

Appendix to INTC Data Brief #4

July 2010

Prepared by: Patricia Brady

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

This Appendix provides tables, charts, and analyses of quantitative and qualitative data. All data were reported on the fall 2009 or spring 2010 Common Data Elements (CDE) reporting forms by the 64 programs that received grant funding in FY2010.

This Appendix is organized into the following sections:

- Standard 3: Resources (spring CDE)
- Standard 7: Mentor/Novice Interactions (fall CDE)
- Standard 8: Formative Assessment (fall CDE)
- Program Disaggregation

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

Notes on the data

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

One program, Will County, declined to seek continuation funding for the FY10 fiscal year. It filled out the fall 2009 CDE, but not the spring 2010 CDE. For internal consistency, none of Will County's responses on the Fall 2009 CDE are included in this Data Brief. The Chicago New Teacher Center #299, Areas 3, 7, 13, 14, & 17 encompassed four separate grants. This program filled out a single CDE reporting form, so INTC received 61 spring 2010 CDEs. For this data brief, INTC is only reporting on the 61 CDEs it received in spring 2010.

Notes on the tables

The tables disaggregate the data in three ways: district-based programs vs. consortium-based programs; programs initially funded in 2009 vs. programs initially funded in 2006 or 2008; and larger programs (serving 75 or more first- and second-year teachers) vs. smaller programs. Tables 4.1 – 4.6, at the end of this Appendix, show the intersections among programs in these three groups. For example, consortium-based programs are equally split between those that serve fewer than 75 beginning teachers and those that serve more than 75.

In each table, the total number of programs responding to the question in each category appears in parentheses in the blue header row. Total numbers (e.g. of district-based programs or consortium-based programs) may vary from table to table. This is because incomplete data were received from the programs—some programs provided some figures but not others. Also, one program did not provide complete numbers of participating first- and second-year teachers, so it was omitted from the “program size” columns.

In the tables, each data cell contains two figures. The first figure is the absolute number of programs; the number in parentheses provides the percentage of the total number of programs of its type (e.g. district-based programs, or programs initially funded in 2009) that responded to that question. Programs that did not respond to a given question are not included in the totals. When the percentages of two paired, adjacent cells (e.g. showing district-based and consortium-based programs) are different by at least 10 percentage points, then the cells are highlighted in a light shade. When the percentages are different by at least 20 percentage points, the cells are highlighted in a darker shade.

STANDARD 3: RESOURCES

Table 1.1. Program costs, by category: overall statistics (spring CDE)

Programs were asked, "Please list what percent (if any) of your overall program costs were spent in each category below. The categories should total 100%." For each category, this table shows the mean, median, maximum, and number of programs with a non-zero response. The minimum for each category is 0.

This table shows the costs for program activities from June 1, 2009 through May 31, 2010. This is a different time period than ISBE's funding year, so the numbers are different from those supplied to ISBE on other budget reports. INTC has chosen to use this time period because it covers a complete academic year and it is consistent with the dates on the fall and spring CDEs for program activities.

	Mean	Median	Maximum	# of programs with a non-zero response (59 total)
Mentor salary and benefits	40%	36%	96%	56
Coordinator salary and benefits	16%	12%	60%	46
Training	13%	10%	87%	52
Supplies and materials	8%	7%	25%	57
New teacher stipends and benefits	8%	4%	43%	33
Substitute teachers	6%	5%	52%	43
Meals	2%	1%	10%	39
Clerical	1.5%	0	12%	17
Mileage	1%	0.5%	22%	34
Evaluation	1%	0	16%	14
Space rental	0.4%	0	10%	13
Other (conference fees, technological support, misc. overhead, tutors, and misc. to districts)	2%	0	25%	13

Table 1.2. Program costs, by category: disaggregated averages (spring CDE)

This table shows the budget categories from the above table which were, on average, at least 5% of the total program budget. It shows the overall averages, and then it disaggregates by type of program.

This table shows the costs for program activities from June 1, 2009 through May 31, 2010. This is a different time period than ISBE's funding year, so the numbers may be different from those supplied to ISBE on other budget reports. INTC has chosen to use this time period because it but covers a complete academic year, and is consistent with the dates on the fall and spring CDEs for program activities.

