



**ISBE-FUNDED BEGINNING TEACHER INDUCTION PROGRAMS  
FY10 FINAL REPORT**

**OCTOBER 2010**

**Prepared for:**  
Illinois State Board of Education

**Prepared by INTC Staff:**

Patricia Brady  
Lara Hebert  
Mary Elin Barnish  
Jeff Kohmstedt  
Chris Murphy-Lucas  
Hilarie Welsh  
Nancy Johnson  
Mike Painter

**Director of INTC:**  
Chris Roegge

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....                                | iii |
| PURPOSE OF THE REPORT .....                            | 1   |
| INTRODUCTION AND RESEARCH METHODOLOGY .....            | 1   |
| SUMMARY OF DATA BRIEFS: PROGRAM DESCRIPTION .....      | 3   |
| SUMMARY OF DATA BRIEFS: PROGRAM IMPACT .....           | 8   |
| OBSERVATIONS FROM INTC STATEWIDE CO-COORDINATORS ..... | 10  |
| DISCUSSION AND TENTATIVE CONCLUSIONS .....             | 13  |
| RECOMMENDATIONS FOR POLICY AND PROGRAMMING .....       | 15  |
| LAYOUT OF RESEARCH AGENDA .....                        | 17  |

## **ISBE-FUNDED BEGINNING TEACHER INDUCTION PROGRAMS FY10 FINAL REPORT**

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This document reports on the status of ISBE-Funded Beginning Teacher Induction Programs. It describes program activities occurring between June 1, 2009 and May 31, 2010.

#### **Purpose of the Report**

This report provides a summary of the six data briefs that were submitted to the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) during the preceding 12 months; observations from the INTC Statewide Co-coordinators; discussion and tentative conclusions; recommendations for ISBE, Illinois New Teacher Collaborative (INTC), and funded programs; and the layout of a research agenda.

#### **Introduction and Research Methodology**

In fall 2009, 66 programs completed the online Common Data Elements (CDE) Reporting Form, and INTC received 62 total CDEs. In spring 2010, INTC received 61. CDE data are qualitative and quantitative, and they encompass multiple-choice, short-answer, and extended-response questions. These data were summarized and aggregated by different program types.

#### **Summaries of Data Briefs**

The CDE data were described in a series of six data briefs. Each data brief contained a main report which provided a summary and interpretation of data and an appendix that contained the raw data presented in tables.

This report summarizes the Data Briefs by providing data on program description and program impact. In the Program Description section, the report provides funded programs' demographics and then describes the programs' operations for each of the nine *Illinois Induction Programs Standards*.

In the Program Impact section, the report examines the impact of programs on retention, teacher quality and student achievement; the impact of ISBE funding on program development; and the impact of the funding process.

#### **Observations from INTC Statewide Co-coordinators**

In this section, the INTC Statewide Co-coordinators describe, from their perspective, what the funded programs do well, in what areas they could improve, and some particularly effective or interesting practices programs have adopted.

#### **Discussion and Tentative Conclusions**

This section draws on the data briefs and co-coordinator observations to describe themes, note common challenges, and warn of potential threats.

**Recommendations for Policy and Programming**

The report examines previous INTC reports and provides an update on the recommendations made in them. It also provides information on why some prior recommendations have only been partially accomplished or have not yet been achieved. New recommendations, meant to be accomplished in the following 12 months, are also provided for INTC, ISBE, and funded programs.

**Layout of Research Agenda**

The report ends by laying out a research agenda with research questions in three categories: program description, program impact, and conclusions. For each research question, the agenda itemizes data that have already been gathered, then proposes data to be collected in the future and an associated timeline. Future data collection efforts will continue to describe programs (both those receiving and not receiving grant funding) and their development. The research focus will shift, however, to program impact so that eventually conclusions can be drawn to inform policy and funding decisions.

## PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

This report includes information regarding activities conducted within the ISBE-Funded Beginning Teacher Induction Programs from June 1, 2009 to May 31, 2010. It provides a summary of the six data briefs that were submitted to the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) during the preceding 12 months; observations from the INTC Statewide Co-coordinators; recommendations for ISBE, Illinois New Teacher Collaborative (INTC), and funded programs; the layout of a research agenda; and INTC plans for future research activities.

## INTRODUCTION AND RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This is the sixth in a series of reports on the status of ISBE-Funded Beginning Teacher Induction Programs. The document describes program activities occurring between June 1, 2009 and May 31, 2010.

In fall 2009, 66 programs completed the online Common Data Elements (CDE) Reporting Form. One program—the Consortium for Educational Change-Marion—encompassed two separate grants, and another program—Chicago New Teacher Center #299, Areas 3, 7, 13, 14, & 1—encompassed four separate grants. Each of these programs filled out a single CDE reporting form, so INTC received 62 total CDEs in fall 2009. In spring 2010, INTC received 61 CDEs because one program—Will County—declined to seek continuation funding for FY10.

The fall 2009 CDE featured questions on

- program demographics;
- Illinois Induction Program Standards 1, 2, 5, 8, and 9; and
- summer mentor and novice teacher trainings.

The spring 2010 CDE featured questions on

- Illinois Induction Program Standards 3, 4, 6, and 7;
- self-reported ratings for each standard on the *Illinois Induction Program Continuum (IIPC)*; and
- a summary of program impact.

