<div align="center">**End of Program Survey**</div>

CAEP Standard/Component: 1.1, 1.5, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 5.5, & technology cross-cutting theme

InTASC Standards: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10

ETSU Clemmer College Framework: 1-8

Administration and Purpose

The End of Program survey is an EPP-created survey which measures candidates' perceptions of their knowledge, skills, dispositions, related to their preparation within their program of study and clinical experiences, as well as other measures related and EPP effectiveness of teacher education operations. The survey's components and statements are tagged and aligned to CAEP, InTASC, and reflect the EPP's conceptual framework and beliefs. The survey content also parallels the completer, mentor teacher, and principal survey.

a. **Points of Administration-** The End of Program survey is administered once at the end of the candidate's residency II field experience (i.e., student teaching) on-line via email distribution from the Office of Educator Preparation. All candidates who are completing their initial teacher preparation program are solicited to respond to the survey.

b. **Purpose of Assessment & Use in Candidate Monitoring or Decisions on Progression-** The data are shared with teacher education faculty and other stakeholders at data meetings, LEA meetings, and retreats. The data results from the survey are used to assess the quality of the teacher education programs and the way programs have prepared candidates for their roles as beginning teachers. The survey is not designed to be an evaluation of the graduates' present level of teaching performance, only a measure of their perception of teacher education preparation. The EPP uses the results to improve the quality of the teacher education programs and the operational effectiveness of the EPP.

c. **Instructions Provided to Respondents to Surveys-** The End of Program survey was developed in 2017 and piloted in the spring of 2018 and has been used to collect data every fall and spring semesters with all initial teacher preparation candidates upon completion of their clinical practice/residency II experience. Candidates are provided with a link to the End of Program survey that is distributed via the ETSU Clemmer College Office of Educator Preparation upon the completion of their residency II field placement, and just prior to graduation. Candidates are asked to be honest, as their responses are a valuable part of the quality assurance process. Directions given to teacher candidates at the end of their EPP program:

Dear ETSU Teacher Education Graduate,

Congratulations!!! You have completed your teacher preparation at ETSU and are ready to inspire and lead future students. Our major objective at ETSU Clemmer College is to make sure our students have the best experience possible related to teacher preparation.

We are requesting that you take the time to complete our brief survey of your perception of the quality of your teacher preparation while at ETSU. The survey will provide you with statements related to instructional practice and professional dispositions and ask you to respond based on the impact it has had on your confidence as a future teacher. For each of the teaching behaviors provided, you will be asked your level of agreement to associated prompt.

Quality teacher preparation at the Clemmer College is only as good as the feedback we receive from our students. We hold your input to the highest regard, and we will use your feedback to guide change across our program. After collecting all surveys, the Clemmer College administration will evaluate data by program licensure areas and will address survey components where have averages fall below a 2.8 on a 4-point scale.

If you have any questions about the survey, please contact Dr. Cindy Chambers at <u>chamberc@etsu.edu</u> *or 423-439-7586.*

Thank you kindly for your time and support,
Clemmer College Administrative Team

d. **Criteria for Success-** A Likert was selected based on seeking to understand about the opinions/perceptions of participants related with single 'latent' variable (i.e, teaching behaviors). "Here during analysis, the scores of the all items of the questionnaire are combined (sum) to generate a composite score." (Joshi, et al., 2015)

The CAEP leadership developed a scoring criterion in conjunction with based on two focus groups and field pretests with LEA partners, both of which took place in the spring of 2018 (Groves et al., 2011). Field pretests are a validity procedure that are small scale rehearsals, that are used to "evaluate the survey instrument as well as the data collection and respondent selection procedures" (Groves et al., 2011, p. 265). The field pre-tests were completed by selected LEA partners prior to their participation in the on-campus focus group. The first piloted version of the survey had participants respond to teacher education behaviors (i.e., indicators) on a 5-point Likert scale based on their level of agreement in their teacher preparation at ETSU: (5- strongly agree, 4- agree, 3- neutral, 2- disagree, 1- strongly disagree).

