Appendix to INTC Data Brief #2   May 2011

Prepared by: Patricia Brady
With assistance from: Jeff Kohmstedt and the INTC staff
INTC Director: Chris Roegge

This Appendix provides tables, charts, and analyses of quantitative and qualitative data. Sections 1 and 5 contain publicly-available Illinois school report card data for FY10. Data in sections 2 and 3 were provided on the winter 2011 survey for districts which have never received Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) induction grant funding. Section 4 compares unfunded districts survey data with preliminary data from the spring 2011 CDE (Common Data Elements reporting form) for funded programs.

This Appendix is organized into the following sections:

- Section 1: Demographic characteristics
- Section 2: Unfunded district program information
- Section 3: Unfunded district budget information
- Section 4: Comparison with funded programs
- Section 5: Unfunded district demographic category disaggregation

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

Methodology

The purpose of the unfunded district survey is to discover what supports new teachers receive in Illinois and how the level of support varies with district type and demographics.

To determine our participant list, we used the ISBE complete list of districts which is available on the website http://www.isbe.state.il.us/research/htmls/directories.htm. We then removed all districts which were listed on the fall 2010 or the fall 2009 CDEs, so the resulting list contained all districts which have not been funded by ISBE and have not been covered by a funded consortium. We phoned all unfunded districts to determine the contact information for the person who could best respond to questions about new teacher supports.

In conjunction with the Chicago New Teacher Center and the Illinois State Board of Education, a print mailing was sent to each unfunded district in January 2011. The envelope contained a letter from ISBE, encouraging districts to complete the survey; a one-page sheet describing INTC; a two-sided paper on induction in Illinois; and a copy of the Illinois Induction Program Continuum. The mailing was timed to arrive at each district around the same time as the first email from INTC.

INTC planned a series of three emails—an initial email and two reminders—which described the survey and why districts should participate. The emails each provided an individual link to the online survey. The survey was expected to take 15 to 20 minutes, and all districts which took the survey by the deadline were entered into a drawing to win one of two $200 Amazon.com gift cards or free INTC Annual Conference registration for a team of four.

Out of 870 total districts in Illinois, we sent the survey to 536 districts. Two hundred ninety (54%) completed the survey. Four districts—two associated with funded programs, and two which were sent the survey—are missing demographic information, so they are not included in the demographic tables in Section 1.

Notes on the tables
The tables in sections 2 and 3 provide data on all questions on the unfunded districts survey. The tables disaggregate the data in four main ways: size, locale, instructional expense per student (to capture some

measure of district finances), and percent of low-income students (to capture some measure of student demographics). For size and locale, we used Illinois State Board of Education categories. ISBE categorizes district size as small, medium, or large, and categorizes locale as urban, suburban, town, or rural. For low-income students, we disaggregated between districts with greater or lower percentages of low-income students than the state average with the city of Chicago removed. With 404,000 students, of whom 87% are low-income, Chicago is a huge outlier and skews the state average. Also, Chicago is not included in the unfunded district data set, because it has several state-funded induction programs operating within its schools. With Chicago, the state weighted average is 45% low-income students; without Chicago, it is 35%. For district instructional expense per pupil, we again disaggregated between districts with higher or lower instructional expenses than the state average with Chicago removed. With Chicago, the state weighted average is $6,483; without Chicago, it is $6,198.

To determine an Illinois district's size classification, the districts are divided into three categories: unit, elementary, and high school. In each category, the largest 25% of districts are classified as "large," the middle 50% are categorized as "medium," and the smallest 25% are categorized as "small."

Illinois districts are also categorized according to the following locale codes.

City: Territory inside an urbanized area, and inside a principal city
  • **City, large**: population of 250,000 or more
  • **City, midsize**: population of 100,000-250,000
  • **City, small**: population less than 100,000
Suburb: Territory outside a principal city and inside an urbanized area
  • **Suburb, large**: population of 250,000 or more
  • **Suburb, midsize**: population of 100,000-250,000
  • **Suburb, small**: population less than 100,000
Town: Territory inside an urban cluster
  • **Town, fringe**: less than 10 miles from an urbanized area
  • **Town, distant**: 10-35 miles from an urbanized area
  • **Town, remote**: more than 35 miles from an urbanized area
Rural: Census-defined rural territory
  • **Rural, fringe**: less than 5 miles from an urbanized area or less than 2.5 miles from an urban cluster
  • **Rural, distant**: 5-25 miles from an urbanized area or 2.5-10 miles from an urban cluster for
  • **Rural, remote**: more than 25 miles from an urbanized area or 10 miles from an urban cluster

SECTION 1: DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

This section compares demographic characteristics of four sometimes-overlapping groups of districts:

- the survey respondents ("responding districts");
- the entire population of unfunded districts which received the survey ("unfunded districts");
- all funded districts, including districts which are part of a funded consortium ("funded districts"); and
- all districts in Illinois ("all districts").

Data in this section come from the Illinois School Report Card database.

Four districts (Chester N HSD 122, Southland College Prep, North Mac CUSD 34, and IDJJ Sch Dist 428) do not have any publicly-available demographic information, so they were left off the charts below.

Table 1.1. District size and type

The Illinois School Report Card website distinguishes among small, medium, and large districts. These size descriptors are based on district type (elementary, high school, and unit) and student population. A high school district, for example, must have more than twice as many students than an elementary district to be classified as "medium." The first three data columns in this table count how many districts fit into the three size categories. The next two columns provide the non-weighted average and mean number of students in each district. The last three columns provide numbers of elementary, high school, and unit districts. The numbers in parentheses are the percents of districts in each category (responding, all unfunded, all funded, all in Illinois) of each size description or type.

	# of small districts	# of medium districts	# of large districts	Average # of students	Median # of students	Elementary districts	High school districts	Unit districts
Responding districts (289)	63 (22%)	148 (51%)	78 (27%)	1,858	1,094	148 (51%)	33 (11%)	108 (37%)
All unfunded districts (534)	137 (26%)	264 (49%)	133 (25%)	1,748	965	267 (50%)	71 (13%)	196 (37%)
All funded districts (332)	81 (24%)	166 (50%)	85 (26%)	3,400	918	112 (34%)	29 (9%)	191 (58%)
All districts in Illinois (866)	218 (25%)	430 (50%)	218 (25%)	2,382	948	379 (44%)	100 (12%)	387 (45%)

Table 1.2. District locale

This table counts how many districts fall under each locale type. The numbers in parentheses are the percents of districts in each category (responding, all unfunded, all funded, all in Illinois) of each locale type. The Illinois School Report Card website distinguishes among 12 different locales. Because there are so few cities, this table combines City: Large, City: Medium, and City: Small into a single City category.

Two districts do not have "district locale" available on the school report card website.

	City (small, medium, large)	Suburb, Large	Suburb, Midsize	Suburb, Small	Town, Fringe	Town, Distant	Town, Remote	Rural, Fringe	Rural, Distant	Rural, Remote
Responding districts (289)	7 (2%)	133 (38%)	19 (7%)	4 (1%)	12 (4%)	23 (8%)	14 (5%)	30 (10%)	61 (21%)	9 (3%)
All unfunded districts (533)	14 (3%)	182 (34%)	30 (6%)	8 (2%)	19 (4%)	45 (8%)	35 (7%)	57 (10%)	124 (23%)	19 (4%)
All funded district (331)	17 (5%)	81 (24%)	7 (2%)	10 (3%)	16 (5%)	37 (11%)	16 (5%)	34 (10%)	98 (30%)	15 (5%)
All districts in Illinois (864)	31 (4%)	263 (30%)	37 (4%)	18 (2%)	35 (4%)	82 (9%)	51 (6%)	91 (11%)	222 (26%)	34 (4%)

Table 1.3. District finances

This table shows the minimum, maximum, mean, and median figures for average teacher salary, instructional expense, and operational expense. All statistics are unweighted.

		Average teacher salary	Instructional expense per pupil	Operational expense per pupil
Responding districts (288)	Minimum	$28,168	$3,268	$6,211
	Maximum	$103,427	$11,518	$21,566
	Mean	$56,578	$5,973	$10,417
	Median	$53,188	$5,548	$9,652
All unfunded districts (533)	Minimum	$28,168	$3,268	$6,211
	Maximum	$103,427	$13,312	$26,660
	Mean	$55,660	$5,945	$10,404
	Median	$52,221	$5,509	$9,644
All funded districts (331)	Minimum	$32,393	$3,234	$5,922
	Maximum	$91,997	$13,783	$23,449
	Mean	$53,103	$5,752	$10,054
	Median	$51.637	$5,479	$9,584
All districts in Illinois (864)	Minimum	$28,168	$3,234	$5,922
	Maximum	$103,427	$13,783	$26,660
	Mean	$54,680	$5,878	$10,281
	Median	$51,868	$5,485	$9,632

Table 1.4. Teacher characteristics
This table shows the minimum, maximum, mean, and median figures for average teacher experience, percent of White teachers, and percent of male teachers. All statistics are unweighted.

