

## First Year Teacher Surveys

---

### **Explanation**

The Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE), in collaboration with the University of Missouri's Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis (OSED), administers an annual survey of first year teachers in Missouri public schools. The current survey was designed in 2014 to align with the [Missouri Teacher Standards \(MTS\)](#) and [Missouri Standards for the Preparation of Educators \(MoSPE\)](#). The survey conforms to the *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing* (2014) and, as such, has passed through a variety of reliability and validity studies. For example, the design team used Messick's (1995) strategies for content validity by demonstrating that the survey measures what it says it measures and conducted an internal consistency study using Cronbach's (1951) coefficient alpha. A detailed explanation of the technical aspects of the first year teacher study is outlined in the [technical guide](#).

Several studies (Darling-Hammond, 2006; Zeichner & Conklin, 2005) have shown that university-based teacher preparation matters. The first year teacher survey is one tool the School of Education uses to measure how effectively we prepare our candidates to be "classroom ready." The survey is distributed by DESE and collected and analyzed by OSED. The results of the first year teacher survey are shared with each educator preparation provider in the state and are benchmarked against a Missouri average.

A copy of the 2016 first year teacher surveys are linked [here](#) (for teacher rated) and [here](#) (for principal rated).

### **Data Table Key**

The first year teacher survey data are presented on the next page. Each question on the current survey is tagged to the CAEP standards; InTASC areas (content; learner and learning; instructional practice; and professionalism); and the MTS. The survey is rated on a five point scale from *Strongly Agree* (5) to *Strongly Disagree* (1).

The key for reading these data is...

SLU =rating of all first year teachers who completed their teacher preparation programs in the School of Education.

MO =rating of all first year teachers who completed a Missouri teacher preparation program.

The data from the old survey is tagged to the CAEP and InTASC areas but not the MTS. The new survey was designed to align to the MTS and, as such, is one of the reasons why the first year teacher survey was redesigned in 2014.

DESE does not disaggregate this data when they report it back to us. SLU has an small N and, as such, disaggregating this data could expose certain completers to identification.

### **Data Tables**

Two tables of data are presented in this document. The first table summarizes data from the current survey and accounts for one collection cycle--the 2016 survey. The second table summarizes data from the first year survey that was conducted from 2007-2014. Two cycles of data--2013 and 2014--are presented in the second table. Each table presents both first year teacher self rated (T) and principal rated (P) data. Because the survey was changed in 2014 and piloted in 2015, data from the 2015 year is not available.

CAEP	inTASC	DESE / MTS	Question	2016 (N>15) (T)	2016 (N>15) (P)
1.1	Learner and learning. Content. Instructional practice.	1.2: Student engagement in subject matter.	I was prepared to incorporate interdisciplinary instruction.	3.65 (SLU) 4.05 (MO)	4.37 (SLU) 3.93 (MO)
1.1 1.4	Content.	1.1: Content knowledge and academic language.	I was prepared in my content area.	4.22 (SLU) 4.28 (MO)	4.45 (SLU) 4.20 (MO)
1.1	Learner and learning. Content. Instructional practice.	1.2: Student engagement in subject matter.	I was prepared to engage students in my content area.	4.09 (SLU) 4.26 (MO)	4.35 (SLU) 4.10 (MO)
1.1	Learner and learning. Content. Instructional practice.	1.2: Student engagement in subject matter.	I was prepared to make my content meaningful to students.	4.17 (SLU) 4.23 (MO)	4.25 (SLU) 4.09 (MO)

