

# Appendix to INTC Data Brief #5

July 2010

Prepared by: Patricia Brady

With assistance from: Jeff Kohmstedt

INTC Staff: Lara Hebert, Mary Elin Barnish, Chris Murphy-Lucas, Hilarie Welsh, Nancy Johnson, Mike Painter

INTC Director: Chris Roegge

This Appendix provides tables, charts, and analyses of quantitative and qualitative data. All data were reported on the spring 2010 Common Data Elements (CDE) reporting forms by the 64 programs that received grant funding in FY2010.

This Appendix is organized into the following sections, all focused on training and professional development:

- Standard 4: Administrator Training
- Standard 6: Mentor Professional Development
- Standard 7: Development of Beginning Teacher Practice
- Program Disaggregation

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

## Notes on the data

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

One program, Will County, declined to seek continuation funding for FY10. It filled out the fall 2009 CDE but not the spring 2010 CDE. For internal consistency, none of Will County's responses on the fall 2009 CDE are included in this Data Brief. The Chicago New Teacher Center #299, Areas 3, 7, 13, 14, & 17 encompassed four separate grants. This program filled out a single CDE reporting form, so INTC received 61 spring 2010 CDEs. For this data brief, INTC is only reporting on the 61 CDEs it received in spring 2010.

## Notes on the tables

The tables disaggregate the data in three ways: 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. Tables 4.1 – 4.6, at the end of this Appendix, show the intersections among programs in these three groups.

In each table, the total number of programs responding to the question in each category appears in parentheses in the blue header row. Total numbers (e.g. of district-based programs or consortium-based programs) may vary from table to table. This is because incomplete data were received from the programs—some programs failed to answer certain question. Also, one program did not provide complete numbers of participating first- and second-year teachers, so it was omitted from the “program size” columns (“75+ beginning teachers” and “<75 beginning teachers”).

In the tables, each data cell contains two figures. The first figure is the absolute number of programs; the number in parentheses provides the percentage of the total number of programs of its type (e.g. district-based programs, or programs initially funded in 2009) that responded to that question. Programs that did not respond to a given question are not included in the totals. When the percentages of two paired, adjacent cells (e.g. showing district-based and consortium-based programs) are different by at least 10 percentage points, then the cells are highlighted in a light shade. When the percentages are different by at least 20 percentage points, the cells are highlighted in a darker shade.

## STANDARD 4: ADMINISTRATOR TRAINING

This section covers administrator trainings which occurred between June 1, 2009 and May 31, 2010.

**Table 1.1. Availability and length of administrator training**

Programs were asked whether they provided induction and mentoring training for their administrators. They differentiated between initial training and subsequent training and were asked to indicate how long the training lasted. Programs were asked to count only the hours that a single administrator could reasonably be expected to attend and were asked to omit hours for repeated sessions offered to accommodate large numbers of mentors.

Each cell shows the number of programs which indicated that they held any administrator training in that category. The number in parenthesis is the mean number of hours that the training lasted.

Three programs which held subsequent training did not hold any initial training during this time period.

Note: in the “Subsequent (ongoing) training” row, much of the variation between adjacent columns can be accounted for by the presence of a single outlier which claimed to provide 56 hours of ongoing professional development.

	All programs	District-based programs	Consortium-based programs	Initially funded in 2009	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008	75+ beginning teachers	<75 beginning teachers
Initial training	36 (6.1)	18 (5.6)	18 (6.7)	17 (7.4)	19 (5.1)	15 (5.8)	21 (6.4)
Subsequent (ongoing) training	17 (11.9)	9 (14.4)	8 (9.1)	4 (8.5)	13 (13.0)	5 (19.4)	12 (8.8)

**Table 1.2. Materials used in initial administrator training**

Programs were asked what materials were used in initial administrator training.

	All programs (35)	District-based programs (18)	Consortium-based programs (17)	Initially funded in 2009 (15)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (20)	75+ beginning teachers (16)	<75 beginning teachers (19)
Induction for the 21st Century Educator (ICE 21) materials	17 (49%)	3 (17%)	14 (82%)	8 (53%)	9 (45%)	9 (56%)	8 (42%)
New Teacher Center (NTC) or Consortium for Educational Change (CEC) materials	16 (46%)	13 (72%)	3 (18%)	7 (47%)	9 (45%)	6 (38%)	10 (53%)
Presenters prepared their own training materials (other than those adapted from specific materials below)	14 (40%)	7 (39%)	7 (41%)	5 (33%)	9 (45%)	4 (25%)	10 (53%)
Charlotte Danielson framework	13 (37%)	10 (56%)	3 (18%)	6 (40%)	7 (35%)	5 (31%)	8 (42%)
Cognitive Coaching	7 (20%)	5 (28%)	2 (12%)	4 (27%)	3 (15%)	3 (19%)	4 (21%)
Other prepared or purchased materials	2 (6%)	1 (6%)	1 (6%)	1 (7%)	1 (5%)	2 (13%)	0