Criteria for Analyzing ETSU End of Program Survey Data (On a 5-point scale):

1.	Program Target Score = 3.5-4.25 (70-85% of average total possible points)

2.	Program Strength = Above 4.25 (> 85% of average total possible points)

3.	Program Area of Need = Under 3.5 (< 70% of total possible points)

In the fall of 2018, CAEP committee and LEA partners reviewed survey literature, feedback from EPP and LEA partners, and best practices in assessment of teacher education candidates across the state of Tennessee, and determined that the coding of the non-numeric responses in our survey should be evaluated on a four-point Likert scale, thus removing the *neutral* fifth response option. (Groves et al., 2011). In addition, the CAEP committee decided to parallel the Tennessee Educator Survey, which is administered state-wide by the Tennessee Department of Education and the Tennessee Research Alliance (TERA) and also supports a 4-point Likert scale with levels of agreement related to a latent variable (Tennessee Department of Education, 2020). The Tennessee Educator Survey "provides all teachers, administrators, and certified staff the opportunity to tell us what is working and what improvements need to be made about education in Tennessee. Survey feedback provides critical, actionable data that influences strategies and goals at the state, district, and school levels" (Tennessee Department of Education, 2020). As a result of best practices in survey development in social sciences (Groves, et al., 2011) and the Tennessee Deppartment of Education (2020), the criteria for success was based on the 4-point Likert scale pertaining to level of agreement (4- strongly agree, 3- agree, 2- disagree, 1- strongly disagree).

Data from the designed End of Program Likert-scale were categorized as ordinal, bipolar, data (DeVellis, 2016).   Based on survey development literature (Croasmun & Ostrom, 2011; DeVellis, 2016; Groves et al., 2011), current state-level data on teacher satisfaction (Tennessee Department of Education, 2019; 2020), and CAEP committee's expectations of scores based on a normal curve, the following criteria for success was defined:

Criteria for Analyzing ETSU End of Program Survey Data (On a 4-point scale):

1.	Program Target Score = 2.8-3.4 (70-85% of average total possible points)

2.	Program Strength = Above 3.4 (> 85% of average total possible points)

3.	Program Area of Need = Under 2.8 (< 70% of total possible points)

Croasmun, J. T., & Ostrom, L. (2011). Using Likert-Type Scales in the Social Sciences. *Journal of Adult Education*, *40*(1), 19-22.

DeVellis, R. F. (2016). *Scale development: Theory and applications* (Vol. 26). Sage publications.

Groves, R. M., Fowler Jr, F. J., Couper, M. P., Lepkowski, J. M., Singer, E., & Tourangeau, R.

    (2011). *Survey methodology* (Vol. 561). John Wiley & Sons.

Joshi, et al. (2015). Likert scale: Explored and explained. *Current Journal of Applied Science and*

    Technology, 396-403.

Tennessee Department of Education. (2019*). Teacher Education Acceleration Model- TEAM*.

    https://team-tn.org/teacher-evaluation/

Tennessee Department of Education. (2020). *Tennessee Educator Survey.*

    http://educatorsurvey.tnk12.gov/

e. **Evaluation Categories Aligned to CAEP, InTASC, National/Professional & State Standards-** The survey's components and statements (i.e., latent variables) are tagged and aligned specifically to CAEP, InTASC, and reflect the EPP's conceptual framework and beliefs. The survey content was co-developed with LEA partners based on the language from the 10 InTASC standards. The survey content and assessment items also parallel the (a) completer, (b) mentor teacher, and (c) principal survey.

Content of Assessment

a. **Indicators Assess Explicitly Identified Aspects of CAEP, InTASC, National/Professional & State Standards-** Statements and components of the End of Program survey are explicitly identified and aligned to the language in the 10 InTASC standard progression levels. In addition to the direct InTASC standard alignment this, EPP created instrument aligns with the following CAEP standards 1.1, 1.5, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 5.5, & technology cross-cutting theme, and all of the attributes of the Clemmer College Conceptual Framework. As of July 2018, CAEP and the Tennessee Department of Education entered a formal agreement where Tennessee EPP programs will have to align to the CAEP standards at the state level. "The CAEP Board of Directors (CAEP Board or Board) and the SBE have adopted standards (CAEP Standards or Standards) that serve as the basis for all EPP accreditation and state approval reviews undertaken by CAEP. The CAEP Standards reflect the voice of the education field on what makes a quality educator" (CAEP, 2018). As a result, the alignment to the CAEP and InTASC standards represents fulfillment of the EPP requirements at the state level.

