

**Validation of First Year Teacher and
Mentor/Administrator Surveys Administered by the Office of
Educational Quality and Accountability**

Report prepared for: Office of Educational Quality and Accountability
and
Oklahoma Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

Report prepared by: Teresa K. DeBacker, Ph.D.
University of Oklahoma

February 19, 2018

Executive Summary

Each spring, the Office of Educational Quality and Accountability (OEQA) distributes online surveys to first year teachers employed in public schools in the State of Oklahoma and their mentors/administrators. The purpose of the surveys is to gather information about the preparedness of first year teachers to enter the classroom. In fall 2015, the OEQA surveys were revised in light of the new Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) standards.

This report presents evidence regarding the validity of the revised OEQA surveys. The unified conceptualization of score validity offered by Samuel Messick (1989) was the foundation of the validity study. Messick describes six inter-related facets of validity: content, substantive, structural, generalizability, external, and consequential. To the extent that evidence reflecting these multiple inter-related facets of validity is favorable, the Office of Educational Quality and Accountability, the Oklahoma State Department of Education, and Educator Preparation Providers in Oklahoma can be confident that survey scores convey meaningful information about teacher preparedness.

The scope and strength of the evidence for the different facets of validity examined herein is variable, but consistently positive. Taken as a whole, the empirical evidence and theoretical rationales presented in this report suggest that users of the Mentor/Administrator and First Year Teacher surveys can feel confident that survey scores convey meaningful information about teacher preparedness and that inferences made about teacher preparedness on the basis of item and scale scores are valid.

Table of Contents

Context and Purpose.....	3
Validity – Definition	4
Content, Substantive, and Structural Evidence of Survey Validity.....	4
Generalizability Evidence of Survey Validity	6
External Evidence of Survey Validity.....	10
Consequential Evidence of Survey Validity.....	11
Conclusion	11
References	12
Appendix A: Items on the OEQA Mentor/Administrator Survey	13
Appendix B: Items on the OEQA First Year Teacher Survey.....	15
Appendix C: How to calculate scale scores for InTASC Domains	20

Context and Purpose

Each spring, the Office of Educational Quality and Accountability (OEQA) distributes online surveys to first year teachers employed in public schools in the State of Oklahoma and their mentors/administrators. The purpose of the surveys is to gather information about the preparedness of first year teachers to enter the classroom. Survey results are shared with the Oklahoma State Department of Education (OSDE) and with Educator Preparation Providers (EPPs) in the State of Oklahoma. In fall 2015, the OEQA surveys were revised in light of the new Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) standards.

The revised Mentor/Administrator survey includes 20 items based on the Interstate Teacher Assessment Support Consortium (InTASC) standards (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2011) that assess the degree to which mentors/administrators are satisfied with first year teacher performance as operationalized by those standards. Additional items on the survey ask about the first year teacher's preparation for integrating instructional technology and the mentor's/administrator's overall satisfaction with the preparedness of the first year teacher. Mentors/ administrators respond to these items using a 6-point Likert-style scale. The survey also invites open-ended responses concerning teacher performance and teacher preparation. The Mentor/Administrator survey items can be found in Appendix A.

The revised First Year Teacher survey includes 19 items based on the InTASC standards that assess the degree to which these novice teachers feel prepared by their route to teacher preparation for the work of teaching as operationalized by those standards. Additional items on the survey ask about preparation for integrating instructional technology and about the first year teacher's overall feelings of preparedness. First year teachers respond to these items using a 6-point Likert-style scale. The survey also invites open-ended responses about particularly beneficial teacher preparation experiences as well as areas in which the first year teacher felt inadequately prepared. The First Year Teacher survey items can be found in Appendix B.

The purpose of this report is to assess the validity of the revised surveys. The revised surveys were used for the first time in spring 2016. Data from the revised First Year Teacher and Mentor/Administrator surveys administered in spring 2016 and spring 2017 are reported here.

