Appendix to INTC Data Brief #3   October 2011

Prepared by: Patricia Brady
With assistance from: Jeff Kohmstedt and Lara Hebert
INTC Staff: Mary Elin Barnish, Hilarie Welsh, Nancy Johnson, Mike Painter, Jason Swanson
INTC Director: Chris Higgins

This Appendix provides tables, charts, and analyses of quantitative and qualitative data. All data were reported on the spring 2011 Common Data Elements (CDE) reporting forms by the programs that received grant funding in FY 2011. Five programs did not complete the Spring 2011 CDE, so their data do not appear in these tables.

This Appendix is organized into the following sections:
· Program self-rankings on the Continuum
· Program goals and progress
· Program budgets

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.

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 (which serve 75 or more first- and second-year teachers) vs. smaller programs.

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 questions.

For each criterion, programs were asked to rank themselves on a 4-point scale from "establishing" to "systematizing." In order to display the programs' responses numerically in the charts below, these descriptors were each assigned a number:

- Establishing = 1
- Applying = 2
- Integrating = 3
- Systematizing = 4

Thus, the lowest score a criterion could receive is a 1, and the highest is a 4.

Cells were color-coded in order to highlight particularly high and low scores and to note differences between types of programs (e.g. district-based and consortium-based programs).

- Green shaded cells: cells in two paired, adjoining columns (e.g. district-based and consortium-based programs) differ by at least 0.4
- Red, large bold font: the 20 lowest-scored items from 2011 (with ratings 2.25 and below)
- Blue, large bold font: the 20 highest-scored items from 2011 (with ratings 3.09 and above)

The numerical cutoffs noted above were chosen somewhat arbitrarily in order to highlight the highest and lowest scores and to highlight scores which show differences between types of programs.

In 2011, these questions were mandatory, and all 41 programs which completed the CDE responded to almost every item. In 2010, these questions were voluntary, and 19 programs responded to them. It should be noted that the 2010 numbers are based on small sample sizes, especially for certain types of programs (consortium-based; initially funded in 2009; and 75+ beginning teachers). So, differences between numbers in paired, adjoining columns—or particularly high or low numbers—may simply reflect a few outliers and not any real differences between types of programs. Thus, we only present the 2010 numbers in the summary chart (1.10).

Table 1.1. Program self-rankings for Continuum Standard 1

Each cell displays the mean score for all programs in that category.

	All programs	District-based programs	Consortium-based programs	Initially funded in 2009	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008	75+ beginning teachers	<75 beginning teachers
Total number of programs responding	41	23	18	12	29	9	32
1.1 Program leadership is selected and role is clearly defined to include being responsible for program planning, operation, oversight, and use of data.	2.98 SD=.58	2.96	3.00	2.75	3.07	3.00	2.97
1.2 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders have the time, fiscal resources, and authority to implement and support the program.	2.44 SD=.82	2.43	2.44	2.25	2.52	2.33	2.47
1.3 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders collaborate to create a culture of commitment to beginning teacher induction and improving student achievement.	2.85 SD=.84	2.78	2.94	2.67	2.93	2.89	2.84
1.4 Program leadership engages in initial and ongoing professional development to understand, design, and implement high-quality induction and mentoring.	2.90 SD=70	2.96	2.83	2.42	3.10	3.11	2.84

Table 1.2. Program self-rankings for Continuum Standard 2

Each cell displays the mean score for all programs in that category.

	All programs	District-based programs	Consortium-based programs	Initially funded in 2009	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008	75+ beginning teachers	<75 beginning teachers
Total number of programs responding	41	23	18	12	29	9	32
2.1 Program design includes learning outcomes for beginning teacher participants that recognize a continuum of teacher development and a focus on student learning with clearly defined participant expectations for program completion.	2.66 SD=.98	2.70	2.61	2.42	2.76	3.00	2.56
2.2 Program design provides for effective communication among program leadership, mentors, beginning teachers, and site administrators and is consistently integrated into district/school improvement goals and ongoing professional development initiatives.	2.27 SD=.85	**2.17**	2.39	**2.25**	2.28	**2.22**	2.28
2.3 Program design includes high quality mentor selection, training, assessment/evaluation, and ongoing support in a mentor learning community.	2.61 SD=.87	2.48	2.78	**2.08**	2.83	2.67	2.59
2.4 Program design defines essential activities including beginning teacher formative assessment, written documentation of beginning teacher/mentor work, analysis of beginning teacher instruction and student learning, and professional development for all stakeholders.	2.88 SD=.83	2.78	3.00	2.50	3.03	**3.11**	2.81
2.5 Program goals and outcomes for teacher development, retention, support, and student learning are reviewed and revised as necessary by designated program leaders and stakeholders based on the analysis of multiple sources of program evaluation data.	2.23 SD=.84	**2.14**	2.33	**2.00**	2.32	**2.13**	**2.25**

