



**ILLINOIS BEGINNING TEACHER INDUCTION PROGRAMS  
FY11 INTC FINAL REPORT**

**OCTOBER 2011**

**Prepared for:**  
Illinois State Board of Education

**Prepared by INTC Staff:**

Patricia Brady  
Lara Hebert  
Mary Elin Barnish  
Jeff Kohmstedt  
Hilarie Welsh  
Nancy Johnson  
Mike Painter  
Jason Swanson

**Director of INTC:**  
Chris Higgins

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	iii
PURPOSE OF THE REPORT .....	1
INTRODUCTION AND RESEARCH METHODOLOGY .....	1
SUMMARY OF DATA BRIEFS: INDUCTION PROGRAM DESCRIPTION.....	4
SUMMARY OF DATA BRIEFS: PROGRAM IMPACT.....	6
OBSERVATIONS FROM INTC STATEWIDE CO-COORDINATORS .....	8
DISCUSSION.....	11
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR POLICY AND PROGRAMMING .....	12
INTC PROPOSED RESEARCH ACTIVITIES.....	14

## ILLINOIS BEGINNING TEACHER INDUCTION PROGRAMS FY11 INTC FINAL REPORT

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This document reports on research conducted by the Illinois New Teacher Collaborative (INTC) during FY11.

#### **Purpose of the Report**

This report provides a summary of the data briefs which were submitted to the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) during the preceding 12 months; observations from the INTC Statewide Co-coordinators; discussion and tentative conclusions; recommendations for ISBE, the Illinois New Teacher Collaborative (INTC), and funded programs; and INTC plans for future research activities.

#### **Introduction and Research Methodology**

INTC conducted four major research initiatives during FY11, all using online survey methodology. Two involved the ISBE grant-funded induction programs, one involved all Illinois districts which have never received ISBE induction funding, and one involved all mentors and new teachers in the funded programs. The last survey, involving over 2,000 teachers, is still being analyzed by Dr. Elizabeth Wilkins of Northern Illinois University and her team and is not described in this report.

#### **Summaries of Data Briefs**

This report summarizes the INTC Data Briefs by providing both descriptive and impact data. Descriptive data covers both the funded programs and never-funded districts. Impact data includes: impact of funded induction programs on retention, impact of budget reductions on funded programs, and impact of ISBE funding on program development.

#### **Observations from INTC Statewide Co-coordinators**

In this section, the INTC Statewide Co-coordinators describe, from their perspective, what the funded programs do well, in what areas they could improve, and some particularly effective or interesting practices programs have adopted.

#### **Discussion**

This section draws on the data briefs and co-coordinator observations to describe themes and potential implications for the future.

#### **Recommendations for Policy and Programming**

This section provides recommendations for INTC, ISBE, induction programs which previously received ISBE induction grant funding, and never-funded Illinois districts and are meant to be accomplished in the following 12 months.

#### **INTC Proposed Research Activities**

This section describes the research that INTC proposes conducting during FY12.

## **PURPOSE OF THE REPORT**

This report includes information regarding Illinois beginning teacher induction programs during FY11 or the 2010-11 academic year: both programs funded by ISBE grants and programs run by districts without such funding. It provides a summary of the data briefs that were submitted to the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) during the preceding 12 months; observations from the INTC Statewide Co-coordinators; recommendations for ISBE, Illinois New Teacher Collaborative (INTC), and funded programs; and INTC plans for future research activities.

## **INTRODUCTION AND RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

INTC completed four major research initiatives in FY11: a fall CDE for the ISBE grant-funded induction programs; a winter survey of all Illinois districts which have never received ISBE induction grant funding; a spring survey of all beginning teachers and all mentors associated with the funded programs; and a spring CDE of funded programs. Additionally, INTC sent a short survey to the programs which received FY10 ISBE funding but chose not to apply for FY11 funding. The methodology of each of these initiatives is described below.

