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**Overview**

After a pilot and development process[[1]](#footnote-1), ESE administered four educator preparation stakeholder surveys in the spring of 2016 to evaluate the perceptions of teacher readiness in the Commonwealth.[[2]](#footnote-2) Considering and comparing the perceptions of key stakeholders is critical to a Sponsoring Organization’s (SO) continuous improvement. This document outlines some of the major trends identified by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE) from surveys of the following stakeholder groups:

| Candidate | Surveyed at the point of preparation program completion |
| --- | --- |
| Completer | Individuals employed in a MA public school who are surveyed one year after program completion |
| Supervising Practitioner | Individuals who served as a supervisor to a candidate during the practicum experience |
| Hiring Principal | Individuals who hired a teacher completer before the start of the 2015-2016 school year |

This summary has two main purposes:

1. To identify trends in survey results at the state level. Individual SOs can use this data as a comparison point when they analyze their own survey data.
2. To give the general public access to important information about perceptions of teacher readiness across Massachusetts.

It is important to note that these surveys represent perceptions of readiness as reported by a subset of key stakeholders in the state who elected to take the survey and should not be considered representative of all stakeholders engaged in educator preparation. For more information on the different key stakeholder groups who took the survey, see Appendix A.

The data points that are included below were selected to provide a high level overview of perceptions of key stakeholders of educator preparation in Massachusetts.[[3]](#footnote-3) This data does not cover all aspects of educator preparation. Rather they provide results of the key findings of the survey in the following areas: 1) Overall readiness, 2) Coursework, 3) Field-based Experience, 4) Supervision 5) Candidate experience, and 6) Preparation for Standards for Effective Teaching Practice.

**State Level Findings**

**Overall Readiness**

* Overall, candidates and completers agree they were prepared to be an effective educator. Supervising Practitioners also had a high rate of agreement.

| *Percentage of stakeholders who selected “strongly agree” or “agree”* | Candidate (n=408) | Completer (n=202) | Supervising Practitioner (n=649) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Preparedness to be an effective educator** | 90% | 88% | 88% |

* Principals, who hired candidates after they completed their program, were less favorable about new teachers’ readiness to meet the needs of the students in the school. On a five point scale from fully ready to not ready, only 27% of principals said candidates were fully ready and immediately impactful with students. The majority of principals (41%) said candidates are mostly ready.[[4]](#footnote-4)

| *Percentage of stakeholders who selected “fully ready”* | Hiring Principals (n=620) |
| --- | --- |
| **Readiness to meet the needs of students in your school** | 27% |

**Coursework**

* Candidates and completers agree coursework prepared them to make a positive impact on PK-12 students’ learning.

| *Percentage of stakeholders who selected “strongly agree” or “agree”* | Candidate (n=408) | Completer (n=202) | Supervising Practitioner (n=649) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **The coursework provided the teacher with the pedagogical content knowledge necessary to be an effective educator** | 89% | 87% | n/a |
| **The coursework provided the teacher with the content knowledge necessary to be an effective educator** | 88% | 85% | n/a |
| **Field-based experiences were explicitly connected to coursework** | 84% | 82% | 87% |
| **Faculty/instructors were effective at preparing educators** | 91% | 90% | n/a |
| **Coursework prepared the teacher to make a positive impact on PK-12 student learning** | 93% | 91% | n/a |

**Field-Based Experiences**

* Candidates and completers agree their field-based experiences prepared them to be an effective educator.
* Supervising Practitioners also agree that the field-based experiences well prepared future educators.
* Candidates, completers and Supervising Practitioners reported differing levels of agreement about the pre-practicum experience. Completers agree most that the pre-practicum experience preparing them for their full student-teaching experience in the practicum. Supervising Practitioners and candidates had lower rates of agreement.
* Completers, who did not experience the Candidate Assessment for Performance (CAP), were less favorable about their assessment in field-based experience than candidates, who experienced both CAP and the Pre-Service Performance Assessment (PPA).

| *Percentage of stakeholders who selected “strongly agree” or “agree”* | Candidates (n=408) | Completers (n=202) | Supervising Practitioners (n=649) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Pre-practicum experience prepared teacher for full student-teaching experience in the practicum** | 75% | 85% | 81% |
| **During field-based experiences, the teacher worked with students from diverse ethnic, racial, socioeconomic and exceptional groups** | 90% | 91% | 90% |
| **Teaching practice improved as a result of undergoing an assessment in field-based experience[[5]](#footnote-5)** | 77% | 69% | n/a |
| **Field-based experience prepared teacher to be an effective educator** | 96% | 94% | 93% |

**Supervision**

* Candidates and completers agree that their Supervising Practitioner was an effective educator and provided feedback that improved practice, but agree less that Supervising Practitioners were knowledgeable about how to be a supervisor.
* Supervising Practitioners, on the other hand, agree at a higher rate than candidates and completers that they provided feedback that improved practice and were knowledgeable about how to be a supervisor.
* Supervising Practitioners, who implemented CAP, agree at a low rate that they received training on CAP that contributed to a consistent and rigorous assessment of the candidate.

| *Percentage of stakeholders who selected “strongly agree” or “agree”* | Candidates (n=408) | Completers (n=202) | Supervising Practitioners (n=649) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **The Supervising Practitioner was an effective educator** | 90% | 94% | n/a |
| **Supervising Practitioner provided feedback that improved practice** | 88% | 88% | 98% |
| **Program Supervisor provided feedback that improved practice** | 87% | 87% | n/a |
| **Supervising Practitioner was knowledgeable about how to be a supervisor** | 86% | 88% | 93% |
| **I received training on CAP that contributed to a consistent and rigorous assessment of the candidate** | n/a | n/a | 47%[[6]](#footnote-6) |

