

INTC Data Brief #5

August 2010

Prepared by: Patricia Brady

With assistance from: Jeff Kohmstedt

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

INTC Director: Chris Roegge

This Data Brief, the fifth of six short reports, is intended to provide a snapshot of data on the 64 induction and mentoring programs that received funding in FY 2010. It describes trainings and professional development for administrators, mentors, and novices.

INTC will provide one more data brief concerning FY 2010 and an end-of-year final report:

- August 30: Program self-rating; program impact & plans for improvement; spring CDE data *Standards 1-9*
- September 30: Final report
Summary of the preceding six data briefs; INTC commentary on program progress to date and policy recommendations

OVERVIEW OF DATA AND ORGANIZATION OF DATA BRIEF

This Data Brief provides highlights of data obtained from the spring 2010 Common Data Elements (CDE) reporting forms by the 64 programs that received grant funding in FY 2010. This Data Brief is organized into three sections:

- Standard 4, Administrator Training: summary of tables 1.1 through 1.5 in the appendix
- Standard 6, Mentor Professional Development: summary of tables 2.1 through 2.5 in the appendix
- Standard 7, Development of Beginning Teacher Practice: summary of tables 3.1 through 3.7 in the appendix

The Appendix, which is available in a separate document, provides complete tables of all quantitative and qualitative data.

The spring CDEs included multiple-choice, short-response, and extended-response questions. The information in this brief is based on program self-reports only.

The Chicago New Teacher Center #299, Areas 3, 7, 13, 14, & 17 encompassed four separate grants. This program filled out a single CDE reporting form, so INTC received 61 spring 2010 CDEs although ISBE funds 64 programs.

The tables disaggregate the data in three ways: district-based programs vs. consortium-based programs; new programs (those initially funded in 2009) vs. continuing programs (those initially funded in 2006 or 2008); and larger programs (serving 75 or more first- and second-year teachers) vs. smaller programs.

STANDARD 4: ADMINISTRATOR TRAINING

Length of training. During the 12-month period of June 1, 2009 through May 31, 2010, 36 programs (half districts, half consortia) held some initial training for administrators around the topics of induction and mentoring. These initial trainings lasted an average of 6.1 hours (5.6 hours for district-based programs vs. 6.7

for consortia; 7.1 hours for new programs vs. 5.2 hours for continuing programs). Additionally, 17 programs held some ongoing induction-related professional development for their administrators, lasting an average of 11.9 hours. (Table 1.1¹)

Materials used. The most popular administrator training program, Induction for the 21st Century Educator (ICE 21), was used by 82% of consortium-based programs, but only 17% of district-based programs. Most district-based programs, on the other hand, used New Teacher Center (NTC) or Consortium for Educational Change (CEC) materials (used by 72% of districts and 18% of consortia), and/or the Charlotte Danielson framework (used 56% of districts and 18% of consortia). Also, 40% of programs overall reported that presenters prepared their own materials; this number was much higher for small programs than for large ones (53% vs. 25%). (Table 1.2)

Content covered. The following topics were covered by administrator trainings in at least 75% of programs: the mentoring process (92%), administrator's role in induction and mentoring (92%), stages of new teacher development (84%), Illinois Professional Teaching Standards (IPTS) and/or content area standards (81%), induction in general (81%), and creating a supportive/collaborative school environment (78%). Consortium-based and district-based programs had some significant differences, with the former being much more likely to cover IPTS (95% vs. 67%), creating a supportive school environment (89% vs. 67%), induction in an Illinois Context (84% vs. 39%), Illinois Induction Standards and/or Illinois Induction Programs Continuum (68% vs. 28%), and National Board for Professional Teaching (NBPT) standards (42% vs. 22%). (Table 1.3)

Number of administrators trained. Programs indicated that 50% of their district-level administrators received initial training prior to June 1, 2009; 26% were trained during the year ending May 31, 2010; and 24% have never been trained. For building-level administrators, those figures are 50%, 35%, and 14%, respectively. Overall, district-based and new programs claimed to have trained higher overall percentages of administrators than have consortium-based and continuing programs (with differences of 11 to 16 percentage points, depending on type of administrator and type of program). (Table 1.4)

STANDARD 6: MENTOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Availability and length of training. During the eight-month period of October 1, 2009 through May 31, 2010, 32 programs provided required initial training to prospective mentors; this training lasted 16.9 hours on average. Additionally, 37 programs required mentors to participate in subsequent / ongoing training, lasting an average of 23.3 hours. Twice as many district-based programs than consortia provided this ongoing training, and their training lasted more than twice as long (26 district-based programs provided 27.8 average hours of training, vs. 11 consortia and 12.7 hours). (Table 2.1)