INTC staff described the below data in a series of three data briefs. Each data brief contains a main report that provides summary and interpretation of data and an appendix that contains the raw data presented in tables. The data briefs are currently available on INTC's website at <http://intc.education.illinois.edu/search/node/data%20brief>.

Additionally, in spring 2011, INTC sent a survey to each mentor and new teacher in the funded programs. New teachers were asked about their backgrounds, teaching assignments and schools, and supports they received from their school, including how valuable these supports were. They also were asked questions on teacher efficacy to determine the impact of the induction program. Mentors were asked about background, training and support for mentors, and their relationship with their mentee. We received completed surveys from 1,211 new teachers and 1019 mentors, for response rates of 61% and 77%, respectively. The surveys are currently being analyzed at Northern Illinois University by Dr. Elizabeth Wilkins and her team. Because of the number of surveys collected and their complexity, analysis will not be complete until early 2012, so findings from these surveys are not included in this report.

### **Fall 2010 CDE**

In fall 2010, INTC surveyed the 46 programs which were receiving ISBE induction grant funding; one program did not respond until after the deadline. This survey was conducted online and included both qualitative and quantitative questions. The fall CDE included questions on:

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

In summarizing and analyzing the data, INTC staff disaggregated the programs in three ways: run by a district or by a consortium; year initially funded by ISBE (2006, 2008, or 2009); and size (greater or less than 75 participating new teachers).

### **Non-continuing programs survey**

In winter 2010, INTC sent a brief survey to the 15 programs which had received FY10 grant funding but chose not to apply for FY11 funding. Ten of those programs completed the survey.

This survey featured questions on:

- why programs chose not to re-apply for grant funding,
- whether programs would consider re-applying for future grant funding, and
- the programs' current status.

### **Unfunded districts survey**

In December 2010, INTC staff phoned the 536 Illinois districts which have never received ISBE beginning teacher induction grant funding. Those brief phone calls provided INTC with the names and contact information for the person at each district who could best answer questions about beginning teacher induction.

In January 2011, the contact person at each district received a print mailing sent in collaboration with the Chicago New Teacher Center, INTC, and ISBE. This mailing included an announcement of the survey and some resources on induction, including the *Illinois Induction Programs Continuum*. Shortly thereafter, INTC emailed an online survey to the district contacts. The survey was mostly quantitative and included questions on:

- the number of new teachers and their participation rates in induction activities,
- what induction activities the district offers,
- how the program is organized and which entities are responsible,
- whether (and how) new teachers and mentors are compensated for their participation,
- mentor job description, selection requirements, and training,
- mentor activities,
- building administrator involvement, and
- funding sources and desired improvements.

Districts were sent two reminder emails and had roughly a month to complete the survey. Ultimately, 290 districts took the survey, for a response rate of 54%.

INTC also conducted a short follow-up telephone survey of a representative sample of non-responders and discovered that their answers did not differ significantly from those of the initial responders.

In summarizing and analyzing the data, INTC disaggregated the districts in four ways: by size (small, medium, and large, per ISBE categories); by percent of low-income students (above and below the state average, with Chicago removed); by average instructional expense (again, above and below the state average, with Chicago removed); and by district locale (city, suburb, town, or rural).

### **Spring 2011 CDE**

In spring 2011, INTC surveyed the 46 programs which were receiving ISBE induction grant funding. Five did not respond, so INTC received 41 complete surveys. This survey was

conducted online and included both qualitative and quantitative questions. The spring CDE included questions on:

- program self-assessment on the *Illinois Induction Program Continuum*;
- program goals and progress; and
- program budgets.

As with the fall CDE, in summarizing and analyzing the data, INTC staff disaggregated the programs in three ways: run by a district or by a consortium; year initially funded by ISBE (2006, 2008, or 2009); and size (greater or less than 75 participating new teachers).

## SUMMARY OF DATA BRIEFS: INDUCTION PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

### Description of state-funded induction programs

*The number of programs and the number of teachers served declined, yet the programs remained diverse and representative of Illinois as a whole.* In FY10, 61 programs<sup>1</sup> received Illinois induction grant funding. Fifteen of those programs decided not to seek continuation funding for FY11. 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.