		Average teacher experience (years)	Percent White teachers	Percent male teachers
Responding districts (289)	Minimum	4.9	24.2%	0
	Maximum	21.3	100%	62%
	Mean	13.2	96.4%	20.6%
	Median	13.0	98.8%	19.0%
All unfunded districts (534)	Minimum	3.4	24.2%	0
	Maximum	23.3	100%	66.1%
	Mean	13.3	96.7%	21.3%
	Median	13.2	99.1%	19.3%
All funded districts (332)	Minimum	6.3	21.7%	0
	Maximum	23.9	100%	55.4%
	Mean	13.5	94.3%	21.4%
	Median	13.5	98.8%	21.0%
All districts in Illinois (866)	Minimum	3.4	21.7%	0
	Maximum	23.9	100%	66.1%
	Mean	13.3	95.8%	21.4%
	Median	13.3	99.0%	20.3%

Table 1.5. Student characteristics
This table shows the minimum, maximum, mean, and median figures for: percentage of low-income students, percentage of Limited English Proficient (LEP) students, percentage of White students, percentage of Black students, percentage of Hispanic students, and percentage of Asian students. All statistics are unweighted.

		% low-income students	% LEP students	% White students	% Black students	% Hispanic students
Responding districts (289)	Minimum	0	0	0	0	0
	Maximum	99.4%	50.4%	100%	100%	94.5%
	Mean	31.5%	3.7%	77.7%	6.2%	9.3%
	Median	30.8%	0.3%	88.5%	1.1%	3.1%
All unfunded districts (534)	Minimum	0	0	0	0	0
	Maximum	99.4%	50.4%	100%	100%	94.5%
	Mean	32.6%	3.3%	78.7%	6.4%	8.5%
	Median	31.6%	0.1%	89.6%	1.0%	2.4%
All funded districts (332)	Minimum	0.8%	0	0	0	0
	Maximum	100.0%	49.9%	100%	99.3%	84.9%
	Mean	39.6%	2.9%	74.8%	11.7%	8.6%
	Median	36.0%	0.1%	89.9%	1.7%	2.6%
All districts in Illinois (866)	Minimum	0	0	0	0	0
	Maximum	100.0%	50.4%	100%	100%	94.5%
	Mean	35.3%	3.1%	77.2%	8.4%	8.5%
	Median	33.8%	0.1%	89.7%	1.2%	2.5%

Table 1.6. Low-income students and average instructional expense

This table shows the number of districts which fall above or below the state average for percent of low-income students and per-pupil instructional expense. As explained in the "Notes on the Tables" section above, the state average was calculated with the city of Chicago removed. The total number of districts which fall into the four categories (responding, all unfunded, all funded, all districts) varies because the instructional expense data is not available for two Illinois districts. Thus, in the first column, the first number in parentheses is the total number of districts for the "% of low-income students" statistics; the second number in parentheses is the total number of districts for the "Average instructional expense" statistics.

	% of low-income students		Average instructional expense	
	<35%	35% or more	<$6,198	$6,198 or more
Responding districts (289 / 288)	169 (58%)	120 (42%)	184 (64%)	104 (36%)
All unfunded districts (534 / 533)	296 (55%)	238 (45%)	351 (66%)	182 (34%)
All funded districts (332 / 331)	155 (47%)	177 (53%)	237 (72%)	94 (28%)
All districts in Illinois (866 / 864)	451 (52%)	415 (48%)	588 (68%)	276 (32%)

SECTION 2: UNFUNDED DISTRICT PROGRAM INFORMATION

The tables in this section show data from the 290 districts which responded to the unfunded districts survey.

Only three programs reported that they are not providing any induction services or support to their new teachers. These services could include, but are not limited to: being assigned a mentor or buddy; attending an orientation, training, or workshops specifically for new teachers; having special meetings with principals; receiving observations from veteran teachers; and receiving special resources, the opportunity to network, or a reduced number of course preparations.

Two of the three programs have no new teachers this year; one has not had any new teachers since 2008, and the other has not had any new teachers since 2006. The third program has a single new teacher this year; it is a rural district serving 541 students over a 97-square-mile area.

Four districts (Chester N HSD 122, Southland College Prep, North Mac CUSD 34, and IDJJ Sch Dist 428) do not have any publicly-available demographic information, so although they may appear in a chart's "total" column, they do not appear in the columns which disaggregate the data by district demographics.

Table 2.1. Number of new teachers in 2010-11
This table shows the number of first-year teachers—new to the profession, not just new to the district—in 2010-11 in each district. The numbers are disaggregated by size of district (small, medium, and large) and district locale (city, suburb, town, and rural). The numbers in parenthesis at the top of each column are the total number of districts of that type. The other numbers in parenthesis show what percentages, of each type of district, has which range of new teacher numbers.

# of 1st-year teachers in 2010-11	Total # of districts (290)	# small districts (63)	# medium districts (148)	# large districts (78)	# city districts (7)	# suburb districts (133)	# town districts (49)	# rural districts (100)
0	60 (21%)	32 (51%)	27 (18%)	1 (1%)	1 (14%)	18 (14%)	8 (16%)	33 (33%)
1	47 (16%)	19 (30%)	28 (19%)	0	1 (14%)	12 (9%)	9 (18%)	25 (25%)
2-3	68 (24%)	9 (14%)	46 (31%)	12 (15%)	1 (14%)	29 (22%)	12 (24%)	25 (25%)
4-5	41 (14%)	2 (3%)	26 (18%)	13 (17%)	0	21 (16%)	9 (18%)	11 (11%)
6-10	39 (13%)	0	18 (12%)	21 (27%)	1 (14%)	25 (19%)	9 (18%)	4 (4%)
11-20	22 (8%)	1 (2%)	3 (2%)	18 (23%)	2 (29%)	16 (12%)	2 (4%)	2 (2%)
21-63	13 (4%)	0	0	13 (17%)	1 (14%)	12 (9%)	0	0

Table 2.2. Number of new teachers in most recent year with new teachers
If programs indicated that they have no new teachers in 2010-11, they were asked when they last had new teachers and how many new teachers they had at that time. This table shows the number of first-year teachers in 2010-11 or in the last year in which the district had any new teachers.

# of 1st-year teachers (in most recent year)	Total # of districts (290)
1	84 (29%)
2-3	83 (29%)
4-5	47 (16%)
6-10	41 (14%)
11-20	22 (8%)
21-63	13 (4%)

Table 2.3. Number of first-year teachers served
This table shows the total number of first-year teachers with no teaching experience served by all of the responding districts. The number in parenthesis shows the percent of the total number of first-year teachers who are employed by each district type.

	Total (290)	District size category			% of low-income students		Average instructional expense		District locale			
		Small (63)	Medium (148)	Large (78)	<35% (169)	35% or more (120)	<$6,198 (184)	$6,198 or more (104)	City (7)	Suburb (133)	Town (49)	Rural (100)
Number of first-year teachers	1571	110 (7%)	493 (31%)	965 (61%)	980 (62%)	588 (37%)	802 (51%)	761 (48%)	101 (6%)	1031 (66%)	187 (12%)	249 (16%)

Table 2.4. Induction components for first-year teachers, disaggregated by number of teachers
This table lists how many districts enact each of five common induction components. Districts could check whether each component was required for all first-year teachers, optional or occurred for some first-year teachers, or did not occur. The numbers are disaggregated by the number of first-year teachers in each program (either in 2010-11, or in the most recent year in which the district had new teachers). Blank answers were interpreted as "did not occur." Districts which did not check any response for this and the following question (reported in Tables 2.9 and 2.10) are not included in the total number of districts listed in the second row.

