

# INTC Data Brief #1

February 2011

Data Brief #1 prepared by: Patricia Brady  
With assistance from: Jeff Kohmstedt and the INTC staff  
INTC Director: Chris Roegge

This Data Brief, the first short report from FY 2011, is intended to provide a snapshot of data on the 45 ISBE-funded induction and mentoring programs reported on the Common Data Elements (CDE) survey they completed in late fall 2010. One funded program did not complete a CDE until after this report was complete. This Data Brief describes the growth of the funded programs, demographics on novice teachers and mentors within the programs, and publicly-available information on the districts within which the programs operate. This Data Brief also reports on data from a separate survey of the funded programs which declined to seek FY11 continuation funding. The raw data is provided in tables in the Appendix, which is a separate document.

## OVERVIEW OF DATA AND ORGANIZATION OF DATA BRIEF

---

This Data Brief provides data on all programs funded in fall 2010, including:

- demographic characteristics of mentors and novices, including retention data;
- demographic characteristics of funded programs; and
- impact of reductions in funding.

The Data Brief also includes information on non-continuing programs.

## DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF MENTORS AND NOVICES

---

**Changes in program size and number of teachers.** Fifteen programs declined to seek continuation funding for FY11, and most of the remaining programs had fewer beginning teachers in 2010-11 than they did the previous year. Seven programs experienced a net gain in the number of first- and second-year teachers, while 36 experienced a decline. The average program in FY11 has 29 fewer new teachers—for a 38% reduction—than it did in FY10. Because of these decreases—in the number of funded programs, and within each funded program—the total numbers of novice teachers and mentors served by all of the funded programs together has declined by 50% since fall 2009. In fact, there are 37% fewer first-year teachers being served now than in fall 2008, when there were only 39 funded programs. (Tables 1.1, 1.2, & 1.3)

**Participant teaching level and content area.** Elementary teachers remain the largest group served, at 39% of the total, and senior high teachers remain the second largest group. We estimate that the first- and second-year teachers in the programs currently serve approximately 108,190 students. The content area specializations of new teachers have shifted over the past three years. For example, in fall 2008, 39% of first-year teachers were grade-level (e.g. second-grade) teachers, while in fall 2010 only 26% were. These shifts mean that the content-area specializations of new teachers are no longer proportional to those of mentors. Proportionately more mentors than new teachers are grade-level teachers (33% vs. 26%). Meanwhile, there are disproportionately fewer mentors than new teachers in the areas of special education, ESL/bilingual education, and math/science. (Tables 1.4 & 1.5)

**Participant race.** Ninety-three percent of mentors in 2010-11 are White, and the percent of White first-year teachers decreased from 90% in 2009-10 to 85% in 2010-11. Categories which increased include Black and multi-racial first-year teachers. The percent of Latino teachers has remained constant. (Tables 1.6 & 1.7)

**Participant background.** This year, first-year teachers are even less likely to come from alternative certification programs (4% in 2010-11 vs. 7% in 2009-10). They are, however, much more likely than in the past to be non-traditional age (older than early-20's): 44% of first-year teachers in 2010-11 were older, compared with 23% in 2009-10 and 16% in 2008-09. (Table 1.8)

**Mentor types.** In 2010-11, a full 92% of mentors are full-time teachers or administrators—up sharply from 2009-10 (81% of mentors). Full-time or full-release mentors dropped from 8% of the total last year to 2% this year, and only seven programs this year (vs. 24 in 2009-10) have any full-time mentors. (Table 1.9)

**Novice teacher retention.** The teacher retention numbers may raise more questions than they answer. For teachers hired in 2009, it appears that program participation boosted the percentage of teachers who stayed in their districts (79% of participants vs. 65% of non-participants), and minimized the percentage of those who were asked to leave (2% of participants vs. 12% of non-participants). However, these comparisons are questionable because programs were only able to trace 47% of non-participants. The remaining 53% may still be teaching in their districts, but it is impossible to tell. Programs were able to account for 99% of participating teachers, suggesting a large discrepancy in record-keeping at the program or district level.

For teachers initially hired in 2007, similar numbers of program participants and non-participants stayed in their districts, left voluntarily, or were asked to leave. These similarities may suggest that the benefits of participation in teacher induction wash out after a few years. Or, the similarities may result from some other factor: Perhaps program participants were disproportionately from subgroups (e.g. teachers in high-need content areas or in high-need schools) that were less likely to stay in their districts, so program participation may actually have boosted retention where it mattered. Or, induction programs in 2007 may have been significantly less developed—and thus less effective—than they are today. In 2007, only 10 programs were receiving state funding; many others may have been using “buddy-style” mentoring or other rudimentary induction. The inability of programs to account for the whereabouts of all recent hires also complicates the drawing of any conclusion. (Table 1.10)

**Retention patterns.** Nearly half of all programs noted that teachers who left their districts prior to 2010-11 were disproportionately math/science teachers or those who were not seen as successful. Around a third noted disproportionate attrition of special education teachers and teachers of some specific content area. One fifth of programs also noticed attrition of teachers in high-poverty or high-need schools, ESL/bilingual teachers, and teachers who did not participate in an induction program. These patterns are different than those reported a year ago, in fall 2009. Then, 74% of programs noted that leavers were likely to be teachers seen as unsuccessful, and math/science teachers were disproportionately likely to leave in only 19% of programs. (Table 1.11)