    Though the CAEP Accreditation Handbook (2018- version 3 Page 97) notes that surveys do not need to meet attributes related to reliability and validity; data quality is an essential component of the survey process. The EPP met construct validity through:

- Two initial retreats were held with EPP faculty and selected LEA partners to inductively reflect on behaviors and pedagogy essential for teacher preparation. As well as how well the inductive

approaches aligned with the InTASC standards (Tuesday 5/9/2017 & Monday 5/22/17; ETSU Valleybook Campus, Gray, TN)

- Acquiring feedback from EPP faculty related to item alignment to the InTASC standards via department meetings (fall 2017).
- Two content validity meetings to discuss InTASC alignment, as well as item wording, structure, and scoring:
  - Content validity meeting #1: CAEP committee and other invited faculty (Friday 9/15/17; ETSU Main Campus)
  - Content validity meeting #2: LEA partners (Principals, teachers, EPP faculty) related to review each items alignment to INTASC standards. This meeting took place on April 18, 2018.

The CAEP and Office of Educator Preparation met and made revisions that added the section related to evaluation of mentor teacher. Meeting took place April 9th, 2020, new addition of mentor teacher evaluation went was added and assessed in May 2020.

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation- CAEP (2018). *Tennessee Department of Education and the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation Partnership Agreement*.
   http://caepnet.org/working-together/~/media/Files/caep/state-partners/tn-partnership-agreement-unsigned.pdf?la=en

b. **Indicators reflect the degree of difficulty or level of effort described in the standards-** The survey will provide statements to the teacher candidates at the end of their EPP program related to instructional practice and professional dispositions and ask them to respond based on the impact it has had on their present-day instructional practices. For each of the teaching behaviors provided, graduating teacher candidates will be asked their level of agreement to associated prompt. In addition, a 4-point agree/disagree scale was used for teacher candidates at the end of their EPP program to evaluate each of the presented indicators. Agree/disagree scales are often used in research due to the uniform response format, and the survey response options only needed to be presented on the scale once, thus reducing time and streamlining the survey administration process (Saris, et al., 2010).

Saris, W., Revilla, M. A., Krosnick, J. A., & Shaeffer, E. M. (2010). Comparing questions with agree/disagree response options to questions with construct-specific response options. *Survey Research Methods. 2010; 4 (1): 61-79.*

c. **Indicators unambiguously describe the proficiencies to be evaluated-** Survey development research also states that agree/disagree scales must have participants respond to each individual item based on item specificity, or one specific teaching behavior for each item, and avoids question prompts that address global behaviors (DeVellis, 2016; Saris, et al., 2010).

The End of Program survey is broken down in four major sections:

1. Demographic information and program of study (n = 3)
2. Evaluation of residency mentor teacher (n = 15)
3. Perception and evaluation of overall preparation as a teacher based on InTASC Standards (n = 48) of the following indicators (see example below):
   a. I am confident in my ability to perform the teacher behavior described.
   b. My program of study prepared me to perform the teacher behavior described.
   c. My mentor teacher demonstrated the teacher behavior described.
4. Evaluation of ETSU Clemmer College Support Staff & Office of Educator Preparation (n = 10)

Sample End of Program survey question in response to indicators aligned to InTASC Standards (section 3):

Please choose your level of agreement with the following statement in each context. Use the arrow to access the scale.