1.1 1.4	Learner and learning. Instructional practice.	2.4: Differentiated instruction.	I was prepared to design lessons that include differentiated instruction.	4.17 (SLU) 4.13 (MO)	4.20 (SLU) 3.84 (MO)
1.1 1.4	Learner and learning. Instructional practice.	2.4: Differentiated instruction.	I was prepared to implement instruction based on a student's IEP.	3.74 (SLU) 3.65 (MO)	4.25 (SLU) 3.79 (MO)
1.1 1.4	Learner and learning. Instructional practice.	2.4: Differentiated instruction.	I was prepared to modify instruction for English language learners.	2.74 (SLU) 3.31 (MO)	3.85 (SLU) 3.51 (MO)
1.1 1.4	Learner and learning. Instructional practice.	2.4: Differentiated instruction.	I was prepared to modify instruction for gifted learners.	3.30 (SLU) 3.61 (MO)	3.85 (SLU) 3.60 (MO)
1.1 1.4	Learner and learning. Instructional practice.	2.4: Differentiated instruction.	I was prepared to create lesson plans to engage all learners.	4.35 (SLU) 4.15 (MO)	4.35 (SLU) 3.94 (MO)
1.1 1.3 1.4	Content. Instructional practice.	3.1: Implementation of curriculum standards.	I was prepared to deliver lessons based on curriculum standards.	4.09 (SLU) 4.27 (MO)	4.40 (SLU) 4.11 (MO)
1.1 1.4	Learner and learning. Instructional practice.	3.2: Lessons for diverse learners.	I was prepared to deliver lessons for diverse learners.	4.30 (SLU) 4.09 (MO)	4.30 (SLU) 3.86 (MO)
1.1	Learner and learning. Instructional practice.	4.1: Instructional strategies leading to student engagement in problem-solving and critical thinking.	I was prepared to implement a variety of instructional strategies.	4.17 (SLU) 4.28 (MO)	4.40 (SLU) 3.95 (MO)
1.1	Learner and learning. Instructional practice.	4.1: Instructional strategies leading to student engagement in problem-solving and critical thinking.	I was prepared to engage students in critical thinking.	4.00 (SLU) 4.12 (MO)	4.20 (SLU) 3.86 (MO)
1.1	Learner and learning. Instructional practice.	4.1: Instructional strategies leading to student engagement in problem-solving and critical thinking.	I was prepared to model critical thinking and problem solving.	4.00 (SLU) 4.11 (MO)	4.25 (SLU) 3.87 (MO)
1.1	Learner and learning. Instructional practice.	4.1: Instructional strategies leading to student engagement in problem-solving and critical thinking.	I was prepared to use technology to enhance student learning.	4.22 (SLU) 4.06 (MO)	4.35 (SLU) 4.04 (MO)
1.1	Instructional practice.	5.1: Classroom management techniques.	I was prepared to create a classroom environment that encourages student engagement.	4.26 (SLU) 4.28 (MO)	4.30 (SLU) 4.01 (MO)

1.1	Instructional practice.	5.1: Classroom management techniques.	I was prepared to use a variety of classroom management strategies.	4.22 (SLU) 4.05 (MO)	4.15 (SLU) 3.79 (MO)
1.1	Instructional practice.	5.1: Classroom management techniques.	I was prepared to manage a variety of discipline issues.	3.57 (SLU) 3.67 (MO)	4.00 (SLU) 3.71 (MO)
1.1	Instructional practice.	5.1: Classroom management techniques.	I was prepared to motivate my students to learn.	4.30 (SLU) 4.14 (MO)	4.35 (SLU) 4.01 (MO)
1.1	Instructional practice.	5.1: Classroom management techniques.	I was prepared to keep my students on task.	4.09 (SLU) 4.03 (MO)	4.30 (SLU) 3.93 (MO)
1.1	Instructional practice.	5.3: Classroom, school, and community culture.	I was prepared to foster positive student relationships.	4.39 (SLU) 4.41 (MO)	4.40 (SLU) 4.25 (MO)
1.1	Instructional practice.	5.2: Management of time, space, transitions, and activities.	I was prepared to facilitate smooth transitions for my students.	4.18 (SLU) 4.10 (MO)	4.40 (SLU) 4.01 (MO)
1.1	Instructional practice.	6.1: Verbal and nonverbal communication.	I was prepared to use effective communication strategies to foster learning.	4.30 (SLU) 4.23 (MO)	4.35 (SLU) 4.05 (MO)
1.1	Instructional practice.	6.1: Verbal and nonverbal communication.	I was prepared to effectively communicate with parents.	3.87 (SLU) 3.87 (MO)	4.30 (SLU) 3.97 (MO)
1.1	Instructional practice.	6.1: Verbal and nonverbal communication.	I was prepared to effectively communicate with all staff.	4.09 (SLU) 4.11 (MO)	4.40 (SLU) 4.06 (MO)
1.1	Instructional practice.	6.2: Sensitivity to culture, gender, intellectual, and physical differences.	I was prepared to promote respect for diverse cultures, genders, and intellectual/physical abilities.	4.35 (SLU) 4.35 (MO)	4.35 (SLU) 4.10 (MO)
1.1 1.5	Instructional practice.	6.4: Technology and media communication tools.	I was prepared to use technology as a communication tool.	4.17 (SLU) 4.18 (MO)	4.45 (SLU) 4.15 (MO)
1.1	Instructional practice.	6.4: Technology and media communication tools.	I was prepared to enhance students' skills using technology as a communication tool.	3.96 (SLU) 4.00 (MO)	4.35 (SLU) 4.01 (MO)
1.1 1.2	Learner and learning. Instructional practice.	7.1: Effective use of assessments.	I was prepared to use assessments to evaluate learning.	4.39 (SLU) 4.26 (MO)	4.45 (SLU) 3.97 (MO)
1.1 1.2	Learner and learning. Instructional practice.	7.1: Effective use of assessments.	I was prepared to develop assessments to evaluate learning.	4.00 (SLU) 4.07 (MO)	4.20 (SLU) 3.84 (MO)

