

Appendix to INTC Data Brief #1

February 2011

Prepared by: Patricia Brady

With assistance from: Jeff Kohmstedt and the INTC staff

INTC Director: Chris Roegge

This Appendix provides tables, charts, and analyses of quantitative and qualitative data. Data from Sections 1 and 3 were reported on the fall 2010 Common Data Elements (CDE) reporting form by the programs that received grant funding in FY11. Section 2 contains publicly-available Illinois school report card data. Data in Section 5 were reported on a separate survey for the programs which declined to seek FY11 continuation funding.

This Appendix is organized into the following sections:

- Section 1: Demographic characteristics of mentors and novices, including retention data
- Section 2: Demographic characteristics of funded programs
- Section 3: Impact of reductions in funding
- Section 4: Program disaggregation
- Section 5: Non-continuing programs

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

Notes on the data

In FY10, INTC received 61 CDEs. Fifteen programs declined to seek continuation funding for FY11, so 46 programs were invited to complete this CDE. One program did not complete the CDE until after this report was complete. Overall, the Data Brief reports on 45 programs, of which 27 are single-district and 18 are consortium-based. The 45 programs also represent 14 that were initially funded in 2009, 23 that were initially funded in 2008, and eight that were funded in 2006. Nine programs have at least 75 new teachers participating, and 36 have fewer than 75.

The number of CDEs received differs from the administrative number of programs. Two programs are funded as a unit but operate as separate and unique programs, so they completed two CDEs.

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

In this Appendix, total numbers (e.g. of district-based programs or consortium-based programs) may vary from table to table. This is because incomplete data were received from the programs—some programs provided some figures but not others. In each table, the total number of programs responding in each category appears in parentheses in the blue header row(s) or blue initial column(s).

The survey for non-continuing programs was sent to 15 programs which had been funded in FY10; 10 responded. This survey also includes multiple-choice, short-response, and extended-response questions.

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. 2008 vs. 2006; and larger programs (serving 75 or more first- and second-year teachers) vs. smaller programs. Tables 4.1 – 4.7 in this Appendix show the intersections among programs in these three groups.

SECTION 1: DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF MENTORS AND NOVICES

Total numbers (e.g. of first-year teachers or of mentors) may vary from table to table. This is because incomplete data were received from the programs—some programs provided some figures but not other figures.

Table 1.1. Total number of participating teachers

The first, second, and fourth columns show the total number of teachers participating in the induction program for the past three years. The third and fifth columns show the increase or decrease in the number of teachers from the previous year, both in absolute terms and as a percentage.

	Total number of teachers 08-09	Total number of teachers 09-10	Increase from 08-09	Total number of teachers 10-11	Decrease from 09-10	Decrease from 08-09
First-year teachers	1,759	2,375	616 (35% increase)	1,109	1,266 (53% decrease)	650 (37% decrease)
Second-year teachers	1,122	1,959	837 (75% increase)	985	974 (50% decrease)	137 (12% decrease)
Mentors	1,813	2,496	683 (38% increase)	1,312	1,184 (47% decrease)	501 (28% decrease)

Table 1.2. Change in number of teachers for individual programs: absolute numbers

This table shows the change in the number of teachers served by each individual program from fall 2009 (FY10) to fall 2010 (FY11). The last two columns disaggregate the programs by the number of new teachers they served in fall 2009 (FY10), not the current number of new teachers, in order to show how programs of different sizes were impacted. From FY10 to FY11, many programs moved from the “large” category to “small” and vice-versa, so the decision was made to use FY10 size classifications for this and the following table.

Notes:

The average program had a net loss of 29 new teachers served from fall 2009 to fall 2010.

One program (a small consortium initially funded in 2006) had exactly the same number of teachers in FY10 and FY11, so its data are not included in this table.

		All programs (43)	District-based programs (26)	Consortium-based programs (17)	Initially funded in 2009 (14)	Initially funded in 2008 (22)	Initially funded in 2006 (7)	75+ beginning teachers (14)	<75 beginning teachers (29)
Programs with more new teachers in FY11	# of programs	7	4	3	5	2	0	1	6
	Average gain: # of teachers	14.4	11.8	18	9.4	27	---	50	8.5
	Minimum gain	1	2	1	1	4	---	---	1
	Maximum gain	50	23	50	23	50	---	---	23
Programs with fewer new teachers in FY11	# of programs	36	22	14	9	20	7	13	23
	Average loss: # of teachers	37.7	31.5	47.4	29	32.6	63.4	60.5	24.8
	Minimum loss	2	2	2	7	2	2	2	2
	Maximum loss	218	218	150	69	150	218	150	90

Table 1.3. Change in number of teachers for individual programs: percent gain/loss

This table shows the percent gain or loss change in the number of teachers served by each individual program from fall 2009 (FY10) to fall 2010 (FY11). The last two columns disaggregate the programs by the number of new teachers they served in fall 2009 (FY10), not the current number of new teachers. The averages in this table are not weighted.

Notes:

Taken together, the FY11 programs experienced a 38% drop in the number of new teachers served from the previous year.

One program (a small consortium initially funded in 2006) had exactly the same number of teachers in FY10 and FY11, so its data are not included on this table.

		All programs (43)	District-based programs (26)	Consortium-based programs (17)	Initially funded in 2009 (14)	Initially funded in 2008 (22)	Initially funded in 2006 (7)	75+ beginning teachers (14)	<75 beginning teachers (29)
Programs with more new teachers in FY11	# of programs	7	4	3	5	2	0	1	6
	Average unweighted gain as a percentage of teachers	58%	77%	33%	55%	68%	---	85%	54%
	Minimum gain	6%	20%	6%	6%	50%	---	---	6%
	Maximum gain	177%	177%	85%	177%	85%	---	---	177%
Programs with fewer new teachers in FY11	# of programs	36	22	14	9	20	7	13	23
	Average unweighted loss as a percentage of teachers	39%	37%	43%	51%	33%	43%	34%	42%
	Minimum loss	2%	2%	8%	35%	3%	2%	2%	8%
	Maximum loss	72%	72%	72%	72%	70%	72%	70%	72%

Table 1.4. Teaching level

Each cell contains the number of teachers—across all responding funded programs—in each category. The number in parentheses provides the percentage of the total number of teachers in that category teaching at (or specializing in) each level. The last column provides the approximate number of students served by these teachers. We performed this rough calculation by multiplying the number of pre-K and elementary teachers by 20, and the number of middle school and junior and senior high school teachers by 80, in order to provide a rough and probably conservative estimate of student numbers.

