

Appendix to INTC Data Brief #3

May 2010

Prepared by: Patricia Brady

With assistance from: Lara Hebert, Jeff Kohmstedt, Chris Murphy-Lucas, Nancy Johnson, Mary Elin Barnish, Hilarie Welsh
INTC Director: Chris Roegge

This Appendix provides tables, charts, and analyses of quantitative and qualitative data. All data were reported on the fall 2009 Common Data Elements (CDE) reporting form by the 66 programs that received grant funding in fall 2009.

This Appendix is organized into the following sections:

- Standard 9: Program Evaluation
- Standards 1-9: Plans for Improvement
- Program Disaggregation

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

Notes on the data

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

The Consortium for Educational Change-Marion encompassed two separate grants and Chicago New Teacher Center #299, Areas 3, 7, 13, 14, & 17 encompassed four separate grants. Each of these programs filled out a single CDE reporting form, so INTC received 62 CDEs although ISBE provides 66 total grants. For this data brief, INTC is only reporting on the 62 CDEs it received; thus, Chicago New Teacher Center appears as a single program, not four.

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 3.1 – 3.6, at the end of this Appendix, show the intersections among programs in these three groups. For example, 62% of larger programs (serving 75 or more novice teachers) are consortium-based, and 76% of these larger programs received their initial funding in 2006 or 2008. However, consortium-based programs are equally split between those that serve fewer than 75 beginning teachers and those that serve more than 75.

In each table, the total number of programs responding 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 provided some figures but not others. Also, two programs did not provide complete numbers of participating first- and second-year teachers, so they were omitted from the “program size” columns.

In the tables, each data cell contains two figures. The first figure is the total 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). 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 9: PROGRAM EVALUATION

Table 1.1. Data used in program evaluation

Programs were asked, “What data do you plan to use this year for program evaluation purposes? Check all that apply.”

	Total	District-based programs (35)	Consortium-based programs (26)	Initially funded in 2009 (25)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (36)	75+ beginning teachers (21)	<75 beginning teachers (39)
Questionnaires for novice teachers to fill out after each professional development session	53	27 (77%)	26 (100%)	19 (76%)	34 (94%)	21 (100%)	31 (79%)
Questionnaires for mentors or administrators to fill out after their training sessions	49	27 (77%)	22 (85%)	18 (72%)	31 (86%)	20 (95%)	28 (72%)
Questionnaires for novice teachers to fill out at the end of a semester or academic year	49	30 (86%)	19 (73%)	20 (80%)	29 (81%)	18 (86%)	30 (77%)
Examination of retention data	48	29 (83%)	19 (73%)	19 (76%)	29 (81%)	17 (81%)	31 (79%)
Questionnaires for mentors or administrators to fill out at the end of a semester or academic year	44	28 (80%)	16 (62%)	18 (72%)	26 (72%)	17 (81%)	27 (69%)
Examination of contact logs maintained by beginning teachers and/or mentors	43	27 (77%)	16 (62%)	15 (60%)	28 (78%)	13 (62%)	30 (77%)
Examination of beginning teacher reflection documents	27	16 (46%)	11 (42%)	13 (52%)	14 (39%)	10 (48%)	17 (44%)
Pre/post surveys or assessments for beginning teachers	26	17 (49%)	9 (35%)	11 (44%)	15 (42%)	8 (38%)	17 (44%)
Focus groups or interviews with novice teachers, mentors, or administrators	22	15 (43%)	7 (27%)	6 (24%)	18 (50%)	12 (57%)	12 (31%)
Exit interviews	17	10 (29%)	7 (27%)	5 (20%)	12 (33%)	7 (33%)	10 (26%)
Any data by an external evaluator	17	7 (20%)	10 (38%)	8 (32%)	9 (25%)	8 (38%)	9 (23%)
Pre/post surveys or assessments for mentors or administrators	16	8 (23%)	8 (31%)	7 (28%)	9 (25%)	7 (33%)	8 (21%)
Examination of student test scores	12	9 (26%)	3 (12%)	8 (32%)	4 (11%)	4 (19%)	8 (21%)
Examination of formal evaluations of new teachers	12	9 (26%)	3 (12%)	9 (36%)	3 (8%)	2 (10%)	10 (26%)

Table 1.2. Methods of data disaggregation

Programs were asked, "How do you plan to break out (disaggregate) your data? Check all that apply."