Materials used. At least half of all programs had presenters prepare their own materials for mentor professional development. Again, consortia were more likely than district-based programs to use ICE 21 materials (72% vs. 25%). Similarly, district-based programs were more likely than consortia to use NTC / CEC materials (75% vs. 11%) and the Charlotte Danielson framework (56% vs. 39%). (Table 2.2)

Content covered. The following topics were covered by at least 85% of programs in their initial mentor training: induction in general (97%); stages of beginning teacher development (97%); establishing a relationship with the mentee (97%); mentor language and roles (94%); induction and mentoring research (91%); and mentoring vs. evaluation (88%). The main difference among programs is that district-based and large (75 or more beginning teachers) programs profess to cover more content than do consortium-based and smaller programs. This may or may not reflect real differences between the programs; mentors in both

¹ All tables referenced in this document are in the Data Brief #5 Appendix, a separate document.

districts and consortia spend a similar number of hours in initial training, but the average initial training conducted by large programs is 50% longer than that provided by smaller programs.

Ongoing mentor training. Programs described ongoing mentor professional development as consisting of networking with other mentors (71%), formal professional development sessions (68%), mentoring of mentors (64%), and a refresher of initial training (54%). However, there were considerable differences among programs. For consortium-based programs, 80% reported that ongoing training was a refresher of initial training, and 40% described it as extending well beyond content covered in initial training; these percentages were roughly reversed for district-based programs. Continuing programs were nearly twice as likely as new programs to provide mentoring of mentors (81% vs. 42%) and networking with other mentors (88% vs. 50%). The two top content areas for ongoing mentor training—observation strategies and tools (81% of programs), and conferencing and feedback skills (77% of programs)—were among the least likely to be covered in initial training. The other top content areas included standards (Illinois Teaching or Learning standards, or content-area standards; 69%) and keeping records (65%). (Tables 2.3 & 2.4)

Degree of participation. Across the board, programs reported that 97.5% of their active mentors had ever received initial training, and 83% of programs reported that 100% of their active mentors had been trained. One surprising finding is that new programs indicated training a higher percentage of their mentors than did continuing programs (97.8% vs. 97.2%). Ongoing (or subsequent) mentor professional development, although not available in every program, typically experienced strong participation; 70% of programs reported that 80% to 100% of their mentors regularly participated in these offerings. (Table 2.5)

STANDARD 7: DEVELOPMENT OF BEGINNING TEACHER PRACTICE

All of the professional development opportunities described in this section occurred between October 1, 2009 and May 31, 2010; summer professional development opportunities were covered on Data Brief #2.

Length of novice teacher professional development. Forty-three programs reported requiring their first-year teachers to attend some trainings provided just for them; trainings provided by districts, new programs, and smaller programs were somewhat longer (around 20 hours) than were those provided by consortia, continuing programs, and larger programs (between 12 and 16 hours). Only 27 programs reported requiring their second-year teachers to attend trainings just for them, and these typically lasted around 13 hours in total. Programs also provided optional trainings for novice teachers as well as professional development opportunities that were open to all teachers. (Tables 3.1 & 3.2)

Materials used. More than three-fourths of presenters prepared their own materials for novice teacher trainings. District-based programs and continuing programs were also likely to use the Charlotte Danielson framework and New Teacher Center materials, while consortium-based programs were more likely to use ICE21 materials. Wong's *First Days of School* was twice as popular in trainings for first-year teachers as for second-year teachers. (Tables 3.3 & 3.4)

Content covered and differentiation. In trainings for first-year teachers, programs covered basic instructional ideas, including classroom management and environment (100%); general instruction, teaching strategies, and pedagogy (91%); lesson planning, unit planning, and curriculum (84%); and Illinois Learning Standards, Illinois Teaching Standards, and content-area standards (80%). Meanwhile, second-year teachers received professional development to help them fine-tune their skills; they were more likely to cover topics including differentiating instruction (87%), formative and summative assessment methods (71%), and analysis of student work (68%), along with topics initially covered in first-year trainings (e.g. pedagogy and standards). However, only half of programs reported differentiating by years of experience; they may have misunderstood the question to mean “differentiation between first-year teachers with and without

experience” rather than “differentiation between first- and second-year teachers”. More than 70% of programs reported differentiating by grade level and content area of teachers. (Tables 3.5, 3.6, & 3.7)

Attendance at optional trainings. Attendance at optional professional development sessions for beginning teachers was, typically, not strong. Only 41% of programs reported that most (80%-100%) first-year teachers attended, and only 36% reported most second-year teachers attended. (Table 3.8)