Table 1.3. Program self-rankings for Continuum Standard 3

Each cell displays the mean score for all programs in that category.

	All programs	District-based programs	Consortium-based programs	Initially funded in 2009	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008	75+ beginning teachers	<75 beginning teachers
Total number of programs responding	41	23	18	12	29	9	32
3.1 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders allocate adequate resources to ensure an appropriate distribution of funds to support components defined in the program design and in alignment with district improvement plan.	2.46 SD=.85	2.65	2.22	2.33	2.52	2.22	2.53
3.2 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders access and coordinate existing professional development resources to effectively align and coordinate with the induction program.	2.85 SD=.81	2.87	2.83	2.75	2.90	2.67	2.91
3.3 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders allocate sufficient, sanctioned, protected time for mentoring to foster high quality mentoring for beginning teachers.	2.56 SD=.85	2.83	2.22	2.33	2.66	2.78	2.50
3.4 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders monitor resource allocations on a regular basis in order to make necessary adjustments as needed during the year.	2.77 SD=1.00	2.91	2.59	2.36	2.93	2.78	2.77
3.5 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders support the development of fiscal reports to document allocations of resources as necessary for accountability and to promote ongoing program improvement.	2.85 SD=1.05	3.04	2.59	2.58	2.96	3.11	2.77

Table 1.4. Program self-rankings for Continuum Standard 4

Each cell displays the mean score for all programs in that category.

	All programs	District-based programs	Consortium-based programs	Initially funded in 2009	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008	75+ beginning teachers	<75 beginning teachers
Total number of programs responding	41	23	18	12	29	9	32
4.1 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders collaborate to design effective professional development for site administrators and promote their full involvement in program operations to maximize ongoing program improvement.	2.27 SD=.98	2.26	2.28	**2.00**	2.38	2.44	**2.22**
4.2 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders collaborate with site administrators to ensure positive working environments for beginning teachers.	2.49 SD=.93	2.39	2.61	2.33	2.56	**2.11**	2.59
4.3 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders collaborate with site administrators to foster the development of collaborative learning communities to promote a program of support for all staff.	2.40 SD=1.06	2.45	2.33	2.33	2.43	2.50	2.38
4.4 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders support site administrators to provide ongoing high quality communications regarding induction program design and implementation.	2.41 SD=.88	2.39	2.44	**2.17**	2.52	2.33	2.44
4.5 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders engage with site administrators to ensure positive mentoring experiences and to uphold the relationship between mentor and beginning teacher as confidential.	2.85 SD=.89	2.83	2.89	2.92	2.83	2.89	2.84
4.6 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders collaborate with site administrators to align their work in support of beginning teachers with the standards for administrators.	2.36 SD=.99	2.32	2.41	2.33	2.37	**2.00**	2.45

Table 1.5. Program self-rankings for Continuum Standard 5

Each cell displays the mean score for all programs in that category.

	All programs	District-based programs	Consortium-based programs	Initially funded in 2009	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008	75+ beginning teachers	<75 beginning teachers
Total number of programs responding	40	23	17	12	28	8	32
5.1 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders are guided by clear, rigorous selection criteria and processes to ensure that beginning teachers will receive high quality mentoring throughout their participation in the induction program.	2.50 SD=.74	2.61	2.35	2.33	2.57	2.75	2.44
5.2 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders ensure that the matching of beginning teachers and mentors is based on multiple relevant factors to establish effective pairing of mentors with beginning teachers.	2.56 SD=.97	2.59	2.53	2.58	2.56	2.57	2.56
5.3 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders define and implement a process to address changes or make necessary adjustments in mentor/beginning teacher matches.	2.51 SD=1.04	2.59	2.41	**2.17**	2.67	2.57	2.50

Table 1.6. Program self-rankings for Continuum Standard 6
Each cell displays the mean score for all programs in that category.