	Required for all first-year teachers				Optional/occurred for some first-year teachers				Does not occur
	Total (287)	1-3 new teachers (164)	4-10 new teachers (88)	11+ new teachers (35)	Total (287)	1-3 new teachers (164)	4-10 new teachers (88)	11+ new teachers (35)	Total (287)
New teachers are assigned a mentor or buddy.	249 (87%)	136 (83%)	80 (91%)	33 (94%)	26 (9%)	16 (10%)	8 (9%)	2 (6%)	12 (4%)
Mentors observe new teachers in classrooms to provide assistance or formative assessment.	161 (56%)	76 (46%)	58 (66%)	27 (77%)	80 (28%)	52 (32%)	24 (27%)	4 (11%)	46 (16%)
New teachers attend special orientation or workshop before school begins.	239 (83%)	122 (74%)	83 (94%)	34 (97%)	21 (7%)	18 (11%)	2 (2%)	1 (3%)	27 (9%)
New teachers attend special workshops during the academic year.	162 (56%)	75 (46%)	59 (67%)	28 (80%)	78 (27%)	53 (32%)	20 (23%)	5 (14%)	47 (16%)
New teachers create and document professional growth plans (e.g. portfolios).	123 (43%)	55 (34%)	45 (51%)	23 (66%)	57 (20%)	35 (21%)	19 (22%)	3 (9%)	107 (37%)

Table 2.5. Induction components for first-year teachers, disaggregated by district size
This table lists how many districts enact each of five common induction components for their first-year teachers. Districts could check whether each component was required for all first-year teachers, optional or occurred for some first-year teachers, or did not occur. Blank answers were interpreted as "did not occur." Districts which did not check any response for this and the following question (reported in Tables 2.9 and 2.10) are not included in the number of districts as listed in the second row.

	Required for all first-year teachers				Optional/occurred for some first-year teachers				Does not occur
	Total (287)	Small (62)	Medium (146)	Large (78)	Total (287)	Small (62)	Medium (146)	Large (78)	Total (287)
New teachers are assigned a mentor or buddy.	249 (87%)	40 (65%)	132 (90%)	76 (97%)	26 (9%)	14 (23%)	10 (7%)	2 (3%)	12 (4%)
Mentors observe new teachers in classrooms to provide assistance or formative assessment.	161 (56%)	19 (31%)	79 (54%)	62 (79%)	80 (28%)	19 (31%)	48 (33%)	13 (17%)	46 (16%)
New teachers attend special orientation or workshop before school begins.	239 (83%)	39 (63%)	122 (84%)	77 (99%)	21 (7%)	11 (18%)	9 (6%)	1 (1%)	27 (9%)
New teachers attend special workshops during the academic year.	162 (56%)	19 (31%)	73 (50%)	69 (88%)	78 (27%)	25 (40%)	47 (32%)	6 (8%)	47 (16%)
New teachers create and document professional growth plans (e.g. portfolios).	123 (43%)	13 (21%)	52 (36%)	57 (73%)	57 (20%)	10 (16%)	36 (25%)	11 (14%)	107 (37%)

Table 2.6. Required induction components for first-year teachers, disaggregated by demographics
This table lists how many districts checked "required for all first-year teachers" for each of five common induction components. The numbers are disaggregated by district size category, district percentage of low-income students, average teacher salary, and district locale. Blank answers were interpreted as "did not occur." Districts which did not check any response for this and the following question (reported in Tables 2.9 and 2.10) are not included in the total number of districts listed in the second row.

	Total (287)	District size category			% of low-income students		Average instructional expense		District locale			
		Small (62)	Medium (146)	Large (78)	<35% (167)	35% or more (119)	<$6,198 (183)	$6,198 or more (102)	City (7)	Suburb (132)	Town (49)	Rural (98)
New teachers are assigned a mentor or buddy.	249 (87%)	40 (65%)	132 (90%)	76 (97%)	149 (89%)	99 (83%)	156 (85%)	91 (89%)	7 (100%)	124 (94%)	45 (92%)	72 (73%)
Mentors observe new teachers in classrooms to provide assistance or formative assessment.	161 (56%)	19 (31%)	79 (54%)	62 (79%)	99 (59%)	61 (51%)	92 (50%	68 (67%)	7 (100%)	91 (69%)	28 (57%)	34 (35%)
New teachers attend special orientation or workshop before school begins.	239 (83%)	39 (63%)	122 (84%)	77 (99%)	147 (88%)	91 (76%)	146 (80%)	91 (89%)	7 (100%)	122 (92%)	41 (84%)	68 (69%)
New teachers attend special workshops during the academic year.	162 (56%)	19 (31%)	73 (50%)	69 (88%)	100 (60%)	61 (51%)	90 (49%)	71 (70%)	6 (86%)	91 (69%)	26 (53%)	38 (39%)
New teachers create and document professional growth plans (e.g. portfolios).	123 (43%)	13 (21%)	52 (36%)	57 (73%)	81 (49%)	41 (34%)	69 (38%)	53 (52%)	5 (71%)	72 (55%)	25 (51%)	20 (20%)

Table 2.7. Induction components for second-year teachers, disaggregated by district size
This table lists how many districts enact each of five common induction components for their second-year teachers. Districts could check whether each component was required for all second-year teachers, optional or occurred for some second-year teachers, or did not occur. The survey did not ask for numbers of second-year teachers, so the numbers are disaggregated by the district size category (small, medium, or large). Blank answers were interpreted as "did not occur." Districts which did not check any response for this and the previous question (reported in Tables 2.3 and 2.4) are not included in the number of districts as listed in the second row.

	Required for all second-year teachers				Optional/occurred for some second-year teachers				Does not occur
	Total (287)	Small (62)	Medium (146)	Large (78)	Total (287)	Small (62)	Medium (146)	Large (78)	Total (287)
New teachers are assigned a mentor or buddy.	114 (40%)	12 (19%)	57 (39%)	44 (56%)	96 (33%)	23 (37%)	52 (36%)	21 (27%)	77 (27%)
Mentors observe new teachers in classrooms to provide assistance or formative assessment.	76 (26%)	7 (11%)	36 (25%)	32 (41%)	113 (39%)	20 (32%)	64 (44%)	29 (37%)	98 (34%)
New teachers attend special orientation or workshop before school begins.	73 (25%)	9 (15%)	34 (23%)	29 (37%)	57 (20%)	14 (23%)	30 (21%)	13 (17%)	157 (55%)
New teachers attend special workshops during the academic year.	72 (25%)	6 (10%)	22 (15%)	43 (55%)	100 (35%)	24 (39%)	58 (40%)	18 (23%)	115 (44%)
New teachers create and document professional growth plans (e.g. portfolios).	78 (27%)	7 (11%)	35 (24%)	35 (45%)	59 (21%)	10 (16%)	29 (20%)	20 (26%)	150 (52%)

Table 2.8. Other induction supports for first-year teachers, disaggregated by demographics
Districts were asked, "Which additional supports do all or most of your 1st-year teachers receive?" This table disaggregates the responses by district size category, district percentage of low-income students, average teacher salary, and district locale. Blank answers were interpreted as "did not occur." Districts which did not check any response for this and the previous question (reported in Tables 2.3 and 2.4) are not included in the number of districts as listed in the second row.

	Total (287)	District size category			% of low-income students		Average instructional expense		District locale			
		Small (62)	Medium (146)	Large (78)	<35% (167)	35% or more (119)	<$6,198 (183)	$6,198 or more (102)	City (7)	Suburb (132)	Town (49)	Rural (98)
New teachers observe mentors or other experienced teachers.	219 (76%)	35 (56%)	111 (76%)	72 (92%)	131 (78%)	87 (73%)	133 (73%)	85 (83%)	7 (100%)	110 (83%)	37 (76%)	64 (65%)
New teachers have formally scheduled time to network with other new teachers.	169 (59%)	15 (24%)	92 (63%)	61 (78%)	102 (61%)	66 (55%)	91 (50%)	77 (75%)	7 (100%)	98 (74%)	26 (53%)	37 (38%)
New teachers have the opportunity to network with teachers outside of their individual schools.	153 (53%)	27 (44%)	67 (46%)	58 (74%)	90 (54%)	62 (52%)	97 (53%)	55 (54%)	3 (43%)	76 (58%)	24 (49%)	49 (50%)
New teachers have a reduced number of course preparations.	8 (3%)	1 (2%)	4 (3%)	3 (4%)	3 (2%)	5 (4%)	5 (3%)	3 (3%)	0	3 (2%)	2 (4%)	3 (3%)
New teachers are prohibited or discouraged from teaching the most demanding/undesirable courses.	35 (12%)	4 (6%)	15 (10%)	16 (21%)	23 (14%)	12 (9%)	20 (11%)	15 (15%)	1 (14%)	16 (12%)	8 (16%)	10 (10%)
New teachers are prohibited or discouraged from leading extra-curricular activities.	31 (11%)	5 (8%)	12 (8%)	14 (18%)	20 (12%)	11 (10%)	21 (11%)	10 (10%)	0	18 (14%)	4 (8%)	9 (9%)
New teachers are videotaped while teaching for later reflection/discussion with others.	14 (5%)	1 (2%)	4 (3%)	9 (12%)	11 (7%)	3 (3%)	7 (4%)	7 (7%)	1 (14%)	7 (5%)	2 (4%)	4 (4%)
New teachers engage in e-mentoring: online discussions, blogs, video or text-chat for new teacher and veteran teacher interactions (not including email).	44 (15%)	4 (6%)	18 (12%)	22 (28%)	27 (16%)	17 (13%)	25 (14%)	19 (19%)	1 (14%)	27 (20%)	8 (16%)	8 (8%)

Table 2.9. Induction components for first-year teachers, with numbers of teachers
This table lists the induction components from Tables 2.5 through 2.9 and provides the number of first-year teachers (not districts) which receive—or don't receive—each support.

