

Consortium for
Educational
Research and
Evaluation–
North
Carolina

North Carolina New Teacher Support Program

Interim Evaluation Report

Authors:

Kevin C. Bastian and Julie T. Marks
Education Policy Initiative at Carolina, University of North
Carolina at Chapel Hill

March 2014

Consortium for
Educational
Research and
Evaluation–
North
Carolina



Table of Contents

Executive Summary	2
Introduction.....	5
Evaluation Sample	6
NC NTSP Teachers	6
Comparison Sample Teachers.....	7
Data Sources	8
NC NTSP Program Documents	8
Survey Responses by NC NTSP Instructional Coaches	8
Survey Responses by NC NTSP Teachers and Comparison Sample Teachers	8
Results.....	11
NC NTSP Summer and Winter Institutes	11
To What Extent did Eligible Teachers Attend a NC NTSP Institute?	11
How Beneficial was the NC NTSP Institute Curriculum?	12
NC NTSP Instructional Coaching.....	14
To What Extent did Eligible Teachers Receive In-Person NC NTSP Instructional Coaching?	14
NC NTSP Instructional Coaches’ Perceptions: What were the Most Significant Challenges and Areas of Growth for NC NTSP Teachers?	16
NC NTSP Instructional Coaches’ Perceptions: What were the Most Frequently Used and Effective Coaching Practices?.....	18
How Beneficial was the NC NTSP Instructional Coaching?	18
NC NTSP Professional Development	22
To What Extent did Eligible Teachers Attend NC NTSP Professional Development Sessions?	22
How Beneficial was the NC NTSP Professional Development Curriculum?.....	25
Teacher Self-Efficacy and Job Satisfaction	28
Did NC NTSP Teachers Report Higher Levels of Self-efficacy and Job Satisfaction?.....	28
Conclusion	30
Appendix A. North Carolina New Teacher Support Program Instructional Coach Survey	32
Appendix B. Perceptions of Success Inventory—Beginning Teacher Survey	38
Appendix C. NC NTSP Institute Surveys.....	43

NORTH CAROLINA NEW TEACHER SUPPORT PROGRAM: INTERIM EVALUATION REPORT

Executive Summary

The Consortium for Educational Research and Evaluation–North Carolina is evaluating North Carolina’s use of Race to the Top (RttT) funds to support the North Carolina New Teacher Support Program (NC NTSP), a comprehensive induction program that targets beginning teachers in schools across the state that qualified for RttT services by being in the lowest 5% of student achievement or by having a graduation rate below 60% (hereafter referred to as RttT schools). The overall purpose of this evaluation is to assess the extent to which this program improves the instructional practice quality, self-efficacy, value-added effectiveness, and retention of participating teachers through the provision of three support components: an institute, instructional coaching, and professional development.

Program Overview

The NC NTSP is implemented by the University of North Carolina General Administration (UNC-GA), in partnership with the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (NCDPI). The program is organized and administered through a central NC NTSP office and four regional anchor sites located at UNC institutions—East Carolina University, the UNC Center for School Leadership Development, UNC Greensboro, and UNC Charlotte.

The program began supporting a small number of beginning teachers in 2011-12 at qualifying and participating schools with low student achievement in four of North Carolina’s eight education regions. For the 2012-13 academic year, the NC NTSP expanded to offer services to first-, second-, and third-year teachers at participating lowest-achieving schools in all eight regions across the state. To support these teachers in 2012-13, the NC NTSP offered: a week-long Summer Institute in August 2012 and a make-up three-day Winter Institute in December 2012; intensive face-to-face and virtual instructional coaching; and six professional development sessions within each of the four NC NTSP regional anchor sites.

Purpose and Structure of the Report

The purpose of this report is to provide UNC-GA and NCDPI with formative feedback on Year 2 (2012-2013) program implementation ahead of the final summative report due in fall 2014. To this end, the report covers the following areas: (1) descriptions of the evaluation sample for the NC NTSP and of the comparison sample teachers; (2) data sources for this interim evaluation report; (3) data on program implementation, participation, and participants’ perceptions of quality for each of the three NC NTSP components; and (4) reports of teacher self-efficacy and job satisfaction.

Evaluation Sample

The NC NTSP evaluation sample includes first-, second-, and third-year teachers who received NC NTSP services and were employed in participating NC NTSP-eligible schools as of

December 2012. This criterion produced an evaluation sample of 384 teachers in 59 schools across 16 Local Education Agencies (LEAs). The sample excluded: (1) novice teachers receiving NC NTSP services at non-RttT schools¹; (2) novice teachers at RttT schools whose schools opted into the program after December 2012; and (3) novice teachers at RttT schools who were hired or entered the program after December 2012.

To construct a comparison sample for 2012-13, the Evaluation Team selected novice (first- and second-year) teachers² within a set of comparably low-performing schools (lowest-achieving 10%) for a total of 838 first- and second-year teachers in 148 schools across 48 unique LEAs.

Data Sources

The Evaluation Team collected the data presented in this 2012-13 interim evaluation report from the UNC-GA implementation team, NC NTSP instructional coaches, NC NTSP evaluation sample teachers, and comparison sample teachers. Specifically, this interim evaluation report draws upon the following data sources: (1) participation records from each of the components of the NC NTSP—Summer Institute, Winter Institute, instructional coaching, and professional development; (2) the *Instructional Coach Survey* responses of NC NTSP instructional coaches; and (3) the *Perceptions of Success Inventory for Beginning Teachers (PSI-BT)* survey responses of NC NTSP evaluation sample teachers and comparison sample teachers.

Findings

Institutes

To address the challenge of providing institutes for new teachers who were hired after the school year began or who were required to complete early-year LEA induction programs, the UNC-GA added a Winter Institute to its existing Summer Institute component. Combined, nearly 57% of the NC NTSP evaluation sample teachers attended either the Summer or Winter institute, with Institute attendance varying across regions. For those teachers who attended an Institute and responded to the *PSI-BT* survey, evidence indicates positive perceptions of Institute quality, with stronger perceptions of quality among those who attended the Winter Institute. .

Instructional Coaching

The average number of monthly visits per teacher varied between the four regional anchor sites and over the course of the year, ranging between one and eight visits per month. The average amount of time the instructional coaches spent with each teacher varied as well, with an average of over three hours per month. Over the course of the 2012-13 academic year, NC NTSP instructional coaches made a total of 11,903 in-person coaching visits to participating evaluation sample teachers.

¹ In the 2012-13 academic year, the NC NTSP provided services to a small number of schools that are not part of the original Race to the Top sample—in the lowest 5% of student achievement or graduation rates below 60%.

² There were a small number of third year teachers in the NC NTSP sample; therefore, the Evaluation Team did not include third year teachers in the comparison sample.

Responses to the NC NTSP Instructional Coach Survey indicate that the most frequent activities employed by instructional coaches were observing teaching and giving feedback, providing strategies for improved instruction, identifying necessary resources, and promoting teachers' self-efficacy. Overall, NC NTSP teachers who responded to the *PSI-BT* survey reported positive perceptions of instructional coach quality, and indicated significantly higher levels of satisfaction with their NC NTSP instructional coach than with their school- or LEA-provided mentor. NC NTSP teachers also indicated significantly higher levels of satisfaction with their NC NTSP instructional coach than the comparison sample teachers expressed about their school- or LEA-provided mentor. Comparing across regions, NC NTSP teachers in the UNCG region provided the highest ratings of their instructional coaches.

Professional Development

Overall, professional development attendance was generally low, but was variable across regions. The region that had the highest level of attendance—the UNC Center for School Leadership Development region—also offered multiple intra-region professional development sessions and received the most support from LEAs and schools via requirements that their teachers participate. Those teachers who attended at least one NC NTSP professional development session and responded to the *PSI-BT* expressed a higher level of satisfaction with program-provided professional development than with their school-provided professional development. They also expressed a higher degree of satisfaction with program-provided professional development than the comparison sample expressed about their school-provided professional development. These professional development ratings varied across NC NTSP regions, with teachers in the UNC-CSLD region reporting lower levels of satisfaction with NC NTSP professional development.

Self-Efficacy and Job Satisfaction

Finally, NC NTSP teachers who responded to the *PSI-BT* survey reported higher levels of self-efficacy and job satisfaction than did comparison sample teachers. Within the NC NTSP, teachers in the UNC-CSLD region expressed less satisfaction with their current job and a greater likelihood of leaving their LEA/school or the profession.

Next Steps

The findings in this report represent intermediate outcomes that are hypothesized to influence program impact over time. The summative evaluation report, due in fall 2014, will include the 2012-13 primary outcome data of teacher value-added, teacher retention, classroom observations, and principal evaluations, as well as the 2013-2014 follow-up to the implementation data presented in this report.

Introduction

Recognizing that beginning teachers comprise a sizable percentage of North Carolina’s public school workforce, have the potential for rapid improvement in terms of raising student achievement, and exit teaching at significantly higher rates than more experienced peers, the University of North Carolina General Administration (UNC-GA), in partnership with the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (NCDPI), created the North Carolina New Teacher Support Program (NC NTSP) as a high-priority Race to the Top (RttT) initiative. The NC NTSP is a comprehensive induction program targeted at beginning teachers in schools that qualified for RttT services by being in the lowest 5% of student achievement or by having a graduation rate below 60% (hereafter referred to as RttT schools). The program aims to improve the instructional practice quality, self-efficacy, effectiveness, and retention of participating teachers through the provision of three support components—an institute, instructional coaching, and professional development. Implementation of these beginning teacher supports is organized through a central NC NTSP office and regional anchor sites located at four UNC institutions—East Carolina University (ECU), UNC-Center for School Leadership Development (UNC-CSLD), UNC Greensboro (UNCG), and UNC Charlotte (UNCC).

Planning for the NC NTSP began during the 2010-11 academic year with a curriculum committee composed of distinguished education faculty, teachers, and Teach For America (TFA) program leaders. The program began supporting a small number of beginning teachers in 2011-12 at participating RttT schools in four of North Carolina’s eight education regions.³ For the 2012-13 academic year, the NC NTSP greatly expanded to offer services to first-, second-, and third-year teachers at all participating RttT schools. To support these teachers in 2012-13, the NC NTSP offered a week-long Summer Institute in August 2012, a make-up, three-day Winter Institute in December 2012, intensive face-to-face and virtual instructional coaching, and six professional development sessions across each of the four NC NTSP regional anchor sites—ECU, UNC-CSLD, UNCG, and UNCC.

The original reporting requirements for this second evaluation report included an evaluation of program impact; however, due to the timing of administrative data availability, the Team was not able to include data in this report on the primary impact outcomes of interest for the NC NTSP—teacher value-added, principal evaluation ratings, and teacher retention. Therefore, to provide UNC-GA program implementers and NCDPI with formative programmatic feedback, the Team has developed this interim evaluation report. The report sections discuss: (1) the evaluation sample for the NC NTSP and comparison sample teachers; (2) data sources for this interim evaluation report; (3) data on program implementation, participation, and participants’ perceptions of quality for each of the three NC NTSP components; and (4) reports of teacher self-efficacy and job satisfaction. In fall 2014, once data are available and processed for teacher value-added, teacher retention, CLASS classroom observations, and principal evaluations, the Team will release a full summative evaluation report that discusses these primary outcomes and includes salient portions of this interim evaluation report.

³ Please see the 2011-12 NC NTSP evaluation report at <http://cerenc.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/NTSP-First-Year-Report-FINAL.pdf> for further details on program implementation.

Evaluation Sample

NC NTSP Teachers

In the second year of the NC NTSP (2012-13)—the first full year of statewide implementation—all RttT schools were eligible to receive services from the NC NTSP. However, not all eligible schools elected to participate, and not all participating schools entered into the program at the same time or employed beginning teachers. Therefore, the Evaluation Team identified the NC NTSP *evaluation sample* as all first-, second-, or third-year teachers who were receiving NC NTSP services and who were employed in *participating* NC NTSP-eligible schools as of December 2012.⁴ As shown in Table 1, this evaluation sample consists of 384 teachers working in 59 schools across 16 Local Education Agencies (LEAs). All together, the NC NTSP provided comprehensive induction services to 544 teachers working in 78 schools and 20 LEAs throughout the 2012-13 school year.