	All programs	District-based programs	Consortium-based programs	Initially funded in 2009	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008	75+ beginning teachers	<75 beginning teachers
Total number of programs responding	41	23	18	12	29	9	32
6.1 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders collaborate to provide foundational training for mentors to develop basic knowledge, skills, and attitudes for quality mentoring.	3.34 SD=.83	**3.26**	**3.44**	3.08	**3.45**	**3.33**	**3.34**
6.2 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders facilitate the development of a professional learning community for mentors to regularly reflect on, improve, and refine their practice.	2.76 SD=.93	2.70	2.83	2.33	2.93	**3.11**	2.66
6.3 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders collaborate to provide ongoing professional development for mentors to advance induction practice and promote beginning teacher development.	2.78 SD=.88	2.91	2.61	2.50	2.90	3.00	2.72

Table 1.7. Program self-rankings for Continuum Standard 7

Each cell displays the mean score for all programs in that category.

	All programs	District-based programs	Consortium-based programs	Initially funded in 2009	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008	75+ beginning teachers	<75 beginning teachers
Total number of programs responding	41	23	18	12	29	9	32
7.1 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders collaborate to provide beginning teacher orientation to clarify district school and induction programs and ensure high levels of beginning teacher participation.	3.29 SD=.85	**3.39**	**3.17**	3.00	**3.41**	**3.44**	**3.25**
7.2 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders collaborate to design and implement formal support of networking opportunities for beginning teachers to ensure their participation in collaborative cultures focused on professional learning and ongoing support.	2.73 SD=1.04	2.83	2.61	**2.25**	2.93	2.78	2.72
7.3 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders implement ongoing professional development to ensure high quality beginning teacher development.	3.00 SD=.90	**3.09**	2.89	3.00	3.00	2.89	3.03
7.4 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders provide and support sanctioned time for induction and mentoring processes to ensure sufficient support for high quality professional development experiences for beginning teachers.	2.88 SD=1.00	2.95	2.78	2.58	3.00	3.00	2.84

Table 1.8. Program self-rankings for Continuum Standard 8
Each cell displays the mean score for all programs in that category.

	All programs	District-based programs	Consortium-based programs	Initially funded in 2009	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008	75+ beginning teachers	<75 beginning teachers
Total number of programs responding	41	23	18	12	29	9	32
8.1 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders ensure that mentors use formative assessment tools collaboratively with beginning teachers for initial self assessment and development of individual learning plans to guide weekly visits and determine the scope, focus, and content of professional development activities.	2.68 SD=.92	2.65	2.72	2.42	2.79	3.11	2.56
8.2 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders ensure that mentors utilize a wide range of formative assessment tools in order to establish multiple measures of teaching from which to promote further professional development.	2.59 SD=.98	2.57	2.61	2.33	2.69	3.00	2.47
8.3 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders establish and maintain procedures for documenting confidential use of formative assessment to gather evidence of reflective processes that impact student learning and practice.	2.76 SD=.95	2.73	2.78	2.42	2.90	3.22	2.63
8.4 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders develop and follow policy regarding use of formative documentation to protect their use for program purposes only and not for evaluation of beginning teachers or for employment decisions.	2.95 SD=1.25	2.76	3.17	2.73	3.04	3.25	2.87

Table 1.9. Program self-rankings for Continuum Standard 9

Each cell displays the mean score for all programs in that category.

	All programs	District-based programs	Consortium-based programs	Initially funded in 2009	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008	75+ beginning teachers	<75 beginning teachers
Total number of programs responding	41	23	18	12	29	9	32
9.1 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders develop and implement an ongoing process for program evaluation based on multiple internal and external sources with formal and informal measures to ensure ongoing program improvement.	2.45 SD=.89	2.45	2.44	**1.92**	2.68	2.75	2.38
9.2 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders analyze multiple sources of data and share results with stakeholders in a systematic way.	2.29 SD=.88	2.35	**2.22**	**1.75**	2.52	2.56	**2.22**
9.3 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders implement a process for mentor accountability in a supportive environment through a defined process of communication and documentation.	2.54 SD=.86	2.43	2.67	2.33	2.62	2.67	2.50
9.4 Program leadership, program partners, and all stakeholders participate in external reviews and statewide data collection designed to examine and improve program quality and effectiveness and to inform policy makers and stakeholders.	2.37 SD=.87	2.30	2.44	**2.00**	2.52	2.33	2.38

Table 1.10. Average scores for each standard

Each cell displays the mean score for all programs in that category. The 2010 means were calculated to the first decimal place; the 2011 means were calculated to two decimal places.