	Total	District-based programs (35)	Consortium-based programs (26)	Initially funded in 2009 (25)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (36)	75+ beginning teachers (21)	<75 beginning teachers (39)
By first- vs. second-year teachers	40	25 (71%)	15 (58%)	9 (36%)	31 (86%)	17 (81%)	22 (56%)
By district	33	N/A	22 (85%)	14 (56%)	19 (53%)	12 (57%)	21 (54%)
By building	21	15 (43%)	6 (23%)	10 (40%)	11 (31%)	7 (33%)	14 (36%)
By grade level of teachers	19	10 (29%)	9 (35%)	6 (24%)	13 (36%)	8 (38%)	10 (26%)
By content area of teachers	12	6 (17%)	6 (23%)	7 (28%)	5 (14%)	5 (24%)	7 (18%)
By mentor type	9	6 (17%)	3 (12%)	2 (8%)	7 (19%)	5 (24%)	4 (10%)
By teacher certification type	8	4 (11%)	4 (15%)	3 (12%)	5 (14%)	3 (14%)	5 (13%)
By race/ethnicity of teachers	3	2 (6%)	1 (4%)	0	3 (8%)	2 (10%)	1 (3%)

Table 1.3. Data analysis personnel

Programs were asked, "Who will analyze the data? Check all that apply."

	Total	District-based programs (35)	Consortium-based programs (26)	Initially funded in 2009 (25)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (36)	75+ beginning teachers (21)	<75 beginning teachers (39)
Induction program coordinator	58	33 (94%)	25 (96%)	25 (100%)	33 (92%)	21 (100%)	36 (92%)
Other induction program leadership	36	20 (57%)	16 (62%)	16 (64%)	20 (56%)	14 (67%)	21 (54%)
District administrator	30	24 (69%)	6 (23%)	12 (48%)	18 (50%)	11 (52%)	19 (49%)
Building administrator	14	10 (29%)	4 (15%)	6 (24%)	8 (22%)	3 (14%)	11 (28%)
Teacher union or association leadership	10	9 (26%)	1 (4%)	4 (16%)	6 (17%)	3 (14%)	7 (18%)
Consultant / external evaluator	9	5 (14%)	4 (15%)	3 (12%)	6 (17%)	3 (14%)	5 (13%)

STANDARDS 1-9: PLANS FOR IMPROVEMENT

All data in this section are from open-ended questions on the CDE which asked programs to describe plans for improvement for each of the nine Illinois Induction Program Standards. The questions read, “What improvements are you planning for this coming year toward meeting or exceeding Standard 1?” (or Standard 2, or Standard 9). Many programs provided more than one planned improvement for each standard.

In analyzing the data, INTC grouped similar responses together. INTC disregarded all comments on past or continuing program strengths; only stated plans for improvement (or descriptions of changes that began during the 2009-10 academic year) were included. If a program listed an improvement under one standard, but it clearly belonged to a different standard, INTC moved the improvement to the correct standard. This makes the response rate for certain questions appear low, even though almost every program provided some response to almost every question. Because these questions are open-ended, it is impossible to determine whether a non-response means that a program is not planning improvements for that standard, or whether the program is planning improvements that it did not describe on the CDE.

The tables below present all responses that were listed by at least two programs.