	All programs (59)	District-based programs (33)	Consortium-based programs (26)	Initially funded in 2009 (24)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (35)	75+ beginning teachers (21)	<75 beginning teachers (37)
Mentor salary and benefits	40%	49%	29%	43%	38%	37%	42%

Coordinator salary and benefits	16%	12%	20%	14%	17%	20%	13%
Training	13%	12%	13%	13%	12%	10%	14%
New teacher stipends and benefits	8%	6%	11%	8%	8%	7%	8%
Supplies and materials	8%	7%	9%	9%	7%	7%	9%
Substitute teachers	6%	7%	6%	5%	7%	7%	6%

Table 1.3. Impact of the ISBE grant funding process (spring CDE)

Programs were asked an open-ended question: “Please describe how the ISBE grant funding process (e.g. proposal process; funding disbursement) has impacted your program design and implementation.” Program responses were summarized, and similar responses were grouped together. This table includes all responses that were made by at least two programs.

	All programs (60)	District-based programs (35)	Consortium-based programs (25)	Initially funded in 2009 (25)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (35)	75+ beginning teachers (21)	<75 beginning teachers (38)
Concerns							
Reduced funding from last year means that program elements had to be cut back, resulting in a loss of quality, and left programs scrambling for money mid-year	20 (33%)	11 (31%)	9 (36%)	10 (40%)	10 (29%)	7 (33%)	12 (32%)
Grant cycle dates do not correspond with school academic years, which makes program planning and implementation difficult—especially as programs did not discover until after the beginning of the fiscal (and academic) year if they would be funded	17 (28%)	12 (34%)	5 (20%)	6 (24%)	11 (31%)	6 (29%)	11 (29%)
It is difficult to plan ahead because of uncertainties regarding future funding availability and levels	15 (25%)	7 (20%)	8 (32%)	10 (40%)	5 (14%)	6 (29%)	9 (24%)
Delays in disbursement/reimbursement resulted in difficulties (from minor to “devastating”) in planning or program implementation	15 (25%)	8 (23%)	7 (28%)	5 (20%)	10 (29%)	6 (29%)	9 (24%)
Future funding cuts would greatly reduce the quality of the program, or the program may cease to exist	4 (7%)	3 (9%)	1 (4%)	1 (3%)	3 (9%)	0	4 (11%)
The program may not exist next year, or it may exist in a greatly reduced state	4 (7%)	4 (11%)	0	1 (3%)	3 (9%)	1 (5%)	3 (8%)
Districts have picked up a greater share of program costs	4 (7%)	3 (9%)	1 (4%)	3 (12%)	1 (3%)	1 (5%)	3 (8%)
Getting the initial grant funding so late (in spring 2009) made recruitment and planning difficult	3 (5%)	0	3 (12%)	3 (12%)	0	1 (5%)	2 (5%)
Program did not receive any FY10 money (as of 4/19/10)	3 (5%)	0	3 (12%)	0	3 (9%)	1 (5%)	2 (5%)
Positive comments							
Without the grant, the program—or specific key elements—would not exist	29 (48%)	18 (51%)	11 (44%)	13 (52%)	16 (46%)	10 (48%)	18 (47%)
The grant and proposal process have been simple	4 (7%)	3 (9%)	1 (4%)	2 (8%)	2 (6%)	1 (5%)	3 (8%)
Receiving a grant extension was helpful	2 (3%)	2 (6%)	0	0	2 (6%)	0	2 (5%)

STANDARD 7: MENTOR/NOVICE INTERACTIONS

Table 2.1. Expectations for first-year / mentor interactions

Programs were asked, “Does the program set expectations for the amount of interactions that first-year teachers have with their mentors?”

	All programs (57)	District-based programs (32)	Consortium-based programs (25)	Initially funded in 2009 (22)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (35)	75+ beginning teachers (20)	<75 beginning teachers (36)
Program specifies a certain amount of time	48 (84%)	27 (84%)	21 (84%)	19 (86%)	29 (83%)	18 (90%)	29 (81%)
Time expectations vary by building/district	5 (9%)	1 (3%)	4 (16%)	2 (9%)	3 (9%)	1 (5%)	4 (11%)
No program-wide expectations	4 (7%)	4 (13%)	0	1 (5%)	3 (9%)	1 (5%)	3 (8%)

Table 2.2. Expectations for second-year / mentor interactions

Programs were asked, “Does the program set expectations for the amount of interactions that second-year teachers have with their mentors?”