		All programs	District-based programs	Consortium-based programs	Initially funded in 2009	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008	75+ beginning teachers	<75 beginning teachers
Total number of programs responding	**2011**	41	23	18	12	29	9	32
	2010	19	13	6	5	14	4	14
Standard 1 (4 criteria)	**2011**	2.79	2.78	2.80	2.52	2.91	2.83	2.78
	2010	2.5	2.4	2.7	2.4	2.5	2.5	2.5
Standard 2 (5 criteria)	**2011**	2.53	2.45	2.62	2.25	2.64	2.63	2.50
	2010	2.2	2.1	2.4	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.2
Standard 3 (5 criteria)	**2011**	2.70	2.86	2.49	2.47	2.79	2.71	2.70
	2010	2.5	2.6	2.4	2.2	2.7	2.3	2.6
Standard 4 (6 criteria)	**2011**	2.46	2.44	2.49	2.35	2.52	2.38	2.49
	2010	2.0	1.8	2.3	1.5	2.2	2.2	2.0
Standard 5 (3 criteria)	**2011**	2.52	2.60	2.43	2.36	2.60	2.63	2.50
	2010	2.2	2.0	2.7	2.1	2.3	2.0	2.3
Standard 6 (3 criteria)	**2011**	2.96	2.96	2.96	2.64	3.09	3.15	2.91
	2010	2.5	2.4	2.6	2.1	2.7	2.6	2.5
Standard 7 (4 criteria)	**2011**	2.98	3.07	2.86	2.71	3.09	3.03	2.96
	2010	2.5	2.5	2.5	1.8	2.8	2.3	2.6
Standard 8 (4 criteria)	**2011**	2.75	2.68	2.82	2.48	2.86	3.15	2.63
	2010	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.0	2.4	2.2	2.4
Standard 9 (4 criteria)	**2011**	2.41	2.38	2.44	2.00	2.59	2.58	2.37
	2010	2.0	1.8	2.4	1.7	2.2	2.2	2.0
Average of all criteria for all standards	**2011**	2.66	2.67	2.64	2.41	2.77	2.75	2.64
	2010	2.3	2.2	2.4	2.0	2.4	2.3	2.3

PROGRAM GOALS AND PROGRESS

Table 2.1. Program improvements

Programs were asked which improvements they were able to make in their programs during the year ending May 31, 2011. In each white cell, the first figure is the total number of responding programs; the number in parentheses provides what percentage of the total number of responding district-based or consortium-based programs made each form of progress. Programs were not given the option to check "no improvements," so it is impossible to tell whether programs which left this question blank had no improvements or simply chose not to respond.

	All programs	District-based programs	Consortium-based programs	Initially funded in 2009	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008
Number of programs which responded to this question	34	20	14	12	22
We offered more or improved new teacher trainings / professional development.	14 (41%)	6 (30%)	8 (57%)	5 (42%)	9 (41%)
We offered more or improved mentor trainings/professional development.	18 (53%)	10 (50%)	8 (57%)	6 (50%)	12 (55%)
We offered more or improved administrator trainings.	12 (35%)	6 (30%)	6 (43%)	2 (17%)	10 (45%)
The program became more structured and/or expectations were clarified.	22 (65%)	10 (50%)	12 (86%)	8 (67%)	14 (64%)
We made improvements in mentor/mentee relationship (e.g. more time; more structure)	9 (26%)	5 (25%)	4 (29%)	3 (25%)	6 (27%)
We made improvements in formative assessment or documentation of new teacher progress.	12 (35%)	6 (30%)	6 (43%)	2 (17%)	10 (45%)
We have improved data-driven decision-making on program design and implementation.	13 (38%)	6 (30%)	7 (50%)	3 (25%)	10 (45%)
We provided more differentiation in program components.	9 (26%)	5 (25%)	4 (29%)	3 (25%)	6 (27%)
We made improvements in program evaluation.	14 (41%)	10 (50%)	4 (29%)	4 (33%)	10 (45%)
We created a specific program for second-year teachers.	8 (24%)	5 (25%)	3 (21%)	4 (33%)	4 (18%)
Full-release mentors were provided.	0	0	0	0	0
We made technological improvements (e.g. better program website).	9 (26%)	4 (20%)	5 (36%)	1 (8%)	8 (36%)
The program (or programs of component districts) received state approval.	5 (15%)	5 (25%)	0	3 (25%)	2 (9%)
We saw growth in support/enthusiasm/participation from stakeholders or component districts.	15 (44%)	8 (40%)	7 (50%)	5 (42%)	10 (45%)