Table 1. Evaluation Sample Characteristics

Characteristics	NC NTSP Evaluation Sample	Comparison Sample
Number of Teachers	384	838
<i>Elementary</i>	189 (49.2%)	478 (57.0%)
<i>Middle</i>	85 (22.1%)	153 (18.3%)
<i>High</i>	110 (28.7%)	207 (24.7%)
Number of Schools	59	148
Number of LEAs	16	48
Performance Composite	55.08 (9.31)	58.47 (5.58)
Percentage of Free/Reduced-price Lunch Students	93.36 (8.94)	85.65 (13.69)
Percentage of Minority Students	90.86 (9.64)	77.88 (19.69)
Total Per-Pupil Expenditures	9033.45 (1898.09)	8280.67 (3621.72)
Urbanicity		
<i>City</i>	44.07	37.16
<i>Suburb</i>	0.00	3.38
<i>Town</i>	6.78	5.41
<i>Rural</i>	49.15	54.05

Note: All school characteristics in this table are from the 2011-12 academic year. The comparison sample for this interim evaluation report is limited to the 148 schools (out of 157 comparison sample eligible schools) that employed first- or second-year teachers (as of September 2012). Upon receipt of the full 2012-13 salary file from the NCDPI, additional comparison sample teachers (those hired after September 2012 and before December 2012) may be identified and included in the full evaluation report.

⁴ At the discretion of a new administrator at Eastlawn Elementary, the school opted out of the NC NTSP in fall 2012 and is not included in the evaluation sample. Eastlawn has rejoined the NC NTSP for the 2013-14 school year.

This evaluation sample excludes (1) novice teachers receiving NC NTSP services at non-RttT schools; (2) novice teachers at RttT schools whose schools opted into the program after December 2012; and (3) novice teachers at RttT schools who were hired or entered the program after December 2012. While these sets of teachers received NC NTSP services, the Evaluation Team excluded them from the evaluation sample to preserve the focus on RttT schools and ensure that the effectiveness of the NC NTSP is only assessed via the performance of teachers who had the opportunity to receive the full intervention model as it was designed.

Comparison Sample Teachers

For the 2011-12 school year, beginning teachers in RttT schools in four of North Carolina's eight education regions were eligible to participate in the NC NTSP.⁵ Due to other RttT interventions in these schools, especially the District and School Transformation (DST) program, the natural comparison sample for the 2011-12 NC NTSP evaluation was the beginning teachers in the RttT schools in the four other education regions not eligible for NC NTSP services that year. As indicated above, however, in 2012-13 the NC NTSP expanded, with all of the state's RttT schools eligible to participate in the program. This expansion precluded the use of RttT schools (and the novice teachers employed therein) as a comparison sample for the 2012-13 evaluation.

Therefore, to construct a comparison sample for 2012-13, the Evaluation Team selected the novice (first- and second-year) teachers at a set of comparably low-performing schools. Specifically, the Team used 2011-12 performance composite data to identify elementary, middle, and high schools in the bottom 10% of performance (233 schools in total). Then, the 74 schools in this set that were eligible for NC NTSP services (RttT schools) were eliminated. Further, two additional schools from this set that were not RttT schools but were receiving NC NTSP services were removed (Hollister Elementary School and Weldon Elementary School). This left 157 schools that were (1) in the bottom 10% of performance in 2011-12, and (2) not eligible/receiving NC NTSP services. Next, using September 2012 salary data provided by the NCDPI, all first- and second-year teachers working in these schools were identified. As of the September 2012 pay period, nine of these 157 schools were not employing any first- or second-year teachers. As a result, the comparison sample for this evaluation memo consists of 838 first- and second-year teachers (as of September 2012) working in 148 schools with student performance in the bottom 10% across 48 unique LEAs (see Table 1, above, for more comparison sample characteristics). Upon the Evaluation Team's receipt of the full 2012-13 salary file from NCDPI, additional comparison sample teachers (those hired after the September 2012 pay period but prior to December 2012) may be identified and included in the full evaluation report scheduled for release in fall 2014.

⁵ Please see the 2011-12 NC NTSP evaluation report at <http://cerenc.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/NTSP-First-Year-Report-FINAL.pdf> for further details on the evaluation sample.

Data Sources

The Team collected the data presented in this 2012-13 interim evaluation report from the UNC-GA implementation team, NC NTSP instructional coaches, NC NTSP evaluation sample teachers, and comparison sample teachers. Specifically, this interim evaluation report draws upon the following data sources: (1) participation records from each of the components of the NC NTSP—Summer Institute, Winter Institute, instructional coaching, and professional development; (2) survey responses by NC NTSP instructional coaches; and (3) survey responses by NC NTSP evaluation sample teachers and comparison sample teachers. The full 2012-13 evaluation report—scheduled for release in fall 2014—will include analyses of (1) student achievement gains; (2) principal evaluation ratings; (3) teacher retention; and (4) measures of instructional proficiency and student engagement taken from the CLASS observation protocol. Below, we elaborate on the data sources used for this interim evaluation report.

NC NTSP Program Documents

To examine the evaluation sample's participation in the components of the NC NTSP, the UNC-GA treatment implementers supplied the Evaluation Team with requested program documents, including: (1) the curricula, agendas, and rosters of attendees for the 2012 NC NTSP Summer and Winter Institutes; (2) logs of coaching sessions by NC NTSP instructional coaches; and (3) the agendas and rosters of attendees for NC NTSP professional development sessions.

Survey Responses by NC NTSP Instructional Coaches

To better understand how NC NTSP instructional coaches supported participating novice teachers, in the spring of 2013 the Evaluation Team developed and administered the *NC NTSP Instructional Coach Survey*. Specifically, this survey instrument asked NC NTSP instructional coaches to: (1) identify the most significant challenges and areas of greatest growth for NC NTSP teachers; (2) indicate the frequency with which they engaged in certain coaching practices (e.g., helping plan units or lessons) and their perceptions of the most efficacious coaching practices; (3) calculate time spent with NC NTSP teachers; and (4) detail their perceptions of school principals, the CLASS observation protocol, relationships with NC NTSP teachers, and the quality of instructional coach training provided by the NC NTSP (see Appendix A for the full survey). All twenty-six of the instructional coaches employed by the NC NTSP (5 in the ECU region, 7 in the UNC-CSLD region, 7 in the UNCG region, and 7 in the UNCC region) responded to this survey.

Survey Responses by NC NTSP Teachers and Comparison Sample Teachers

To assess (1) the perceptions of NC NTSP teachers regarding the focus and quality of NC NTSP components, and (2) the perceptions of both NC NTSP teachers and comparison sample teachers regarding school-provided novice teacher supports, school context, teacher practices, self-efficacy, and job satisfaction, the Evaluation Team partnered with North Carolina State University's College of Education to administer the *Perceptions of Success Inventory-Beginning*

Teachers (PSI-BT) survey.⁶ For this evaluation there were four survey groups—NC NTSP Summer Institute attendees, NC NTSP Winter Institute attendees, NC NTSP teachers who did not attend an institute, and comparison sample teachers (see Appendix B for the survey). Teachers in all four survey groups completed the regular *PSI-BT* items. In addition, all NC NTSP teachers completed items developed by the Evaluation Team assessing NC NTSP instructional coaching and professional development; NC NTSP teachers who attended an institute (summer or winter) also completed unique institute-specific items developed by the Evaluation Team (Appendix C). Researchers at North Carolina State used both online and paper-based mediums to administer the *PSI-BT* in spring 2013 (April to June).

Table 2 (following page) presents response rates on the *PSI-BT* for the NC NTSP and comparison sample groups, overall, and for each of the three NC NTSP survey groups. Slightly more than half of all NC NTSP teachers in the evaluation sample responded to the survey (50.9%), with much higher response rates for those NC NTSP teachers who attended an institute (56.6% for summer and 59.7% for winter) than those who did not (40.9%). To encourage responses in the comparison sample, the Evaluation Team provided a \$5 financial incentive to survey completers; nearly 45% of comparison sample teachers responded to the survey. Overall, these response rates represent a substantial improvement to those from the *PSI-BT* administered during the 2011-12 NC NTSP evaluation, but should still be considered in the low-to-medium range. Due to the possibility for bias in the respondent sample, the bottom of Table 2 details participation in NC NTSP components for those NC NTSP teachers who did and did not respond to the survey. On average, NC NTSP survey respondents were more likely to attend an Institute (either Summer or Winter), received more instructional coach visits per month, and attended more professional development sessions. Given these differences, it is important to carefully interpret all survey results.

⁶ Please see <http://ncsu.edu/succeed/beginning-teachers/> for more information on the development and use of the *PSI-BT* instrument.

Table 2. PSI-BT Response Rates for Evaluation Sample

Survey Group	Survey Respondents	Administered Surveys	Response Rate
<i>NC NTSP Overall</i>	<i>195</i>	<i>383</i>	<i>50.9%</i>
NC NTSP Summer Institute	47	83	56.6%
NC NTSP Winter Institute	80	134	59.7%
NC NTSP No Institute	68	166	40.9%
<i>Comparison Group</i>	<i>362</i>	<i>818</i>	<i>44.3%</i>

Participant Regional Affiliation		Institute Attendance (%)		Instructional Coaching (visits/month)		Professional Development (sessions attended)	
		<i>Respond</i>	<i>Non Respond</i>	<i>Respond</i>	<i>Non Respond</i>	<i>Respond</i>	<i>Non Respond</i>
<i>n</i>							
ECU	47	80.8%	60.0%	6.35	5.31	2.89	1.15
UNC-CSLD	47	72.3%	71.0%	2.30	1.90	3.87	3.08
UNCG	41	43.9%	31.7%	4.05	3.99	2.92	1.49
UNCC	52	65.4%	32.4%	2.30	1.90	1.94	0.66

Note: While 195 NC NTSP teachers responded to the survey, 8 were missing their identification number, meaning the Evaluation Team can only identify region for 187 NC NTSP respondents. Furthermore, the Evaluation Team could only administer the *PSI-BT* to 383 of the 384 teachers in the NC NTSP evaluation sample and 818 of the 838 teachers in the comparison sample due to missing email addresses.

Results

Results in the sections below are organized into four main topics—the NC NTSP Summer and Winter Institutes, NC NTSP instructional coaching, NC NTSP professional development, and teacher self-efficacy and job satisfaction. Specific research questions are asked within each topic to structure the discussion.

NC NTSP Summer and Winter Institutes

To What Extent did Eligible Teachers Attend a NC NTSP Institute?

In advance of the 2012-13 school year, the NC NTSP held a week-long Summer Institute in Chapel Hill from July 30 through August 3. As shown in Table 3 (following page), 83 teachers in the evaluation sample attended the Summer Institute, with more than half of the attendees coming from the UNC-CSLD region (Durham Public Schools, Halifax County Schools, and Weldon City Schools).⁷ These institute attendees represented 25 unique schools and 10 unique LEAs. Given the challenges of securing high attendance rates in advance of the school year—late hiring, conflicting LEA/school beginning teacher induction and professional development—the UNC-GA program implementers also offered a three-day Winter Institute, from December 1 through December 3, for all eligible NC NTSP teachers who were unable to attend the Summer Institute. In total, 134 evaluation sample teachers from 40 unique schools and 14 unique LEAs attended the Winter Institute.⁸

Of the 384 NC NTSP teachers in the evaluation sample, 57% attended either the Summer or Winter Institute. Across regions, however, there was sizable heterogeneity in attendance, with more than 70% of the evaluation sample teachers in the ECU and UNC-CSLD regions attending an Institute, while only 38% and 46% of the evaluation sample teachers attended from the UNCG and UNCC regions, respectively.