CDE data were qualitative and quantitative, and they encompassed multiple-choice, short-answer, and extended-response questions. INTC staff members downloaded quantitative data from Qualtrics, a web-based survey tool, into Microsoft Excel spreadsheets. They then calculated descriptive statistics, disaggregated by three types of programs: district-based programs vs. consortium-based programs; programs initially funded in 2009 vs. programs initially funded in 2006 or 2008; and larger programs (serving 75 or more first- and second-year teachers) vs. smaller programs. INTC staff also downloaded qualitative responses into Microsoft Word and disaggregated the data by program type. INTC staff analyzed the qualitative responses by identifying themes, commonalities, and anomalies.

INTC staff described the CDE data in a series of six data briefs. Each data brief contained a main report which provided a summary and interpretation of data and an appendix that contained

the raw data presented in tables. The data briefs are currently available on INTC's website at <http://intc.education.illinois.edu/search/node/data%20brief>.

Those data briefs are as follows:

Data Brief #1: Novice teacher, mentor, and program demographics

Data Brief #2: Illinois Induction Program Standards 1, 2, and 5 (leadership, program design, and mentor selection and assignment), plus summer trainings for mentors and novices

Data Brief #3: Illinois Induction Program Standard 9 (evaluation), plus program plans for improvement under each standard

Data Brief #4: Illinois Induction Program Standards 3, 7, and 8 (resources, mentor/novice interactions, and formative assessment)

Data Brief #5: Illinois Induction Program Standards 4, 6, and 7 (administrator, mentor, and novice teacher involvement and professional development)

Data Brief #6: Program self-rankings on the *IIPC*; program plans for future improvement; and impact of programs on teacher quality, student achievement, and teacher retention.

CDE data were based on program self-reports only. Thus, in order to provide valuable triangulation and an outsider's viewpoint, the INTC Statewide Co-coordinators wrote their own reflections on program progress, successes, and challenges. The Co-coordinators are in continual contact with funded programs through e-mails, phone calls, site visits, regional meetings and other networking methods, and their intuitive and anecdotal accounts of the program add depth and richness to the CDE reports.

## SUMMARY OF DATA BRIEFS: PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

### Demographics

The 2009 expansion from 39 to 66 funded programs allowed for a 35% growth in the number of first-year teachers participating in state-funded induction and mentoring programs, a 75% growth in the number of second-year teachers, and a 38% growth in the number of mentors. The larger increase for second-year teachers suggests that many continuing programs added or expanded the second year of their program, and that new teachers opted to remain in the program for a second year. (DB #1)<sup>1</sup>

Novice teachers were predominantly White (90%), from university-based teacher education programs (93%), and in their early 20s (77%). Mentors were even more likely to be White (94%), and most were full-time teachers or administrators (81%), although 38% of programs reported using at least one full-time or retired mentor. The numbers of novice teachers and mentors at different grade levels and in the various content areas were roughly the same, suggesting that, overall, there were sufficient mentors in each area (although there may have been shortages at individual programs). (DB #1)

The programs served a diverse group of districts which represented a cross-section of Illinois on most demographic categories including percentages of White students, low income students, English Language Learners, and students passing standardized tests. Other program demographics—including district size, average teacher salary, teacher experience, teachers with master's degrees, and district instructional expense per student—had means close to the state average and a wide range across the programs from minimum to maximum. (DB #1)

### Standard 1: Induction Program Leadership, Administration, and Support

Most programs were coordinated or managed by teams, but 43% of district-based programs and 32% of consortium-based programs were led by individuals, whether full- or part-time. District administrators ranged from being not involved (typically superintendents and human resources administrators) to very involved (typically curriculum and instruction administrators) in the program. Union involvement varied. Forty-four percent of district-based programs described their unions as being actively involved, and 85% described them as actively supportive. These numbers are more than 20 points lower for consortium-based programs. (DB #2)

### Standard 2: Program Goals and Design

All programs reported aligning themselves with school or district improvement plans, often by covering improvement-plan topics in professional development, and some improvement plans included participation in induction and mentoring programs. Continuing programs were more likely than new programs to have ISBE-approved induction programs (94% vs. 63%) or, for consortia, to report that all of their component districts had ISBE-approved induction programs (58% vs. 22%).

Nearly a quarter of programs had a multi-tiered mentoring structure. In the most common model, used by nine programs, new teachers were assigned two mentors: a building-level

---

<sup>1</sup> Each paragraph ends with a parenthetical reference to the Data Brief in which the data were originally reported.

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 used different models, such as providing three mentoring tiers. Multi-tiered programs were twice as likely to be based in single-district programs as in consortia and were twice as likely to be used by continuing programs as new ones.

All programs required mentor observations of beginning teachers. At least 75% of programs required 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. (DB #2)

### Standard 3: Resources

In total, ISBE provided the programs with \$7,063,600 in FY10. The average program received \$2,221 per new teacher served in 2009-10. This figure represents a range from \$149 per new teacher to \$8,394. Single-district programs received more per new teacher than consortia. Continuing programs (initially funded in 2006 or 2008) received more per new teacher than new programs. Smaller programs (with fewer than 75 new teachers) received more per new teacher than larger programs. Programs serving high-poverty districts received more per new teacher than did programs serving low-poverty districts. Each of these categories, however, contains considerable internal variation, as the following chart shows.