	Required for all first-year teachers	Optional/occurred for some first-year teachers	Does not occur
New teachers are assigned a mentor or buddy.	1449	99	20
Mentors observe new teachers in classrooms to provide assistance or formative assessment.	1081	329	157
New teachers attend special orientation or workshop before school begins.	1473	50	42
New teachers attend special workshops during the academic year.	1188	257	120
New teachers create and document professional growth plans (e.g. portfolios).	841	256	401
	Occurs for all or most first-year teachers		Does not occur
New teachers observe mentors or other experienced teachers.	1304		183
New teachers have formally scheduled time to network with other new teachers.	1115		372
New teachers have the opportunity to network with teachers outside of their individual schools.	1034		453
New teachers have a reduced number of course preparations.	40		1447
New teachers are prohibited or discouraged from teaching the most demanding / undesirable courses.	228		1259
New teachers are prohibited or discouraged from leading extra-curricular activities.	215		1272
New teachers are videotaped while teaching for later reflection/discussion with others.	164		1323
New teachers engage in e-mentoring: online discussions, blogs, video or text-chat for new teacher and veteran teacher interactions (not including email).	390		1097

Table 2.10. ISBE-approval
Districts were asked whether their induction program has been formally approved by ISBE.

	Total (196)	Small (33)	Medium (93)	Large (70)	<35% (123)	35% or more (73)	<$6,198 (120)	$6,198 or more (75)	City (4)	Suburb (104)	Town (35)	Rural (53)
Yes, the induction program was approved by ISBE for new teachers to use in moving from initial to standard certifications	119 (61%)	7 (21%)	49 (53%)	63 (90%)	83 (67%)	36 (49%)	64 (53%)	55 (73%)	3 (75%)	79 (76%)	20 (57%)	17 (32%)

Table 2.11. Coordinator role
Districts were asked, "What is the main job responsibility of the person who coordinates and manages new teacher induction activities?" This table disaggregates the responses by district size category, district percentage of low-income students, average teacher salary, and district locale.

		District size category			% of low-income students		Average instructional expense		District locale			
	Total (284)	Small (61)	Medium (145)	Large (77)	<35% (166)	35% or more (117)	<$6,198 (181)	$6,198 or more (101)	City (7)	Suburb (131)	Town (49)	Rural (96)
A program coordinator, whose job description is almost 100% induction-related	6 (2%)	0	1 (1%)	5 (6%)	5 (3%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	5 (5%)	0	6 (5%)	0	0
An administrator	211 (74%)	46 (75%)	112 (77%)	53 (69%)	117 (70%)	94 (80%)	145 (80%)	65 (64%)	5 (71%)	87 (66%)	39 (80%)	80 (83%)
A teacher	20 (7%)	8 (13%)	9 (6%)	3 (4%)	14 (8%)	6 (5%)	12 (7%)	8 (8%)	0	7 (5%)	6 (12%)	7 (7%)
A mentor	5 (2%)	2 (3%)	3 (2%)	0	4 (2%)	1 (1%)	4 (2%)	1 (1%)	0	1 (1%)	0	4 (4%)
Coordination and management of the program is shared amongst a team	36 (13%)	5 (8%)	17 (12%)	13 (17%)	22 (13%)	14 (12%)	17 (9%)	18 (18%)	2 (29%)	24 (18%)	4 (8%)	5 (5%)
Other	6 (2%)	0	3 (2%)	3 (4%)	5 (3%)	1 (1%)	2 (1%)	4 (4%)	0	6 (5%)	0	0

Table 2.12. Division of responsibilities

Districts were asked to indicate which entity is responsible for nine common induction-related tasks. The choices of entity were: individual school; the district; an ROE, ISC, or other entity; and does not occur. This table disaggregates the responses by size of district. Districts which did not respond to any of the questions were removed from analysis. If districts responded to some tasks but left others blank, the blanks were converted to "does not occur;" this was typically a small percentage of the total "does not occur" for each item. Districts were allowed to check more than one responsible entity for each task.

	All districts (284)				Small districts (61)				Medium districts (146)				Large districts (77)			
	Individual schools	The district	ROE, ISC, or other	Does not occur or no answer	Individual schools	The district	ROE, ISC, or other	Does not occur or no answer	Individual schools	The district	ROE, ISC, or other	Does not occur or no answer	Individual schools	The district	ROE, ISC, or other	Does not occur or no answer
Provides mentor training	93 33%	172 61%	23 8%	42 15%	15 25%	26 43%	8 13%	19 31%	61 42%	79 54%	10 7%	21 14%	17 22%	66 86%	5 6%	2 3%
Provides new teacher training	118 42%	205 72%	38 13%	6 2%	19 31%	35 57%	17 28%	4 7%	75 51%	94 64%	16 11%	2 1%	24 31%	75 97%	5 6%	0
Provides administrator training related to induction	33 12%	137 48%	52 18%	90 32%	8 13%	19 31%	19 31%	22 36%	22 15%	60 41%	24 16%	53 36%	3 4%	57 74%	8 10%	15 19%
Selects mentors and assigns new teacher/mentor pairs	171 60%	130 46%	2 1%	23 8%	24 39%	29 48%	1 2%	15 25%	98 67%	54 37%	1 1%	8 5%	47 61%	46 60%	0	0
Evaluates the induction program	72 25%	199 70%	8 3%	50 18%	11 18%	3 5%	2 3%	23 38%	42 29%	94 64%	4 3%	26 18%	19 25%	73 95%	2 3%	1 1%
Pays mentor salaries	10 4%	150 53%	7 2%	125 44%	1 2%	10 16%	1 2%	50 82%	9 6%	74 51%	3 2%	66 45%	0	65 84%	3 4%	9 12%
Pays new teacher stipends	8 3%	83 29%	2 1%	196 69%	2 3%	9 15%	2 3%	49 80%	6 4%	39 27%	0	104 71%	0	34 44%	0	43 56%
Pays for resources and training supplies	35 12%	234 82%	8 3%	35 12%	9 15%	36 59%	3 5%	19 31%	20 14%	122 84%	1 1%	13 9%	6 8%	74 96%	4 5%	2 3%
Pays for substitutes and other release time	38 13%	232 82%	7 2%	32 11%	9 15%	40 66%	2 3%	14 23%	20 14%	118 81%	3 2%	16 11%	9 12%	73 95%	2 3%	2 3%

Table 2.13. New teacher compensation
Districts were asked "Are 1st-year teachers compensated for participating in induction activities?" and invited to check all of the responses which applied. This table disaggregates the responses by: district size category; district percentage of low-income students; average teacher salary; and district locale.

		District size category			% of low-income students		Average instructional expense		District locale			
	Total (286)	Small (61)	Medium (146)	Large (78)	<35% (166)	35% or more (119)	<$6,198 (182)	$6,198 or more (102)	City (7)	Suburb (132)	Town (49)	Rural (97)
Yes, with CPDUs	138 48%	28 46%	59 40%	50 64%	85 30%	52 44%	78 43%	59 58%	3 43%	68 52%	26 53%	40 41%
Yes, with classroom supplies or professional resources	50 17%	12 20%	19 13%	19 24%	27 11%	23 19%	32 18%	18 18%	1 14%	27 20%	8 16%	14 14%
Yes, with stipends	52 18%	5 8%	23 16%	23 29%	27 14%	24 20%	27 15%	24 24%	2 29%	30 23%	9 18%	10 10%
Yes, with other incentives	16 6%	2 3%	4 3%	10 13%	14 6%	2 2%	12 7%	4 4%	1 14%	9 7%	2 4%	4 4%
No compensation	117 41%	31 51%	72 49%	14 18%	61 8%	56 47%	83 46%	33 32%	3 43%	43 33%	19 39%	52 54%

Table 2.14. Mentor primary job description
Districts were asked to describe the primary job or role of the majority of their currently active mentors.