1.1 1.2	Learner and learning. Instructional practice.	7.2: Assessment data to improve learning.	I was prepared to analyze assessment data to improve instruction.	4.04 (SLU) 4.01 (MO)	4.25 (SLU) 3.82 (MO)
1.1	Professional responsibility.	7.5: Communication of student progress and maintaining records.	I was prepared to help students set learning goals based on assessment results.	3.83 (SLU) 3.86 (MO)	4.20 (SLU) 3.78 (MO)
1.1	Professional responsibility.	7.5: Communication of student progress and maintaining records.	I was prepared to work with colleagues to set learning goals using assessment results.	3.65 (SLU) 3.95 (MO)	4.35 (SLU) 3.91 (MO)
1.1 1.2	Professional responsibility.	8.1: Self-assessment and improvement.	I was prepared to analyze data to reflect on areas for professional growth.	3.78 (SLU) 4.00 (MO)	4.40 (SLU) 3.84 (MO)
1.1	Professional responsibility.	8.1: Self-assessment and improvement.	I was prepared to reflect on my practices for professional growth.	4.30 (SLU) 4.26 (MO)	4.40 (SLU) 4.01 (MO)
1.1	Professional responsibility.	9.1: Collaborating to meet student needs.	I was prepared to collaborate with colleagues to support student learning.	4.09 (SLU) 4.24 (MO)	4.50 (SLU) 4.11 (MO)
1.1	Professional responsibility.	9.1: Collaborating to meet student needs.	I was prepared to collaborate with parents to support student learning.	3.91 (SLU) 3.91 (MO)	4.25 (SLU) 3.94 (MO)
1.1	Professional responsibility.	9.1: Collaborating to meet student needs.	I was prepared to participate in professional organizations.	3.65 (SLU) 4.01 (MO)	4.35 (SLU) 3.99 (MO)

87% of SLU first year teachers rated their preparation in the School of Education as either good (65%) or very good (22%) on the 2016 survey.

100% of principals who evaluated SLU first year teachers marked the School of Education as either good (55%) or very good (45%) on the 2016 survey.

CAEP	InTASC	Question	2013 (N=6)**	2014 (N=5)
------	--------	----------	--------------	------------

1.1	Content.	Having a thorough knowledge of the subjects taught.	4.50 (SLU) (T) 4.07 (MO)	4.36 (SLU) (T) 4.05 (MO)  4.00 (SLU) (P) 3.98 (MO)
1.1	Learner and learning. Instructional practice.	Understanding how students learn and develop.	4.33 (SLU) (T) 4.09 (MO)	4.36 (SLU) (T) 4.05 (MO)  3.60 (SLU) (P) 3.76 (MO)
1.1 1.4	Learner and learning. Instructional practice.	Understanding how students differ in their approaches to learning.	5.00 (SLU) (T) 4.15 (MO)	4.36 (SLU) (T) 4.10 (MO)  3.20 (SLU) (P) 3.72 (MO)
1.1 1.4	Learner and learning. Instructional practice.	Designing lessons that address differentiated learning.	4.67 (SLU) (T) 3.91 (MO)	4.21 (SLU) (T) 3.84 (MO)  3.40 (SLU) (P) 3.60 (MO)
1.1 1.4	Learner and learning. Instructional practice.	Delivering lessons that are developed for differentiated learning.	4.67 (SLU) (T) 3.85 (MO)	3.77 (SLU) (T) 3.78 (MO)  3.20 (SLU) (P) 3.58 (MO)
1.1 1.3 1.4	Content. Instructional practice.	Planning lessons based on curriculum goals and performance standards.	4.33 (SLU) (T) 3.98 (MO)	4.07 (SLU) (T) 3.94 (MO)  3.80 (SLU) (P) 3.82 (MO)
1.1 1.4	Learner and learning. Instructional practice.	Facilitating higher levels of learning by employing a variety of instructional strategies.	4.50 (SLU) (T) 3.99 (MO)	4.21 (SLU) (T) 3.96 (MO)  3.40 (SLU) (P) 3.68 (MO)
1.1	Learner and learning. Instructional practice.	Creating a classroom learning environment that encourages student engagement.	4.00 (SLU) (T) 4.17 (MO)	4.21 (SLU) (T) 4.11 (MO)

