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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report is designed to provide information related to the effectiveness of teacher preparation programs in Florida by focusing on the early professional experiences of teachers who had completed three types of programs: Initial Teacher Preparation programs (ITPs), District Alternative Certification programs (DACPs), and Educator Preparation Institutes (EPIs).

Program completers were surveyed via the web and asked about their backgrounds, their teacher preparation programs, and the professional support they have received in their schools. Principals were surveyed regarding the competence and performance of these teachers, and their readiness for the teaching profession. Peer mentors who work with beginning (and other) teachers were surveyed to find out about their professional background and about the quality of their mentoring experience.

The report is an analysis of the responses from 2,255 teachers, 659 principals, and 1,533 mentors. We also use comparable data from six previous years to examine trends over time and between program types. The analysis includes elements that are common to all ITP, DACP and EPI teachers alike – their backgrounds, current job placement, and workplace experiences, as well as elements unique to the different teacher preparation programs. The teachers also were asked about the effectiveness of their respective programs. We also present a qualitative analysis of teachers’ recommendations for program improvement, in their own words.

Acknowledging that teachers do not become thoroughly professionalized as a result of their initial training, we include a detailed study of workplace support structures in place for new teachers: teacher induction programs, peer mentors, administrators, other teachers, and other school climate factors. We also see whether the quality of school climate is associated with various outcomes, including teachers’ sense of efficacy and their plans to stay in the profession.

There is also an analysis of the factors teachers consider important when searching for their first job. Understanding employment preferences will better help policymakers find ways to hire teachers in hard-to-staff or inner-city schools, by adapting assignments to take advantage of the likes and dislikes of teachers. A related section discusses the outreach and recruitment efforts of DACPs and EPIs.

We end the report with findings and recommendations for program maintenance and improvement. In the Appendices, we include additional information about pathways to certification, the definitions of the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices, and copies of the web-based survey instruments.

The FLDOE canvassed all school districts prior to distributing the teacher survey this year, specifically seeking to determine 1) whether districts required district-level approval prior to DOE distributing surveys to teachers, principals, and mentors; 2) whether DOE was permitted to distribute the surveys directly to respondents, or whether the district itself would distribute surveys; and 3) whether there were particular dates or weeks when they preferred the surveys to be administered or preferred not to have the surveys administered.
A modified approach to increasing response rates was implemented this year. In all but ten school districts, surveys were administered directly by the evaluation team to teachers and principals. In these other ten districts, the web-based surveys were distributed by district professional development coordinators and district alternative certification program coordinators. (In smaller counties, these jobs may be performed by the same individual.) District contacts were sent the list of 2007-08 completers of all three teacher preparation programs – and their supervising school principals per FLDOE data.

The following is a summary of the most important conclusions and recommendations from the report.

**Conclusions**

1. **Expansion of the Teaching Labor Pool**

The demographic profile of the population of 2007-08 program completers who were teaching in the schools confirms that the state’s efforts to expand the teaching labor pool have succeeded in many ways:

There were higher percentages of male teachers among DACP (31.8 %) and EPI completers (27.5%) than in ITP programs (10.5 %). Alternative certification programs attracted older teachers as a percent of their completers than ITP programs. Over sixty-seven percent of the recent DACP completers teaching in Florida public schools were over 30 years old, compared to only 32.4 percent of ITP completers, and 76.8 percent of EPI completers were over 30 years old.

2. **Critical Shortage Areas**

The teaching assignments of program completers show that Florida continues to succeed in addressing critical shortage areas through alternative preparation programs. The largest teacher shortages in Florida and nationally are in middle and high schools. Completers of DACPs and EPIs are more likely to be assigned to critical areas in the secondary schools and are more likely to teach in those subject areas of greatest need. Nearly 70 percent (69.2%) of DACP completers were teaching at the secondary level, as were 55.6 percent of EPI completers. These rates are significantly higher than ITP completers, among whom fewer than one in four (24.6%) were assigned to secondary schools.

3. **Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (FEAPs)**

The FEAPs are the common set of competencies in all of Florida’s teacher preparation programs. Overall, the results indicate that the FEAPs serve as a common language and set of expectations for inservice teachers in addition to their role as competency criteria. Survey results show that a new teacher’s competency in the FEAPs mirrors his or her principal’s expectations for performance and serves as a good predictor of whether that individual will meet criteria for re-employment.

4. **Teacher Level of Preparedness**
Teachers, their principals and their peer mentors who responded to the survey all reported high levels of satisfaction with the level of preparedness of teachers from all program types, responding with favorable ratings on both teachers’ competency levels and eligibility for rehire.

5. Peer Mentoring and Induction Support

Most teachers placed a high value on structured support programs and on peer mentoring as contributing to their professional development. Around three out of four teachers participated in a formal induction program, with most rating their programs as overall “effective” or “very effective.” Over 75 percent of ITP, 82 percent of DACP, and 85 percent of EPI respondents had been assigned a peer mentor in their first year of teaching. Nearly 80 percent reported that their peer mentor was at least “somewhat important” to “very important” in their professional development.

6. Teacher Recruitment and Retention

Educators searching for their first teaching position placed most importance on the geographic location of the school. This was the same finding as in last year’s study. The finding that was most different between the two studies was the importance teachers placed on the teaching assignment being offered. In last year’s study, appropriateness of teaching assignment – teaching in the area one is certified in -- was the second most important factor in deciding where to teach. However, in the current study, teaching assignment was among the least important factors. This shift may reflect the current economic environment in which school districts have sustained severe budget cuts, leading to a smaller demand for teachers. Thus, teachers may be more willing to accept a position teaching out-of-field.

Teachers seeking employment also considered the reputation of the school as being a safe place to work, and administrative and leadership styles. They cared about the timeliness of the job offer and opportunities for professional development. Also important to many teachers were the people they met during their job interview. School climate and professional support mechanisms have been shown to be critical in teacher retention. These results point out that the same factors are important in recruiting teachers.

7. Preparation for the Classroom

In last year’s study, there was more concern expressed by teachers who felt unprepared for diversity in the classroom. Teachers who received adequate preparation in ESE and ESOL were thankful that they did. Teachers who did not feel prepared for diverse classrooms faulted their teacher preparation programs for the deficiency, and some faulted their school districts. This year, however, this theme hardly appeared at all in the data.
Recommendations

The following are recommendations from the analysis of quantitative and qualitative data.

1. The DOE should conduct an independent study that determines whether student achievement is affected by the route their teachers took to certification.

   Such a study should be an extension of the current research on the value added by different teacher preparation programs. A recent study was conducted on the effect of ABCTE certification of student achievement. DOE should contract such a study that would estimate the effects of ITP, DACP, and EPI certification on student achievement in math and reading.

2. Continue to use and improve the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (FEAPs) as the core standards for teacher professional performance.

   The FEAPs provide all teachers, teacher educators, and employers with a common set of expectations for teacher instructional performance. In order to keep the FEAPs current and relevant, they should be placed on a regular review cycle (like the Sunshine State Standards).

3. The FLDOE should provide the data from this report on a regular basis to colleges and universities that are training teachers in Florida.

   Results from this report will help institutions of higher education continue to monitor their own performance and receive feedback from their completers as required in Florida Statutes. Such use of data for continuous improvement purposes should allow the FLDOE and teacher training programs to streamline the continued approval process for all types of teacher preparation programs.
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Teachers from Florida Educator Preparation Programs

Introduction

The Report

This report is designed to provide information related to the effectiveness of teacher preparation programs in Florida by focusing on the early professional experiences of teachers who had completed three types of programs: Initial Teacher Preparation programs (ITPs), District Alternative Certification programs (DACPs), and Educator Preparation Institutes (EPIs).

Section 1004.04(5), Florida Statutes, authorizes ITPs and requires that:

[By] January 1 of each year, the Department of Education shall report … information for each postsecondary educational institution that has state-approved programs of teacher education to the Governor, the State Board of Education, the Commissioner of Education, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, all Florida postsecondary teacher preparation programs, and interested members of the public.

Additionally, Section 1004.85, Florida Statutes, authorizing EPIs, and Rule 6A-5.066, F.A.C., which implements approval processes for all types of teacher preparation programs, require that continued approval of teacher preparation programs of each type be based in part on the satisfaction of program completers and their subsequent school district employers with the level of preparedness for teaching provided by their respective programs. This report is published in fulfillment of Section 1004.04, F.S., requirements. It is also provided to assist all institutions with approved programs in meeting their continued approval requirements in the area of completer and employer satisfaction, by annually providing high-level, statewide data in these performance areas that lead institutions to do further and more in-depth study.

Program completers were surveyed via the web and asked about their backgrounds, their teacher preparation programs, and the professional support they have received in their schools. Principals were surveyed regarding the competence and performance of these teachers, and their readiness for the teaching profession. Peer mentors who work with beginning (and other) teachers were surveyed to find out about their professional background and about the quality of their mentoring experience.

The report is an analysis of the responses from 2,255 teachers, 659 principals, and 1,533 mentors. We also use comparable data from five previous years to examine trends over time and between program types. The analysis includes elements that are common to all ITP, DACP and EPI teachers alike – their backgrounds, current job placement, and workplace experiences. The teachers also were asked about the effectiveness of their respective programs. We present an analysis of teachers’ recommendations for program improvement in their own words.

A supportive and collaborative workplace is crucial in retaining highly qualified teachers. Acknowledging that teachers do not become thoroughly professionalized as a result of their
initial training, we include a detailed study of workplace support structures in place for new teachers: teacher induction programs, peer mentors, administrators, other teachers, and other school climate factors. We also investigate whether the quality of school climate is associated with various outcomes, including teachers’ sense of efficacy and their plans to stay in the profession.

An analysis of the factors teachers consider important when searching for their first job is also conducted. Understanding employment preferences will better help policymakers find ways to hire teachers in hard-to-staff or inner-city schools, by adapting assignments to take advantage of the likes and dislikes of teachers. A related section discusses the outreach and recruitment efforts of DACPs and EPIs.

We end the report with findings and recommendations for program maintenance and improvement. In the Appendices, we include additional information about pathways to certification, the definitions of the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices, and copies of the web-based survey instruments.

Teacher Preparation and Certification in Florida

Florida has a two-tiered certification system, which provides for an individual to begin teaching under a non-renewable Temporary Certificate by demonstrating subject matter knowledge, during which time professional education requirements are completed. The Professional Certificate requires that candidates demonstrate mastery in three areas: general knowledge, subject matter knowledge, and professional preparation and education competence.[1]

In order to increase the pool of eligible individuals in the teaching labor market while maintaining high standards, The Florida Legislature and State Board of Education have provided for multiple types of programs designed to prepare teachers for Florida’s classrooms. These programs are all approved by the Department of Education and are designed to provide candidates from different backgrounds with routes through which they can meet the preparation requirements for issuance of a Florida Professional Educator’s Certificate in the area they wish to teach. These include:

§ Initial Teacher Preparation Programs (s. 1004.04, F.S.)

§ Professional Preparation Programs offered through

- Educator Preparation Institutes (s. 1004.85, F.S.)
- District Alternative Certification Programs (s. 1012.56, F.S.)

Initial teacher preparation programs (ITPs) are those that typically terminate in a bachelor’s or master’s degree in education. However, what distinguishes these program completers from others is that they have completed a program in one or more specific subject area(s) and may qualify for a Professional Certification upon program completion. At the time of this publication, there are 526 initial teacher preparation programs offered by 34 Florida state
universities, independent colleges, and community and state colleges (those authorized to offer bachelor’s degrees).

To enroll in either an Educator Preparation Institute (EPI) or a District Alternative Certification Program (DACP), an individual must already hold a bachelor’s degree. These programs were conceived to help primarily with critical shortage areas in secondary education where a content major in the areas of arts and sciences could be paired with intense pedagogical training to move teachers without delay into the classroom with the tools they need to become effective. These programs are referred to as “alternative certification” programs and are provided through approved EPIs at 28 community and state colleges and 4 state universities, and delivered through approved district alternative certification programs (DACPs) by all of Florida’s school districts.

Because of Florida’s two-tier certification system, many individuals receive their teacher “preparation” during their first years of teaching. Only teachers employed by the school district and who hold a Temporary Certificate may enroll in a district’s alternative certification program. Over half of the completers in EPIs are currently employed teachers, and a large number of individuals enrolled in ITP programs have completed one or more years of teaching at the time of completion. Therefore, Florida’s teacher preparation programs not only contribute potential new teachers to fill vacancies in Florida, but they also respond to the needs of early career teachers by providing them the means to complete their teacher preparation and retaining them in the classroom while they work toward earning a Florida Professional Certificate.

Demographic Characteristics of Program Completers

Analysis of age, gender and race/ethnicity are based on the actual number of individuals employed as teachers during the 2008-09 school year who completed ITPs, DACPs, and EPIs during the 2007-08 school year. We refer to these data as population data. Other findings in the report are based on samples of those teachers or on previous samples across time. These are referred to as sample data.

The demographic profile of the population confirms that the state’s efforts to expand the teaching labor pool have succeeded in many ways (see Table 1). There were higher percentages of male teachers among DACP (31.8%) and EPI completers (27.5%) than in ITP programs (10.5%) among 2007-2008 completers. The differences in gender representation have remained stable over time. Sample data from previous studies show that between 25 and 40 percent of DACP completers and participants between 2004 and 2008 were male; between 10 and 20 percent of ITP completers between 2005 and 2008 were male.

Table 1 (Population Data)
Gender of Teachers by Preparation Program Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>ITP N</th>
<th>ITP Percent</th>
<th>DACP N</th>
<th>DACP Percent</th>
<th>EPI N</th>
<th>EPI Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2877</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>1007</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>72.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3215</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1476</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alternative certification programs also attracted older teachers as a percentage of their completers than more traditional college-based programs. Nearly seventy percent of the recent DACP completers teaching in Florida public schools were over 30 years old, compared to only 33 percent of ITP completers. EPI completers were even older than DACP completers: nearly 80 percent were over 30 years old. This early cohort of EPI completers, then, does not appear to be recent college graduates using the EPI as an alternative to majoring in education (see Table 2).

**Table 2 (Population Data)**
Age of Teachers by Preparation Program Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>ITP N</th>
<th>ITP Percent</th>
<th>DACP N</th>
<th>DACP Percent</th>
<th>EPI N</th>
<th>EPI Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>2173</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3215</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1476</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are not consistent racial/ethnic differences between teachers who have followed different routes to certification (see Table 3). In particular, the alternative routes did not attract significantly greater representation from minority groups. Percentages of black completers are somewhat higher in DACP programs (20.3%) than ITP (11.6%). However, blacks comprise only 12.3% of EPI completers. There were a higher proportion of Hispanic completers in ITP programs (14.1%) than in DACP (12.3%) or EPI programs (9.1%). These differences in racial/ethnic representation have remained fairly constant over time for ITP and DACP completers.

**Table 3 (Population Data)**
Race of Teachers by Preparation Program Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>ITP N</th>
<th>ITP Percent</th>
<th>DACP N</th>
<th>DACP Percent</th>
<th>EPI N</th>
<th>EPI Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>2345</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>74.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3215</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1476</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grade Level Placement of Program Completers**

The teaching assignments of program completers show that Florida is succeeding in addressing critical shortage areas through alternative training programs. Teaching assignments of ITP and
EPI completers differed substantially from DACP completers. Most ITP completers (74.2%) and nearly half of EPI completers (43.2%) were assigned to grades K-5 in contrast to 30.3 percent of DACP completers. The largest teacher shortages in Florida and nationally are in middle and high schools. Over two-thirds (69.2%) of DACP completers were teaching at the secondary level (grades 6-12) and over half (55.6%) of EPI completers. These rates are significantly higher than ITP completers, among whom fewer than 24.6 percent were assigned to secondary schools (see Table 4).

Grade assignment of DACP and ITP completers has remained stable over the study period, thus helping to mitigate critical shortages of secondary subject matter teachers, and succeeding at the mission for which the program was designed. For all six study years, the percent of DACP completers teaching in middle and high schools was between 60 and 81 percent, and ITP completers varied between 20 and 35 percent over the last four years (see Figure 1). In the three years of data for EPI completers, the percentage assigned to secondary schools has risen from just over 20 percent to well over half the completers.

Table 4 (Population Data)
Grade Level Taught by Beginning Teachers by Preparation Program Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>ITP N</th>
<th>ITP Percent</th>
<th>DACP N</th>
<th>DACP Percent</th>
<th>EPI N</th>
<th>EPI Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre K</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K to 5</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 8</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 to 12</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2599</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1188</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Teacher Sample Data. Percent of program completers who are teaching secondary school over time by program type. For DACP the percent per year is as follows: 80.3% for 2004, 74% for 2005, 68.1% for 2006, 74% for 2007, 69.1% for 2008, and 64.6% for 2009. For ITP the percent per year is as follows: 26.9% for 2005, 27.7% for 2006, 31% for 2007, 27.2% for 2008, 31.2% for 2009. For EPI the percent per year is as follows: 27.8% for 2007, 49% for 2008, and 57.8% for 2009.