In explaining their decisions, non-continuing programs pointed to the new administrative rules, especially the ones requiring each mentor to be paid \$1,200 from grant funds and requiring each mentor to spend 60 hours per year with each new teacher. These rules, they said, would violate teacher contracts or would make it fiscally impossible, given the level of funding, for them to serve all of their new teachers. Programs also explained that Illinois did not pay its FY10 obligations in a timely manner and that the drop in funding levels made the programs unsustainable.

Although the number of programs dropped by 30% from FY10 to FY11, the total number of new teachers served fell by 50%, mainly because districts hired fewer new teachers.

Despite the drop in the number of funded programs, the programs still serve a diverse and representative group of districts which represent a cross-section of Illinois. Most program demographics (e.g. percentage of English Language Learners or average teacher salary) have means close to the state average, and a wide range across the programs from minimum to maximum.

*New teacher and mentor demographics changed slightly.* In FY11, as in years past, the funded programs serve more elementary teachers than any other group of new teachers. The content-area specializations of new teachers have, however, shifted over the past few years. 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.

Compared with previous years, a smaller percentage of new teachers in FY11 were White (85%) or from alternative certification programs (4%). Meanwhile, the number of traditional-age (early 20s) first-year teachers declined, from 84% in 2008-09 to 56% in 2010-11.

The biggest change in the mentor population is the increase in the percentage of mentors who are full-time teachers or administrators (from 81% in FY10 to 92% in FY11). (FY11 Data Brief #1)

*Programs self-assessed similar weaknesses and strengths.* Programs assessed themselves on the *Illinois Induction Program Continuum*. They rated themselves highest on their professional

---

<sup>1</sup> ISBE officially funded 64 grants, but four of them were run by the Chicago New Teacher Center as a single program.

development for mentors (standard 6) and their development of beginning teachers' practice (standard 7). They gave the lowest ratings to building administrators' involvement (standard 4) and the program evaluation they do (standard 9). Some differences existed between groups of programs—large programs, for example, gave themselves higher ratings on average, except in the areas of resources (standard 3) and building administrator involvement. When asked to select a standard to focus on for the future, programs most often mentioned the two that received the lowest ratings, along with standard 2, which encompasses program goals and design.

*Different types of programs received different levels of funding, although the differentials were smaller than in the past.* Programs initially funded in 2006 or 2008 received, on average, \$730 more per beginning teacher than did newer programs, and smaller programs received \$394 more per beginning teacher than did larger programs. These differences are smaller than in FY10, likely due at least in part to new administrative rules which require programs to pay each mentor \$1,200 from grant funds. Programs reported that mentor salaries represented nearly 65% of total expenses, up from 40% in FY10. Programs often supplemented ISBE grant funds with district and other funds—both to offer more supports and to support more new teachers than those covered by the grant. (FY11 Data Brief #3)

### **Description of unfunded districts' induction programs**

*Unfunded districts were demographically similar to funded districts, but typically had fewer new teachers.* In Illinois, 536 districts have never received ISBE induction grant funding. These districts—as well as districts in funded programs—are demographically similar to the state as a whole on a number of measures (e.g. district size, average teacher experience in years, percent of low-income students, district locale).

The average unfunded district does not have many first-year teachers. Just over 20% of districts have no first-year teachers, and only 25% of districts have more than five. Meanwhile, the average funded program serves more than 25 first-year teachers—partly because many funded programs serve multiple districts, each of which may only have one or two new teachers.

*Large, suburban districts—and districts with higher average instructional expenses, fewer low-income students, and more new teachers—provided far more services to their beginning teachers.* Nearly all unfunded districts report providing some level of induction for their first-year teachers. However, certain programs provide far fewer services than others. Teachers in small and rural districts—and those in districts with few new teachers, low expenses, and more low-income students—receive far less support than their counterparts in other districts. For example, only 65% of small districts but 97% of large districts require new teachers to be paired with a mentor or buddy. Similar differences occur for requirements that mentors observe new teachers in their classrooms (31% vs. 79%), new teachers attend summer orientations (63% vs. 99%), and new teachers attend workshops during the academic year (31% vs. 88%).