Note: Some teachers work with multiple grade levels (e.g. K-8, which encompasses both elementary and middle school). To reflect this, programs were given the option to categorize any individual teacher as .5 at one level and .5 at another.

		Pre-K	Elementary	Middle school / junior high	Senior high school	Total # of teachers	Apx. # of students
2010-11	First-year teachers	32 (3%)	429.5 (39%)	263.5 (24%)	374 (34%)	1,099	60,230
	Second-year teachers	46 (5%)	408 (43%)	209 (22%)	277 (29%)	940	47,960
	Mentors	24 (2%)	539 (42%)	278.5 (22%)	453.5 (35%)	1,295	N/A
2009-10	First-year teachers	75 (3%)	983 (42%)	497 (21%)	787 (34%)	2,342	123,880
	Second-year teachers	70 (4%)	809 (42%)	452 (24%)	582 (30%)	1,913	100,300
	Mentors	52 (2%)	1,009 (41%)	613 (25%)	789 (32%)	2,463	N/A
2008-09	First-year teachers	58 (4%)	666 (43%)	378 (25%)	435 (28%)	1,537	79,520
	Mentors	43 (3%)	739 (44%)	404 (24%)	478 (29%)	1,674 ¹	N/A

¹ This figure includes 10 teachers who were classified as “other”, which was not a category on the fall 2009 and fall 2010 CDEs.

Table 1.5. Content area/subjects taught

Each cell contains the number of teachers—across all responding funded programs—in each category. The number in parentheses provides the percentage of the total number of teachers in that category teaching in each content area.

		Grade level (e.g. Grade 2)	Special education	ESL / Bilingual	Math or science	English or social studies	Special subject (e.g. art, music)	Other	Total
2010-11	First-year teachers	291 (26%)	206 (19%)	71 (6%)	186 (17%)	136 (12%)	136 (12%)	75 (7%)	1,099
	Second- year teachers	305 (32%)	149 (16%)	61 (6%)	119 (13%)	113 (12%)	154 (16%)	39 (4%)	940
	Mentors	374 (33%)	173 (15%)	34 (3%)	172 (15%)	192 (17%)	128 (11%)	75 (7%)	1,148
2009-10	First-year teachers	691 (30%)	385 (17%)	99 (4%)	737 (32%) ²		294 (13%)	87 (4%)	2293
	Second- year teachers	631 (33%)	261 (14%)	96 (5%)	615 (32%)		238 (12%)	65 (3%)	1906
	Mentors	813 (33%)	355 (15%)	75.5 (3%)	869.5 (36%)		228 (9%)	93 (4%)	2434
2008-09	First-year teachers ³	600 (39%)	193 (13%)	Not a category in 2008-09	507 (33%)		187 (12%)	48 (3%)	1535
	Mentors	620 (38%)	186 (11%)		560 (34%)		177 (11%)	82 (5%)	1625

² The fall 2009 and 2008 CDEs did not distinguish between math/science and English/social studies/history teachers; instead, they grouped all of these under “content-area teachers”.

³ The 2008-09 CDE survey did not gather this information for second-year teachers.

Table 1.6. Teacher race

Each cell contains the number of teachers—across all responding funded programs—in each category. The number in parentheses provides the percentage of the total number of teachers in that category of each race. Percentages rounded to less than 1% are omitted.

		White	Black	Hispanic ⁴	Native Hawaiian / Pacific Islander ⁵	Asian	Native American	Two or more races	Total
2010-11	First-year teachers	871 (85%)	80 (8%)	Not a category in 2010-11	0	10 (1%)	7 (1%)	55 (5%)	1,023
	Second-year teachers	756 (86%)	64 (7%)		1	15 (2%)	1	44 (5%)	881
	Mentors	1,036 (93%)	63 (6%)		1	3	2	12 (1%)	1,117
2009-10	First-year teachers	1,981 (90%)	148 (7%)	Not a category in 2009-10	9	18 (1%)	2	42 (2%)	2,200
	Second-year teachers	1,680 (88%)	182 (10%)		2	16 (1%)	1	33 (2%)	1,914
	Mentors	2,185 (94%)	125 (5%)		0	8 (0.3%)	0	14	2,332
2008-09	First-year teachers	1,370 (83%)	148 (10%)	89 (5%)	Not a category in 2008-09	19 (1%)	3	13	1,642
	Mentors	1,520 (90%)	118 (10%)	33 (2%)		3	0	6	1,680

Table 1.7. Teacher ethnicity

Each cell contains the number of teachers—across all responding funded programs—in each category. The number in parentheses provides the percentage of the total number of teachers in that category of each ethnicity. Ethnicity data were not gathered for 2008-09.

		Latino	Not Latino	Total
2010-11	First-year teachers	50 (5%)	969 (95%)	1,019
	Second-year teachers	60 (7%)	813 (93%)	873
	Mentors	31 (3%)	1,098 (97%)	1,129
2009-10	First-year teachers	118 (5%)	2,073 (95%)	2,191
	Second-year teachers	76 (4%)	1,790 (96%)	1,866
	Mentors	45 (2%)	2,157 (98%)	2,202

⁴ “Hispanic” is no longer a category for 2009-10. State reporting guidelines now ask for ethnicity (Latino/not Latino) to be reported separately from race.

