

Cooperating Teacher Survey: Additional Items Administered at Midterm to Share Data Results & Collect Key Stakeholder Feedback (CAEP R5.3)

Fall 2022 Data Analysis (N = 47)

Art Education (BSED)
Music - Secondary Ed (BMED)
Secondary Education - History and Social Studies (BSED)
Secondary Education- English (BSED)
Secondary Education - Mathematics (BSED)
Secondary Education - Science (BSED)
Secondary Education - Spanish (BSED)
Secondary Education - Physical Education (BSED)

Strengths

Cooperating Teachers were asked if they had additional comments regarding strengths their student teacher demonstrated. Thirty-two respondents identified specific strengths. The strengths listed below represent those mentioned most frequently.

- Professionalism
- Strong lesson planning
- Building a rapport with students

Areas for Improvement

Cooperating Teachers were asked if they had additional comments regarding observed areas for improvement for their student teacher. Twenty-one respondents offered specific comments in this section. The areas for improvement listed below represent those mentioned most frequently.

- Classroom Management

Recommendations

Cooperating Teachers were asked if they had any recommendations regarding how student teaching expectations or required assignments/assessments could be strengthened. Fifteen respondents offered comments. The comments listed below represent the recommendations mentioned most frequently.

- Classroom management
- More fieldwork experience before student teaching
- CWS assignment expectations unclear

Quantitative Data

The majority of respondents from all programs marked 3 (*Agree/Appropriate/Satisfied*) or 4 (*Strongly agree/Very Appropriate/Very Satisfied*) on all sections of the survey. Data are supplied if more than 10% of respondents marked the following categories: 3 (*Disagree/Inappropriate/Dissatisfied*), 4 (*Strongly Disagree/Very Inappropriate/Very Dissatisfied*), or 5 (*Not observed/Applicable*). While no single category on the survey received a 10% on these categories, the following three areas did indicate overall concern with lesson design.

- 8.5% of respondents selected Not Observed/Applicable for “Developed effective Instructional Plans that demonstrated appropriate lesson structure and pacing” (InTASC Standards 7 & 8)
- 8.5% of respondents selected Not Observed/Applicable for “Used assessment results to inform instructional decisions” (InTASC Standards 6 & 7)
- 8.5% of respondents selected Not Observed/Applicable for “Designed instruction to teach analytical, practical, creative, and/or research-based thinking” (InTASC Standard 8)

Sufficient Depth, Breadth and Coherence of Student Teaching Requirements

Respondents were asked to rate their observations of their student teacher’s knowledge and skills for various items aligned to professional teaching standards, and responses were requested on a Likert

scale from 1 (*Very Inappropriate*) to 4 (*Very Appropriate*). The items asked if candidates had “Sufficient depth to support independent teaching after completion of student teaching (post-graduation)”; “Sufficient breadth to support independent teaching after completion of student teaching (post-graduation)”; and “Sufficient coherence between coursework expectations to allow for demonstration of expected practice in student teaching.” No items were marked at 10% or higher.

Satisfaction with Cooperating Teacher Preparation and Training Materials

Respondents were asked to rate their level of satisfaction with the preparation and training materials provided to them. The scale ranged from 1 (*Very Dissatisfied*) to 4 (*Very Satisfied*) with another option for 5 (*Not Received/Completed*). The following data highlights the sections in which approximately 10% of respondents marked *Not Received/Completed*, *Very Dissatisfied*, or *Dissatisfied*:

- 8.5% of respondents marked *Not Received/Completed* for “Online, self-paced trainings on the PEP website on topics such as Quality-Mentoring, Communicating with Teacher Candidates, Assessment, Cooperating Teacher Roles & Responsibilities, and Overview of the Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument”