

**STATE-FUNDED INDUCTION AND  
MENTORING PROGRAMS IN ILLINOIS  
MID-TERM REPORT**



**ILLINOIS NEW TEACHER COLLABORATIVE  
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN**

**Renee T. Clift  
Patricia Brady  
Linda J. Fisher**

**Linda Kolbusz-Kosan  
Lara Hebert  
Nancy Johnson**

**FEBRUARY 2008 – MAY 2008**



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT THE FUNDED PROGRAMS.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>BUDGET ALLOCATIONS.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>SELF-REPORTED PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS .....</b>	<b>4</b>
SUPPORT FOR NEW TEACHERS .....	5
MENTORS AND MENTOR ACTIVITY .....	5
PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION .....	6
<b>STRENGTHS AND CHALLENGES BASED ON DATA FROM THE MID-TERM REPORT .....</b>	<b>7</b>
ENTHUSIASM AMONG PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS .....	7
OPPORTUNITY TO BUILD A FOUNDATION .....	7
IMPROVED ADMINISTRATOR SUPPORT .....	7
UNIQUENESS OF CONSORTIA.....	8
RELIABILITY AND TIMELINESS OF STATE FUNDING.....	8
INCREASED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT.....	8
CLARITY OF EXPECTATIONS .....	8
SUSTAINING CAPACITY .....	8
PROBLEMS UNIQUE TO CONSORTIA .....	9
<b>SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>APPENDIX 1 LIST OF PROGRAMS .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>APPENDIX 2 DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION ABOUT FUNDED PROGRAMS.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>APPENDIX 3 BUDGET INFORMATION .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>APPENDIX 4 COMMON DATA ELEMENTS CHART .....</b>	<b>17</b>



## INTRODUCTION

---

In 2007, the Illinois General Assembly allocated increased funding for induction and mentoring programs across the state. This made it possible to continue funding for the ten original state-funded programs, first funded in 2006, and to fund new programs. On December 24, 2007, the Illinois State Board of Education issued a Request for Proposals, and by January 23<sup>rd</sup>, there were 40 applicants. The Illinois New Teacher Collaborative (INTC), in conjunction with state board staff, facilitated the review of proposals. Reviewers recommended that 31 be funded, and in February 2008, these additional programs met with the ten continuing programs prior to the INTC annual conference.

As a whole, the 41 programs (see Appendix 1) represent a broad spectrum of characteristics. The goal of funding was to learn the ways in which programs that serve the wide range of districts and schools across Illinois can build on recommended practice and can transform those recommendations into high quality comprehensive induction and mentoring programs across the state.

This report describes the activities reported by these programs from initial funding through May 2008. The purpose of this report is to provide state board staff with a summary of how state funds have impacted the early stages of induction and mentoring initiatives. The first part of the report provides details on the demographic characteristics of all of the programs. The second section provides a description of the budget allocations across the programs. The third part of the report describes the data each of the programs reported using a format labeled the Common Data Elements (CDE) form. The final section summarizes what we can learn from the programs thus far.

## GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT THE FUNDED PROGRAMS

---

The INTC website ([intc.ed.uiuc.edu](http://intc.ed.uiuc.edu)) provides an easily accessible description of the funded programs.

### **VISITORS TO THE INTC WEBSITE ([intc.ed.uiuc.edu](http://intc.ed.uiuc.edu)) CAN DO THE FOLLOWING:**

- read a one-page abstract for each site
- review implementation components of each program individually as well as compare it to other programs within three categories (new teachers, mentors, other data)
- find the funded programs' legislative districts, federal and state, and locate the names and contact information of the elected officials for each program by site and by elected official
- see the names of partners (as applicable) for each funded site
- access reports on the first year of the funded programs

This report will not replicate that information. Instead, this section describes the demographic characteristics of the districts served by the programs. More than half of the current programs are run by or within single school districts, and just under a third are based at a Regional Office of Education (ROE). Three of the programs are operating out of universities, and a consortium affiliated with a professional organization administers one program. Two university-based programs and one based at a regional office

<b>Single district: 28 programs</b>	<b>Multiple district: 13 programs</b>
6 urban (Chicago)	6 small town / rural
9 large town / mid-size city	3 urban fringe
13 suburban / urban fringe	4 variety
25 run by district	11 run by ROE
1 run by ROE	1 run by university
2 run by universities	1 run by consortium

work with only one school district (See Appendix 2, Table 2.1). Twenty-seven programs are in the northeast and northwest regions of the state, ten are in the east central and west central regions, and four are in the southeast and southwest regions.

The programs serve schools/districts with total populations varying from 529 students to 33,929 students, plus the Chicago public schools (390,243 students) (Table 2.2); they impact between one and 26 districts (Table 2.3) and between one and 82 schools (Table 2.4). All together (based on May 19, 2008, data) these programs serve approximately 1,581 first-year teachers and 481 second-year teachers; they are involved in supporting teaching and learning with 51 full-time mentors, 32 lead mentors, and 1,360 building level mentors. Together the mentors and the beginning teachers impact more than 78,890 students in Illinois schools.

In the following paragraphs, demographic information was taken from the Illinois Interactive Report Card website, at iirc.niu.edu. This website lists information for individual districts; to compute comparable information for multi-district programs, a weighted average of the component districts was used. Fifteen programs serve a minority white population and nine serve a predominantly white population (Table 2.5). Overall, rural districts were often predominantly white; urban and mid-size city districts were typically racially mixed; and urban fringe districts showed the greatest variation from nearly single-race homogenous

<b>Average instructional expense per student</b>			
The Illinois state average is \$5,567.			
<\$4,600:	\$4,600-\$5,600:	\$5,600-\$6,300:	>\$6,300:
6 programs	21 programs	4 programs + Chicago	3 programs

to racially diverse. The funded programs also show significant variation in terms of test scores (Table 2.6), teacher salaries (Table 2.7), and per pupil expenditures

(Table 2.8). The lowest average instructional expense per pupil was found in Belvidere SD, at \$3,819, and the highest expense was in Glenview SD, at \$6,658. The ROEs and consortia tended to fall in the middle, even if they had considerable disparity among their component districts.

The funded programs also varied significantly by average teaching experience (Table 2.9). The state average is 13 years, and programs ranged from 6.6 years (at Lindop SD) to 16.8 years (at Geneseo SD). This may be used as a vague proxy for turnover, although many factors (such as recent retirements or population growth) can impact this number, even if turnover is typically quite low. This statistic, when given for a large district or ROE, can mask a great amount of internal variation between schools. This may provide an explanation for why the nine programs with the least teacher experience are all districts, not ROEs or consortia.

<b>Average teacher experience</b>			
The Illinois state average is 13 years.			
<10 years:	10 – 13 years:	13 – 15 years:	>15 years:
4 programs	13 programs	12 programs + Chicago	6 programs

<b>Average percentage of teachers with master's degrees</b>			
The Illinois state average is 52%.			
<40%:	40% – 52%:	52% – 60%:	>60%:
7 programs	11 programs	9 programs + Chicago	8 programs

The percentage of teachers with master's degrees is highest in urban areas. Fifty-two percent of teachers, on average in Illinois, hold master's degrees. Teacher salary appears to be somewhat

correlated with master's degrees, but only in districts with particularly low salaries. The percentage of teachers with master's degrees varied from a low of 29% in the CFV ROE to a high of 74% in Glenview SD (Table 2.10).