⁷ A total of 97 teachers attended the NC NTSP Summer Institute. Fourteen of these teachers were excluded from the evaluation sample because (1) five taught at non-RttT schools, and (2) nine taught at a school (Eastlawn Elementary School) that withdrew from program participation.

⁸ A total of 143 teachers attended the NC NTSP Winter Institute. Nine of these teachers were excluded from the evaluation sample because they worked at non-RttT schools.

Table 3. Attendance at NC NTSP Summer/Winter Institute for the Evaluation Sample

Institute	Overall Teacher Attendance	Individual Teacher Attendance by Region			
		<i>ECU Region</i>	<i>UNC-CSLD Region</i>	<i>UNCG Region</i>	<i>UNCC Region</i>
Summer Institute	83 (21.6%)	10 (14.9%)	48 (44.0%)	15 (18.3%)	10 (7.9%)
Winter Institute	134 (34.9%)	40 (59.7%)	30 (27.5%)	16 (19.5%)	48 (38.1%)
No Institute Attended	167 (43.5%)	17 (25.4%)	31 (28.4%)	51 (62.2%)	68 (54.0%)
Total Teachers	384	67	109	82	126

Institute	LEA and School Attendance by Region									
	Overall Attendance		<i>ECU Region</i>		<i>UNC-CSLD Region</i>		<i>UNCG Region</i>		<i>UNCC Region</i>	
	<i>LEA</i>	<i>School</i>	<i>LEA</i>	<i>School</i>	<i>LEA</i>	<i>School</i>	<i>LEA</i>	<i>School</i>	<i>LEA</i>	<i>School</i>
Summer Institute	10	25	3	5	3	10	2	4	2	6
Winter Institute	14	40	5	9	4	12	2	6	3	13

How Beneficial was the NC NTSP Institute Curriculum?

To measure attendees’ perceptions of the quality of the NC NTSP Summer and Winter Institutes, the Evaluation Team developed a set of questions, aligned with the Institute curriculum, asking attendees to indicate the extent to which they felt better prepared (after the NC NTSP Institute) to carry out key teaching practices. The Evaluation Team included these items on the *PSI-BT* survey administered in spring 2013.

The NC NTSP evaluation sample teachers who attended the Summer Institute and responded to the *PSI-BT* survey were most positive about the Institute’s sessions on academic goal setting and Common Core/NC Essential Standards—62% and 66% of respondents, respectively, agreed or strongly agreed that these sessions were beneficial (see Table 4, following page). Respondents reported feeling least aided by the Institute’s focus on backwards planning and communicating with students’ parents/caregivers—only 45% and 49% of respondents, respectively, agreed or strongly agreed that the Institute better prepared them to carry out these teaching practices. Summatively, 62% of respondents indicated that the Summer Institute better prepared them (agreed or strongly agreed) for the first few weeks of school; 68% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that the NC NTSP Summer Institute helped them develop confidence, knowledge, and skills in teaching.

Table 4. NC NTSP Summer Institute Survey Questions (Evaluation Sample)

After the NC NTSP Summer Institute . . .	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I was better prepared to set ambitious academic goals for my students.	4.3%	4.3%	2.1%	27.7%	31.9%	29.8%
I better understood the Common Core Standards and NC Essential Standards.	4.3%	2.1%	4.3%	23.4%	44.7%	21.3%
I was better prepared to backwards plan units and lessons to reach academic goals.	4.3%	2.1%	17.0%	31.2%	25.5%	19.2%
I was better prepared to create rigorous, objective-driven classroom assessments.	4.3%	2.1%	17.0%	23.4%	38.3%	14.9%
I was better prepared to create a classroom management plan.	2.1%	8.5%	10.6%	19.2%	34.0%	25.5%
I was better prepared to analyze student achievement data and adjust classroom instruction.	6.4%	2.1%	12.8%	23.4%	44.7%	10.6%
I was better prepared to effectively communicate with students' parents or caregivers.	6.4%	4.3%	17.0%	23.4%	29.8%	19.2%
I was better prepared for the first few weeks of school.	4.3%	6.4%	2.1%	25.5%	31.9%	29.8%
Overall, the NC NTSP Summer Institute was helpful in developing my confidence, knowledge, and skills in teaching.	4.3%	2.1%	2.1%	23.4%	34.0%	34.0%

Note: n=47

In comparison to the responses of Summer Institute attendees, those NC NTSP evaluation sample teachers who attended the Winter Institute and responded to the *PSI-BT* survey reported higher levels of agreement (agree or strongly agree)—between 67% and 86%, respectively—with the survey items (see Table 5, following page). Winter Institute respondents were most positive about the Institute's foci on academic goal setting and classroom management—77% and 86% of respondents, respectively, agreed or strongly agreed that the Institute better prepared them to carry out these teaching practices. Overall, 80% of respondents indicated that the Winter Institute better prepared them for the remainder of the school year, and 82% of respondents

agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that the NC NTSP Winter Institute helped them develop confidence, knowledge, and skills in teaching.

Table 5. NC NTSP Winter Institute Questions (Evaluation Sample)

After the NC NTSP Winter Institute . . .	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I was better prepared to set ambitious academic goals for my students.	1.3%	1.3%	0.0%	20.3%	50.6%	26.6%
I better understood the Common Core Standards and NC Essential Standards.	1.3%	6.3%	2.5%	21.5%	46.8%	21.5%
I was better prepared to backwards plan units and lessons to reach academic goals.	1.3%	5.1%	7.6%	19.0%	44.3%	22.8%
I was better prepared to create rigorous, objective-driven classroom assessments.	1.3%	2.5%	2.5%	24.1%	48.1%	21.5%
I was better prepared to create a respectful classroom environment that encourages student achievement.	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	12.7%	57.0%	29.1%
I was better prepared to analyze student achievement data and adjust classroom instruction.	1.3%	2.5%	2.5%	22.8%	50.6%	20.3%
I was better prepared for the remainder of the school year.	1.3%	0.0%	1.3%	16.5%	54.4%	25.3%
Overall, the NC NTSP Winter Institute was helpful in developing my confidence, knowledge, and skills in teaching.	1.3%	0.0%	2.5%	13.9%	49.4%	32.91%

Note: n=79

NC NTSP Instructional Coaching

To What Extent did Eligible Teachers Receive In-Person NC NTSP Instructional Coaching?

To assess the frequency of NC NTSP instructional coaching, the UNC-GA program implementers provided the Evaluation Team with logs of in-person coaching visits. As shown in the first panel of Table 6 (following page), NC NTSP instructional coaches made frequent visits to the classrooms of the beginning teachers they coached. In the UNCG and UNCC regions, instructional coaches averaged nearly four in-person visits per month with teachers—nearly once a week. In the ECU region, instructional coaches made more frequent visits per teacher,

particularly early in the school year and after the holiday break, while in the UNC-CSLD region, instructional coaches averaged approximately two visits per month—once every other week. For the NC NTSP teachers in our evaluation sample, NC NTSP instructional coaches made a total of 11,903 in-person coaching visits throughout the 2012-13 academic year.

Table 6. NC NTSP Instructional Coaching Frequency (Evaluation Sample)

Month	ECU		UNC-CSLD		UNCG		UNCC	
	Total Visits	Avg. Per Teacher	Total Visits	Avg. Per Teacher	Total Visits	Avg. Per Teacher	Total Visits	Avg. Per Teacher
August & September	545	8.3	196	2.3	256	6.7	311	2.7
October	630	9.4	289	3.3	316	4.0	354	3.1
November	283	4.2	224	2.3	331	4.2	450	3.6
December	278	4.2	175	1.7	275	3.5	367	3.0
January	480	7.2	211	2.3	316	3.9	432	3.6
February	292	4.5	169	1.9	301	3.7	419	3.5
March	305	4.8	186	2.0	310	3.8	450	3.9
April	319	5.1	149	1.6	278	3.4	433	3.7
May & June	417	6.7	217	2.7	395	4.9	544	4.7

Region	Per Month: Instructional Coaching Time with NC NTSP Teachers						
	First-Year Teachers						
	Less Than 1 Hour	1-2 Hours	2-3 Hours	3-4 Hours	4-5 Hours	More Than 5 Hours	
Overall	0	3	5	5	8	5	
ECU	0	1	0	1	2	1	
UNC-CSLD	0	0	1	3	2	1	
UNCG	0	1	3	0	2	1	
UNCC	0	1	1	1	2	2	
Region	Second- and Third-Year Teachers						
	Overall	2	6	6	4	5	2
	ECU	0	1	1	1	2	0
	UNC-CSLD	0	1	4	0	0	2
	UNCG	2	2	0	1	1	0
	UNCC	0	2	1	2	2	0

Note: Instructional Coaches; n=26

Responses to items on the *NC NTSP Instructional Coach Survey* were used to determine the amount of time that NC NTSP instructional coaches spent with NC NTSP teachers, per month. The lower panel of Table 6 presents instructional coach responses, overall and by region, for first-year teachers (who are hypothesized to require greater amounts of coaching assistance), and second- and third-year teachers (combined). Overall, NC NTSP instructional coaches reported spending more time, per month, with first-year teachers; the modal response value was four to five hours, with half of the coaches reporting an average of four hours or more. There were two modal response values regarding second- and third-year teachers—one to two hours and two to three hours of instructional coaching—with many instructional coaches providing more than three hours of monthly coaching to second- and third-year teachers. Despite differences across regions in the number of in-person coaching visits per month, instructional coaches' time spent with NC NTSP teachers was similar in each region.

NC NTSP Instructional Coaches' Perceptions: What were the Most Significant Challenges and Areas of Growth for NC NTSP Teachers?

To assess the perceptions of NC NTSP instructional coaches regarding the experiences of NC NTSP teachers and the coaching practices that most aided those teachers, the Evaluation Team developed the *NC NTSP Instructional Coach Survey*. The survey was administered to all 26 NC NTSP instructional coaches in June 2013.

To assess the most significant challenges and areas of growth for NC NTSP teachers, instructional coaches were provided with a list of items and asked to select the three most pressing issues and three areas of greatest growth for (1) first-year teachers, and (2) second- and third-year teachers. Table 7 (following page) presents a list of various knowledge, skills, and practices and the frequency with which coaches rated them as either the top three challenges or areas of growth for these two groups.

For first-year teachers, NC NTSP instructional coaches overwhelmingly indicated that effectively managing student behavior was the biggest challenge, followed by implementing classroom procedures and teaching students with varying ability levels. After a year of coaching, professional development, and on-the-job learning, the NC NTSP instructional coaches indicated that these first-year teachers had made the most growth in their ability to (1) manage student behavior, (2) use a variety of instructional strategies, (3) implement classroom procedures, and (4) create a positive environment.

For second- and third-year teachers, the most significant challenges centered on instruction rather than classroom management, with teaching students of varying ability, asking higher-order questions, and motivating students to learn receiving the most coach responses. NC NTSP instructional coaches deemed second- and third-year teachers to have made the most growth in (1) motivating students, (2) teaching students with varying ability, (3) managing student behavior, and (4) implementing classroom procedures.

