

ILLINOIS NEW TEACHER COLLABORATIVE (INTC) 2010 CONFERENCE REPORT

*LAURA A. BARWEGEN, ED.D.
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WHEATON COLLEGE*

Purpose of Assessment Report

- ▶ to provide information to the INTC Board regarding overall conference participant perceptions;
- ▶
- ▶ to determine if there were significant differences in perceptions among the 2007, 2008, 2009, and 2010 conference participants; and
- ▶ to report differences in participant perceptions that were found to be dependent upon participant's position held within the district, school size, district type, stage of mentoring program, or geographical location within the state of Illinois.

Demographics

Who Was There?

- ▶ 186 survey respondents
- ▶ 14.7% – administrators, 12.9% – mentees, 50.3% – mentors, (77.9% from the “battery”) 13.5% – “support personnel”, 0.6% – higher education (N = 1), and 8.0% – “other/special.”
- ▶ 25.5% respondents came from schools under 400 students, up from 16.4% in 2008, and 4% in 2007
- ▶ Balanced representation from urban, suburban, and rural: 26.4%, 39.2%, and 34.4%, respectively.
- ▶ Over half of the attendees (51.3%) are developing an existing program, less than a fifth (15.2%) are initiating a beginning program and a third (33.5%) are evaluating a defined program.

Table 1. Percentage of conference participants identified with school type: 2007-2010 comparisons.

	2007	2008	2009	2010
Urban	25.20%	26.00%	26.40%	27.70%
Suburban	43.40%	31.00%	39.20%	37.70%
Rural	31.40%	43.00%	34.40%	34.00%

Table 2. Percentage of conference participants identified with school size: 2007-2010 comparisons.*

	2007	2008	2009	2010
0-250	4.00%	8.25%	8.50%	12.10%
251-400	18.70%	8.25%	15.50%	13.40%
401-1000	40.00%	26.80%	32.60%	25.50%
1001-2500 (1001+)	37.30%	23.71%	11.60%	6.00%
2501-5000	--	9.28%	9.30%	7.40%
5001+	--	23.71%	22.50%	35.60%

**I have some concerns about this survey item. Individuals may be misconstruing school size with district size. This item should be restated for the 2011 survey.*

Table 3. Percentage of conference attendees identified with geographical location: 2007-2010 comparisons.

	2007	2008	2009	2010
Chicago area	1.20%	6.67%	6.90%	9.00%
Suburban Chicago	34.10%	20.00%	28.50%	25.10%
Northern Illinois	11.80%	21.90%	19.20%	14.40%
Central Illinois	43.20%	36.19%	41.50%	42.50%
Southern Illinois	7.90%	15.24%	3.80%	9.00%

Table 4. Comparison between 2007-2010 respondents in the developmental stage of their program.

	2007	2008	2009	2010
Initiating a beginning program	27.40%	15.84%	24.20%	15.20%
Developing an existing program	56.70%	61.39%	49.20%	51.30%
Evaluating a defined program	15.90%	21.78%	26.60%	33.50%

Goals of INTC Annual Conference that are Assessed through Survey

- ▶ Inform Participants of Innovative Ideas in Induction/
Mentoring Programs Across the State and Nation
- ▶ Assist Districts Developing Plans for Retaining Quality
Educators within their School/District through the
Development of Quality Induction/Mentoring Programs
Sharing State and National Perspectives and Research
- ▶ Provide Assistance for Districts to Develop, Enhance
and/or evaluate District Induction/Mentoring Programs

So, how did we do this year?

GOAL #1**Inform Participants of Innovative Ideas in Induction/Mentoring Programs Across the State and Nation**

Table 5. Perceptions of innovative ideas presented at the 2010 conference, in descending order of mean value.