Overall, the sites represent a wide variation in size, type of program, geographic location, and populations served. Additionally, a sizeable percentage of the districts within the programs would qualify as “high need” based on number of low-income students, teacher turnover, and student performance on standardized tests. Just as the programs have individual designs and cater to unique populations, their budgets also show considerable variation.

## BUDGET ALLOCATIONS

The total amount of money granted to the 41 programs is \$8,543,107 with \$6,458,032 going to the 31 new programs and \$2,085,075 to the ten continuing programs.

<b>Budget allocation for funded programs</b>				
<b>Program type</b>	<b>Salaries</b>	<b>Benefits</b>	<b>Purchased services</b>	<b>Supplies and materials</b>
31 new programs	37%	3%	49%	11%
10 continuing programs	56%	7%	31%	6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>10%</b>

All 41 budgets were broken down into the categories of coordinator salaries, mentor stipends, new teacher stipends, substitute teacher costs, benefits for the various groups, training expenses, supplies and materials, mileage, space rental, meals, clerical (if allowed), and payments to individual school districts by Regional Offices of Education. Table 3.2 in Appendix 3 provides the budget analysis of all funded programs. A summarized budget breakdown, with percentages of total grant money spent, is provided in the box below.

### **BUDGET BREAKDOWN**

Evaluation.....	3.98%
Coordinators' Salaries.....	12.96%
Coordinators' Benefits.....	0.54%
Mentors' Stipends.....	30.55%
Mentors' Benefits.....	2.76%
New Teachers' Stipends.....	9.09%
New Teachers' Benefits.....	0.19%
Substitutes.....	7.19%
Substitutes' Benefits.....	0.24%
Training.....	17.66%
Supplies and Materials.....	9.91%
Mileage.....	0.87%
Space Rental.....	0.46%
Secretarial/Clerical.....	0.14%
Meals.....	0.94%
Payments to school districts.....	2.50%

Payments to school districts are those monies given by the Regional Offices of Education to participating programs. At this point in time, there is no information on how the various school districts are spending their allotments from the Regional Offices of Education. A request will be made to the ROEs to obtain this information from any school district receiving funds from this grant in order that it can be included in the December report.

The budgets of new programs averaged \$208,324 and that of continuing programs was \$208,508. The demographic data reveals that 13 programs, including all the Chicago programs, have a high percentage (61% or more) of students classified as low income. Those 13 programs received 41% of the total grant funds provided by the state. Six programs have an above average number (41-60%) of students classified as low income. Those six programs received 15% of the grant funds. Sixteen programs had a below average number (20-40%) of students classified as low income; they received 27% of the total allotted funds. Six programs had a low average number (below 20%) of low-income students and their programs received 17% of the total grant budget (See Table 3.1). The range of the amount of money awarded to programs was from \$14,850 to \$630,224.

### MONEY AWARDED TO PROGRAMS

# of programs	Budget range:
2	under \$50,000
9	between \$50,000-100,000
10	between \$100,000-200,000
9	between \$200,000-300,000
9	between \$300,000-400,000
1	between \$400,000-500,000

Single district programs received 66% of all money granted; Regional Offices of Education/Consortia received 28% of the total; and universities/colleges received 6% of the total.

Grant money supporting programs in the Chicago suburban area was \$2,561,741 (30% of total grant money). In the central part of the state the total was \$1,904,786 (22% of

total grant money), with approximately one-third of that amount going to one school district. In the northwestern part of the state, including the Rockford area, the total was \$1,744,973 (20% of total grant money). The grants serving the city of Chicago schools received \$1,414,665 (17% of total grant money). The southern part of the state received \$916,942 (11% of total grant money).

### SELF-REPORTED PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

To begin a process of providing comparable information across the programs, a team comprising INTC staff with evaluation expertise from four universities developed a list of information items one might want from the pilots. This list was based on two documents created by the Illinois Policy Team: Moving Toward/Developing Beyond and the Spring 2008 draft of the Illinois Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Beginning Teacher Induction Programs. Four iterations of this list resulted in The Common Data Elements Chart (CDE) (See Appendix 4), which was shared with all of the funded programs in April 2008. From May 2008 through June 2008, INTC staff visited each of the 31 newly funded programs to assist program personnel with completing the CDEs. A summary report of each visit was made and kept on file in the INTC file server. With the exception of three programs, the CDEs were completed and returned to INTC by July 2008. The following summary does not include information on those three programs. The CDEs provided varying levels of detail. For example, one program provided an all-but-blank CDE, stipulating that it would not have the requested information until late summer. In general, the CDEs reflected a high level of attention from the sites and the program coordinators.

In summarizing across the CDEs, it is evident that the sites often had different interpretations for the same questions. This range will form the base of the next round of CDEs, which will not be as open-ended, but rather will be based on checklists of attributes. Because there is an independent evaluation of the ten continuing programs, the following analysis discusses information from the 29 newly funded programs which provided INTC with a CDE. The programs have been grouped into three categories: single-district (16 programs), consortia (regional offices and the Consortium for Educational Change, comprising ten programs), and universities (three programs).

Twenty-one of the programs already had induction and mentoring programs prior to receiving ISBE funding, and they reported enhancing their programs in a variety of ways. Seventeen sites provided additional or enhanced training for novice teachers or mentors, and nine provided training for administrators as well. Nine sites also provided substitute pay or stipends for mentors and/or novices to meet, do observations, and/or attend conferences. Additionally, individual sites described a variety of such other enhancements as a significant addition of technology and adding full-release instructional coaches.

### **ENHANCEMENTS PLANNED BY FUNDED PROGRAMS**

21 of the newly funded programs had pre-existing induction and mentoring programs; below is a list of the most common enhancements that the programs made using the grant money.

- Provide additional or enhanced training for novice teachers or mentors
- Provide administrator training
- Provide substitute pay or stipends for mentors and/or novices to meet, do observations, and/or attend conferences
- Buy additional supplies or materials
- Improve communication with administrators
- Provide networking and community for mentors
- Pay for an external evaluator

For the eight sites having no prior programs, two were able to begin some level of implementation in the spring. One brand-new program was able to train mentors, hold an orientation for beginning teachers, and have mentor/novice pairs begin weekly meetings. Another brand-new program was also able to begin a new program in spring 2008, as it recruited ten novice teachers and provided them with mentors.

### **SUPPORT FOR NEW TEACHERS**

Programs most commonly defined a “new teacher” as someone who is new to the profession and starting his/her first year of teaching. One district excluded any non-teaching staff, such as counselors, while three programs suggested they would induct and mentor any teachers new to the district, even if they already had some teaching experience. Ten district-based programs reported that participation in the induction and mentoring program was mandatory for all new teachers. Other programs, including the consortia, recruited new teachers at meetings; through a phone, email, or written invitation; or in person, through mentors, administrators, or union staff. Two universities recruited new teachers through phone, email, or written communication and the third noted that participation varied by district, ranging from required to voluntary. One university program is working only with graduates from its own teacher education program.

Most new programs did not begin working with their 2007-08 new hires, but spent the spring and early summer preparing for the 2008-09 academic year by identifying and training mentors, setting up the new teacher trainings, training administrators, etc. Most schools had not completed their 2008-09 hiring by the time the mid-term report was due, but those who did report on new hires suggested that most new teachers are white females who came through traditional teacher education programs. In many of these reports, special education and bilingual teachers are over-represented among the content areas.