In the State of Oklahoma, there are a number of different routes to teacher certification. These include completion of an accredited traditional educator preparation program, completion of a national alternative route (e.g., Teach for America, Troops to Teachers, American Board for Certification of Teacher Excellence), or completion of the alternative certification route or the paraprofessional route offered by the Oklahoma State Department of Education. Respondents in this validation study included teachers coming through each of the possible preparation routes and their mentors/administrators.

Validity – Definition

In this report we adopt the unified conceptualization of score validity offered by Samuel Messick.

“Validity is an integrated evaluative judgment of the degree to which empirical evidence and theoretical rationales support the adequacy and appropriateness of inferences and actions based on test scores or other modes of assessment.” (Messick, 1989, p. 13.)

Situating this perspective within the current context, OEQA, OSDE, and EPPs can be confident that survey scores convey meaningful information about teacher preparedness to the extent that evidence reflecting multiple inter-related facets of validity is, considered collectively, favorable.

Messick describes six inter-related facets of validity:

1. Content: The extent to which the content of the assessment represents an appropriate sample of the target skills and knowledge of interest (e.g., teacher preparedness).
2. Substantive: The extent to which the assessment taps the cognitive processes that underlie the target construct.
3. Structural: The extent to which the internal structure of the assessment adequately represents the structure of the target construct.
4. Generalizability: The extent to which score interpretations are consistent across different groups of people, different times and settings, etc.
5. External: The extent to which scores on the target assessment are related to other measures in expected ways.
6. Consequential: The extent to which scores on the target assessment produce meaningful information that serves a legitimate need and are free of bias in scoring, interpretation, or use of the test.

This integrated and comprehensive approach to validity helps to prevent *construct under-representation* (a situation in which the content of a measure is narrower or more limited than the construct of interest, such that measurement of the construct of interest is incomplete) while also avoiding the introduction of *construct-irrelevant variance* (a situation in which the content of a measure is broader than the construct of interest, such that the meaning of the resulting scores is diluted by construct-irrelevant variance) (Messick, 1989). Each of the six inter-related facets of validity is addressed in this analysis of the validity of the OEQA surveys for mentors/administrators and first year teachers.

Content, Substantive, and Structural Evidence of Survey Validity

The majority of items on the OEQA First Year Teacher and Mentor/Administrator surveys utilize the language of the ten InTASC standards in a highly literal way. Therefore, evidence relevant to the content, substantive, and structural facets of survey validity can be found in the report

prepared by Council of Chief State School Officers' (CCSSO) Model Core Teaching Standards of the Interstate Teacher Assessment Support Consortium. The report, titled *InTASC Core Model Teaching Standards: A Resource for State Dialogue*, explains the steps taken by the consortium to clearly articulate what teachers should know and be able to do to ensure that every P-12 student reaches the goal of being ready to enter college or the workforce in today's world. The core model teaching standards:

“...articulate what effective teaching and learning looks like in a transformed public education system – one that empowers every learner to take ownership of their learning, that emphasizes the learning of content and application of knowledge and skill to real world problems, that values the differences each learner brings to the learning experience, and that leverages rapidly changing learning environments by recognizing the possibilities they bring to maximize learning and engage learners.”

(Council of Chief State School Officers, 2011, p. 3)

The ten InTASC Standards are grouped into four domains: The Learner and Learning, Content, Instructional Practice, and Professional Responsibility (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2011). To provide additional structural evidence of score validity of the First Year Teacher and Mentor/Administrator surveys, we calculated Cronbach's alpha coefficients for items representing each domain of InTASC Standards, as well as for the full survey. Items associated with each InTASC Domain are listed in Table 1¹.