	All programs (47)	District-based programs (27)	Consortium-based programs (20)	Initially funded in 2009 (12)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (35)	75+ beginning teachers (18)	<75 beginning teachers (28)
Program specifies a certain amount of time	27 (57%)	14 (52%)	13 (65%)	8 (67%)	19 (54%)	10 (56%)	16 (57%)
Time expectations vary by building/district	6 (13%)	2 (7%)	4 (20%)	1 (8%)	5 (14%)	3 (17%)	3 (11%)
No program-wide expectations	14 (30%)	11 (41%)	3 (15%)	3 (25%)	11 (31%)	5 (28%)	9 (32%)

Table 2.3. Required time for novice/mentor interactions

Programs were asked, “If program specifies a certain amount of time [for novice/mentor interactions], what is the monthly total number of hours? If totals are provided by week or year, please convert to a monthly sum.”

	First-year teachers (43)	Second-year teachers (21)
Mean	5.4	4.5
Minimum	.5	.25
Maximum	8	8
Median	6	5
Mode	6	6

Table 2.4. Content requirements for first-year / mentor interactions

Programs were asked what content the program requires to be covered in interactions between first-year teachers and their mentors.

	All programs (57)	District-based programs (32)	Consortium-based programs (25)	Initially funded in 2009 (24)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (33)	75+ beginning teachers (20)	<75 beginning teachers (36)
Learning environment	56 (98%)	31 (97%)	25 (100%)	24 (100%)	32 (97%)	20 (100%)	35 (97%)
Reflection and professional growth	55 (96%)	31 (97%)	24 (96%)	24 (100%)	31 (94%)	19 (95%)	35 (97%)
Planning for instruction	54 (95%)	29 (91%)	25 (100%)	24 (100%)	30 (91%)	19 (95%)	34 (94%)
Instructional delivery	54 (95%)	30 (94%)	24 (96%)	24 (100%)	30 (91%)	19 (95%)	34 (94%)
Communication	51 (89%)	27 (84%)	24 (96%)	24 (100%)	27 (82%)	17 (85%)	33 (92%)
Assessment	51 (89%)	29 (91%)	22 (88%)	23 (96%)	28 (85%)	19 (95%)	32 (89%)
Collaborative relationships	50 (88%)	27 (84%)	23 (92%)	22 (92%)	28 (85%)	17 (85%)	32 (89%)
Professional conduct	50 (88%)	28 (88%)	22 (88%)	23 (96%)	27 (82%)	16 (80%)	33 (92%)
Content knowledge	48 (84%)	26 (81%)	22 (88%)	21 (88%)	27 (82%)	17 (85%)	31 (86%)
Diversity	44 (77%)	24 (75%)	20 (80%)	21 (88%)	23 (70%)	17 (85%)	26 (72%)
Human development and learning	39 (68%)	19 (59%)	20 (80%)	16 (67%)	23 (70%)	15 (75%)	23 (64%)
Program provides materials to structure these interactions	47 (82%)	28 (88%)	19 (76%)	20 (83%)	27 (82%)	17 (85%)	29 (81%)

Table 2.5. Content requirements for novice / mentor interactions

Programs were asked, “What content does the program require to be covered in mentor/novice interactions?”

	First-year teachers (57)	Second-year teachers (42)
Learning environment	56 (98%)	37 (88%)
Reflection and professional growth	55	41

	(96%)	(98%)
Planning for instruction	54 (95%)	39 (93%)
Instructional delivery	54 (95%)	39 (93%)
Communication	51 (89%)	34 (81%)
Assessment	51 (89%)	39 (93%)
Collaborative relationships	50 (88%)	34 (81%)
Professional conduct	50 (88%)	33 (79%)
Content knowledge	48 (84%)	34 (81%)
Diversity	44 (77%)	29 (69%)
Human development and learning	39 (68%)	29 (69%)
Program provides materials to structure these interactions	47 (82%)	34 (81%)

Table 2.6. Time provisions for meetings between mentors and first-year teachers (fall CDE)

Programs were asked how they provided time for regularly scheduled meetings between mentors and first-year teachers. They could check more than one answer, and they were asked not to include provisions for classroom observations.

Some programs did not check either of the bottom two options (“These provisions are common across the entire program” or “These provisions vary by building or district”), so the percentages in the bottom two rows do not add up to 100%.