The main induction and mentoring activities that programs engaged in were mentoring new teachers and providing initial and continuing training for new teachers, mentors, and administrators. Beyond this, programs reported conducting other activities to help orient the novices to their buildings and districts and induct them into the teaching profession. Two district-based programs reported sending their new teachers to out-of-district conferences and workshops; one reported that the entire faculty was made more aware of issues faced by novice teachers; three provided resources and classroom tools; three reported providing new teachers with increased access to building administrators, lead teachers, and curriculum specialists; and three provided time to network with new and experienced teachers.

### **MENTORS AND MENTOR ACTIVITY**

It is difficult to provide a demographic summary of mentors because some programs had not yet selected mentors. Among the reports INTC received mentors often reflected the general demographics of the district (e.g. districts with a majority of white female teachers had mainly white female mentors). All of the consortia reported that mentor selection was left to the discretion of their component districts or individual schools, but two of the university-based programs selected mentors themselves.

Mentor assignment across the programs was typically done by administrators at the building level or by mentor coordinators, although universities tended to match their own pairs. Across all programs, the assignments tried to create pairs who were geographically close and who taught similar content areas and grade levels.

#### **CRITERIA FOR MENTOR SELECTION**

Following are the most common criteria, in order of occurrence, that newly funded programs used in selecting mentors.

- Years of teaching experience
- Positive teaching evaluations
- Principal recommendations
- Willingness to be a mentor
- Personal characteristics (e.g. nurturing personality; confidentiality)

Programs reported that days allocated to mentor training ranged from one to six, with three to four days being most common. District-based programs were most likely to have a member of the district

staff conduct the training, with CEC a close second; other trainers included the mentor coordinator, New Teacher Center staff, and consultants. Six ROE/consortia-based programs reported training mentors themselves, but two assumed that individual districts were conducting the training, and one trained mentors in districts without their own training programs. University-based programs typically conducted their own mentor training.

Six district-based programs reported using New Teacher Center materials and five used materials based on the Charlotte Danielson framework, with three using ICE-21 training. Meanwhile, ten regional office programs used ICE-21 training, with only two using each of the NTC and Danielson materials. Among university-based programs, one used the Danielson framework while the others created their own materials.

Most programs reported using some written evaluation of the mentor training, often a survey distributed at the end of each session. Few programs were able to articulate their results; most reported that mentors felt positively about the trainings and their main concerns were regarding time (e.g. trainings too close together, or more time needed on some topics).

To monitor mentors' assistance and the mentor/mentee relationship, most programs reported relying on some sort of log in which mentors recorded what assistance they had provided and when. These logs varied in the amount of detail they collected: some programs required simple calendars listing dates and times, while others asked for mentors and mentees to complete Collaborative Assessment Logs or asked for weekly self-reflection sheets, portfolios, mentee journals, or checklists. Some programs reported that mentors operated on the honor system, while others had principals or mentor coordinators provide some oversight, typically by collecting the logs. Surveys and other evaluations revealed that most new teachers were happy with the mentoring relationship, and the main concerns regarded time: they wanted more time to meet with mentors or less paperwork and other requirements.

#### **PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION**

District-based programs were most often managed by central office personnel, but three were led by building principals and one by a classroom teacher. Among the consortia, one program is run by the induction and mentoring coordinator; one by a consultant; and seven by regional office staff. Two programs are run by committees. Almost all district-based programs involved their central administrators in some significant way, but the consortia and the university-based programs most often reported only keeping district administrators informed of program progress. Programs reported that building-level administrators were much less involved than district administrators. Five district-based programs reported no induction and mentoring training for their administrators, six reported specific training sessions, and the others provided some information or training to some subset of their administrators, such as sending them to a

state or national conference at which induction and mentoring were part of the program. Among the consortia, four reported training based on Induction for the 21st Century materials (ICE 21) and one provided its own training. For the remaining consortium-based programs, training varied by district and two consortia reported no administrator training. Among the universities, one provided its own administrator training; the others did not. Only 13 programs (six district-based programs, six consortia, and one university) reported evaluating their administrator training, typically with some sort of survey.

## **STRENGTHS AND CHALLENGES BASED ON DATA FROM THE MID-TERM REPORT**

The final section of the Common Data Elements (CDE) form had seven open-ended questions requiring general summarization of the programs.

### **OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS ON THE CDE FORM**

- Unique features
- Current strengths
- Success of the program to date
- Major challenges faced
- How challenges were addressed
- Resources and support needed to be more successful
- How capacity is being built to sustain the program with limited state funding

Based on the answers to these open-ended questions, the summary provided above, and informal conversations with program participants, this report concludes with observations on the current status of the State of Illinois funded induction and mentoring programs.

### **ENTHUSIASM AMONG PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS**

There is a great deal of enthusiasm for the concept of mentoring new teachers and numerous participants noted that this is an area which has needed to be addressed for years. Initiatives have increased awareness of the need for mentoring. Programs reported that mentoring and induction programs have been elevated into the forefront of districts' school improvement plans, and they have become on-going and consistent. A high level of enthusiasm, better staff morale, impressive results, and the feeling that the program will be transformational to the district were all reported as examples of the positive impact of funding.

### **OPPORTUNITY TO BUILD A FOUNDATION**

A number of grant recipients noted that funding enabled successful beginnings for the year, opportunities to meet the needs of a new and diverse staff, and opportunities for enhancement and growth for experienced teachers. They feel that they are now able to create structured designs with a vision for helping new teachers. Many reported that a reliable and consistent support system has been established and that a culture of support and inquiry is being created, making it easy for new teachers to seek help. Programs were pleased that mentors are demonstrably committed to the task; staff members are willing to be mentors and to participate in training. Because of funding, mentors are more experienced, more knowledgeable, and better trained than in the past. There is an improved quality of discussion on improving teacher effectiveness between administrators and mentors.

### **IMPROVED ADMINISTRATOR SUPPORT**

Programs reported that there is more support from trained and committed administrators and that more and more administrators are "buying into the program." At the same time, administrator knowledge and commitment is a continual concern to the programs because any induction and mentoring program would not succeed without the support of the administrators. Having more stable and consistent program leadership in many programs would allow for more attention and resources to be focused on this issue.

## **UNIQUENESS OF CONSORTIA**

Programs based at regional offices of education, consortia among school districts, and universities saw themselves in the unique position of dealing with multiple schools or school districts. They provide a wide range of different programming for various districts, many of which could not provide this programming on their own. They serve many types and sizes of school districts—which are often small or rural—thus fulfilling state program requirements for a diverse participant base. Cooperation, collaboration, and participation of many district entities were each cited by consortia and Regional Offices of Education as strengths of their various programs. They noted that many districts in various consortia had committed to supporting the program and that there is a high level of participation by schools in implementing a new program, something that was not previously possible in many small districts.

## **RELIABILITY AND TIMELINESS OF STATE FUNDING**

Programs reported that funding, which began in the middle of the school year, resulted in no opportunity to train mentors, rushed deadlines to complete program requirements, inability to provide data because the program would not begin until the fall, questionable effectiveness of a short timeframe, and an inability to meet grant requirements quickly and effectively while putting systems and protocols in place for implementation. Understanding the grant process was a challenge for some programs and others felt the lack of permanent funding (or its uncertainty) by the state leads to a sense of futility. Unclear or possibly conflicting expectations from ISBE and INTC were also cited as a problem.