Subject Area Placement of Program Completers Compared by Program Type

Similar to the differences in grade level assignments, the subject area placement of ITP program completers differed significantly from DACP and EPI completers. The infusion of completers of alternative certification programs into the teaching force has helped staff classrooms in critical need subject areas.

Completers of DACP programs in particular and to a lesser extent EPI completers, are assigned in greater proportions than ITP completers to the areas of greatest shortage (see Table 5). DACP and EPI math completers represented more than three times the percentage of completers of teacher preparation programs. ITP math teachers were only 3.3 percent of completers who were
teaching in the schools, compared with DACP completers (10.8%) and EPI completers (11.6%) who were teaching in the schools.

This difference was similar in the sciences. DACP and EPI science completers represented over three times the percentage of ITP completers. ITP science teachers comprised only 2.8 percent of completers who were teaching in the schools, compared with DACP and (9.5%) and EPI completers (8.6%). There has been stability in subject area assignments over the six-year study period. Teachers responding to previous surveys who were assigned to math and science classes have been a relatively stable percentage, comprising between 12 and 21 percent of DACP respondents.[4]

In previous evaluations, language arts and reading were grouped as one specialty. This year, we separate the two. In the critical need area of reading, alternatively certified teachers represented more than double the rate (nearly 4% for DACP and EPI) of ITP teachers (less than 2%).

On the other hand there is little difference between the three program types in percentage of completers with Exceptional Student Education (ESE) assignments in 2007-08, and the groups have converged over time. However, since neither the DACPs nor EPIs are tailored to the ESE program, there is little reason to predict a substantive difference among program types (see Table 5).

**Table 5 (Population Data)**
Subject Area Placement by Teacher Preparation Program Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>ITP N</th>
<th>ITP Percent</th>
<th>DACP N</th>
<th>DACP Percent</th>
<th>EPI N</th>
<th>EPI Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary integrated</td>
<td>1836</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Arts</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE/Health</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3215</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1476</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Design

Previous Research on Alternative Routes To Educator Certification

As alternative routes to educator certification have proliferated, so has the need to attend to the quality of the teachers who are not trained in traditional programs – i.e., in colleges of education or content area majors (such as Art Education offered in a college of fine arts). States and school districts that have developed non-traditional programs have to a greater or lesser extent developed assessment systems to demonstrate that such teachers have demonstrably the same minimum levels of pedagogic competency and content area knowledge as those trained in Initial Teacher Preparation programs (Feistritzer et al., 2005).

Research into the competency and effectiveness of teachers certified through various routes can be broken down in several categories. First, several studies have examined differences in classroom or student outcomes between teachers through different preparation routes. Some have examined student achievement through standardized tests (e.g., Goldhaber and Brewer, 2000; Darling-Hammond, Berry and Thoreson, 2001). Others have studied levels of teacher preparation in various educator competencies, such as observed classroom skills, or self-reported levels of competency (e.g., Zientek, 2007; Good, McCaslin, Tsang, Zhang, Wiley, Bozack and Hester, 2006).

Research has also focused on the extent to which the availability of preparation programs has broadened the pool of prospective teachers to persons who did not complete a teacher preparation program while in college. Studies have focused on the supply of teachers in math and science, the problem of out-of-field teachers, and placement of alternatively certified teachers in schools with the greatest need (e.g., Shen, 1997; Cohen-Vogel and Smith, 2007). Other studies are reviews of research on non-traditional certification, either exhaustive or pertinent to a specific subject area such as special education (e.g., Zeichner and Schulte, 2001; Rosenberg and Sindelar, 2005).

Thus, studies of teacher competence and effectiveness have used a wide array of outcome measures. In the present study, we will examine differences in teachers’ self-reported competency; and their competency as reported by principals. We will also report on teachers’ ratings of their preparation programs, including components specific to the District Alternative Certification Programs and Educator Preparation Institutes.

A major difficulty in the research on different routes to teacher certification has been the definition of traditional and non-traditional routes. For example, several of the studies cited above used data from the School and Staffing Survey, a national survey conducted by the National Center for Educational Statistics. In the teacher questionnaire, respondents were asked whether they were “alternatively certified,” but there was no definition of the term offered. As a result, teachers judged for themselves whether to consider their certification program traditional or “alternative.” A teacher who completed a Masters of Arts in Teaching (MAT) program at a traditional teacher training institution might well have reported being “alternatively certified,” though such programs are generally grouped with traditional ones.
There is little consensus on what constitutes an “alternative certification” program. Comparisons have been drawn between teachers with “temporary,” “emergency,” “provisional” and “no certification.” It is no wonder that findings are inconsistent, given that the meaning of the term, “non-traditional” generally refers to programs that may be substantially different from state to state and from respondent to respondent.

Since the state of Florida has defined District Alternative Certification Programs (DACPs), and over 70 percent of the districts avail themselves of the state-developed program, there is considerably more specificity in studying Florida DACPs than comparing ACPs (Alternative Certification Programs) across states. Similarly, EPIs are a particular alternate route that is also implemented with some commonality, to the extent that they are post-baccalaureate programs, and are also required to assess potential completers according to the twelve Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (FEAPs). Although there are real advantages to studying certification programs that are similar, the programs are far from uniform in their design and implementation. Legislation that implemented the DACPs and EPIs deliberately left broad license to local school districts and institutions of higher education to offer innovative programs that would appeal to a broad range of college graduates who did not complete a teacher preparation program.

**Instrument Design – Five Instruments**

The data collection instruments were five web-based surveys, one for each category of respondent: three categories of beginning teachers, principal, and classroom mentor. The surveys have been used and modified over the last six years for the teachers completing or participating in the DACPs and for the last four years for ITP program completers. EPI items were added two years ago, and continue to be revised.

The teacher survey included many common items (e.g., demographics, teaching position-related, school climate, effectiveness of their training, self-appraisal of effectiveness, etc.) for all three categories of respondent. It included program-specific items, as well as items designed to capture these new teachers’ perceptions of the support they received from their schools’ principals, colleagues, and mentors. Items were included that related to their prior workforce experience and others that pertained to an older workforce entering teaching. For all completers, items identified the institution or district where they completed their program. This year’s survey again included a set of questions that collected information about the factors that teachers consider when choosing their first school placement. These items provide additional information on teachers’ labor market decision making, and are intended to assist policymakers and practitioners with their efforts to recruit and retain qualified teachers.

The principal surveys included items asking the principal to rate each teacher’s effectiveness in the twelve FEAPs, reading instruction, and preparing students for the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT). One final item asked the principal whether each teacher had met the principal’s criteria for rehiring.

The survey of peer mentors included items related to the frequency of contact with their teacher and their own training, professional credentials and experience. In addition, mentors were asked about their role vis-à-vis the teacher, and their own evaluation of the teacher’s effectiveness.
**Teacher Sample**

In the teacher study the sample was drawn from:

- All teachers who completed an Initial Teacher Preparation (ITP) program in Florida in 2007-08 and employed in Florida public schools in 2008-09;
- All teachers who completed an Educator Preparation Institute (EPI) in Florida in 2007-08 and employed in Florida public schools in 2008-09;
- All teachers who completed a District Alternative Certification Program (DACP) in Florida in 2007-08 and employed in Florida public schools in 2008-09.

The names and occupational details of Florida public school teachers who had completed ITP programs, teachers who had completed EPIs, and teachers who had completed DACPs in 2007-2008 were obtained from the Florida Department of Education. These data comprised the core of a teacher-level data set that included, among other variables, teachers’ current employment status, job assignment, and route to certification.

The school assignment of each of these certified teachers was used to cross-reference the teacher with her/his principal. The data set was then utilized as a master population frame of the principals of all teachers certified in Florida 2007-2008.

Once the population frame was identified, the next step was to determine a sampling fraction in order to draw a sample of the desired size. In many web-based surveys, the sampling fraction is 1.0, signifying that all elements in the population will be included in the sample, since there is no increase in cost for distributing surveys once the instrument is designed and the email list is complete. There are often, however, increased costs during data coding, since certain variables must be coded by hand. Nevertheless, we chose to include the whole population of beginning teachers in the sample, thus turning it into a canvass of the population.

The FLDOE canvassed all school districts prior to distributing the survey this year, specifically seeking to determine 1) whether districts required district-level approval prior to DOE distributing surveys to teachers, principals, and mentors; 2) whether DOE was permitted to distribute the surveys directly to respondents, or whether the district itself would distribute surveys; and 3) whether there were particular dates or weeks when they preferred the surveys to be administered or preferred not to have the surveys administered.

In all but ten school districts, surveys were administered directly by the evaluation team to teachers and principals. In these other ten districts, the web-based surveys were distributed by district professional development coordinators and district alternative certification program coordinators. (In smaller counties, these jobs may be performed by the same individual.) District contacts were sent the list of 2007-08 completers of all three teacher preparation programs – and their supervising school principals per FLDOE data.

There were a total of 2,255 teacher surveys returned: 1035 from ITP program completers; 930 from DACP completers; and 290 from EPI completers.
Principal Sample

The sample of school principals was drawn from the population of all principals with one or more recent program completers on their faculty (i.e., completers of ITP, DACP, and EPI programs in 2007-08).

Principals were asked to evaluate each of these teachers who were currently employed at their schools. The principals’ surveys were pre-populated with the names of the beginning teachers in their schools, and there were additional places for them to list eligible teachers who may not have been included in the list.

Surveys were received from 659 principals. They completed surveys evaluating a total of 1,616 teachers. The number of teachers evaluated by principals varied from one to as high as fourteen teachers. There were 253 principals who completed surveys for only one teacher. The average number of teachers evaluated by each principal was 2.45. The results of the principal surveys will be presented in the section on Analysis of Teacher Competency below.

Mentor Sample

In DACPs, having a peer mentor working with the beginning teacher is a required program component, but most ITP and EPI respondents are also assigned peer mentors. Since there is no comprehensive or centralized list of peer mentors working with beginning teachers, we enlisted the assistance of the DACP district coordinators. We asked them to distribute survey links to all mentors working with any beginning teachers.

In prior years, we had limited the study only to mentors of DACP completers. The expansion to all mentors of beginning teachers has resulted in more than doubling the responses: 2,217 mentors completed surveys in last year’s study, and 1,533 completed the survey this year. Although this is a large number of respondents, the decline from the previous year may be accounted for the fact that many of this year’s mentors already had completed the identical survey last year. Some, no doubt, would choose not to fill it out again.

Calculation of Return Rates

We defined “return rates” as the number of surveys returned divided by the targeted number in the population. We computed two kinds of return rates for principals: one as the percentage of principals returning surveys, and the other as the percentage of teachers rated by principals. Return rates were high for such a broad sample study: overall, 41.7% of teachers responded to the survey. Of these, the return rate was 32.2% for ITP completers, 63.0% for DACP completers, and 40.1% for EPI completers. Surveys were returned by 659 principals, assessing 1,616 teachers. This represented 30.7% of 2,149 targeted principals.

In this case, we do not have a way to estimate the size or direction of the sample bias. However, when we are able to compare the results from the sample with certain known parameters in the population, the validity of other estimates is improved.
In the next section, we will compare the sample with the population on three known parameters: gender, age, and race/ethnicity. We will see that the sample closely resembles the population along these three characteristics.

Sample Statistics and Generalizability

There were 1,035 valid surveys returned from ITP program completers; 930 from DACP completers; and 290 from EPI completers. Where comparable, the estimates in the sample closely approximated the real parameters in the population for all three groups. In the case of ethnicity, percentage estimates were close to those of actual numbers of completers teaching in Florida public schools.

There were only a few significant differences between population and sample parameters. The greatest variation was in the percent of Hispanic respondents (see Figures 2-5). Population parameters were below 20 percent, while Hispanic completers were overrepresented in the DACP and ITP subsamples.

Figure 2 provides a comparison of population and sample data for the percent of teachers who are white. For ITP, the percent of teachers who are white in the population is approximately 70%, and in the sample it is 62.7%. For DACP, the percent of teachers who are white in the population is approximately 65%, and in the sample it is approximately 52.7%. For EPI, the percent of teachers who are white in the population is approximately 74%, and in the sample it is 71.4%.

Figure 3 provides a comparison of population and sample data for the percent of teachers who are black. For ITP, the percent of teachers who are black in the population is approximately 11%, and in the sample it is 12%. For DACP, the percent of teachers who are black in the population is approximately 20%, and in the sample it is approximately 18.5%. For EPI, the percent of teachers who are black in the population is approximately 12%, and in the sample it is 16.0%.

Figure 3 provides a comparison of population and sample data for the percent of teachers who are Hispanic. For ITP, the percent of teachers who are Hispanic in the population is approximately 14%, and in the sample it is 21.9%. For DACP, the percent of teachers who are Hispanic in the population is approximately 13%, and in the sample it is approximately 24.7%. For EPI, the percent of teachers who are Hispanic in the population is approximately 9%, and in the sample it is 9.4%.

Figure 3 provides a comparison of population and sample data for the percent of teachers who are Asian. For ITP, the percent of teachers who are Asian in the population is approximately 2%, and in the sample it is 1.3%. For DACP, the percent of teachers who are Asian in the population is approximately .6%, and in the sample it is approximately 2%. For EPI, the percent of teachers who are Asian in the population is approximately 2%, and in the sample it .3%.
Research Findings: Teachers’ Prior Experience

In the previous sections, we used population data to describe the breakdown of gender, race, age and teaching assignment among program completers. In this section, we turn to findings on the prior job experience of survey respondents.

Prior Experience of Respondents

The teacher survey included two items on the prior work experience of respondents: the first about the teachers’ occupation or profession prior to program completion, the second about their employment status and job held one year prior to beginning teaching. Teachers in the alternative programs do indeed come from a broad array of occupational and professional backgrounds.

DACP and EPI teachers brought a wide range of professional experiences to their teaching. The majority of the respondents came from fields that were not related to education, such as business, health, and technical fields. For example, 22.8 percent of DACP completers working in Florida public schools in 2008-09 reported working in the business sector or “other” fields (25.6%) as their primary occupation prior to teaching. A similar percent of EPI respondents reported working in the business sector (23%) although 53 percent reported working in “other” fields. (see Table 6 and Figures 6-8).

Interestingly, ITP completers indicated that almost half had worked in education and slightly over half had worked in “business” or “other” fields. Although education majors are often thought of as a homogeneous group, being young and inexperienced, we see a picture of many ITP completers having been in the workplace prior to finishing their degrees.

Approximately 25 percent of DACP and 20 percent of EPI respondents came to teaching with education-related work experience, such as teaching in preschools, public schools and private schools, as well as serving as paraprofessionals. Some served in non-teaching roles, and others provided education in non-school settings (see Figures 6-8).

An important finding is that all three types of teacher preparation programs have served as a route to professionalization among persons who had worked in and around education prior to becoming teachers, including paraprofessionals, substitute teachers, child care workers and others. Over the five years of the study, between 21 and 36 percent of DACP respondents classified themselves as working in some area of education one year prior to entering teaching. But it is clear that the ITPs also serve this function, preparing not only students straight out of high school, but many with prior work experience as well.

Table 6 (Teacher Sample Data)
Teachers’ Prior Occupation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>ITP N</th>
<th>ITP Percent</th>
<th>DACP N</th>
<th>DACP Percent</th>
<th>EPI N</th>
<th>EPI Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>ITP N</td>
<td>ITP Percent</td>
<td>DACP N</td>
<td>DACP Percent</td>
<td>EPI N</td>
<td>EPI Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substitute Teacher</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraprofessional</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science or engineering</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay-at-home parent/guardian</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social work</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative staff/secretary</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health-related</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day care worker</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV/Radio news</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine arts</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University/college</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal-related</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1009</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(No response)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6 reports on the activity one year prior to beginning teaching. For DACP completers, n=914, 23% were in business, 25% in education, 4% in health related fields, and 48% in other fields.

Figure 7 reports on the activity one year prior to beginning teaching. For EPI completers, n=283, 23% were in business, 21% in education, 4% in health related fields, and 52% in other fields.

Figure 8 reports on the activity one year prior to beginning teaching. For ITP completers, n=1009, 8% were in business, 45% in education, 3% in health related fields, and 44% in other fields.
The percentage of DACP respondents who reported having been students one year before entering teaching has declined from 19 percent in SY 2003-04 to 11.4 percent in 2008-09, and only 10.0 percent of EPI respondents were students before beginning their programs. Before implementing these non-traditional training programs, there was a concern among some educators that college students might avoid an education major once they knew of alternative routes to teacher certification. However, it does not appear that students are using these opportunities to replace more traditional four-year education degrees, at least not in large numbers as some policymakers had projected (see Table 7).

