Mentor Teacher Evaluation Survey

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

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

ETSU Clemmer College Framework: 1-10

Administration and Purpose

The mentor teacher evaluation survey is an EPP-created survey which measures mentor teacher's perceptions of the knowledge, skills, dispositions, of the ETSU teacher candidate student they are mentoring. 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 end of program, completer teacher, and principal survey.

a. **Points of Administration-** The mentor teacher evaluation survey is an online survey that is administered at the end of the teacher candidates' residency I and residency II field placements. The data is collected from the online software program and aggregated by licensure area. Descriptive statistics are provided to all licensure areas for data review.

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. 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 designed only to measure of mentor teacher perceptions of their ETSU residency teacher candidate's teaching behaviors. . 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 mentor teacher survey was developed and piloted in the fall of 2019. Mentor teachers are provided with a link to the completer survey that is distributed via the ETSU Clemmer College Office of Educator Preparation. Mentor teachers are asked to be honest, as their responses are a valuable part of the quality assurance process. Directions given to mentors:

Dear Mentor Teachers,

I want to begin by thanking each of you for doing such a wonderful job mentoring our residency candidates this year, especially during this difficult semester. Your support and hard work DOES NOT go unnoticed. Our candidates are very lucky to have a mentor like you.

We at Clemmer College believe in preparing teachers that not only have the content knowledge and pedagogy skills to facilitate learning in a classroom, but are active agents in improving and influencing lives in their communities. Because teacher preparation is a dynamic process that involves input from a diverse support team (e.g., faculty, supervisors, mentor teachers, and principals), it is essential to closely monitor the aspects of our programs that our partners feel we excel in, and those areas that we as a College need to improve upon. Therefore, we are reaching out to you today to honor the accountability process, and provide us with valuable feedback on the teaching performance our residency candidates demonstrate during their time with you.

The survey will provide you with statements related to instructional practice and professional dispositions, and we are requesting that you complete our brief survey in relation to the residency candidate you mentored the majority of the 2019-2020 school year.

Here is the link to the survey. It should take you approximately 10 minutes.
Link.survey.etsu.edu

If you have any questions about the survey, please contact Laura Click, Director of Field Experience and Residency at clicklm@etsu.edu or 423-439-4200.

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 CAEP committee and LEA partners determined that the coding of the non-numeric responses in our survey should be evaluated on a four-point Likert scale (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 completer 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 Completer 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) end of program, (b) completer, 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 mentor teacher 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, as well as the diversity & technology cross-cutting themes, 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.

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 mentor teachers related to instructional and professional practice of their ETSU teacher candidate's behavior, knowledge, and professional dispositions. For each of the teaching behaviors provided, mentors will be asked their level of agreement to associated prompt. In addition, a 4-point agree/disagree scale was used for mentors 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). 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 mentor teacher survey is broken down in four major sections:

1. Demographic information and employment status (n = 5)
2. Perception and evaluation of overall preparation as a teacher based on InTASC Standards (n = 16).
3. Mentor teacher perception of ETSU Office of Educator Preparation (n = 7)
4. Mentor teacher perception of ETSU Teacher Candidate Supervisors (n = 5)

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-** 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).

d. **Indicators require higher levels of intellectual behaviors-** Each survey item (indicator) on the mentor teacher survey were 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 completer 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. *(<u>Note</u>: the level of Bloom's goes in descending order, with 6 being the highest cognitive application, and 1 being the lowest*)

<u>Survey Items on Bloom's Level 6 (Creating) and Level 5 (Evaluating) (n = 6)</u>

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.

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

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 all survey items related to ETSU teacher candidate's performance are a direct derivative of the language in the InTASC standards, the completer 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 16 items which directly align to required teaching behaviors from the InTASC standards. The section relating to overall preparation as a teacher has provides mentor teachers 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 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 completers are asked to SA, A, D, or SD to each survey item (indicator), therefore leading questions were avoided and do not lead completers 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 mentor teacher 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, end of program, and conpleter 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 completer survey prior to use.