**Table 1.3. Content covered in administrator training**

Programs were asked what content was covered in initial administrator training. The last column indicates content covered in ongoing administrator training (i.e. any training subsequent to the initial training).

	All programs (37)	District-based programs (18)	Consortium-based programs (19)	Initially funded in 2009 (17)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (20)	75+ beginning teachers (16)	<75 beginning teachers (21)	Covered in ongoing training, all programs (18)
Mentoring process	34 (92%)	15 (83%)	19 (100%)	15 (88%)	19 (95%)	14 (88%)	20 (95%)	7 (39%)
Administrator's role in induction/mentoring	34 (92%)	16 (89%)	18 (95%)	16 (94%)	18 (90%)	14 (88%)	20 (95%)	11 (61%)
Stages of new teacher development	31 (84%)	15 (83%)	16 (84%)	15 (88%)	16 (80%)	13 (81%)	18 (86%)	11 (61%)
Illinois Professional Teaching Standards and/or Content Area Standards	30 (81%)	12 (67%)	18 (95%)	14 (82%)	16 (80%)	14 (88%)	16 (76%)	10 (56%)
Induction, in general	30 (81%)	13 (72%)	17 (89%)	15 (88%)	15 (75%)	13 (81%)	17 (81%)	5 (28%)
Creating a supportive/collaborative school environment	29 (78%)	12 (67%)	17 (89%)	13 (76%)	16 (80%)	12 (75%)	17 (81%)	10 (56%)
Induction in Illinois context	23 (62%)	7 (39%)	16 (84%)	10 (59%)	13 (65%)	12 (75%)	11 (52%)	8 (44%)
Evaluating beginning teachers	18 (49%)	9 (50%)	9 (47%)	7 (41%)	11 (55%)	6 (38%)	12 (57%)	11 (61%)
Illinois Induction Standards and/or Illinois Induction Programs Continuum	18 (49%)	5 (28%)	13 (68%)	9 (53%)	9 (45%)	8 (50%)	10 (48%)	8 (44%)
NBPT Standards	12 (32%)	4 (22%)	8 (42%)	4 (24%)	8 (40%)	6 (38%)	6 (29%)	4 (22%)

**Table 1.4. Number of administrators who received induction and mentoring training**

Programs were asked how many district- and building-level administrators have received induction and mentoring training to date. They were instructed to omit administrators who have no involvement with the induction and mentoring program, with mentors, or with novice teachers.

In this table, the percentages in each cell are of the total number of administrators (either district-level or building-level) in each category, not of the total number of programs in each category. Fifty programs provided numbers for both district-level and building-level administrators; six programs only provided numbers for one or the other.

Note: Programs were also asked if any school board members had attended the administrator trainings. Only two programs—both based in single districts—checked yes. Additionally, consortium-based programs were asked if any of their component districts provided additional induction-related professional development to administrators. Only one ROE said yes, and the training was provided at only one of their component districts.

		All programs	District-based programs	Consortium-based programs	Initially funded in 2009	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008	75+ beginning teachers	<75 beginning teachers
District-level administrators	# of programs responding to this question	53	29	24	21	32	20	32
	Total number of district administrators	608	243	365	237	371	380	222
	Trained prior to June 1, 2009	305 (50%)	134 (55%)	171 (47%)	104 (44%)	201 (54%)	214 (56%)	87 (39%)
	Trained between June 1, 2009 and May 31, 2010	160 (26%)	69 (29%)	91 (25%)	96 (41%)	64 (17%)	76 (20%)	84 (38%)
	Have never been trained	143 (24%)	40 (16%)	103 (28%)	37 (16%)	106 (29%)	90 (24%)	51 (23%)
Building-level administrators	# of programs responding to this question	53	30	23	21	32	19	33
	Total number of building administrators	1966	1060	906	417	1549	1328	620
	Trained prior to June 1, 2009	991 (50%)	487 (46%)	504 (56%)	211 (51%)	780 (50%)	695 (52%)	289 (47%)
	Trained between June 1, 2009 and May 31, 2010	691 (35%)	504 (48%)	187 (20%)	182 (44%)	509 (33%)	475 (36%)	216 (35%)
	Have never been trained	284 (14%)	69 (7%)	215 (24%)	24 (6%)	260 (17%)	158 (12%)	115 (19%)

## STANDARD 6: MENTOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

This section covers mentor professional development which occurred between October 1, 2009 and May 31, 2010. Data Brief #2 covered mentor professional development which occurred during the summer (June 1, 2009 through September 30, 2009).