Table 2.1. Plans for improvement: Standard 1
Induction Program Leadership, Administration, and Support

	Total # of programs	District-based programs (35)	Consortium-based programs (27)	Initially funded in 2009 (26)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (36)	75+ beginning teachers (21)	<75 beginning teachers (39)
Program leadership will increase communication with stakeholders (e.g. unions, mentors, novices, administrators, and/or the public)	22	12 (34%)	10 (37%)	6 (23%)	16 (44%)	12 (57%)	10 (26%)
Program leadership will attend professional development, either internal or external (e.g. conferences)	7	2 (6%)	5 (19%)	1 (4%)	6 (17%)	4 (19%)	3 (8%)
Program leadership will collaborate more with stakeholders (e.g. school board, union, administration, program participants, and/or participating sites)	7	7 (20%)	0	5 (19%)	2 (6%)	0	6 (15%)
Program will institute a new or expanded oversight/leadership committee	6	5 (14%)	1 (4%)	5 (19%)	1 (3%)	2 (10%)	4 (10%)
Program leadership will use technology to increase communication	3	2 (6%)	1 (4%)	0	3 (8%)	1 (5%)	2 (5%)
No response / no specifics	30	14 (40%)	16 (59%)	13 (50%)	17 (47%)	8 (38%)	21 (54%)

Table 2.2. Plans for improvement: Standard 2

Program Goals and Design

	Total # of programs	District-based programs (35)	Consortium-based programs (27)	Initially funded in 2009 (26)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (36)	75+ beginning teachers (21)	<75 beginning teachers (39)
Program will develop more structure or accountability for beginning teachers	13	8 (23%)	5 (19%)	9 (35%)	4 (11%)	5 (24%)	8 (21%)
Program will make improvements to mentor/novice interactions (e.g. more structure; more regular meeting times)	8	4 (11%)	4 (15%)	4 (15%)	4 (11%)	1 (5%)	7 (18%)
Program design will become solidified, often based on a particular model (e.g. IPTS; Danielson's Framework)	5	5 (14%)	0	4 (15%)	1 (3%)	0	5 (13%)
Program will become differentiated for first- and second-year teachers	5	3 (9%)	2 (7%)	0	5 (14%)	1 (5%)	3 (8%)
Program will provide more opportunities for mentors and/or beginning teachers to do classroom observations	3	2 (6%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	2 (6%)	0	3 (8%)
Program will help component districts become ISBE-approved	3	0	3 (11%)	1 (4%)	2 (6%)	1 (5%)	2 (5%)
Program plans to apply for ISBE approval	2	1 (3%)	1 (4%)	2 (8%)	0	0	2 (5%)
Program will help component districts develop their programs in alignment with established expectations and standards	2	0	2 (7%)	0	2 (6%)	1 (5%)	1 (3%)
Program will become differentiated for first- and second-year mentors	2	0	2 (7%)	1 (4%)	1 (3%)	1 (5%)	1 (3%)
Program will become integrated into school and district improvement plans	2	2 (6%)	0	0	2 (6%)	0	2 (5%)
Program will try to change school/district culture so all are committed to beginning teacher development	2	1 (3%)	1 (4%)	0	2 (6%)	1 (5%)	1 (3%)
Program will create or revise the manual/handbook	2	2 (6%)	0	0	2 (6%)	0	2 (5%)
No response / no specifics	23	12 (34%)	11 (41%)	10 (38%)	13 (36%)	9 (43%)	13 (33%)