**Table 1.1: ISBE grant funding per beginning teacher**

| Category  | # of programs | Mean grant award per new teacher | Difference between means | Maximum    | Minimum  |
|---|---------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|------------|----------|
| Small programs (< 75 new teachers)                  | 39            | <b>\$2,639.65</b>                | \$1,197.25               | \$8,394.30 | \$148.57 |
| Larger programs (at least 75 new teachers)          | 21            | <b>\$1,442.40</b>                |                          | \$5,668.01 | \$262.53 |
| Continuing programs (initially funded 2006 or 2008) | 35            | <b>\$2,562.89</b>                | \$821.48                 | \$8,394.30 | \$508.92 |
| New programs (initially funded 2009)                | 25            | <b>\$1,741.41</b>                |                          | \$5,354.77 | \$148.57 |
| District-based programs                             | 34            | <b>\$2,550.60</b>                | \$761.51                 | \$8,394.30 | \$148.57 |
| Consortia-based programs                            | 26            | <b>\$1,789.09</b>                |                          | \$5,332.00 | \$256.85 |
| High poverty (low income students >50%)             | 22            | <b>\$2,430.27</b>                | \$331.04                 | \$8,394.30 | \$148.57 |
| Low poverty (low income students <50%)              | 38            | <b>\$2,099.23</b>                |                          | \$6,031.35 | \$256.85 |

Program budgets varied widely. On average, the top expenses were mentor salaries and benefits, followed by coordinator salaries, training expenses, supplies and materials, new teacher stipends, and substitute teachers. (DB #4)

#### **Standard 4: Site Administrator Roles and Responsibilities**

More than half of the programs provided some initial training for administrators, lasting six hours on average. Consortia most commonly used Induction for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Educator while districts used New Teacher Center (NTC), Consortium for Educational Change (CEC), or Charlotte Danielson materials. Topics focused on the mentoring process, new teacher development, the administrator's role in induction, and creating a supportive and collaborative school environment. Programs reported that by June 1, 2010, only a quarter of site and district administrators had received no training. (DB #5)

#### **Standard 5: Mentor Selection and Assignment**

District-based programs typically defined the mentor selection process and mentor-novice matching criteria, while consortium-based programs typically left these decisions to their component districts. Mentor selection criteria were most likely to include administrator recommendations, a certain amount of teaching experience, and personality characteristics. Mentor-novice matches were typically made to ensure physical proximity as well as grade-level and subject-area similarities. Programs serving small or rural districts, or programs with full-time mentors, were more likely than others to report difficulties ensuring good content-area or grade-level matches for all novices. (DB #2)

#### **Standard 6: Mentor Professional Development**

Many programs provided initial training for mentors, which lasted an average of 16 hours. District-based programs were twice as likely as consortia to offer subsequent or ongoing mentor training, and their trainings were more than twice as long (28 hours for districts vs. 13 hours for consortia). 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. Mentor trainings covered a wide range of mentoring topics, from the theoretical to the practical. Less than 3% of active mentors have never received initial training. (DB #2 & DB #5)

#### **Standard 7: Development of Beginning Teacher Practice**

Nearly all programs—and more district-based programs than consortia—provided some sort of summer training to incoming first-year teachers. District-based programs required, on average, almost 20 hours of training, and consortia required almost 9 hours. In contrast, only 44% of continuing programs and 6% of new programs serving second-year teachers offered them any summer training. For first-year teachers, most presenters prepared their own materials. In addition, consortium-based programs often used ICE21 materials, district-based programs used the Charlotte Danielson Framework, and both used Harry and Rosemary Wong's *First Days of School*.

Trainings for first-year teachers covered basic teaching skills including classroom management, lesson planning, and curriculum, along with program- and district-specific information. During the academic year, a majority of programs provided professional development sessions for first-year teachers, and a minority of programs provided such sessions for second-year teachers. Sessions for first-year teachers covered basic instructional ideas, while second-year teachers received professional development to help them fine-tune their skills. More than 70% of programs reported differentiating by grade level and content area. Most sessions were required,

and attendance at optional professional development was, typically, not strong. (DB #2 & DB #5)

Programs were far more likely to require that mentors spend a certain amount of time each week (or month) with first-year teachers than with second-year teachers, which perhaps hints to some program differentiation. Mentors of first-year teachers were also required to spend slightly more time each month with their protégés (5.4 hours vs. 4.5 hours for second-year teachers). These meetings typically took place before or after school, during planning periods, or during lunch. Less than half of programs provided release time or scheduled meeting times, such as early dismissal days or common planning periods. Programs also required mentors to cover certain topics; for first-year teachers, the top selections were ones typically seen as pressing needs: classroom environment, planning, and instructional delivery. (DB #4)

Most programs provided first-year teachers with the opportunity to network with new teachers from other schools, but few provided a reduced number of course preparations, a prohibition against teaching the most demanding or undesirable courses, or a prohibition from leading extra-curricular activities. (DB #4)

### **Standard 8: Formative Assessment**

All programs provided first-year teachers with some form of formative assessment, typically through mentor observation reports, novice self-reflection, analysis of student work, and analysis of student assessment data. All reporting programs required mentors to do classroom observations of their protégés. Programs requiring only one or two observations per year typically specified formal pre/post conferences for each, while programs requiring up to one observation each week demanded less time and documentation for each. A minority of programs used full-release, retired, or flexible-schedule mentors; the others typically provided some release time for observations. Requirements and provisions were similar for first- and second-year teachers. (DB #4)