⁵ This racial category is new for 2009-10.

Table 1.8. Novice teacher education background, age, when hired

Each cell contains the number of teachers—across all responding funded programs—in each category. The number in parentheses provides the percentage of the total number of teachers in that category falling into each type (traditional teacher education or alternative certification; traditional age vs. older; hired before or after school began).

		From traditional teacher-ed programs	From alternative certification programs	Traditional age (early 20s)	Non-traditional age	Hired before school year began	Hired after school year began
2010-11	First-year teachers	968 (96%)	41 (4%)	565 (56%)	443 (44%)	975 (88%)	134 (12%)
2009-10	First-year teachers	2,152 (93%)	160 (7%)	1,731 (77%)	527 (23%)	2,132 (91%)	212 (9%)
2008-09	First-year teachers	1,368 (94%)	95 (6%)	1,136 (84%)	223 (16%)	1,391 (89%)	178 (11%)

Table 1.9. Types of mentors

The first and third rows provide the total number of mentors who fit into each category, for 2009-10 and 2010-11, and the numbers in parentheses provide the percentage of the total number of mentors falling into each type for the past three years. The number of mentors in each category was not collected in 2008-09. The second, fourth, and fifth rows provide the number of programs with mentors of each type; the numbers in parentheses provide the percentage of the programs which responded to this question using each mentor type. Some programs have more than one mentor type. Percentages rounded to less than 1% are omitted.

		Full-time or full-release mentors	Part-time mentors with other, non-teaching duties	Part-time mentors with other teaching duties	Full-time teachers or administrators	Retired personnel	Other
2010-11	Total number of mentors	22 (2%)	10 (1%)	4	1,193 (92%)	65 (5%)	8 (1%)
	Number of programs with mentors in this category	7 (18%)	5 (13%)	2 (5%)	36 (92%)	14 (36%)	2 (5%)
2009-10	Total number of mentors	206 (8%)	10	188 (8%)	1,994 (81%)	68 (3%)	12
	Number of programs with mentors in this category	24 (38%)	7 (11%)	11 (17%)	45 (71%)	15 (24%)	3 (5%)
2008-09	Number of programs with mentors in this category	4 (10%)	5 (12%)	2 (5%)	26 (63%)	3 (7%)	1 (2%)

Table 1.10. Novice teacher retention

The first data column shows the total number of new teachers hired across all of the funded programs, separated into six rows based on whether they were hired in 2009-10, 2008-09, or 2007-08, and whether they participated in an induction/mentoring program. The second data column shows an adjusted total: the number of new teachers hired minus those whose current employment is unknown. It also shows what percent of the total number of new teachers hired can be accounted for. Finally, these two columns show how many programs provided data for and had new teachers representing each of these categories.

The last four columns provide the number of new teachers who stayed in the district and who left the district for various reasons: voluntarily, RIFed and not rehired, or asked to leave for performance reasons. The numbers in parentheses provide the percentage of the adjusted total number of teachers hired who participated (or did not).

		Total # of new teachers hired	Adjusted total: total minus unknowns	# who stayed in the district	# who voluntarily left the district	# who were RIFed, not rehired	# who were asked to leave
Teachers hired in 2009-10	Participated in induction / mentoring program	2,470 (40 programs)	2,439 (99%) (38 programs)	1,917 (79%)	114 (5%)	370 (15%)	38 (2%)
	No program participation	560 (21 programs)	263 (47%) (18 programs)	172 (65%)	21 (8%)	38 (14%)	32 (12%)
Teachers hired in 2008-09	Participated in induction / mentoring program	2,129 (37 programs)	1,731 (81%) (33 programs)	1,326 (77%)	175 (10%)	172 (10%)	58 (3%)
	No program participation	340 (16 programs)	242 (71%) (13 programs)	178 (74%)	33 (14%)	20 (8%)	11 (5%)
Teachers hired in 2007-08	Participated in induction / mentoring program ⁶	1,905 (29 programs)	1,396 (73%) (26 programs)	1,032 (74%)	197 (14%)	88 (6%)	79 (6%)
	No program participation	488 (18 programs)	424 (87%) (16 programs)	311 (73%)	65 (15%)	29 (7%)	19 (4%)

⁶ Only 10 programs were funded in 2007. For more recently-funded programs, it is unclear how well-developed the program was at that time.

Table 1.11. Attrition patterns

Programs reported the following patterns in novice teachers who left their districts. These categories are not mutually exclusive, so some programs selected more than one.

Noted attrition patterns	# of programs, 2009-10 (31 programs responding)	# of programs, 2010-11 (25 programs responding)
Teachers who were not seen as successful	23 (74%)	12 (48%)
Special education teachers	12 (39%)	9 (36%)
Teachers of various content areas, not including math/science	9 (29%)	8 (32%)
Teachers in high-poverty or high-need schools	8 (26%)	5 (20%)
Teachers who did not participate in an induction and mentoring program	7 (23%)	5 (20%)
Math/science teachers	6 (19%)	12 (48%)
ESL/bilingual teachers	3 (10%)	5 (20%)
Teachers of a particular race or ethnicity	0	1 (4%)

SECTION 2: DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF FUNDED PROGRAMS

Unless otherwise noted, the data for the 46 programs funded for FY11 were taken from the Illinois School Report Card, using data from the latest year available.

To calculate statistics (e.g. average per-pupil instructional expenses) for each multi-district program, 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 as a consistent reflection of district size. The total for all component districts was then divided by the total student enrollment across all districts in the program. When we calculated the medians and means across all programs, we did not weight the statistics by program size: Each program is weighted the same.