## **INCREASED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

In addition to the need for more time, more money, and more staff, program personnel reported a great need for on-going professional development for administrators, mentors, and new teachers. A number of programs felt that it would be helpful to visit other programs and to have the opportunity to share information. Help with technology and evaluation were also mentioned as areas of needed support.

## **CLARITY OF EXPECTATIONS**

Issues such as the amount of required paperwork, lack of consistency in reporting requirements, and duplication of assignments were listed as concerns by many of the programs. They requested that INTC provide a clearer delineation of responsibilities of personnel; a list of all program coordinators; a structured calendar of due dates, meetings, and training; and scheduling of regional rather than state meetings to reduce time and expense. Programs indicated that on their end, there was the need for more rigorous mentor selection and better mentor-new teacher matching system, more support from and monitoring by administrators, more support for mentors, and a model for mentor training,

## **SUSTAINING CAPACITY**

Programs indicated that because the state funding provided the impetus to beginning or improving induction and mentoring programs, the programs could become ingrained into the school culture. Many programs indicated that district resources, other grants, business community help, or corporate sponsorship would be potential sources of funds in the event of reduced or no state funding. Training of mentors and administrators, which was made possible through the use of state money, will provide the skills necessary to keep the program going and to strengthen the basic foundation of a mentoring program. Materials will have been purchased which can be used for years to come. Responders felt that the state funding was instrumental in educating administrators and school boards to the importance of the induction and mentoring issue and its being seen as a priority and a necessity.

## PROBLEMS UNIQUE TO CONSORTIA

Programs that are dealing with multiple schools and school districts reported difficulties with effective communication. Sending information to multiple schools and receiving it back in a timely and consistent manner appear to be common problems. It is difficult for the consortia to acquire accurate, accessible records on various aspects of the program from participating districts. The ROE personnel have difficulties retrieving, organizing, and making accessible to their participating districts the information which is needed for evaluation. In ROEs that deal with small school districts, there is the problem of finding appropriate personnel to serve as mentors.

## SUMMARY

---

In general, programs report that the experience gained from having a mentoring program has led to insights that are being applied to continuously improve current programs. But to continue improvement, sustainable, consistent and assured funding is needed in order to provide some stability. In addition, programs requested more easily accessible professional development and networking opportunities and more clarity in terms of expectations from ISBE and INTC.

It is clear that there is a wide variation in the level of design and implementations across the programs from February through May 2008. One way of thinking about the programs is to think of them in three different stages of development.

**Implementing:** These projects were funded; planning took place early on through the proposal development stage; and the programs were ready to implement upon receipt of funding.

**Changing and Growing:** These sites had a program and are using the pilot dollars and the state resources and professional development to change their focus. Some of the programs are adding lead mentors to their mentor pool, some are moving from mentors to trained mentors and some are doing system-wide reform.

**Delayed Implementation:** Some districts fall into this category due to late funding and stringent internal fiscal constraints. Some did not have a plan ready to implement upon funding. Some are truly beginning their programs and are still putting the infrastructure together (training administrators, buying resources, shopping for the right professional development, searching for new teachers, etc.).

While both single district programs and consortia may fall into each of these categories, single district programs have some advantages in that they are not working across varied administrative organizational structures or bargaining units. There will be considerable movement into the top two categories once summer trainings have been conducted and school has begun. Our next report will focus on the implementation period between June and October 2008.

## APPENDIX 1 LIST OF PROGRAMS

---

**ACI** – Associated Colleges of Illinois – Chicago  
**Belleville SD** – Belleville Twp. H. S. Dist. #201 – Belleville  
**Belvidere SD** – Belvidere CUSD #100 – Belvidere  
**Berwyn SD** – Berwyn South School Dist. #100 – Berwyn  
**BHS ROE** – Bureau/Henry/Stark ROE #28 – Atkinson  
**CarDunAI SD** – Cont: CUSD #300 (Carpentersville/Dundee)  
**CFV ROE** – Cont: ROE SchoolWorks Champaign-Ford ROE #9 and Vermilion ROE #54  
**CGJM ROE** – Calhoun/Greene/Jersey/Macoupin ROE#40 – Carlinville  
**Champaign SD** – Cont: Champaign CUSD #4  
**Chicago Area 14** – Cont: Chicago Public Schools, Instructional Area 14  
**Chicago GOLDEN** – Chicago Public Schools #299, GOLDEN – Area 3  
**Chicago Literacy** – Chicago Dist. #299, Literacy – Areas 14 & 15  
**Chicago Math** – Chicago Public Schools #299 HS Math – Areas 13 & 17  
**CJS ROE** – Carroll/JoDaviess/Stephenson ROE #8 – Stockton  
**Decatur SD** – Decatur Public School District #61 – Decatur  
**DeKalb SD** – DeKalb CUSD #428 – DeKalb  
**DePaul** – DePaul University – Chicago  
**DesPlaines SD** – DesPlaines CCSD #62 – DesPlaines  
**DLM ROE** – DeWitt/Livingston/McLean ROE#17 – Normal  
**DuPage ROE** – DuPage County ROE #19 – Wheaton  
**Geneseo SD** – Geneseo CUSD #228 – Geneseo  
**Glenview SD** – Glenview Public School Dist. #34 – Glenview  
**GovState** – Governors State University – University Park  
**Harlem SD** – Harlem Unit Dist. #122 – Machesney Park  
**I-KAN ROE** – I-KAN (Iroquois/Kankakee) ROE #32 – Kankakee  
**Lake ROE** – Lake County ROE #34 – Grayslake  
**Lee/Ogle ROE** – Cont: Lee/Ogle ROE #47  
**Lindop SD** – Lindop School District #92 – Broadview  
**Marion** – Consortium for Educational Change – Marion  
**McLean SD** – McLean County CUSD #5 – Normal  
**Mon/Rand ROE** – Monroe/Randolph ROE #45 – Waterloo  
**Naperville SD** – Naperville CUSD #203 – Naperville  
**Oswego SD** – Oswego CUSD #308 – Oswego  
**Plainfield SD** – Cont: Plainfield School District #202  
**Quincy SD** – Cont: Quincy School District #172  
**Rockford SD** – Cont: Rockford School District #205  
**RockIsland ROE** – Rock Island County ROE #49 – Moline  
**Springfield SD** – Cont: Springfield SD #186  
**St. Clair ROE** – Cont: St. Clair ROE #50  
**Urbana SD** – Urbana School District #116 – Urbana  
**Woodstock SD** – Woodstock Comm. Unit School Dist. #200

## APPENDIX 2

### DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION ABOUT FUNDED PROGRAMS

The below tables provide additional data to support assertions in the report text. The tables are presented here in the same order in which they are referenced in the text.

All of the below demographic information was taken from the ISBE-funded Illinois Interactive Report Card website at [irc.niu.edu](http://irc.niu.edu), using data from the latest year available (usually 2007). The website posts information on individual schools and individual districts. To calculate statistics (e.g. on 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. The total for all component districts was then divided by the total student enrollment across all districts in the program.