		District size category			% of low-income students		Average instructional expense		District locale			
	Total (275)	Small (55)	Medium (141)	Large (78)	<35% (161)	35% or more (113)	<$6,198 (175)	$6,198 or more (99)	City (7)	Suburb (131)	Town (47)	Rural (89)
Full-time teachers	250 91%	45 82%	132 94%	74 95%	150 93%	101 89%	155 89%	96 97%	6 86%	127 97%	41 87%	77 87%
Full-time administrators	14 5%	9 16%	4 3%	1 1%	8 5%	6 4%	13 7%	1 1%	0	1 1%	1 2%	12 13%
Retired teachers or administrators	3 1%	0	2 1%	1 1%	1 1%	2 2%	3 2%	0	0	0	3 6%	0
Full-time or full-release mentors	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Part-time mentors with other induction responsibilities	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Part-time mentors with some teaching responsibilities	2 1%	0	0	2 3%	1 1%	1 1%	1 1%	1 1%	1 14%	1 1%	0	0
Other	4 1%	1 2%	3 2%	0	1 1%	3 3%	3 2%	1 1%	0	2 2%	2 4%	0

Table 2.15. Mentor selection requirements

Districts were asked, "Before someone can become a mentor in your district, what is s/he required to do?" They were instructed to check all responses that applied to their district. Districts without formal requirements were not included, which is why Table 2.14 has different totals.

	Total (265)	District size category			% of low-income students		Average instructional expense		District locale			
		Small (52)	Medium (137)	Large (76)	<35% (157)	35% or more (108)	<$6,198 (170)	$6,198 or more (95)	City (7)	Suburb (126)	Town (45)	Rural (87)
Formally apply	80 30%	7 13%	36 26%	37 49%	55 35%	25 23%	34 20%	46 48%	6 86%	55 44%	7 16%	12 14%
Successfully complete a minimum number of years of teaching (average: 4.3 years)	147 55%	23 44%	68 50%	56 74%	92 59%	55 51%	86 51%	61 64%	6 86%	84 67%	20 44%	37 43%
Be interviewed	63 24%	9 17%	37 27%	17 22%	45 29%	18 17%	33 19%	30 32%	4 57%	26 21%	14 31%	19 22%
Have his/her classroom observed	62 23%	13 25%	35 26%	14 18%	32 10%	30 28%	42 25%	20 21%	3 43%	22 17%	10 22%	27 31%
Submit a recommendation (e.g. from administrator) or provide references or evaluations (often of a certain level)	27 10%	3 6%	10 7%	14 18%	19 12%	8 7%	16 9%	11 12%	1 14%	13 10%	7 16%	6 7%
Complete a mentor training program	109 41%	7 13%	47 34%	54 71%	73 46%	35 32%	60 35%	48 51%	3 43%	73 58%	16 36%	16 18%
Hold a master's degree	9 3%	4 8%	4 3%	1 1%	3 2%	6 6%	5 3%	4 4%	0	4 3%	0	5 6%
Other (administrator's decision; status as Master Teacher; etc.)	46 17%	12 23%	27 20%	7 9%	24 15%	22 20%	31 18%	15 16%	1 14%	18 14%	7 16%	20 23%

Table 2.16. Mentor initial training

Districts were asked how much initial training their mentors received. Districts were omitted from the "none" category if they indicated on previous questions that they did not have any mentors and that mentoring does not occur in their district.

	Total (273)	District size category			% of low-income students		Average instructional expense		District locale			
		Small (55)	Medium (140)	Large (77)	<35% (159)	35% or more (113)	<$6,198 (172)	$6,198 or more (100)	City (7)	Suburb (129)	Town (46)	Rural (90)
None	83 30%	32 58%	45 32%	6 8%	38 24%	45 40%	57 33%	26 26%	0	26 20%	13 28%	44 49%
One day or less (up to 8 hours)	125 45%	15 27%	73 51%	37 47%	81 50%	44 39%	82 47%	43 43%	4 57%	62 48%	23 49%	36 40%
Several days (8-40 hours)	57 21%	7 13%	20 14%	29 37%	35 22%	21 18%	29 17%	27 27%	2 29%	35 27%	9 19%	10 11%
A week or more (more than 40 hours)	8 3%	0	2 1%	6 8%	5 3%	3 3%	4 2%	4 4%	1 14%	6 5%	1 2%	0

Table 2.17. Mentor ongoing support
Districts were asked how much ongoing support their mentors received. Districts were omitted from the "none" category (and from the total) if they indicated on previous questions that they did not have any mentors and that mentoring does not occur in their district.

	Total (272)	District size category			% of low-income students		Average instructional expense		District locale			
		Small (53)	Medium (140)	Large (78)	<35% (159)	35% or more (112)	<$6,198 (172)	$6,198 or more (99)	City (7)	Suburb (129)	Town (46)	Rural (89)
No ongoing support	90 33%	24 45%	52 37%	17 22%	46 29%	47 42%	69 40%	24 24%	1 14%	36 28%	17 37%	39 44%
Ongoing support, once or a few times a year	124 46%	21 40%	64 46%	39 50%	81 51%	43 38%	77 45%	47 47%	3 43%	66 51%	20 43%	35 39%
Ongoing support, at least monthly	58 21%	9 17%	26 19%	22 28%	34 21%	23 21%	29 17%	28 28%	3 43%	28 22%	10 22%	16 18%

Table 2.18. Mentor activity frequency

Districts were asked how often mentors are expected to engage in the following mentoring activities. Districts were omitted from analysis if they indicated on previous questions that they did not have any mentors and that mentoring does not occur in their district. Some districts responded to certain activities but not to others, so totals do not always equal 100%.

	Total (275)	District size category			% of low-income students		Average instructional expense		District locale			
		Small (55)	Medium (141)	Large (78)	<35% (161)	35% or more (113)	<$6,198 (174)	$6,198 or more (100)	City (7)	Suburb (130)	Town (46)	Rural (91)
Meet with mentee: no specified district expectations	71 26%	22 40%	37 26%	12 15%	34 21%	37 33%	55 32%	16 16%	0	22 17%	11 24%	38 42%
… once a week	118 43%	21 38%	55 39%	41 53%	79 49%	38 34%	59 34%	58 58%	4 57%	72 55%	16 35%	25 27%
… once a month OR once a quarter	85 31%	12 22%	48 34%	25 32%	47 29%	38 34%	60 34%	25 25%	3 43%	35 27%	19 41%	28 31%
… once a semester OR once a year	1	0	1 1%	0	1 1%	0	0	1 1%	0	1 1%	0	0
Observe mentee teach: no specified district expectations	107 39%	33 60%	62 44%	12 15%	59 37%	48 42%	77 44%	30 30%	1 14%	37 28%	18 39%	51 56%
… once a week	2 1%	1 2%		1 1%	2 1%		1 1%	1 1%	1 14%	0	0	1 1%
… once a month OR once a quarter	92 33%	16 29%	35 25%	40 51%	56 35%	35 31%	54 31%	37 37%	2 29%	49 38%	16 35%	24 26%
… once a semester OR once a year	67 24%	4 7%	39 28%	24 31%	41 25%	26 23%	38 22%	29 29%	2 29%	41 32%	11 24%	13 14%
Attend mentor training or workshops: no specified district expectations	138 50%	40 73%	80 57%	18 23%	68 42%	70 62%	99 57%	39 39%	4 57%	46 35%	29 63%	59 65%
… once a week	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
… once a month OR once a quarter	52 19%	3 5%	18 13%	30 38%	33 20%	18 16%	26 15%	25 25%	2 29%	35 27%	6 13%	8 9%
… once a semester OR once a year	78 28%	10 18%	39 28%	29 37%	56 35%	22 19%	44 25%	34 34%	1 14%	47 36%	11 24%	19 21%
Submit a record of mentoring activities: no specified district expectations	113 41%	34 62%	66 47%	13 17%	60 37%	53 47%	83 48%	30 30%	2 29%	43 33%	16 35%	53 58%
… once a week	5 2%	0	0	5 6%	2 1%	3 3%	2 1%	3 3%	1 14%	4 3%	0	0
… once a month OR once a quarter	60 22%	7 13%	27 19%	25 32%	39 24%	20 18%	26 15%	33 33%	1 14%	35 27%	12 26%	11 12%
… once a semester OR once a year	90 33%	12 22%	45 32%	33 42%	57 35%	33 29%	58 33%	32 32%	3 43%	47 36%	17 37%	23 25%
Participate in a formative or summative evaluation of mentoring skills: no specified district expectations	183 67%	40 73%	102 72%	41 53%	104 65%	79 70%	113 65%	70 70%	4 57%	85 65%	29 63%	65 71%
… once a week	1	0	0	1 1%	0	1 1%	1 1%	0	0	1 1%	0	0
… once a month OR once a quarter	13 5%	1 2%	3 2%	8 10%	8 5%	4 4%	7 4%	5 5%	1 14%	7 5%	3 7%	1 1%
… once a semester OR once a year	72 26%	12 22%	33 23%	27 35%	46 29%	26 23%	48 28%	24 24%	2 29%	35 27%	14 30%	21 23%