Large, suburban, well-funded, and low-poverty districts also are more likely to:

- have ISBE-approved induction programs,
- pay their mentors a stipend,
- have stringent, formal requirements and processes for mentor selection,
- provide more initial training and ongoing support for their mentors,

- formally require more activities from their mentors (e.g. meet with mentees a certain number of times, observe mentees teach, and submit a record of mentoring activities), and
- provide common planning periods or release time for mentors and mentees to meet.

*Certain commonalities occurred across districts.* Districts provide most of their induction activities themselves, although ROEs are more likely to be involved in providing mentor, new teacher, and administrator training for small districts. For example, ROEs or ISCs provide new teacher training for 6% of large districts, 11% of medium districts, and 31% of small districts.

In 91% of districts, mentors are full-time teachers, and an additional 5% use full-time administrators. None of the districts reported having any full-time or full-release mentors.

Less than 15% of districts overall provide new teachers with a reduced number of course preparations or discourage them from leading extra-curricular activities or teaching the most demanding courses.

Building-level administrators are involved in new teacher induction in several key ways: selecting and assigning mentors to the new teachers in their buildings (in 70% of districts); meeting regularly with new teachers for purposes other than evaluation (56%); and overseeing and monitoring induction activities in their buildings (54%).

*Induction services were typically funded at the district level, and districts recognized how they could improve if they had more funding.* Unfunded districts pay for nearly all of their induction activities with district funds. If they had more funding, programs would like to offer more or improved mentor trainings (79%); offer more or improved new teacher trainings (71%); offer more or improved administrator trainings (60%); and improve the mentor/mentee relationship (e.g. more release time or more structure) (53%). (FY11 Data Brief #2)

## SUMMARY OF DATA BRIEFS: PROGRAM IMPACT

### **Impact of funded induction programs on retention**

*Recent results suggest a positive relationship between induction and retention.* For teachers initially hired in 2007, both induction program participants and non-participants have similar retention records. However, 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). Many FY11 programs were non-existent or rudimentary in 2007 and 2008, so it is impossible to provide meaningful long-term comparisons. (FY11 Data Brief #1)

### **Impact of budget reductions on funded programs**

*FY11 budget cuts were even more devastating than those in FY10, although mitigated somewhat by smaller numbers of participants.* Even programs that reported being relatively unscathed by FY10 budget cuts—such as veteran programs which were initially funded in 2006—described being negatively impacted by budget cuts. More than half of all programs reported holding fewer mentor trainings, providing fewer novice teacher trainings, buying fewer resources, and/or

cutting substitute reimbursements. 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. More than 65% of programs with full-release mentors had to reduce or eliminate positions. However, these cuts could have been worse: Because programs, on average, served fewer new teachers in FY11, they had somewhat lower funding needs than in FY10.

Fifteen programs which were funded in FY10 chose not to seek funding for FY11. A majority (70%) of survey respondents reported providing some sort of induction services, paid for largely by district funds, but they claimed their budgets had been reduced by an average of 72%. (FY11 Data Brief #1)

### **Impact of ISBE funding on program development**

*Time and money have had a positive impact on program development.* Programs were asked to assess themselves on the *Illinois Induction Program Continuum*, and the older programs (those initially funded in 2006 or 2008) consistently gave themselves higher ratings than did the programs initially funded in 2009. The older programs have had more time to become established and to share and develop best practices. Also, the older programs had the benefit of being funded initially when budgets were more generous. (FY11 Data Brief #3)