Table 7. Instructional Coaches' Perceptions of Challenges and Areas of Growth for NC NTSP Teachers

Knowledge, Skills, Practices	Number of Ratings by Coaches Among . . .			
	Top Three Most Significant Challenges Faced by BT1s	Top Three Areas of Most Growth for BT1s	Top Three Most Significant Challenges Faced by BT2/3s	Top Three Areas of Most Growth for BT2/3s
Content Knowledge	1	0	2	3
Knowledge of Standards	1	4	2	4
Creating/Communicating Classroom Vision & Goals	0	2	0	0
Motivating Students to Learn	7	2	8	8
Effectively managing Student Behavior	23	15	7	6
Implementing Classroom Procedures to Maximize Instructional Time	10	9	1	6
Creating a Positive Classroom Environment	4	9	2	5
Backwards Planning Objective-Driven Lessons and Units	1	3	1	3
Creating Assessments	0	1	2	0
Clearly Explaining Lesson Content	1	4	0	5
Teaching Students With Differing Ability Levels	9	4	13	7
Using a Variety of Instructional Strategies	1	14	5	5
Providing Meaningful Academic Feedback	0	0	3	1
Asking Higher-Order Questions and Promoting Critical Thinking	6	1	10	4
Using Student Assessment Data to Adjust Instruction	3	1	3	3
Relationships with School Administrators	5	0	6	0
Communicating with Parents	0	1	1	1
Time for Planning, Grading, and Reflection	4	1	6	3
Relationships with Other/Veteran Teachers	0	1	0	0
Maintaining Personal and Professional Balance	2	4	0	1

Note: n=26

NC NTSP Instructional Coaches' Perceptions: What were the Most Frequently Used and Effective Coaching Practices?

To assess the practices of NC NTSP instructional coaches, the Evaluation Team provided instructional coaches with a set of coaching activities and asked them to (1) indicate the frequency with which they engaged in such activities, and (2) select the three coaching activities that they felt were most effective in assisting NC NTSP teachers. Table 8 (following page) shows that instructional coaches were most frequently observing instruction and giving feedback, providing strategies to improve instructional quality, finding/supplying resources, and promoting teachers' self-efficacy and personal/professional balance. The instructional coaches rated the three most effective coaching practices as (1) providing strategies to improve instructional quality, (2) assisting with classroom management concerns, and (3) observing instruction and providing feedback.

How Beneficial was the NC NTSP Instructional Coaching?

To measure the perceptions of NC NTSP teachers regarding the extent to which NC NTSP instructional coaches assisted with key teaching practices, the Evaluation Team developed a set of survey items to append to the *PSI-BT*. Additionally, the Evaluation Team added a set of summative items to the *PSI-BT*, for both NC NTSP and comparison sample teachers, concerning the extent to which NC NTSP instructional coaches or school/LEA-provided mentors contributed to overall teaching success.

For the NC NTSP evaluation sample teachers who received instructional coaching and responded to the *PSI-BT* survey, Table 9 (second page following) indicates that more than 80% of NC NTSP teachers agreed or strongly agreed that they felt aided by their instructional coaches in the areas of reflecting on teaching (93%), instructional concerns/strategies (90%), classroom management (83%), and unit/lesson planning (82%). Fewer NC NTSP teachers felt aided by their instructional coaches in the areas of analyzing student assessment data and communicating with parents/caregivers of students—68% and 72% of respondents, respectively, agreed or strongly agreed with these items. Nearly all respondents (96%) felt that their NC NTSP instructional coach was empathetic. Finally, for each area of assistance, NC NTSP teachers in the UNCG region reported feeling the most aided by their instructional coach.

Table 8. Instructional Coach Self-Perceptions of the Frequency and Effectiveness of NC NTSP Instructional Coach Activities

Instructional Coaching Activity	Frequency of Coaching Activity					Number of Ratings by Coaches Among Top Three Most Effective Activities
	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	
Co-Teaching	0	11	10	4	1	5
Modeling Lessons	0	4	17	3	2	6
Observing Classroom Instruction and Providing Feedback	6	18	2	0	0	10
Assisting with Student Behavior Concerns	9	11	6	0	0	12
Helping Plan Units or Lessons	3	8	13	1	0	6
Providing Strategies to Improve Instructional Quality	11	14	0	0	1	14
Assisting In Small Group Work	1	19	3	3	0	5
Helping Create Classroom Assessments	0	2	9	13	2	0
Helping Teachers Track Student Assessment Data & Adjust Instruction	1	6	13	6	0	0
Finding/Providing Resources for Teachers	16	9	1	0	0	9
Promoting Teachers' Self-Efficacy and Personal/Professional Balance	15	10	1	0	0	2
Meeting with School Administrators	1	5	13	7	0	0
Leading/Participating in PLCs	1	4	10	10	1	2
Helping Teachers Better Communicate With Parents and Other Student Stakeholders	0	8	16	2	0	0
Helping Teachers with Administrative Tasks & Paperwork	0	4	17	5	0	0
Helping Teachers Navigate and Fit into the School's Culture	5	5	13	3	0	1
Identifying and Prioritizing Areas for Improvement	5	13	8	0	0	6

Note: n=26

Table 9. NC NTSP Instructional Coaching Questions (Evaluation Sample)

My Instructional Coach assigned by the NC NTSP . . .	Response Groups	n	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
has provided assistance with classroom management.	Overall	181	0.5%	2.8%	0.5%	12.7%	37.6%	45.9%
	<i>ECU</i>	47	2.1%	2.1%	0.0%	17.0%	36.2%	42.6%
	<i>UNC-CSLD</i>	44	0.0%	6.8%	0.0%	15.9%	56.8%	20.5%
	<i>UNCG</i>	39	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.6%	23.1%	74.4%
	<i>UNCC</i>	51	0.0%	2.0%	2.0%	13.7%	33.3%	49.0%
has provided assistance with instructional concerns.	Overall	180	0.0%	2.8%	0.6%	6.1%	36.1%	54.4%
	<i>ECU</i>	47	0.0%	4.3%	2.1%	6.4%	38.3%	48.9%
	<i>UNC-CSLD</i>	43	0.0%	4.7%	0.0%	4.7%	51.2%	39.5%
	<i>UNCG</i>	39	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.6%	74.4%
	<i>UNCC</i>	51	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%	11.8%	29.4%	56.9%
has provided assistance related to communication with parents or caregivers of my students.	Overall	181	1.1%	6.1%	10.5%	9.9%	35.9%	36.5%
	<i>ECU</i>	47	2.1%	6.4%	17.0%	12.8%	25.5%	36.2%
	<i>UNC-CSLD</i>	44	0.0%	11.4%	15.9%	11.4%	43.2%	18.2%
	<i>UNCG</i>	39	0.0%	2.6%	2.6%	5.1%	33.3%	56.4%
	<i>UNCC</i>	51	2.0%	3.9%	5.9%	9.8%	41.2%	37.3%
has provided assistance with unit or lesson planning.	Overall	181	0.5%	5.0%	3.3%	8.8%	31.5%	50.8%
	<i>ECU</i>	47	2.1%	8.5%	4.3%	10.6%	31.9%	42.6%
	<i>UNC-CSLD</i>	44	0.0%	6.8%	2.3%	11.4%	36.4%	43.2%
	<i>UNCG</i>	39	0.0%	0.0%	5.1%	0.0%	28.2%	66.7%
	<i>UNCC</i>	51	0.0%	3.9%	2.0%	11.8%	29.4%	52.9%
has provided assistance with analysis of student assessment data.	Overall	180	0.6%	10.0%	6.7%	14.4%	36.1%	32.2%
	<i>ECU</i>	47	0.0%	10.6%	10.6%	17.0%	27.7%	34.0%
	<i>UNC-CSLD</i>	44	0.0%	13.6%	9.1%	11.4%	45.5%	20.5%
	<i>UNCG</i>	39	0.0%	2.6%	0.0%	12.8%	35.9%	48.7%
	<i>UNCC</i>	50	2.0%	12.0%	6.0%	16.0%	36.0%	28.0%
encourages me to reflect on my teaching.	Overall	180	0.0%	1.7%	0.6%	4.4%	31.1%	61.9%
	<i>ECU</i>	46	0.0%	2.2%	0.0%	6.5%	39.1%	52.2%
	<i>UNC-CSLD</i>	44	0.0%	2.3%	2.3%	4.5%	38.6%	52.3%
	<i>UNCG</i>	39	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.6%	17.9%	79.5%
	<i>UNCC</i>	51	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%	3.9%	27.5%	66.7%
is empathetic.	Overall	181	0.0%	2.2%	0.0%	1.7%	29.8%	66.3%
	<i>ECU</i>	47	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	2.1%	29.8%	66.0%
	<i>UNC-CSLD</i>	44	0.0%	4.5%	0.0%	4.5%	38.6%	52.3%
	<i>UNCG</i>	39	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.6%	74.4%
	<i>UNCC</i>	51	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.5%	72.5%

Note: Table 9 presents results for the NC NTSP teachers whose survey responses included a unique identification number.

Summatively, when asked whether their NC NTSP instructional coach had helped develop their confidence, knowledge, and skills in teaching, 77% of NC NTSP respondents agreed or strongly agreed (Table 10). By comparison, only 61% of NC NTSP teachers responded similarly for their school-/LEA-provided mentor, and only 53% of comparison sample teachers responded similarly regarding their school-/LEA-provided mentor. Each of these differences—within the NC NTSP sample and between NC NTSP teachers and comparison teachers—was statistically significant.⁹ Table 11 (following page) shows that 62% of NC NTSP respondents attributed “quite a bit” or “a great deal” of their teaching success to assistance from their NC NTSP instructional coach. Only 46% of NC NTSP teachers responded similarly for their school-/LEA-assigned mentor, and only 41% of comparison sample teachers responded similarly for their school-/LEA-assigned mentor. Once again, both of these differences were statistically significant. Finally, comparing across regions, NC NTSP teachers in the UNCG region reported the strongest agreement or attributed more of their success to their NC NTSP instructional coach. For the items in Tables 10 and 11, NC NTSP teachers in the ECU region reported stronger agreement and attributed more of their success to their school- or LEA-assigned mentor than to their NC NTSP instructional coach.

Table 10. Summative Instructional Coaching/Mentoring Questions (Evaluation Sample)

NTSP Instructional Coaching Item	NTSP Response Groups	<i>n</i>	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Overall, my <i>IC provided by the NTSP</i> has been helpful in developing my confidence, knowledge, and skills in teaching.	Overall	181	5.5%	2.8%	1.7%	13.3%	34.3%	42.5%
	<i>ECU</i>	47	4.3%	4.3%	2.1%	19.1%	38.3%	31.9%
	<i>UNC-CSLD</i>	44	6.8%	4.5%	2.3%	13.6%	40.9%	31.8%
	<i>UNCG</i>	39	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%	2.6%	35.9%	59.0%
	<i>UNCC</i>	51	7.8%	2.0%	2.0%	15.7%	23.5%	49.0%
Overall, my <i>school or school district assigned mentor</i> has been helpful in developing my confidence, knowledge, and skills in teaching.	Overall	176	6.8%	7.4%	5.1%	19.9%	33.0%	27.8%
	<i>ECU</i>	42	11.9%	4.8%	2.4%	7.1%	38.1%	35.7%
	<i>UNC-CSLD</i>	44	6.8%	6.8%	11.4%	27.3%	31.8%	15.9%
	<i>UNCG</i>	40	0.0%	7.5%	5.0%	22.5%	32.5%	32.5%
	<i>UNCC</i>	50	8.0%	10.0%	2.0%	22.0%	30.0%	28.0%
	Comparison Group	346	10.7%	7.2%	5.5%	24.0%	29.5%	23.1%

Note: Table 10 presents results for the NC NTSP teachers whose survey responses included a unique identification number.

⁹ To assess statistical significance, the Evaluation Team created a dichotomous variable (Agree or Strong Agree=1, Strongly Disagree to Slight Agree=0) and employed standard independent sample t-tests to test for meaningful differences across groups.