Table 2.19. Mentor/mentee meetings provisions
Districts were asked, "How is time provided for regularly-scheduled meeting times between mentors and new teachers?" Districts were omitted from the "none" category if they indicated on previous questions that they did not have any mentors and that mentoring does not occur in their district. Districts could check more than one option.

	Total (268)	District size category			% of low-income students		Average instructional expense		District locale			
		Small (51)	Medium (139)	Large (77)	<35% (156)	35% or more (111)	<$6,198 (171)	$6,198 or more (96)	City (7)	Suburb (128)	Town (46)	Rural (86)
Pairs mainly meet before/after school, during planning periods, or during lunch.	232 87%	43 84%	118 85%	70 91%	136 87%	95 86%	148 87%	83 86%	6 86%	109 85%	39 85%	77 90%
Pairs have common planning periods to facilitate these meetings.	68 25%	8 16%	35 25%	25 32%	45 29%	35 32%	34 20%	34 35%	2 29%	43 34%	10 22%	13 15%
Schools provide release time for these meetings.	57 21%	4 8%	26 19%	27 35%	39 25%	18 16%	37 22%	20 21%	2 29%	37 29%	9 20%	9 10%
Schools have special meeting times which mentors and new teachers can use.	40 15%	5 10%	20 14%	15 19%	29 19%	11 10%	18 11%	22 23%	2 29%	26 20%	5 11%	7 8%
Other	10 4%	2 4%	6 4%	2 3%	4 3%	6 5%	7 4%	3 3%	1 14%	3 2%	3 7%	3 3%

Table 2.20. Mentor compensation
Districts were asked how mentors are compensated for participating in induction activities. Districts were omitted from the "none" category if they indicated on previous questions that they did not have any mentors and that mentoring does not occur in their district. Districts could check more than one option.

	Total (273)	District size category			% of low-income students		Average instructional expense		District locale			
		Small (55)	Medium (139)	Large (78)	<35% (160)	35% or more (112)	<$6,198 (172)	$6,198 or more (100)	City (7)	Suburb (130)	Town (46)	Rural (89)
No compensation	80 29%	35 64%	40 29%	5 6%	32 20%	48 43%	60 35%	20 20%	0	19 15%	14 30%	47 53%
With CPDUs	97 36%	12 22%	47 34%	37 47%	63 39%	33 29%	55 32%	41 41%	3 43%	53 41%	19 41%	21 24%
With classroom supplies or professional resources	19 7%	3 5%	8 6%	8 10%	13 8%	6 5%	8 5%	11 11%	0	13 10%	2 4%	4 4%
With stipends	146 53%	9 16%	73 53%	63 81%	99 62%	46 41%	81 47%	64 64%	5 71%	92 71%	23 50%	25 28%
With other incentives	9 3%	2 4%	4 3%	3 4%	7 4%	2 2%	3 2%	6 6%	2 29%	5 4%	0	2 2%

Table 2.21. Building administrator involvement

Districts were asked how building-level administrators were involved in new teacher induction.

	Total (279)	District size category			% of low-income students		Average instructional expense		District locale			
		Small (58)	Medium (142)	Large (78)	<35% (164)	35% or more (114)	<$6,198 (179)	$6,198 or more (99)	City (7)	Suburb (131)	Town (47)	Rural (93)
Not involved	12 4%	2 3%	4 3%	6 8%	7 4%	5 4%	8 4%	4 4%	0	5 4%	5 11%	2 2%
Attend training about the specific needs of new teachers and their role in induction	64 23%	4 7%	39 27%	20 26%	38 23%	25 22%	35 20%	28 28%	4 57%	37 28%	4 9%	18 19%
Select and assign mentors to the new teachers in the building	196 70%	33 57%	105 74%	57 73%	117 71%	78 68%	127 71%	68 69%	5 71%	93 71%	32 68%	65 70%
Meet regularly with new teachers outside of the district's formal evaluation process	157 56%	32 55%	73 51%	51 65%	91 55%	65 57%	94 53%	62 63%	5 71%	80 61%	22 47%	49 53%
Oversee / monitor building induction activities	152 54%	25 43%	84 59%	42 54%	83 51%	68 60%	91 51%	60 61%	4 57%	75 57%	24 51%	48 52%
Other (e.g. attend or lead some workshops; hold informal meetings)	13 5%	1 2%	4 3%	8 10%	6 4%	7 6%	8 4%	5 5%	2 29%	8 6%	1 2%	2 2%

SECTION 3: UNFUNDED DISTRICT BUDGET INFORMATION

This section explores in what ways the survey respondents are representative of all districts in Illinois. All tables disaggregate the data for three groups: unfunded districts which responded to the Unfunded District Survey; all unfunded districts; and all districts in Illinois. Data in this section come from the Illinois School Report Card database.

Four districts (Chester N HSD 122, Southland College Prep, North Mac CUSD 34, and IDJJ Sch Dist 428) do not have any publicly-available demographic information, so although they may appear in a chart's "total" column, they do not appear in the columns which disaggregate the data by district demographics.

Table 3.1. Funding sources and amounts

Districts were asked to allocate how much of their total induction expenses come from the following sources. Districts do not appear in this table if their allocations do not add up to the total expenses they provided earlier. In each data cell, the first number is the total number of districts of each demographic which use that category of funding. The second number is the average percentage of funding—for districts which use that type of funding—which falls into that category.

	Total (157)	District size category			% of low-income students		Average instructional expense		District locale			
		Small (17)	Medium (84)	Large (52)	<35% (96)	35% or more (57)	<$6,198 (99)	$6,198 or more (54)	City (3)	Suburb (81)	Town (27)	Rural (42)
District funds	124 89%	14 96%	70 91%	40 81%	83 89%	41 87%	79 90%	45 86%	3 63%	67 86%	15 93%	39 93%
IDEA funds	2 33%	0	2 33%	0	0	2 33%	2 33%	0	0	0	1 33%	1 33%
Title I funds	10 74%	0	7 76%	3 70%	3 83%	7 70%	9 77%	1 50%	0	5 80%	3 70%	2 67%
Title II funds	36 74%	3 100%	14 71%	19 72%	18 72%	18 75%	19 83%	17 63%	1 27%	21 68%	11 86%	3 88%
State grants	7 68%	1 50%	3 91%	3 50%	7 68%	0	4 50%	3 91%	1 83%	3 72%	1 100%	2 38%
Federal grants	1 100%	0	1 100%	0	1 100%	0	0	1 100%	0	1 100%	0	0
Corporation / foundation grants	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
University funds	1 13%	0	1 13%	0	0	1 13%	1 13%	0	0	0	1 13%	0
Other	5 54%	0	1 29%	4 60%	1 67%	4 51%	4 60%	1 29%	0	4 51%	0	1 67%

Table 3.2. Desired improvements

Districts were asked how they would like to improve their program, if they had more funding. They were presented with a checklist and could select as many options as they liked and write in their own options as "other."