Table 2.2. Number of programs selecting each standard for improvement

Programs were asked to select two Illinois Induction Program Standards to focus on for next year.

Within each white cell, the first number is the total number of programs selecting each standard; the number in parenthesis is the percent, of the total number of programs in its category, which selected each standard. Each program was encouraged to select two standards for improvement, although in each year (2010 and 2011) two programs only selected one standard each. 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.

In 2010, one program did not provide the number of new teachers served, so the numbers in the last two columns do not add up to the total in the first column.

Standard		Programs selecting this standard	District-based programs	Consortium-based programs	Initially funded in 2009	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008	75+ beginning teachers	<75 beginning teachers
# of programs responding	2011	38	22	16	11	27	8	30
	2010	58	33	25	23	35	21	36
1	2011	6 (16%)	3 (14%)	3 (19%)	3 (27%)	3 (11%)	1 (13%)	5 (17%)
	2010	6 (10%)	3 (9%)	3 (12%)	4 (17%)	2 (6%)	2 (10%)	4 (11%)
2	2011	12 (32%)	8 (36%)	4 (25%)	4 (36%)	8 (30%)	2 (25%)	10 (33%)
	2010	17 (29%)	12 (36%)	5 (20%)	7 (30%)	10 (29%)	7 (33%)	10 (28%)
3	2011	3 (8%)	2 (9%)	1 (6%)	1 (9%)	2 (7%)	0	3 (10%)
	2010	5 (9%)	0	5 (20%)	0	5 (14%)	3 (14%)	2 (6%)
4	2011	12 (32%)	8 (36%)	4 (25%)	3 (27%)	9 (33%)	4 (50%)	8 (27%)
	2010	17 (29%)	11 (33%)	6 (24%)	7 (30%)	10 (29 %)	3 (14%)	13 (36%)
5	2011	3 (8%)	1 (5%)	2 (13%)	0	3 (11%)	3 (38%)	0
	2010	15 (26%)	7 (21%)	8 (32%)	6 (26%)	9 (26%)	4 (19%)	10 (28%)
6	2011	8 (21%)	3 (14%)	5 (31%)	3 (27%)	5 (19%)	0	8 (27%)
	2010	10 (17%)	7 (21%)	3 (12%)	4 (17%)	6 (17%)	2 (10%)	8 (22%)
7	2011	5 (13%)	3 (14%)	2 (13%)	0	5 (19%)	2 (25%)	3 (10%)
	2010	16 (28%)	10 (30%)	6 (24%)	5 (22%)	11 (31%)	6 (29%)	10 (28%)
8	2011	5 (13%)	4 (18%)	1 (6%)	1 (9%)	4 (15%)	1 (13%)	4 (13%)
	2010	8 (14%)	4 (12%)	4 (16%)	2 (9%)	6 (17%)	5 (24%)	3 (8%)
9	2011	9 (24%)	5 (23%)	4 (25%)	4 (36%)	5 (19%)	3 (38%)	6 (20%)
	2010	20 (34%)	11 (33%)	9 (36%)	9 (39%)	11 (31%)	9 (43%)	11 (31%)

Table 2.3. Weaknesses/challenges: general categories

Programs were asked three open-ended questions:

a) What was particularly successful this past year in your induction program? How could you tell it was successful? Please mention any data, measures, or artifacts you have that indicate it was successful.

b) What did you feel was less successful this past year? Please mention any data, measures, or artifacts you have that indicate it was not successful.

c) What specific challenges did your program face this past year?

Programs' responses to the first question were individual and idiosyncratic (e.g. introduction of e-portfolios, rapport among beginning teachers, new teacher support sessions), without common themes. However, many program responses to questions b and c were remarkably similar, and the below chart summarizes the programs' main areas of concern. For each program, responses to questions b and c were combined due to the similarity in responses.