Four funded programs (AUSL, NLU, ACI, Chicago NTC, and Chicago ONS) each operates within a limited subset of Chicago SD #299, and ACI operates in individual schools across several districts, including Chicago. Where data were available for individual schools—for Tables 2.3 through 2.7—we created weighted averages based on the individual schools within each of these programs. However, some school report card data (e.g. average instructional expense per pupil; average teacher experience) are only available for entire districts. In tables 2.8 through 2.12, we used district numbers and a weighted average of the total student enrollment in each participating school to calculate the means. For programs operating within the Chicago Public Schools, the schools were determined by area in 2008-09.

One funded program did not provide an updated list of districts/schools before this data brief was complete, so its data are compiled using the 2009-10 participating schools.

Table 2.1. Program size

The 2009-10 data are self-reported from the CDEs and only include the schools and districts which the programs are specifically working with. For 2008-09, the number of districts is self-reported by the programs, while the number of schools is taken from the online school report cards and includes all schools within the specified districts.

	2008-09 (FY09)	2009-10 (FY10)	% increase from 2008-09 to 2009-10	2010-11 (FY11)	% decrease from 2009-10 to 2010-11
Number of programs	39	66	69%	46 ⁷	30%
Total # of schools served	998	1,484	49%	Not collected in 2010-11	N/A
Total # of schools which currently have new teachers	Not collected in 2008-09	1,194	N/A	689 ⁸	42%
Total # of districts served	204	356	75%	205 ⁹	42%

⁷ This figure includes the program which submitted the fall 2010 CDE late.

⁸ This figure may be inaccurate for a few reasons. First, programs listed the number of schools, but not the names, so there is no way to check whether any schools are serviced by more than one program. Also, two programs—including the one which did not complete the fall 2011 CDE—did not provide a number of schools.

⁹ Some Chicago-based programs work with schools in other districts. The non-Chicago districts are not included in this number because the programs are working with individual schools, not entire districts. However, the school demographics are used in calculating statistics for tables 2.3 through 2.6.

Table 2.2. Program leadership/ownership

This table lists the number of programs which are run by districts, ROEs, universities, or other consortia. The number in parentheses provides what percentage of the total number of programs falls into each category.

The numbers of programs listed here differ from the administrative numbers of programs. In 2010-11, two Chicago-based programs are funded as a single administrative unit but operate as separate and unique programs, so they completed two CDEs. This chart shows the number of functioning programs which completed CDEs, and includes the FY11 program which submitted a late CDE.

	Run by district	Run by ROE or ISC	Run by university	Run by support provider
FY11	27 (59%)	14 (30%)	3 (7%)	2 (4%)
FY10	34 (56%)	21 (34%)	4 (7%)	2 (3%)

Table 2.3. Student enrollment

This table provides the total student enrollment in all districts served by each program (or for Chicago programs, the total student enrollment in all schools served by each program).

	Minimum	Maximum	Median	Mean	Total students
2010-11	482 (Lindop SD #92)	42,686 (Chicago NTC)	7,704	11,225	516,370
2009-10	443 (Lindop SD #92)	40,449 (Elgin SD U-46)	8,300	10,765	710,522
2008-09	529 (Lindop SD #92)	33,929 (DLM ROE #17)	10,676	11,969	466,794

Table 2.4. Student race: Black, Hispanic, Asian, Native American, and multi-race

This table provides the program-wide racial percentages of students within all component districts (or for Chicago programs, the average percentages in schools served by each program.) The Illinois state average is 52.8% White students, 18.8% Black students, 21.1% Hispanic students, 4.2% Asian students, 0.2% Native American students, and 2.9% multi-racial students.

		Minimum	Maximum	Median	Mean
White	2010-11	0.2%	97.0%	60.3%	53.2%
	2009-10	0.1%	98.7%	61.7%	53.6%
Black	2010-11	0.8%	99.5%	8.9%	21.4%
	2009-10	0.1%	98.9%	8.8%	23.8%
Hispanic	2010-11	0.3%	84.9%	9.1%	18.5%
	2009-10	0.1%	84.6%	7.9%	16.3%
Asian	2010-11	0.04%	17.2%	1.3%	3.3%
	2009-10	0%	16.4%	1.2%	3.1%
Native	2010-11	0%	0.6%	0.1%	0.2%
	2009-10	0%	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%
Other / Multi-race	2010-11	0%	8.9%	3.8%	3.5%
	2009-10	0%	8.6%	3.2%	3.1%

Table 2.5. Student income

This table provides the program-wide percentage of low income students within all component districts (or for Chicago programs, the average percentage of low income students in schools served by each program.) The Illinois state average is 45.4% low-income students.

	Minimum	Maximum	Median	Mean
2010-11	7.7% (Yorkville SD #115)	97.6% (AUSL)	43.2%	47.2%
2009-10	7.8% (Naperville SD #203)	94.8% (NLU)	44.4%	45.6%
2008-09	5% (Naperville SD #203)	91% (Chicago Golden)	39%	44.8%

Table 2.6. English Language Learners

This table provides the program-wide percentage of students classified as Limited English Proficient (LEP) within all component districts (or for Chicago programs, the average percentage of LEP students in schools served by each program.) The Illinois state average is 7.6% LEP students.

	Minimum	Maximum	Median	Mean
2010-11	0% (2 programs)	35.6% (DesPlaines SD #62)	4%	6.8%
2009-10	0% (6 programs)	36.7% (DesPlaines SD #62)	3.3%	6.1%
2008-09	These data are not available for 2008-09			

Table 2.7. Teacher salary

This table provides the program-wide average salary of teachers employed by component districts. The Illinois state average is \$63,296.

	Minimum	Maximum	Median	Mean
2010-11	\$44,803 (ROE SchoolWorks)	\$80,527 (Naperville SD #203)	\$59,526	\$59,500
2009-10	\$42,340 (Adams/Pike ROE #1)	\$90,100 (Township SD #214)	\$56,832	\$59,607
2008-09	\$40,900 (ROE Schoolworks)	\$72,100 (Naperville SD #203)	\$53,500	\$55,277

Table 2.8. Teacher experience

This table provides the program-wide average teacher experience of teachers employed by component districts. The Illinois state average is 12.7 years.

