

Perception Surveys

Data Dashboard Protocol



Data Overview



Essential Question

- Do school leadership and our candidates perceive that they are prepared to meet the needs of all their students?



Dashboard Pages

- Novice Teacher Perceptions:
 - Summary
 - By Construct
 - By Question
 - By Candidate
- Principal Perceptions:
 - Summary
 - By Construct
 - By Question
 - By Candidate



Data Description

Perception of teacher candidates and principals regarding readiness to teach, by sub-populations (e.g., race/ethnicity, content exam, certification route, gender, etc.), by teaching construct, question, and individual candidate, and disaggregated by admission cohort/academic year comparable to the state averages.

Protocol Description



Recommended Participants

- EPP Leadership (Dean, Directors, Department Chairs, Data Lead)
- Certification Officer
- Faculty/Field Supervisors
- Course Leaders and/or Instructors
- Technical Assistance Provider Staff
- District and/or Campus Leaders



Recommended Time

90-120 minutes



Examples of How this Dashboard's Data Could be Leveraged

- Insights into the perceived readiness to teach of candidates, from candidates themselves and campus-level principals both in aggregate and on the individual level
- Inform EPPs about the perceived strength and alignment between the EPP and LEA partners
- Identify trends and outliers regarding stakeholders' perception of preparedness to teach by teaching construct and each individual question

Protocol: Perception Surveys Dashboard

Frame > Describe > Plan



Frame

Occurs before reviewing the data to orient stakeholders and focus the analysis.



Guiding Questions (discuss and answer all that are applicable)

- What are we trying to understand and do from these data?
- What do you expect to see in the data (are there any assumptions or biases that need to be named)?
- What decisions can this data help us make?



Example:

We want to understand what the perception of novice teachers and campus principals are about the readiness of the candidates to teach in order to identify trends and outliers.

We expect that an overwhelming percentage of our candidates and the campus-level principals describe that candidates are “well prepared” or “sufficiently prepared” across all constructs on the perception survey instrument. This is especially true for our candidates’ readiness to teach students with disabilities and students identified as English Language Learners (ELLs), as these are focus areas/specialties of the program in which candidates take additional courses/concepts that are interwoven across all coursework. We expect our elementary program candidates to report higher levels of preparedness to teach, as the program has been in existence longer and has more frequent partnership meetings with the candidate student teaching/internship placement PK-12 campus staff.

These insights can then be used to inform the continuous improvement of candidate readiness and the strength of partnerships with LEAs. This includes identifying and implementing specific strategies or approaches that increase confidence in each candidates’ ability to teach.

Your framing...

Protocol: Perception Surveys Dashboard

Frame > Describe > Plan



Describe

Occurs during the review of data to make meaning of the data and support decision making.



Guiding Questions (discuss and answer all that are applicable)

- What do you see in the data?
- Are there trends, outliers, correlations, etc.?
- What does the data suggest?



Example:

In the data a trend that we noticed was that candidates reported lower than expected confidence in their abilities to differentiate instruction to meet the needs of students with disabilities. Additionally, when drilling down to the question level, the principals do not feel confident in candidates' abilities to adequately address the needs of students identified as ELLs by implementing formal and informal assessments for students identified as ELLs to demonstrate their learning, matersing the English Language Proficiency Standards (ELPS). Principals do feel confident in our candidates' abilities to understand and adhere to federal and state laws for both special education students and students identified as ELLs.

When comparing candidates and principals' perception of candidates' "preparedness to implement instruction in the classroom," campus principals report significantly higher levels of preparedness to "use content-specific pedagogy to deliver lessons aligned with state standards" than candidates. Conversely, candidates report significantly higher levels of preparedness to "work with a diverse student population" than principals.

These data suggest:

- *Candidates necessitate more robust and aligned development in supporting PK-12 students with disabilities and English Language Learners,*
- *There exists a need for our educator preparation program and partnering districts to collaborate on the curricular resources (high-quality instructional materials) and instructional approaches (pedagogies) necessary for candidates to be 'prepared to teach,' and*
- *Our educator preparation program must better understand (and have a more complete understanding) of the PK-12 student populations and needs of those students in order to be able to better develop/prepare candidates to teach all PK-12 students.*

Your description...

Protocol: Perception Surveys Dashboard

Frame > Describe > Plan



Plan

Occurs after the analysis of the data, resulting in a codified plan with actions that support continuous improvement.



Guiding Questions (discuss and answer all that are applicable)

- Based on this data, what should we do next?
- What are the specifics (timelines, resources, limitations. etc.) of our plan?
- How will we ensure the plan is effective? How will we know if/when it is effective?
- How will we share the results (both the plan and the outcomes of the plan) with stakeholders?



Example:

In order to better prepare candidates to support all PK-12 students, in particular students with disabilities and students identified as ELLs, our program leads will:

- *Better understand the needs of our PK-12 partners by implementing quarterly partnership meeting with each campus,*
- *During the summer term, we will explicitly label interventions and approaches for students with disabilities, students identified as ELLs, and all other special populations, in both coursework (course goals and signature assignments) and the clinical experience/internship (observing and coaching),*
- *During the summer fall term we will examine our own performance gates to: 1) Ensure alignment, 2) Compare and/or confirm the trends re: perception v. our own performance measures, and 3) Identify more robust performance gates/ measures, and 4) Consider the approaches that support a candidates' ability to demonstrate proficiency on the performance gates*

The program leads will meet quarterly to examine progress against the goals stated above, monitoring and adjusting as necessary.

We will know this plan has been effective when candidates are both meeting the performance gates (e.g. instructional performance on T-TESS, signature assignment) and candidates/principals are reporting higher levels of perception about readiness to teach. We have set the following goals regarding point increases, by construct, for both candidates and principals:

Candidates		
Construct	Current Mean	Goal Mean
Instruction	2.29	2.6
Students with Disabilities	2.28	2.4
English Language Learners	2.20	2.35

Principals		
Construct	Current Mean	Goal Mean
Instruction	2.42	2.7
Students with Disabilities	2.18	2.35
English Language Learners	2.04	2.35

The current data and plan will be shared with all staff and faculty during our 'Fall Launch.' The leads will provide an update after each quarterly meeting, culminating in a sharing of the results after the first year during the subsequent year's 'Fall Launch.'

Your plan...