**Table 2.1: Program leadership/ownership**

<b>Run by district: 25 programs</b>	<b>Run by ROE: 12 programs</b>	<b>Run by university: 3 programs</b>	<b>Run by consortium: 1 program</b>
Belleville SD; Belvidere SD; Berwyn SD; CarDunAl SD; Champaign SD; Chicago Area 14; Chicago GOLDEN; Chicago Literacy; Chicago Math; Decatur SD; DeKalb SD; DesPlaines SD; Geneseo SD; Glenview SD; Harlem SD; Lindop SD; McLean SD; Naperville SD; Oswego SD; Plainfield SD; Quincy SD; Rockford SD; Springfield SD; Urbana SD; Woodstock SD	BHS ROE; CFV ROE; CGJM ROE; CJS ROE; DLM ROE; DuPage ROE; I-KAN ROE; Lake ROE; Lee/Ogle ROE; Mon/Rand ROE; RockIsland ROE; St. Clair ROE	DePaul; GovState; ACI	Marion

**Table 2.2: Total student enrollment in districts served by each program**

<b>&lt;2,000 students: 1 program</b>	<b>2,000 – 5,000 students: 7 programs</b>	<b>5,001 – 10,000 students: 9 programs</b>	<b>10,001 – 15,000 students: 8 programs</b>	<b>15,001 – 20,000 students: 4 programs</b>	<b>&gt;20,000 students: 6 programs + Chicago</b>
Lindop SD (529)	CFV ROE (2,331); Geneseo SD (2,788); Berwyn SD (3,547); Urbana SD (4,054); Lake ROE (4,074); Glenview SD (4,201); DesPlaines SD (4,707)	Belleville SD (5,009); DeKalb SD (5,857); Woodstock SD (6,390); Quincy SD (6,431); Harlem SD (8,005); Belvidere SD (8,728); Decatur SD (8,763); Champaign SD (8,914); Mon/Rand ROE (9,414)	DuPage ROE (10,676); McLean SD (12,213); Marion (12,741); BHS ROE (13,130); Lee/Ogle ROE (13,204); CJS ROE (13,415); Oswego SD (13,789); Springfield SD (13,800)	CGJM ROE (15,396); Naperville SD (18,449); CarDunAl SD (18,617); Rock Island ROE (19,349)	St. Clair ROE (20,394); I-KAN ROE (24,104); Plainfield SD (25,957); GovState (26,206); Rockford SD (27,787); DLM ROE (33,929); Chicago (390,243)

**Table 2.3: Number of school districts involved in each program**

<b>1 school district: 28 programs</b>	<b>2-5 districts: 2 programs</b>	<b>6-10 districts: 2 programs</b>	<b>11-15 districts: 5 programs</b>	<b>16-20 districts: 2 programs</b>	<b>21+ districts: 2 programs</b>
ACI; Belleville SD; Belvidere SD; Berwyn SD; CarDunAI SD; Champaign SD; Chicago Area 14; Chicago GOLDEN; Chicago Literacy; Chicago Math; Decatur SD; DeKalb SD; DePaul (+ Archdiocese of Chicago); DesPlaines SD; Geneseo SD; Glenview SD; Harlem SD; Lake ROE; Lindop SD; McLean SD; Naperville SD; Oswego SD; Plainfield SD; Quincy SD; Rockford SD; Springfield SD; Urbana SD; Woodstock SD	<b>4:</b> CFV ROE <b>5:</b> DuPage ROE	<b>8:</b> RockIsland ROE <b>10:</b> Lee/Ogle ROE (+ 1 special ed coop)	<b>11:</b> GovState; Mon/Rand ROE <b>14:</b> CJS ROE <b>15:</b> St. Clair ROE; CGJM ROE	<b>17:</b> Marion ROE <b>20:</b> I-KAN ROE	<b>22:</b> DLM ROE <b>26:</b> BHS ROE

**Table 2.4: Number of schools served by each funded program**

<b>1-5 schools: 2 programs</b>	<b>6-10 schools: 10 programs</b>	<b>11-20 schools: 8 programs</b>	<b>21-40 schools: 11 programs</b>	<b>&gt;41 schools: 10 programs</b>
Lindop SD (1); Belleville SD (2)	Geneseo SD (6); CFV ROE (7); DePaul (7); Berwyn SD (8); Urbana SD (8); Glenview SD (8); Woodstock SD (9); Lake ROE (10); Belvidere SD (10); ACI (10)	DesPlaines SD (11); Quincy SD (11); Harlem SD (11); DeKalb SD (12); Champaign SD (16); Oswego SD (17); Decatur SD (20); McLean SD (20)	Naperville SD (21); Chicago GOLDEN (21); CarDunAI SD (22); Plainfield SD (23); Chicago Area 14 (25); Chicago Math (25); Mon/Rand ROE (25); DuPage ROE (25); Springfield SD (31); Lee/Ogle ROE (37); Marion (40)	Rockford SD (47); Chicago Literacy (47); Rock Island ROE (48); St. Clair ROE (48); CJS ROE (49); BHS ROE (51); CGJM ROE (51); I-KAN ROE (64); GovState (66); DLM ROE (82)

**Table 2.5: Student race: Average percentage of White students in districts served by each program**

The Illinois state average is 55% White students.

<b>Minority White students (&lt;50% White): 9 programs + Chicago</b>	<b>Mixed race (50%-80%): 17 programs</b>	<b>Majority White students (&gt;80%): 9 programs</b>
Lindop SD (1%); Lake ROE (7%); Chicago (8%); GovState (12%); Berwyn SD (20%); St. Clair SD (28%); Rockford SD (41%); Champaign SD (48%); Decatur SD (48%); Urbana SD (48%)	DesPlaines SD (50%); Springfield SD (55%); CarDunAI SD (62%); Plainfield SD (64%); Rock Island ROE (65%); Belleville SD (65%); Belvidere SD (65%); Oswego SD (66%); DeKalb SD (68%); I-KAN ROE (69%); Woodstock SD (69%); DuPage ROE (70%); McLean SD (73%); Glenview SD (73%); Marion SD (76%); Naperville SD (77%); DLM ROE (82%)	CFV ROE (85%); CJS ROE (85%); Harlem SD (86%); Lee/Ogle ROE (87%); BHS ROE (87%); Quincy SD (88%); Mon/Rand ROE (94%); Geneseo SD (96%); CGJM ROE (98%)

**Table 2.6: Standardized tests: Average percent of students passing (meets or exceeds state standards, all subjects) in districts served by each program**

The Illinois state average is 74%.

<b>Far below state average (&lt;65%): 9 programs + Chicago</b>	<b>Below state average (65% - 73%): 5 programs</b>	<b>At or above state average (74% - 82%): 15 programs</b>	<b>Far above state average (&gt;83%): 6 programs</b>
Lake ROE, 50%; Belleville SD, 58%; Chicago, 60%; CFV ROE, 61%; Decatur SD, 61%; Rockford SD, 62%; Lindop SD, 63%; St. Clair ROE, 63%; Springfield SD, 64%; Gov State, 64%	Urbana SD, 68%; Marion, 70%; Harlem SD, 73%; Rock Island ROE, 73%; I-KAN ROE, 73%	Champaign SD, 74%; BHS ROE, 75%; Woodstock SD, 76%; CJS ROE, 76%; CGJM ROE, 76%; DeKalb SD, 77%; Quincy SD, 77%; Plainfield SD, 77%; Berwyn SD, 77%; Belvidere SD, 78%; Mon/Rand ROE, 78%; CarDunAI ROE, 78%; Lee/Ogle ROE, 80%; DLM ROE, 80%; Oswego SD, 81%	McLean SD, 83%; DesPlaines SD, 84%; Geneseo SD, 85%; DuPage ROE, 88%; Glenview SD, 91%; Naperville SD, 91%

**Table 2.7: Average teacher salary in districts served by each program**

The Illinois state average is \$58,300.

<b>Low (&gt;\$50,000): Salary in '000s: 11 programs</b>	<b>Below average (\$50,001 - \$58,300): Salary in '000s: 17 programs</b>	<b>Above average (&gt;\$58,300): Salary in '000s: 7 programs + Chicago</b>
CFV ROE (\$40.9); Quincy SD (\$42.0); Lindop SD (\$44.1); BHS ROE (\$46.7); Berwyn SD (\$47.1); CGJM ROE (\$48.0); I-KAN ROE (\$48.3); GovState (\$48.5); CJS ROE (\$48.6); Decatur SD (\$49.2); Marion (\$49.9)	Champaign SD (\$50.1); Plainfield SD (\$50.3); Springfield SD (\$51.2); Mon/Rand ROE (\$51.2); DLM ROE (\$51.6); McLean SD (\$52.2); Lee/Ogle ROE (\$52.4); Oswego SD (\$53.2); Urbana SD (\$53.5); Harlem SD (\$53.8); Woodstock SD (\$54.4); Belvidere SD (\$54.7); St. Clair ROE (\$55.5); CarDunAI SD (\$55.8); Geneseo SD (\$55.8); Lake ROE (\$56.2); Glenview SD (\$56.7)	Rockford SD (\$60.2); Rock Island ROE (\$60.6); DesPlaines SD (\$64.0); DuPage ROE (\$64.3); DeKalb SD (\$65.9); Chicago (\$66.0); Belleville SD (\$69.5); Naperville SD (\$72.1)

**Table 2.8: Average instructional expense per student in districts served by each program**

CFV ROE is not included in this table because the numbers for one of its districts were not available.

The Illinois state average is \$5,567 (for fiscal year 2005-06).

<b>Low (&lt;\$4,600): 6 programs</b>	<b>Below average (\$4,600-\$5,600): 21 programs</b>	<b>Above average (\$5,600-\$6,300): 4 programs + Chicago</b>	<b>High (&gt;\$6,300): 3 programs</b>
Belvidere SD (\$3819), Decatur SD (\$4015), Geneseo SD (\$4255), Oswego SD (\$4384), Mon/Rand ROE (\$4442), CGJM ROE (\$4453)	I-KAN ROE (\$4641), Quincy SD (\$4663), McLean SD (\$4693), GovState (\$4694), BHS ROE (\$4775), Berwyn SD (\$4782), Lee/Ogle ROE (\$4881), DLM ROE (\$4921), Plainfield SD (\$4922), Marion (\$4932), Springfield SD (\$5134), CarDunAI SD (\$5194), St. Clair ROE (\$5215), Belleville SD (\$5220), Woodstock SD (\$5241), Rock Island ROE (\$5242), Lindop SD (\$5250), CJS ROE (\$5354), Rockford SD (\$5429), Harlem SD (\$5430), DeKalb SD (\$5561)	Champaign SD (\$5693), DuPage ROE (\$6014), Lake ROE (\$6034), Naperville SD (\$6179), Chicago (\$6255)	Urbana SD (\$6311), DesPlaines SD (\$6450), Glenview SD (\$6658)

**Table 2.9: Average teacher experience in districts served by each program**

The Illinois state average is 13 years.

<b>Low (&lt;10 years): 4 programs</b>	<b>Below average (10.1 – 13 years): 13 programs</b>	<b>Above average (13-15 years): 12 programs + Chicago</b>	<b>High (&gt;15 years): 6 programs</b>
Lindop SD (6.6); Plainfield SD (8.3); Oswego SD (8.5); Berwyn SD (8.6)	CarDunAI SD (10.6); Glenview SD (11.1); Woodstock SD (11.5); Belvidere SD (11.7); DesPlaines SD (11.8); GovState (11.9); Champaign (11.9); CFV ROE (12.1); Belleville SD (12.3); Springfield SD (12.7); DeKalb SD (12.8); McLean SD (12.9); Naperville SD (12.9)	Quincy SD (13.1); Lake ROE (13.2); Chicago (13.2); St. Clair ROE (13.4); DuPage ROE (13.4); Harlem SD (13.7); Mon/Rand ROE (14.2); I-KAN ROE (14.3); Lee/Ogle ROE (14.3); Decatur SD (14.4); DLM ROE (14.5); CGJM ROE (14.8); CJS ROE (14.9)	BHS ROE (15.3); Urbana SD (15.3); Rockford SD (15.4); Marion (15.6); Rock Island ROE (15.7); Geneseo SD (16.8)

**Table 2.10: Average percentage of teachers with master’s degrees in districts served by each program**

The Illinois state average is 52%.

<b>Low (&lt;40%): 7 programs</b>	<b>Below average (40%-52%): 11 programs</b>	<b>Above average (52%-60%): 9 programs + Chicago</b>	<b>High (&gt;60%): 8 programs</b>
CFV ROE (29%); Marion (32%); St. Clair ROE (32%); CGJM ROE (36%); GHS ROE (38%); Mon/Rand ROE (39%); GovState (39%)	Decatur SD (43%); Plainfield SD (44%); CJS ROE (44%); DLM ROE (44%); Springfield SD (46%); I-KAN ROE (47%); Oswego SD (48%); McLean SD (48%); Belleville SD (48%); Belvidere SD (49%); Quincy SD (50%)	Berwyn SD (54%); Champaign SD (54%); Lake ROE (54%); DeKalb SD (55%); Lindop SD (55%); Rock Island ROE (55%); Chicago (55%); Lee/Ogle ROE (58%); Urbana SD (58%); Woodstock SD (59%)	CarDunAI SD (63%); Harlem SD (64%); DesPlaines SD (64%); DuPage ROE (65%); Rockford SD (65%); Geneseo SD (66%); Naperville SD (69%); Glenview SD (74%)

### APPENDIX 3 BUDGET INFORMATION

**Table 3.1: Average percentage of students classified as low-income in districts served by each program**

The state average is 41%. There are 6 programs operating within Chicago, so there are slightly more programs which have a below-average low-income rate (22 programs) than an above-average low-income rate (19 programs)

<b>High (&gt;60%): 7 + Chicago (6 programs)</b>	<b>Above average (41%-60%): 6 programs</b>	<b>Below average (20%-40%): 16 programs</b>	<b>Low (&lt;20%): 6 programs</b>
Springfield SD (62%); Decatur SD (65%); St. Clair ROE (66%); Rockford SD (68%); GovState (72%); Berwyn (77%); Lake ROE (80%); Chicago (85%)	Champaign SD (44%); Quincy SD (44%); Rock Island ROE (44%); Lindop SD (46%); Marion (49%); Urbana SD (59%)	Mon/Rand ROE (22%); McLean SD (24%); Lee/Ogle ROE (25%); Belleville SD (29%); DLM ROE (29%); Woodstock SD (31%); CarDunAl SD (32%); Harlem SD (33%); Belvidere SD (34%); DesPlaines SD (34%); BHS ROE (34%); DeKalb SD (35%); CGJM ROE (35%); CJS ROE (35%); I-KAN ROE (39%); CFV ROE (40%)	Naperville SD (5%); Plainfield SD (6%); Oswego SD (9%); DuPage ROE (13%); Glenview SD (15%); Geneseo SD (17%)

**Table 3.2: Budget analysis chart**

For space reasons, the chart appears on the following page.