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.

	All programs (40)	District-based programs (22)	Consortium-based programs (18)	Initially funded in 2009 (11)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (29)	75+ beginning teachers (9)	<75 beginning teachers (31)
Concern regarding funding (e.g. funding cuts; lateness of payments)	26 (65%)	11 (50%)	15 (83%)	5 (45%)	21 (72%)	5 (56%)	21 (68%)
Concern regarding grant restrictions and requirements (e.g. 60-hour rule; $1,200 stipend for mentors)	15 (38%)	9 (41%)	6 (33%)	4 (36%)	11 (38%)	5 (56%)	10 (32%)
Concern regarding schools, districts, or administrators (e.g. lack of support)	11 (28%)	5 (23%)	6 (33%)	4 (36%)	7 (24%)	2 (22%)	9 (29%)
Internal program concern (e.g. a specific program component was poorly received or poorly attended)	17 (43%)	12 (55%)	5 (28%)	5 (45%)	12 (41%)	5 (56%)	12 (39%)

Table 2.4. Weaknesses/challenges: details

This table shows program responses to the same questions as in Table 2.3, but it breaks them into more specific categories. These are the most common weaknesses that programs identified or challenges that they faced during the 2010-11 academic year.

	All programs (40)	District-based programs (22)	Consortium-based programs (18)	Initially funded in 2009 (11)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (29)	75+ beginning teachers (9)	<75 beginning teachers (31)
Funding/budget cuts necessitated cuts to mentor training and support.	8 (20%)	4 (18%)	4 (22%)	2 (18%)	6 (21%)	2 (22%)	6 (19%)
Funding/budget cuts necessitated cuts to novice teacher professional development.	5 (13%)	3 (14%)	2 (11%)	1 (9%)	4 (14%)	2 (22%)	3 (10%)
Funding/budget cuts meant that not all new teachers could be served.	3 (8%)	1 (5%)	2 (11%)	0	3 (10%)	0	3 (10%)
Funding/budget cuts necessitated cuts to coordinator/leadership time and support.	7 (18%)	4 (18%)	3 (17%)	1 (9%)	6 (21%)	2 (22%)	5 (16%)
Funding/budget cuts necessitated cuts in substitutes and release time.	5 (13%)	2 (9%)	3 (17%)	1 (9%)	4 (14%)	1 (11%)	4 (13%)
The late payment of grant funds caused difficulties.	5 (13%)	2 (9%)	3 (17%)	1 (9%)	4 (14%)	0	5 (16%)
Other funding/budget problems.	14 (35%)	5 (23%)	9 (50%)	4 (36%)	10 (34%)	4 (44%)	10 (32%)
The ISBE 60-hours rule (for mentor/mentee contact) created hardships.	10 (25%)	7 (32%)	3 (17%)	3 (27%)	7 (24%)	4 (44%)	6 (19%)
The ISBE rule to pay $1,200 per mentor from grant funds created hardships.	7 (18%)	2 (9%)	5 (28%)	3 (27%)	4 (14%)	1 (11%)	6 (19%)
Administrators were unsupportive or there were communication problems.	5 (13%)	1 (5%)	4 (22%)	2 (18%)	3 (10%)	1 (11%)	4 (13%)
ROEs experienced specific problems (e.g. related to working with multiple districts)	4 (10%)	0	4 (22%)	1 (9%)	3 (10%)	0	4 (13%)
Other	20 (50%)	14 (64%)	6 (33%)	6 (55%)	14 (48%)	4 (44%)	16 (52%)

PROGRAM BUDGETS

Table 3.1. ISBE expenses per beginning teacher
Programs were asked for their total ISBE grant expenditures and the number of new teachers served by this grant for the 2010-11 academic year. Programs could select any one-year period (e.g. 8/1/2010 to 7/31/2011, or 7/1/2010 to 6/30/2011), depending on the fiscal year followed by their district or program. Thus, these numbers may be slightly different from those for the FY11 ISBE grant period, but perhaps more accurately reflect actual program expenses for an academic year. We then used the programs' numbers to calculate ISBE expenses per beginning teacher.