	Minimum	Maximum	Median	Mean
2010-11	7.1 (Yorkville SD #115)	15.5 (Rock Island ROE)	12.5	12.5
2009-10	6.0 (Lindop SD #92)	17.7 (G-RF SD #4)	12.7	12.7
2008-09	6.6 (Lindop SD #92)	16.8 (Geneseo SD)	13.2	13.3

Table 2.9. Teachers with master's degrees

This table provides the program-wide percentage of teachers with master's degrees employed by component districts. The Illinois state average is 57.4%. 52

	Minimum	Maximum	Median	Mean
2010-11	30.6% (ROE SchoolWorks)	72.4% (Glenview SD)	54.2%	53.9%
2009-10	26.3% (ROE SchoolWorks)	76.8% (Glenview SD #34)	54.1%	53.7%
2008-09	29% (ROE SchoolWorks)	74% (Glenview SD #34)	54%	50%

Table 2.10. Teacher race

This table provides the program-wide racial percentage of teachers employed by component districts in 2009-10. The Illinois state average is 85.2% White, 8.1% Black, 5.2% Hispanic, 1.4% Asian, and 0.2% Native American.

		Minimum	Maximum	Median	Mean
White	2010-11	50.6% (Chicago PSD #299)	100% (Madison ROE #41)	94.3%	88.2%
	2009-10	49.9% (Chicago PSD #299)	100% (Madison ROE #41)	94.0%	87.0%
Black	2010-11	0 (6 programs)	31.5% (Lindop SD #92)	1.2%	6.5%
	2009-10	0 (10 programs)	30.9% (Lindop SD #92)	1.3%	7.3%
Hispanic	2010-11	0 (3 programs)	15.2% (Chicago PSD #299)	2.2%	4.1%
	2009-10	0 (6 programs)	15.1% (Chicago PSD #299)	1.6%	4.5%
Asian	2010-11	0 (7 programs)	3.7% (Chicago PSD #299)	0.6%	1.1%
	2009-10	0 (8 programs)	3.7 (Chicago PSD #299)	0.7%	1.1%
Native	2010-11	0 (34 programs)	0.8% (Chicago PSD #299)	0	0.1%
	2009-10	0 (46 programs)	0.8% (Chicago PSD #299)	0	0.1%

Table 2.11. Instructional expense

This table provides the program-wide average instructional expense per student in component districts. The Illinois state average is \$6,483 (for fiscal year 2008-09).

	Minimum	Maximum	Median	Mean
2010-11	\$4,590 (Bond County SD #2)	\$8,790 (DesPlaines SD #62)	\$5,932	\$6,160
2009-10	\$4,409 (BFE ROE #3)	\$9,500 (Township SD #214)	\$5,656	\$5,845
2008-09	\$3,819 (Belvidere SD)	\$6,658 (Glenview SD)	\$5,220	\$5,207

SECTION 3: IMPACT OF REDUCTIONS IN FUNDING AND NUMBER OF NEW TEACHERS

In each table in this section, 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 questions.

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. Cells in all the three “initially funded” columns are highlighted if the difference between any two cells is at least 10% (for a light shade) or 20% (for the darker shade).

Table 3.1. Program adaptations to FY10 and FY11 budget reductions: by program type

This table provides program responses to the multiple-choice questions, “How did your program adapt to FY10 budget reductions?” and “How did your program adapt to FY11 budget reductions?” Programs could check more than one response for each question. If programs did not check “Our program was impacted” for a given year, but did check at least one response for the following question “How did reduced funding impact your program?” for that same year, we assumed that the program was impacted.

The table disaggregates data by program type (district-based or consortium-based). The numbers in parenthesis provide percentages within columns.

	FY10 budget reductions			FY11 budget reductions		
	All programs (42)	District-based programs (24)	Consortium-based programs (18)	All programs (44)	District-based programs (26)	Consortium-based programs (18)
We had fewer new teachers, thus reducing the impact of grant reductions.	21 (50%)	12 (50%)	9 (50%)	18 (41%)	10 (38%)	8 (44%)
Districts paid more.	15 (36%)	9 (38%)	6 (33%)	19 (43%)	13 (50%)	6 (33%)
We are seeking (or have obtained) funding from alternative sources (e.g. other partners; corporation/foundation grants).	5 (12%)	3 (13%)	2 (11%)	10 (23%)	6 (23%)	4 (22%)
We weren't able to make up the difference, so our program was impacted.	39 (93%)	22 (92%)	17 (94%)	44 (100%)	26 (100%)	18 (100%)

Table 3.2. Program adaptations to FY10 and FY11 budget reductions: by funding year

This table provides program responses to the multiple-choice questions, “How did your program adapt to FY10 budget reductions?” and “How did your program adapt to FY11 budget reductions?” Programs could check more than one response for each question. If programs did not check “Our program was impacted” for a given year, but did check at least one response for the following question “How did reduced funding impact your program?” for that same year, we assumed that the program was impacted.

The table disaggregates data by the year each program was initially funded. The numbers in parenthesis provide percentages within columns.