Table 1. Items associated with each InTASC domain

InTASC Domain	Mentor/Administrator Survey	First Year Teacher Survey
The Learner and Learning	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
Content	7, 8, 9, 10	7, 8, 9, 10
Instructional Practice	11, 12, 13, 14, 15	11, 12, 13, 14, 15
Professional Responsibility	17, 18, 19, 20	17, 18, 19

Cronbach's alpha coefficients, based on the full survey and the four domains embodied in the InTASC standards, ranged from .92 to .99, indicating a very high degree of internal consistency among the items on the full scale and within each subscale². This suggests that (a) the full set of items reflects a single underlying construct (teacher effectiveness), and (b) the items within each of the InTASC domains are likewise measuring a unified underlying construct (i.e., understanding of the learner and learning, understanding of content, understanding of

¹ Instructions for calculating subscale scores for the InTASC domains can be found in Appendix 1.

² Chronbach's alpha coefficients range from 0.00 to 1.00, with higher magnitudes indicating higher degrees of internal consistency among the set of items. Coefficients greater than .70 are considered adequate for basic research. When scores are used to make high stakes decisions about individuals, coefficients of at least .90 are warranted (Nunnally, 1978).

instructional practice, understanding of professional responsibility). Cronbach’s alpha coefficients for the Mentor/Administrator survey can be found in Table 2. Cronbach’s alpha coefficients for the First Year Teacher survey can be found in Table 3.

Table 2. Cronbach’s alpha coefficients for Mentor/Administrator surveys

	Learner & Learning	Content Knowledge	Instructional Practice	Professional Responsibility	Full Survey
# items	6	4	5	5	21 ³
2015-2016 (n=484)	.96	.95	.97	.96	.99
2016-2017 (n=300)	.94	.92	.96	.95	.98

Table 3. Cronbach’s alpha coefficients for First Year Teacher surveys

	Learner & Learning	Content Knowledge	Instructional Practice	Professional Responsibility	Full Survey
# items	6	4	5	4	20 ⁴
2015-2016 (n=1029)	.94	.94	.96	.95	.98
2016-2017 (n=709)	.95	.93	.95	.94	.98

In regard to the content and substantive facets of validity, the theoretical and empirical rationales described in the InTASC report provide solid evidence that the surveys represent an appropriate sample of teacher skills and knowledge, as well as associated underlying cognitive processes. In regard to the structural facet of validity, the Cronbach’s alpha coefficients presented above further suggest that the structure of the assessment is consistent with the structure of the construct being measured.

Generalizability Evidence of Survey Validity

To provide evidence of score generalizability, domain scores from the First Year Teacher and Mentor/Administrator surveys were compared between (a) the 2015-16 versus 2016-17 cohorts of respondents and (b) traditionally versus alternatively⁵ certified teachers. In addition, self-ratings were compared among first year teachers teaching in rural versus urban versus suburban settings⁶. Assuming a similar degree of preparedness and level of performance in each subsequent cohort of first year teachers, and among first teachers employed in different community settings (rural, urban, suburban), the lack of statistically significant differences

³ The full survey includes 20 items assessing the four InTASC areas plus one item assessing Technology Integration.

⁴ The full survey includes 19 items assessing the four InTASC areas plus one item assessing Technology Integration.

⁵ Completers of the various alternative routes to teacher certification were grouped together in these analyses.

⁶ Community setting information (rural, urban, suburban) was not available for mentor/administrator scores.

would indicate that the instrument is generalizable across samples. On the other hand, it would be reasonable to expect differences in degree of preparedness between two groups of teachers who differed substantially in the depth of their preparation before entering the classroom. Therefore, the presence of statistically significant differences between the traditionally certified teachers and the alternatively certified teachers would indicate that the survey is able to detect differences where they are expected.

Results of a series of two (cohort: 2015-16, 2016-17) by two (certification route: traditional, alternative) factorial analyses of variance (ANOVAs) of Mentor/Administrator scores in the four InTASC domains and technology integration revealed a common pattern. Significant main effects were found in each domain for both cohort and certification route. Ratings of the 2015-16 cohort were significantly higher than those of the 2016-17 cohort, and ratings of the traditionally prepared teachers were significantly higher than those of the alternatively prepared teachers. The magnitude of the certification route effect always larger than that of the cohort effect, as indicated by the *F* statistics. Interaction effects were non-significant in all cases. Descriptive statistics can be found in Table 4. ANOVA results can be found in Table 5.