				3.00 (SLU) (P) 3.86 (MO)
1.1	Learner and learning. Instructional practice.	Using communication skills to effectively foster learning.	4.17 (SLU) (T) 4.17 (MO)	4.50 (SLU) (T) 4.13 (MO)  3.60 (SLU) (P) 3.84 (MO)
1.1 1.2	Learner and learning. Instructional practice.	Using assessments effectively to evaluate student academic achievement.	4.80 (SLU) (T) 3.91 (MO)	4.07 (SLU) (T) 3.88 (MO)  3.80 (SLU) (P) 3.66 (MO)
1.1 1.2	Professional responsibility.	Using professional development to enhance knowledge and skills.	3.67 (SLU) (T) 3.95 (MO)	3.93 (SLU) (T) 3.90 (MO)  3.60 (SLU) (P) 3.80 (MO)
1.1 1.2	Instructional practice.	Using professional instructional practices.	4.33 (SLU) (T) 4.07 (MO)	4.38 (SLU) (T) 4.03 (MO)  3.80 (SLU) (P) 3.79 (MO)
1.1	Professional responsibility.	Interacting effectively with colleagues and parents to support student learning.	4.17 (SLU) (T) 4.04 (MO)	4.14 (SLU) (T) 3.97 (MO)  3.80 (SLU) (P) 3.91 (MO)
1.1 1.5	Professional responsibility.	Using electronic technology effectively as part of instructional practice.	4.67 (SLU) (T) 3.92 (MO)	4.29 (SLU) (T) 3.82 (MO)  2.80 (SLU) (P) 3.91 (MO)
1.1	Instructional practice.	Using effective classroom management practices.	3.67 (SLU) (T) 3.90 (MO)	3.92 (SLU) (T) 3.83 (MO)  2.80 (SLU) (P) 3.61 (MO)

85.7% of SLU first year teachers rated their preparation in the School of Education as either good (21.4%) or very good (64.3%) on the 2014 survey.

25% of principals who evaluated SLU first year teachers rated their preparation in the School of Education as fair; whereas, 75% of principals rated SLU teacher preparation as good.

100% of SLU first year teachers rated their preparation in the School of Education as either good (16.7%) or very good (83.3%) on the 2013 survey.

\*\* The response rate for the 2013 principal rated first year teacher survey was too small for DESE to report the data.

## **Conclusion**

The first year teacher survey data indicate that our candidates are “classroom ready.” According to the 2016 survey data, our candidates rate themselves at a 4.00 or higher in the areas of (1) content knowledge; (3) curriculum implementation; (4) critical thinking; (5) positive classroom environment; (6) effective communication; (8) and professionalism. These ratings indicate candidate strengths--with the highest rating of 4.20 in curriculum implementation.

Candidates, on the other hand, rated themselves at a 3.99 or lower in the following areas: (2) learning, growth, and development; (7) student assessment and data analysis; and (9) professional collaboration. These ratings indicate areas for growth in our programs--with the lowest rating of 3.66 in learning, growth, and development.

Principals rated SLU first year teachers at a 4.00 or higher on all surveyed areas--with the highest rating of 4.40 in professionalism and the lowest rating of 4.10 in learning, growth, and development.

## **References**



American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, & National Council on Measurement in Education. (2014). *Standards for educational and psychological testing*. Produced by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing.

Cornbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, 16(3), 297-333.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). *Power teacher education: Lessons from exemplary programs*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Messick, S. (1995). Standards of validity and validity of standards in performance assessment. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 14(4), 5-8.

Zeichner, K., & Conklin, H. (2005). Teacher education programs. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA Panel on Research and Teacher Education* (pp. 645-735). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.