	FY10 budget reductions				FY11 budget reductions			
	All programs (42)	Initially funded in 2009 (12)	Initially funded in 2008 (23)	Initially funded in 2006 (7)	All programs (44)	Initially funded in 2009 (13)	Initially funded in 2008 (23)	Initially funded in 2006 (8)
We had fewer new teachers, thus reducing the impact of grant reductions.	21 (50%)	6 (50%)	10 (43%)	5 (71%)	18 (41%)	6 (46%)	9 (39%)	3 (38%)
Districts paid more.	15 (36%)	4 (33%)	8 (35%)	3 (43%)	19 (43%)	7 (54%)	10 (43%)	2 (25%)
We are seeking (or have obtained) funding from alternative sources (e.g. other partners; corporation/foundation grants).	5 (12%)	0	3 (13%)	2 (29%)	10 (23%)	0	7 (30%)	3 (38%)
We weren't able to make up the difference, so our program was impacted.	39 (93%)	12 (100%)	22 (96%)	5 (71%)	44 (100%)	13 (100%)	23 (100%)	8 (100%)

Table 3.3. Program adaptations to FY10 and FY11 budget reductions: by program size

This table provides program responses to the multiple-choice questions, “How did your program adapt to FY10 budget reductions?” and “How did your program adapt to FY11 budget reductions?” Programs could check more than one response for each question. If programs did not check “Our program was impacted” for a given year, but did check at least one response for the following question “How did reduced funding impact your program?” for that same year, we assumed that the program was impacted.

The table disaggregates data by program size. The numbers in parenthesis provide percentages within columns.

	FY10 budget reductions			FY11 budget reductions		
	All programs (42)	75+ beginning teachers (9)	<75 beginning teachers (33)	All programs (44)	75+ beginning teachers (9)	<75 beginning teachers (35)
We have fewer new teachers, thus reducing the impact of grant reductions.	21 (50%)	4 (44%)	17 (52%)	18 (41%)	3 (33%)	15 (43%)
Districts are paying more.	15 (36%)	3 (33%)	12 (36%)	19 (43%)	3 (33%)	16 (46%)
We are seeking (or have obtained) funding from alternative sources (e.g. other partners; corporation/foundation grants).	5 (12%)	3 (33%)	2 (6%)	10 (23%)	5 (56%)	5 (14%)
We aren't able to make up the difference, so our program was impacted.	39 (93%)	9 (100%)	30 (91%)	44 (100%)	9 (100%)	35 (100%)

Table 3.4. Impact on programs of reduced FY10 funding: by program type

This table provides program responses to the multiple-choice questions, “How did reduced funding impact your program in FY10?” and “How did reduced funding impact your program in FY11?” Programs could check more than one response for each question. Six programs did not respond to this question; one of them noted that their program was not impacted by reduced funding due to lower numbers of new teachers.

The table disaggregates data by program type (district-based or consortium-based). The numbers in parenthesis provide percentages within columns.

	FY10 budget reductions			FY11 budget reductions		
	All programs (39)	District-based programs (22)	Consortium-based programs (17)	All programs (44)	District-based programs (26)	Consortium-based programs (18)
We bought fewer resources (e.g. books, video cameras) for program use or for distribution to new teachers.	28 (72%)	16 (73%)	12 (71%)	34 (77%)	21 (81%)	13 (72%)
We held fewer (or shorter) novice teacher trainings, meetings, or events than the previous year.	18 (46%)	9 (41%)	9 (53%)	24 (55%)	13 (50%)	11 (61%)
We held fewer (or shorter) mentor trainings, meetings, or events than the previous year.	17 (44%)	11 (50%)	6 (35%)	26 (59%)	15 (58%)	11 (61%)
Substitute reimbursement was cut or eliminated.	17 (44%)	6 (27%)	11 (65%)	24 (55%)	10 (38%)	14 (78%)
Program leaders couldn't attend the INTC conference or other events.	15 (38%)	6 (27%)	9 (53%)	24 (55%)	11 (42%)	13 (72%)
The program coordinator position was reduced (e.g. from full- to part-time).	8 (21%)	2 (9%)	6 (35%)	13 (30%)	5 (19%)	8 (44%)
We reduced (or eliminated) stipends for novice teachers.	8 (21%)	2 (9%)	6 (35%)	13 (30%)	6 (23%)	7 (39%)
We reduced (or eliminated) full-time or full-release mentors.	5 (13%)	5 (23%)	0	11 (25%)	8 (31%)	3 (17%)
We only were able to serve a portion of our novice teachers (e.g. we cut the 2 nd -year program, or we can only serve some 1 st -year teachers).	5 (13%)	1 (5%)	4 (24%)	15 (34%)	9 (35%)	6 (33%)
Other (e.g. reduced evaluation; increased novice/mentor ration)	5 (13%)	2 (9%)	3 (18%)	5 (11%)	1 (4%)	4 (22%)

Table 3.5. Impact on programs of reduced FY10 funding: by funding year

This table provides program responses to the multiple-choice questions, “How did reduced funding impact your program in FY10?” and “How did reduced funding impact your program in FY11?” Programs could check more than one response for each question. Six programs did not respond to this question; one of them noted that their program was not impacted by reduced funding due to lower numbers of new teachers.

The table disaggregates data by the year each program was initially funded. The numbers in parenthesis provide percentages within columns.

	FY10 budget reductions				FY11 budget reductions			
	All programs (39)	Initially funded in 2009 (12)	Initially funded in 2008 (22)	Initially funded in 2006 (5)	All programs (44)	Initially funded in 2009 (13)	Initially funded in 2008 (23)	Initially funded in 2006 (8)
We bought fewer resources (e.g. books, video cameras) for program use or for distribution to new teachers.	28 (72%)	10 (83%)	15 (68%)	3 (60%)	34 (77%)	11 (85%)	17 (74%)	6 (75%)
We held fewer (or shorter) novice teacher trainings, meetings, or events than the previous year.	18 (46%)	4 (33%)	12 (55%)	2 (40%)	24 (55%)	5 (38%)	14 (61%)	5 (63%)
We held fewer (or shorter) mentor trainings, meetings, or events than the previous year.	17 (44%)	3 (25%)	12 (55%)	2 (40%)	26 (59%)	8 (62%)	13 (57%)	5 (63%)
Substitute reimbursement was cut or eliminated.	17 (44%)	4 (33%)	12 (55%)	1 (20%)	24 (55%)	8 (62%)	12 (52%)	4 (50%)
Program leaders couldn't attend the INTC conference or other events.	15 (38%)	5 (42%)	9 (41%)	1 (20%)	24 (55%)	6 (46%)	13 (57%)	5 (63%)
The program coordinator position was reduced (e.g. from full- to part-time).	8 (21%)	1 (8%)	7 (32%)	0	13 (30%)	0	10 (43%)	3 (38%)
We reduced (or eliminated) stipends for novice teachers.	8 (21%)	2 (17%)	6 (27%)	0	13 (30%)	3 (23%)	7 (30%)	3 (38%)
We reduced (or eliminated) full-time or full-release mentors.	5 (13%)	2 (17%)	3 (14%)	0	11 (25%)	3 (23%)	5 (22%)	3 (38%)
We only were able to serve a portion of our novice teachers (e.g. we cut the 2 nd -year program, or we can only serve some 1 st -year teachers).	5 (13%)	2 (17%)	3 (14%)	0	15 (34%)	3 (23%)	7 (30%)	5 (63%)
Other (e.g. reduced evaluation; increased novice/mentor ration)	5 (13%)	1 (8%)	2 (9%)	2 (40%)	5 (11%)	1 (8%)	3 (13%)	1 (13%)