	All programs (61)	District-based programs (35)	Consortium-based programs (26)	Initially funded in 2009 (25)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (36)	75+ beginning teachers (21)	<75 beginning teachers (39)
Pairs meet before/after school, during planning periods, or during lunch only.	47 (77%)	27 (77%)	20 (77%)	21 (84%)	26 (72%)	15 (71%)	31 (79%)
Pairs have common planning periods to facilitate these meetings.	27 (44%)	11 (31%)	16 (62%)	15 (60%)	12 (33%)	10 (48%)	17 (44%)
Schools provide release time for these meetings.	26 (43%)	12 (34%)	14 (54%)	9 (36%)	17 (47%)	13 (62%)	13 (33%)
Schools have meeting times each week (e.g. early dismissal days), which mentors and beginning teachers can use.	20 (33%)	6 (17%)	14 (54%)	13 (52%)	7 (19%)	8 (38%)	12 (31%)
These provisions are common across the entire program.	23 (38%)	20 (57%)	3 (12%)	8 (32%)	15 (42%)	7 (33%)	15 (38%)
These provisions vary by building or district.	30 (49%)	10 (29%)	20 (77%)	17 (68%)	13 (36%)	12 (57%)	18 (46%)

Table 2.7. Time provisions for meetings between mentors and second-year teachers (fall CDE)

Programs were asked how they provided time for regularly scheduled meetings between mentors and second-year teachers. They could check more than one answer, and they were asked not to include provisions for classroom observations.

Some programs did not check either of the bottom two options (“These provisions are common across the entire program” or “These provisions vary by building or district”), so the percentages in the bottom two rows do not add up to 100%.

	All programs (50)	District-based programs (26)	Consortium-based programs (24)	Initially funded in 2009 (16)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (34)	75+ beginning teachers (20)	<75 beginning teachers (29)
Pairs meet before/after school, during planning periods, or during lunch only.	37 (74%)	20 (77%)	17 (71%)	12 (75%)	25 (74%)	13 (65%)	23 (79%)
Pairs have common planning periods to facilitate these meetings.	21 (42%)	8 (31%)	13 (54%)	9 (56%)	12 (35%)	8 (40%)	13 (45%)
Schools provide release time for these meetings.	20 (40%)	8 (31%)	12 (50%)	5 (31%)	15 (44%)	11 (55%)	9 (31%)
Schools have meeting times each week (e.g. early dismissal days), which mentors and beginning teachers can use	13 (26%)	4 (15%)	9 (38%)	6 (38%)	7 (21%)	5 (25%)	8 (28%)
These provisions are common across the entire program.	18 (36%)	15 (58%)	3 (13%)	4 (25%)	14 (41%)	7 (35%)	10 (34%)
These provisions vary by building or district.	23 (46%)	7 (27%)	16 (67%)	10 (63%)	13 (38%)	10 (50%)	13 (45%)

Table 2.8. Time provisions for meetings between mentors and novice teachers (fall CDE)

This table uses data from tables 2.6 and 2.7, but disaggregates between programs which mandated the same provisions across all buildings/districts, and those programs for which provisions varied across buildings/districts.

	First-year teachers		Second-year teachers	
	Provisions are common across entire program (23)	Provisions vary by district/building (30)	Provisions are common across entire program (18)	Provisions vary by district/building (23)
Pairs meet before/after school, during planning periods, or during lunch only.	16 (70%)	24 (80%)	13 (72%)	19 (83%)
Pairs have common planning periods to facilitate these meetings.	7 (30%)	20 (67%)	6 (33%)	15 (65%)
Schools provide release time for these meetings.	10 (43%)	13 (43%)	7 (39%)	11 (48%)
Schools have meeting times each week (e.g. early dismissal days), which mentors and beginning teachers can use.	5 (22%)	14 (47%)	4 (22%)	8 (35%)

Table 2.9. Other assistance for novice teachers

Programs were asked to check whether the listed forms of assistance were part of their programs for first- or second-year teachers from June 1, 2009 through May 31, 2010.