Results of a series of two (cohort: 2015-16, 2016-17) by two (certification route: traditional, alternative) factorial ANOVAs of First Year Teacher scores in the four InTASC domains and technology integration again revealed a common pattern. Significant main effects for certification route were found in each domain, with the self-ratings of traditionally prepared teachers being significantly higher than the self-ratings of alternatively prepared teachers. Main effects for cohort and interaction effects were non-significant in all cases. Descriptive statistics can be found in Table 6. ANOVA results can be found in Table 7.

Results of a series of one-way ANOVAs comparing the self-ratings of teachers teaching in rural, urban, and suburban settings revealed no statistically significant differences among the three groups. Descriptive statistics can be found in Table 8.

Generalizability of the surveys is also affected by response rate. Response rates ranged from 25% (acceptable) to 54% (strong)⁷. See Table 9.

⁷ CAEP defines an acceptable rate of return as 20% or above. (CAEP, 2016).

Table 4: Means and standards deviations on Mentor/Administrator scores by academic year and teacher certification route

	Traditional		Alternative Routes	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
2015-16	n=345		n=133	
Learner and Learning	5.02	.92	4.76	.98
Content Knowledge	4.91	.93	4.61	1.03
Instructional Practice	4.87	.96	4.52	1.06
Professional Responsibility	4.89	.95	4.65	1.06
Technology Integration	5.07	1.01	4.76	1.06
2016-2017	n=237		n=72	
Learner and Learning	4.87	.76	4.53	1.07
Content Knowledge	4.69	.81	4.38	1.14
Instructional Practice	4.64	.89	4.12	1.26
Professional Responsibility	4.71	.93	4.34	1.26
Technology Integration	4.86	.99	4.86	1.12

Table 5: Cohort by route factorial ANOVA results for Mentor/Administrator scores

	Cohort Main Effect			Route Main Effect			Interaction Effect		
	F	df	p	F	df	p	F	df	p
Learner and Learning	5.89	1, 778	.015	15.89	1, 778	.000	.33	1, 778	.568
Content Knowledge	8.07	1, 778	.005	14.78	1, 778	.000	.00	1, 778	.961
Instructional Practice	12.02	1, 778	.001	23.71	1, 778	.000	.54	1, 778	.462
Professional Responsibility	8.83	1, 778	.003	12.89	1, 778	.000	.56	1, 778	.453
Technology Integration	2.44	1, 776	.118	7.38	1, 776	.007	.70	1, 776	.404

Table 6: Means and standards deviations on First Year Teacher self-ratings by academic year and teacher certification route

	Traditional		Alternative Routes	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
2015-2016	(n=470)		(n=388)	
Learner and Learning	5.05	.85	4.67	1.03
Content Knowledge	4.90	.92	4.53	1.08
Instructional Practice	4.92	.92	4.50	1.11
Professional Responsibility	4.97	.92	4.61	1.12
Technology Integration	4.86	1.14	4.45	1.28
2016-2017	(n=367)		(n=352)	
Learner and Learning	5.06	.87	4.69	1.09
Content Knowledge	4.91	.94	4.56	1.14
Instructional Practice	4.89	.94	4.51	1.15
Professional Responsibility	5.00	.94	4.71	1.13
Technology Integration	4.85	1.15	4.43	1.32

Table 7: Cohort by route factorial ANOVA results for First Year Teacher self-ratings

	Cohort Main Effect			Route Main Effect			Interaction Effect		
	<i>F</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
Learner and Learning	.17	1, 1573	.683	59.42	1, 1573	.000	.02	1, 1573	.880
Content Knowledge	.11	1, 1563	.738	48.77	1,1563	.000	.01	1, 1563	.928
Instructional Practice	.08	1, 1561	.783	58.95	1,1561	.000	.12	1, 1561	.730
Professional Responsibility	1.57	1, 1559	.210	38.83	1,1559	.000	.47	1, 1559	.493
Technology Integration	.03	1, 1554	.859	44.58	1,1554	.000	.02	1, 1554	.894