Table 3.6. Impact on programs of reduced FY10 funding: by program size

This table provides program responses to the multiple-choice questions, “How did reduced funding impact your program in FY10?” and “How did reduced funding impact your program in FY11?” Programs could check more than one response for each question. Six programs did not respond to this question; one of them noted that their program was not impacted by reduced funding due to lower numbers of new teachers.

The table disaggregates data by program size. The numbers in parenthesis provide percentages within columns.

	FY10 budget reductions			FY11 budget reductions		
	All programs (39)	75+ beginning teachers (9)	<75 beginning teachers (30)	All programs (44)	75+ beginning teachers (9)	<75 beginning teachers (35)
We bought fewer resources (e.g. books, video cameras) for program use or for distribution to new teachers.	28 (72%)	5 (56%)	23 (77%)	34 (77%)	7 (78%)	27 (77%)
We held fewer (or shorter) novice teacher trainings, meetings, or events than the previous year.	18 (46%)	3 (33%)	15 (50%)	24 (55%)	6 (67%)	18 (51%)
We held fewer (or shorter) mentor trainings, meetings, or events than the previous year.	17 (44%)	5 (56%)	12 (40%)	26 (59%)	5 (56%)	21 (60%)
Substitute reimbursement was cut or eliminated.	17 (44%)	4 (44%)	13 (43%)	24 (55%)	4 (44%)	20 (57%)
Program leaders couldn't attend the INTC conference or other events.	15 (38%)	4 (44%)	11 (37%)	24 (55%)	6 (67%)	18 (51%)
The program coordinator position was reduced (e.g. from full- to part-time).	8 (21%)	2 (22%)	6 (20%)	13 (30%)	4 (44%)	9 (26%)
We reduced (or eliminated) stipends for novice teachers.	8 (21%)	3 (33%)	5 (17%)	13 (30%)	5 (56%)	8 (23%)
We reduced (or eliminated) full-time or full-release mentors.	5 (13%)	1 (11%)	4 (13%)	11 (25%)	4 (44%)	7 (20%)
We only were able to serve a portion of our novice teachers (e.g. we cut the 2 nd -year program, or we can only serve some 1 st -year teachers).	5 (13%)	0	5 (17%)	15 (34%)	2 (22%)	13 (37%)
Other (e.g. reduced evaluation; increased novice/mentor ration)	5 (13%)	1 (11%)	4 (13%)	5 (11%)	3 (33%)	2 (6%)

SECTION 4: PROGRAM DISAGGREGATION

Tables in this section show the intersections among the three binary methods of program classification in the above sections: district-based programs vs. consortium-based programs; programs initially funded in 2009 vs. 2008 vs. 2006; and 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.

Table 4.1. District-based programs (27 total)

Initially funded in 2009	9 (33%)
Initially funded in 2008	12 (44%)
Initially funded in 2006	6 (22%)
75+ beginning teachers	5 (19%)
<75 beginning teachers	22 (81%)

Table 4.2. Consortium-based programs (18 total)

Initially funded in 2009	5 (28%)
Initially funded in 2008	11 (61%)
Initially funded in 2006	2 (11%)
75+ beginning teachers	4 (22%)
<75 beginning teachers	14 (78%)

Table 4.3. Programs initially funded in 2009 (14 total)

District-based programs	9 (64%)
Consortium-based programs	5 (36%)
75+ beginning teachers	0
<75 beginning teachers	14 (100%)

Table 4.4. Programs initially funded in 2008 (23 total)

District-based programs	12 (52%)
Consortium-based programs	11 (48%)
75+ beginning teachers	6 (26%)
<75 beginning teachers	17 (74%)

Table 4.5. Programs initially funded in 2006 (8 total)

District-based programs	6 (75%)
Consortium-based programs	2 (25%)
75+ beginning teachers	3 (38%)
<75 beginning teachers	5 (63%)

Table 4.6. Programs serving 75 or more beginning teachers (9 total)

District-based programs	5 (56%)
Consortium-based programs	4 (44%)
Initially funded in 2009	0
Initially funded in 2008	6 (67%)
Initially funded in 2006	3 (33%)

Table 4.7. Programs serving fewer than 75 beginning teachers (36 total)

District-based programs	22 (61%)
Consortium-based programs	14 (39%)
Initially funded in 2009	14 (39%)
Initially funded in 2008	17 (47%)
Initially funded in 2006	5 (14%)

SECTION 5: NON-CONTINUING PROGRAMS

This section shows data reported on the survey for programs which did not seek FY11 continuation funding.

Ten programs responded to the survey: six consortia and four single-district programs; six programs initially funded in 2009 and four initially funded in 2008; and three large programs (serving more than 75 beginning teachers in FY10) and seven smaller programs.