## **DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF FUNDED PROGRAMS**

**Number of programs and districts and schools served.** The number of funded programs dropped by 30% from 2009-10 to 2010-11. This fact—coupled with funding reductions and an education market in which fewer jobs opened up for new teachers—caused a 38% drop (to 219) in the total number of districts served by the ISBE grant, and a 42% drop (to 689) in the number of schools served which currently have new teachers. The programs choosing not to apply for FY11 continuation funding were disproportionately ROEs, causing a drop from 34% of programs in FY10 to 30% in FY11. (Tables 2.1 & 2.2)

**Program demographics.** The programs serve a diverse group of districts which represent a cross-section of Illinois, from small districts (482 students enrolled at Lindop SD #92) to large districts (Chicago NTC serves schools with a combined 42,686 students). In percentages of White, Black, Hispanic, and Asian students, low income students, and English Language Learners, the funded program mean is within three percentage points of the Illinois state average. Additionally, for each demographic statistic, there is a wide range between the programs’ minimum and maximum (e.g. 0.2% White students in schools served by NLU to 97% White students in the CGJM ROE #40). Other program demographics—including average teacher salary, teacher experience, teachers with master’s degrees, teacher race, and district instructional expense per student—have means close to the state average, and a wide range across the programs from minimum to maximum. Program trends during the past three years have mirrored state trends. For example, the percent of teachers

with master's degrees has been rising, in both the funded programs and in Illinois as a whole. (Tables 2.3 through 2.12)

## **IMPACT OF REDUCTIONS IN FUNDING AND NUMBER OF NEW TEACHERS**

**Program adaptations to FY10 and FY11 budget reductions.** The impact of ISBE budget reductions for FY10 and FY11 was somewhat reduced because many programs had fewer new teachers and thus had lower funding needs. However, more than a third of programs reported that their districts had to pay more to make up for the funding cuts (36% of programs in FY10; 43% in FY11). A smaller subset of programs (23% in FY11) reported seeking (or having obtained) funding from alternate sources, although no program initially funded in 2009 reported doing so, and more large programs than small (56% vs. 14%) sought such funding. Despite these efforts, nearly all programs reported being negatively impacted by budget cuts (93% in FY10; 100% in FY11). (Tables 3.1, 3.2, & 3.3)

**Impact on programs of funding reductions.** Programs were asked how they were impacted by budget reductions. Their responses show that FY11 budget reductions were even more catastrophic than those in FY10, with more programs checking more categories of reductions. These responses may reflect not only funding cuts but also new administrative rules which impacted how funding could be spent. Top on the list of reductions for FY11 were: buying fewer resources (77%), holding fewer mentor trainings (59%) and novice teacher trainings (55%), and cutting substitute reimbursements (55%). Around a third of programs had to make the more-significant steps of reducing the program coordinator positions, reducing or eliminating stipends for novice teachers, and choosing to serve only a portion of the novice teachers. One quarter of programs reduced or eliminated full-time or full-release mentors; this is actually a large percentage, as only 38% of programs had full-release mentors in 2009-10. Also worth noting is that the programs which were initially funded in 2006 noted little impact of budget cuts in FY10, but in FY11 they were often impacted to a greater extent than were later-funded programs. (Tables 3.4, 3.5, & 3.6)

## **NON-CONTINUING PROGRAMS**

**Reasons to not seek FY11 funding.** Ten programs completed the survey for previously-funded programs which declined to seek FY11 continuation funding. When asked why they did not seek FY11 funding, seven programs responded that the administrative rules were overly burdensome. Four programs explained that the state did not pay its FY10 obligations in a timely manner, and four noted that the reduced funding they were offered meant that they had to dramatically reduce or eliminate their entire program. Three noted that they were not receiving enough grant money to make the effort worthwhile, and two no longer had the staffing to run an induction program or manage the grant. Programs initially funded in 2009 were particularly impacted by the reduced funding. In an open-ended question, programs chiefly complained about the administrative rules, particularly the stipulation that they pay all mentors \$1,200. Programs explained that this rule made it fiscally impossible for them to continue serving all new teachers in all districts, or that it violated teacher contracts. (Tables 5.1 & 5.2)

**Conditions required for seeking FY12 funding.** One program indicated definite plans to apply for FY12 funding. Of the other nine, seven indicated that they would only apply for FY12 funding if the administrative rules were changed, and seven would only apply if state budget conditions were improved. Four programs wanted to be sure that local budget conditions had improved. None of the programs indicated that they would only apply if there were less paperwork or fewer requirements. (Table 5.3)

**Current program status.** Seven programs indicated that they are currently providing some sort of induction services for new teachers. Almost all are using district funds and claim that their budget has been reduced by an average of 72%. As a result, at least 50% of responding programs noted that they bought fewer resources,

held fewer novice and mentor trainings, reduced the program coordinator positions, and reduced stipends for novices and mentors. (Table 5.4)