Table 8. ANOVA results for teacher self-ratings by community setting

	Rural		Urban		Suburban	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
2015-16	n=389		n=410		n=308	
Learner and Learning	4.93	.84	4.84	.99	4.99	.95
Content Knowledge	4.78	.93	4.70	1.03	4.87	1.01
Instructional Practice	4.78	.95	4.71	1.04	4.86	1.01
Professional Responsibility	4.89	.92	4.76	1.05	4.90	1.02
Technology Integration	4.80	1.14	4.62	1.25	4.76	1.19
2016-2017	n=231		n=218		n=209	
Learner and Learning	4.85	1.03	4.84	1.03	5.01	.91
Content Knowledge	4.71	1.12	4.72	1.06	4.84	.97
Instructional Practice	4.69	1.12	4.69	1.08	4.78	1.0
Professional Responsibility	4.83	1.10	4.83	1.02	4.94	.98
Technology Integration	4.60	1.25	4.56	1.30	4.78	1.21

Table 9. Survey response rates

	2015-2016	2016-2017
First Year Teacher	54%	38%
Mentor/Administrator	29%	25%

In regard to the generalizability facet of validity, as stated above, the absence of statistically significant differences between the 2015-16 and 2016-17 cohorts, and among teachers employed in rural versus urban versus suburban community settings, would indicate that the instrument is generalizable across samples. For cohort, no differences were found for first year teacher self-ratings, but differences were found for mentor/administrator scores. For community setting, no differences were found among the self-ratings of teachers. In contrast, the presence of statistically significant differences between mentors'/administrators' scores of, and the self-ratings of, traditionally versus alternatively prepared teachers would indicate that the instrument is sensitive to actual group differences. In fact, large differences were found for

both first year teacher and mentor/administrator scores. The preponderance of the generalizability evidence indicates that survey scores convey consistent meaning when the survey is used across different subsets of teachers and their mentors/administrators.

External Evidence of Survey Validity

In addition to the InTASC-based items, each of the OEQA surveys includes an item asking for an overall assessment of preparedness. On the Mentor/Administrator survey, the item reads, “Overall, this teacher’s preparation/route to certification effectively prepared the teacher to have a positive impact on P-12 student learning and development.” On the First Year Teacher survey, the item reads, “Overall, my preparation/route to certification effectively prepared me to have a positive impact on P-12 student learning and development.” To provide external evidence of score validity, correlations were calculated between these summary ratings of preparedness and scores on the InTASC domains for Mentor/Administrator scores and First Year Teacher self-ratings.

For Mentor/Administrator data, Spearman correlation coefficients⁸ ranged from .79 to .81, indicating a very high level of convergence between administrator ratings in the specific domains and the administrator’s overall assessment of teacher preparedness. See Table 8. Note that this information was only available for the 2016-2017 sample.

For First Year Teacher data, Spearman’s rank correlation coefficients ranged from .58 to .76, indicating a high level of convergence between teacher self-ratings in the specific domains and teachers’ overall assessment of their preparedness. See Table 9.

In regard to the external facet of validity, the empirical evidence presented above provides reasonable evidence that scores on the Mentor/Administrator survey and the first teacher survey were related to an independent measure of preparedness (the summary judgement) in expected ways.

Table 8. Correlation of Ratings of Mentors/Administrators

		Learner and Learning	Content Knowledge	Instructional Practice	Professional Responsibility
2016-2017	Overall, Well-Prepared Spearman Correlation n=315	.80	.79	.79	.81

⁸ Spearman’s rank correlation coefficients range from -1.0 to +1.0. The higher the magnitude of the coefficient, the stronger the monotonic relationship between the two sets of scores. Positive correlation coefficients indicate that an increase in one variable is associated with an increase in the second variable. Negative correlation coefficients indicate that an increase in one variables is associated with a decrease in the second variable.