Table 11. Summative Instructional Coaching/Mentoring Questions (Evaluation Sample)

NTSP Instructional Coaching Item	NTSP Response Groups	<i>n</i>	None at All	Hardly Any	Some	Quite a Bit	Great Deal
Of the success you have had as a beginning teacher, what amount would you attribute to help from <i>your IC assigned by the NTSP</i> .	Overall	181	0.6%	7.7%	29.3%	34.8%	27.6%
	<i>ECU</i>	47	0.0%	10.6%	36.2%	29.8%	23.4%
	<i>UNC-CSLD</i>	44	0.0%	11.4%	40.9%	34.1%	13.6%
	<i>UNCG</i>	39	0.0%	0.0%	15.4%	30.8%	53.8%
	<i>UNCC</i>	51	2.0%	7.8%	23.5%	43.1%	23.5%
Of the success you have had as a beginning teacher, what amount would you attribute to help from <i>your school or school district assigned mentor</i> .	Overall	177	9.0%	22.0%	23.2%	27.1%	18.6%
	<i>ECU</i>	42	11.9%	11.9%	21.4%	28.6%	26.2%
	<i>UNC-CSLD</i>	45	17.8%	28.9%	26.7%	20.0%	6.7%
	<i>UNCG</i>	40	2.5%	20.0%	25.0%	32.5%	20.0%
	<i>UNCC</i>	50	4.0%	26.0%	20.0%	28.0%	22.0%
	Comparison Group	348	11.2%	19.0%	28.5%	27.3%	14.1%

Note: Table 11 presents results for the NC NTSP teachers whose survey responses included a unique identification number

NC NTSP Professional Development

To What Extent did Eligible Teachers Attend NC NTSP Professional Development Sessions?

Throughout the 2012-13 school year, each NC NTSP region (ECU, UNC-CSLD, UNCG, and UNCC) hosted six professional development sessions for participating teachers. The ECU, UNCG, and UNCC regions held whole-region sessions for the evaluation sample, while the professional development in the UNC-CSLD region was split into three groups: (1) participating teachers in Durham and Vance counties; (2) participating teachers in Halifax, Hertford, and Weldon City; and (3) sessions offered jointly with the NC Center for the Advancement of Teaching (NCCAT).¹⁰ Across regions, most professional development sessions were single-day events; three of the NCCAT sessions were two-day events. Table 12 (following page) shows that professional development topics varied across region and provider, with NC NTSP instructional coaches and regional staff selecting session topics aligned with the needs of the teachers in that region.

¹⁰ In the spring of 2013 the ECU region offered three professional development sessions for teachers in Robeson County. Because these schools and teachers entered the NC NTSP after December 2012, they are not part of the evaluation sample.

Table 12. NC NTSP Professional Development Topics (Evaluation Sample)

Region/ Provider	Session 1	Session 2	Session 3	Session 4	Session 5	Session 6
ECU	9/22/2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Classroom Vision and Data Tracking Student Centered Learning Strategies 	10/6/2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Classroom Management 	11/3/2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creating and Managing Centers Technology Resources for Planning and Instruction 	2/16/2013 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Professional School Ethics Promoting Higher Order Thinking Skills 	3/9/2013 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Classroom Organization Teaching English Language Learners 	4/27/2013 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Testing Preparation (Grades 3-12) “Make It, Take It” (Grades K-2)
UNC- CSLD (Durham & Vance)	9/22/2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NC Professional Teaching Standards 	10/20/2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Facilitating Learning for all Students 	11/17/2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Differentiated Instruction Aligned with the CCCS 	2/2/2013 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understanding and Creating Performance Events 	3/9/2013 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understanding and Creating Performance Events 	4/20/2013 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> End of Year Reflection
UNC- CSLD (Halifax, Hertford, & Weldon City)	9/8/2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Linking Big Goals to Classroom Management and Data Driven Instruction 	10/13/2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whole Group and Small Group Differentiated Instruction 	11/17/2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How Teachers, Parents, and Students Create Great Schools 	2/9/2013 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understanding and Creating Performance Events 	3/2/2013 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Using Backwards Design to Structure Lesson Planning 	4/13/2013 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> End of Year Reflection
UNC- CSLD (NC Center for the Advancement of Teaching)	9/11/2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Behavior Management 	11/15-16/2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Differentiated Instruction and Assessment 	11/30/2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Better Understanding Student Poverty 	12/13-14/2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Backwards Design with the CCSS Brain Research and Student Learning/Memory 	2/5-6/2013 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Behavior Management II 	N/A
UNCG	9/15/2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establishing a Respectful Environment Time Management Formative Assessment 	10/13/2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Classroom Management Lesson Planning Promoting Higher Order Thinking Skills 	11/17/2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Literacy and Math Learning Centers Classroom Routines 	2/9/2013 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Choice of 3 Breakout Sessions Focused on Literacy Across the Curriculum 	3/9/2013 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Station Activities 	4/20/2013 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Breakout Sessions and Keynote Speaker
UNCC	9/15/2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognizing Cultural Bias Establishing Classroom Culture Using Technology to Enhance Learning 	10/20/2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Classroom Management 	11/17/2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planning and Implementing Engaging Lessons 	2/9/2013 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formal Evaluations Using Data to Improve Practice 	3/16/2013 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responding to the Socio-Emotional Needs Of Children 	5/18/2013 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Testing Preparation What to Do After Testing

The top half of Table 13 presents counts, by session and provider, of the number of NC NTSP evaluation sample teachers in attendance at the NC NTSP professional development sessions. The bottom half of Table 13 displays the average number of professional development sessions attended, per teacher, and percentages of the number of professional development sessions attended. Overall, Table 13 indicates that within the NC NTSP evaluation sample: (1) attendance at professional development sessions was low, with zero sessions attended as the modal value; and (2) significant heterogeneity existed across regions in attendance, with NC NTSP teachers in the UNC-CSLD region attending an average of 3.42 sessions (out of 6) and NC NTSP teachers in the UNCC region attending an average of 1.19 sessions (out of 6).¹¹

Table 13. Attendance at NC NTSP Professional Development Sessions (Evaluation Sample)

Region/Provider	PD Session 1	PD Session 2	PD Session 3	PD Session 4	PD Session 5	PD Session 6
ECU	29	30	26	27	27	20
UNC-CSLD (Durham & Vance)	26	21	16	16	15	15
UNC-CSLD (Halifax, Hertford, & Weldon City)	30	28	21	20	19	6
UNC-CSLD (NC Center for the Advancement of Teaching)	23	27	25	23	21	N/A
UNCG	23	26	25	34	35	38
UNCC	10	28	36	30	21	25

		NC NTSP Overall	Region			
			<i>ECU</i>	<i>UNC-CSLD</i>	<i>UNCG</i>	<i>UNCC</i>
Per Teacher, Average Number of PD Sessions Attended:		2.25 (2.16)	2.37 (2.09)	3.42 (2.16)	2.21 (2.06)	1.19 (1.69)
Number of PD Sessions Attended	<i>Zero</i>	33.6%	26.9%	14.7%	29.3%	56.4%
	<i>One</i>	13.3%	14.9%	8.3%	18.3%	13.5%
	<i>Two</i>	11.7%	16.4%	12.8%	13.4%	7.1%
	<i>Three</i>	11.7%	11.9%	15.6%	9.8%	9.5%
	<i>Four</i>	6.8%	4.5%	8.3%	7.3%	6.4%
	<i>Five</i>	11.7%	16.4%	13.8%	14.6%	5.6%
	<i>Six</i>	11.2%	9.0%	26.6%	7.3%	1.6%

¹¹ The NC NTSP and many of the LEAs participating in the program did not require professional development attendance.

How Beneficial was the NC NTSP Professional Development Curriculum?

To measure attendees' perceptions of the quality of the NC NTSP professional development sessions, the Evaluation Team developed a set of items asking attendees to indicate the extent to which the professional development content improved their ability to carry out key teaching practices. The Evaluation Team included these items on the *PSI-BT* survey administered in spring 2013.

For those NC NTSP evaluation sample teachers who attended professional development sessions and responded to the *PSI-BT* survey, Table 14 (following page) indicates that respondents were positive about professional development quality. For example, 79% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that the NC NTSP professional development improved their ability to create rigorous, standards-aligned units and lesson plans; 87% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the NC NTSP professional development provided them with instructional strategies that improved their students' learning. Comparing across regions, NC NTSP teachers in the UNC-CSLD region rated their professional development sessions lower than did teachers in the other three NC NTSP regions on multiple items.

Summatively, Table 15 (second page following) shows that 86% of NC NTSP evaluation sample respondents felt that the NC NTSP professional development helped them develop confidence, knowledge, and skills in teaching. When posed with a similar statement about school- or LEA-provided professional development, only 65% of NC NTSP respondents agreed or strongly agreed, and only 60% of comparison sample respondents agreed or strongly agreed. These differences—within the NC NTSP evaluation sample and between NC NTSP teachers and comparison sample teachers—were statistically significant. Finally, as in Table 14, NC NTSP teachers in the UNC-CSLD region were less likely to agree or strongly agree that NC NTSP professional development was helpful in developing their confidence, knowledge, and skills in teaching.

Table 14. NC NTSP Professional Development Questions (Evaluation Sample)

The PD provided by the NC NTSP ...	NTSP Response Groups	<i>n</i>	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
improved my classroom management skills.	Overall	147	0.7%	1.4%	5.4%	23.1%	45.6%	23.8%
	<i>ECU</i>	39	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.6%	53.8%	20.5%
	<i>UNC-CSLD</i>	37	2.7%	2.7%	16.2%	29.7%	35.1%	13.5%
	<i>UNCG</i>	36	0.0%	2.8%	2.8%	19.4%	36.1%	38.9%
	<i>UNCC</i>	35	0.0%	0.0%	2.9%	17.1%	57.1%	22.9%
improved my ability to create rigorous, standards aligned unit and lesson plans.	Overall	148	1.4%	0.0%	5.4%	14.2%	52.0%	27.0%
	<i>ECU</i>	39	2.6%	0.0%	7.7%	12.8%	59.0%	17.9%
	<i>UNC-CSLD</i>	37	2.7%	0.0%	5.4%	16.2%	45.9%	29.7%
	<i>UNCG</i>	37	0.0%	0.0%	2.7%	13.5%	45.9%	37.8%
	<i>UNCC</i>	35	0.0%	0.0%	5.7%	14.3%	57.1%	22.9%
improved my ability to create rigorous, standards-driven assessments.	Overall	148	2.0%	0.7%	6.8%	19.6%	46.6%	24.3%
	<i>ECU</i>	39	2.6%	0.0%	5.1%	30.8%	43.6%	17.9%
	<i>UNC-CSLD</i>	37	2.7%	2.7%	8.1%	16.2%	48.6%	21.6%
	<i>UNCG</i>	37	2.7%	0.0%	5.4%	13.5%	40.5%	37.8%
	<i>UNCC</i>	35	0.0%	0.0%	8.6%	17.1%	54.3%	20.0%
improved my ability to analyze student assessment data and adjust instruction.	Overall	148	1.4%	2.7%	6.8%	22.3%	45.3%	21.6%
	<i>ECU</i>	39	2.6%	2.6%	10.3%	20.5%	43.6%	20.5%
	<i>UNC-CSLD</i>	37	2.7%	2.7%	5.4%	32.4%	40.5%	16.2%
	<i>UNCG</i>	37	0.0%	5.4%	2.7%	16.2%	40.5%	35.1%
	<i>UNCC</i>	35	0.0%	0.0%	8.6%	20.0%	57.1%	14.3%
improved my ability to reflect on my teaching practice.	Overall	148	0.7%	0.0%	2.0%	13.5%	48.0%	35.8%
	<i>ECU</i>	39	0.0%	0.0%	2.6%	5.1%	61.5%	30.8%
	<i>UNC-CSLD</i>	37	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	27.0%	40.5%	29.7%
	<i>UNCG</i>	37	0.0%	0.0%	2.7%	8.1%	40.5%	48.6%
	<i>UNCC</i>	35	0.0%	0.0%	2.9%	14.3%	48.6%	34.3%
provided me with instructional strategies that improved my students' learning.	Overall	148	0.7%	0.7%	0.7%	10.8%	50.0%	37.2%
	<i>ECU</i>	39	0.0%	2.6%	0.0%	12.8%	53.8%	30.8%
	<i>UNC-CSLD</i>	37	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	16.2%	51.4%	29.7%
	<i>UNCG</i>	37	0.0%	0.0%	2.7%	5.4%	35.1%	56.8%
	<i>UNCC</i>	35	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.6%	60.0%	31.4%

Note: Table 14 presents results for the NC NTSP teachers whose survey responses included a unique identification number.