Table 7 (Teacher Sample Data)
Teachers Activity One Year Prior to Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>ITP N</th>
<th>ITP Percent</th>
<th>DACP N</th>
<th>DACP Percent</th>
<th>EPI N</th>
<th>EPI Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worked full-time</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked part-time</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sought employment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended college or university</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteered</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay-at-home-parent</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Findings: Alternative Certification Programs

District Alternative Certification Program Components

The FLDOE, in collaboration with educators from around the state, identified the program components essential to ensure that Florida’s DACPs prepare high quality teachers. Four crucial components that must occur during the early phases of the program to prepare beginning teachers are survival training (a period of initial preparation prior to entering the classroom that includes classroom management training and curriculum development); mentoring; a pre-assessment of skills and abilities; and an individual learning plan.

We asked district alternative certification program completers whether they had received each component. Survival training, including classroom management training, is usually conducted just before the school year begins. The training is meant to familiarize new teachers with school rules and regulations, to train them in keeping attendance, writing lesson plans, and establishing classroom routines early in the term. Among completers in 2007-08, 82.7% had received classroom management training, an increase over the previous year. Fully 95.4 percent of respondents felt that the training was very useful or somewhat useful, also an increase from the previous year (see Figures 9-10).
Fewer than 60 percent of respondents reported having had a pre-assessment of their skills on the twelve Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (52.1%). This percentage has remained stable over the last five years. Ninety-six percent of respondents who had a professional development plan reported that the IPDP was maintained throughout their program participation (see Figures 11-12).

Figure 9 reports how soon after beginning teaching the teachers received classroom management training, n=877. The percentages for various time periods are reported as follows: 39% before beginning, 14% before one month, 12% between 2 and 3 months, 8% between 3 and 6 months, 9% more than 6 months, and 17% received no training.

Figure 10 reports how useful the DACP training in classroom management skills was to first year teachers, n=720. 61.5% reported it was very useful. 33.9% reported it was somewhat useful. 4.6% reported it was not very useful.

Figure 11 reports whether or not an individual professional development plan was developed for the teacher. 52% reported yes and 48% reported no.

Figure 12 reports whether the individual professional development plan was maintained for the teacher throughout his or her program participation. 96% reported yes, 4% reported no.
Teachers’ Comments and Recommendations about Their Training Programs

Teachers were asked to offer comments and recommendations on their training programs. Comments were offered by 280 ITP program completers, 399 DACP completers, and 129 EPI completers. This represented 27.1 percent of ITP respondents, 43.0 percent of DACP respondents, and 44.8 percent of EPI respondents. We will discuss this year's teacher comments in comparison with those in last year's evaluation study.

In this year's methodology, open-ended responses were first reviewed, and coders generated categories common across surveys. Categories were also generated a priori, as a result of those found in prior years' evaluations. Comments from teachers about their preparation programs were overwhelmingly positive overall. Although we lack quantitative comparison, this year's respondents seemed even more positive about their programs than were last year's respondents.

Overall program quality and relevance

Among 10 themes identified, 3 expressed a general positive appraisal of the program. One theme, which we called "the program was a positive and beneficial experience," was identified by nearly 400 of the 808 respondents who offered comments. The negative version of the code, (the program was not a positive nor beneficial experience) was offered by only 82, or 10 percent of responders to this item. One ITP was succinct in the credit he gave his teacher preparation program:

The experience was very rewarding in many ways. It shaped my philosophy on education and gave me a solid foundation of pedagogy to help me make crucial decisions about curriculum, instruction, and lesson plans. [ITP completer]

The EPI was perfect for me. Class times were workable around my job and family. Teachers had practical experience to share. Information about classroom techniques, student development and educational theory was exactly what I wanted to learn. [EPI completer]

I believe that the on-line approach with mentors was more challenging, disciplined and difficult than the current program offered through …. In talking to other teachers who went through the other program, it was evident to me that the ACE program I completed was more rigorous. I believe it truly made me a better teacher and I am grateful for the challenge and opportunity I was given. [A DACP completer]

The positive responses were well distributed across the three types of certification: the theme was mentioned by nearly 200 DACP completers responding to the item (49%), more than 100 ITP (40%), and nearly 100 EPI (68%) respondents. These are large numbers, considering the ongoing debate about the applicability of some pedagogy programs to the real life classroom. It is gratifying to see that teachers from all three routes have good things to say about their programs. In contrast, there were only 82 comments about the program not being a positive and useful experience. This represented only 1 in 10 respondents, and was evenly distributed across certification routes.
A second theme that was a general positive appraisal of the program was that the respondent’s certification program had “program requirements that were useful and applicable.” This theme was present in over 100 open-ended responses, evenly distributed across certification type.

Observation hours done prior to Internship were very helpful in forming my own teaching style, classroom management procedures and more. Also, having the option of beginning internship when school students begin classes was most helpful in observing and creating classroom procedures and having a good rapport with students. I'm very happy with my teacher preparation program …. [An ITP completer]

However, its antithetical theme, “program aspects not useful, or lacking certain aspects,” was also mentioned by over 100 respondents. Again, this reaction was relatively evenly distributed across program types; between 10 and 20 percent of teachers responding to these items offered this criticism.

My teacher preparation included extensive lesson planning, which was not practical or useful. We did not learn how to use gradebooks or electronic grading systems. As an ESE teacher, I could have used more experiences writing IEPs, monitoring students' goals, and completing ESE paperwork. [An ITP teacher]

A third general positive appraisal that teachers offered about their certification program was that it “prepared them for the classroom environment.” Over 130 teachers responding to this item (17%) expressed this opinion. These responses were evenly distributed across the program types. One ITP completer, for example, was specific about the components of her degree that prepared her for the classroom:

The knowledge I gained through [my teacher prep program] has prepared me tremendously to enter the workforce as a new teacher. Immediately after graduating, school administrators recognized the rigor and reputation of [my undergraduate teacher preparation program], and I know that helped me secure a job in such a competitive [pool] of applicants seeking employment…. [My program] is well rounded and encompasses all aspects of the educational environment including: curriculum, assessment & data, literacy, technology, special education, working with families, and classroom management.
Program Components

One ITP teacher appreciated the practical preparation: “[My program] helped a lot. Hands-on activities created during different sessions stimulated my creativity.” Another ITP completer appreciated the direct preparation for the classroom:

Classroom Management class was my favorite class. It had sooo much valuable information [sic]. A class using an actual "Teacher's Edition" would have been useful. Book knowledge is great but hands on with "the real thing" would make a lot of sense. I was able to participate in an Accelerated Induction to Teaching program which was tough but appreciated.

An EPI completer had similar comments:

I enjoyed my program. I gained a lot of valuable information from the 2 field experiences I had to complete….We also had monthly-bimonthly optional EPI workshops that students were able to attend where I learned valuable information.

A DACP completer had similar appreciation for the program:

I felt it was a great program. The instructors guided us as to what our school district is looking for. It's important to note our instructors were VERY supportive and their feedback was much more beneficial and useful many times than the feedback from our Administrators. The program was GREAT - VERY useful information "hands on" as opposed to "theory" and "text book." Coming from another career, this was an awesome realistic program.

In contrast, only 41 teachers (5%) felt that their certification program did not prepare them well for the classroom. Most of the teachers who expressed this concern were ITP and EPI teachers. For example, two ITP completers offered these suggestions:

I think the biggest deficit in the teacher preparation program is the everyday duties of a teacher. Keeping up with a plan book or taking time to put grades in. I know that I expected to be spending a lot of time working on the planning and keeping up the grade book; I knew that I would have to deal with parents, other teachers, and staff. What I didn't realize was the time it took to maintain a cohesive and smooth school day. I am amazed at how I have learned to prepare the afternoon before so that I can walk in in the morning and not feel rushed to be ready for my students.

Realistically speaking, the opportunities available to first year teachers are limited. Teacher prep programs need to be geared more towards the more difficult aspects of teaching: urban schools, poverty, limited diversity environments, young pregnancies, parentless homes, no parental involvement, situations and ways to engage students who have no interest at all in learning.

A DACP completer suggested the following;

Classroom management is such an important issue; I'd like to see more training in this area... perhaps a requirement to visit other classes, in person or by video. Perhaps the video component
could be incorporated into ACP. Watch other teachers to learn classroom management. This is so important. When I started teaching, I'd not been in any classroom for years!! I had no experience.

Two EPI completers felt that a reallocation of credits would be worthwhile:

I did feel the last 2 courses I took were over-rated. I think diversity and ethics could be made one class. This would open a class to lesson planning, current curriculum text reviews, adaptation, and individual practicums in lesson planning. I don't think enough attention is paid to the actual rigor of everyday teaching (including preparing plans, time management in the classroom, what teachers can expect to happen daily).

Yes, I learned a lot, but I think more time in an actual classroom/field experience would have been useful. I also felt they could have done more with data collection. They taught a lot about the theories and research, which was nice.

**Support at the building level**

Many teachers wrote about the follow-up support they need after they have completed the teacher certification program. One ITP completer suggested that there be more support on site:

I wish that I had more time to meet with new teachers as well as teachers who have been teaching for a long time. There should be a team of people at each school for new teachers to communicate with. As a teacher who started after the school year began, I wish I would have had more guidance in regards to procedures and expectations.

A comment related to preparation for the classroom was that some teachers felt they would have benefitted from “a longer period of internship or hands-on experience.” Over 70 teachers expressed this criticism, both ITP and EPI completers, with about 10 percent of teachers responding to this item for both types. One ITP completer felt that the internship was the most important part of her training:

The most important part of my teacher preparation was the semester-long internship I undertook. This taught me everything I know and use as far as teaching styles, flexibility, etc. Classroom management skills were learned while substitute teaching.

While a handful of teachers offered that they were satisfied with their ESE preparation, more than 30 felt that their certification programs did not offer them sufficient experience with ESE students. This was a complaint from last year’s sample as well.

There should be more emphasis on inclusion. Teachers are being bombarded with students that have special needs (some [have] severe emotional disturbances) and are thrown in the classroom with the other 20 something children. There should be a training on how to handle difficult mentally and emotional disturbances in the classroom while keeping a "normal" environment …. These programs are necessary, due to the fact that special education classes are being less and less promoted and students who have special needs are being placed in a classroom that has not prepared the teacher for the child's individual situation. They should be in an ESE classroom all
day, or new teachers be trained in ESE as well if they are going to take part in these children’s education effectively.

First year ESE teachers need to have ESE teachers as their mentors who can help familiarize them with their multi-grade level curriculum, modifications, assessment procedures, and paperwork responsibilities. [An EPI completer]

Finally, teachers commented freely on the help they received from persons involved with their certification programs. Over 70 teachers cited helpful administration (most of these in DACP programs); over 50 cited helpful mentors, and another 50 cited helpful professors. Few offered complaints about program staff.

This school is a model school for how teams of teachers work to help every student achieve success. This school is not just a school but a fixture in the community. It is the wonderful staff, teachers, administrators, students, and parents that make [the school] what it is. [An ITP teacher]

This is my first year teaching, and I must say it was quite stressful, but I have had the opportunity to be assigned the most wonderful, talented, creative and highly effective teacher as my mentor. I am very lucky to work with a wonderful staff of teachers and administrators as well. [An ITP completer]

Although the county does not provide much in terms of new teacher preparation, my principals at …Middle School are very supportive, helpful, and encouraging. After hearing some scary first year teacher stories, I am very thankful that administration and staff supported me through my first year. [An ITP teacher]

Having an ACTIVE peer teacher is what is most important. Once I was teaching, I feel that my teacher was the best for questions and concerns that I was facing. [An EPI completer]

I had the fortunate experience of teaching at a very supportive school with supportive and positive administrators. I was lucky enough to work alongside my mentor teacher who was the five day music teacher at the school. I found that my daily teaching experience in combination with my mentoring and ACP classroom training has made me a highly effective and successful teacher. I plan on staying in my current district and subject area until retirement. [A DACP teacher]

However, one ITP teacher complained about a lack of clear leadership from administration:

I feel that the administrators need to let the teachers (especially new teachers1-3 years) know specifically what it is that they expect. I think they need to lead by example. If they want specific instruction done, a certain way, they should show them, not tell them or rely on the coach to show them. When it boils down to it, they are the ones who have the final say, and if the coach is basically doing the same thing that the teacher is doing, and the principal observes you and feel it's not meeting their standard, then they should take the initiative to come in and model what they want, not tell them; some of us learn visually. [An ITP teacher]
I'd like to see the flow of information between the EPI administrators, the District, school administrators, and the FL Dept of Ed function more smoothly. At times, there's been conflicting instructions which may cause confusion as a new teacher does not yet know the ropes of such a large system. However, my overall experience with my EPI administrators has been EXTRAORDINARILY POSITIVE. [An EPI completer]

Summary of Teachers Comments

In summary, the comments and recommendations offered by teachers regarding their certification programs were much like we have seen in previous evaluations, although there appear to be fewer negative comments this year than in previous studies. Teachers commented most on features of their program that led to a feeling of professional preparedness. Interestingly, rather than telling a story of beginning educators who have been thrown into the choppy waters of public school classrooms and being left to sink or swim, these teachers offer thoughtful commentaries on aspects of their preparation programs from the viewpoint of the real classroom, making cogent connections between program components and real life experiences. There were constructive positive and negative comments from ITP completers about their teacher preparation programs. Most offered that their certification programs were effective pre-professionalizing experiences.

In last year’s study, there was more concern expressed by teachers who felt unprepared for diversity in the classroom. Teachers who received adequate preparation in ESE and ESOL were thankful that they did. Teachers who did not feel prepared for diverse classrooms faulted their teacher preparation programs for the deficiency, and some faulted their school districts. This year, however, this theme hardly appeared at all in the data.

As found in last year’s evaluation, teachers appreciated programs with committed and knowledgeable administrators and staff. Teachers who went through well-organized programs with capable staff acknowledged their importance. Teachers who were left to their own devices to understand rules and regulations were confused and/or resentful.

Finally, the responses belied considerable variation among teacher preparation programs of all three types. This is not surprising, given the discretion exercised by local school districts in their use of the state-developed model or district-designed alternative certification programs, the welcome differences among colleges and universities offering Initial Teacher Preparation programs, and the inclusion of additional institutions – especially community and state colleges– in implementing the EPIs.

An important use of this annual study is that, if survey results show that particular programs have frequent and recurring complaints about lack of preparation for public school classrooms or disorganized programs or uninformed staff, these programs should be visited and provided technical assistance. The qualities of relevance, organization and leadership are absolute requirements for effective programs.
Research Findings: Workplace Support

New Teacher Induction Programs

In the previous sections, we focused on programs that initially prepare high quality teachers. But it is at least as important to attend to retaining good teachers in the field of education. In this section, we look at support networks for new teachers that can be encouraged and maintained by administrators and other teachers. Specifically, we discuss findings about new teacher induction programs, peer mentors, and various components that make up school climate.

Over the past two decades, the press for staffing classrooms with qualified teachers has broadened from only a supply-side set of strategies (that is, to increase the rolls of qualified teachers) to also include a focus on support systems for beginning teachers. Because a wide array of new teacher induction activities has been found effective in teacher satisfaction and retention, there has been a dramatic rise nationally in required new teacher induction programs. Even in states that have not mandated them, new teacher support programs have increased dramatically as well (Smith and Ingersoll, 2004).

The purposes of teacher induction programs are to increase student learning by providing a set of supervised support services for teachers in their first year of teaching, to assist new teachers in continuance of their professional development, and to verify satisfactory performance for the professional certificate. Until 1997, Florida school districts were required to provide all first-year Florida teachers with new teacher induction programs in their first year of teaching. Still, in 2008-09, the vast majority of survey respondents from all program types took part in new teacher induction programs. Indeed, nearly 74 percent of ITP respondents and 78 percent of EPI respondents had participated in an induction program. Similarly, DACP respondents indicated that 77 percent had participated in an induction program (see Table 8).

Table 8 (Teacher Sample Data)
Effectiveness of Induction Programs by Preparation Program Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness of Induction Programs</th>
<th>ITP N</th>
<th>ITP Percent</th>
<th>DACP N</th>
<th>DACP Percent</th>
<th>EPI N</th>
<th>EPI Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly effective</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very effective</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(No response)</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recent literature has emphasized the importance of the organizational climate of the school as an important factor in teachers’ decisions to leave or stay in a particular school, or even to quit the profession as a whole. Teachers are more likely to stay in schools that are well-organized, have good leadership, and offer opportunities for them to interact with their peers and have an influence on school policies (Liu, 2007). Schools where the professional culture has changed from teachers being isolated in their classrooms to being integrated with their colleagues and leaders are more likely to retain their faculty (Johnson 2004). Sanders and Rivera (1998) make the point that schools should take a “finders and keepers” attitude to their new teachers – to aggressively find ways to support them.

Overall, studies have found that former educators more often cited reasons other than poor salary for leaving teaching, mostly centered on issues of lack of professionalism: poor administrative support, low levels of faculty participation in decision-making and invasive bureaucracy. Job requirements that seem the antithesis of professionalism are supervising school buses, playgrounds, lunchrooms, having limited access to the building, and no private offices. (Kardos 2005; Mills, 2001; Metropolitan Life Survey of Former Teachers, 1986; Voke, 2002; Spears, Gould, & Lee, 2000; Smith 2007).