Table 2.3. Plans for improvement: Standard 3

Resources

	Total # of programs	District-based programs (35)	Consortium-based programs (27)	Initially funded in 2009 (26)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (36)	75+ beginning teachers (21)	<75 beginning teachers (39)
Program will budget for substitutes or other release time for mentors and/or beginning teachers	14	10 (29%)	4 (15%)	9 (35%)	5 (14%)	4 (19%)	10 (26%)
Program will provide additional materials to mentors or beginning teachers	5	3 (9%)	2 (7%)	2 (8%)	3 (8%)	2 (10%)	3 (8%)
Program will better allocate money, or make allocations more organized	5	3 (9%)	2 (7%)	1 (4%)	4 (11%)	4 (19%)	1 (3%)
Program will improve monitoring to ensure that all funds are used as directed	4	1 (3%)	3 (11%)	2 (8%)	2 (6%)	2 (10%)	1 (3%)
Program will save money by using internal trainers	3	3 (9%)	0	0	3 (8%)	2 (10%)	1 (3%)
Program will build district support and involvement so that program may be sustainable even if grant funding is reduced	2	1 (3%)	1 (4%)	0	2 (6%)	1 (5%)	1 (3%)
Program will plan for use of additional resources if funding is increased	2	1 (3%)	1 (4%)	2 (8%)	0	1 (5%)	1 (3%)
Program will become more efficient in managing resources	2	1 (3%)	1 (4%)	0	2 (6%)	2 (10%)	0
No response / no specifics	19	9 (26%)	10 (37%)	7 (27%)	12 (33%)	4 (19%)	14 (36%)

Table 2.4. Plans for improvement: Standard 4
 Site Administrator Roles and Responsibilities

	Total # of programs	District-based programs (35)	Consortium-based programs (27)	Initially funded in 2009 (26)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (36)	75+ beginning teachers (21)	<75 beginning teachers (39)
Program plans to train more administrators or offer more administrator academies	36	17 (49%)	19 (70%)	15 (58%)	21 (58%)	15 (71%)	20 (51%)
Program would like administrators to be more involved in administering the program, monitoring compliance, or working directly with novice teachers	7	5 (14%)	2 (7%)	1 (4%)	6 (17%)	2 (10%)	5 (13%)
Program plans to improve administrator training	6	5 (14%)	1 (4%)	2 (8%)	4 (11%)	2 (10%)	4 (10%)
The program wants administrators to attend professional development sessions for mentors or beginning teachers	5	5 (14%)	0	1 (4%)	4 (11%)	2 (10%)	3 (8%)
Program would like to bring principals together to network and share ideas	2	1 (3%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	1 (3%)	1 (5%)	1 (3%)
Program leaders plan individual meetings with site administrators	2	2 (6%)	0	1 (4%)	1 (3%)	0	2 (5%)
Program plans to involve principals in data collection or interpretation	2	1 (3%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	1 (3%)	1 (5%)	1 (3%)
Program wants to improve administrator attendance at meetings	2	0	2 (7%)	0	2 (6%)	1 (5%)	1 (3%)
Programs leaders will work with site administrators to strengthen their districts' programs	2	0	2 (7%)	0	2 (6%)	1 (5%)	1 (3%)
No response / no specifics	14	11 (31%)	3 (11%)	7 (27%)	7 (19%)	2 (10%)	11 (28%)

Table 2.5. Plans for improvement: Standard 5
Mentor Selection and Assignment

	Total # of programs	District-based programs (35)	Consortium-based programs (27)	Initially funded in 2009 (26)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (36)	75+ beginning teachers (21)	<75 beginning teachers (39)
Program will improve its mentor application/selection process	7	6 (17%)	1 (4%)	2 (8%)	5 (14%)	2 (10%)	5 (13%)
Program will make mentor selection a more formal process, or will encourage component districts to do so	5	2 (6%)	3 (11%)	3 (12%)	2 (6%)	3 (14%)	2 (5%)
Program will continue training mentors to increase the available pool	5	3 (9%)	2 (7%)	4 (15%)	1 (3%)	1 (5%)	4 (10%)
Program will increase or improve its mentor recruitment efforts	4	4 (11%)	0	1 (4%)	3 (8%)	2 (10%)	2 (5%)
Program will improve the mentor/novice matching process	4	4 (11%)	0	1 (4%)	3 (8%)	1 (5%)	3 (8%)
Program will monitor that the selection process is occurring per program guidelines	4	2 (6%)	2 (7%)	0	4 (11%)	2 (10%)	1 (3%)
Program will offer training for administrators to assist in mentor selection/assignment and to increase administrator support for the process	3	0	3 (11%)	0	3 (8%)	2 (10%)	1 (3%)
Program will add or replace a full-release mentor	3	3 (9%)	0	1 (4%)	2 (6%)	1 (5%)	2 (5%)
Program plans to hire more mentors/coaches to enable program expansion	2	1 (3%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	1 (3%)	0	2 (5%)
No response / no specifics	24	12 (34%)	12 (44%)	13 (50%)	11 (31%)	5 (24%)	18 (46%)