Table 9. Correlation of Self-Ratings of First Year Teachers

		Learner and Learning	Content Knowledge	Instructional Practice	Professional Responsibility
2015-2016	Overall, Well-Prepared Spearman Correlation n=1066	.64	.63	.64	.58
2016-2017	Overall, Well-Prepared Spearman Correlation n=718	.74	.74	.76	.68

Consequential Evidence of Survey Validity

The consequential aspect of score validity can be assessed in light of the legitimate need for, and the meaningfulness of, information conveyed by survey scores. A variety of State agencies have a legitimate need for information about teacher preparedness, including the OSDE and the OEQA. Each of these agencies is concerned about teacher effectiveness and school accountability. EPPs also have a legitimate need for information about teacher preparedness, given their commitment to continual improvement of their teacher preparation programs.

Evidence that the surveys produce meaningful information can be found throughout this report in discussions of the other five inter-related facets of validity. Additionally, procedures around data collection and use further support consequential validity in several ways. First, EPPs receive survey results in a timely manner. The surveys are administered by OEQA each spring and data are made available to EPPs within one month of the close of data collection. Second, results are shared with EPPs as summary reports, but also at the item level. This allows EPPs to assess program strengths and opportunities for improvement in highly specific aspects of teacher effectiveness. Finally, data are shared with EPPs in raw form as well as report form. This allows EPPs to calculate scale scores for InTASC domains or manipulate the data in other ways to facilitate program assessment and continuous improvement.

Conclusion

The scope and strength of the evidence for the different facets of validity presented herein is variable, but consistently positive. Taken as a whole, the empirical evidence and theoretical rationales presented in this report suggest that users of the Mentor/Administrator and First Year Teacher surveys can feel confident that survey scores convey meaningful information about teacher preparedness and that inferences made about teacher preparedness on the basis of item and scale scores are valid.

References

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation. (2016, March). *Accreditation Handbook, Version III: Appendix G – Assessment rubric for EPP-created assessments used in accreditation*. <http://caepnet.org/~media/Files/caep/knowledge-center/appendixgmarch2016-1-1.pdf>

Council of Chief State School Officers. (2011, April). Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) Model Core. Teaching Standards: A Resource for State Dialogue. <https://www.ccsso.org/resource-library/intasc-model-core-teaching-standards-and-learning-progressions-teachers-10>

Messick, S. (1989). Validity. In R. L. Linn (Ed.), *Educational Measurement* (3rd ed., pp. 13-103). New York: Macmillan.

Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Appendix A: Items on the OEQA Mentor/Administrator Survey

This survey is designed to seek input regarding first year teachers' preparation for entering the classroom. Your responses will be used to improve educator preparation in the state of Oklahoma.

The person completing the survey is:

- Administrator/mentor to a first-year teacher
 Teacher/mentor to a first-year teacher

For each statement, please indicate your level of agreement using the scale provided (1-strongly disagree to 6-strongly agree) for the first-year teacher you are mentoring.

InTASC Domain 1: The Learner and Learning

1. The teacher understands how learners grow and develop.
2. The teacher recognizes that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas.
3. The teacher designs and implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences.
4. The teacher uses understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards.
5. The teacher works with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning.
6. The teacher encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

InTASC Domain 2: Content

7. The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches.
8. The teacher creates learning experiences that make the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assure mastery of the content.
9. The teacher understands how to connect concepts to each other and to authentic local and global issues.
10. The teacher knows how to use differing perspectives to engage learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving.

InTASC Domain 3: Instructional Practice

11. The teacher understands and uses multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth and guide learners' decision making.
12. The teacher understands and uses multiple methods of assessment to monitor learner progress and to guide his/her decision making.