**Peer Mentors**

New teacher induction programs consist of various components, but the most ubiquitous is the use of peer mentors. Mentor programs vary on such dimensions as the selection of mentors, their training, and whether their specialty is the same as that of their mentee. Most studies of the effectiveness of mentors and mentor programs show positive effects, although research quality is somewhat variable. (Fideler and Haselkorn 1999; Education Week 2000; Ingersoll and Kralik, 2004; Johnson et al. 2004; Kardos 2004; Rosenholtz 1989; Smith and Ingersoll 2004).

In this study, peer mentor information was collected using two instruments: the teacher surveys described above and a separate survey for the mentors themselves. In previous years, only mentors assigned to district alternative certification participants received surveys. Last year, we asked district alternative certification coordinators to distribute survey links not only to DACP mentors, but also to mentors working with other teachers as well. The new strategy resulted in more than double the sample of mentors (n=2,217) returning the survey. This year, 1,533 mentors returned the survey. In the first four study years, the percentage of mentors who were teaching while serving as mentors had remained at about 80 percent. In the last two study years, the figure has increased to about 90 percent.

Mentoring has been shown to be a critical component in helping beginning teachers through their early teaching years, and findings in this study confirm its importance. Mentors serve as individual guides to introduce new teachers into the profession. Most beginning teachers in Florida are assigned a peer mentor. Over 75 percent of ITP and 85 percent of EPI respondents had been assigned a peer mentor in their first year of teaching. For participants in the district alternative certification programs, a mentor is required and assigned for each year the teacher is participating in the program, which usually lasts from one to two years. Still, only 82 percent of DACP respondents reported having been assigned a mentor in their first year of the program (see Table 9).
Table 9 (Teacher Sample Data)
Respondents Assigned a Peer Mentor in their First Year by Preparation Program Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Currently Assigned a Peer Mentor</th>
<th>ITP N</th>
<th>ITP Percent</th>
<th>DACP N</th>
<th>DACP Percent</th>
<th>EPI N</th>
<th>EPI Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1018</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(No response)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings indicated fairly high levels of contact and interaction between some beginning teachers and their peer mentors (see Table 10). Nearly 29 percent of ITP completers, and 27 percent of EPI completers reported meeting with their mentors at weekly, and some reported meeting nearly every day (20% ITP, 5% EPI). The rate was lower for DACP completers, but nearly 23 percent reported meeting with their mentors weekly; only 1.3 percent indicated meeting with their mentors nearly every day. A high percentage of ITP completers (69%) EPI completers (60.4%) and DACP participants (67.2%) reported their interactions with their mentors to be “important” or “very important” (see Table 11).

Table 10 (Teacher Sample Data)
Frequency of Contact with Peer Mentors by Preparation Program Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Contact</th>
<th>ITP N</th>
<th>ITP Percent</th>
<th>DACP N</th>
<th>DACP Percent</th>
<th>EPI N</th>
<th>EPI Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not yet</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once monthly</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A few times per month</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearly every day</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(No Response)</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 (Teacher Sample Data)
Importance of Mentors to Teachers Professional Development by Preparation Program Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of Mentors</th>
<th>ITP N</th>
<th>ITP Percent</th>
<th>DACP N</th>
<th>DACP Percent</th>
<th>EPI N</th>
<th>EPI Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly important</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Importance of Mentors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of Mentors</th>
<th>ITP N</th>
<th>ITP Percent</th>
<th>DACP N</th>
<th>DACP Percent</th>
<th>EPI N</th>
<th>EPI Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not very important</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(No response)</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There has been considerable research on the advantages (or lack thereof) of beginning teachers working with mentors holding the same educational specialty. We were able to track the trends in matching subject areas among the three program types. In 2004-05, almost 90 percent of DACP mentors were assigned to beginning teachers with similar subject area specialties. This rate has declined to about 80 percent in 2008-09. Interestingly, both ITP and EPI completers report a similar percentage of mentors with the same subject area expertise over the past four years, approximating 80 percent.

The Florida Legislature established the Dale Hickam Excellent Teaching Program to encourage districts to use teachers who hold certification from the National Board of Professional Teacher Standards (NBPTS) as mentors. Through the program, the state also offers a bonus for teachers who have become certified by the NBPTS. In return, these teachers may provide mentoring services at no cost to districts and earn an additional bonus. Serving as a peer mentor for beginning teachers may also serve as a component of the Profile of Professional Growth, which is a professional portfolio required for renewal of their certification.[5] Last year, National Board-certified teachers comprised over 40 percent of the responding mentors who currently held a teaching position themselves. This figure (28.2%) is lower in this year’s sample

### Influence of Peer Mentoring

Correlational analyses were conducted to describe the association between items specific to the support function of the peer mentors. The variables included frequency of contact with peer mentors; whether mentors had the same subject area expertise as the respondent; and how the teachers rated the importance of their mentors.

A significant and positive correlation (r= .29) was found between teachers’ amount of contact time with their mentor and the mentors’ experience in the same or similar subject as the teacher. This finding means that mentors and teachers who have subject matter in common spend more time working together than those who do not share content background. However, there was a negative association (r= -.31) between sharing content area with the mentor and the mentor’s importance to the development of the teacher, according to teacher respondents.

The most substantial correlation (r =.58) was found between teachers’ frequency of contact with their mentors and the mentor’s importance to his or her professional development. This is a very strong finding -- the more time teachers spend with their peer mentors, the more highly they are valued (see Table 12).

It appears that the pedagogical knowledge and experience shared by mentors have a greater impact on the professional development of teachers than sharing skills and techniques specific to a shared content specialty. Beginning and inexperienced teachers may well have better control
and grasp over their subject matter than they do over their teaching techniques, so they may not need as much guidance from mentors about their course content as they do about pedagogy. The lasting personal and professional impact of mentors may come from sharing their insights about teaching and learning.

These findings suggest that mentor contact should be maximized to the extent possible. Mentor support is quite evidently a central component in supporting beginning teachers, along with the other school-level policies and practices discussed above.

Table 12 (Teacher Sample Data)
Workplace supports and teacher outcomes: Pearson Correlation Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Frequency of contact</th>
<th>Same subject area</th>
<th>Important in development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of contact with mentor Coefficient</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.288</td>
<td>0.582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of contact with mentor Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of contact with mentor N</td>
<td>1757</td>
<td>1745</td>
<td>1755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor and teacher have same subject area Coefficient</td>
<td>0.288</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor and teacher have same subject area Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor and teacher have same subject area N</td>
<td>1745</td>
<td>1748</td>
<td>1747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor important in teachers' development Coefficient</td>
<td>0.582</td>
<td>-0.311</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor important in teachers' development Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor important in teachers' development N</td>
<td>1755</td>
<td>1747</td>
<td>1758</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School Climate and Factor Analysis – Replication of Previous Study

Teachers responded to eleven items about the school environment, ranging from formal support structures, such as formal observations and structured meetings, to less tangible school climate characteristics, such as feeling a part of the school community and having collaborative colleagues (see Table 13).

In the evaluation report conducted in 2007, we performed an Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) on the 11 items that were hypothesized to be indicators of school climate. EFA is a statistical technique that can be used to seek patterns in responses to a series of items or questions. Items that share a similar response pattern are said to be indicators of a factor, usually thought of as an underlying construct that is being partially “measured” by the respective items contained in the factor. An EFA was conducted for two purposes. First, the analysis would determine whether the survey items shared similar response patterns to form theoretically plausible factors; second,
the EFA would reduce the original eleven survey items to a smaller set of factors that can be used to see whether these support factors are associated with teacher outcomes. Third, when EFAs reveal theoretically plausible factors, the validity of the items is greatly increased.[6]

Table 13 (Teacher Sample Data)
Principal Component Matrix for Factor Analysis of School Climate and Support Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surveys Items</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-How often do the teachers in your school work together to respond to student needs?</td>
<td>0.793</td>
<td>-0.121</td>
<td>0.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-How much do teachers at your school share common beliefs and values about what the mission of the school should be?</td>
<td>0.488</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-How often do the teachers in your school give each other feedback about teaching?</td>
<td>0.649</td>
<td>-0.094</td>
<td>0.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-How often is time scheduled at your school to work collaboratively (e.g., team meetings, learning communities, etc.)</td>
<td>0.299</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>-0.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-How much are teachers involved in making important educational decisions in your school?</td>
<td>0.416</td>
<td>0.340</td>
<td>-0.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Do the policies at your school contribute to or interfere with your ability to teach effectively?</td>
<td>0.391</td>
<td>0.383</td>
<td>-0.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-How often did you meet formally with other new teachers in your first year of teaching?</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-Did your principal/assistant principal help you understand the overall mission and vision of your school?</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>0.699</td>
<td>0.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-Did your principal/assistant principal help you become a valued member of the school community?</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.752</td>
<td>0.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-How often during your first year of teaching did your principal/assistant principal provide you useful feedback about your teaching?</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.485</td>
<td>0.417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-How many times during your first year of teaching were you formally observed in the classroom?</td>
<td>-0.063</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.496</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results of the 2007 factor analysis indicated a three-factor solution. The items in these factors made theoretical sense, and represented ‘Principal support,’ ‘Teacher collaboration,’ and ‘School governance.’ The items contributing to the first factor had to do with either principal support or other formally structured events that provide the new teacher support and feedback. Items contributing to the second factor represented collaboration among teachers, including school policies that allocated time to pursue collaboration. The third factor represented facilitative and productive school policies: Are teachers involved in decision making? Do they share common beliefs and values? Are the school policies facilitative of the school mission? (Table 13 shows the exact wording of each item.)
We conducted the same factor analysis for the 2007-08 study. Factors were similar, but not identical, to those described above. Six items loading on the first factor represented ‘teacher collaboration,’ as well as ‘teacher governance.’ The items included several about collaborative opportunities and several about school policies that include teachers in decision-making. We will refer to this factor as ‘teacher collaboration and influence.’

The second factor in the 2007-08 study reflected the ‘principal support’ factor from the previous year’s study. Three items loaded on this factor and represented the principal’s effort to usher the teacher into the culture of the school through discussing the school’s mission, helping to integrate the teacher into the school community, and providing feedback about teaching, that is, playing an instructional leadership role.

The third factor was comprised of two items, but represented a less coherent theme. One item asked about formal meetings with other teachers, and the other asked about the responding teacher having been observed in the classroom. We called this factor ‘formal feedback mechanisms.’

In this year’s study, we are conducting a similar EFA, but with slightly different statistical properties: we are allowing factors to correlate with one another. In the previous evaluation, we forced factors to be orthogonal (uncorrelated). This is often the default approach, but we decided to allow for factor intercorrelation because we believe, on theoretical grounds, that such factors as those described above would correlate in real life. For example, teachers who experience greater collaboration in their schools may be likely to also report more supportive principals.

Findings in the current study support the three-factor solution. Again, four items load on a Teacher Collaboration and Influence factor, three items load on a Principal Support factor, and two items load on a Formal Feedback factor. Only one item cross-loaded on the second two factors: whether the principal provided useful feedback.

Factor scores were computed for each respondent, thus providing them values on ‘teacher collaboration and influence,’ ‘principal support,’ and ‘formal feedback mechanisms.’ These scores were then used in correlation analyses with several variables of interest: teachers’ ratings of their overall effectiveness and their expectations for being rehired; and principals’ intentions to rehire teachers. In addition to factor correlations, a separate set of correlation analyses were conducted for variables related to mentoring and induction.

**Results: School Support Factors and Teacher Outcomes**

A bivariate correlation analysis was conducted to determine the association between the three school support factors and these dependent variables: whether the teacher has been (or is expecting to be) rehired for the next school year; and the teacher’s self-reported overall teaching effectiveness.

There were small but statistically significant correlations between the three teacher support factors and self-reported effectiveness and job status for the next academic year (see Table 14). Correlation coefficients were around 0.1, an effect size that is considered small. That is,
association among these factors and outcome, while statistically significantly different from zero, does not explain much of the variability among teachers regarding their effectiveness and employment status. However, it is important to note that all significant associations were in the predicted direction and these findings have persisted over two study years and two different samples.

Table 14 (Teacher Sample Data)
Workplace supports and teacher outcomes: Pearson Correlation Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Teacher has been rehired for next year</th>
<th>Teacher self-reported effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher collaboration and influence Coefficient</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher collaboration and influence Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher collaboration and influence N</td>
<td>1325</td>
<td>1719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal support Coefficient</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal support Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal support N</td>
<td>1325</td>
<td>1719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal feedback mechanisms Coefficient</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal feedback mechanisms Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal feedback mechanisms N</td>
<td>1325</td>
<td>1719</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The positive coefficients indicate that teachers in schools with stronger support mechanisms are more likely to report a higher level of teaching effectiveness, and are more likely to stay in teaching. These findings suggest that new teachers are able to draw on their colleagues in a positive manner, and that new teachers may feel more competent as a result. Collaborating with other teachers is facilitated through formal structures, such as scheduled meetings and making time for collaborative work. When these structures are in place, it appears that new teachers and veterans work more effectively together to resolve student issues.

A Caution on Interpreting Findings

The reader should exercise caution in inferring causality from the results of these correlation analyses. Teachers who met with their mentors more frequently may have received more help, and thus seen their mentors as having provided greater assistance to their development as teachers. However, an equally plausible explanation is that if teachers found mentors to be helpful, they would be expected to meet with their mentor more frequently. Therefore, further studies are needed to explore the issue of causality and to make claims about the effects of specific program components. Such cautions should be understood for all correlational analyses. It is also of interest that the correlations found in this study were of near-identical magnitude to those reported in the evaluation study conducted over the last two years.
Analysis of Teacher Competency

A central issue in teacher preparation program policy is the comparative quality of teachers who have taken different routes to teacher preparation. Principals were asked three types of questions related to the quality of their teachers. First, they were asked to rate each teacher on his or her performance in each of the 12 Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (FEAPs). In addition, principals were asked about the performance of the teacher in reading instruction and preparing students to take standardized achievement tests. Finally, they were asked whether each teacher met their criteria for rehiring.

Teachers were also asked to evaluate their teacher preparation programs in terms of the FEAPs. Since the teacher survey included multiple items per FEAP (unlike the principal survey, which included only one item per FEAP), we were provided the opportunity not only to see how well prepared the teacher felt, but also whether there were other underlying or unifying themes in the FEAP items (see below).

Principal Ratings of Teacher Competency

Figures 15a-n shows the principal ratings on each FEAP, broken down by teacher preparation programs. Principal ratings of teacher competency were very high, and did not differ substantially by program type. The areas that principals felt were of some concern were Assessment, Communication, Critical Thinking, and Test-Taking Strategies. (These were areas that the principals rated 90 percent or less of the teachers as “effective” or “highly effective.”). Principals felt the teachers better prepared in Technology, Teaching Reading, and Learning Environment than in last year’s evaluation. There were virtually no important differences between principal ratings of teachers across program type.

Principals were also asked whether individual teachers met their criteria for rehiring (see Figure 16). As in the ratings of the teachers’ competency, there were no differences between program types. Principals reported that about 95% of teachers met their criteria for rehiring, regardless of program type.

Figure 15a reports principals rating of teacher effectiveness for the area of Assessment. For ITP, n=258, 39.8% reported effective and 51.1% reported very effective. For DACP, n=128, 42.1% reported effective and 46.2 reported very effective. For EPI, n=63, 40.8 % reported effective and 47.9 reported very effective.

Figure 15b reports principals rating of teacher effectiveness for the area of Communication. For ITP, n=258, 39.8% reported effective and 51.1% reported very effective. For DACP, n=128, 42.1% reported effective and 46.2 reported very effective. For EPI, n=63, 40.8 % reported effective and 47.9 reported very effective.

Figure 15c reports principals rating of teacher effectiveness for the area of Continuous Improvement. For ITP, n=264, 41.5% reported effective and 51.4% reported very effective. For DACP, n=133, 42.8% reported effective and 49% reported very effective. For EPI, n=63, 40.8 % reported effective and 47.9% reported very effective.
Figure 15d reports principals rating of teacher effectiveness for the area of Critical Thinking. For ITP, n=258, 39.8% reported effective and 51.1% reported very effective. For DACP, n=128, 42.1% reported effective and 46.2% reported very effective. For EPI, n=62, 43.7% reported effective and 43.7% reported very effective.

Figure 15e reports principals rating of teacher effectiveness for the area of Diversity. For ITP, n=267, 26.2% reported effective and 68.4% reported very effective. For DACP, n=132, 27.3% reported effective and 65% reported very effective. For EPI, n=66, 32.4% reported effective and 60.6% reported very effective.

Figure 15f reports principals rating of teacher effectiveness for the area of Ethics. For ITP, n=278, 16.2% reported effective and 81.7% reported very effective. For DACP, n=141, 20.1% reported effective and 77.8% reported very effective. For EPI, n=71, 22.5% reported effective and 77.5% reported very effective.

Figure 15g reports principals rating of teacher effectiveness for the area of Human Development and Learning. For ITP, n=259, 37% reported effective and 55.2% reported very effective. For DACP, n=129, 42.1% reported effective and 46.9% reported very effective. For EPI, n=64, 48.6% reported effective and 42.9% reported very effective.