Table 15. Summative Professional Development Questions (Evaluation Sample)

Professional Development Item	NTSP Response Groups	<i>n</i>	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Overall, the PD <i>provided by the NC NTSP</i> was helpful in developing my confidence, knowledge, and skills in teaching.	Overall	148	0.7%	0.0%	1.4%	12.2%	45.9%	39.9%
	<i>ECU</i>	39	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.8%	53.8%	33.3%
	<i>UNC-CSLD</i>	37	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	21.6%	48.6%	27.0%
	<i>UNCG</i>	37	0.0%	0.0%	2.7%	5.4%	29.7%	62.2%
	<i>UNCC</i>	35	0.0%	0.0%	2.9%	8.6%	51.4%	37.1%
Overall, the PD <i>provided by my school or school district</i> was helpful in developing my confidence, knowledge, and skills in teaching.	Overall	182	4.9%	0.0%	6.0%	23.6%	50.0%	15.4%
	<i>ECU</i>	47	0.0%	0.0%	8.5%	19.1%	59.6%	12.8%
	<i>UNC-CSLD</i>	44	15.9%	0.0%	2.3%	27.3%	36.4%	18.2%
	<i>UNCG</i>	40	2.5%	0.0%	5.0%	15.0%	57.5%	20.0%
	<i>UNCC</i>	51	2.0%	0.0%	7.8%	31.4%	47.1%	11.8%
	Comparison Group	358	5.3%	0.0%	8.1%	26.8%	46.7%	13.1%

Note: Table 15 presents results for the NC NTSP teachers whose survey responses included a unique identification number.

Teacher Self-Efficacy and Job Satisfaction

Did NC NTSP Teachers Report Higher Levels of Self-efficacy and Job Satisfaction?

To measure perceptions of self-efficacy and job satisfaction for NC NTSP and comparison sample teachers, the Evaluation Team relied on a set of pre-existing items on the *PSI-BT* survey. For those teachers who were in the evaluation sample and responded to the *PSI-BT* survey, Table 16 (following page) indicates that NC NTSP teachers reported higher levels of self-efficacy and job satisfaction than did comparison sample teachers.

Regarding self-efficacy, 78% of NC NTSP teachers, versus 71% of comparison teachers, agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that they can successfully instruct students with a variety of ability levels; 60% of NC NTSP teachers, versus 53% of comparison teachers, agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that they are able to motivate all students; and 85% of NC NTSP teachers, versus 76% of comparison teachers, agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that they feel inspired to instruct students to the best of their ability. The difference between NC NTSP and comparison sample teachers on this final self-efficacy item was statistically significant.

Regarding job satisfaction, 59% of NC NTSP teachers, versus 53% of comparison teachers, agreed or strongly agreed that they were satisfied with their current job; 70% of NC NTSP teachers, versus 65% of comparison teachers, agreed or strongly agreed that they considered teaching to be their ideal career. The job satisfaction responses differed greatly across NC NTSP regions—43% of UNC-CSLD teachers were satisfied with their current job, 34% had not considered leaving teaching, and 30% intended to leave the profession or their current school/LEA.

When asked about their career intentions, 56% of NC NTSP respondents indicated that they were not considering leaving teaching, versus 52% in the comparison group; 16% of both the NC NTSP and comparison sample teachers intended to leave the profession or their current school/LEA.

Table 16. Self-Efficacy and Job Satisfaction (Evaluation Sample)

Efficacy and Job Satisfaction Items	NTSP Response Groups	n	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I am able to successfully teach students with a variety of ability levels.	Overall	184	0.0%	1.6%	2.2%	18.5%	61.4%	16.3%
	<i>ECU</i>	47	0.0%	2.1%	2.1%	17.0%	63.8%	14.9%
	<i>UNC-CSLD</i>	45	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	31.1%	57.8%	11.1%
	<i>UNCG</i>	40	0.0%	2.5%	2.5%	12.5%	60.0%	22.5%
	<i>UNCC</i>	52	0.0%	1.9%	3.8%	13.5%	63.5%	17.3%
	Comp. Group	361	0.3%	1.9%	2.8%	23.5%	52.6%	18.8%
I am able to motivate all students.	Overall	184	0.0%	5.4%	8.7%	26.1%	47.3%	12.5%
	<i>ECU</i>	47	0.0%	4.3%	0.0%	29.8%	55.3%	10.6%
	<i>UNC-CSLD</i>	45	0.0%	4.4%	15.6%	20.0%	46.7%	13.3%
	<i>UNCG</i>	40	0.0%	5.0%	10.0%	25.0%	42.5%	17.5%
	<i>UNCC</i>	52	0.0%	7.7%	9.6%	28.8%	44.2%	9.6%
	Comp. Group	361	2.2%	5.8%	10.8%	27.7%	40.7%	12.7%
I feel inspired to instruct students to the best of my ability.	Overall	182	2.7%	2.2%	4.4%	6.0%	38.5%	46.2%
	<i>ECU</i>	46	2.2%	4.3%	6.5%	8.7%	37.0%	41.3%
	<i>UNC-CSLD</i>	44	2.3%	2.3%	4.5%	4.5%	45.5%	40.9%
	<i>UNCG</i>	40	2.5%	0.0%	5.0%	10.0%	32.5%	50.0%
	<i>UNCC</i>	52	3.8%	1.9%	1.9%	1.9%	38.5%	51.9%
	Comp. Group	362	2.2%	2.5%	5.3%	13.8%	32.6%	43.7%
In general, I am satisfied with my current job.	Overall	183	7.1%	7.7%	9.3%	17.5%	33.3%	25.1%
	<i>ECU</i>	46	6.5%	6.5%	2.2%	19.6%	37.0%	28.3%
	<i>UNC-CSLD</i>	44	6.8%	11.4%	20.5%	18.2%	25.0%	18.2%
	<i>UNCG</i>	41	7.3%	4.9%	17.1%	9.8%	36.6%	24.4%
	<i>UNCC</i>	52	7.7%	7.7%	0.0%	21.2%	34.6%	28.8%
	Comp. Group	362	7.7%	8.0%	11.9%	19.3%	34.8%	18.2%
I consider teaching to be my ideal career.	Overall	182	3.8%	5.5%	4.9%	15.9%	40.1%	29.7%
	<i>ECU</i>	46	2.2%	4.3%	4.3%	26.1%	32.6%	30.4%
	<i>UNC-CSLD</i>	44	4.5%	9.1%	6.8%	9.1%	40.9%	29.5%
	<i>UNCG</i>	40	2.5%	5.0%	7.5%	15.0%	42.5%	27.5%
	<i>UNCC</i>	52	5.8%	3.8%	1.9%	13.5%	44.2%	30.8%
	Comp. Group	362	5.3%	6.4%	5.3%	18.0%	31.2%	34.0%

Career Intentions	NTSP Response Groups	n	Not Considering Leaving	Considered Leaving, Decided to Return	Making Preparations to Leave in the Future	Leaving Teaching After This Year	Remain in Teaching, Leave LEA or School
Think about your intentions regarding teaching. Which response best fits your current intentions?	Overall	182	55.5%	19.2%	9.3%	4.4%	11.5%
	<i>ECU</i>	47	66.0%	23.4%	6.4%	0.0%	4.3%
	<i>UNC-CSLD</i>	44	34.1%	22.7%	13.6%	9.1%	20.5%
	<i>UNCG</i>	40	57.5%	17.5%	12.5%	5.0%	7.5%
	<i>UNCC</i>	51	62.7%	13.7%	5.9%	3.9%	13.7%
	Comp. Group	361	51.5%	21.9%	10.8%	4.2%	11.6%

Note: Table 16 presents results for the NC NTSP teachers whose survey responses included a unique identification number.

Conclusion

As demonstrated in this interim report, in the 2012-13 academic year the NC NTSP provided comprehensive induction supports to a much larger sample of LEAs, schools, and teachers than it did in 2011-12. Furthermore, this report only focused on those teachers included in the evaluation sample, while the NC NTSP also provided beginning teacher supports to additional schools and teachers that did not meet the requirements for evaluation sample inclusion. These data indicate that the NC NTSP is making progress towards its objective to support novice teachers in North Carolina's RttT schools.

In the evaluation of the first NC NTSP component—the Summer Institute—participation data indicate that achieving a high level of attendance is challenging due to late hiring in LEAs and competing LEA orientation/induction programs. To address this concern, the UNC-GA program implementers offered a make-up Winter Institute in December 2012; combined, nearly 57% of the NC NTSP evaluation sample teachers attended either the Summer or Winter institute. For those teachers who attended an Institute and responded to the *PSI-BT* survey, evidence indicates positive perceptions of Institute quality, with stronger perceptions of quality among those who attended the Winter Institute. To promote a higher level of Institute attendance in 2013-14, the UNC-GA program implementers are offering eight regional two-day Institutes prior to the start of the school year and a statewide, three-day Institute in September.

Participation data from instructional coaching—the second component of the NC NTSP—indicate that program coaches provided intensive supports to beginning teachers. On average, NC NTSP instructional coaches met with their novice teachers multiple times per month and often invested more than three hours per month in these coaching sessions. Responses to the *NC NTSP Instructional Coach Survey* indicate that instructional coaches most frequently observed teaching and gave feedback, provided strategies for improved instruction, identified necessary resources, and promoted teachers' self-efficacy. Overall, NC NTSP teachers who responded to the *PSI-BT* survey reported positive perceptions of instructional coach quality, and indicated significantly higher levels of satisfaction with their NC NTSP instructional coach than with their school- or LEA-provided mentor. NC NTSP teachers also indicated significantly higher levels of satisfaction with their NC NTSP instructional coach than the comparison sample teachers expressed about their school- or LEA-provided mentor. Comparing across regions, NC NTSP teachers in the UNCG region provided the highest ratings of their instructional coaches.

Evaluation of the final NC NTSP component—professional development—revealed that attendance was generally low overall, but was variable across regions. The region with the highest level of attendance—UNC-CSLD—also was the region that (1) offered multiple, intra-region professional development sessions, and (2) received the most support from LEAs and schools via requirements that their teachers participate. For those teachers who attended at least one NC NTSP professional development session and responded to the *PSI-BT*, NC NTSP teachers expressed a higher level of satisfaction with program-provided professional development than with their school-provided professional development, and they also expressed a higher degree of satisfaction than the comparison sample expressed about their school-provided professional development. These ratings varied across NC NTSP regions, with teachers in the UNC-CSLD region reporting lower levels of satisfaction with NC NTSP professional development.

Finally, those NC NTSP teachers who responded to the *PSI-BT* survey reported higher levels of self-efficacy and job satisfaction than did comparison sample teachers. This suggests that the NC NTSP may boost teachers' confidence and resiliency in teaching. Within the NC NTSP, teachers in the UNC-CSLD region expressed less satisfaction with their current job and a greater likelihood of leaving their LEA/school or the profession.

Taken together, the results reported in this interim evaluation report—particularly the beginning teachers' responses to the *PSI-BT* survey—indicate that the NC NTSP is providing high-quality beginning teacher induction services. These supports are hypothesized to have positive effects on teacher effectiveness, evaluation ratings, and retention. The final summative evaluation report, targeted for release in fall 2014, will provide data regarding whether the 2012-13 NC NTSP had significant effects on these outcomes of interest.

Appendix A. North Carolina New Teacher Support Program Instructional Coach Survey

- 1) From the drop-down list below, please identify and rank the *three most significant challenges* faced by the **BT1** NC NTSP teachers you coached. If your response is not listed, please select other and write-in the challenge.

