in order for beginning teachers to be able to use this program as a means of moving from initial to standard certification. Nearly all programs (94%) funded in 2006 or 2008 currently have ISBE-approved induction and mentoring programs; the two that are not approved both use full-release mentors, which are not provided for under the approval rules. Only 63% of programs initially funded in 2009 have ISBE-approved programs.

Two-thirds (66%) of consortia funded in 2006 report that all of their component districts' programs have ISBE approval, compared with 55% of consortia funded in 2008, and 22% of consortia funded in 2009. (Tables 2.5 & 2.6)

Program communication. Programs are most likely to communicate with building and district administrators via email or informal communication, but they also use one-on-one contact and group meetings. Programs in general are most likely to communicate with school board members during regularly-scheduled school board meetings; although, one fifth of programs—both district- and consortium-based—reported having no communication with the school board. (Table 2.7)

Multi-tiered. Nearly one third (31%) of district-based programs and 15% of consortium-based programs are multi-tiered. Continuing programs are more likely than new programs to be multi-tiered (34% vs. 16%). In the standard multi-tiered model, used by nine programs, new teachers are assigned two mentors: a building-level mentor, who has a similar teaching assignment and helps with operational information; and a district-level mentor, who serves as an instructional coach. Other programs use different models, such as providing three mentoring tiers. (Tables 2.8 & 2.9)

Required elements. All programs require mentor observations of beginning teachers; at least 75% of programs require mentor/beginning teacher face-to-face meetings as well as beginning teacher observations of mentors. Fewer programs required small group sessions or the creation of a professional growth plan, and less than 20% of programs required videoconferencing or e-mentoring. (Table 2.10)

STANDARD 5: MENTOR SELECTION AND ASSIGNMENT

Defining process and criteria for mentor selection and assignment. District-based programs typically define the mentor selection process and criteria (74% of programs), the mentor/novice matching process (66% of programs), and the mentor-novice matching criteria (77% of programs) at the program level. In consortium-based programs, however, these processes and criteria are typically defined at the building or district level (only 17% define the selection and assignment process, and 38% define the matching criteria, at the program level). (Table 3.1)

Mentor selection criteria. In selecting mentors, 80% or more of reporting programs require:
- administrator recommendations
- tenure, a standard teaching certificate, and/or years of teaching experience
- personality characteristics
- completion of mentor training and willingness to serve as a mentor.

Comparatively fewer programs require outstanding teaching evaluations (45%) or a master's degree (14%), or look for evaluations from previous years serving as a mentor (24%). (Table 3.2)

Mentor selection and assignment personnel. Mentors are more likely to be selected by committee (76% of programs) than by individuals, and they are also likely to be assigned to individual new teachers by a committee (60% of programs). Individuals are typically building or district administrators, and committees are typically composed of people with positions including building and district administrators, program coordinators, and mentor coordinators. All reporting programs initially funded in 2009, but only 88% of continuing programs, use grade level and subject area match as key criteria for matching mentors and novices. Other major criteria include physical proximity (69% of new programs; 83% of continuing programs), personality type (46% of new programs, 54% of continuing programs), and mentor requests (23% of new programs, 29% of continuing programs). (Tables 3.3, 3.4, & 3.5)

Matching challenges. Programs reported typically being quite successful in matching mentors to novice teachers. Eight programs reported that, when unsuccessful pairings occurred, new mentors were quickly

assigned. Five programs serving small or rural districts reported challenges in providing novice teachers with an appropriate match, and five programs with full-time mentors reported challenges in ensuring good content-area or grade-level matches for all novices. Four programs also had trouble finding same-subject matches for novices in certain content areas (e.g. music; secondary math). (Table 3.6)

STANDARDS 6 AND 7: SUMMER TRAININGS FOR MENTORS AND NOVICES

Novice teacher trainings: requirements and hours. Nearly all programs (94% of district-based programs vs. 81% of consortium-based programs; 88% of new programs vs. 89% of continuing programs) provided some sort of summer training to incoming first-year teachers. When offered, this training was likely to be substantial: the district-based programs required, on average, almost 20 hours of training, and consortia required almost 9 hours. Eleven programs also provided optional training (either in addition to or in place of required training), and some invited first-year teachers to attend other professional development in addition to novice-specific training. However, most programs did not provide such trainings to incoming second-year teachers. Only 44% of continuing programs and 6% of new programs serving second-year teachers offered them any summer training. (Tables 4.1 & 4.2)

Novice teacher trainings: materials and content. Only programs initially funded in 2009 were asked to respond to these questions. In trainings for first-year teachers, more than 80% of presenters prepared their own materials. In addition, consortium-based programs often used ICE21 materials (70%), district-based programs used the Charlotte Danielson Framework (69%), and both used Harry and Rosemary Wong's *First Days of School* (54% for districts, 80% for consortia). At least two-thirds of programs covered the following topics: Illinois Teaching and Learning Standards; induction program expectations; classroom management, general instruction, lesson planning, and curriculum; working with parents; and, for district-based programs only, school/district policies. (Tables 4.3 & 4.4)

Mentor trainings. Mentors received both initial and ongoing training over the summer. Initial mentor trainings involved, on average, 16 required hours. District-based programs required more ongoing professional development hours for mentors than did consortium-based programs (19 vs. seven hours). District-based programs often used Charlotte Danielson, NTC, CEC, or Cognitive Coaching materials, while 90% of consortium-based programs used ICE21 materials, often in combination with other materials. Initial and ongoing mentor trainings covered a wide range of mentoring topics, from the theoretical to the practical. Only programs initially funded in 2009 were asked to describe these trainings' materials and content, so this information is only relevant for new programs. (Tables 4.5, 4.6, & 4.7)