	District size category			% of low-income students		Average instructional expense		District locale			
	Total (276)	Small (60)	Medium (138)	Large (77)	<35% (161)	35% or more (114)	<$6,198 (174)	$6,198 or more (100)	City (7)	Suburb (126)	Town (49)	Rural (93)
Offer more or improved administrator trainings/professional development	165 60%	33 55%	84 61%	47 61%	89 55%	75 66%	111 64%	52 52%	6 86%	71 56%	29 59%	58 62%
Offer more or improved mentor trainings/professional development	218 79%	48 80%	110 80%	59 77%	121 75%	96 84%	143 82%	73 73%	7 100%	93 74%	39 80%	78 84%
Offer more or improved new teacher trainings/professional development	195 71%	43 72%	102 74%	49 64%	108 67%	86 75%	130 75%	63 63%	5 71%	78 62%	41 84%	70 75%
Create a specific program for second-year teachers	111 40%	19 32%	62 45%	30 39%	62 39%	49 43%	68 39%	43 43%	4 57%	54 43%	18 37%	35 38%
Improve the mentor/mentee relationship (e.g. more release time; more structure)	146 53%	26 43%	76 55%	44 57%	83 52%	63 55%	97 56%	49 49%	2 29%	69 55%	28 57%	47 51%
Make a more structured induction program with clarified expectations	104 38%	27 45%	62 45%	15 19%	50 31%	54 47%	71 41%	32 32%	1 14%	39 31%	17 35%	47 51%
Provide more differentiation in program components	92 33%	8 13%	41 30%	42 55%	55 34%	36 32%	51 29%	40 40%	3 43%	58 46%	14 29%	16 17%
Apply for state approval	45 16%	12 20%	28 20%	5 6%	18 11%	27 24%	33 19%	11 11%	0	11 9%	11 22%	23 25%
Provide full-release mentors	48 17%	8 13%	20 14%	20 26%	28 17%	20 18%	25 14%	23 23%	1 14%	27 21%	5 10%	15 16%
Improve formative assessment of new teachers or documentation of new teacher progress	95 34%	11 18%	51 37%	33 43%	51 32%	44 39%	56 32%	38 38%	4 57%	55 44%	11 22%	25 27%
Improve program evaluation	99 36%	11 18%	57 41%	31 40%	60 37%	39 34%	59 34%	39 39%	3 43%	54 43%	16 33%	26 28%
Improve data-driven decision-making about program design and implementation	112 41%	19 32%	57 41%	36 47%	65 40%	47 41%	71 41%	41 41%	3 43%	55 44%	17 35%	37 40%
Make technological improvements	69 25%	10 17%	36 26%	22 29%	42 26%	26 23%	40 23%	28 28%	2 29%	34 27%	12 24%	20 22%
Other (e.g. pay for stipends; provide an official program; pay for consultants to present workshops)	8 3%	1 2%	3 2%	4 5%	4 2%	4 4%	6 3%	2 2%	0	6 5%	2 4%	0

Table 3.3. Reasons for being unfunded

Districts were asked why they are not currently receiving ISBE Induction and Mentoring Grant Funding. They were presented with a checklist and could select as many options as they liked and write in their own options as "other."

	Total (278)	District size category			% of low-income students		Average instructional expense		District locale			
		Small (61)	Medium (141)	Large (76)	<35% (163)	35% or more (115)	<$6,198 (177)	$6,198 or more (100)	City (7)	Suburb (127)	Town (47)	Rural (97)
We were not aware of these funds.	151 54%	30 49%	75 53%	46 61%	90 55%	61 53%	93 53%	57 57%	4 57%	69 54%	23 49%	55 57%
We did not have the resources and/or staffing to apply for these funds or to manage the grant.	65 23%	21 34%	34 24%	10 13%	33 20%	32 28%	46 26%	19 19%	5 71%	21 17%	12 26%	27 28%
The grant amount was not large enough to make it worth our time.	25 9%	4 7%	14 10%	7 9%	13 8%	12 10%	19 11%	6 6%	1 14%	9 7%	7 15%	8 8%
The administrative requirements were unworkable or overly burdensome for our district.	35 13%	5 8%	21 15%	9 12%	17 10%	18 16%	23 13%	12 12%	3 43%	13 10%	5 11%	14 14%
We applied for grant funding in the past and our proposal was rejected.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
We didn't have enough new teachers to make it worth our time.	81 29%	31 51%	43 30%	7 9%	48 29%	33 29%	51 29%	29 29%	1 14%	27 21%	11 23%	42 43%
Other (e.g. I don't know; we have little turnover; we can cover our induction expenses ourselves)	35 13%	6 10%	15 11%	14 18%	23 14%	12 10%	22 12%	13 13%	1 14%	20 16%	7 15%	7 7%

SECTION 4: COMPARISON WITH FUNDED PROGRAMS

As this data brief was being prepared, 37 of the 46 funded programs had submitted their Spring 2011 CDE Reporting Forms. The remaining nine programs had requested extensions. The CDE data will be reported in full for all programs in Data Brief #3. However, the results from the 37 CDEs are included here in order to make comparisons with the unfunded districts.

Each of the below tables includes data from all responding unfunded districts, large unfunded districts, and funded programs. The middle group was included because, on the whole, its new teachers received more supports than teachers employed by other types of districts (e.g. small or rural districts). Thus, it allows a comparison between the "best" unfunded districts and the funded programs, which include a wide range of districts (including small, rural, and high-poverty districts). Thus, these charts demonstrate what the ISBE grant funds actually buy.

Note: The "Unfunded districts" and "Large unfunded districts" column report on numbers of districts, while the "Funded programs" section includes both single districts (typically large ones) as well as multi-district consortia.

Table 4.1. Induction components for first-year teachers

This table lists how many districts/programs enact each of five common induction components for their first-year teachers. Survey respondents could check whether each component was required for all first-year teachers, optional or occurred for some first-year teachers, or did not occur. Blank answers were interpreted as "did not occur." Districts which did not check any response for this and the following question (reported in Table 4.2) are not included in the number of districts as listed in the top row.

	Unfunded districts (287)			Large unfunded districts (78)			Funded programs (36)		
	Required	Optional	Does not occur	Required	Optional	Does not occur	Required	Optional	Does not occur
New teachers are assigned a mentor or buddy.	249 (87%)	26 (9%)	12 (4%)	76 (97%)	2 (3%)	0	34 (97%)	3 (8%)	0
Mentors observe new teachers in classrooms.	161 (56%)	80 (28%)	46 (16%)	62 (79%)	13 (17%)	3 (4%)	34 (94%)	3 (8%)	0
New teachers attend special orientation or workshop before school begins.	239 (83%)	21 (7%)	27 (9%)	77 (99%)	1 (1%)	0	27 (75%)	7 (19%)	1 (3%)
New teachers attend special workshops during the academic year.	162 (56%)	78 (27%)	47 (16%)	69 (88%)	6 (8%)	3 (4%)	28 (78%)	7 (19%)	1 (3%)
New teachers create and document professional growth plans (e.g. portfolios).	123 (43%)	57 (20%)	107 (37%)	57 (73%)	11 (14%)	10 (13%)	30 (83%)	6 (17%)	0

Table 4.2. Other induction supports for first-year teachers

Unfunded districts were asked, "Which additional supports do all or most of your 1st-year teachers receive?" The funded programs were asked this question in a slightly different way; they had to check whether each support was "required," "optional," or "did not occur." This table includes any response of "required" or "optional." Districts which did not check any response for this and the previous question (reported in Table 4.1) are not included in the number of districts as listed in the top row.

	Unfunded districts (287)	Large unfunded districts (78)	Funded programs (36)
New teachers observe mentors or other experienced teachers.	219 (76%)	72 (92%)	36 (100%)
New teachers have formally scheduled time to network with other new teachers.	169 (59%)	61 (78%)	33 (92%)
New teachers have the opportunity to network with teachers outside of their individual schools.	153 (53%)	58 (74%)	33 (92%)
New teachers have a reduced number of course preparations.	8 (3%)	3 (4%)	7 (19%)
New teachers are prohibited or discouraged from teaching the most demanding/undesirable courses.	35 (12%)	16 (21%)	12 (33%)
New teachers are prohibited or discouraged from leading extra-curricular activities.	31 (11%)	14 (18%)	9 (25%)
New teachers are videotaped while teaching for later reflection/discussion with others.	14 (5%)	9 (12%)	28 (78%)
New teachers engage in e-mentoring: online discussions, blogs, video or text-chat for new teacher and veteran teacher interactions (not including email).	44 (15%)	22 (28%)	21 (58%)

Table 4.3. Coordinator role

Districts/programs were asked, "What is the main job responsibility of the person who coordinates and manages new teacher induction activities?"