Drop-down responses:

- *Content knowledge*
- *Knowledge of the NC Essential Standards/NC Standard Course of Study*
- *Creating and/or communicating a classroom vision/learning goals*
- *Motivating students to learn*
- *Effectively managing student behavior*
- *Implementing classroom procedures and routines that maximize instructional time*
- *Creating a positive and respectful classroom environment*
- *Backwards planning objective-driven lessons and units*
- *Creating assessments (both formative and summative)*
- *Clearly explaining lesson content*
- *Teaching students with differing ability levels*
- *Using a variety of instructional strategies*
- *Providing meaningful academic feedback to students*
- *Asking higher-order questions/promoting critical thinking by students*
- *Using student assessment data to adjust instruction*
- *Relationships with school administrators*
- *Communicating with parents and other stakeholders for students*
- *Lack of time for collaborative planning, grading, and self-reflection*
- *Relationships with other/veteran teachers*
- *Maintaining personal and professional balance*
- *Other*

- 2) From the drop-down list below, please identify and rank the *three most significant challenges* faced by the **BT2/BT3** NC NTSP teachers you coached. If your response is not listed, please select other and write-in the challenge.

Drop-down responses:

- *Content knowledge*
- *Knowledge of the NC Essential Standards/NC Standard Course of Study*
- *Creating and/or communicating a classroom vision/learning goals*
- *Motivating students to learn*
- *Effectively managing student behavior*
- *Implementing classroom procedures and routines that maximize instructional time*
- *Creating a positive and respectful classroom environment*
- *Backwards planning objective-driven lessons and units*
- *Creating assessments (both formative and summative)*
- *Clearly explaining lesson content*
- *Teaching students with differing ability levels*

- *Using a variety of instructional strategies*
- *Providing meaningful academic feedback to students*
- *Asking higher-order questions/promoting critical thinking by students*
- *Using student assessment data to adjust instruction*
- *Relationships with school administrators*
- *Communicating with parents and other stakeholders for students*
- *Lack of time for collaborative planning, grading, and self-reflection*
- *Relationships with other/veteran teachers*
- *Maintaining personal and professional balance*
- *Other*

Directions: Please indicate how often you engaged in the following activities with the NC NTSP teachers you coached.

Response sets

(a) Always (b) Often (c) Sometimes (d) Rarely (e) Never

- 3) Co-teaching
- 4) Modeling lessons
- 5) Observing classroom instruction and providing feedback
- 6) Assisting with student behavior concerns
- 7) Helping plan units or lessons
- 8) Providing strategies to improve instructional quality
- 9) Assisting in small group work
- 10) Helping create classroom assessments
- 11) Helping teachers track student assessment data and adjust instruction
- 12) Finding/providing resources (e.g. websites, instructional materials) for teachers
- 13) Promoting teachers' self-efficacy and personal/professional balance
- 14) Meeting with school administrators
- 15) Leading/participating in PLCs
- 16) Helping teachers better communicate with parents and other student stakeholders
- 17) Helping teachers with administrative tasks and paperwork (e.g. IEPs, HR documents)
- 18) Helping teachers navigate and fit into the school's culture
- 19) Identifying and prioritizing areas for improvement and specify necessary steps for improvement
- 20) On average, how much time did you spend with each of the first -year (BT1) NC NTSP teachers you coached, per month?
(a) 0-60 minutes (b) 60-120 minutes (c) 120-180 minutes (d) 180-240 minutes (e) 240-300 minutes (f) more than 300 minutes

21) On average, how much time did you spend with each of the second or third-year (BT2/BT3) NC NTSP teachers you coached, per month?

(a) 0-60 minutes (b) 60-120 minutes (c) 120-180 minutes (d) 180-240 minutes (e) 240-300 minutes (f) more than 300 minutes

22) From the drop-down list below, please identify and rank the three coaching practices that were most effective in assisting the NC NTSP teachers you coached.

Potential drop-down responses:

- *Co-teaching*
- *Modeling lessons*
- *Observing with the CLASS protocol and providing feedback*
- *Assisting with student behavior concerns*
- *Helping plan units or lessons*
- *Providing strategies to improve instructional quality*
- *Assisting in small group work*
- *Helping create classroom assessments*
- *Helping teachers track student assessment data and adjust instruction*
- *Finding/providing resources for teachers*
- *Promoting teachers' self-efficacy and personal/professional balance*
- *Meeting with school administrators*
- *Leading/participating in PLCs*
- *Helping teachers better communicate with parents and other student stakeholders*
- *Helping teachers with administrative tasks and paperwork*
- *Helping teachers navigate and fit into the school's culture*
- *Helping teachers identify/prioritize areas for improvement and specify necessary steps for improvement*
- *Other*

23) From the drop-down list below, please identify and rank the three areas in which the **BT1** NC NTSP teachers you coached made the largest improvements during the school year.

Drop-down responses:

- *Content knowledge*
- *Knowledge of the NC Essential Standards/NC Standard Course of Study*
- *Creating and/or communicating a classroom vision/learning goals*
- *Motivating students to learn*
- *Effectively managing student behavior*
- *Implementing classroom procedures and routines that maximize instructional time*
- *Creating a positive and respectful classroom environment*
- *Backwards planning objective-driven lessons and units*
- *Creating assessments (both formative and summative)*
- *Clearly explaining lesson content*
- *Teaching students with differing ability levels*
- *Using a variety of instructional strategies*

- *Providing meaningful academic feedback to students*
- *Asking higher-order questions/promoting critical thinking by students*
- *Using student assessment data to adjust instruction*
- *Relationships with school administrators*
- *Communicating with parents and other stakeholders for students*
- *Collaborative planning, grading, and self-reflection*
- *Relationships with other/veteran teachers*
- *Maintaining personal and professional balance*
- *Other*

24) From the drop-down list below, please identify and rank the three areas in which the **BT2/BT3** NC NTSP teachers you coached made the largest improvements during the school year.

Drop-down responses:

- *Content knowledge*
- *Knowledge of the NC Essential Standards/NC Standard Course of Study*
- *Creating and/or communicating a classroom vision/learning goals*
- *Motivating students to learn*
- *Effectively managing student behavior*
- *Implementing classroom procedures and routines that maximize instructional time*
- *Creating a positive and respectful classroom environment*
- *Backwards planning objective-driven lessons and units*
- *Creating assessments (both formative and summative)*
- *Clearly explaining lesson content*
- *Teaching students with differing ability levels*
- *Using a variety of instructional strategies*
- *Providing meaningful academic feedback to students*
- *Asking higher-order questions/promoting critical thinking by students*
- *Using student assessment data to adjust instruction*
- *Relationships with school administrators*
- *Communicating with parents and other stakeholders for students*
- *Collaborative planning, grading, and self-reflection*
- *Relationships with other/veteran teachers*
- *Maintaining personal and professional balance*
- *Other*

Directions: For each question, please select an answer from the response set provided. Answers for some questions concern the frequency with which events occurred; answers for other questions concern your level of agreement with the statement.

25) Principals were supportive of my coaching relationship with teachers?

- (a) All (b) Most (c) Some (d) Few (e) None

- 26) Principals were supportive of the NC NTSP as a whole.
(a) All (b) Most (c) Some (d) Few (e) None
- 27) Principals were focused on improving the performance of novice teachers at their schools.
(a) All (b) Most (c) Some (d) Few (e) None
- 28) Principals and NC NTSP teachers communicated effectively.
(a) All (b) Most (c) Some (d) Few (e) None
- 29) Principals and NC NTSP teachers enjoyed relationships characterized by trust and mutual respect.
(a) All (b) Most (c) Some (d) Few (e) None
- 30) I worked collaboratively with additional mentors provided to NC NTSP teachers (e.g. LEA/school provided mentors and/or DST Turnaround coaches)
(a) All (b) Most (c) Some (d) Few (e) None
- 31) The CLASS protocol effectively captures the components of high-quality teaching.
(a) Strongly agree (b) Agree (c) Neither agree nor disagree (d) Disagree (e) Strongly disagree
- 32) When used in a coach-teacher relationship, the CLASS protocol is an effective tool to improve novice teacher performance.
(a) Strongly agree (b) Agree (c) Neither agree nor disagree (d) Disagree (e) Strongly disagree
- 33) In my coaching activities with NC NTSP teachers I frequently used CLASS to provide feedback.
(a) Strongly agree (b) Agree (c) Neither agree nor disagree (d) Disagree (e) Strongly disagree
- 34) NC NTSP teachers and I communicated well with each other.
(a) All (b) Most (c) Some (d) Few (e) None
- 35) I enjoyed a high level of trust and mutual respect with the NC NTSP teachers I coached.
(a) All (b) Most (c) Some (d) Few (e) None
- 36) The NC NTSP teachers I coached listened to and acted on the feedback I provided them.
(a) All (b) Most (c) Some (d) Few (e) None
- 37) I felt well-prepared by the NC NTSP to coach in a manner consistent with the NC NTSP curriculum.
(a) Strongly agree (b) Agree (c) Neither agree nor disagree (d) Disagree (e) Strongly disagree
- 38) I felt well-prepared by the NC NTSP training to be an effective instructional coach.
(a) Strongly agree (b) Agree (c) Neither agree nor disagree (d) Disagree (e) Strongly disagree
- 39) I felt well-matched to the NC NTSP teachers that I coached.
(a) All (b) Most (c) Some (d) Few (e) None

Directions: Please respond to the short answer questions.

- 40) Please describe how you were matched or assigned to NC NTSP teachers for coaching.
- 41) Please identify the training or resources you need to be more effective as an instructional coach.

Appendix B. Perceptions of Success Inventory—Beginning Teacher Survey

Unless otherwise noted, PSI-BT items have a 6 point scale: strongly disagree, disagree, slightly disagree, slightly agree, agree, and strongly agree.

Domain One: School- or LEA-Provided Mentor Support

Directions: Please respond to the survey questions below concerning the mentor provided by your SCHOOL or SCHOOL DISTRICT.

- 1) In my current experience in my school, a mentoring relationship is or would be important to me.
- 2) Has your school or school district assigned you a mentor?
-If yes, continue answering mentoring questions
-If no, skip to colleague support
- 3) In what month did you first meet with your school or school district assigned mentor?
1) July, 2) August, 3) September . . . 12) June
- 4) How much time do you spend meeting with your school or school district provided mentor **each month**?
1) 0-30 minutes, 2) 30 minutes to 1 hour, 3) 1-2 hours, 4) 2-3 hours, 5) 3-4 hours, 6) 4-5 hours, or 7) more than 5 hours
- 5) If you have a subject or grade-level specialty, does your school or school district assigned mentor teach the same subject or grade-level?
1) Yes, 2) No, or 3) Not applicable
- 6) My school or school district assigned mentor has provided assistance with classroom management.
- 7) My school or school district assigned mentor has provided assistance with instructional concerns.
- 8) My school or school district assigned mentor has provided assistance related to communication with parents or caregivers of my students.
- 9) My school or school district assigned mentor has provided assistance with unit or lesson planning.
- 10) My school or school district assigned mentor has provided assistance with analysis of student assessment data.
- 11) My school or school district assigned mentor is empathetic.
- 12) My school or school district assigned mentor encourages me to reflect about my teaching.
- 13) Of the success you have had as a beginning teacher, what amount would you attribute to help from your school or school district assigned mentor?
1) a great deal, 2) quite a bit, 3) some, 4) hardly any, or 5) none

- 14) Overall, my school or school district assigned mentor has been helpful in developing my confidence, knowledge, and skills in teaching.

Domain Two: Colleague Support

Directions: Please respond to the survey questions below concerning the support you receive from colleagues in your school.

- 15) I have opportunities for meaningful conversations with other novice teachers in a setting free of evaluation.
- 16) I have common planning times with other teachers at my same grade level or subject area.
- 17) I have opportunities to visit and observe exemplary teachers.
- 18) I have a colleague in my same subject area or grade level who will answer my questions.

Domain Three: Administration Support

Directions: Please respond to the survey questions below concerning the support you receive from administrators in your school.

- 19) The administration at my school provides appropriate feedback for my discipline decisions.
- 20) The administration at my school encourages me to be an effective teacher.
- 21) The administration has oriented me to the school and staff.
- 22) I have on-going face-to-face communication with my administration.
- 23) The administration provides me with effective instructional leadership.