5.1. Reasons to not seek FY11 funding, fixed-choice

This table provides program responses to the multiple-choice question, “Why did your program decide to not seek FY11 ISBE grant funding?” Programs could check more than one response.

	All programs (10)	District-based programs (4)	Consortium-based programs (6)	Initially funded in 2009 (6)	Initially funded in 2008 (4)	75+ beginning teachers (3)	<75 beginning teachers (7)
The new administrative rules were overly burdensome on our program	7 (70%)	3 (75%)	4 (67%)	5 (83%)	2 (50%)	2 (67%)	5 (71%)
The state did not pay its FY10 obligations in a timely manner	4 (40%)	3 (75%)	1 (17%)	2 (33%)	2 (50%)	0	4 (57%)
Reduced funding meant that we had to dramatically reduce or eliminate our entire program	4 (40%)	0	4 (67%)	4 (67%)	0	3 (100%)	1 (14%)
We were not receiving enough grant money to make the effort worthwhile	3 (30%)	1 (25%)	2 (33%)	3 (50%)	0	2 (67%)	1 (14%)
We no longer have the staffing to run an induction program or to manage the grant	2 (20%)	1 (25%)	1 (17%)	0	2 (50%)	0	2 (29%)

5.2. Reasons to not seek FY11 funding, extended response

This list provides program responses to the open-ended question “Please provide any specifics related to the above that you can.” The following are unedited program responses.

- The amount of grant money we were going to receive would not have covered even mentors for just the 1st year teachers in our program of __ districts because of the requirement to pay 1200.00. The ROE had not received even 1 payment of the 2010 grant at the time we needed to make the decision to continue.
- Our program supported a consortium of __ school districts and over 75 mentors. The new administrative rules requiring payment of \$1200 for each mentor, with reduced funding, would have put a burden of having to choose only a few districts to support.
- Faculty members who were coordinating grants efforts within the university had other obligations and project requirements that prevented them with continuing at this time.
- The mandated money for mentors put us in a relationship with our districts we were not comfortable.
- When we counted up the number of new teachers and the mentors needed to meet their needs, and then looked at the reduction in dollars for our grant, there was no way we could pay all of the mentors the stipends let alone meet other professional development needs.
- As we have not received our funding from last year's program, but we incurred all of the costs associated with our original grant, we did not want to continue deficit spending. In addition, the new requirement of using the funding only to pay mentors limited our options and placed us in an odd predicament. Under last year's grant, we serviced

___ districts; with the new allocation we would receive this year, we would only be able to possibly fund one district's mentors; having to choose one district out of the ___, would put us in an uncomfortable position with our districts. Allocating a staff member's time and salary to work with only one district's mentors on a limited basis also factored into our decision. We are firm believers in the induction and mentoring process, but as a result of the above factors, we decided against applying this year.

- The specific 60 hours @ \$1,200 specification for two years of mentoring was counter to our contract in that we do not reimburse teachers for Year Two monetarily, but offer them two internal university credits on the salary schedule for our Year Two program. Also, we could not provide Year One new “first year” teachers with a different monetary amount than our new “experienced” teachers as part of the new grant stipulations.

5.3. Conditions required for seeking FY12 funding

This table provides program responses to the multiple-choice question, “Under what conditions would you consider seeking FY12 ISBE grant funding?” Programs could check more than one response.

One program indicated that it planned to apply for FY12 funding regardless of conditions, so its responses are not included here.

	All programs (9)	District-based programs (4)	Consortium-based programs (5)	Initially funded in 2009 (6)	Initially funded in 2008 (3)	75+ beginning teachers (3)	<75 beginning teachers (6)
If state budget conditions are improved	7 (78%)	3 (75%)	4 (80%)	5 (83%)	2 (67%)	3 (100%)	4 (67%)
If the administrative rules are different (e.g. if the \$1,200-mentor-stipend requirement is eliminated)	7 (78%)	2 (50%)	5 (100%)	5 (83%)	2 (67%)	3 (100%)	4 (67%)
If local budget conditions are improved	4 (44%)	2 (50%)	2 (40%)	2 (33%)	2 (67%)	2 (67%)	2 (33%)
If we have enough new teachers to make it worthwhile	2 (22%)	2 (50%)	0	0	2 (67%)	0	2 (33%)
If there is less paperwork and fewer requirements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

5.4. Current program status

Seven programs indicated that they are currently providing some sort of induction services for new teachers. The tables in this section show what sources are paying for the program, how much their budget has been reduced, and impact of budget reductions. All of the questions were multiple-choice except for the question asking by what percentage the budgets have been reduced. Because of the small response size, these questions have not been disaggregated by program type, year initially funded, or program size.

What funding sources currently support the induction program?	All programs (7)
District funds	6
ROE funds	1
Other	2

How has your overall induction budget changed from last year?	All programs (7)
Stayed the same	1
Reduced	6

By what percentage--approximately--has your budget been reduced?	All programs (5)
Minimum	50%
Maximum	95%
Mean	72%

How is reduced funding impacting your program in 2010-11? (Check all that apply.)	All programs (6)
We bought fewer resources (e.g. books, video cameras) for program use or for distribution to new teachers.	5
We held fewer (or shorter) novice teacher trainings, meetings, or events than the previous year.	4
The program coordinator position was reduced (e.g. from full- to part-time).	4
We reduced (or eliminated) stipends for novice teachers.	4
Program leaders couldn't attend the INTC conference or other events.	4
We reduced (or eliminated) full-time or full-release mentors.	3
We held fewer (or shorter) mentor trainings, meetings, or events than the previous year.	3
We reduced stipends and/or benefits for mentors.	3
Substitute reimbursement was cut or eliminated.	2
Other (e.g. cut instructional enhancement mentors)	1
We only were able to serve a portion of our novice teachers (e.g. we cut the 2 nd -year program, or we can only serve some 1 st -year teachers).	0