### **Standard 9: Program Evaluation**

All responding programs planned to survey mentors, novices, and/or administrators to evaluate program quality. Also common were plans to examine retention data and contact logs. Somewhat under half of programs planned to examine reflection documents, student test scores, and formal novice teacher evaluations; organize focus groups; and conduct interviews. Few programs planned exit interviews or external evaluation, although several wished that they were allowed to budget for external evaluators. Data were almost always analyzed by the induction program coordinator, who frequently was assisted by district or building administrators or union membership—although all of these forms of assistance were more common in district-based programs. (DB #3)

### **Other categories**

Impacts of the economy: Programs reported that the economy has had varying impacts on retention. These impacts included: widespread RIFing of new teachers; decreased attrition, or else increased attrition to higher-paying districts; increase in job applicants and a decrease in retirements; and an increase in second-career job applicants. Only eight programs reported no impact from the state of the economy. (DB #1)

Program self-ratings and plans for improvement: In an optional section, 19 programs rated themselves on each criterion on the *IIPC*. This is a small subgroup and results may not be representative of all programs. Ratings for each criterion ranged from 1 (establishing) through 4 (systematizing); higher numbers, therefore, represent programs that consider themselves more advanced. The five lowest-rated individual criteria—those with overall scores of 2.0 or lower—all concerned program evaluation and use of data or the involvement of site administrators. Programs rated themselves highest on four standards: Program Leadership, Resources, Mentor Training, and Development of Beginning Teacher Practice. The largest variations occurred between new and continuing programs: New programs rated themselves lower than continuing programs on all but three of the 39 individual criteria.

In spring 2010, programs were asked to identify two standards to work on for the next year. The standards that programs identified most as areas for improvement were those which received the lowest self-ratings on the *IIPC*, and vice-versa. The only exception was Standard 7 (Development of Beginning Teacher Practice), which received among the highest self-ratings on the *IIPC*, but which was a popular choice for self-improvement. (DB #6)

## SUMMARY OF DATA BRIEFS: PROGRAM IMPACT

### **Impact of programs on retention, teacher quality, and student achievement**

In districts served by the funded programs, between 26% and 29% of novice teachers hired in 2007 or 2008 left their initial teaching positions, whether or not they participated in an induction and mentoring program. However, nonparticipants were twice as likely as participants to leave their district by choice, while program participants typically moved to new positions within their districts or were subject to a reduction in force (RIF). Roughly equal numbers of program participants and non-participants were dismissed for poor performance. (DB #1)

In spring 2010, 20 programs indicated that they had some data on program impact on teacher retention. They typically examined retention data and used surveys and interviews, and occasionally were able to track changes over time. Nine programs noted that budget problems were having a big impact on retention figures, largely through RIFing of new teachers. Seven programs concluded that the program had a positive impact on teacher retention. (DB #6)

Seven programs indicated that they had some data on program impact on teacher quality. They noted the difficulty in defining teacher quality and in collecting meaningful data that is easily analyzed. The data they had were gleaned from teacher and mentor surveys, collaborative assessment logs, ratings of novice teacher growth on the *Illinois Continuum of Teacher Development* or the Danielson framework, some examination of student progress, and a comparison of recordings of novice teachers at the beginning and end of the year. Programs typically concluded that teachers showed positive growth and increased quality during the year. None of the programs described using a control group. (DB #6)

Three programs indicated that they were collecting data on program impact on student achievement, but none was willing to assert any correlation between inducted/mentored teachers and student achievement at this point. All noted the difficulty in analyzing this data and the complexity involved in examining student achievement and development. (DB #6)

### **Impact of ISBE funding on program development**

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
- clarify 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. (DB #2)

In fall 2009, programs listed their plans for future improvement for each standard. New programs were disproportionately more likely to be making plans for certain activities that older programs should be expected to already have done. These included

- setting up leadership committees;
- providing novice teachers with more structure;
- solidifying the program design, often based on a particular model (e.g. Danielson’s Framework);
- beginning to budget for substitutes or other release time or mentors and novices,
- increasing the mentor pool;
- improving or expanding mentor trainings; and
- conducting surveys and evaluations for the first time.

Meanwhile, continuing programs were disproportionately more likely to be fine-tuning their programs via

- increasing communication with shareholders;
- sending program leadership to conferences;
- differentiating the program for first- and second-year teachers;
- encouraging administrators to be more involved in the program;
- using the *Illinois Continuum of Teacher Development* in the formative assessment process; and
- gathering new types of data (e.g. teacher evaluations; mentor contact logs). (DB #3)

### **Impacts of the funding process**

Programs also described the negative impacts of the grant funding process and timelines on their program design and implementation. One third of programs complained that reduced funding from FY09 to FY10 meant that program elements had to be cut back, resulting in a loss of quality, which left programs scrambling for money mid-year. This was particularly difficult for new programs. Programs also noted that planning and implementation were difficult because grant cycle dates did not correspond with school academic years—especially because programs did not discover whether they would be funded until after the beginning of the fiscal and academic year. Funding uncertainties and delays in disbursement resulted in difficulties ranging from minor to “devastating”. Programs worried about the impact of potential future funding cuts: they could greatly reduce program quality, force the program to close, or force districts to pay a much greater share of program costs. (DB #4)

