

Supervisor Survey of Mentor Teachers

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 supervisor evaluation of mentor teacher survey is an EPP-created survey which measures ETSU residency supervisor's perceptions of the professional knowledge, skills, dispositions of in-service teachers who mentor ETSU teacher education candidates. The survey's components and statements are tagged and aligned to CAEP, InTASC, and reflect the EPP's conceptual framework and beliefs.

- a. Points of Administration-** The supervisor evaluation of mentor teacher 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, and retreats. In addition, data is used to help collect information on mentor teachers who work with ETSU residency students. The data results from the survey are used to assess the quality of the mentor teacher and their effectiveness in preparing candidates for their roles as beginning teachers. The survey measures the ETSU supervisors' perceptions of the mentor teacher's ability to model effective teaching techniques, dispositions, and professionalism, as well as, establish a supportive relationship and climate for the residency candidate. 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 supervisor evaluation of mentor teacher survey was developed and piloted in the spring of 2020. Supervisors are provided with a link to the survey and were asked to complete the survey for each mentor teacher they work with who mentor ETSU candidates. The email and request to participate comes directly from the ETSU Clemmer Office of Educator

Preparation. Based on feedback from our LEA principal partners in the survey development process, supervisors are asked to rate all mentor teachers.

Good afternoon supervisors,

I want to begin by thanking each of you for doing such a wonderful job with your students this year, especially during this difficult semester. Your support and hard work does not go unnoticed. Our students should be very thankful to have a mentor like you.

As you know, the wheel keeps on spinning, and as we prepare to finish up one year, another year begins. It is now time for our office to begin requesting residency placements for the upcoming year, and we are asking for your help.

Our office has created a short survey that gives you an opportunity to provide feedback on the mentor teacher that you worked with the majority of this past year. This means we will need you to complete a survey for each mentor teacher. This is the only way to provide individual input, so we can determine if the mentor teacher is someone we would like to continue to place students with. I know this means that some of you will have numerous surveys to complete, but the survey is short and for those mentors that are doing a great job their survey will go quickly. Please be honest-this information will be kept confidential and your name will never be released.

***The questions on this survey have also been included on the End of Program survey that is given to residency candidates, so they also have the opportunity to provide feedback.*

Please use the survey link below and complete one survey for each mentor teacher you worked with for the majority of the year (this should be the 1st placement mentor). If you have any questions, please feel free to email or call: 423-384-4275.

Here is the link to the survey. link.survey.etsu.edu

Thank you again for all you do for our students,

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 Department 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 Supervisor 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, 3*96-403.

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 also align with the (a) end of program, and (b) mentor teacher.

Content of Assessment

- a. **Indicators Assess Explicitly Identified Aspects of CAEP, InTASC, National/Professional & State Standards-** Statements and components of the completer 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.

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 supervisors related to instructional practice and professional dispositions of mentor teachers who work with ETSU residency candidates. For each of the teaching behaviors provided, supervisors will be asked their level of agreement to associated prompt. In addition, a 4-point agree/disagree scale was used for supervisors 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 (Sarlis, 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; Sarlis, et al., 2010). The supervisor survey is broken down in two major sections:

1. Demographic information (n = 5)
2. Mentor teacher's ability to model effective teaching techniques, dispositions, and professionalism, as well as, establish a supportive relationship and climate for the residency candidate on InTASC Standards (n = 16).

Sarlis, 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 supervisor evaluation of 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*.

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.

- e. **Indicators require consequential attributes of candidate proficiencies-** Because all survey items are a direct derivative of the language in the InTASC standards, the supervisor evaluation of mentor teacher 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, National/Professional & State Standards-** The survey has 16 items which directly align to required teaching behaviors from the InTASC standards. The supervisors are provided 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 mentor teacher. 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 items. 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 completer 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 end of program, and mentor teacher survey to provide increased credibility of the results. All three 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 LEA partners to obtain feedback in order to retain high quality mentor teachers. In addition, all members of the CAEP team provided feedback on the Supervisor survey prior to use. The pilot survey took place in the spring of 2020.