**Table 2.1. Availability and length of mentor training**

Programs were asked whether they provided training for their mentors, divided into four categories: required initial training, optional initial training, required ongoing training, and required ongoing training. Programs were asked to count only the hours that a single mentor could reasonably be expected to attend and were asked to omit hours for repeated sessions offered to accommodate large numbers of mentors.

Each cell shows the number of programs which indicated that they held any mentor training in that category. The number in parenthesis is the mean number of hours that the training lasted.

Connections between categories:

- 1 program held both required initial and optional initial training
- 12 programs held both required ongoing and optional ongoing training
- 27 programs offered some initial (required and/or optional) and some ongoing (required and/or optional) training
- 5 programs left the question blank (3 districts, 2 consortia; 4 new programs, 1 continuing; 2 large programs, 3 small)
- 5 entered 0 for each category (2 districts, 3 consortia; 1 new program, 4 continuing; 1 large program, 4 small)

	All programs	District-based programs	Consortium-based programs	Initially funded in 2009	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008	75+ beginning teachers	<75 beginning teachers
Required initial training	32 (16.9)	16 (17.5)	16 (16.4)	14 (16.8)	18 (17.0)	12 (21.2)	19 (14.7)
Optional initial training	3 (11.0)	0	3 (11.0)	1 (16.0)	2 (8.5)	2 (9.5)	1 (14)
Required ongoing training	37 (23.3)	26 (27.8)	11 (12.7)	15 (25.8)	22 (21.6)	10 (21.9)	26 (24.5)
Optional ongoing training	19 (12.9)	9 (15.9)	10 (10.2)	9 (8.8)	10 (16.6)	9 (16.8)	10 (9.4)

**Table 2.2. Materials used in initial mentor training**

Programs were asked what materials were used in initial mentor training.

	All programs (34)	District-based programs (16)	Consortium-based programs (18)	Initially funded in 2009 (15)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (19)	75+ beginning teachers (13)	<75 beginning teachers (20)
Presenters prepared their own training materials (other than those adapted from specific materials below)	18 (53%)	10 (63%)	8 (44%)	8 (53%)	10 (53%)	5 (38%)	12 (60%)
Induction for the 21st Century Educator (ICE 21) materials	17 (50%)	4 (25%)	13 (72%)	8 (53%)	9 (47%)	9 (69%)	7 (35%)
Charlotte Danielson framework	16 (47%)	9 (56%)	7 (39%)	7 (47%)	9 (47%)	6 (46%)	10 (50%)
New Teacher Center (NTC) or Consortium for Educational Change (CEC) materials	14 (41%)	12 (75%)	2 (11%)	7 (47%)	7 (37%)	4 (31%)	10 (50%)
Cognitive Coaching	8 (24%)	5 (31%)	3 (17%)	6 (40%)	2 (11%)	2 (15%)	6 (30%)
Other prepared or purchased materials	3 (9%)	1 (6%)	2 (11%)	0	3 (16%)	2 (15%)	1 (5%)

**Table 2.3. Content covered in mentor training**

Programs were asked what content was covered in initial mentor training. The last column indicates content covered in ongoing mentor training (i.e. any training subsequent to the initial training).