## OBSERVATIONS FROM INTC STATEWIDE CO-COORDINATORS

The two INTC Statewide Co-coordinators have gathered a wealth of anecdotal data from their site visits, phone calls and informal conversations with program leaders, Professional Learning and Networking (PLaN) meetings, networking sessions, and attendance at conferences. We posit that the co-coordinators' knowledge is deep and rich, and adds an important layer to the quantitative and comparative data from the CDEs. In this section, we describe the co-coordinators' intuitive sense and anecdotal evidence of what is working for the funded programs, areas in which they could improve, and specific programs that are using some particularly novel or effective practices.

### **What do the funded programs do well, in general?**

The Co-coordinators report that the programs, in general, have moved from "buddy" mentoring to work focused on professionalism, skill building, and student learning. In general, most if not all programs

- had regular mentor/new teacher conversations about teaching and learning;
- acculturated new teachers to their schools, districts, and the profession;
- had a commitment to induction and mentoring, to collaboration, and to new teachers;
- understood the importance of induction in new teacher development;
- have an interest in data and continuous program improvement;
- were increasing the depth and rigor of internal measurements and data collection;
- understood the importance of the administrator's role;
- collaborated across programs on trainings, speakers, and content, as well as spread innovations including assessment, record-keeping instruments, and the use of technology;
- understood that a viable induction and mentoring program includes reflection, analysis of student work, and skill development as articulated in the *Illinois Professional Teaching Standards*;
- provided quality, consistent training for mentors and professional development for first-year teachers; and
- were increasing the differentiation of professional development and/or program implementation for mentors and beginning teachers based on experience, content areas, and grade-levels.

### **In what areas could the funded programs improve, in general?**

Program progress has been iterative and varied as programs focus on different areas for improvement and develop at different rates. Some programs have been models of promising practices in areas that in other programs are still at the establishing level. Budget difficulties often limited the ability of programs to innovate and improve. Despite these issues, the programs continued to develop and improve over time. In general, the recommendations for improvement echo the improvement goals reported by individual programs on the CDE.

In general, the programs could consider:

- increasing the standardization and objectivity of mentor selection and assignment;
- resolving inconsistencies regarding administrator involvement and roles;

- offering supports and professional development opportunities beyond one-on-one mentoring and workshops (e.g. study groups, multi-tier mentoring, observing experienced teachers in practice);
- helping improve working conditions and job assignments for novice teachers;
- emphasizing public relations and communication;
- using data to advocate for induction and mentoring as critical to new teacher growth and student achievement;
- initiating partnerships with other funded program leaders for collaborative learning and program improvement;
- improving data collection and analysis methods, focusing on impact, and sharing tools and findings with stakeholders and other programs;
- making an early and concerted effort to focus induction activities on instruction and student learning;
- including the common core standards (national standards) and the revised *Illinois Professional Teaching Standards* in new teacher training;
- maintaining momentum and consistency as the program builds and develops, as state requirements and funding changes, and as program leadership structures change;
- establishing and maintaining a steering/advisory committee with representatives from all district/program constituencies;
- ensuring program quality so all beginning teachers receive promised levels of support through enhanced accountability and ongoing monitoring procedures; and
- fully aligning programs with district and school initiatives and school/district improvement plans.

### **What are some particularly effective or interesting practices?**

All programs are, of necessity, different in order to work in their diverse local contexts. Each program has some elements that are particularly effective and worthy of emulation. Many programs have taken a leadership role in promoting and sharing their practices through state and national conference presentations. The co-coordinators listed several particularly interesting, novel, or effective practices which they observed in one or more programs. This list is not fully inclusive, as so many programs are doing exciting and innovative work.

Promising practices include

- the use of technology in creative and unique ways: to communicate with new teachers and mentors, to provide professional development opportunities, to encourage reflection through blogs and discussion boards, and to allow new teachers and mentors to share their practice;
- strong administrator participation and training;
- collaboration of all stakeholders, especially from the program's inception;
- collaborative building of electronic systems for monitoring and tracking induction activities and participation;
- consortia's provision of technical assistance to component districts, facilitating district work with the *IIPC* and with research-based decision-making;
- mentoring of mentors by a mentor coach;

- a tiered mentor training system, with the third tier training mentor leaders to train and mentor new mentors and to advocate for and continuously improve the district programs;
- a four-year induction and mentoring program;
- the use of lesson study, and the inclusion of National Board Certified Teachers as mentors;
- the use of differentiated mentoring, including the use of short-term, intensive “extended learning contracts”;
- program evaluation that measures impact on student achievement;
- resident new teachers who co-teach with veteran mentors;
- universities that use faculty members as lead mentors and track their own graduates teaching in high needs schools;
- work with turn-around schools; and
- an examination of the connections between teacher preparation and the needs of new teachers.

## DISCUSSION AND TENTATIVE CONCLUSIONS

In fall 2009, the programs were diverse in region, demographics, and in how they delivered their programs. A loss in the number of funded programs, or an increase in standardized requirements, is likely to reduce this diversity. Having diverse programs will allow for research into impacts of programs and program components on retention, teacher development, and student achievement.