Goal 1. Inform participants of innovative ideas in induction/mentoring programs across the state and nation	MEAN/SD	<i>STRONGLY AGREE</i> (4)	<i>AGREE</i> (3)	<i>DISAGREE</i> (2)	<i>STRONGLY DISAGREE</i> (1)
I learned new information about the Illinois Induction Program Continuum	M=3.70 SD=.48	57.1%	42.4%	0.5%	0.0%
The ideas presented at the conference will help strengthen the induction/mentoring programs in my district.	M=3.61 SD=.51	62.0%	37.0%	1.1%	0.0%
I was able to discuss induction/mentoring programs with others throughout the state.	M=3.60 SD=.51	60.9%	38.0%	1.1%	0.0%
I learned new information about successful induction/mentoring programs.	M=3.57 SD=.51	57.1%	42.4%	0.5%	0.0%
This conference strengthened my knowledge about the defining features of successful induction/mentoring programs.	M=3.56 SD=.54	58.2%	39.7%	2.2%	0.0%
I learned about the various induction/mentoring programs across the state of Illinois.	M=3.50 SD=.51	50.5%	48.9%	0.5%	0.0%
The hotel facilities and accommodations were good.	M=3.49 SD=.55	51.1%	47.2%	1.1%	0.6%
The presenters at this conference were engaging and informative.	M=3.30 SD=.60	36.9%	56.8%	5.7%	0.6%
The keynote presentations were valuable.	M=3.05 SD=.67	22.4%	63.5%	11.2%	2.9%
The exhibits were valuable.	M=2.94 SD=.72	21.0%	54.5%	22.2%	2.3%

GOAL #1**Inform Participants of Innovative Ideas in Induction/Mentoring Programs Across the State and Nation**

Table 6. Perceptions of innovative ideas presented at the conference: 2007-2010 comparisons.

Goal 1. Inform participants of innovative ideas in induction/mentoring programs across the state and nation	2007 MEAN/SD	2008 MEAN/SD	2009 MEAN/SD	2010 MEAN/SD	F ratio
I learned new information about the Illinois Induction Program Continuum	---	---	M=3.45 SD=.60	M=3.70 SD=.48	17.989**
The ideas presented at the conference will help strengthen the induction/mentoring programs in my district.	M=3.56 SD=.50	M=3.46 SD=.54	M=3.41 SD=.63	M=3.61 SD=.51	4.326**
I was able to discuss induction/mentoring programs with others throughout the state.	M=3.44 SD=.57	M=3.41 SD=.59	M=3.56 SD=.53	M=3.60 SD=.51	4.078**
I learned new information about successful induction/mentoring programs.	M=3.63 SD=.49	M=3.51 SD=.52	M=3.50 SD=.63	M=3.57 SD=.51	1.653
This conference strengthened my knowledge about the defining features of successful induction/mentoring programs.	M=3.56 SD=.55	M=3.42 SD=.61	M=3.43 SD=.66	M=3.56 SD=.54	2.814*
I learned about the various induction/mentoring programs across the state of Illinois.	M=3.72* SD=.46	M=3.38 SD=.52	M=3.42 SD=.61	M=3.50 SD=.51	12.379**
The hotel facilities and accommodations were good.	M=3.64 SD=.53	M=3.28 SD=.69	M=3.38 SD=.69	M=3.49 SD=.55	8.844**
The presenters at this conference were engaging and informative.	M=3.28 SD=.58	M=3.37 SD=.55	M=3.21 SD=.68	M=3.30 SD=.60	1.469
The keynote presentations were valuable.	---	---	M=2.74 SD=1.00	M=3.05 SD=.67	10.573**
The exhibits were valuable.	M=3.41 SD=.55	M=3.11 SD=.72	M=2.84 SD=.74	M=2.94 SD=.72	20.520**

*p < .05, **p < .01

GOAL #1
Inform Participants of Innovative Ideas in Induction/ Mentoring Programs
Across the State and Nation

Kudos for

- ▶ Mary Clement's presentation: energy, enthusiasm, and knowledge

- ▶ Increase for 2010 in participants':
 - learning new information about the Illinois Induction Program Continuum;
 - gathering ideas that will help strengthen a district's induction/mentoring program;
 - discussing induction/mentoring programs with others; and
 - finding a keynote presentation valuable.