Figure 15h reports principals rating of teacher effectiveness for the area of Knowledge of Subject Matter. For ITP, n=262, 39.4% reported effective and 53.5% reported very effective. For DACP, n=137, 31.7% reported effective and 62.8% reported very effective. For EPI, n=68, 28.2% reported effective and 67.6% reported very effective.

Figure 15i reports principals rating of teacher effectiveness for the area of Learning Environment. For ITP, n=266, 28.2% reported effective and 65.5% reported very effective. For DACP, n=133, 35.9% reported effective and 55.9% reported very effective. For EPI, n=63, 32.4% reported effective and 56.3% reported very effective.

Figure 15j reports principals rating of teacher effectiveness for the area of Planning. For ITP, n=267, 34.8% reported effective and 59.9% reported very effective. For DACP, n=137, 43.4% reported effective and 51% reported very effective. For EPI, n=64, 35.7% reported effective and 55.7% reported very effective.

Figure 15k reports principals rating of teacher effectiveness for the area of Roll of the Teacher. For ITP, n=262, 30.5% reported effective and 62.4% reported very effective. For DACP, n=135, 38.6% reported effective and 54.5% reported very effective. For EPI, n=65, 39.4% reported effective and 52.1% reported very effective.

Figure 15l reports principals rating of teacher effectiveness for the area of Technology. For ITP, n=260, 45.9% reported effective and 46.6% reported very effective. For DACP, n=130, 42.1% reported effective and 47.6% reported very effective. For EPI, n=64, 41.4% reported effective and 50% reported very effective.
Figure 15m reports principals rating of teacher effectiveness for the area of Reading. For ITP, n=251, 37.3% reported effective and 51.1% reported very effective. For DACP, n=134, 49.3% reported effective and 43.8% reported very effective. For EPI, n=64, 45.1% reported effective and 45.1% reported very effective.

Figure 15n reports principals rating of teacher effectiveness for the area of Test Taking Strategies. For ITP, n=256, 47.7% reported effective and 42.8% reported very effective. For DACP, n=132, 47.6% reported effective and 43.4% reported very effective. For EPI, n=62, 47.9% reported effective and 39.4% reported very effective.

Repeat for 15b through 15n (exchange underline word with each graph)

Figure 16 reports the percent of teachers who meet principal’s criteria for rehiring. For ITP, n=284, 94.9% met the criteria. For DACP, n=141, 96.5% met the criteria. For EPI, 95.5% met the criteria.

**Teacher Self-Ratings of Teaching Competency**

Teachers were asked how well prepared they felt on indicators of each individual FEAP, in addition to teaching reading and test preparation skills. Participants were asked to rate 41 items. The items were explicitly identified as components of each FEAP. Respondents rated each item on a 1-4 scale. 1 meant the teacher’s program was “ineffective” in preparing them in the competency; 4 meant they felt their program was “highly effective” in preparing them for the competency. For each respondent, specific FEAP-identified items were summed and averages obtained to assess their perceptions on their preparedness for each FEAP. Table 15 shows respondents’ average ratings for the effectiveness of their program for each FEAP competency.

Overall, EPI completers indicated they felt somewhat less prepared than DACP and ITP completers. Nevertheless the average satisfaction with teachers’ pedagogical preparation was high across program types, with average scores ranging between 3.0 and 3.6 (see Table 15).

**Table 15 (Teacher Sample Data)**
Mean Ratings on Participants’ Perceptions of Preparation of FEAP Competencies by Certification Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competencies</th>
<th>Certification Type</th>
<th>Certification Type</th>
<th>Certification Type</th>
<th>Certification Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ITP Mean</td>
<td>DACP Mean</td>
<td>EPI Mean</td>
<td>EPI Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEAP 1 (Assessment)</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEAP 2 (Communication)</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEAP 3 (Continuous Improvement)</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEAP 4 (Critical Thinking)</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEAP 5 (Diversity)</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In designing the survey, the number of items included about each FEAP was reduced to two or three, so that the total number of FEAP items was reduced to 41. Second, the items were no longer explicitly identified as components of each FEAP. Instead, the goal was to validate the items by seeing whether they correlated with each other in such a way that items grouped together to form coherent themes. If they did, how many themes would there be, and how well would they reflect or subsume the original FEAPs?

In order to determine common themes among the new (and unidentified) FEAP items, an exploratory factor analysis was conducted. As described above, EFA is a statistical technique used to find patterns in responses to a series of items or questions. Items that correlate with each other are said to be indicators of a factor, usually thought of as an underlying construct that is being partially “measured” by the respective items contained in the factor.

In last year’s evaluation, an EFA identified four common themes, or factors, among the 41 FEAP items. The first was labeled “Instructional Strategies,” including items about strategies for improving students’ critical thinking, planning for instruction, and providing feedback to students. The second theme described “Research and Assessment Skills,” and included items about assessing student achievement, using assessment results to improve instruction, monitoring student performance, and others. The third factor concerned “Professional Ethics,” and included items about ethical standards, treating students equitably, and recognizing and dealing with cultural differences. The fourth and final factor included items about the teacher’s “Use of Technology”, and included items about choosing relevant instructional materials, using technology to manage student data, and finding resources outside the classroom to enhance learning.

As discussed above, we allowed factors to correlate in this year’s analysis, since there are strong reasons to believe that the factors do correlate in real life. That is, for example, teachers who
score high on Research and Assessment Skills would also probably score high on Instructional Strategies. The component matrix is presented in Table 15.

The findings are remarkably similar to those in last year’s evaluation. The Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) identified four factors whose description is the same as last year’s four: Instructional Strategies, Research and Assessment Skills, Professional Ethics, and Use of Technology. Table 16 presents factor loadings, with absolute value over .4 highlighted in bold for all 41 items. Almost all items were represented in one of the four factors, and only four loaded on two factors over the level of ± 0.4: ‘modifying instruction based on student performance,” which loaded on both Instructional Strategies and Research and Assessment Skills; “using technology tools to manage and evaluate student data,” which loaded on both Research and Assessment Skills and Use of Technology; “adapting communication style based on the needs of individuals and groups,” which loaded on both Research and Assessment and Professional Ethics; and “identifying strategies that expand students’ critical thinking,” which loaded on Instructional Strategies and Professional Ethics.

Once the four factors were identified, we took an unconventional approach to calculating factor scores for the students, as we did in last year’s evaluation. The standard approach to calculating factor scores is to multiply each item by the factor weighting from the EFA, and then add them to compute the factor score. In particular, it is the respondents’ standardized score (or z-score) on each item that is multiplied by the factor weight.

Standardizing factor scores would not provide a way to determine how competent teachers felt on each of the factors, because the distribution of factor scores always has a mean of zero. So using standard factor scores would enable us to determine which respondents felt more competent than others, but it would not allow us to find the absolute level of competence expressed in the sample, since the EFA means will always equal zero – no matter the level of competence the teachers report.

Instead, we borrowed from the findings in the EFA to identify which items were best associated with each of the four factors, and we added them as unweighted and unstandardized scores to compute a score for each of the constructs identified in the EFA. This allowed us not only to group items according to their contribution to each new construct, but also to determine the actual levels of competence reported by the respondents.

Factor scores ranged from 1 to 4: 1 meant the teacher’s program was “ineffective” in preparing them in the competency; 4 meant they felt their program was “highly effective” in preparing them for the competency.

**Table 16 (Teacher Sample Data) Factor Loadings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How effective was your preparation program in preparing you to:</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify strategies that expand students’ critical thinking.</td>
<td>0.631</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.631</td>
<td>0.217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan activities that require students to gather information and solve problems.</td>
<td>0.581</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>-0.034</td>
<td>0.278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How effective was your preparation program in preparing you to:</td>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td>Factor 3</td>
<td>Factor 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate activities that promote positive communication among students.</td>
<td>0.598</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>0.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide opportunities for students to receive constructive feedback…</td>
<td>0.574</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use relevant materials and technologies to promote student learning.</td>
<td>0.349</td>
<td>-0.125</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply human development theories to first and second language acquisition…</td>
<td>0.470</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan lessons with specific learning and performance outcomes …</td>
<td>0.569</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>0.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborate with other educators when planning lessons.</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>0.328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop technology enriched activities that meets the diverse needs of students.</td>
<td>0.166</td>
<td>-0.086</td>
<td>-0.036</td>
<td>0.838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflect on practice and modify instruction as needed.</td>
<td>0.538</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.155</td>
<td>0.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognize and identify developmental differences among students.</td>
<td>0.579</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>0.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate reading strategies in instructional planning in various subject areas.</td>
<td>0.529</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish classroom procedures that promote a positive and safe environment.</td>
<td>0.413</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td>0.262</td>
<td>-0.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employ a variety of assessment strategies…</td>
<td>0.502</td>
<td>0.348</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>-0.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain academic focus through techniques that address differences in learning…</td>
<td>0.720</td>
<td>0.173</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>-0.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use a variety of teaching techniques and strategies to effectively instruct all students…</td>
<td>0.715</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>-0.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use instructional time effectively.</td>
<td>0.372</td>
<td>0.349</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modify instruction based upon assessed student performance.</td>
<td>0.480</td>
<td>0.436</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>-0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use technology in instructional delivery to enrich student learning experiences.</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>0.740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use resources outside the classroom to enrich student learning experiences.</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>0.316</td>
<td>-0.041</td>
<td>0.451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate how knowledge can be applied to real-world settings.</td>
<td>0.298</td>
<td>0.326</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use assessment data to improve student achievement.</td>
<td>0.277</td>
<td>0.693</td>
<td>-0.072</td>
<td>-0.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use questions and activities that engage students in higher order thinking.</td>
<td>0.565</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use a variety of developmentally appropriate activities to engage &amp; motivate students.</td>
<td>0.510</td>
<td>0.284</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate an understanding of how the subject is linked to other disciplines.</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>0.445</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use results from individual reading assessments to improve academic performance.</td>
<td>0.274</td>
<td>0.807</td>
<td>-0.202</td>
<td>-0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognize signs of students' difficulty with the reading …</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>0.724</td>
<td>-0.109</td>
<td>-0.060</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How effective was your preparation program in preparing you to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepare students for taking standardized tests by using aggregated data...</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td><strong>0.800</strong></td>
<td>-0.190</td>
<td>0.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor student performance on core benchmarks throughout the year.</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td><strong>0.805</strong></td>
<td>-0.132</td>
<td>0.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use technology tools to manage and evaluate student data.</td>
<td>-0.210</td>
<td><strong>0.433</strong></td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td><strong>0.550</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make efforts to protect students from harmful conditions that interfere with their learning.</td>
<td>-0.063</td>
<td>0.354</td>
<td><strong>0.468</strong></td>
<td>0.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adhere to ethical standards expected of an educator...</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>-0.164</td>
<td><strong>0.930</strong></td>
<td>-0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adhere to the Code of Ethics and Principles of Professional Conduct...</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>-0.195</td>
<td><strong>0.960</strong></td>
<td>-0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat students equitably by fostering acceptance of diversity in the classroom.</td>
<td>0.202</td>
<td>-0.105</td>
<td><strong>0.795</strong></td>
<td>-0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate effectively with families and students from culturally diverse backgrounds.</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
<td>0.380</td>
<td><strong>0.514</strong></td>
<td>-0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapt communication style based on the needs of individuals and groups.</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td><strong>0.410</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.431</strong></td>
<td>-0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access relevant educational research.</td>
<td>-0.048</td>
<td><strong>0.482</strong></td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td>0.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement strategies acquired through professional growth opportunities.</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td><strong>0.526</strong></td>
<td>0.345</td>
<td>0.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide meaningful feedback regarding student performance to families.</td>
<td>-0.020</td>
<td><strong>0.609</strong></td>
<td>0.256</td>
<td>0.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with colleagues to improve students’ educational experiences.</td>
<td>-0.096</td>
<td><strong>0.503</strong></td>
<td>0.288</td>
<td>0.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate knowledge of research-based...reading strategies.</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td><strong>0.532</strong></td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>0.077</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings show that teachers felt very well prepared in the four competencies identified in the EFA. For all program types, means ranged between 3 and 3.5, meaning the average rating for their preparation was between highly effective and effective. A breakdown by program type shows slight but consistent differences. For all four factors, ITP teachers felt best prepared. DACP completers felt somewhat less prepared, and EPI completers felt marginally less prepared on all four competence factors.

Although there is a temptation to attribute the differences to fewer hours of preparation, gauging this has become more difficult as “alternative” delivery systems are becoming the norm. For example, many courses are delivered online across preparation types, and actual contact hours are difficult to determine. Nevertheless the average satisfaction with their pedagogical preparation was high across program types (see Figure 17).

Figure 17 reports the percent of teachers rating the effectiveness of their programs in preparing them for various competencies. For the competency of instructional strategies, the average rating for ITP was 3.44, for DACP was 3.24, and for EPI was 3.39. For the competency of research and...
assessment, the average rating for ITP was 3.29, for DACP was 3.10, and for EPI was 3.14. For the competency of ethics, the average rating for ITP was 3.56, for DACP was 3.37, and for EPI was 3.50. For the competency of technology, the average rating for ITP was 3.37, for DACP was 3.17, and for EPI was 3.32.
Outreach and Recruitment

Marketing and Publicizing the Alternative Certification Programs

Policymakers and educational professionals in Florida have been creative and forward-thinking in finding ways to broaden the teacher labor market – to attract “non-traditional” individuals to the education profession. DACPs and EPIs have shown considerable growth since their inception: District Alternative Certification Programs (DACPs), which all districts must offer to teachers working in the public schools holding Temporary Certificates; and Educator Preparation Institutes (EPIs), offering college graduates a means to certification.

For such programs to be successful, it is not sufficient that they be well conceptualized and designed. They must also be broadly marketed to attract persons who may be considering career changes, or who need to become certified to continue and advance in their educational careers. Both DACPs and EPIs are doing an excellent job reaching these audiences, and enrollment in both programs continues to grow significantly.

Among DACP completers who responded to the survey, 45 percent had heard of the program before entering the profession (see Figure 18). This figure was lower than in the prior year (60%); the district alternative certification option has remained relatively unchanged in visibility since its inception.

Figure 18 reports whether teachers knew about the alternative certification option before they began teaching. 55% reported no. 45% reported yes.

Even more significantly, among the respondents who were aware of the district alternative certification option before entering teaching, more than 77 percent said that knowing about the DACP option did serve as an incentive for their choosing to enter the field (see Figure 19).

Figure 19 reports whether knowing about alternative certification influenced a persons decision to teach. 77% of the teachers reported yes, and 20% reported no.

More than two thirds of the respondents first heard about the district alternative certification option from school or district administrators (37%), or other teachers (31%). The district staff and administration are doing well in fulfilling their role in making teachers holding Temporary Certifications aware of their options for earning the Professional Certificate. Additionally, as Figure 20 shows, 13 percent learned of the program through recruitment events or from the FLDOE website (14%). Thus, continuing and even stepping up such marketing efforts appears to be valuable, especially given their relatively low cost.

Figure 20 reports where teachers first heard about the alternative certification option. 37% reported an administrator, 13% a recruitment event, 14% the DOE website, 5% an other website, and 31% reported an other option.

School district administrators and staff (47%) were the most common initial information source for the EPI option, as they were for teachers who pursued DACP option. Interestingly, 14
percent indicated they heard of the EPI option from newspapers. EPI administrators should consider increasing their newspaper exposure, as it is a relatively low-cost strategy for reaching a broad demographic, and has proven to be effective (see Figure 21).

Figure 21 reports where teachers first heard about the EPI option. 47% reported school district, 8% a local information session, 8% the DOE website, 3% the radio, 14% a newspaper, and 21% reported another option.

EPI marketing efforts were successful. Among responding EPI completers, 54 percent reported that knowing about the EPI option influenced their decisions to teach. Additionally, over half of the EPI respondents (52%) took advantage of student loan programs (see Figures 22-23).

Figure 22 reports whether knowing about the EPI option influenced the teacher’s decision to teach. 54% reported yes. 46% reported no.

Figure 23 reports whether teachers received financial aid in their EPI program. 52% reported yes. 48% reported no.

Teacher Choice of First Job

District and schools’ abilities to target teacher recruitment efforts and to attract beginning teachers to schools of greatest staffing needs are difficult in part because the research literature tells us little about teachers’ labor market decision making. The most consistent body of evidence suggests that, like most professions, teachers consider prevailing wages when they make decisions about entering the teacher workforce (Baugh & Stone, 1982). Additionally, teacher compensation influences teachers’ entries and exits from the teacher labor market, as well as their mobility between schools (Brewer, 1996; Gritz & Theobald, 1996; Hanushek et al., 2004; Lankford et al., 2002). Economic incentives, improvement in working conditions, teacher induction and mentoring, opportunities for professional development and growth have been shown to influence teachers’ choosing their first school (Kolbe & Rice, 2008; Rice et al., 2008).