The funding levels per beginning teacher varied widely. Some variation is inevitable and desirable and can indicate diversity in program design and in local funding levels. Larger programs may achieve economies of scale; newer programs may need more resources to get started. However, programs experienced a huge disparity in funding in FY10, with the highest-funded program receiving more than 50 times as much per new teacher as the lowest-funded program.

Consortia-based programs have greater intrinsic challenges than single districts. It is harder for them to collaborate and obtain buy-in across stakeholder groups. They often cannot mandate attendance or participation. It is more difficult to monitor program implementation, to align to district and school improvement plans, and to tailor their programs to meet local needs. However, these programs are essential for rural and small-town districts, which lack the human and fiscal resources to provide comprehensive induction.

Providing induction is a developmental process, and newly developing programs should not be held to the same implementation standards/expectations as those that have been in place for a longer period of time. The only common expectation should be that all programs engage in a continuous development process guided by data and aligned with the *Illinois Induction Programs Standards*.

Programs in general are developing over time; all reported making major changes since their initial funding, and continuing programs rated themselves higher on almost every criterion on the *IIPC*. However, this development may not be sustainable with budget reductions, as programs are having to curtail—not expand—their programs. Budget cuts are particularly difficult for new programs. Moving toward some sort of standardized ratings system will provide a clearer, more consistent picture of this developmental process.

Program leaders have continued to improve their evaluation procedures. Some programs have tried to examine program impact (on retention, teacher quality, student achievement) but they noted the intrinsic difficulty in trying to define “quality” or to link a program with student outcomes and weed out all other variables. Programs could use some assistance or advice in this area, and perhaps some standardized instruments. INTC’s research has, thus far, been primarily descriptive and important for gaining an understanding of the diversity of program design and implementation strategies. In the future, INTC should expand the research focus to include longitudinal and impact-based research questions.

Programs should encourage districts to focus on making school cultures more collaborative, increasing administrator involvement, and providing institutionalized supports for novice

teachers. These could include a reduced number of course preparations, a prohibition against teaching the most demanding or undesirable courses, or a prohibition from leading extra-curricular activities. Such supports are still all too rare.

Novice teachers who did not participate in induction programs were more likely than their participating peers to voluntarily leave their districts. However, in light of deep state and district budget cuts, teacher retention is less of an issue for this reporting period, except perhaps in key shortage areas.

Findings related to program differentiation and professional development for second-year teachers were mixed. Evidence indicated differing professional development content for first and second-year teachers, as well as program leadership's intentions to fine-tune this differentiation. However, a large discrepancy existed between the amount of professional development provided for second-year teachers when compared to the offering for their first-year colleagues. Given the differences between continuing programs and the new programs, this may be a sign of programs' developmental stages; or perhaps, in a time of limited budgets, they have made the conscious decision to focus on the needs of first-year teachers.

## RECOMMENDATIONS FOR POLICY AND PROGRAMMING

### Recommendations from previous INTC reports

Three previous INTC reports each issued recommendations for ISBE, INTC, and the funded programs. The reports include:

- November 2009, “State-Funded Induction and Mentoring Programs in Illinois Report”;
- February 2009, “State-Funded Induction and Mentoring Programs in Illinois Final Report”; and
- October 2007, “Beginning Teacher Induction Pilot Programs: A Description of the First Year of Pilot Program Implementation”.

These recommendations are summarized below and are grouped according to how much progress has been achieved in each area.

These lists are included here as an effort to provide follow up from past reports and introduce the next section which makes new recommendations and repeats some previous ones. In the below lists, if a recommendation has not (yet) been followed, it is not necessarily a sign of failure by INTC, ISBE, or the funded programs. Times change, budgets are cut, and new priorities emerge. Some previous recommendations may no longer be valid or important. Also, some recommendations may have been followed more by one group than another. For example, INTC may have been following a recommendation to “promote” the use of some procedure, but this does not necessarily mean that the procedure has been adopted by the majority of funded programs. The following paragraphs also show, in parenthesis, which INTC report initially made the recommendation.

#### Recommendations that have been mostly or entirely accomplished:

INTC conducts regional meetings and workshops, as well as an annual Induction and Mentoring Conference, to allow programs to collaborate and share strategies and tools (Oct ’07; Feb ’09). These activities are organized around the *Illinois Induction Program Standards* (Nov ’09). INTC has also made its data collection cycles more regular so participants understand what is expected and has proposed a statewide research agenda (Feb ’09).

ISBE has allowed the funded programs to expand beyond the initial ten pilots (Oct ’07). The funded programs, for the most part, have created leadership teams which include representatives from various stakeholder groups (Feb ’09). They provide initial orientation, ongoing networking, and professional development sessions for new teachers, mentors, and administrators (Oct ’07).

#### Recommendations that have seen some progress:

The funded programs have different priorities, enjoy different levels of funding, and are at different stages of development. Some programs are close to having comprehensive, differentiated induction programs for second-year teachers and for teachers in specialty certification areas (Feb ’09), while other programs—especially new or smaller programs—may not. Some programs have strong professional development programs for administrators (Nov ’09), while others do not have the necessary release time, trainers, or local administrative

support. Many administrators have received training as is required by ISBE rules, but the specific content, skill development, and amount of time spent can vary greatly. While the recommendation stated that this professional development be articulated and shared statewide, the funding, release time, and trainers required to accomplish this tend to fall to individual programs which may lack adequate resources. The recent approval of the *IIPC* Administrator's Academy will contribute to increased statewide alignment of administrator training.

INTC and collaborative partners have begun developing a system of statewide technical assistance (Feb '09). The Statewide Co-coordinators provide technical assistance to funded programs through individual site visits and needs-based Professional Learning and Networking (PLaN) sessions. Collaboration of the Technical Assistance working group and the *IIPC* development team is making progress toward a formalized framework for statewide implementation.

ISBE, in collaboration with stakeholders from across the state, has developed guidelines and recommendations for funded programs (Oct '07, Feb '09) through the approval of the *IIPC*. In addition, the Administrative Rule changes that occurred in October 2009 establish new requirements for mentor contact time and minimum stipends, emphasizing the importance of the work of mentors and requiring careful record-keeping by program leaders. However, establishing specified criteria for all funded programs (Oct '07; Feb '09) has not been fully achieved. Further progress toward this recommendation requires an understanding of what works and what does not, and what program elements are particularly cost-effective. At this time, there is no research consensus in these areas. INTC will expand its research efforts to include questions related to the impact of programs and program components, as laid out in the research agenda that is provided at the end of this report.

Three recommendations from October, 2007 involved both INTC and ISBE: expanding outreach to stakeholders about the importance of induction and mentoring; establishing communication protocols and procedures; and, with input from the Illinois Induction Policy Team, increasing research and evaluation to identify and promote continuous improvement. These recommendations have seen some progress, but due to their complexity, they have not yet been completely achieved.

Collaboration with New Teacher Center partners and union leaders produced a one-page induction and mentoring advocacy flyer, and funded programs have been encouraged to develop their own advocacy and communication strategies. In addition, INTC leaders are recruiting more involvement from teacher education institutions in discussions about beginning teacher induction. All funded programs have been trained to use the *IIPC* for continuous improvement purposes, and methods of data collection and analysis guide their continuous improvement plans. However, programs need assistance to further develop and implement strong, evaluation tools and analysis methods. ISBE could ensure that it is clear and timely in communicating deadlines, requirements, and changes to the programs.

Three other recommendations on research involved collecting data about roles and training of administrators (Feb '09), creating case studies of promising practices (Feb '09), and coordinating research among INTC, ISBE, SRI, and IERC (Nov '09). INTC plans to collect more

administrator data in the future, as part of its larger research agenda. Although some program profiles have been started, there is no consensus yet on definitions and metrics for program success or “promising practices”. INTC, SRI, and IERC have collaborated on research in the past, and SRI continues to share their data instruments; however, SRI and IERC are not currently engaged in research on Illinois induction programs.

The programs have had some opportunity to share structures, templates, and tools that they can use for communication with stakeholders (Feb ’09). INTC is providing resources, time, and encouragement for such collaboration during the fall 2010 PLaN meetings.

Recommendations that have not yet been achieved:

Budgets and funding cycles have made it impossible for funded programs to establish and manage viable budgets with funds for induction and mentoring. Since 2007 there have been recommendations about creating a stable, multi-year, and dependable funding cycle to support and evaluate funded programs (Feb ’09; Oct ’07). The school budgeting cycle had been inconsistent with the legislature’s, with local budgets determined in the spring and state budgets being approved as late as mid-winter in years when the state faced substantial fiscal challenges. Also, resources have not been available for a multiyear statewide scale up (Oct ’07).

Other recommendations were not achievable because of the state’s financial problems. These include expanding the funded programs to include varied contexts and implementation strategies (Feb ’09), and funding more programs that focus on secondary teachers and teachers in specialized areas (Feb ’09).

At present, administrator preparation does not include teacher development and induction and mentoring (Feb ’09), and preservice teacher education programs do not all require the use of the *Illinois Continuum of Teacher Development* (Feb ’09).

**New recommendations**

The following recommendations are intended to be completed within the next 12 months.

Recommendations for INTC:

1. INTC should begin to follow a new research agenda that expands the focus from description of funded programs to include the impact of funded programs, and that may ultimately lead to conclusions about cost-effectiveness and best practices. INTC should then work with ISBE, funded programs, and other statewide stakeholders to collaboratively define “successful” induction programs. These groups should articulate specific expectations and general recommendations for induction programs, which allow flexibility for local variation.
2. INTC should coordinate opportunities for the funded programs to collaborate, share, and develop tools in order to increase the spread of innovation, improve program evaluation, and allow for continuous program improvement.

Recommendations for ISBE:

1. ISBE should provide regular communication and concerted consultation with INTC, funded programs, and other stakeholders regarding decisions, legislative and ISBE rule changes, grant funding procedures, and the impact of these decisions on induction programs.
2. As state funding allows, ISBE should provide a steady and stable stream of funding, to be disbursed in a timely manner, with annual re-funding, and a funding cycle that is aligned with district academic calendars. Funding notification should occur several months before the school year begins. ISBE and the Illinois Induction Policy Advisory Team should determine a process for dispersing grant funds in an equitable manner that reflects an understanding of local needs and variations but reduces the range of per teacher expenditures. Also, ISBE should begin a plan for a statewide scale-up of funded programs, to be implemented after the state budget situation improves.