*Despite budget cuts, funding allowed programs to continue making improvements.* Despite funding cuts, programs reported making improvements during the past year. These were more likely to be lower-cost improvements (e.g. increasing stakeholder support) than more costly ones (e.g. providing full-release mentors). Programs initially funded in 2009 were more likely to make improvements that older programs had already accomplished, such as providing more structure and creating a second-year program. Programs initially funded in 2006 or 2008 reported making more improvements overall than did the newer programs—perhaps because FY11 budget cuts impacted newer programs to a greater extent. (FY11 Data Brief #3)

*Funded programs provided a significantly higher level of induction service than did even the most-sophisticated unfunded districts.* Among unfunded districts, large suburban districts provide considerably more induction services than do their smaller peers. However, the average funded program provides significantly more. New teachers receive more services. Programs are managed by a full-time coordinator or by a team, not a single administrator with other responsibilities. Mentor selection is more formal and rigorous, mentors receive more initial and ongoing training, and all mentors receive a stipend. Mentors have more requirements (e.g. number of hours to meet with mentees; submitting records of mentoring activities), and these are more likely to be formal with scheduled meeting time (e.g. common planning periods or release time). Building-level administrators are more likely to attend training on induction. However, building administrators in large suburban unfunded districts are more likely to meet regularly with new teachers and to oversee their building's induction activities—perhaps because, without a full-time program coordinator, site administrators have to maintain a greater level of involvement or else critical activities will be left undone. (FY11 Data Brief #2)

## **Observations from INTC Statewide Co-coordinators**

Statewide coordinators have worked with grant-funded programs since the grants were first awarded. They have conducted site visits to gain information about the functioning of specific programs and to provide technical assistance for the continuous improvement process of the programs; they have assisted with networking among programs throughout the state; they have facilitated online discussions, meetings, and webinars; they have coordinated the sharing of resources and innovations; they have conducted annual pre-conference sessions designed specifically for funded programs; and they have attended and presented at professional conferences.

Through their activities and their exposure to induction and mentoring programs statewide, the coordinators have gained anecdotal and perceptual evidence of the structures and functions of these programs. Their views, articulated below, represent an important addition to the research evidence provided elsewhere in the report.

### **What do the funded programs do well, in general?**

This section lists program aspects that many have incorporated into induction and mentoring. It is worth noting that program development occurs over time and some programs are further along than others in each of these areas. In general, all programs understand the need to pay attention to and strive toward improvement in these areas:

- Mentor commitment, program coordinator commitment, and administrator commitment
- Solidification of workshop and activity content so that a comprehensive, cohesive program is developed over the years
- Emphasis on continuous improvement for existing workshops and trainings
- Use of the *Illinois Induction Program Continuum* to self-assess, establish goals, and create action plans
- Establishment of regular data collection that articulates new teacher and mentor response to the program
- Presentation of information about the program to administrators and other district and state policymakers to advocate for continued and improved support for teacher induction
- Use of a viable mentor training provider (e.g., New Teacher Center, ICE21, CEC)
- Expansion of induction programs to provide a separate curriculum for second year teachers
- Establishment of a specified mentor selection process and criteria
- Increased expertise of mentors and program coordinators due to program longevity
- Communication with INTC regarding specific needs and challenges
- Use of Illinois Professional Teaching Standards or locally-developed teacher effectiveness criteria for new teacher formative assessment and for guiding professional development

### **In what areas could the funded programs improve, in general?**

All programs have need for growth, development, and improvement. Some of these needs are articulated by program coordinators or administrators; others were determined by the INTC statewide coordinators during conversations with program personnel or through observations during site visits. As with the previous section, the items below reflect the improvement needs of numerous programs.