Takes responsibility for contributing to and advancing the profession.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
I am confident in my ability to perform the teacher behavior described.	O	O	O	O
My program of study prepared me to perform the teacher behavior described.	O	O	O	O
My mentor teacher demonstrated the teacher behavior described.	O	O	O	O

Prompts/indicators (i.e., latent variables) describe the proficiencies to be evaluated, have a single subject and are stated in terms of behaviors or practices directly derived from the InTASC standards. In addition, each of the indicators were specifically designed so that scoring is anchored in the teaching behaviors related to teaching professional best practices. The CAEP committee, with feedback from LEA

partners, reviewed and edited survey items to remove double-barreled and ambiguous wording (DeVellis, 2016).

DeVellis, R. F. (2016). *Scale development: Theory and applications* (Vol. 26). Sage publications.

Saris, W., Revilla, M. A., Krosnick, J. A., & Shaeffer, E. M. (2010). Comparing questions with agree/disagree response options to questions with construct-specific response options. *Survey Research Methods. 2010; 4 (1): 61-79.*

d. **Indicators require higher levels of intellectual behaviors-** Each survey item (indicator) on the End of Program survey was written to address teaching performance behaviors of the InTASC standards.   Each of the InTASC standards were developed to maintain the specific delineation between knowledge, dispositions, and performances related to teaching behaviors (CCSSO, 2013). For example, InTASC standard #2, which addresses understanding diverse learner needs, has indicators related to performance, essential knowledge, and dispositions.   The CCSSO (2013) has specifically noted that the *performance* indicator has been "put first, as the aspect can be observed and assessed in teaching practice" (p. 6), as compared to that of *knowledge* and *dispositions*.

Each of the survey items (indicators) use specific language from the InTASC standards in association with teacher performance behaviors.   The End or Program survey was developed to meet the highest possible level of Bloom's taxonomy (Krathwol, 2002) of cognition. Below is the representation that all survey item falling within the upper level of Bloom's taxonomy. *(Note: the level of Bloom's goes in descending order, with 6 being the highest cognitive application, and 1 being the lowest*)

Survey Items on Bloom's Level 6 (Creating) and Level 5 (Evaluating) (n = 7)

1. Assess student performance and can make informed instructional decisions to meet learners' developmental needs (cognitive, social, emotional, and physical)

2. Adapt instruction to address students' individual strengths, interests, and needs to advanced individual student learning in different ways.

3. Design instruction to build on learners' prior knowledge and experiences

4. Develop a learning environment that promotes self-directed and collaborative interactions and experiences

5. Recognize learning misconceptions in a discipline, and then is able to create learning experiences that build accurate conceptual understanding.

6. Understand how to connect concepts and use differing perspectives to engage learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving related to his/her discipline

7. Plan for instruction based on formative and summative assessment data, prior learning knowledge, and learner interest.

Survey Items on Bloom's Level 4 (Analyze) and Level 3 (Applying) (n = 9)

1. Use verbal and nonverbal communication with individuals from diverse cultural backgrounds and differing perspectives in the learning environment.

2. Possess a deep knowledge of content standards and learning progressions in the discipline s/he teaches

3. Understand AND use multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor student progress, and to guide decision making.

4. Engage learners in using a range of learning and technology tools to access, interpret, and evaluate information.

5. Use a variety of instructional strategies to support and expand learners' communication through speaking, listening, writing, and other modes.

6. Understand the expectations of the profession including code of ethics, professional standards of practice, and relevant policy and law.

7. Seek opportunities to draw upon current educational theory, policy, and research as sources of analysis and reflection to improve practice.

8. Collaborate with learners, families, and other school personnel to establish mutual expectations and ongoing communication to support learner development and achievement.

9. Take responsibility for contributing to and advancing the profession.

Survey Items on Bloom's Level 2 (Understanding) and Level 1 (Remembering) (n = 0)

1. None

Council of Chief State School Officers [CCSSO] (2013, April). *Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards and Learning Progressions for Teachers 1.0: A resource for ongoing teacher development.* Washington, DC: Author.