Other non-monetary factors such as working conditions (e.g., class size; Cannata, 2007), preference for living in a particular area or community, geographic location (Boyd, Lankford, Loeb and Wyckoff, 2003), timing of job offers (Levin & Quinn, 2006); and opportunities for mentoring and induction (Smith & Ingersoll, 2004) may all influence teacher labor market decisions.

In summary, it is clear from the literature that teachers weigh many factors simultaneously in their decision making. Prior research has often focused on the influence of one particular factor (e.g., salary or student characteristics). This leaves policymakers and educational leaders with the difficult task of crafting effective recruitment and placement policies without the insight that a more developed research literature would provide.

Teachers reported that the most important information sources they used when searching for their first job were centered at the local level. District websites, administrators, and job fairs were three of the four most cited sources of information (see Figure 24). These local sources of
information far exceeded state and national recruitment efforts, though between 100 and 200 teachers of more than 2200 relied on state-level information for finding their first job.

Figure 24 reports the number of teachers who used various information sources when searching for their first job. The number of teachers for each information source follows: Job listing on district or school websites is approximately 450; word-of-mouth from family and friends is approximately 305; school or district administrators is approximately 265; district job fair is approximately 180; faculty/instructors in your teacher prep program is approximately 160; on-campus recruitment/job fairs is approximately 125; job listings on the Florida DOE website is approximately 120; job listings on national teacher employment websites is approximately 50; great Florida teach-in is approximately 35.

Our findings show that school leaders seeking to attract teachers to fill openings have considerable leverage when competing for teachers. Although most teachers in the sample said that geographic location of the school was the most important factor in seeking their first job, the next most cited factors are under the control of school policy and leadership. Teachers placed a high priority on “safe” districts, district or school leadership and being offered a contract in timely fashion. They cared about being offered opportunities for professional development and about the people they met during their job interview. School climate and professional support mechanisms have been shown to be critical in teacher retention. These results point out that the same factors are important in recruiting teachers to begin with (see Figure 25).

As the literature has shown, teachers cared less about salary and benefits. Only between 100 and 150 of over more than 2,200 respondents listed these pecuniary factors as important in their first job choice. It is important to realize, however, that school and district administrators generally have few degrees of freedom when it comes to salary and benefit offers. These are tightly proscribed in most Florida school districts. But policymakers at the district and school level should know that there are many strategies to compete for the best teachers. Those strategies center on making their schools inviting places to work, with strong professional support structures and opportunities for professional development.

Figure 25 reports the number of teachers reporting that various factors were important in considering their first teaching position. The number of teachers for each factor follows: Where the district or school is located is approximately 510; the district school’s reputation as being a safe place to work is approximately 280; district school administration and leadership is approximately 250; when the contact was offered is approximately 250; the people you met on your job interview is approximately 225; opportunities for new teacher induction and mentoring is approximately 210; the types of students served by the district/school is approximately 180; the amount and types of benefits offered is approximately 145; the salary amount offered is approximately 120; the teaching assignment is approximately 80; opportunities to lead extra curricular activities is approximately 80.
Conclusions

1. Expansion of the Teaching Labor Pool

The demographic profile of the population of 2007-08 program completers who were teaching in the schools confirms that the state’s efforts to expand the teaching labor pool have succeeded in many ways:

There were higher percentages of male teachers among DACP (31.8 %) and EPI completers (27.5%) than in ITP programs (10.5 %). Alternative certification programs attracted older teachers as a percent of their completers than ITP programs. Over sixty-seven percent of the recent DACP completers teaching in Florida public schools were over 30 years old, compared to only 32.4 percent of ITP completers, and 76.8 percent of EPI completers were over 30 years old.

2. Critical Shortage Areas

The teaching assignments of program completers show that Florida continues to succeed in addressing critical shortage areas through alternative preparation programs. The largest teacher shortages in Florida and nationally are in middle and high schools. Completers of DACPs and EPIs are more likely to be assigned to critical areas in the secondary schools and are more likely to teach in those subject areas of greatest need. Nearly 70 percent (69.2%) of DACP completers were teaching at the secondary level, as were 55.6 percent of EPI completers. These rates are significantly higher than ITP completers, among whom fewer than one in four (24.6%) were assigned to secondary schools.

3. Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (FEAPs)

The FEAPs are the common set of competencies in all of Florida’s teacher preparation programs. Overall, the results indicate that the FEAPs serve as a common language and set of expectations for inservice teachers in addition to their role as competency criteria. Survey results show that a new teacher’s competency in the FEAPs mirrors his or her principal’s expectations for performance and serves as a good predictor of whether that individual will meet criteria for re-employment.

4. Teacher Level of Preparedness

Teachers, their principals and their peer mentors who responded to the survey all reported high levels of satisfaction with the level of preparedness of teachers from all program types, responding with favorable ratings on both teachers’ competency levels and eligibility for rehire.

5. Peer Mentoring and Induction Support

Most teachers placed a high value on structured support programs and on peer mentoring as contributing to their professional development. Around three out of four teachers
participated in a formal induction program, with most rating their programs as overall “effective” or “very effective.” Over 75 percent of ITP, 82 percent of DACP, and 85 percent of EPI respondents had been assigned a peer mentor in their first year of teaching. Nearly 80 percent reported that their peer mentor was at least “somewhat important” to “very important” in their professional development.

6. Teacher Recruitment and Retention

Educators searching for their first teaching position placed most importance on the geographic location of the school. This was the same finding as in last year’s study. The finding that was most different between the two studies was the importance teachers placed on the teaching assignment being offered. In last year’s study, appropriateness of teaching assignment – teaching in the area one is certified in -- was the second most important factor in deciding where to teach. However, in the current study, teaching assignment was among the least important factors. This shift may reflect the current economic environment in which school districts have sustained severe budget cuts, leading to a smaller demand for teachers. Thus, teachers may be more willing to accept a position teaching out-of-field.

Teachers seeking employment also considered the reputation of the school as being a safe place to work and administrative and leadership styles. They cared about the timeliness of the job offer and opportunities for professional development. Also important to many teachers were the people they met during their job interview. School climate and professional support mechanisms have been shown to be critical in teacher retention. These results point out that the same factors are important in recruiting teachers.

7. Preparation for the Classroom

In last year’s study, there was more concern expressed by teachers who felt unprepared for diversity in the classroom. Teachers who received adequate preparation in ESE and ESOL were thankful that they did. Teachers who did not feel prepared for diverse classrooms faulted their teacher preparation programs for the deficiency, and some faulted their school districts. This year, however, this theme hardly appeared at all in the data.

Recommendations

The following are recommendations from the analysis of quantitative and qualitative data.

1. The DOE should conduct an independent study that determines whether student achievement is affected by the route their teachers took to certification

Such a study should be an extension of the current research on the value added by different teacher preparation programs. A recent study was conducted on the effect of ABCTE certification of student achievement. DOE should contract such a study that would estimate the effects of ITP, DACP, and EPI certification on student achievement in math and reading.
2. Continue to use and improve the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (FEAPs) as the core standards for teacher professional performance.

The FEAPs provide all teachers, teacher educators, and employers with a common set of expectations for teacher instructional performance. In order to keep the FEAPs current and relevant, they should be placed on a regular review cycle (like the Sunshine State Standards).

3. The FLDOE should provide the data from this report on a regular basis to colleges and universities that are training teachers in Florida.

Results from this report will help institutions of higher education continue to monitor their own performance and receive feedback from their completers as required in Florida Statutes. Such use of data for continuous improvement purposes should allow the FLDOE and teacher training programs to streamline the continued approval process for all types of teacher preparation programs.
Appendices
APPENDIX A

VALIDATION

The Following section is extracted from a, “Beginning Teachers from Florida Teacher Preparation Programs, January 2008.”

(http://www.altcertflorida.org/pdf/Beginning%20Teachers%20in%20Florida%2001-07-08.pdf)

FEAPs Ratings Validation

This section presents empirical evidence that supports the validity of the ratings of teachers’ performance on Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (FEAPs) according to their principals’ ratings and teachers’ self-rating. This directly addresses the question of whether principals’ and teachers’ ratings of effectiveness are plausible indicators of actual competency. To this end, several measures, including overall perceptions of effectiveness and whether teachers meet principals’ criteria for rehiring, document the consistency of the FEAPs ratings as indicators of quality teaching, that is, teachers that principals wish to retain. Presented below are the results of several analyses, each of which augments the validity of the FEAPs ratings as indicators of teacher competency.

Principal Ratings and Teacher Self-ratings

Both teachers and principals provided ratings of teachers’ competencies on each of the twelve FEAPs. Teachers provided self-reported ratings for each FEAP. Principals rated teachers on each FEAP.

Teachers and principals shared a similar pattern across all FEAPs (see Figures 26 a-n). Teachers’ self-assessments were significantly higher than principals’ ratings; however, both sets of ratings reflected an overall positive appraisal of new teachers’ effectiveness. Furthermore, teachers were asked to rate their own overall effectiveness. These responses were correlated with the mean principal rating of teachers across all 12 FEAPs. The bivariate correlation between teachers’ overall ratings and the principals’ was .28 (n = 308; p < .001), indicating a statistically significant moderate correlation between the two measures. Thus, there is convergence in how both teachers and principals appraise teachers’ performance on the FEAPs. This finding supports the validity of the FEAPs ratings, in so far as both teachers and principals independently arrived at similar conclusions about teachers’ competencies.

Principal FEAP Ratings and Teacher Rehire

As discussed in the prior section, principal and teacher FEAPs ratings were similar. Principal FEAPs ratings were also strong predictors of the principals’ evaluation of the “rehirability” of the teacher for the following academic year. Principals were asked, “Does this person meet your criteria for rehiring?” The correlation between the principals’ responses to this question and the principals’ overall FEAP ratings was calculated to be .30 (n = 312; p < .001), thus indicating a moderate correlation between their FEAPs ratings and their intentions to rehire. Furthermore,
according to principals’ ratings, teachers who scored below 70 percent effectiveness in the FEAPs were 17 times more likely not to be rehired than teachers who scored over 70 percent on their FEAPs effectiveness ratings. [8]

Summary of Validation Evidence

Results indicate a strong case for the validity of the FEAPs ratings as a measure of teacher quality. Both teachers and principals provide similar ratings of teachers on the FEAPs, thus indicating a shared perspective on teacher competency. This is important to note because it indicates that what is being measured by the FEAPs ratings is readily identifiable by both teachers and principals and scored similarly by the two groups.

Additionally, principals’ FEAPs ratings are good predictors of principals’ evaluation of whether the teachers meet the criteria for rehiring. Teachers who were given high ratings by principals were much more likely to be rehired the following year than were teachers who received low FEAPs ratings.
## Appendix B

### Appendix B1 (Teacher Population Data)
Percentage of 2007-2008 ITP Completers Employed in Florida Public Schools in 2008-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>All Program Completers</th>
<th>Completers Employed in Florida Public Schools</th>
<th>Percentage Completers Employed in Florida Public Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barry University</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethune Cookman University</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearwater Christian College</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chipola College</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flagler College</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida A&amp;M University</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Atlantic University</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida College</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Gulf Coast University</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Institute of Technology</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida International University</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Memorial University</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Southern College</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State University</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville University</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn University</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami-Dade College</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nova Southeastern University</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Beach Atlantic University</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rollins College</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Leo University</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Petersburg College</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stetson University</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### School Completers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>All Program Completers</th>
<th>Completers Employed in Florida Public Schools</th>
<th>Percentage Completers Employed in Florida Public Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southeastern University</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Central Florida</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Florida</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Miami</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Florida</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Florida</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Tampa</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of West Florida</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warner University</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Programs Total</td>
<td>5770</td>
<td>3092</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Appendix B2 (Teacher Population Data)**

Percentage of 2007-2008 DACP Completers Employed in Florida Public Schools in 2008-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>All Program Completers</th>
<th>Completers Employed in Florida Public Schools</th>
<th>Percentage Completers Employed in Florida Public Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alachua</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>87.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brevard</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broward</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calhoun</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citrus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collier</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dade</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>83.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeSoto</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>All Program Completers</td>
<td>Completers Employed in Florida Public Schools</td>
<td>Percentage Completers Employed in Florida Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duval</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>88.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escambia</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flagler</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gadsden</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilchrist</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glades</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulf</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardee</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendry</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hernando</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlands</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>87.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian River</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafayette</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>92.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leon</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manatee</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nassau</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okaloosa</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okeechobee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>87.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osceola</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Beach</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>All Program Completers</td>
<td>Completers Employed in Florida Public Schools</td>
<td>Percentage Completers Employed in Florida Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasco</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinellas</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polk</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>86.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putnam</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Johns</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lucie</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarasota</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminole</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>86.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumter</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suwannee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volusia</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wakulla</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAU/AD Henderson</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSUS/Florida High</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMU</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UF/PK Yonge</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSDB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Programs</td>
<td>1716</td>
<td>1479</td>
<td>86.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix B3 (Teacher Population Data)
Percentage of 2007-2008 EPI Completers Employed in Florida Public Schools in 2008-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Colleges</th>
<th>All Program Completers</th>
<th>Completers Employed in Florida Public Schools</th>
<th>Percentage Completers Employed in Florida Public Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brevard CC</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broward CC</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Florida CC</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daytona State College</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edison College</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida CC at Jacksonville</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulf Coast CC</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough CC</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian River State College</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake City CC</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Sumter CC</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami-Dade College</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Florida CC</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Florida State College</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Beach CC</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasco Hernando CC</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pensacola Junior College</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polk CC</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>74.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe College</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminole CC</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Johns River CC</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Petersburg College</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State College of Florida-Manatee and Sarasota</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Florida</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of West Florida</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tallahassee CC</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valencia CC</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Programs Total</td>
<td><strong>1374</strong></td>
<td><strong>755</strong></td>
<td><strong>54.9%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

Figure 26a: FEAP #1: ASSESSMENT

Teachers’ Ratings of Institutional Effectiveness in preparing them for FEAPS

Means by Institution

(Mean for all preparation programs = 3.38; standard deviation = .562; n=1006)

Figure 26a: FEAP #1: ASSESSMENT
Scale: 1.0 = Ineffective, 2.0 = Not very effective, 3.0 = Effective, 4.0 = Very effective

- Southeastern University (n=3), 2.6731
- University of South Florida-St. Petersburg (n=20), 2.97
- 26 University of Central Florida (n=123), 3.19
- 33 University of West Florida (n=34), 3.20
- 18 Miami-Dade College (n=19), 3.28
- 30 University of South Florida (n=142), 3.30
- 8 Florida Atlantic University (n=90), 3.33
- 17 Lynn University (n=4), 3.33
- 21 Rollins College (n=3), 3.33
- 19 Nova Southeastern University (n=41), 3.34
- 29 University of North Florida (n=57), 3.36
- 27 University of Florida (n=45), 3.37
- 6 Flagler College (n=15), 3.38
- 15 Florida State University (n=55), 3.41
- 20 Palm Beach Atlantic University (n=6), 3.44
- 7 Florida A&M University (n=15), 3.44
- 12 Florida International University (n=115), 3.48
- 10 Florida Gulf Coast University (n=27), 3.52
- 14 Florida Southern College (n=16), 3.52
- 28 University of Miami (n=18), 3.57
- 25 Stetson University (n=4), 3.58
- 24 St. Petersburg College (n=46), 3.60
- 13 Florida Memorial University (n=9), 3.63
- 1 Barry University (n=52), 3.63
- 22 Saint Leo University (n=31), 3.68
- 34 Warner Southern College (n=5), 3.73
- 2 Bethune-Cookman College (n=4), 3.75
- 32 University of Tampa (n=5), 3.80
- 3 Chipola College (n=2), 3.83
Mean institutional score is the mean score reported by all individuals who completed the teacher preparation program at that institution, who are teaching in Florida public schools, and who responded to the survey. The highest possible score is 4.0 points, representing respondents who felt their ITP was “very effective” in preparing them for a given competency. The lowest possible score is 1.0 points, representing respondents who felt their ITP was “ineffective” in preparing them for a given competency.
Figure 26b: FEAP # 2: COMMUNICATIONS

Teachers’ Ratings of Institutional Effectiveness in preparing them for FEAPS

Means by Institution

(Mean for all preparation programs = 3.43; standard deviation = .516; n=986)

Figure 26b: FEAP # 2: COMMUNICATIONS
Scale: 1.0 = Ineffective, 2.0 = Not very effective, 3.0 = Effective, 4.0 = Very effective