- Consistent, expanded program evaluation—data collection, analysis, and interpretation—that measures implementation as well as impact, such as the relationship between induction and mentoring and student achievement
- Conscious use of a program improvement cycle so that the program is evaluated at least annually and evaluation leads to revised goals, plans, and activities
- Availability of resources such as funding, time, personnel, and materials
- Regular communication among all stakeholders
- Representation of all stakeholders on a local steering or advisory committee
- Follow-up for mentor and new teachers workshops and trainings
- Determination of the role of data in furthering support for the program
- Alignment of induction and mentoring program goals and action plans with district and school improvement plans and initiatives; incorporation of the induction and mentoring program as an integral part of professional development
- Support from all members of the school community to induct and mentor new teachers
- Advocacy for induction and mentoring conveyed to the local community, parents, and board of education members
- Integration of external services and networks into the program to expand networking and learning opportunities beyond program and district boundaries (e.g. statewide opportunities such as webinars, book discussion groups, and workshops conducted by INTC and others)
- Participation in a professional learning community of induction program leaders and mentors
- More clear definition of mentor roles, responsibilities, and expectations, and communicating this to all involved in the program

### **What are some particularly effective or interesting practices?**

The list below states a number of exemplary practices displayed by induction and mentoring programs. Some occur among a number of programs; some are exclusive to one program.

- All district administrators participated in Administrators Academy #1028 on the use of the *Illinois Induction Program Continuum*.
- University professors served as mentors to new teachers.
- Seven selected programs were supported by CEC/NTC grant-supported Compact.
- Steering committees determined program progress, establish goals and action plans for the new school year, and select mentors using an application process.
- Designated program coordinators with full or part-time release managed and implemented program components.
- Lead mentors planned and conducted workshops and trainings for new teachers and mentors.
- Differentiated mentor training was held with mentors mentoring other mentors.
- A large unit district shared training and workshops with surrounding rural districts.
- A consortium served as technical assistance provider to individual district programs. Leaders met regularly to discuss research, continuous program improvement cycles, and services needed from the consortium.
- Programs experimented with technology for professional development, networking, data collection, formative assessment, and observations over the internet

**What issues are being faced by formerly funded programs (and others) as they attempt to maintain induction and mentoring supports?**

In the summer of 2011, the Illinois Legislature reduced induction and mentoring to \$1.00 in the state budget. Thus, the FY11 ISBE grant-funded induction programs would not receive state funding in FY12. Some programs, especially consortia, ended their program coordination. Some consortia continued, requiring districts to pay for the services. Many individual districts, including some component districts of the consortia, are attempting to sustain a program using local resources. This section provides a list of some of the commonly faced challenges across all previously-funded programs.

- Lack of funds to pay mentors
- Lack of funds to provide substitutes for workshops, trainings, and observations
- Lack of funds to pay stipends to new teachers for before/after-school induction activities
- Lack of funds to support a program coordinator
- Lack of funds to hire a training provider
- Lack of funds to provide induction materials (e.g., professional literature, videos)
- Decrease in administrative and board support because of lack of funding
- Inability to assess induction effects on teacher change and student achievement, despite impact data being required by policymakers for funding support
- Reduced program requirements due to lack of grant monies and because programs are no longer obligated to the ISBE grant's Administrative Rules requirements

## DISCUSSION

First-year teachers in Illinois received radically disparate induction experiences. A small, rural district without state induction funding was likely to provide fewer trainings for new teachers and mentors, have fewer requirements for mentors, and run a less formal program than did a large, suburban district. Meanwhile, the ISBE grant-funded induction programs provided significantly higher-quality and more-comprehensive induction services for their beginning teachers—even though these programs were demographically similar to the state as a whole. These strengths were due to funding and also to the opportunities for collaboration, self-reflection, and development of best practices.

Illinois has now all but eliminated this funding, which raises the serious concern that the previously-funded programs will be forced to take steps backwards. Strong and comprehensive induction can accelerate the development of new teachers who can impact student learning. Illinois requires impact data in order to support future funding, yet with no funding, there are limits to the amount of impact that can occur and be measured. We are also concerned that reform legislation will change teacher evaluation and that teacher induction will not be in place when those changes take effect.

During this time of no funding, INTC has a particularly vital role to play as it continues its services to the formerly-funded programs, steps up services to never-funded districts, and attempts to stand in the gap to allow induction to survive and flourish. INTC is needed as a convener of statewide stakeholders; as a provider of resources, knowledge, technical assistance, and training; and as a coordinator of induction-related research in Illinois.