	All programs (34)	District-based programs (16)	Consortium-based programs (18)	Initially funded in 2009 (15)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (19)	75+ beginning teachers (13)	<75 beginning teachers (20)	Covered in ongoing training, all programs (26)
Induction, in general	33 (97%)	16 (100%)	17 (94%)	14 (93%)	19 (100%)	12 (92%)	20 (100%)	8 (31%)
Stages / continuum of beginning teacher development	33 (97%)	15 (94%)	18 (100%)	14 (93%)	19 (100%)	13 (100%)	19 (95%)	14 (54%)
Establishing relationship with mentee	33 (97%)	15 (94%)	18 (100%)	14 (93%)	19 (100%)	13 (100%)	19 (95%)	14 (54%)
Mentor language and roles	32 (94%)	15 (94%)	17 (94%)	14 (93%)	18 (95%)	13 (100%)	18 (90%)	16 (62%)
Induction and mentoring research	31 (91%)	15 (94%)	16 (89%)	14 (93%)	17 (89%)	13 (100%)	17 (85%)	13 (50%)
Mentoring vs. evaluation	30 (88%)	14 (88%)	16 (89%)	13 (87%)	17 (89%)	13 (100%)	16 (80%)	15 (58%)
Specific program expectations	28 (82%)	14 (88%)	14 (78%)	11 (73%)	17 (89%)	10 (77%)	17 (85%)	12 (46%)
Keeping records	28 (82%)	12 (75%)	16 (89%)	13 (87%)	15 (79%)	11 (85%)	17 (85%)	17 (65%)
Communicating with administration	28 (82%)	11 (69%)	17 (94%)	11 (73%)	17 (89%)	12 (92%)	15 (75%)	13 (50%)
State context	26 (76%)	11 (69%)	15 (83%)	12 (80%)	14 (74%)	12 (92%)	14 (70%)	9 (35%)
Illinois Teaching or Learning standards, or content area standards	26 (76%)	11 (69%)	15 (83%)	12 (80%)	14 (74%)	12 (92%)	13 (65%)	18 (69%)
Conferencing and feedback skills	26 (76%)	10 (63%)	16 (89%)	10 (67%)	16 (84%)	12 (92%)	13 (65%)	20 (77%)
Working with adult learners	25 (74%)	10 (63%)	15 (83%)	11 (73%)	14 (74%)	11 (85%)	13 (65%)	15 (58%)
Observation strategies and tools	21 (62%)	8 (50%)	13 (72%)	10 (67%)	11 (58%)	12 (92%)	8 (40%)	21 (81%)
Illinois Induction and Mentoring Standards, or Induction Program Continuum	19 (56%)	6 (38%)	13 (72%)	9 (60%)	10 (53%)	9 (69%)	10 (50%)	13 (50%)
Analyzing student work	15 (44%)	4 (25%)	11 (61%)	6 (40%)	9 (47%)	10 (77%)	5 (25%)	20 (77%)

**Table 2.4. Description of ongoing mentor training**

Programs were asked to describe their required ongoing mentor training. They could select all options that applied.

	All programs (28)	District-based programs (18)	Consortium-based programs (10)	Initially funded in 2009 (12)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (16)	75+ beginning teachers (8)	<75 beginning teachers (20)
Networking with other mentors	20 (71%)	13 (72%)	7 (70%)	6 (50%)	14 (88%)	5 (63%)	15 (75%)
Formal professional development sessions (beyond a refresher of initial training)	19 (68%)	15 (83%)	4 (40%)	8 (67%)	11 (69%)	4 (50%)	15 (75%)
Mentoring of mentors (e.g. by mentor coordinator)	18 (64%)	11 (61%)	7 (70%)	5 (42%)	13 (81%)	7 (88%)	11 (55%)
Refresher of initial training	15 (54%)	7 (39%)	8 (80%)	7 (58%)	8 (50%)	5 (63%)	10 (50%)
Book or research study group	4 (14%)	3 (17%)	1 (10%)	1 (8%)	3 (19%)	1 (13%)	3 (15%)
Online discussion forum	2 (7%)	0	2 (20%)	0	2 (13%)	1 (13%)	1 (5%)

**Table 2.5. Percent of mentors receiving training**

Programs were asked what percent of their active mentors have received initial training at any point in time and what percent of their active mentors participated in ongoing professional development from October 1, 2009 through May 31, 2010.

	All programs	District-based programs	Consortium-based programs	Initially funded in 2009	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008	75+ beginning teachers	<75 beginning teachers
# of programs indicating what percent of active mentors have been trained	59	33	26	25	34	20	38
Mean percent of active mentors who have been trained	97.5%	97.1%	98.0%	97.8%	97.2%	99.0%	96.7%
# of programs indicating that 100% of mentors have been trained	49 (83%)	28 (85%)	21 (81%)	20 (80%)	29 (85%)	18 (90%)	31 (82%)
# of programs indicating what percent of active mentors participated in ongoing professional development	43	26	17	18	25	14	28
Less than 50% regularly participated	9 (21%)	4 (15%)	5 (29%)	3 (17%)	6 (24%)	4 (29%)	4 (14%)
50% - 79% regularly participated	4 (9%)	3 (12%)	1 (6%)	3 (17%)	1 (4%)	1 (7%)	3 (11%)
80% - 100% regularly participated	30 (70%)	19 (73%)	11 (65%)	12 (67%)	18 (72%)	9 (64%)	21 (75%)

## STANDARD 7: DEVELOPMENT OF BEGINNING TEACHER PRACTICE

This section covers beginning teacher professional development which occurred between October 1, 2009 and May 31, 2010. Data Brief #2 covered beginning teacher professional development which occurred during the summer (June 1, 2009 through September 30, 2009).