- Clearwater Christian College (n=2), 3.17
- University of Central Florida (n=122), 3.28
- Chipola College (n=1), 3.33
- Florida Institute of Technology (n=1), 3.33
- Jacksonville University (n=1), 3.33
- University of Miami (n=15), 3.36
- University of South Florida-St. Petersburg (n=15), 3.36
- University of South Florida (n=83), 3.38
- Florida Southern College (n=6), 3.39
- Florida Atlantic University (n=61), 3.39
- Florida Gulf Coast University (n=22), 3.39
- University of North Florida (n=35), 3.40
- Bethune-Cookman College (n=4), 3.42
- Saint Leo University (n=32), 3.42
- Florida A&M University (n=17), 3.43
- Flagler College (n=18), 3.44
- Palm Beach Atlantic University (n=3), 3.44
- Southeastern University (n=2), 3.50
- Florida State University (n=59), 3.51
- University of West Florida (n=31), 3.52
- University of Florida (n=34), 3.52
- Florida International University (n=64), 3.52
- Miami-Dade College (n=5), 3.53
- Nova Southeastern University (n=42), 3.54
- University of Tampa (n=8), 3.67
- Florida Memorial University (n=5), 3.67
- St. Petersburg College (n=23), 3.68
- Barry University (n=49), 3.69
- Stetson University (n=14), 3.93
- Rollins College (n=3), 4.00
- Warner Southern College (n=2), 4.00
Mean institutional score is the mean score reported by all individuals who completed the teacher preparation program at that institution, who are teaching in Florida public schools, and who responded to the survey. The highest possible score is 4.0 points, representing respondents who felt their ITP was “very effective” in preparing them for a given competency. The lowest possible score is 1.0 points, representing respondents who felt their ITP was “ineffective” in preparing them for a given competency.
Figure 26c: FEAP #3: CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

Teachers’ Ratings of Institutional Effectiveness in preparing them for FEAPS

Means by Institution

(Mean for all preparation programs = 3.41; standard deviation = .531; n=987)

Figure 26c: FEAP #3: CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT
Scale: 1.0 = Ineffective, 2.0 = Not very effective, 3.0 = Effective, 4.0 = Very effective

- 23 Southeastern University (n=3), 2.89
- 31 University of South Florida-St. Petersburg (n=20), 3.03
- 33 University of West Florida (n=33), 3.14
- 21 Rollins College (n=3), 3.22
- 29 University of North Florida (n=58), 3.29
- 8 Florida Atlantic University (n=90), 3.33
- 20 Palm Beach Atlantic University (n=6), 3.33
- 27 University of Florida (n=43), 3.35
- 26 University of Central Florida (n=121), 3.35
- 7 Florida A&M University (n=15), 3.36
- 30 University of South Florida (n=139), 3.37
- 6 Flagler College (n=15), 3.40
- 14 Florida Southern College (n=15), 3.40
- 19 Nova Southeastern University (n=39), 3.40
- 18 Miami-Dade College (n=17), 3.41
- 15 Florida State University (n=55), 3.43
- 17 Lynn University (n=3), 3.44
- 12 Florida International University (n=112), 3.46
- 10 Florida Gulf Coast University (n=27), 3.52
- 32 University of Tampa (n=4), 3.58
- 13 Florida Memorial University (n=9), 3.59
- 24 St. Petersburg College (n=45), 3.60
- 34 Warner Southern College (n=5), 3.60
- 22 Saint Leo University (n=30), 3.66
- 25 Stetson University (n=4), 3.67
- 1 Barry University (n=52), 3.68
- 28 University of Miami (n=18), 3.69
- 2 Bethune-Cookman College (n=4), 3.75
- 3 Chipola College (n=2), 3.83

Mean institutional score is the mean score reported by all individuals who completed the teacher preparation program at that institution, who are teaching in Florida public schools, and who responded to the survey. The highest possible score is 4.0 points, representing respondents who
felt their ITP was “very effective” in preparing them for a given competency. The lowest possible score is 1.0 points, representing respondents who felt their ITP was “ineffective” in preparing them for a given competency.
Figure 26d: FEAP # 4: CRITICAL THINKING

Teachers’ Ratings of Institutional Effectiveness in preparing them for FEAPS

Means by Institution

(Mean for all preparation programs = 3.43; standard deviation = .510; n=1005)

Figure 26d: FEAP # 4: CRITICAL THINKING
Scale: 1.0 = Ineffective, 2.0 = Not very effective, 3.0 = Effective, 4.0 = Very effective

- 23 Southeastern University (n=3), 2.78
- 31 University of South Florida-St. Petersburg (n=20), 3.15
- 33 University of West Florida (n=33), 3.18
- 26 University of Central Florida (n=123), 3.31
- 27 University of Florida (n=46), 3.36
- 30 University of South Florida (n=141), 3.38
- 20 Palm Beach Atlantic University (n=6), 3.39
- 8 Florida Atlantic University (n=90), 3.39
- 29 University of North Florida (n=58), 3.40
- 19 Nova Southeastern University (n=41), 3.40
- 2 Bethune-Cookman College (n=4), 3.42
- 15 Florida State University (n=55), 3.42
- 7 Florida A&M University (n=15), 3.42
- 21 Rollins College (n=3), 3.44
- 14 Florida Southern College (n=16), 3.46
- 10 Florida Gulf Coast University (n=26), 3.46
- 18 Miami-Dade College (n=19), 3.47
- 6 Flagler College (n=15), 3.49
- 12 Florida International University (n=116), 3.50
- 25 Stetson University (n=4), 3.50
- 28 University of Miami (n=18), 3.52
- 24 St. Petersburg College (n=46), 3.58
- 13 Florida Memorial University (n=9), 3.59
- 1 Barry University (n=52), 3.66
- 17 Lynn University (n=3), 3.67
- 34 Warner Southern College (n=5), 3.67
- 22 Saint Leo University (n=31), 3.71
- 32 University of Tampa (n=5), 3.73
- 3 Chipola College (n=2), 4.00

Mean institutional score is the mean score reported by all individuals who completed the teacher preparation program at that institution, who are teaching in Florida public schools, and who responded to the survey. The highest possible score is 4.0 points, representing respondents who
felt their ITP was “very effective” in preparing them for a given competency. The lowest possible score is 1.0 points, representing respondents who felt their ITP was “ineffective” in preparing them for a given competency.
**Figure 26e: FEAP # 5: DIVERSITY**

Teachers’ Ratings of Institutional Effectiveness in preparing them for FEAPS

Means by Institution

(Mean for all preparation programs = 3.49; standard deviation = .498; n=986)

**Figure 26e: FEAP # 5: DIVERSITY**
Scale: 1.0 = Ineffective, 2.0 = Not very effective, 3.0 = Effective, 4.0 = Very effective

- 23 Southeastern University (n=2), 2.83
- 31 University of South Florida-St. Petersburg (n=20), 3.13
- 33 University of West Florida (n=33), 3.30
- 7 Florida A&M University (n=15), 3.33
- 25 Stetson University (n=4), 3.33
- 8 Florida Atlantic University (n=89), 3.41
- 29 University of North Florida (n=57), 3.41
- 19 Nova Southeastern University (n=41), 3.42
- 18 Miami-Dade College (n=17), 3.43
- 17 Lynn University (n=3), 3.44
- 27 University of Florida (n=42), 3.44
- 14 Florida Southern College (n=16), 3.46
- 6 Flagler College (n=15), 3.47
- 34 Warner Southern College (n=5), 3.47
- 30 University of South Florida (n=139), 3.47
- 26 University of Central Florida (n=122), 3.48
- 12 Florida International University (n=112), 3.49
- 15 Florida State University (n=54), 3.51
- 20 Palm Beach Atlantic University (n=6), 3.56
- 21 Rollins College (n=3), 3.56
- 10 Florida Gulf Coast University (n=27), 3.57
- 2 Bethune-Cookman College (n=4), 3.67
- 1 Barry University (n=52), 3.68
- 22 Saint Leo University (n=30), 3.69
- 13 Florida Memorial University (n=9), 3.70
- 28 University of Miami (n=17), 3.71
- 24 St. Petersburg College (n=46), 3.75
- 32 University of Tampa (n=5), 3.87
- 3 Chipola College (n=2), 4.00

Mean institutional score is the mean score reported by all individuals who completed the teacher preparation program at that institution, who are teaching in Florida public schools, and who responded to the survey. The highest possible score is 4.0 points, representing respondents who
felt their ITP was “very effective” in preparing them for a given competency. The lowest possible score is 1.0 points, representing respondents who felt their ITP was “ineffective” in preparing them for a given competency.
Figure 26f: FEAP # 6: ETHICS

Teachers’ Ratings of Institutional Effectiveness in preparing them for FEAPS

Means by Institution

(Mean for all preparation programs = 3.56; standard deviation = .498; n=986)

Figure 26f: FEAP # 6: ETHICS
Scale: 1.0 = Ineffective, 2.0 = Not very effective, 3.0 = Effective, 4.0 = Very effective

- 31 University of South Florida-St. Petersburg (n=20), 3.22
- 23 Southeastern University (n=3), 3.33
- 33 University of West Florida (n=33), 3.42
- 19 Nova Southeastern University (n=41), 3.47
- 26 University of Central Florida (n=121), 3.48
- 27 University of Florida (n=42), 3.48
- 18 Miami-Dade College (n=17), 3.49
- 6 Flagler College (n=14), 3.50
- 25 Stetson University (n=4), 3.50
- 30 University of South Florida (n=141), 3.50
- 8 Florida Atlantic University (n=90), 3.53
- 29 University of North Florida (n=58), 3.54
- 7 Florida A&M University (n=15), 3.56
- 21 Rollins College (n=3), 3.56
- 12 Florida International University (n=110), 3.56
- 2 Bethune-Cookman College (n=4), 3.58
- 10 Florida Gulf Coast University (n=27), 3.62
- 14 Florida Southern College (n=16), 3.65
- 13 Florida Memorial University (n=9), 3.67
- 17 Lynn University (n=3), 3.67
- 15 Florida State University (n=54), 3.68
- 28 University of Miami (n=17), 3.69
- 1 Barry University (n=51), 3.71
- 22 Saint Leo University (n=29), 3.71
- 24 St. Petersburg College (n=46), 3.82
- 20 Palm Beach Atlantic University (n=6), 3.83
- 32 University of Tampa (n=5), 3.93
- 34 Warner Southern College (n=5), 3.93
- 3 Chipola College (n=2), 4.00

Mean institutional score is the mean score reported by all individuals who completed the teacher preparation program at that institution, who are teaching in Florida public schools, and who responded to the survey. The highest possible score is 4.0 points, representing respondents who
felt their ITP was “very effective” in preparing them for a given competency. The lowest possible score is 1.0 points, representing respondents who felt their ITP was “ineffective” in preparing them for a given competency.
Figure 26g: FEAP # 7: HUMAN DEVELOPMENT AND LEARNING

Teachers’ Ratings of Institutional Effectiveness in preparing them for FEAPS

Means by Institution

(Mean for all preparation programs = 3.47; standard deviation = .524; n=995)

Figure 26g: FEAP # 7: HUMAN DEVELOPMENT AND LEARNING
Scale: 1.0 = Ineffective, 2.0 = Not very effective, 3.0 = Effective, 4.0 = Very effective

- 23 Southeastern University (n=3), 2.78
- 31 University of South Florida-St. Petersburg (n=19), 3.07
- 33 University of West Florida (n=32), 3.29
- 8 Florida Atlantic University (n=88), 3.33
- 20 Palm Beach Atlantic University (n=6), 3.33
- 27 University of Florida (n=46), 3.39
- 29 University of North Florida (n=57), 3.40
- 30 University of South Florida (n=138), 3.41
- 18 Miami-Dade College (n=19), 3.42
- 19 Nova Southeastern University (n=41), 3.42
- 26 University of Central Florida (n=122), 3.44
- 7 Florida A&M University (n=15), 3.44
- 21 Rollins College (n=3), 3.44
- 15 Florida State University (n=55), 3.47
- 12 Florida International University (n=115), 3.50
- 6 Flagler College (n=15), 3.53
- 14 Florida Southern College (n=16), 3.54
- 2 Bethune-Cookman College (n=4), 3.58
- 25 Stetson University (n=4), 3.58
- 10 Florida Gulf Coast University (n=26), 3.59
- 17 Lynn University (n=3), 3.67
- 28 University of Miami (n=18), 3.67
- 24 St. Petersburg College (n=46), 3.68
- 13 Florida Memorial University (n=9), 3.70
- 1 Barry University (n=52), 3.71
- 22 Saint Leo University (n=31), 3.78
- 32 University of Tampa (n=5), 3.80
- 34 Warner Southern College (n=5), 3.80
- 3 Chipola College (n=2), 3.83

Mean institutional score is the mean score reported by all individuals who completed the teacher preparation program at that institution, who are teaching in Florida public schools, and who responded to the survey. The highest possible score is 4.0 points, representing respondents who
felt their ITP was “very effective” in preparing them for a given competency. The lowest possible score is 1.0 points, representing respondents who felt their ITP was “ineffective” in preparing them for a given competency.
Figure 26h: FEAP # 8: KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT MATTER

Teachers’ Ratings of Institutional Effectiveness in preparing them for FEAPS

Means by Institution

(Mean for all preparation programs = 3.35; standard deviation = .561; n=994)

Figure 26h: FEAP # 8: KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT MATTER
Scale: 1.0 = Ineffective, 2.0 = Not very effective, 3.0 = Effective, 4.0 = Very effective

- 23 Southeastern University (n=3), 2.89
- 33 University of West Florida (n=34), 3.01
- 31 University of South Florida-St. Petersburg (n=20), 3.08
- 2 Bethune-Cookman College (n=4), 3.17
- 29 University of North Florida (n=58), 3.21
- 26 University of Central Florida (n=120), 3.26
- 27 University of Florida (n=45), 3.28
- 8 Florida Atlantic University (n=89), 3.30
- 18 Miami-Dade College (n=19), 3.30
- 30 University of South Florida (n=143), 3.30
- 7 Florida A&M University (n=13), 3.31
- 19 Nova Southeastern University (n=41), 3.31
- 17 Lynn University (n=4), 3.33
- 20 Palm Beach Atlantic University (n=6), 3.33
- 15 Florida State University (n=54), 3.36
- 12 Florida International University (n=113), 3.41
- 25 Stetson University (n=4), 3.42
- 10 Florida Gulf Coast University (n=27), 3.43
- 6 Flagler College (n=15), 3.51
- 14 Florida Southern College (n=16), 3.52
- 24 St. Petersburg College (n=44), 3.55
- 22 Saint Leo University (n=30), 3.59
- 34 Warner Southern College (n=5), 3.60
- 28 University of Miami (n=18), 3.63
- 1 Barry University (n=50), 3.65
- 21 Rollins College (n=3), 3.67
- 13 Florida Memorial University (n=9), 3.74
- 32 University of Tampa (n=5), 3.87
- 3 Chipola College (n=2), 4.00

Mean institutional score is the mean score reported by all individuals who completed the teacher preparation program at that institution, who are teaching in Florida public schools, and who responded to the survey. The highest possible score is 4.0 points, representing respondents who
felt their ITP was “very effective” in preparing them for a given competency. The lowest possible score is 1.0 points, representing respondents who felt their ITP was “ineffective” in preparing them for a given competency.
Figure 26i: FEAP # 9: LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS

Teachers’ Ratings of Institutional Effectiveness in preparing them for FEAPS

Means by Institution

(Mean for all preparation programs = 3.45; standard deviation = .513; n=993)

Figure 26i: FEAP # 9: LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS
Scale: 1.0 = Ineffective, 2.0 = Not very effective, 3.0 = Effective, 4.0 = Very effective

- 23 Southeastern University (n=3), 3.11
- 33 University of West Florida (n=31), 3.20
- 31 University of South Florida-St. Petersburg (n=19), 3.21
- 20 Palm Beach Atlantic University (n=6), 3.28
- 26 University of Central Florida (n=121), 3.32
- 8 Florida Atlantic University (n=89), 3.36
- 7 Florida A&M University (n=15), 3.40
- 29 University of North Florida (n=58), 3.40
- 19 Nova Southeastern University (n=41), 3.41
- 27 University of Florida (n=46), 3.41
- 14 Florida Southern College (n=16), 3.42
- 6 Flagler College (n=15), 3.42
- 30 University of South Florida (n=139), 3.45
- 12 Florida International University (n=114), 3.46
- 18 Miami-Dade College (n=19), 3.47
- 15 Florida State University (n=54), 3.49
- 25 Stetson University (n=4), 3.50
- 10 Florida Gulf Coast University (n=27), 3.51
- 21 Rollins College (n=3), 3.56
- 28 University of Miami (n=18), 3.57
- 2 Bethune-Cookman College (n=4), 3.58
- 22 Saint Leo University (n=30), 3.64
- 13 Florida Memorial University (n=8), 3.67
- 1 Barry University (n=52), 3.69
- 24 St. Petersburg College (n=46), 3.72
- 17 Lynn University (n=3), 3.89
- 32 University of Tampa (n=5), 3.93
- 34 Warner Southern College (n=5), 3.93
- 3 Chipola College (n=2), 4.00

Mean institutional score is the mean score reported by all individuals who completed the teacher preparation program at that institution, who are teaching in Florida public schools, and who responded to the survey. The highest possible score is 4.0 points, representing respondents who
felt their ITP was “very effective” in preparing them for a given competency. The lowest possible score is 1.0 points, representing respondents who felt their ITP was “ineffective” in preparing them for a given competency.
**Figure 26j: FEAP # 10: PLANNING & INSTRUCTION**