		All programs responding (60)	District-based programs (34)	Consortium-based programs (26)	Initially funded in 2009 (24)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (36)	75+ beginning teachers (21)	<75 beginning teachers (38)
Novice teachers had the opportunity to network with teachers outside of their individual schools.	Occurred program-wide	44 (73%)	29 (85%)	15 (58%)	18 (75%)	26 (72%)	13 (62%)	30 (79%)
	Occurred in some buildings/districts	13 (22%)	3 (9%)	10 (38%)	5 (21%)	8 (22%)	7 (33%)	6 (16%)
	Did not occur	3 (5%)	2 (6%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	2 (6%)	1 (5%)	2 (5%)
Novice teachers had time set aside to network with each other.	Occurred program-wide	34 (57%)	23 (68%)	11 (42%)	15 (63%)	19 (53%)	9 (43%)	24 (63%)
	Occurred in some buildings/districts	23 (38%)	9 (26%)	14 (54%)	8 (33%)	15 (42%)	10 (48%)	13 (34%)
	Did not occur	3 (5%)	2 (6%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	2 (6%)	2 (10%)	1 (3%)
Novice teachers had a reduced number of course preparations.	Occurred program-wide	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Occurred in some buildings/districts	7 (12%)	4 (12%)	3 (12%)	0	7 (19%)	5 (24%)	2 (5%)
	Did not occur	51 (85%)	28 (82%)	23 (88%)	22 (92%)	29 (81%)	16 (76%)	34 (89%)
Novice teachers were assigned a classroom aide (not including aides routinely assigned to teachers, such as for special education).	Occurred program-wide	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Occurred in some buildings/districts	5 (8%)	4 (12%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	4 (11%)	3 (14%)	2 (5%)
	Did not occur	55 (92%)	30 (88%)	25 (96%)	23 (96%)	32 (89%)	18 (86%)	36 (95%)
Novice teachers were prohibited or discouraged from teaching the most demanding / undesirable courses.	Occurred program-wide	1 (2%)	1 (3%)	0	0	1 (3%)	0	1 (3%)
	Occurred in some buildings/districts	19 (32%)	8 (24%)	11 (42%)	5 (21%)	14 (39%)	11 (52%)	8 (21%)
	Did not occur	39 (65%)	24 (71%)	15 (58%)	18 (75%)	21 (58%)	10 (48%)	28 (74%)
Novice teachers were prohibited or discouraged from leading extra-curricular activities.	Occurred program-wide	2 (3%)	2 (6%)	0	2 (8%)	0	0	2 (5%)
	Occurred in some buildings/districts	17 (28%)	5 (15%)	12 (46%)	7 (29%)	10 (28%)	10 (48%)	7 (18%)
	Did not occur	41 (68%)	27 (79%)	14 (54%)	15 (63%)	26 (72%)	11 (52%)	29 (76%)

STANDARD 8: FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT

Table 3.1. Formative assessment process for first-year teachers

Programs were asked, “For the 2009-10 academic year, how will first-year teachers receive formative assessment (assessment of their teaching progress unrelated to retention decisions)?”

	All programs responding (61)	District-based programs (35)	Consortium-based programs (26)	Initially funded in 2009 (25)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (36)	75+ beginning teachers (21)	<75 beginning teachers (39)
Mentors’ observation reports or discussions	60 (98%)	34 (97%)	26 (100%)	25 (100%)	35 (97%)	21 (100%)	38 (97%)
Personal goal-setting and self-analysis	52 (85%)	32 (91%)	20 (77%)	25 (100%)	27 (75%)	17 (81%)	34 (87%)
Analysis of student work samples	45 (74%)	27 (77%)	18 (69%)	20 (80%)	25 (69%)	15 (71%)	30 (77%)
Analysis of student assessment data	44 (72%)	26 (74%)	18 (69%)	21 (84%)	23 (64%)	14 (67%)	30 (77%)
Other mentor reports or discussions (besides observation reports)	26 (43%)	15 (43%)	11 (42%)	7 (28%)	19 (53%)	10 (48%)	15 (38%)
Administrators’ observation or other reports or discussions	26 (43%)	16 (46%)	10 (38%)	10 (40%)	16 (44%)	11 (52%)	15 (38%)
Analysis of other artifacts	25 (41%)	18 (51%)	7 (27%)	13 (52%)	12 (33%)	9 (43%)	16 (41%)
Creation of a portfolio or other evidence	25 (41%)	15 (43%)	10 (38%)	11 (44%)	14 (39%)	12 (57%)	13 (33%)

Table 3.2. Formative assessment process for second-year teachers

Programs were asked, “For the 2009-10 academic year, how will second-year teachers receive formative assessment (assessment of their teaching progress unrelated to retention decisions)?”