## RECOMMENDATIONS FOR POLICY AND PROGRAMMING

### Recommendations for 2011-12

#### Recommendations for INTC:

1. INTC should continue its mission as a statewide resource, knowledge, technical assistance, and training provider, using face-to-face, small- and large-group, and online media, and via facilitating professional learning networks for new teachers, mentors, and program leaders. This assistance should be shared between previously-funded and never-funded programs, to maintain and continue building the momentum of the former and to build capacity at the latter.
2. INTC should continue its roles in advocacy and policy and as a leader and as a convener of multiple induction stakeholders across the state.
3. INTC's research efforts should increasingly examine program outcomes/impact. INTC should share with programs a) ways that they can measure outcomes themselves and b) successful research strategies used by local, national, and international programs.

#### Recommendations for ISBE:

1. ISBE should maintain communication with INTC, previously funded programs, and other induction stakeholders in order to provide a seamless transition if and when future funding becomes available. This is particularly important in areas where legislative change directly impacts new teachers in areas such as certification and evaluation.
2. ISBE should continue supporting research, centralized expertise, and support in order to pave the way for future funding and to encourage continuous program improvement.

#### Recommendations for previously-funded programs:

1. These programs should endeavor to survive during this unfunded year, both for the benefit of current new teachers and to maintain capacity and momentum into the future, using INTC's services to the greatest extent possible.
2. These programs should recognize and embrace their roles as state leaders and, to the extent possible, share their knowledge and advocacy skills to improve induction statewide.

#### Recommendations for never-funded programs:

1. These programs—like the previously-funded programs—should do their utmost to avail themselves of the free and low-cost resources available in Illinois—including conferences, workshops, online activities, and informal networking—in order to learn more about quality induction and consider ways that it can be adapted in their local contexts.

2. These programs should, as time and resources permit, continue to improve their programs and provide more opportunities for new teachers, more training and resources for mentors, and more support for site administrators. They should endeavor to use a continuous improvement cycle based on the Continuum of program development, using INTC as a resource if needed.

### **Recommendation for long-term consideration**

At a recent Partnership Board meeting, induction stakeholders from across Illinois were asked to dream about the future of induction. Many attendees described an ideal of life-long induction and learning: a smooth and seamless spectrum from preservice through early inservice through mastery. This would involve teacher education programs, school districts, regional offices of education, and statewide entities to plan and enact. Preparing for such an eventuality will take years of effort, and strong statewide leadership will be necessary to convene and convince all involved parties.

## INTC PROPOSED RESEARCH ACTIVITIES, 2011-12

### Main thrusts for 2011-12 research

- build Illinois capacity to assess the benefits of induction and mentoring
- produce qualitative portraits of programs in transition, to show exemplary programs carrying on and possibly the problems of defunding

### Proposed timeline

Fall 2011/ Winter 2012	Conduct a methodological meta-analysis of existing studies of induction's effects. Compile local, national, and international induction research results in a useful, searchable way—for INTC use and for the public website. Specifically, look for connections between induction activities and outcomes (e.g. teacher efficacy, student achievement). Produce research briefs for distribution to a general audience (e.g. school board members; state lawmakers).
Winter/ Spring 2012	Based on tools used in the above research, and tools that have been developed by Illinois programs, put together a user-friendly packet of tools and worksheets that programs could use to do their own internal research and evaluation. Emphasize tools that focus on different outcomes measures (i.e. effects of induction). Offer trainings to programs in using the tools (online or in person) and offer to help with planning and analysis. Request that programs share the results with INTC; find ways to help distribute results to a wider audience and ISBE.
Spring/ Summer 2012	Collect qualitative data to showcase exemplary programs, ways that programs are continuing to function despite lack of funding, and ways in which the lack of funding is impacting program survival and success. Statewide co-coordinators can provide advice on which programs to spotlight and which issues to focus on.