GOAL #1
Inform Participants of Innovative Ideas in Induction/ Mentoring Programs
Across the State and Nation

The 2011 planning committee might consider

- (1) Re-evaluating the exhibits, or possibly how they are assessed as ways that they contribute to the goals of the conference. How can participants better see the value of these? “The exhibits at the reception are not valuable – just a reception so people can interact would serve the same purpose”
Would it?
- (2) The purpose of the keynote presentations. Conference participants appear to value them for their motivation, energy, and enthusiasm, and then value the sharing times and breakout sessions for information and in-depth learning. The keynotes who are valued bring this energy; those who bring information but aren’t as inspiring are not viewed as being as valuable.
- (3) Continuing to provide time for discussion and for information on frameworks for successful programs in Illinois.

GOAL #2**Assist Districts Developing Plans for Retaining Quality Educators within their School/District through the Development of Quality Induction/Mentoring Programs Sharing State and National Perspectives and Research**

Table 7. Perceptions of the sharing of state and national perspectives and research, in descending order of mean value: 2010.

Goal 2. Assist districts developing plans for retaining quality educators within their school/district through the development of quality induction/mentoring programs sharing state and national perspectives and research	MEAN/SD	<i>STRONGLY AGREE</i> (4)	<i>AGREE</i> (3)	<i>DISAGREE</i> (2)	<i>STRONGLY DISAGREE</i> (1)
This conference will assist my district in the development of a quality induction/mentoring program	M=3.53 SD=.51	53.5%	45.9%	0.6%	0.0%
I left this conference with a plan for developing/enhancing our district induction/mentoring program.	M=3.46 SD=.56	49.4%	47.6%	2.9%	0.0%
This conference will assist my district in developing plans for retaining quality educators.	M=3.43 SD=.53	45.0%	53.2%	1.8%	0.0%
This conference contributed to the inclusion of state and national perspectives and research in the plan we developed.	M=3.37 SD=.58	42.4%	52.3%	5.2%	0.0%

GOAL #2**Assist Districts Developing Plans for Retaining Quality Educators within their School/District through the Development of Quality Induction/Mentoring Programs Sharing State and National Perspectives and Research**

Table 8. Perceptions of the sharing of state and national perspectives and research: 2007-2010 comparisons.

Goal 2. Assist districts developing plans for retaining quality educators within their school/district through the development of quality induction/mentoring programs sharing state and national perspectives and research	2007 MEAN/SD	2008 MEAN/SD	2009 MEAN/SD	2010 MEAN/SD	<i>F value</i>
I left this conference with a plan for developing/enhancing our district induction/mentoring program.	M = 3.57 SD = .53	M = 3.31 SD = .56	M = 3.40 SD = .62	M=3.46 SD=.56	4.977**
This conference will assist my district in the development of a quality induction/mentoring program	M = 3.54 SD = .54	M = 3.46 SD = .52	M = 3.39 SD = .62	M=3.53 SD=.51	2.326
This conference will assist my district in developing plans for retaining quality educators.	M = 3.56 SD = .56	M = 3.42 SD = .53	M = 3.33 SD = .61	M=3.43 SD=.53	4.216**
This conference contributed to the inclusion of state and national perspectives and research in the plan we developed.	M = 3.37 SD = .59	M = 3.24 SD = .63	M = 3.24 SD = .64	M=3.37 SD=.58	2.229

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

GOAL #2

**Assist Districts Developing Plans for Retaining Quality Educators within their School/District through the Development of Quality Induction/Mentoring Programs
Sharing State and National Perspectives and Research**

Kudos for

- ❖ Meeting all four items which provide evidence that the INTC conference is meeting Goal #2
- ❖ Segregating groups dependent upon stage of mentoring program (goal from 2010 which appears to have been addressed);
- ❖ Continuing to emphasize the importance of bringing the “battery” members and/or representatives of the district/school induction/ mentoring program (goal from 2010 which the demographic data indicates is increasing).