	Evaluation	Coor Salaries	Coor Benefits	Mentor Stipends	Mentor Benefits	NT Stipends	NT Benefits	Subs	Sub Benefits	Training	Materials/Supplies	Mileage	Space Rental	Secretary	Meals	Payments to SD's	TOTALS
<b>SITE NAME (NP SDs)</b>																	
Belleville SD				39,100	5,450						3,000	10,770					58,320
Belvidere SD	5,000	53,475	7,489	165,123	22,911			4,200			20,400	8,000					286,598
Berwyn SD	1,938	26,000	2,750	73,715	7,570	66,455	6,875				46,300	43,397					275,000
CPS Golden	10,000			84,900				50,250			159,100	9,000	28,000				341,250
CPS Literacy	20,000	43,200		100,800		102,000					65,000						331,000
CPS Math	12,000	18,000	4,500	27,000		90,000		5,200			10,125	20,000					186,825
Decatur SD	4,000			191,287	51,985	40,500		100,481	1,760		90,466	128,096	3,750	3,000	14,899		630,224
DeKalb SD	4,000	24,689	2,389	22,075	1,901	9,702	705	2,900			24,078	3,265					95,704
DesPlaines SD	8,000	21,950		28,200		6,000		22,320			48,200	5,950	3,300				143,920
Geneseo SD	25,000			5,500		2,750		1,650			10,000	1,000					45,900
Glenview SD	2,000	125,164		7,656		10,560		39,850			58,500	13,600					257,330
Harlem SD		4,690	105	21,660	510	37,410	885				2,000	500					67,760
Lindop SD		48,000		20,000				3,582			38,088	4,500					114,170
McLean SD	4,000	101,215	3,835	153,519	12,045	24,291		1,170			28,460	22,022	4,000		6,000		360,557
Naperville SD	8,000	61,270	60	12,636	225	11,400	370	9,600			31,700	5,900	500				141,661
Oswego SD	35,061	38,377	175	81,625	1,647	24,000	283	32,500			83,538	55,696		2,573	9,059		364,534
Urbana SD	4,602	1,000		31,275	4,714	23,125	3,485	11,730	260		4,800	22,543					107,534
Woodstock SD	8,967			48,344	903	12,843	341	15,708			23,170	41,090					151,366
<b>Totals</b>	<b>152,568</b>	<b>567,030</b>	<b>21,303</b>	<b>1,114,415</b>	<b>109,861</b>	<b>461,036</b>	<b>12,944</b>	<b>301,141</b>	<b>2,020</b>	<b>681,925</b>	<b>460,329</b>	<b>11,550</b>	<b>31,000</b>	<b>2,573</b>	<b>29,958</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3,959,653</b>
% of total	3.85	14.32	0.54	28.14	2.77	11.64	0.33	7.61	0.05	17.22	11.63	0.29	0.78	0.06	0.76	0.00	100.00

<b>SITE NAME (NP ROEs)</b>																	
BHS ROE	8,000	18,375	5,250	23,940		15,960		18,240	9,120	10,750	27,165	6,565			4,665		148,030
CEC Marion	6,000	93,033		64,680		54,000		44,410			40,500	26,938	44,115	1,200	11,168		386,044
CGJM ROE	4,000	39,516	1,685	51,200		33,200					4,500	17,440	300	9,358	5,760		166,959
CIS ROE		8,000	2,200	34,000				16,600			17,700	3,000			3,500		85,000
DLM ROE		80,349						10,000			92,000	58,000					240,349
DuPage ROE		19,800		76,800		76,800					14,470	13,120					200,990
I-KAN ROE	15,545	55,294	1,422	63,295		1,720		46,800			31,655	22,820	365		19,170		258,086
Lake ROE	9,000	15,863		11,236		10,160					36,799	6,942					90,000
Mon/Ran ROE	2,605	19,000	520	32,000				5,600			9,750	17,120	4,500				91,095
Rock Is ROE	25,000	23,459	714	25,680							49,458	11,125	600			214,000	350,036
<b>Total</b>	<b>70,150</b>	<b>372,689</b>	<b>11,791</b>	<b>382,831</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>191,840</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>141,650</b>	<b>9,120</b>	<b>307,582</b>	<b>203,670</b>	<b>55,545</b>	<b>2,100</b>	<b>9,358</b>	<b>44,263</b>	<b>214,000</b>	<b>2,016,589</b>
% of total	3.48	18.48	0.58	18.98	0.00	9.51	0.00	7.02	0.45	15.25	10.10	2.75	0.10	0.46	2.19	10.61	100.00

<b>SITE NAME (NP Cs)</b>																	
ACI	10,000	16,000	4,800	22,000							5,300	15,800	1,000	1,200		2,700	78,800
DePaul	3,575	22,897	5,373	13,000	1,300	26,000	2,600	4,305			13,000	9,740					101,790
Gov State	25,096	60,450		138,400		15,000					35,800	26,454					301,200
<b>Total</b>	<b>38,671</b>	<b>99,347</b>	<b>10,173</b>	<b>173,400</b>	<b>1,300</b>	<b>41,000</b>	<b>2,600</b>	<b>4,305</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>54,100</b>	<b>51,994</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>1,200</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2,700</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>481,790</b>
% of total	8.03	20.62	2.11	35.99	0.27	8.51	0.54	0.89	0.00	11.23	10.79	0.21	0.25	0.00	0.56	0.00	100.00

<b>SITE NAME (CP SDs)</b>																	
Champaign		9,972	1,314	60,923	8,027			66,870	8,811		64,593	11,020					231,530
Quincy				49,468	6,054	6,795	826	1,017			4,800	2,950					71,910
Car/Dun SD	250	4,300		9,000							500	800					14,850
CPS Area 14				300,000	75,000												375,000
Plainfield SD	39,000			30,000		15,000		35,000			258,000	23,000					400,000
Rockford				301,901	24,822						59,117	9,199					395,039
Springfield	10,000	7,418	1,098	74,411	11,061			24,579	877		31,400	39,083	1,750				201,677
<b>Total</b>	<b>49,250</b>	<b>21,690</b>	<b>2,412</b>	<b>825,703</b>	<b>124,964</b>	<b>21,795</b>	<b>826</b>	<b>127,466</b>	<b>9,688</b>	<b>418,410</b>	<b>86,052</b>	<b>1,750</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,690,006</b>
% of total	2.91	1.28	0.14	48.86	7.39	1.29	0.05	7.54	0.57	24.76	5.09	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00

<b>SITE NAME (CP ROEs)</b>																	
Lee/Ogle ROE	4,625	2,000	500	56,000				19,600			28,365	2,050	2,200	4,200			119,540
CFV ROE	5,250	10,590		4,770		2,970		15,300			18,375	3,750					61,005
St.Clair ROE	19,659	33,751	52,842	57,697		57,697		5,130			38,945	2,200	1,050		3,250		214,524
<b>Total</b>	<b>29,534</b>	<b>46,341</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>113,612</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>60,667</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>40,030</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>46,740</b>	<b>44,745</b>	<b>4,400</b>	<b>5,250</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3,250</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>395,069</b>
% of total	7.48	11.73	0.13	28.76	0.00	15.36	0.00	10.13	0.00	11.83	11.33	1.11	1.33	0.00	0.82	0.00	100.00