**Table 3.1. Availability and length of first-year teacher professional development**

Programs were asked whether they provided training for their first-year teachers, divided into four categories:

- professional development provided specifically for first-year teachers and a required as a part of program participation
- professional development provided specifically for first-year teachers, with optional attendance
- professional development opportunities open to all teachers; first-year teachers required to attend
- professional development opportunities open to all teachers, with optional attendance

Programs were asked to count only the hours that a single first-year teacher could reasonably be expected to attend and were asked to not count hours for repeated sessions offered to accommodate large numbers of teachers.

Each cell shows the number of programs which indicated that they held any professional development in that category. The number in parenthesis is the mean number of hours that the training lasted.

16 programs held both required and optional professional development for first-year teachers

5 programs held professional development for all teachers of which some was required for first-year teachers to attend while some was optional to attend

Only 1 program (single district, funded in 2009, <75 beginning teachers) left the question blank or put 0s for all answers

	All programs	District-based programs	Consortium-based programs	Initially funded in 2009	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008	75+ beginning teachers	<75 beginning teachers
Required professional development, for 1 <sup>st</sup> -year teachers only	43 (17.5)	29 (20.1)	14 (12.0)	17 (20.1)	26 (15.8)	14 (12.6)	28 (20.1)
Optional professional development, for 1 <sup>st</sup> -year teachers only	28 (14.1)	13 (13.8)	15 (14.3)	8 (9.1)	20 (16.0)	13 (10.0)	15 (17.6)
Required professional development, open to all teachers	18 (20.1)	13 (23.8)	5 (10.2)	5 (23.7)	13 (18.7)	5 (18.4)	13 (20.7)
Optional professional development, open to all teachers	26 (27.8)	12 (22.6)	14 (32.2)	10 (21.7)	16 (31.6)	12 (34.3)	13 (23.3)

**Table 3.2. Availability and length of second-year teacher professional development**

Programs were asked whether they provided training for their first-year teachers, divided into four categories:

- professional development provided specifically for second-year teachers and required as a part of program participation
- professional development provided specifically for second-year teachers, with optional attendance
- professional development opportunities open to all teachers; second-year teachers required to attend
- professional development opportunities open to all teachers, with optional attendance

Programs were asked to count only the hours that a single second-year teacher could reasonably be expected to attend, and were asked to not count hours for repeated sessions offered to accommodate large numbers of teachers.

Each cell shows the number of programs which indicated that they held any professional development in that category. The number in parenthesis is the mean number of hours that the training lasted.

4 programs held both required and optional professional development for second-year teachers

4 programs held professional development for all teachers of which some was required for second-year teachers to attend while some was optional to attend

	All programs	District-based programs	Consortium-based programs	Initially funded in 2009	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008	75+ beginning teachers	<75 beginning teachers
Required professional development, for 2 <sup>nd</sup> -year teachers only	27 (13.1)	21 (12.9)	6 (14.2)	9 (13.0)	18 (13.2)	9 (9.3)	17 (15.4)
Optional professional development, for 2 <sup>nd</sup> -year teachers only	10 (11.4)	5 (8.6)	5 (14.1)	1 (6.0)	9 (11.9)	6 (12.1)	4 (10.3)
Required professional development, open to all teachers	15 (15.1)	10 (17.4)	5 (10.4)	3 (19.3)	12 (14.0)	5 (7.0)	10 (19.1)
Optional professional development, open to all teachers	19 (21.9)	9 (20.9)	10 (22.9)	5 (12.6)	14 (25.3)	10 (26.5)	9 (16.9)

**Table 3.3. Materials used in first-year teacher professional development**

Programs were asked what materials were used in professional development sessions for first-year teachers from October 1, 2009 through May 31, 2010. Other materials may have been used in initial teacher training during summer 2009, as described in Data Brief #2.