13. The teacher plans instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy.
14. The teacher plans instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of learners and the community context.
15. The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways.

Technology Integration

16. The teacher integrates available technology effectively and appropriately into instruction.

InTASC Domain 4: Professional Responsibility

17. The teacher engages in ongoing professional learning and uses evidence to continually evaluate his/her practice, particularly the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (learners, families, other professionals, and the community).
18. The teacher engages in ongoing professional learning and uses evidence to continually adapt practice to meet the needs of each learner.
19. The teacher seeks appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to take responsibility for student learning.
20. The teacher seeks appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, other school professionals, and community members to ensure learner growth.
21. The teacher seeks appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to advance the profession.

Other Items

This survey is designed to measure how well educator preparation programs are preparing teachers for the classroom. Overall, how would you rate the preparedness of the teacher? (1-very unprepared to 6-very prepared)

What are your recommendations for strengthening the teacher's preparation? (open ended)

The teacher received his/her license via:

- Traditional route
- Alternative route (State Department of education alternative placement program)
- Troops to teachers
- Paraprofessional
- Teach for America
- ABCTE
- Emergency certification

The teacher received his/her degree at which of the following institutions? (Menu of EPPs in Oklahoma)

Appendix B: Items on the OEQA First Year Teacher Survey

This survey is designed to seek input regarding teachers' preparation for entering the classroom. Your responses will be used to improve educator preparation in the state of Oklahoma.

Is the person completing this survey a first-year teacher?

- I am a first-year teacher
- I am not a first-year teacher

Through which route did you receive your teaching license?

- Traditional route
- Alternative route (State Department of education alternative placement program)
- Troops to teachers
- Paraprofessional
- Teach for America
- ABCTE
- Emergency certification

For each statement, please indicate your level of agreement using the scale provided. (1-strongly disagree to 6-strongly agree)

InTASC Domain 1: The Learner and Learning

My educator preparation program prepared me to:

1. understand how learners grow and develop.
2. recognize that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas.
3. design and implement developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences.
4. use understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards.
5. work with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning.
6. encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

InTASC Domain 2: Content

My educator preparation program prepared me to:

7. understand the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches.
8. create learning experiences that make the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assure mastery of the content.
9. understand how to connect concepts to each other and to authentic local and global issues.
10. know how to use differing perspectives to engage learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving.

InTASC Domain 3: Instructional Practice

My educator preparation program prepared me to:

11. understand and use multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth and guide learners' decision making.
12. understand and use multiple methods of assessment to monitor learner progress and to guide my decision making.
13. plan instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy.
14. plan instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of learners and the community context.
15. understand and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways.

Technology Integration

My educator preparation program prepared me to:

16. integrate available technology effectively and appropriately into instruction.

Category 4: Professional Responsibility

My educator preparation program prepared me to:

17. engage in ongoing professional learning and uses evidence to continually evaluate his/her practice, particularly the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (learners, families, other professionals, and the community).
18. engage in ongoing professional learning and use evidence to continually adapt practice to meet the needs of each learner.
19. seek appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to take responsibility for student learning.
20. seek appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, other school professionals, and community members to ensure learner growth.

Overall Rating

Overall, I feel I was well-prepared. (1-strongly disagree to 6-strongly agree)

Other Items

Were any of your educator preparation courses delivered in a P12 classroom? (Y/N)

Was your student teaching experience based on a co-teaching/student teaching model (e.g. St. Cloud University Model)? (Y/N)

What courses or experiences in your teacher education program stand out as particularly important or meaningful? Explain. (open ended response)

Given the challenges you have faced as a classroom teacher, in what area(s) could you have used more preparation? (open ended response)

Please note awards or honors received, degrees or certificates earned, and other recognitions from the current school year. (open ended response)

Were you assigned a mentor from your school district this school year? (Y/N)

Please indicate the number of contact hours with your mentor teacher.