	All programs responding (52)	District-based programs (30)	Consortium-based programs (22)	Initially funded in 2009 (11)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (36)	75+ beginning teachers (18)	<75 beginning teachers (28)
Mentors’ observation reports or discussions	43 (91%)	22 (85%)	21 (100%)	11 (100%)	32 (89%)	17 (94%)	25 (89%)
Personal goal-setting and self-analysis	37 (79%)	23 (88%)	14 (67%)	9 (82%)	28 (78%)	15 (83%)	21 (75%)
Analysis of student work samples	37 (79%)	23 (88%)	14 (67%)	7 (64%)	30 (83%)	14 (78%)	22 (79%)
Analysis of student assessment data	35 (74%)	21 (81%)	14 (67%)	8 (73%)	27 (75%)	13 (72%)	22 (79%)

Other mentor reports or discussions (besides observation reports)	20 (43%)	11 (42%)	9 (43%)	3 (27%)	17 (47%)	8 (44%)	11 (39%)
Administrators' observation or other reports or discussions	20 (43%)	11 (42%)	9 (43%)	5 (45%)	15 (42%)	9 (50%)	11 (39%)
Analysis of other artifacts	18 (38%)	13 (50%)	5 (24%)	4 (36%)	14 (39%)	9 (50%)	9 (32%)
Creation of a portfolio or other evidence	17 (36%)	9 (35%)	8 (38%)	2 (18%)	15 (42%)	12 (67%)	5 (18%)

Table 3.3. Structure of formative assessment process for first-year teachers

Programs were asked to describe the formative assessment process for first-year teachers, with three multiple-choice options. Programs were able to select more than one response.

	All programs responding (52)	District-based programs (30)	Consortium-based programs (22)	Initially funded in 2009 (23)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (29)	75+ beginning teachers (17)	<75 beginning teachers (34)
Relatively formal, with specific guides provided by the program and required documentation	33 (63%)	17 (57%)	16 (73%)	16 (70%)	17 (59%)	11 (65%)	22 (65%)
Loosely structured by the program (e.g. the program provides formative assessment training for mentors, but process and implementation are determined by mentor/novice pairs)	22 (42%)	14 (47%)	8 (36%)	8 (35%)	14 (48%)	8 (47%)	13 (38%)
Formative assessment varies (e.g. by mentor or building) and is not structured by the program	4 (8%)	2 (7%)	2 (9%)	2 (9%)	2 (7%)	1 (6%)	3 (9%)

Table 3.4. Structure of formative assessment process for second-year teachers

Programs were asked to describe the formative assessment process for second-year teachers, with three multiple-choice options. Programs were able to select more than one response.

	All programs responding (38)	District-based programs (22)	Consortium-based programs (16)	Initially funded in 2009 (10)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (28)	75+ beginning teachers (17)	<75 beginning teachers (20)
Relatively formal, with specific guides provided by the program and required documentation	23 (61%)	13 (59%)	10 (63%)	5 (50%)	18 (64%)	14 (82%)	9 (45%)
Loosely structured by the program (e.g. the program provides formative assessment training for mentors, but process and implementation are determined by mentor/novice pairs)	14 (37%)	9 (41%)	5 (31%)	6 (60%)	8 (29%)	4 (24%)	9 (45%)
Formative assessment varies (e.g. by mentor or building) and is not structured by the program	4 (11%)	2 (9%)	2 (13%)	1 (10%)	3 (11%)	2 (12%)	2 (10%)

Table 3.5. Annual frequency of mentor observations for first-year teachers

Programs were asked how many times per year each mentor was expected to observe in the classrooms of first-year teachers.

	All programs responding (49)	District-based programs (27)	Consortium-based programs (22)	Initially funded in 2009 (20)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (29)	75+ beginning teachers (14)	<75 beginning teachers (34)
Minimum	1	2	1	1.5	1	1	1
Maximum	35	35	17	35	17	9	35
Mean	5.4	6.6	3.8	6.7	4.4	3.1	6.3
Mode	3	3	3	2	3	3	2
Median	3	3	2	3	3	3	3

Table 3.6. Annual frequency of mentor observations for second-year teachers

Programs were asked how many times per year each mentor was expected to observe in the classrooms of second-year teachers.

	All programs responding (33)	District-based programs (16)	Consortium-based programs (17)	Initially funded in 2009 (8)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (25)	75+ beginning teachers (12)	<75 beginning teachers (20)
Minimum	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum	35	35	10	10	35	9	35
Mean	4.5	5.3	3.8	2.9	5.1	3.0	5.5
Mode	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Median	2	3	2	2	3	2	3

Table 3.7. Pre/post conferences for mentor observations of first-year teachers

Programs were asked if pre/post conferences are required for mentor observations of first-year teachers. Data in this table are disaggregated in a fourth way—by programs requiring six or more mentor observations of first-year teachers per year, vs. programs requiring fewer than six—in order to examine whether programs requiring large numbers of observations are requiring pre/post conferences for all of them.