	All programs (55)	District-based programs (33)	Consortium-based programs (22)	Initially funded in 2009 (21)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (34)	75+ beginning teachers (19)	<75 beginning teachers (35)
Presenters prepared their own training materials (other than those adapted from specific materials below)	46 (84%)	30 (91%)	16 (73%)	19 (90%)	27 (79%)	15 (79%)	31 (89%)
New Teacher Center (NTC) or Consortium for Educational Change (CEC) materials	19 (35%)	16 (48%)	3 (14%)	7 (33%)	12 (35%)	6 (32%)	12 (34%)
Induction for the 21st Century Educator (ICE 21) materials	23 (42%)	6 (18%)	17 (77%)	10 (48%)	13 (38%)	9 (47%)	13 (37%)
Charlotte Danielson framework	29 (53%)	22 (67%)	7 (32%)	12 (57%)	17 (50%)	10 (53%)	19 (54%)
Harry and Rosemary Wong's <i>First Days of School</i>	24 (44%)	12 (36%)	12 (55%)	8 (38%)	16 (47%)	8 (42%)	15 (43%)
Other prepared or purchased materials (top choices: Ruby Payne's <i>A Framework for Understanding Poverty</i> (4); Paula Rutherford's <i>Why Didn't I Learn This in College?</i> (3); Robert Marzano's <i>The Art and Science of Teaching</i> (2))	18 (33%)	13 (39%)	5 (23%)	6 (29%)	12 (35%)	7 (37%)	11 (31%)

**Table 3.4. Materials used in second-year teacher professional development**

Programs were asked what materials were used in professional development sessions for second-year teachers from October 1, 2009 through May 31, 2010. Other materials may have been used in initial teacher training during summer 2009, as described in Data Brief #2.

	All programs (32)	District-based programs (22)	Consortium-based programs (10)	Initially funded in 2009 (9)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (23)	75+ beginning teachers (12)	<75 beginning teachers (19)
Presenters prepared their own training materials (other than those adapted from specific materials below)	25 (78%)	19 (86%)	6 (60%)	8 (89%)	17 (74%)	8 (67%)	16 (84%)
Charlotte Danielson framework	13 (41%)	10 (45%)	3 (30%)	3 (33%)	10 (43%)	5 (42%)	8 (42%)
New Teacher Center (NTC) or Consortium for Educational Change (CEC) materials	12 (38%)	10 (45%)	2 (20%)	2 (22%)	10 (43%)	5 (42%)	6 (32%)
Induction for the 21st Century Educator (ICE 21) materials	11 (34%)	5 (23%)	6 (60%)	4 (44%)	7 (30%)	3 (25%)	7 (37%)
Harry and Rosemary Wong's <i>First Days of School</i>	7 (22%)	5 (23%)	2 (20%)	1 (11%)	6 (26%)	2 (17%)	5 (26%)
Other prepared or purchased materials (top choice: Ruby Payne's <i>A Framework for Understanding Poverty</i> (2))	12 (38%)	11 (50%)	1 (10%)	5 (56%)	7 (30%)	3 (25%)	8 (42%)

**Table 3.5. Content covered in professional development for first-year teachers**

Programs were asked what content was covered in professional development for first-year teachers from October 1, 2009 through May 31, 2010. Other content may have been covered in initial teacher training during summer 2009, as described in Data Brief #2. The last column is taken from Table 3.6 and shows the content covered in professional development for second-year teachers.