Domain Four: Classroom Management

Directions: Please respond to the survey questions below concerning your classroom management behaviors and success.

- 24) I have developed clear routines and procedures for my classroom that are aligned with school policy.
- 25) I have implemented consistent routines and procedures in my classroom.
- 26) My routines and procedures positively impact the behavior of my students.
- 27) The discipline in my classroom is supportive of a good learning environment for my students.
- 28) I feel in control when I am teaching.
- 29) My students' behaviors are consistent with my classroom expectations.
- 30) I am able to use communication to diffuse disruptive student behavior.

Domain Five: Encouraging Student Success

Directions: Please respond to the survey questions below concerning your instructional practices.

- 31) I am able to successfully teach students with a variety of ability levels.
- 32) I am able to motivate all students.
- 33) I am able to use a variety of teaching strategies to provide my students with instruction that is effective for them.
- 34) I am able to effectively teach my students from diverse backgrounds.
- 35) I am able to frame my instructional decisions based on my students' learning.

Domain Six: Curricular and Instructional Resources

Directions: Please respond to the survey questions below concerning the curricular and instructional resources provided by your SCHOOL or SCHOOL DISTRICT.

- 36) I have adequate instructional supplies, such as copy paper, a functioning copier, and pens/pencils that I need for teaching.
- 37) I have been provided with curriculum that aligns with the state's objectives for my grade level or subject area.
- 38) I have the curriculum materials I need to teach effectively.
- 39) I have been provided with the instructional technology I need to teach effectively.
- 40) My students have the curricular resources they need to learn effectively.
- 41) How many school or school district provided professional development sessions did you attend?
1) Zero, 2) 1-2, 3) 3-5, 4) 6-10, or 5) more than 10
- 42) The professional development provided by my school or school district improved my classroom management skills.
- 43) The professional development provided by my school or school district improved my ability to create rigorous, standards-aligned unit and lesson plans.
- 44) The professional development provided by my school or school district improved my ability to create rigorous, standards-driven assessments.
- 45) The professional development provided by my school or school district improved my ability to analyze student assessment data and adjust instruction.
- 46) The professional development provided by my school or school district improved my ability to reflect on my teaching practice.
- 47) The professional development provided by my school or school district provided me with instructional strategies that improved my students' learning.
- 48) Overall, the professional development provided by my school or school district was helpful in developing my confidence, knowledge, and skills in teaching.

Domain Seven: Assignment and Workload

Directions: Please respond to the survey questions below concerning your current teaching assignments and workload.

- 49) I think the number of preparations I have for my classes is appropriate for a novice teacher.
- 50) I have at least one period per day that I can devote without interruption to planning for my classes.
- 51) My overall teaching workload is reasonable.
- 52) Novice teachers are allowed to choose whether to take on extra duties or not.
- 53) If this is your first year teaching, did you have a reduced teaching schedule or number of preparations?
1) Yes, 2) No, or 3) Not my first year teaching

Domain Eight: Assessment and Evaluation

Directions: Please respond to the survey questions below concerning how you assess and evaluate student learning.

- 54) I informally assess each student on a daily basis.
- 55) I formally assess each student on a weekly basis.
- 56) I use North Carolina's academic standards to create classroom assessments.
- 57) I am able to write quality unit/chapter tests for my students.
- 58) I am able to effectively create classroom assessments other than classroom tests.
- 59) I use a variety of measures to assess my students.
- 60) I use formative assessment in my classroom.
- 61) I use summative assessment in my classroom.
- 62) I have time to interpret my students' assessment data.

Domain Nine: Parental Contacts

Directions: Please respond to the survey questions below concerning your contact with parents and/or caregivers.

- 63) The parents or caregivers of my students are supportive of their child's progress in school.
- 64) I am able to effectively communicate with my students' parents or caregivers.
- 65) I have adequate guidance and support in working with parents or caregivers.

Domain Ten: Satisfaction and Commitment

Directions: Please respond to the survey questions below concerning your job satisfaction and commitment to teaching.

- 66) In general, I am satisfied with my current job.
- 67) I consider teaching to be my ideal career.
- 68) I feel inspired to instruct students to the best of my ability.
- 69) If someone could change any of the following items, which ones would be the most important to improve your satisfaction with your job? Choose the THREE most important items only.
- 70) I am most interested in participating in and/or learning more about?
- 71) Think about your intentions regarding teaching. Which response best fits your current intentions?

Domain Eleven: Demographics

Please respond to the survey questions below concerning basic demographic information.

- 72) What level of teaching experience do you currently possess?
1) I am a first year teacher, 2) I am a second year teacher, 3) I am a third year teacher, or 4) I have taught for more than 3 years
- 73) What is the grade-level or subject-area you primarily teach?
1) PK, 2) K, 3) 1st grade, 4) 2nd grade, 5) 3rd grade, 6) 4th grade, 7) 5th grade, 8) Middle school math, 9) Middle school reading, 10) Middle school science, 11) Middle school social studies, 12) High school math, 13) High school English, 14) High school science, 15) High school social studies, 16) Exceptional children, 17) PE/Health, 18) Art/music, or 19) Other
- 74) In what month of the 2012-13 school year did you begin teaching?
1) July, 2) August, 3) September . . . 12) June
- 75) I received my preparation to teach through:
1) Traditional four-year university program 2) Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) 3) Licensure or certificate program 4) Lateral or alternative entry program 5) Other
- 76) I received my teacher training at:
1) North Carolina public university 2) North Carolina private university 3) Out-of-state university 4) On-line university/program 5) Teach For America 6) Other

Appendix C. NC NTSP Institute Surveys

NC NTSP Summer Institute Questions

Directions: Please respond to the survey questions below concerning the North Carolina New Teacher Support Program Summer Institute.

- 1) Did you attend the North Carolina New Teacher Support Program Summer Institute held in Chapel Hill, North Carolina, from July 30-August 3, 2012?
-If yes, proceed to NC NTSP Summer Institute questions
-If no, skip ahead to NC NTSP instructional coaching questions
- 2) After the North Carolina New Teacher Support Program Summer Institute I was better prepared to set ambitious academic goals for my students.
- 3) After the North Carolina New Teacher Support Program Summer Institute I better understood the Common Core Standards and North Carolina Essential Standards.
- 4) After the North Carolina New Teacher Support Program Summer Institute I was better prepared to backwards plan units and lessons to reach academic goals.
- 5) After the North Carolina New Teacher Support Program Summer Institute I was better prepared to create rigorous, objective-driven classroom assessments.
- 6) After the North Carolina New Teacher Support Program Summer Institute I was better prepared to create a classroom management plan.
- 7) After the North Carolina New Teacher Support Program Summer Institute I was better prepared to analyze student achievement data and adjust classroom instruction accordingly.
- 8) After the North Carolina New Teacher Support Program Summer Institute I was better prepared to effectively communicate with students' parents or caregivers.
- 9) After the North Carolina New Teacher Support Program Summer Institute I was better prepared for the first few weeks of school.
- 10) Overall, the North Carolina New Teacher Support Program Summer Institute was helpful in developing my confidence, knowledge, and skills in teaching.

NC NTSP Winter Institute Questions

Directions: Please respond to the survey questions below concerning the North Carolina New Teacher Support Program Winter Institute.

- 1) Did you attend the North Carolina New Teacher Support Program Winter Institute held in Chapel Hill, North Carolina, from December 1-3, 2012?
-If yes, proceed to NC NTSP Winter Institute questions
-If no, skip ahead to NC NTSP instructional coaching questions
- 2) After the North Carolina New Teacher Support Program Winter Institute I was better prepared to set ambitious academic goals for my students.
- 3) After the North Carolina New Teacher Support Program Winter Institute I better understood the Common Core Standards and North Carolina Essential Standards.
- 4) After the North Carolina New Teacher Support Program Winter Institute I was better prepared to backwards plan units and lessons to reach academic goals.
- 5) After the North Carolina New Teacher Support Program Winter Institute I was better prepared to create rigorous, objective-driven classroom assessments.
- 6) After the North Carolina New Teacher Support Program Winter Institute I was better prepared to create a respectful classroom environment that encourages student achievement.
- 7) After the North Carolina New Teacher Support Program Winter Institute I was better prepared to analyze student achievement data and adjust classroom instruction accordingly.
- 8) After the North Carolina New Teacher Support Program Winter Institute I was better prepared for the remainder of the school year.
- 9) Overall, the North Carolina New Teacher Support Program Winter Institute was helpful in developing my confidence, knowledge, and skills in teaching.

NC NTSP Instructional Coaching Questions

Directions: Please respond to the survey questions below concerning the instructional coach provided to you by the North Carolina New Teacher Support Program.

- 1) Has the North Carolina New Teacher Support Program assigned you an instructional coach?
-If yes, continue answering instructional coaching questions
-If no, skip to NC NTSP professional development questions
- 2) In what month did you first meet with the instructional coach provided by the North Carolina New Teacher Support Program?
1) July, 2) August, 3) September . . . 12) June
- 3) How much time do you spend meeting with the instructional coach provided by the North Carolina New Teacher Support Program **each month**?
1) 0-30 minutes, 2) 30 minutes to 1 hour, 3) 1-2 hours, 4) 2-3 hours, 5) 3-4 hours, 6) 4-5 hours, or 7) more than 5 hours
- 4) My instructional coach assigned by the North Carolina New Teacher Support Program has provided assistance with classroom management.
- 5) My instructional coach assigned by the North Carolina New Teacher Support Program has provided assistance with instructional concerns.
- 6) My instructional coach assigned by the North Carolina New Teacher Support Program has provided assistance related to communication with parents or caregivers of my students.
- 7) My instructional coach assigned by the North Carolina New Teacher Support Program has provided assistance with unit or lesson planning.
- 8) My instructional coach assigned by the North Carolina New Teacher Support Program has provided assistance with analysis of student assessment data.
- 9) My instructional coach assigned by the North Carolina New Teacher Support Program is empathetic.
- 10) My instructional coach assigned by the North Carolina New Teacher Support Program encourages me to reflect about my teaching.
- 11) Of the success you have had as a beginning teacher, what amount would you attribute to help from your instructional coach assigned by the North Carolina New Teacher Support Program?
1) a great deal, 2) quite a bit, 3) some, 4) hardly any, or 5) none
- 12) Overall, my instructional coach provided by the North Carolina New Teacher Support Program has been helpful in developing my confidence, knowledge, and skills in teaching.

NC NTSP Professional Development Questions

Directions: Please respond to the survey questions below concerning the professional development provided to you by the North Carolina New Teacher Support Program. Please note, these questions do NOT refer to the Winter Institute.

- 1) Did you attend any North Carolina New Teacher Support Program professional development sessions?
-If yes, proceed to NC NTSP professional development questions
-If no, skip to PSI-BT questions
- 2) The professional development provided by the North Carolina New Teacher Support Program improved my classroom management skills.
- 3) The professional development provided by the North Carolina New Teacher Support Program improved my ability to create rigorous, standards-aligned unit and lesson plans.
- 4) The professional development provided by the North Carolina New Teacher Support Program improved my ability to create rigorous, standards-driven assessments.
- 5) The professional development provided by the North Carolina New Teacher Support Program improved my ability to analyze student assessment data and adjust instruction.
- 6) The professional development provided by the North Carolina New Teacher Support Program improved my ability to reflect on my teaching practice.
- 7) The professional development provided by the North Carolina New Teacher Support Program provided me with instructional strategies that improved my students' learning.
- 8) Overall, the professional development provided by the North Carolina New Teacher Support Program was helpful in developing my confidence, knowledge, and skills in teaching.

Contact Information:
Julie T. Marks
jtmarks@email.unc.edu

© 2014 Consortium for Educational Research and Evaluation–North Carolina



● Carolina Institute
for Public Policy



THE UNIVERSITY
of NORTH CAROLINA
at CHAPEL HILL