**Candidate Experience**

* More candidates than completers agree that there were checkpoints throughout the program to make sure they were meeting standards than about their admission process and advising.
* Completers were more favorable about their advising than candidates.

| *Percentage of stakeholders who selected “strongly agree” or “agree”* | Candidates (n=408) | Completers (n=202) |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **The admission processes rigorously screened candidates for skills and qualities that are important in the licensure role** | 75% | 74% |
| **I was effectively advised throughout my program** | 73% | 80% |
| **There were checkpoints throughout the program to make sure candidates were meeting standards** | 80% | 82% |

**Preparation on Professional Standards for Teachers (PSTs)**

* Candidates were highly confident in their ability to implement the standards, except for Standard 3, which received a lower rate of agreement than Standards 1,2, and 4.
* Completers were not as favorable as candidates, however, they felt more prepared in Standard 3. Completers were most confident in their abilities in Standard 4.
* Overall, Supervising Practitioners were also more critical than candidates.

| *Percentage of stakeholders who selected “Exemplary” or “Proficient”* | Candidates (n=408) | Completers (n=202) | Supervising Practitioners (n=649) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Overall, how well prepared was the teacher to meet performance expectations outlined in…*** |  | | |
| **Standard 1: Curriculum, Planning, and Assessment** | 95% | 90% | 90% |
| **Standard 2: Teaching All Students** | 95% | 86% | 88% |
| **Standard 3: Family and Community Engagement** | 79% | 86% | 78% |
| **Standard 4: Professional Culture** | 96% | 93% | 93% |

**Conclusion**

These survey results offer valuable information for the continuous improvement of teacher preparation programs in Massachusetts as it highlights areas of current strengths and areas for improvement. Sponsoring Organizations are offered several comparison points with these surveys. They can compare the perceptions of key stakeholders across several points in time to identify trends within or across stakeholder groups. ESE will administer these surveys every year and will continue to monitor the validity and reliability of the instruments.

For more information, please see our survey page at <http://www.doe.mass.edu/edprep/surveys/>

All questions should be directed to edprep@doe.mass.edu

**Appendix A: Response Rates and Stakeholder Group Definitions**

The response rates in the first full implementation of the stakeholder surveys exceeded that of any of the previous pilots conducted. ESE will continue to work to ensure the highest possible survey response rates.

| **Stakeholder Group** | **Stakeholder Group Defined** | **Possible survey takers** | **Completed Survey** | **Partial Complete** | **Response Rate[[7]](#footnote-7)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Candidate | Surveyed at the point of preparation program completion | 2,311 | 587 | 228 | 25% |
| Completer | Individuals employed in a MA public school who are surveyed one year after program completion | 2,064 | 388 | 200 | 19% |
| Supervising Practitioner | Individuals who served as a supervisor to a candidate during the practicum experience | 2,555 | 649 | 163 | 25% |
| Hiring Principal | Individuals who hired a teacher completer before the start of the 2015-2016 school year | 2,038 | 1,077 | 24 | 53% |
| **Total:** |  | **8,968** | **2,701** | **615** | **30%** |

For this survey administration year (2015-16), survey takers were:

* **Teacher Preparation Candidates**: Recent program completers who completed a program in 2015-16 and were not employed as teacher of record[[8]](#footnote-8) before or during their initial teacher preparation program.
* **Teacher Preparation Completers**: Teachers who completed a program in 2014-2015 and were employed in an MA public school in 2015-2016 and were not employed as teacher of record before or during their initial teacher preparation program.
* **Hiring Principals**: Hired a program completer who was not already teacher or record before or during their initial teacher preparation program in 2015-2016
* **Supervising Practitioners** Supervised the candidates during the 2015-2016 year while they were in their practicum.

ESE has developed this suite of surveys in order to triangulate perceptions across different perspectives at varying points in time.

**Appendix B: Survey Scales**

Blank copies of the surveys are available [here](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edprep/surveys/).

**Sections: Coursework, Field-Based Experience, Candidate Experience, Supervision and Overall Readiness**

2015-2016 Program Evaluation Criteria Items:

* Strongly agree
* Agree
* Neither agree nor disagree
* Disagree
* Strongly disagree

**Section: Preparation on Professional Standards for Teachers**

Professional Standards for Teachers Items:

* Exemplary
* Proficient
* Needs Improvement
* Unsatisfactory

**Section: Overall Readiness**

Principal Survey Items:

* Fully ready
* Mostly ready
* Moderately ready
* Minimally ready
* Not ready

1. To learn more about ESE’s survey development process, please see the Educator Preparation Stakeholder Surveys Development & Validation memo: http://www.doe.mass.edu/edprep/surveys/SurveyDevelopment.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. ESE prioritized the development and administration of surveys associated with initial teacher licensure as this is the largest group of program completers in Massachusetts every year. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Full survey instruments with all items can be found here: http://www.doe.mass.edu/edprep/surveys/ [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. See Appendix B for full survey scales. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. This includes both candidates that experienced Pre-service Performance Assessment (PPA) and Candidate Assessment for Performance (CAP) during the 2015-16 pilot period [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. This only includes 135 Supervising Practitioner that self-identified as supervisors that implemented CAP [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. The response rate is calculated using the number of respondents who completed the survey divided by the total number of possible survey takers. Survey takers who only partially completed the survey are not included in the response rate calculation. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. A Teacher of Record is a teacher who is assigned primary responsibility for a student’s learning in a subject, grade or course. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)