The 2011 planning committee might consider

- ❖ Attending to the correlational trend between conference year and helping districts to retain quality educators. Is it the goal of the conference to assist with this retention process? What are the sessions and/or activities that contribute to this goal? These are two possible questions for the planning team to consider.

GOAL #3**Provide Assistance for Districts to Develop, Enhance, and/or Evaluate District Induction/Mentoring Programs**

Table 9. Perceptions of assistance provided to districts in developing, enhancing and/or evaluating district induction/mentoring programs: 2010 conference.

Goal 3. Provide assistance for districts to develop, enhance, and/or evaluate district induction/mentoring programs	MEAN/SD	<i>STRONGLY AGREE</i> (4)	<i>AGREE</i> (3)	<i>DISAGREE</i> (2)	<i>STRONGLY DISAGREE</i> (1)
The conference provided opportunity to use the Illinois Induction Program Continuum in evaluating our district induction/mentoring program	M=3.55 SD=.53	57.2%	41.0%	1.7%	0.0%
I was provided with the opportunity to develop, enhance, and/or evaluate the district induction/mentoring program.	M=3.51 SD=.57	54.3%	43.4%	1.7%	0.6%
The conference provided sufficient time to network with others <i>within</i> my district.	M=3.50 SD=.60	55.0%	39.8%	5.3%	0.0%
The time allotted for districts to develop, enhance, and/or evaluate their induction/mentoring programs was valuable.	M=3.48 SD=.61	53.2%	42.2%	4.0%	0.6%
The presenters chosen enabled and/or assisted in the development, enhancement, and/or evaluation of induction/mentoring programs.	M=3.36 SD=.57	40.9%	54.4%	4.7%	0.0%
The conference provided sufficient time to network with others <i>outside</i> my district.	M=3.32 SD=.62	40.2%	51.7%	8.0%	0.0%

GOAL #3**Provide Assistance for Districts to Develop, Enhance, and/or Evaluate District Induction/Mentoring Programs**

Table 10. Perceptions of assistance provided to districts in developing, enhancing and/or evaluating district induction/mentoring programs: 2007-2010 comparisons.

Goal 3. Provide assistance for districts to develop, enhance, and/or evaluate district induction/mentoring programs	2007 MEAN/SD	2008 MEAN/SD	2009 MEAN/SD	2010 MEAN/SD	<i>F value</i>
The time allotted for districts to develop, enhance, and/or evaluate their induction/mentoring programs was valuable.	M=3.40 SD=.66	M=3.30 SD=.63	M=3.45 SD=.62	M=3.48 SD=.61	2.043
I was provided with the opportunity to develop, enhance, and/or evaluate the district induction/mentoring program.	M=3.48 SD=.61	M=3.29 SD=.56	M=3.43 SD=.58	M=3.51 SD=.57	3.735**
The conference provided sufficient time to network with others <i>within</i> my district.	M=3.39 SD=.75	M=3.27 SD=.68	M=3.38 SD=.66	M=3.50 SD=.60	1.836
The conference provided sufficient time to network with others <i>outside</i> my district.	M=3.08 SD=.71	M=3.21 SD=.66	M=3.35 SD=.63	M=3.32 SD=.62	5.289**
The presenters chosen enabled and/or assisted in the development, enhancement, and/or evaluation of mentoring programs.	M=3.30 SD=.62	M=3.35 SD=.57	M=3.31 SD=.66	M=3.36 SD=.57	1.755

t Test

Opportunity to use the Illinois Induction Program Continuum	---	---	M=3.37 SD=.62	M=3.55 SD=.53	-2.818**
---	-----	-----	------------------	------------------	----------

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

GOAL #3
**Provide Assistance for Districts to Develop, Enhance, and/or
Evaluate District Induction/Mentoring Programs**

Kudos for

- ▶ There is a pattern dependent upon conference year for participants' agreement that time is provided for them to work with others outside of their district ($r = .151$). Even though it is considered a weak correlation, it is statistically significant.
- ▶ Use of the Illinois induction/mentoring continuum. Participants liked the handout provided at the beginning of the conference and would like to see next year's conference ascribe to this theme as well.