<b>Total of 10</b>	<b>78,784</b>	<b>68,031</b>	<b>2,912</b>	<b>939,315</b>	<b>124,964</b>	<b>82,462</b>	<b>826</b>	<b>167,496</b>	<b>9,688</b>	<b>465,150</b>	<b>130,797</b>	<b>6,150</b>	<b>5,250</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3,250</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2,085,075</b>
<b>Total of 31</b>	<b>261,389</b>	<b>1,039,066</b>	<b>43,267</b>	<b>1,670,646</b>	<b>111,161</b>	<b>693,876</b>	<b>15,544</b>	<b>447,096</b>	<b>11,140</b>	<b>1,043,607</b>	<b>715,993</b>	<b>68,095</b>	<b>34,300</b>	<b>11,931</b>	<b>76,921</b>	<b>214,000</b>	<b>6,458,032</b>
<b>Total of 41</b>	<b>340,173</b>	<b>1,107,097</b>	<b>46,179</b>	<b>2,609,961</b>	<b>236,125</b>	<b>776,338</b>	<b>16,370</b>	<b>614,592</b>	<b>20,828</b>	<b>1,508,757</b>	<b>846,790</b>	<b>74,245</b>	<b>39,550</b>	<b>11,931</b>	<b>80,171</b>	<b>214,000</b>	<b>8,543,107</b>
% of total	3.98	12.96	0.54	30.55	2.76	9.09	0.19	7.19	0.24	17.66	9.91	0.87	0.46	0.14	0.94	2.50	100.00

## APPENDIX 4 COMMON DATA ELEMENTS CHART

This is the chart that was distributed to the 31 programs which were initially funded in 2008. The 10 continuing programs received a similar chart, but with two columns: one for 2006-07 beginning teachers who were in their second year of teaching, and one for 2007-08 beginning teachers who were in their first year of teaching.

### Use of FY 08 Funding

1. Are you using FY 08 funding to enhance an **existing** program for teachers hired in Fall 2007?
2. If so, please describe the induction and mentoring program for your district/consortium prior to receiving funding.
3. Please describe how funding has enhanced the pre-existing program.

OR

1. Are you using FY 08 funding to implement a **new** program for beginning teachers hired in Fall 2007?
2. Are you using FY 08 funding to implement a **new** program for beginning teachers to be hired in Fall 2008?
3. Please describe the implementation of the program to date.

Information about the beginning teachers	
Demographic information Age, race, linguistic background, grade level(s) teaching, subject area concentration	
How many beginning teachers were hired at the beginning of the year?	
How many beginning teachers were hired mid-year?	
How many beginning teachers came through university-based teacher education programs?	
How many beginning teachers came through alternate route programs?	
What criteria were used to select beginning teachers into the pilot program?	
How were the beginning teachers identified?	
Who qualifies as a beginning teacher?	
How were they recruited to participate in the program?	
How were the beginning teachers introduced to their mentors?	
What training and information did the beginning teachers receive at the beginning of their entry into the program?	
Who conducted the <u>initial</u> training?	
When did the initial training occur?	
What materials were used?	
Which of the following standards were used in the initial training? IPTS; (Draft) Illinois Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Beginning Teacher Induction Programs; Content Area	
How was initial training/orientation evaluated?	
What records were kept on the nature, quality, and impact of the initial	

training?	
What were the results of the evaluation?	
How will the results be used to improve the program?	
When did <u>continuing</u> professional development/training targeted for beginning teachers occur in addition to mentoring?	
How often did continuing professional development/training targeted for beginning teachers occur in addition to mentoring?	
Who conducted the training?	
When did continuing training occur?	
What materials were used?	
Which of the following standards were used in the training? IPTS; (Draft) Illinois Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Beginning Teacher Induction Programs; Content Area	
How was continuing training/orientation evaluated?	
What records were kept on the nature, quality, and impact of the continuing training?	
What were the results of the evaluation?	
How will the results be used to improve the program?	
<b>Information about the mentors</b>	
Demographic information Age, race, linguistic background, grade level(s) teaching, subject area concentration	
How many mentors were hired at the beginning of the year?	
How many mentors were hired mid-year?	
What criteria were used to select mentors?	
Who selected the mentors?	
What process was used to select mentors?	
How were mentors assigned to new teachers?	
How many new teachers are assigned to mentors?	
Who made the assignments?	
How were mentors trained <u>initially</u> ?	
When did initial training on induction and mentoring occur?	
Who conducted the training?	
What materials were used?	
Which of the following standards were used in the training? IPTS; (Draft) Illinois Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Beginning Teacher Induction Programs; Content Area	
How was the initial training evaluated?	
What records were kept on the nature, quality, and impact of the initial training?	
What were the results of the evaluation?	
How will the results be used to improve the program?	
When did <u>continuing</u> professional development/training for induction and mentoring occur for mentors?	
How often did continuing professional development/training for induction and mentoring occur for mentors?	
Who conducted the training?	
What materials were used?	
Which of the following standards were used in the training? IPTS; (Draft) Illinois Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for	

Beginning Teacher Induction Programs; Content Area		
How was continuing training evaluated?		
What records were kept on the nature, quality, and impact of the continuing training?		
What were the results of the evaluation?		
How will the results be used to improve the program?		
<b>Information about district/building/regional/university administrator involvement</b>		
Who provides overall program management?		
Which central administrators are involved in the program? Describe their responsibilities.		
How are building level administrators involved in the program? Describe their responsibilities.		
How are central administrators made aware of the program?		
How are building level administrators made aware of the program?		
<b>Orientation/training on induction and mentoring provided to administrators</b>	<b>Central/District Administrators</b>	<b>Building Level Administrators</b>
How were administrators trained <u>initially</u> ?		
When did initial training occur?		
Who conducted the training?		
What materials were used?		
Which of the following standards were used in the training? IPTS; (Draft) Illinois Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Beginning Teacher Induction Programs; Content Area		
How was initial training evaluated?		
What records were kept on the nature, quality, and impact of the initial training?		
What were the results of the evaluation?		
How will the results be used to improve the program?		
When and how often did <u>continuing</u> professional development/training on induction and mentoring occur?		
Who conducted the training?		
What materials were used?		
Which of the following standards were used in the training? IPTS; (Draft) Illinois Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Beginning Teacher Induction Programs; Content Area		
How was <u>continuing</u> training evaluated?		
What records were kept on the nature, quality, and impact of the continuing training?		
What were the results of the evaluation?		
How will the results be used to improve the program?		

<b>Information about the program implementation process</b>	
How were mentors provided time to observe beginning teachers?	
Were new teachers provided time to observe mentors or other experienced teachers?	
How does the program provide regularly scheduled time for mentors and beginning teachers to meet and work together in addition to the observations?	
How is the policy monitored?	
What records were kept on the nature, quality, and impact of mentors' assistance to new teachers?	
What were the results of the evaluation of the records?	
How will the results be used to improve the program?	
What forms of assistance do mentors give to beginning teachers?	
How is the content of the assistance monitored?	
What records are kept on the appropriateness and impact of the content?	
What were the results of the evaluation of the records?	
How will the results be used to improve the program?	
What additional assistance was provided to beginning teachers by the program?	
How is this assistance monitored?	
What records are kept on the appropriateness and impact of the content?	
What were the results of the evaluation of the records?	
How will the results be used to improve the program?	
What is the relationship between induction assistance/information and other initiatives in the district?	
What is the relationship between induction assistance/information and other initiatives in the building?	

### General Summarizing Questions

What do you see as the unique features of your program?

What do you see as the current strengths of your program?

How would you characterize the success of the program to date?

What are the major challenges you have faced during this reporting period?

How have you addressed those challenges?

What resources and types of support would help your program to be more successful?

How are you building capacity to sustain the program with limited (or no) state funding?