	All programs responding (56)	District-based programs (32)	Consortium-based programs (24)	Initially funded in 2009 (23)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (33)	75+ beginning teachers (21)	<75 beginning teachers (34)	Programs requiring 6+ observations (11)	Programs requiring <6 observations (34)
Yes, they are required each time a mentor observes a beginning teacher.	44 (79%)	23 (72%)	21 (88%)	17 (74%)	27 (82%)	18 (86%)	25 (74%)	7 (64%)	31 (91%)
Yes, but they are required for only some observations.	7 (13%)	6 (19%)	1 (4%)	3 (13%)	4 (12%)	2 (10%)	5 (15%)	2 (18%)	3 (9%)
No, they are not required at the program level.	6 (11%)	4 (13%)	2 (8%)	2 (9%)	4 (12%)	2 (10%)	4 (12%)	2 (18%)	1 (3%)
Requirements vary by building or district.	1 (2%)	1 (3%)	0	1 (4%)	0	0	1 (3%)	0	0

Table 3.8. Pre/post conferences for mentor observations of second-year teachers

Programs were asked if pre/post conferences are required for mentor observations of second-year teachers. Data in this table are disaggregated in a fourth way—by programs requiring six or more mentor observations of second-year teachers per year, vs. programs requiring fewer than six—in order to examine whether programs requiring large numbers of observations are requiring pre/post conferences for all of them.

	All programs responding (34)	District-based programs (18)	Consortium-based programs (16)	Initially funded in 2009 (9)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (25)	75+ beginning teachers (14)	<75 beginning teachers (20)	Programs requiring 6+ observations (6)	Programs requiring <6 observations (18)
Yes, they are required each time a mentor observes a beginning teacher.	24 (71%)	13 (72%)	11 (69%)	6 (67%)	18 (72%)	11 (79%)	12 (60%)	4 (67%)	15 (83%)
Yes, but they are required for only some observations.	3 (9%)	2 (11%)	1 (6%)	2 (22%)	1 (4%)	0	3 (15%)	0	3 (17%)
No, they are not required at the program level.	6 (18%)	3 (17%)	3 (19%)	1 (11%)	5 (20%)	2 (14%)	4 (20%)	2 (33%)	0
Requirements vary by building or district.	2 (6%)	1 (6%)	1 (6%)	0	2 (8%)	2 (14%)	0	0	0

Table 3.9. Time provisions for mentor observations of first -year teachers (fall CDE)

Programs were asked how they provided time for mentors to perform classroom observations of first-year teachers. They could check more than one answer.

Some programs did not check either of the bottom two options (“These provisions are common across the entire program” or “These provisions vary by building or district”), so the percentages in the bottom two rows do not add up to 100%.

	All programs (55)	District-based programs (32)	Consortium-based programs (23)	Initially funded in 2009 (21)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (34)	75+ beginning teachers (19)	<75 beginning teachers (35)
Using release time provided on request	40 (73%)	20 (63%)	20 (87%)	15 (71%)	25 (74%)	15 (79%)	24 (69%)
Using planning periods to observe	37 (67%)	19 (59%)	18 (78%)	14 (67%)	23 (68%)	13 (68%)	24 (69%)
Using regularly scheduled release time	15 (27%)	6 (19%)	9 (39%)	6 (29%)	9 (26%)	7 (37%)	8 (23%)
Using full-time release mentors	12 (22%)	11 (34%)	1 (4%)	4 (19%)	8 (24%)	5 (26%)	7 (20%)
Using “flexible schedule” mentors (retired, university personnel, or administrative personnel) ¹	12 (22%)	5 (16%)	7 (30%)	3 (14%)	9 (26%)	5 (26%)	7 (20%)
These provisions are common across the entire program.	23 (42%)	19 (59%)	4 (17%)	7 (33%)	16 (47%)	7 (37%)	16 (46%)
These provisions vary by building or district.	21 (38%)	5 (16%)	16 (70%)	11 (52%)	10 (29%)	9 (47%)	12 (34%)

Table 3.10. Time provisions for mentor observations of second-year teachers (fall CDE)

Programs were asked how they provided time for mentors to perform classroom observations of second-year teachers. They could check more than one answer.

Some programs did not check either of the bottom two options (“These provisions are common across the entire program” or “These provisions vary by building or district”), so the percentages in the bottom two rows do not add up to 100%.

	All programs (42)	District-based programs (23)	Consortium-based programs (19)	Initially funded in 2009 (12)	Initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (30)	75+ beginning teachers (16)	<75 beginning teachers (25)
Using release time provided on request	32 (76%)	15 (65%)	17 (89%)	10 (83%)	22 (73%)	13 (81%)	18 (72%)
Using planning periods to observe	28 (67%)	14 (61%)	14 (74%)	8 (67%)	20 (67%)	11 (69%)	17 (68%)

¹ One program checked both “full-time release mentors” and “flexible schedule mentors”.

Using regularly scheduled release time	9 (21%)	3 (13%)	6 (32%)	2 (17%)	7 (23%)	5 (31%)	4 (16%)
Using “flexible schedule” mentors (retired, university personnel, or administrative personnel) ²	9 (21%)	3 (13%)	6 (32%)	1 (8%)	8 (27%)	4 (25%)	5 (20%)
Using full-time release mentors	6 (14%)	5 (22%)	1 (5%)	1 (8%)	5 (17%)	4 (25%)	2 (8%)
These provisions are common across the entire program.	17 (40%)	14 (61%)	3 (16%)	4 (33%)	13 (43%)	6 (38%)	11 (44%)
These provisions vary by building or district.	17 (40%)	4 (17%)	13 (68%)	8 (67%)	9 (30%)	7 (44%)	10 (40%)

Table 3.11. Time provisions for mentor observations of novice teachers (fall CDE)

This table uses data from tables 2.9 and 2.10, but disaggregates between programs which mandated the same provisions across all buildings/districts, and those programs for which provisions varied across buildings/districts.

	First-year teachers		Second-year teachers	
	Provisions are common across entire program (23)	Provisions vary by district/building (21)	Provisions are common across entire program (17)	Provisions vary by district/building (17)
Using release time provided on request	15 (65%)	19 (90%)	10 (59%)	16 (94%)
Using planning periods to observe	16 (70%)	19 (90%)	12 (71%)	14 (82%)
Using regularly scheduled release time	6 (26%)	7 (33%)	3 (18%)	5 (29%)
Using “flexible schedule” mentors (retired, university personnel, or administrative personnel) ³	5 (22%)	5 (24%)	5 (29%)	4 (24%)
Using full-time release mentors	7 (30%)	1 (5%)	3 (18%)	1 (6%)

² One program checked both “full-time release mentors” and “flexible schedule mentors”.

³ One program checked both “full-time release mentors” and “flexible schedule mentors”.

PROGRAM DISAGGREGATION

Tables in this section show the intersections among the three binary methods of program classification: district-based programs vs. consortium-based programs; programs initially funded in 2009 vs. programs initially funded in 2006 or 2008; programs serving 75 or more beginning teachers vs. programs serving fewer than 75 beginning teachers. These are the ways that programs are disaggregated in the preceding tables in this appendix.

In some tables, the percentages of programs serving 75+ vs. <75 beginning teachers do not add up to 100. This is because one program did not provide complete information on the number of beginning teachers that it serves.

Table 4.1. District-based programs (35 total)

Initially funded in 2009	15 (43%)
Initially funded in 2006 or 2008	20 (57%)
75+ beginning teachers	8 (23%)
<75 beginning teachers	26 (74%)

Table 4.2. Consortium-based programs (26 total)

Initially funded in 2009	10 (38%)
Initially funded in 2006 or 2008	16 (62%)
75+ beginning teachers	13 (50%)
<75 beginning teachers	13 (50%)

Table 4.3. Programs initially funded in 2009 (25 total)

District-based programs	15 (60%)
Consortium-based programs	10 (40%)
75+ beginning teachers	5 (20%)
<75 beginning teachers	20 (80%)

Table 4.4. Programs initially funded in 2006 or 2008 (36 total)

District-based programs	20 (56%)
Consortium-based programs	16 (44%)
75+ beginning teachers	16 (44%)
<75 beginning teachers	19 (53%)

Table 4.5. Programs serving 75 or more beginning teachers (21 total)

District-based programs	8 (38%)
Consortium-based programs	13 (62%)
Initially funded in 2009	5 (24%)
Initially funded in 2006 or 2008	16 (76%)

Table 4.6. Programs serving fewer than 75 beginning teachers (39 total)

District-based programs	26 (67%)
Consortium-based programs	13 (33%)
Initially funded in 2009	20 (51%)
Initially funded in 2006 or 2008	19 (49%)