	All programs (55)	District-based programs (33)	Consortium-based programs (22)	Initially funded in 2009 (21)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (34)	75+ beginning teachers (19)	<75 beginning teachers (35)	Covered in professional development for 2 <sup>nd</sup> year teachers, all programs (31)
Classroom management / environment	55 (100%)	33 (100%)	22 (100%)	21 (100%)	34 (100%)	19 (100%)	35 (100%)	20 (65%)
General instruction / teaching strategies / pedagogy	50 (91%)	30 (91%)	20 (91%)	19 (90%)	31 (91%)	17 (89%)	32 (91%)	22 (71%)
Lesson planning / unit planning / curriculum	46 (84%)	29 (88%)	17 (77%)	19 (90%)	27 (79%)	15 (79%)	31 (89%)	21 (68%)
Illinois Learning Standards / content area standards	44 (80%)	26 (79%)	18 (82%)	17 (81%)	27 (79%)	17 (89%)	26 (74%)	22 (71%)
Illinois Professional Teaching Standards	44 (80%)	24 (73%)	20 (91%)	18 (86%)	26 (76%)	15 (79%)	28 (80%)	19 (61%)
Induction program expectations	42 (76%)	23 (70%)	19 (86%)	20 (95%)	22 (65%)	13 (68%)	28 (80%)	17 (55%)
Differentiating instruction	40 (73%)	24 (73%)	16 (73%)	15 (71%)	25 (74%)	15 (79%)	24 (69%)	27 (87%)
Working with parents, administrators, and/or the community	40 (73%)	25 (76%)	15 (68%)	18 (86%)	22 (65%)	12 (63%)	27 (77%)	16 (52%)
Content-area-specific teaching strategies	38 (69%)	26 (79%)	12 (55%)	17 (81%)	21 (62%)	12 (63%)	26 (74%)	19 (61%)
Formative and summative assessment methods / strategies	37 (67%)	21 (64%)	16 (73%)	14 (67%)	23 (68%)	14 (74%)	22 (63%)	22 (71%)
School/district policies and procedures	34 (62%)	25 (76%)	9 (41%)	14 (67%)	20 (59%)	13 (68%)	20 (57%)	9 (29%)
Special education / inclusion / RtI / social-emotional learning	33 (60%)	21 (64%)	12 (55%)	14 (67%)	19 (56%)	13 (68%)	19 (54%)	16 (52%)
Working with diverse populations or English language learners	33 (60%)	21 (64%)	12 (55%)	14 (67%)	19 (56%)	12 (63%)	21 (60%)	16 (52%)
Analysis of student work	31 (56%)	16 (48%)	15 (68%)	12 (57%)	19 (56%)	9 (47%)	22 (63%)	21 (68%)
Child development / psychology / learning styles / learning theory	23 (42%)	15 (45%)	8 (36%)	10 (48%)	13 (38%)	8 (42%)	14 (40%)	13 (43%)
Legal issues for teachers	15 (27%)	8 (24%)	7 (32%)	7 (38%)	8 (21%)	7 (37%)	8 (23%)	5 (16%)

**Table 3.6. Content covered in professional development for second-year teachers**

Programs were asked what content was covered in professional development for second-year teachers from October 1, 2009 through May 31, 2010. Other content may have been covered in initial teacher training during summer 2009, as described in Data Brief #2.

	All programs (31)	District-based programs (22)	Consortium-based programs (9)	Initially funded in 2009 (8)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (23)	75+ beginning teachers (12)	<75 beginning teachers (18)
Differentiating instruction	27 (87%)	18 (82%)	9 (100%)	7 (88%)	20 (87%)	11 (92%)	15 (83%)
Illinois Learning Standards / content area standards	22 (71%)	15 (68%)	7 (78%)	6 (75%)	16 (70%)	9 (75%)	12 (67%)
General instruction / teaching strategies / pedagogy	22 (71%)	16 (73%)	6 (67%)	6 (75%)	16 (70%)	8 (67%)	13 (72%)
Formative and summative assessment methods / strategies	22 (71%)	15 (68%)	7 (78%)	6 (75%)	16 (70%)	9 (75%)	12 (67%)
Analysis of student work	21 (68%)	14 (64%)	7 (78%)	6 (75%)	15 (65%)	7 (58%)	14 (78%)
Lesson planning / unit planning / curriculum	21 (68%)	16 (73%)	5 (56%)	6 (75%)	15 (65%)	8 (67%)	13 (72%)
Classroom management / environment	20 (65%)	13 (59%)	7 (78%)	4 (50%)	16 (70%)	9 (75%)	10 (56%)
Illinois Professional Teaching Standards	19 (61%)	13 (59%)	6 (67%)	6 (75%)	13 (57%)	6 (50%)	12 (67%)
Content-area-specific teaching strategies	19 (61%)	12 (55%)	7 (78%)	6 (75%)	13 (57%)	7 (58%)	12 (67%)
Induction program expectations	17 (55%)	10 (45%)	7 (78%)	5 (63%)	12 (52%)	5 (42%)	11 (61%)
Special education / inclusion / RtI / social-emotional learning	16 (52%)	11 (50%)	5 (56%)	4 (50%)	12 (52%)	6 (50%)	9 (50%)
Working with diverse populations or English language learners	16 (52%)	10 (45%)	6 (67%)	5 (63%)	11 (48%)	5 (42%)	10 (56%)
Working with parents, administrators, and/or the community	16 (52%)	10 (45%)	6 (67%)	4 (50%)	12 (52%)	5 (42%)	10 (56%)
Child development / psychology / learning styles / learning theory	13 (43%)	8 (36%)	5 (56%)	3 (38%)	10 (43%)	7 (58%)	5 (28%)
School/district policies and procedures	9 (29%)	6 (27%)	3 (33%)	1 (13%)	8 (35%)	5 (42%)	3 (17%)
Legal issues for teachers	5 (16%)	3 (14%)	2 (22%)	1 (13%)	4 (17%)	3 (25%)	2 (11%)

**Table 3.7. Differentiation in professional development**

Programs were asked how they differentiated training or professional development for new teachers.