		All programs	District-based programs	Consortium-based programs	Initially funded in 2009	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008	75+ beginning teachers	<75 beginning teachers
Number of programs	FY11	41	23	18	12	29	9	32
	FY10	60	24	36	25	35	21	39
Average ISBE expense per beginning teacher	FY11	$2,399	$2,583	$2,246	$1,883	$2,613	$2,092	$2,486
	FY10	$2,221	$2,551	$1,789	$1,741	$2,563	$1,442	$2,640
Median ISBE expense per beginning teacher	FY11	$2,002	$2,063	$1,867	$1,528	$2,108	$2,063	$1,979
Minimum ISBE expense per beginning teacher	FY11	$683	$1,121	$683	$1,123	$683	$683	$1,123
Maximum ISBE expense per beginning teacher	FY11	$11,147	$11,147	$5,055	$4,754	$11,147	$4,912	$11,147

Table 3.2. Total expenses per beginning teacher
Programs were asked for their total induction expenditures (including ISBE funds and all other sources of funding) and the number of new teachers participating in all induction activities for the 2010-11 academic year. We used the programs' numbers to calculate total expenses per beginning teacher. This table only includes 29 programs; the others either left the questions blank or entered evidently incorrect numbers (e.g. the total number of beginning teachers served was a smaller number than the number of beginning teachers covered by the ISBE grant).

Thirteen of those 29 programs report serving more new teachers than those covered by the ISBE grant. Of those, four use ISBE grant funds as the only source of funding. Nine provide additional funds, and all but one provide enough additional funds that the total expenses per beginning teacher is higher than the ISBE expenses per grant-covered beginning teacher.

	All programs (29)	District-based programs (17)	Consortium-based programs (12)	Initially funded in 2009 (7)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (22)	75+ beginning teachers (5)	<75 beginning teachers (24)
Median total expense per beginning teacher	$2,384	$2,638	$2,187	$1,667	$2,594	$2,594	$2,297
Average total expense per beginning teacher	$2,987	$3,347	$2,478	$2,085	$3,275	$3,648	$2,850
Minimum total expense per beginning teacher	$1,164	$1,164	$1,474	$1,164	$1,255	$2,033	$1,255
Maximum total expense per beginning teacher	$9,555	$9,555	$4,754	$4,754	$9,555	$8,672	$9,555

Table 3.3. Total expenses compared with ISBE expenses

This table compares the programs' ISBE expenses with their total expenses, as shown in Tables 3.1 and 3.2.

	Programs with higher ISBE expenses	Programs with higher total expenses	Programs with identical ISBE and total expenses
Total number of responding programs	5	15	9
Median difference per beginning teacher	$574	$912	N/A
Average difference per beginning teacher	$769	$1,149	N/A
Minimum difference per beginning teacher	$98	$129	N/A
Maximum difference per beginning teacher	$1,592	$3,760	N/A

Table 3.4. ISBE program costs, by category: overall statistics

Programs were asked, "For the time period you provided above, please list what percent (if any) of your ISBE grant expenditures and the overall program expenditures were spent in each category. Each column should total 100%." This table shows the ISBE grant expenditures only; total program expenditures are shown in Table 3.5.

The means and medians were calculated based **only** on programs with non-zero responses for that category.

Programs were omitted if their percentages did not total 100%.

		Mean	Median	Maximum	# of programs with a non-zero response
Total number of programs	2011		38		
	2010		59		
Mentor salary and benefits	2011	63.5%	61%	100%	38 (100%)
	2010	40%	36%	96%	56 (95%)
Coordinator salary and benefits	2011	19.5%	19%	35%	24 (63%)
	2010	16%	12%	60%	46 (78%)
Other training costs	2011	7.9%	4%	25%	26 (68%)
	2010	13%	10%	87%	52 (88%)
Supplies and materials	2011	5.4%	4%	27%	30 (79%)
	2010	8%	7%	25%	57 (97%)
New teacher stipends and benefits	2011	10.7%	9%	30%	13 (34%)
	2010	8%	4%	43%	33 (56%)
Substitute teachers	2011	12.8%	10%	35%	20 (53%)
	2010	6%	5%	52%	43 (73%)
Meals	2011	2.3%	1.1%	7%	19 (50%)
	2010	2%	1%	10%	39 (66%)
Clerical	2011	1.8%	1.6%	2%	4 (11%)
	2010	1.5%	0	12%	17 (29%)
Mileage	2011	2.4%	1%	10%	21 (55%)
	2010	1%	0.5%	22%	34 (58%)
Evaluation	2011	2.9%	3%	5%	5 (13%)
	2010	1%	0	16%	14 (24%)
Space rental	2011	1.25%	1%	1.5%	2 (5%)
	2010	0.4%	0	10%	13 (22%)
Other (conference fees, technological support, misc. overhead, tutors, and misc. to districts)	2011	2%	0	25%	13 (34%)
	2010	2%	0	25%	13 (22%)