Krathwohl, D. R. (2002). A revision of Bloom's taxonomy: An overview. *Theory into Practice*, *41*(4), 212-218.

e. **Indicators require consequential attributes of candidate proficiencies-** Because nearly all survey items are a direct derivative of the language in the InTASC standards, the End of Program survey meets, and

potentially exceeds, the minimal sufficient level. The minimal sufficient level to meet this CAEP sub-standard is that at least 80% indicators require observers to judge consequential attributes of candidate proficiencies in InTASC standards, and 95% is deemed above expectation.

Survey Content

a. **Questions aligned to EPPs mission, CAEP, InTASC, Naitonal/Professional & State Standards-** The survey has 48 items which directly align to required teaching behaviors from the InTASC standards. The section relating to overall preparation as a teacher provides end of program eacher candidates with one InTASC teacher behavior and asks them to select one of four response options on a Likert scale: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Agree, and Strongly Agree in relation to three categories: (a) perception of self confidence in the teacher behavior, EPP overall preparation of the teacher behavior, and (c) mentor teachers' ability to demonstrate the teacher behavior. In addition, the survey asks for comments in the form of suggestions and strengths of the education program. In addition to the direct InTASC standard alignment this, EPP created instrument aligns with the following CAEP standards 1.1, 1.5, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 5.5, & technology cross-cutting theme, and all of the attributes of the Clemmer College Conceptual Framework.

b. **Items have single subject and are unambiguous-** To the highest degree possible, the CAEP committee, with help from LEA partners, avoided double-barreled, complex, and ambiguous survey times. Complex indicators (verb indicators) were written based on LEA and EPP collaboration and instrument development. Based on the recommendation of the collaboration group, the more complex indicators, or indicators have two action verbs (e.g., understands and uses), represent a more advanced proficiency, and direct language was kept from the InTASC standards.

c. **Leading questions are avoided-** All survey items were stated positively, and teacher candidates at the end of their EPP program are asked to SA, A, D, or SD to each survey item (indicator), therefore leading questions were avoided and do not lead teacher candidates at the end of their EPP program towards a specific response.

d. **Items state in terms of behaviors and practices-** Prompts/indicators describe the proficiencies to be evaluated, have a single subject and are stated in terms of behaviors or practices directly derived from the InTASC standards. In addition, each of the indicators were specifically designed so that scoring is anchored in the teaching behaviors related to teaching professional best practices.

Survey Data Quality

a. **Choices are qualitatively defined using specific criteria aligned with key attributes-** Likert scales that have an agree/disagree scale are widely used in education and social sciences (DeVellis, 2016). An agree, disagree scale is a range of answer options that go from strongly agree to strongly disagree. It allows respondents to answer more precisely and it provides a more nuanced survey responses to analyze. Since each survey item is directly related to teacher behaviors from the InTASC standards, research has shown that this item specificity are much less prone to response bias towards default agreement (DeVellis, 2016; Groves et al., 2011; Saris, et al., 2010). Each of following features of agree/disagree Likert scales was implemented for the End of Program survey items (indicators):

1. All survey items started with a positively worded declarative statement
2. All survey items had an ordered continuum of response options that are directly associated with each declarative statement.
3. A survey response options were balanced between positive and negative response choices, with no neutral choice
4. All survey response options were qualitatively labeled (e.g., strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree).
5. Quantitative values were assigned to each of the qualitative labels (4- strongly agree, 3- agree, 2- disagree, 1- strongly disagree)

   (DeVellis, 2016; Groves et al., 2011; Saris, et al., 2010).

b. **Feedback provided to EPP is actionable-** Feedback from this instrument is triangulated with the principal, completer, and mentor teacher survey to provide increased credibility of the results. All four survey instruments use the same teacher behavior prompts (declarative statement) so data can be analyzed from multiple perspectives by the EPP.

c. **EPP provides evidence that questions are piloted prior to use-** The CAEP leadership developed a scoring criterion in conjunction with based on two focus groups and field pretests with LEA partners, both of which took place in the spring of 2018 (Groves et al., 2011). The field pre-tests were completed by selected LEA partners prior to their participation in the on-campus focus group. In addition, all member of the CAEP team piloted and provided feedback on the End of Program survey prior to use.