Table 2.6. Plans for improvement: Standard 6

Mentor Professional Development

	Total # of programs	District-based programs (35)	Consortium-based programs (27)	Initially funded in 2009 (26)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (36)	75+ beginning teachers (21)	<75 beginning teachers (39)
Program will improve, expand, or streamline mentor training and professional development	24	18 (51%)	6 (22%)	14 (54%)	10 (28%)	6 (29%)	18 (46%)
Program will provide (typically unstructured) opportunities for mentors to network and reflect	23	13 (37%)	10 (37%)	9 (35%)	14 (39%)	9 (43%)	14 (36%)
Program will provide (more) ongoing training for mentors who have already had initial training	12	4 (11%)	8 (30%)	4 (15%)	8 (22%)	7 (33%)	5 (13%)
Program will introduce a self-assessment or formative-assessment component for mentors	8	5 (14%)	3 (11%)	3 (12%)	5 (14%)	3 (14%)	5 (13%)
Program will differentiate trainings for first-year and second-year mentors	5	2 (6%)	3 (11%)	2 (8%)	3 (8%)	2 (10%)	3 (8%)
Program will encourage mentors to attend conferences, INTC PLaN meetings, and optional trainings	4	2 (6%)	2 (7%)	1 (4%)	3 (8%)	2 (10%)	2 (5%)
Mentor training will start earlier so mentors will be ready for the new school year	2	1 (3%)	1 (4%)	0	2 (6%)	0	2 (5%)
Program will develop a more formal mentor support structure	2	2 (6%)	0	2 (8%)	0	0	2 (5%)
Program will train mentors to conduct beginning teacher or mentor trainings	2	0	2 (7%)	0	2 (6%)	1 (5%)	1 (3%)
No response / no specifics	5	2 (6%)	3 (11%)	3 (12%)	2 (6%)	2 (10%)	1 (3%)

Table 2.7. Plans for improvement: Standard 7

Development of Beginning Teacher Practice

	Total # of programs	District-based programs (35)	Consortium-based programs (27)	Initially funded in 2009 (26)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (36)	75+ beginning teachers (21)	<75 beginning teachers (39)
Program will offer more novice teacher professional development sessions, or more sessions on particular topics	25	14 (40%)	11 (41%)	10 (38%)	15 (42%)	12 (57%)	12 (31%)
Program will provide beginning teachers with more (or improved) social networking and support, from peers and mentors	7	4 (11%)	3 (11%)	4 (15%)	3 (8%)	1 (5%)	6 (15%)
Program will provide differentiated professional development for first- and second-year teachers	5	2 (6%)	3 (11%)	0	5 (14%)	2 (10%)	3 (8%)
Program will provide time for beginning teachers to collaborate and problem solve	4	3 (9%)	1 (4%)	2 (8%)	2 (6%)	0	4 (10%)
Program will provide differentiated professional development for various content areas and roles	3	2 (6%)	1 (4%)	2 (8%)	1 (3%)	1 (5%)	2 (5%)
Program will create a new teacher website or new online resources	3	3 (9%)	0	1 (4%)	2 (6%)	1 (5%)	2 (5%)
Program plans to hold professional development earlier in the summer	2	2 (6%)	0	1 (4%)	1 (3%)	0	2 (5%)
Program will present trainings at different school sites	2	0	2 (7%)	0	2 (6%)	1 (5%)	1 (3%)
Program leaders will work with districts so they can develop orientations for beginning teachers	2	0	2 (7%)	1 (4%)	1 (3%)	0	2 (5%)
No response / no specifics	20	11 (31%)	9 (33%)	10 (38%)	10 (28%)	5 (24%)	14 (36%)

Table 2.8. Plans for improvement: Standard 8
Formative Assessment

	Total # of programs	District-based programs (35)	Consortium-based programs (27)	Initially funded in 2009 (26)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (36)	75+ beginning teachers (21)	<75 beginning teachers (39)
Program will make the formative assessment process more formal, structured, and intentional	15	9 (26%)	6 (22%)	7 (27%)	8 (22%)	4 (19%)	11 (28%)
The formative assessment process will include more emphasis on the analysis of data (e.g. student work; observation data)	15	10 (29%)	5 (19%)	7 (27%)	8 (22%)	4 (19%)	11 (28%)
Program will offer new/more/improved mentor training in the formative assessment process	15	8 (23%)	7 (26%)	8 (31%)	7 (19%)	5 (24%)	10 (26%)
Program will require better documentation or accountability of the formative assessment process	11	4 (11%)	7 (26%)	4 (15%)	7 (19%)	5 (24%)	6 (15%)
Program will use the Illinois Continuum of Teacher Development in formative assessment	7	4 (11%)	3 (11%)	0	7 (19%)	5 (24%)	2 (5%)
Program will offer training for beginning teachers in the formative assessment process	5	4 (11%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	4 (11%)	2 (10%)	2 (5%)
Program will begin using CALs (Collaborative Assessment Logs)	2	2 (6%)	0	1 (4%)	1 (3%)	0	2 (5%)
No response / no specifics	17	9 (26%)	8 (30%)	9 (35%)	8 (22%)	3 (14%)	13 (33%)

Table 2.9. Plans for improvement: Standard 9

Program Evaluation

	Total # of programs	District-based programs (35)	Consortium-based programs (27)	Initially funded in 2009 (26)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (36)	75+ beginning teachers (21)	<75 beginning teachers (39)
Program will share more data with stakeholders (e.g. administrators; mentors; participating districts)	15	11 (31%)	4 (15%)	5 (19%)	10 (28%)	6 (29%)	9 (23%)
Program leadership is looking for new ways to use data to improve the program	12	8 (23%)	4 (15%)	4 (15%)	8 (22%)	5 (24%)	7 (18%)
Program is re-thinking its data collection and analysis (no specifics)	12	8 (23%)	4 (15%)	9 (35%)	3 (8%)	3 (14%)	9 (23%)
Program will provide more structure for mentors, and/or more mentor accountability	10	6 (17%)	4 (15%)	5 (19%)	5 (14%)	4 (19%)	6 (15%)
Program will institute new or improved surveys	9	6 (17%)	3 (11%)	4 (15%)	5 (14%)	3 (14%)	5 (13%)
Program wants to improve data collection tools and/or collect data more often	8	6 (17%)	2 (7%)	3 (12%)	5 (14%)	2 (10%)	6 (15%)
Program will gather new types of data (e.g. mentor contact log; resource use; teacher evaluations)	5	2 (6%)	3 (11%)	0	5 (14%)	3 (14%)	2 (5%)
Program is planning to work with a new external evaluator or university partner	5	5 (14%)	0	4 (15%)	1 (3%)	2 (10%)	3 (8%)
Program will examine impact on teacher retention	4	2 (6%)	2 (7%)	2 (8%)	2 (6%)	2 (10%)	2 (5%)
Program will add interviews or focus groups to data collection	4	2 (6%)	2 (7%)	1 (4%)	4 (11%)	2 (10%)	2 (5%)
Program will examine impact on student achievement	3	1 (3%)	2 (7%)	0	3 (8%)	0	3 (8%)
Program will be conducting surveys and evaluations for the first time	3	1 (3%)	2 (7%)	3 (12%)	0	1 (5%)	2 (5%)
Program will look at data findings by external researchers who are working with this program or similar programs	3	2 (6%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	2 (6%)	1 (5%)	2 (5%)
Program wants to involve more stakeholders in data analysis	3	3 (9%)	0	2 (8%)	1 (3%)	0	3 (8%)
Program will begin using online surveys	2	2 (6%)	0	0	2 (6%)	1 (5%)	1 (3%)
Program plans for more systemic data collection	2	0	2 (7%)	0	2 (6%)	2 (10%)	0
Program will buy a software package to use for monitoring mentor/novice interactions	2	0	2 (7%)	0	2 (6%)	2 (10%)	0
No response / no specifics	12	5 (14%)	7 (26%)	5 (19%)	7 (19%)	4 (19%)	7 (18%)

Table 2.10. Number of non-responders for each standard

As shown in Tables 2.1 through 2.9, programs were asked about their plans for improvement for each of the nine Standards. This table shows the number of programs which did not provide a response that fit under each of the nine standards. The programs included here could have left the question blank; could have supplied an answer which fit better under another standard; could have described past events, not plans for the future; or could have provided an answer with no specifics (e.g. “We will improve our mentoring program.”)

	Total # of programs	District-based programs (35)	Consortium-based programs (27)	Initially funded in 2009 (26)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (36)	75+ beginning teachers (21)	<75 beginning teachers (39)
Plans for improvement: Standard 1 No response / no specifics	30	14 (40%)	16 (59%)	13 (50%)	17 (47%)	8 (38%)	21 (54%)
Plans for improvement: Standard 2 No response / no specifics	23	12 (34%)	11 (41%)	10 (38%)	13 (36%)	9 (43%)	13 (33%)
Plans for improvement: Standard 3 No response / no specifics	19	9 (26%)	10 (37%)	7 (27%)	12 (33%)	4 (19%)	14 (36%)
Plans for improvement: Standard 4 No response / no specifics	14	11 (31%)	3 (11%)	7 (27%)	7 (19%)	2 (10%)	11 (28%)
Plans for improvement: Standard 5 No response / no specifics	24	12 (34%)	12 (44%)	13 (50%)	11 (31%)	5 (24%)	18 (46%)
Plans for improvement: Standard 6 No response / no specifics	5	2 (6%)	3 (11%)	3 (12%)	2 (6%)	2 (10%)	1 (3%)
Plans for improvement: Standard 7 No response / no specifics	20	11 (31%)	9 (33%)	10 (38%)	10 (28%)	5 (24%)	14 (36%)
Plans for improvement: Standard 8 No response / no specifics	17	9 (26%)	8 (30%)	9 (35%)	8 (22%)	3 (14%)	13 (33%)
Plans for improvement: Standard 9 No response / no specifics	12	5 (14%)	7 (26%)	5 (19%)	7 (19%)	4 (19%)	7 (18%)

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 the first four tables, the percentages of programs serving 75+ vs. <75 beginning teachers do not add up to 100. This is because two programs did not provide complete information on the number of beginning teachers that they serve.

Table 3.1. 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 3.2. Consortium-based programs (27 total)

Initially funded in 2009	11 (41%)
Initially funded in 2006 or 2008	16 (59%)
75+ beginning teachers	13 (48%)
<75 beginning teachers	13 (48%)

Table 3.3. Programs initially funded in 2009 (26 total)

District-based programs	15 (58%)
Consortium-based programs	11 (42%)
75+ beginning teachers	5 (19%)
<75 beginning teachers	20 (77%)

Table 3.4. 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 3.5. 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 3.6. 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%)