	Unfunded districts (284)	Large unfunded districts (77)	Funded programs (36)
A program coordinator, whose job description is almost 100% induction-related	6 (2%)	5 (6%)	8 (22%)
An administrator	211 (74%)	53 (69%)	8 (22%)
A teacher	20 (7%)	3 (4%)	3 (8%)
A mentor	5 (2%)	0	0
Coordination and management of the program is shared amongst a team	36 (13%)	13 (17%)	11 (31%)
Other	6 (2%)	3 (4%)	6 (17%)

Table 4.4. New teacher compensation

Districts/programs were asked "Are first-year teachers compensated for participating in induction activities?" and invited to check all of the responses which applied.

	Unfunded districts (286)	Large unfunded districts (78)	Funded programs (36)
Yes, with CPDUs	138 48%	50 64%	25 69%
Yes, with classroom supplies or professional resources	50 17%	19 24%	12 33%
Yes, with stipends	52 18%	23 29%	12 33%
Yes, with other incentives	16 6%	10 13%	6 17%
No compensation	117 41%	14 18%	1 3%

Table 4.5. Mentor selection requirements

Districts/programs were asked, "Before someone can become a mentor in your district, what is s/he required to do?" They were instructed to check all responses that applied to their district. Unfunded districts without mentors or without formal requirements were not included.

	Unfunded districts (265)	Large unfunded districts (76)	Funded programs (35)
Formally apply	80 30%	37 49%	22 63%
Successfully complete a minimum number of years of teaching	147 55%	56 74%	28 80%
Be interviewed	63 24%	17 22%	15 43%
Have his/her classroom observed	62 23%	14 18%	1 3%
Submit a recommendation (e.g. from administrator) or provide references or evaluations (often of a certain level)	27 10%	14 18%	13 37%
Complete a mentor training program	109 41%	54 71%	26 74%
Hold a master's degree	9 3%	1 1%	4 11%
Other (administrator's decision; status as Master Teacher; etc.)	46 17%	7 9%	4 11%

Table 4.6. Mentor initial training

Districts/programs were asked how much initial training their mentors received. Unfunded districts were omitted from the "none" category if they indicated on previous questions that they did not have any mentors and that mentoring does not occur in their district.

	Unfunded districts (273)	Large unfunded districts (77)	Funded programs (37)
None	83 30%	6 8%	0
One day or less (up to 8 hours)	125 45%	37 47%	7 19%
Several days (8-40 hours)	57 21%	29 37%	26 70%
A week or more (more than 40 hours)	8 3%	6 8%	4 11%

Table 4.7. Mentor activity frequency

Districts/programs were asked how often mentors are expected to engage in the following mentoring activities. Unfunded districts were omitted from analysis if they indicated on previous questions that they did not have any mentors and that mentoring does not occur in their district. Some districts responded to certain activities but not to others, so totals do not always equal 100%.

	Unfunded districts (275)	Large unfunded districts (78)	Funded programs (37)
Meet with mentee: no specified district expectations	71 26%	12 15%	8 22%
… once a week	118 43%	41 53%	29 78%
… once a month OR once a quarter	85 31%	25 32%	0
… once a semester OR once a year	1	0	0
Observe mentee teach: no specified district expectations	107 39%	12 15%	1 3%
… once a week	2 1%	1 1%	2 5%
… once a month OR once a quarter	92 33%	40 51%	15 41%
… once a semester OR once a year	67 24%	24 31%	19 51%
Attend mentor training or workshops: no specified district expectations	138 50%	18 23%	9 24%
… once a week	0	0	1 3%
… once a month OR once a quarter	52 19%	30 38%	18 49%
… once a semester OR once a year	78 28%	29 37%	9 24%
Submit a record of mentoring activities: no specified district expectations	113 41%	13 17%	2 5%
… once a week	5 2%	5 6%	6 16%
… once a month OR once a quarter	60 22%	25 32%	15 41%
… once a semester OR once a year	90 33%	33 42%	13 35%
Participate in a formative or summative evaluation of mentoring skills: no specified district expectations	183 67%	41 53%	14 38%
… once a week	1	1 1%	0
… once a month OR once a quarter	13 5%	8 10%	7 19%
… once a semester OR once a year	72 26%	27 35%	16 43%

Table 4.8. Mentor/mentee meetings provisions
Districts/programs were asked, "How is time provided for regularly-scheduled meeting times between mentors and new teachers?" Unfunded districts were omitted from the "none" category if they indicated on previous questions that they did not have any mentors and that mentoring does not occur in their district. Survey respondents could check more than one option.

	Unfunded districts (268)	Large unfunded districts (77)	Funded programs (37)
Pairs mainly meet before/after school, during planning periods, or during lunch.	232 87%	70 91%	30 81%
Pairs have common planning periods to facilitate these meetings.	68 25%	25 32%	22 59%
Schools provide release time for these meetings.	57 21%	27 35%	15 41%
Schools have special meeting times which mentors and new teachers can use.	40 15%	15 19%	13 35%
Other (e.g. use of full-release or retired mentors; varies by school)	10 4%	2 3%	9 24%

Table 4.9. Building administrator involvement
Districts/programs were asked how building-level administrators were involved in new teacher induction.

	Unfunded districts (279)	Large unfunded districts (78)	Funded programs (37)
Not involved	12 4%	6 8%	2 5%
Attend training about the specific needs of new teachers and their role in induction	64 23%	20 26%	20 54%
Select and/or assign mentors to the new teachers in the building	196 70%	57 73%	29 78%
Meet regularly with new teachers outside of the district's formal evaluation process	157 56%	51 65%	17 46%
Oversee / monitor building induction activities	152 54%	42 54%	8 22%
Other (e.g. attend or lead some workshops; hold informal meetings)	13 5%	8 10%	4 11%

SECTION 5: UNFUNDED DISTRICT DEMOGRAPHIC CATEGORY DISAGGREGATION

Tables in this section provide a demographic breakdown the unfunded districts which responded to the online survey. They show the intersections among the four main methods of classification from the preceding two sections in this appendix: size (small, medium, and large districts); student population (percent of low-income students below or above the state average minus Chicago); district finances (per-pupil instructional expense below or above the state average minus Chicago); and district location (urban, suburban, town, or rural).

In each table, percentages are calculated for each column.

Table 5.1. District size

		District size category		
		Small (63)	Medium (148)	Large (78)
% of low-income students	< 35%	25 (40%)	93 (63%)	51 (65%)
	35% or more	38 (60%)	55 (37%)	27 (35%)
Average instructional expense	<$6,198	46 (75%)	97 (66%)	41 (53%)
	$6,198 or more	16 (25%)	51 (34%)	37 (47%)
District locale	City	0	5 (3%)	2 (3%)
	Suburb	3 (5%)	70 (47%)	60 (77%)
	Town	7 (11%)	32 (22%)	10 (13%)
	Rural	53 (84%)	41 (28%)	6 (8%)

Table 5.2. Percent of low-income students

		% of low-income students	
		<35 (169)	35% or more (120)
District size	Small	25 (15%)	38 (32%)
	Medium	93 (55%)	55 (46%)
	Large	51 (30%)	27 (23%)
Average instructional expense	<$6,198	97 (57%)	87 (73%)
	$6,198 or more	72 (43%)	32 (27%)
District locale	City	3 (2%)	4 (3%)
	Suburb	89 (53%)	44 (37%)
	Town	19 (11%)	30 (25%)
	Rural	58 (34%)	42 (35%)

Table 5.3. Average per-pupil instructional expense

		Average instructional expense	
		<$6,198 (184)	$6,198 or more (104)
District size	Small	46 (25%)	16 (15%)
	Medium	97 (53%)	51 (49%)
	Large	41 (22%)	37 (36%)
% of low-income students	<35%	97 (53%)	72 (69%)
	35% or more	87 (47%)	32 (31%)
District locale	City	1 (1%)	6 (6%)
	Suburb	58 (32%)	75 (72%)
	Town	46 (25%)	3 (3%)
	Rural	79 (43%)	20 (19%)

Table 5.4. District locale

		District locale			
		City (7)	Suburb (133)	Town (49)	Rural (100)
District size	Small	0	3 (2%)	7 (14%)	53 (53%)
	Medium	5 (71%)	70 (53%)	32 (65%)	41 (41%)
	Large	2 (29%)	60 (45%)	10 (20%)	6 (6%)
% of low-income students	< 35%	3 (43%)	89 (67%)	19 (39%)	58 (58%)
	35% or more	4 (57%)	44 (33%)	30 (61%)	42 (42%)
Average instructional expense	<$6,198	1 (14%)	58 (44%)	46 (94%)	79 (79%)
	$6,198 or more	6 (86%)	75 (56%)	3 (6%)	20 (20%)