- 1 or more hours per week
- 1-3 hours per week
- 4-7 hours per week
- I did not have a mentor

Is your mentor in your same teaching area? (Y/N)

How satisfied are you with your mentoring experience? (1-very dissatisfied to 6-very satisfied)

How can the mentoring experience be improved? (open ended response)

In what area(s) were you initially certified? (Please check all that apply.)

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Elementary Educ | <input type="checkbox"/> Instr/Vocal Music | <input type="checkbox"/> Speech/Drama/ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Early Childhood | <input type="checkbox"/> Physical Education/ | <input type="checkbox"/> Debate |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Special Education | <input type="checkbox"/> Health/Safety | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Educ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Foreign Language | <input type="checkbox"/> Art | <input type="checkbox"/> Library Media |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Math | <input type="checkbox"/> Business Education | <input type="checkbox"/> Specialist |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Science | <input type="checkbox"/> Gifted Education | <input type="checkbox"/> School Counselor |
| <input type="checkbox"/> English | <input type="checkbox"/> Family & Consumer | <input type="checkbox"/> Reading Specialist |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Social Studies | <input type="checkbox"/> Sciences | <input type="checkbox"/> Gifted & Talented |

What is your current primary teaching assignment? (Please choose at least one of the following, you may choose more than one option.)

	PreK	Grade 1-3	Grade 4-6	Grade 7-9	Grade 10-12
Agriculture Education					
Art					
Business Education					
Early Childhood					
Elementary Education					
English					
Family & Consumer Sciences					
Foreign Language					
Gifted & Talented					
Gifted Education					
Instrumental/Vocal Music					
Library Media Specialist					
Math					
Physical Education/Health/Safety					
Reading Specialist					
School Counselor					
Science					
Social Studies					
Special Education					
Speech/Drama/Debate					

In what additional area(s) are you certified? (Please check all that apply.)

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Elementary Educ | <input type="checkbox"/> Instr/Vocal Music | <input type="checkbox"/> Speech/Drama/Debate |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Early Childhood | <input type="checkbox"/> Physical Education/Health/Safety | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Educ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Special Education | <input type="checkbox"/> Art | <input type="checkbox"/> Library Media Specialist |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Foreign Language | <input type="checkbox"/> Business Education | <input type="checkbox"/> School Counselor |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Math | <input type="checkbox"/> Gifted Education | <input type="checkbox"/> Reading Specialist |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Science | <input type="checkbox"/> Family & Consumer Sciences | <input type="checkbox"/> Gifted & Talented |
| <input type="checkbox"/> English | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Social Studies | | |

In which other roles do you currently participate?

- Team Leader
- Instructional Coach
- Mentor
- Student Organization Sponsor
- Coach

Do you teach in a Title I school? (Y/N)

Which of the following describes your school district?

- Rural
- Urban
- Suburban

From which institution did you receive recommendation for teacher certification? (If you hold an alternative or emergency certificate please select the Oklahoma State Department of Education.)

Menu of EPPs in Oklahoma

Did you participate in any high school programs and/or classes that influenced your decision to become a teacher? (Y/N)

If yes, please describe. i.e. Future Educators of America/Educators Rising, Teacher Cadet, etc. (open ended response)

Appendix C: How to calculate scale scores for InTASC Domains

Subscale scores that correspond to the four InTASC domains are created by calculating the mean score for the group of items comprising each domain, as noted below.

Mentor/Administrator Survey

The Learner and Learning = mean (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)

Content = mean (7, 8, 9, 10)

Instructional Practice = mean (11, 12, 13, 14, 15)

Professional Responsibility = mean (17, 18, 19, 20, 21)

Note. Item 16 measures technology integration

First Year Teacher Survey

The Learner and Learning = mean (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)

Content = mean (7, 8, 9, 10)

Instructional Practice = mean (11, 12, 13, 14, 15)

Professional Responsibility = mean (17, 18, 19, 20)

Note. Item 16 measures technology integration