	All programs (53)	District-based programs (31)	Consortium-based programs (22)	Initially funded in 2009 (20)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (33)	75+ beginning teachers (20)	<75 beginning teachers (32)
By grade level (e.g. elementary / secondary)	40 (75%)	25 (81%)	15 (68%)	15 (75%)	25 (76%)	15 (75%)	24 (75%)
By content area or specialization	37 (70%)	25 (81%)	12 (55%)	16 (80%)	21 (64%)	12 (60%)	25 (78%)
By years of experience	26 (49%)	14 (45%)	12 (55%)	8 (40%)	18 (55%)	10 (50%)	15 (47%)

**Table 3.8. Percent of new teachers attending optional professional development**

Programs were asked what percent of their new teachers participated in optional professional development from October 1, 2009 through May 31, 2010.

	All programs	District-based programs	Consortium-based programs	Initially funded in 2009	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008	75+ beginning teachers	<75 beginning teachers
# of programs indicating what percent of <b>first-year</b> teachers attended optional professional development	29	14	15	8	21	14	15
Less than 50% regularly participated	10 (34%)	4 (29%)	6 (40%)	3 (38%)	7 (33%)	8 (57%)	2 (13%)
50% - 79% regularly participated	7 (24%)	4 (29%)	3 (20%)	2 (25%)	5 (24%)	0	7 (47%)
80% - 100% regularly participated	12 (41%)	6 (43%)	6 (40%)	3 (38%)	9 (43%)	6 (43%)	6 (40%)
# of programs indicating what percent of <b>second-year</b> teachers attended optional professional development	11	6	5	1	10	7	4
Less than 50% regularly participated	5 (45%)	3 (50%)	2 (40%)	1 (100%)	4 (40%)	3 (43%)	2 (50%)
50% - 79% regularly participated	2 (18%)	0	2 (40%)	0	2 (20%)	1 (14%)	1 (25%)
80% - 100% regularly participated	4 (36%)	3 (50%)	1 (20%)	0	4 (40%)	3 (43%)	1 (25%)

## PROGRAM DISAGGREGATION

---

Tables in this section show the intersections among the three binary methods of program classification: district-based programs vs. consortium-based programs; programs initially funded in 2009 vs. programs initially funded in 2006 or 2008; programs serving 75 or more beginning teachers vs. programs serving fewer than 75 beginning teachers. These are the ways that programs are disaggregated in the preceding tables in this appendix.

In some tables, the percentages of programs serving 75+ vs. <75 beginning teachers do not add up to 100. This is because one program did not provide complete information on the number of beginning teachers that it serves.

**Table 4.1. District-based programs (35 total)**

Initially funded in 2009	15 (43%)
Initially funded in 2006 or 2008	20 (57%)
75+ beginning teachers	8 (23%)
<75 beginning teachers	26 (74%)

**Table 4.2. Consortium-based programs (26 total)**

Initially funded in 2009	10 (38%)
Initially funded in 2006 or 2008	16 (62%)
75+ beginning teachers	13 (50%)
<75 beginning teachers	13 (50%)

**Table 4.3. Programs initially funded in 2009 (25 total)**

District-based programs	15 (60%)
Consortium-based programs	10 (40%)
75+ beginning teachers	5 (20%)
<75 beginning teachers	20 (80%)

**Table 4.4. Programs initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (36 total)**

District-based programs	20 (56%)
Consortium-based programs	16 (44%)
75+ beginning teachers	16 (44%)
<75 beginning teachers	19 (53%)

**Table 4.5. Programs serving 75 or more beginning teachers (21 total)**

District-based programs	8 (38%)
Consortium-based programs	13 (62%)
Initially funded in 2009	5 (24%)
Initially funded in 2006 or 2008	16 (76%)

**Table 4.6. Programs serving fewer than 75 beginning teachers (39 total)**

District-based programs	26 (67%)
Consortium-based programs	13 (33%)
Initially funded in 2009	20 (51%)
Initially funded in 2006 or 2008	19 (49%)