Recommendations for funded program leaders:

1. Funded program leaders should clearly define and communicate all stakeholder roles and responsibilities in the induction process. When possible, given budget constraints, more professional development should be provided for administrators. Follow-through should be monitored and stakeholders should be held accountable for beginning teacher experiences.
2. Funded program leaders should work together to plan for sustaining programs at the highest level of quality possible during challenging financial times.
3. Funded program leaders should define their measures of program success and develop a continuous improvement plan based on these outcomes and the *IIPC*. This plan should include ongoing measurement of progress toward achieving program goals.

## LAYOUT OF RESEARCH AGENDA

The research agenda below is intended to set the direction for the next three years of data collection and analysis. It is divided into three sections: description, impact, and conclusions. Data must be gathered in the first two sections so that conclusions may be drawn.

### Research questions: Description

| Research questions  | Data already gathered  | Research plans for future  | When to start gathering data           |
|---|--|--|--|
| <p><b>1.</b> What do induction and mentoring programs look like?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Who are the participants (e.g. novice teachers, mentors, program leaders, administrators)?</li> <li>• What are the various program components, and how are they enacted?</li> <li>• What are the various contexts in which these programs operate?</li> </ul> <p>What similarities and differences exist across different types of programs: district- vs. consortium-based; small vs. large; newly funded vs. continuing; funded vs. non-funded?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CDE Data</li> <li>• SRI data</li> <li>• UIUC research</li> <li>• IERC data</li> </ul> | <p>INTC will prepare a shorter (and largely quantitative) electronic “audit sheet” that funded programs complete several times each year, to replace the current CDE</p> <p>Unfunded programs will be invited to complete a short survey with questions drawn from past CDEs and the current audit sheet</p> | <p>Fall 2010</p> <p>Winter 2010/11</p> |
| <p><b>2.</b> How are programs collecting, analyzing, and using data to make program modifications and to examine program impact?</p> <p>What tools are being used that can be expanded to more programs?</p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited anecdotal and CDE data</li> </ul>   | <p>A few programs will be invited to share their research tools</p> <p>INTC will conduct on-site interviews; analysis of artifacts (e.g. data collection tools used by various programs); notes taken at PLaN meetings</p>   | <p>Winter 2011</p> <p>Spring 2011</p>  |
| <p><b>3.</b> How do various stakeholders/participants—administrators, beginning teachers, mentors, and other teachers—perceive the induction and mentoring program and the school climate?</p> <p>How are their experiences and perceptions similar and different?</p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SRI data</li> <li>• UIUC research</li> </ul>  | <p>INTC or another entity will continue SRI-like surveys, and perhaps some interviews of selected personnel at selected programs</p>   | <p>Spring 2011</p>                     |
| <p><b>4.</b> What are the costs of induction? How do these costs vary based on induction and mentoring components or district characteristics?</p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some budget analysis</li> </ul>   | <p>INTC will provide continued and more in-depth budget analysis, requiring more information from programs</p>   | <p>Spring 2011</p>                     |

### Research questions: Impact

For these research questions, there has been little data gathered to date, although a careful review of SRI, IERC, CDE, and UIUC data can provide some direction. Additionally, individual programs may have some data in these areas.

| Research Questions  | Research plans for future  | When to start gathering data        |
|---|--|-------------------------------------|
| <p><b>1.</b> What impact do Illinois Induction and Mentoring programs (individually and collectively) have on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• novice teacher recruitment and retention;</li> <li>• student achievement (including test scores, attendance, and the novice/veteran gap);</li> <li>• new teacher development;</li> <li>• mentors, other teachers, and administrators; and</li> <li>• collaboration and other whole-school climate and culture?</li> </ul> <p>What are the impacts of individual components (e.g. beginning teacher networking)?</p> <p>And, how can one isolate the impact of the I&amp;M program apart from other variables?</p> | <p>INTC will seek volunteer programs to help create and pilot-test tools that could provide consistent measures of retention, teacher development, and student achievement (see RQ #2 above).</p> <p>INTC will ask all programs to use a uniform set of tools (potentially electronic, to feed into a central INTC database)</p> | <p>Winter 2011</p> <p>Fall 2011</p> |
| <p><b>2.</b> How does state funding impact I&amp;M programs (or, what benefits does the money buy)?</p> <p>What is the trajectory of development for I&amp;M programs—with and without state funding?</p>   | TBD  | Fall 2011                           |
| <p><b>3.</b> What impact does INTC (and its various activities) have on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• individual programs and program development;</li> <li>• the spread of innovation and successful strategies; and</li> <li>• meeting the needs of stakeholders served by INTC?</li> </ul>   | External evaluation needed   | Fall 2011                           |
| <p><b>4.</b> What impacts do administrators—and other individuals—have on induction and mentoring programs?</p>   | INTC will conduct surveys of program personnel   | Fall 2011                           |

### Research questions: Conclusions

1. What programs are successful, and how do we define “success”?
2. What program components—or combinations thereof—are essential to an effective program, regardless of context—or in varying contexts?
3. How does the cost of the program (or of individual components) compare to the various benefits (financial and otherwise)?
4. What are promising practices that individual programs are enacting—either in general, or for individual programs and in individual contexts? (Consider program impacts, as described above.)
5. How do successful programs meet common challenges?