The 2010 planning committee might consider

- (1) Continuing to move in the direction of assisting in the development of already existing plans and evaluating induction/mentoring programs, with segments continued to be offered for those districts who are still initiating a program.

Table 11. Highest rated survey items ($M > 3.50$) for 2010 conference.

SURVEY ITEM	Goal #	MEAN/SD
I learned new information about the Illinois Induction Program Continuum.	1	M=3.70 SD=.48
The ideas presented at the conference will help strengthen the induction/mentoring program in my district.	1	M=3.61 SD=.51
I was able to discuss induction/mentoring programs with others throughout the state.	1	M=3.60 SD=.51
I learned new information about successful induction/mentoring programs.	1	M=3.57 SD=.51
This conference strengthened my knowledge about the defining features of successful induction/mentoring programs.	1	M=3.56 SD=.54
The conference provided opportunity to use the Illinois Induction Program Continuum in evaluating our district induction/mentoring program	3	M=3.55 SD=.53
This conference will assist my district in the development of a quality induction/mentoring program	2	M=3.53 SD=.51
I was provided with the opportunity to develop, enhance, and/or evaluate the district induction/mentoring program.	3	M=3.51 SD=.57
The conference provided sufficient time to network with others <i>within</i> my district.	3	M=3.50 SD=.60
I learned about the various induction/mentoring programs across the state of Illinois.	1	M=3.50 SD=.51

Table 12. Overall lowest rated survey items ($M < 3.30$) for 2010 conference.

SURVEY ITEM	MEAN/SD
The presenters at this conference were engaging and informative.	M=3.30 SD=.60
Keynote presentations were valuable.	M=3.05 SD=.67
The Exhibits were valuable.	M=2.94 SD=.72

Table 13. 2010 Survey Items with significant differences in conference perceptions dependent upon district type.

	URBAN <i>N</i> = 40	SUBURBAN <i>N</i> = 57	RURAL <i>N</i> = 54	<i>F</i> RATIO
Presenters were engaging and informative	3.34	3.40	3.08	4.721**
Exhibits were valuable	2.93	3.08	2.62	6.601**
Assist my district in retaining quality educators	3.26	3.53	3.39	3.111*
Left with a plan to dev/enhance district program	3.41	3.62	3.35	3.668**

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Best features

- ▶ Mary Clement “was awesome”
- ▶ Break-out sessions
- ▶ Time to work with others: stage-alike, role-alike and team discussion segments
- ▶ Introducing the new continuum
- ▶ Conference booklet was a nice addition

Qualitative recommendations

- ▶ Schedule the conference after ISAT testing
- ▶ Longer sessions – 60 min instead of 45
- ▶ Binder of handouts?
- ▶ After lunch: scenarios (humor?) depicting new teachers & mentors??
- ▶ More new teacher sessions?

Slices of qualitative world

- ▶ “Best I’ve attended in 4 years!”
- ▶ “Well-structured, focused, met our personal needs, good food, rooms, service”
- ▶ “The way the conference was organized was excellent!”
- ▶ “Thank you for a very well designed conference. You’ve given us tools to collect/show data that supports the importance of mentoring program.”
- ▶ “Nancy Johnson and the organizers did a phenomenal job in every area - Congratulations!”

Suggestions for next year

- ▶ Mentor continuum, again – “Continuing the continuum”
- ▶ Team building and trust
- ▶ Steps toward solutions – especially how to move along the continuum
- ▶ Igniting the light within



*Laura Barwegen, Ed.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Education
Wheaton College
630.752.5476 (office)
815.751.8191 (cell)
Laura.Barwegen@wheaton.edu*

If anyone is interested in partnering with me, as I lead teams of teacher candidate researchers, in researching and reporting on the results of a question districts would like answered, please contact me at the information above. My goal is to prepare future teachers who know how to frame a question, collect and analyze appropriate data, and draw conclusions in order to best serve the students, districts, and communities with whom they work.