Table 3.5. Program costs, by category: disaggregated averages

This table shows the budget categories from the above table which were, on average, at least 5% of the total program budget. It shows the overall averages, then disaggregates by type of program.

Before calculating averages, all blanks and responses of zero were omitted.

		All programs	District-based programs	Consortium-based programs	Initially funded in 2009	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008	75+ beginning teachers	<75 beginning teachers
Total number of programs	2011	38	20	18	10	28	9	29
	2010	59	33	26	24	35	21	37
Mentor salary and benefits	2011	64%	65%	62%	62%	64%	69%	62%
	2010	40%	49%	29%	43%	38%	37%	42%
Coordinator salary and benefits	2011	19%	23%	18%	17%	20%	19%	20%
	2010	16%	12%	20%	14%	17%	20%	13%
Training	2011	8%	10%	6%	8%	8%	6%	8%
	2010	13%	12%	13%	13%	12%	10%	14%
New teacher stipends and benefits	2011	11%	11%	10%	11%	11%	5%	12%
	2010	8%	6%	11%	8%	8%	7%	8%
Supplies and materials	2011	5%	6%	5%	9%	4%	4%	6%
	2010	8%	7%	9%	9%	7%	7%	9%
Substitute teachers	2011	13%	15%	8%	9%	14%	13%	13%
	2010	6%	7%	6%	5%	7%	7%	6%

Table 3.6. ISBE and overall program costs, by category: overall statistics, 2011 only
This table compares programs' ISBE grant expenses, by category, with their total program expenses, by category.
The means and medians were calculated based only on programs with non-zero responses for that category.

Programs were omitted if their percentages did not total 100%.

		Mean	Median	Maximum	# of programs with a non-zero response
Total number of programs	ISBE-grant expenses			38	
	Total program expenses			30	
Mentor salary and benefits	ISBE-grant expenses	63.5%	61%	100%	38 (100%)
	Total program expenses	59.4%	59.1%	99%	30 (100%)
Coordinator salary and benefits	ISBE-grant expenses	19.5%	19%	35%	24 (63%)
	Total program expenses	16.9%	14%	40%	23 (77%)
Other training costs	ISBE-grant expenses	7.9%	4%	25%	26 (68%)
	Total program expenses	9.0%	5%	26%	23 (77%)
Supplies and materials	ISBE-grant expenses	5.4%	4%	27%	30 (79%)
	Total program expenses	4.8%	3%	17%	27 (90%)
New teacher stipends and benefits	ISBE-grant expenses	10.7%	9%	30%	13 (34%)
	Total program expenses	10.9%	8%	30%	12 (40%)
Substitute teachers	ISBE-grant expenses	12.8%	10%	35%	20 (53%)
	Total program expenses	9.1%	7%	23.5%	20 (67%)
Meals	ISBE-grant expenses	2.3%	1.1%	7%	19 (50%)
	Total program expenses	2.8%	2%	10%	17 (57%)
Clerical	ISBE-grant expenses	1.8%	1.6%	2%	4 (11%)
	Total program expenses	4.6%	4%	10%	5 (17%)
Mileage	ISBE-grant expenses	2.4%	1%	10%	21 (55%)
	Total program expenses	2.5%	1.6%	8%	17 (57%)
Evaluation	ISBE-grant expenses	2.9%	3%	5%	5 (13%)
	Total program expenses	4.5%	4.4%	9%	5 (17%)
Space rental	ISBE-grant expenses	1.25%	1%	1.5%	2 (5%)
	Total program expenses	1%	1%	1%	1 (3%)
Other (conference fees, technological support, misc. overhead, tutors, and misc. to districts)	ISBE-grant expenses	2%	0	25%	13 (34%)
	Total program expenses	5.3%	2%	15%	8 (27%)