Teachers’ Ratings of Institutional Effectiveness in preparing them for FEAPS

Means by Institution

(Mean for all preparation programs = 3.43; standard deviation = .521; n=1003)

Figure 26j: FEAP # 10: PLANNING & INSTRUCTION
Scale: 1.0 = Ineffective, 2.0 = Not very effective, 3.0 = Effective, 4.0 = Very effective

- 23 Southeastern University (n=3), 2.67
- 20 Palm Beach Atlantic University (n=6), 3.11
- 31 University of South Florida-St. Petersburg (n=20), 3.17
- 29 University of North Florida (n=58), 3.28
- 33 University of West Florida (n=34), 3.29
- 26 University of Central Florida (n=122), 3.31
- 27 University of Florida (n=44), 3.32
- 17 Lynn University (n=3), 3.33
- 21 Rollins College (n=3), 3.33
- 25 Stetson University (n=4), 3.33
- 18 Miami-Dade College (n=19), 3.35
- 6 Flagler College (n=15), 3.38
- 19 Nova Southeastern University (n=41), 3.41
- 8 Florida Atlantic University (n=91), 3.42
- 30 University of South Florida (n=142), 3.42
- 12 Florida International University (n=116), 3.43
- 15 Florida State University (n=53), 3.46
- 7 Florida A&M University (n=15), 3.49
- 10 Florida Gulf Coast University (n=27), 3.49
- 14 Florida Southern College (n=16), 3.50
- 13 Florida Memorial University (n=9), 3.59
- 28 University of Miami (n=18), 3.61
- 24 St. Petersburg College (n=45), 3.66
- 2 Bethune-Cookman College (n=4), 3.67
- 1 Barry University (n=52), 3.68
- 22 Saint Leo University (n=31), 3.73
- 34 Warner Southern College (n=5), 3.73
- 32 University of Tampa (n=5), 3.87
- 3 Chipola College (n=2), 4.00

Mean institutional score is the mean score reported by all individuals who completed the teacher preparation program at that institution, who are teaching in Florida public schools, and who responded to the survey. The highest possible score is 4.0 points, representing respondents who
felt their ITP was “very effective” in preparing them for a given competency. The lowest possible score is 1.0 points, representing respondents who felt their ITP was “ineffective” in preparing them for a given competency.
Figure 26k: FEAP # 11: ROLE OF THE TEACHER

Teachers’ Ratings of Institutional Effectiveness in preparing them for FEAPS

Means by Institution

(Mean for all preparation programs = 3.38; standard deviation = .578; n=982)

Figure 26k: FEAP # 11: ROLE OF THE TEACHER
Scale: 1.0 = Ineffective, 2.0 = Not very effective, 3.0 = Effective, 4.0 = Very effective

- 23 Southeastern University (n=2), 2.83
- 33 University of West Florida (n=33), 3.05
- 31 University of South Florida-St. Petersburg (n=20), 3.07
- 27 University of Florida (n=43), 3.23
- 8 Florida Atlantic University (n=88), 3.27
- 18 Miami-Dade College (n=17), 3.29
- 26 University of Central Florida (n=120), 3.30
- 29 University of North Florida (n=58), 3.30
- 17 Lynn University (n=4), 3.33
- 19 Nova Southeastern University (n=41), 3.35
- 30 University of South Florida (n=138), 3.36
- 7 Florida A&M University (n=14), 3.38
- 12 Florida International University (n=111), 3.39
- 15 Florida State University (n=55), 3.41
- 6 Flagler College (n=15), 3.44
- 20 Palm Beach Atlantic University (n=6), 3.44
- 14 Florida Southern College (n=16), 3.48
- 10 Florida Gulf Coast University (n=27), 3.52
- 22 Saint Leo University (n=29), 3.53
- 21 Rollins College (n=3), 3.56
- 1 Barry University (n=50), 3.60
- 28 University of Miami (n=18), 3.61
- 24 St. Petersburg College (n=46), 3.62
- 13 Florida Memorial University (n=9), 3.63
- 34 Warner Southern College (n=5), 3.67
- 2 Bethune-Cookman College (n=4), 3.75
- 32 University of Tampa (n=5), 3.80
- 25 Stetson University (n=3), 3.89
- 3 Chipola College (n=2), 4.00

Mean institutional score is the mean score reported by all individuals who completed the teacher preparation program at that institution, who are teaching in Florida public schools, and who responded to the survey. The highest possible score is 4.0 points, representing respondents who
felt their ITP was “very effective” in preparing them for a given competency. The lowest possible score is 1.0 points, representing respondents who felt their ITP was “ineffective” in preparing them for a given competency.
Figure 26: FEAP # 12: TECHNOLOGY

Teachers’ Ratings of Institutional Effectiveness in preparing them for FEAPS

Means by Institution

(Mean for all preparation programs = 3.29; standard deviation = .597; n=991)

Figure 26: FEAP # 12: TECHNOLOGY
Scale: 1.0 = Ineffective, 2.0 = Not very effective, 3.0 = Effective, 4.0 = Very effective

- 31 University of South Florida-St. Petersburg (n=20), 2.87
- 33 University of West Florida (n=33), 2.87
- 23 Southeastern University (n=3), 2.89
- 27 University of Florida (n=43), 3.17
- 8 Florida Atlantic University (n=90), 3.19
- 7 Florida A&M University (n=15), 3.20
- 19 Nova Southeastern University (n=40), 3.21
- 29 University of North Florida (n=58), 3.21
- 26 University of Central Florida (n=122), 3.24
- 30 University of South Florida (n=139), 3.25
- 12 Florida International University (n=112), 3.31
- 18 Miami-Dade College (n=17), 3.31
- 14 Florida Southern College (n=16), 3.33
- 20 Palm Beach Atlantic University (n=6), 3.33
- 21 Rollins College (n=3), 3.33
- 25 Stetson University (n=4), 3.33
- 10 Florida Gulf Coast University (n=27), 3.35
- 15 Florida State University (n=55), 3.36
- 6 Flagler College (n=15), 3.38
- 17 Lynn University (n=3), 3.44
- 28 University of Miami (n=18), 3.44
- 34 Warner Southern College (n=5), 3.47
- 22 Saint Leo University (n=30), 3.50
- 13 Florida Memorial University (n=9), 3.56
- 32 University of Tampa (n=5), 3.60
- 1 Barry University (n=51), 3.61
- 24 St. Petersburg College (n=46), 3.62
- 2 Bethune-Cookman College (n=4), 3.67
- 3 Chipola College (n=2), 4.00

Mean institutional score is the mean score reported by all individuals who completed the teacher preparation program at that institution, who are teaching in Florida public schools, and who responded to the survey. The highest possible score is 4.0 points, representing respondents who
felt their ITP was “very effective” in preparing them for a given competency. The lowest possible score is 1.0 points, representing respondents who felt their ITP was “ineffective” in preparing them for a given competency.
Figure 26m: PRACTICE # 13: READING

Teachers’ Ratings of Institutional Effectiveness in preparing them for Practice

Means by Institution

(Mean for all preparation programs = 3.40; standard deviation = .557; n=983)

Figure 26m: PRACTICE # 13: READING
Scale: 1.0 = Ineffective, 2.0 = Not very effective, 3.0 = Effective, 4.0 = Very effective

- 23 Southeastern University (n=3), 3.00
- 31 University of South Florida-St. Petersburg (n=20), 3.03
- 34 Warner Southern College (n=5), 3.20
- 33 University of West Florida (n=33), 3.20
- 29 University of North Florida (n=58), 3.25
- 8 Florida Atlantic University (n=87), 3.31
- 20 Palm Beach Atlantic University (n=6), 3.33
- 30 University of South Florida (n=139), 3.34
- 26 University of Central Florida (n=121), 3.35
- 18 Miami-Dade College (n=17), 3.35
- 14 Florida Southern College (n=15), 3.38
- 19 Nova Southeastern University (n=41), 3.38
- 27 University of Florida (n=42), 3.40
- 15 Florida State University (n=55), 3.40
- 25 Stetson University (n=4), 3.42
- 12 Florida International University (n=113), 3.44
- 6 Flagler College (n=15), 3.44
- 7 Florida A&M University (n=15), 3.44
- 21 Rollins College (n=3), 3.44
- 22 Saint Leo University (n=29), 3.54
- 10 Florida Gulf Coast University (n=27), 3.56
- 17 Lynn University (n=3), 3.56
- 24 St. Petersburg College (n=44), 3.57
- 2 Bethune-Cookman College (n=4), 3.67
- 13 Florida Memorial University (n=8), 3.67
- 32 University of Tampa (n=5), 3.67
- 1 Barry University (n=52), 3.70
- 28 University of Miami (n=17), 3.71
- 3 Chipola College (n=2), 3.83

Mean institutional score is the mean score reported by all individuals who completed the teacher preparation program at that institution, who are teaching in Florida public schools, and who responded to the survey. The highest possible score is 4.0 points, representing respondents who
felt their ITP was “very effective” in preparing them for a given competency. The lowest possible score is 1.0 points, representing respondents who felt their ITP was “ineffective” in preparing them for a given competency.
Figure 26n: PRACTICE # 14: TEST-TAKING STRATEGIES

Teachers’ Ratings of Institutional Effectiveness in preparing them for Practice

Means by Institution

(Mean for all preparation programs = 3.21; standard deviation = .665; n=1001)

Figure 26n: PRACTICE # 14: TEST-TAKING STRATEGIES
Scale: 1.0 = Ineffective, 2.0 = Not very effective, 3.0 = Effective, 4.0 = Very effective

- 31 University of South Florida-St. Petersburg (n=20), 2.70
- 23 Southeastern University (n=3), 2.83
- 33 University of West Florida (n=34), 2.91
- 25 Stetson University (n=4), 3.00
- 26 University of Central Florida (n=122), 3.02
- 8 Florida Atlantic University (n=89), 3.11
- 30 University of South Florida (n=142), 3.12
- 29 University of North Florida (n=57), 3.13
- 19 Nova Southeastern University (n=40), 3.16
- 27 University of Florida (n=46), 3.16
- 18 Miami-Dade College (n=19), 3.24
- 12 Florida International University (n=116), 3.30
- 6 Flagler College (n=15), 3.30
- 14 Florida Southern College (n=15), 3.30
- 34 Warner Southern College (n=5), 3.30
- 15 Florida State University (n=54), 3.32
- 24 St. Petersburg College (n=46), 3.33
- 20 Palm Beach Atlantic University (n=6), 3.33
- 21 Rollins College (n=3), 3.33
- 17 Lynn University (n=4), 3.38
- 10 Florida Gulf Coast University (n=27), 3.39
- 2 Bethune-Cookman College (n=4), 3.50
- 3 Chipola College (n=2), 3.50
- 7 Florida A&M University (n=15), 3.50
- 13 Florida Memorial University (n=9), 3.50
- 32 University of Tampa (n=5), 3.50
- 28 University of Miami (n=18), 3.53
- 22 Saint Leo University (n=31), 3.53
- 1 Barry University (n=50), 3.54

Mean institutional score is the mean score reported by all individuals who completed the teacher preparation program at that institution, who are teaching in Florida public schools, and who
responded to the survey. The highest possible score is 4.0 points, representing respondents who felt their ITP was “very effective” in preparing them for a given competency. The lowest possible score is 1.0 points, representing respondents who felt their ITP was “ineffective” in preparing them for a given competency.
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APPENDIX E

Pathways to Full State Certification in Florida

Professional Certificate

- **Renewable - Valid 5 School Years**
  - Valid Standard Certificate Issued by Another State
  - Valid Certificate Issued by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards

Temporary Certificate

- **Nonrenewable - Valid 3 School Years**
  - Bachelor's Degree with a Major in the Content Area
  - Bachelor's Degree with Required Courses and 2.5 GPA in the Content Area
  - Bachelor's Degree with a Passing Score on the Florida Subject Area Examination
  - Bachelor's Degree with a Valid Certificate Issued by the American Board of Teacher Excellence (ABCTE)

Options for Moving from the Temporary Certificate to the Professional Certificate:

- Professional Preparation College Courses, Teaching Experience, Demonstration of Professional Education Competence in the Classroom, and Florida Certification Examinations
- District Alternative Certification Program and Florida Certification Examinations
- Educator Preparation Institute Program and Florida Certification Examinations
- Valid ABCTE Certificate and Demonstration of Professional Education Competence in the Classroom
- Approved College Professional Training Option for a Content Major, Teaching Experience, Demonstration of Professional Education Competence in the Classroom, and Florida Certification Examinations
- Two Semesters of successful full-time college teaching experience and passing the Florida Subject Certification Examination
APPENDIX F


The twelve essential practices of effective teaching are:

1. Accomplished Practice One – Assessment.
   a) Accomplished level. The accomplished teacher uses assessment strategies (traditional and alternate) to assist the continuous development of the learner.
   b) Professional level. The professional teacher continually reviews and assesses data gathered from a variety of sources. These sources can include, but shall not be limited to, pretests, standardized tests, portfolios, anecdotal records, case studies, subject area inventories, cumulative records, and student services information. The professional teacher develops the student’s instructional plan that meets cognitive, social, linguistic, cultural, emotional, and physical needs.
   c) Preprofessional level. The preprofessional teacher collects and uses data gathered from a variety of sources. These sources will include both traditional and alternative strategies. Furthermore, the teacher can identify and match the student’s instructional plan with their cognitive, social, linguistic, cultural, emotional, and physical needs.

2. Accomplished Practice Two – Communication.
   a) Accomplished level. The accomplished teacher uses effective communication techniques with students and all other stakeholders.
   b) Professional level. The professional teacher constantly seeks to create a classroom that is accepting, yet businesslike, on task, and produces results. She/he communicates to all students high expectations for learning, and supports, encourages and gives positive and fair feedback about their learning efforts. This teacher models good communication skills and creates an atmosphere in the classroom that encourages mutual respect and appreciation of different cultures, linguistic backgrounds, learning styles, and abilities.
   c) Preprofessional level. The preprofessional teacher recognizes the need for effective communication in the classroom and is in the process of acquiring techniques which she/he will use in the classroom.

3. Accomplished Practice Three – Continuous Improvement.
a) Accomplished level. The accomplished teacher engages in continuous professional quality improvement for self and school.

b) Professional level. The professional teacher recognizes the need to strengthen her/his teaching through self reflection and commitment to life-long learning. The teacher becomes aware of and is familiar with the School Improvement Plan. The teacher’s continued professional improvement is characterized by participation in inservice, participation in school/community committees, and designing and meeting the goals of a professional development plan.

c) Preprofessional level. The preprofessional teacher realizes that she/he is in the initial stages of a life-long learning process and that self reflection is one of the key components of that process. While her/his concentration is, of necessity, inward and personal, the role of colleagues and school-based improvement activities increase as time passes. The teacher’s continued professional improvement is characterized by self reflection, work with immediate colleagues and teammates, and meeting the goals of a personal professional development plan.

4. Accomplished Practice Four – Critical Thinking.

a) Accomplished level. The accomplished teacher uses appropriate techniques and strategies which promote and enhance critical, creative, and evaluative thinking capabilities of students.

b) Professional level. The professional teacher will use a variety of performance assessment techniques and strategies that measure higher order thinking skills in students and can provide realistic projects and problem solving activities which will enable all students to demonstrate their ability to think creatively.

c) Preprofessional level. The preprofessional teacher is acquiring performance assessment techniques and strategies that measure higher order thinking skills in students and is building a repertoire of realistic projects and problem solving activities designed to assist all students in demonstrating their ability to think creatively.

5. Accomplished Practice Five – Diversity.

a) Accomplished level. The accomplished teacher uses teaching and learning strategies that reflect each student’s culture, learning styles, special needs, and socio-economic background.

b) Professional level. The professional teacher establishes a risk-taking environment which accepts and fosters diversity. The teacher must demonstrate knowledge of varied cultures by practices such as conflict resolution, mediation, creating a climate of openness,
inquiry and support.

c) Preprofessional level. The preprofessional teacher establishes a comfortable environment which accepts and fosters diversity. The teacher must demonstrate knowledge and awareness of varied cultures. The teacher creates a climate of openness, inquiry, and support by practicing strategies as acceptance, tolerance, resolution, and mediation.

6. Accomplished Practice Six – Ethics.

a) Accomplished level. The accomplished teacher adheres to the Code of Ethics and Principles of Professional Conduct of the Education Profession in Florida.

b) Professional level. The professional teacher adheres to the Code of Ethics and Principles of Professional Conduct of the Education Profession in Florida.

c) Preprofessional level. The preprofessional teacher adheres to the Code of Ethics and Principles of Professional Conduct of the Education Profession in Florida.

7. Accomplished Practice Seven – Human Development and Learning.

a) Accomplished level. The accomplished teacher uses an understanding of learning and human development to provide a positive learning environment which supports the intellectual, personal, and social development of all students.

b) Professional level. Drawing upon well established human development/learning theories and concepts and a variety of information about students, the professional teacher provides learning opportunities appropriate to student learning style, linguistic and cultural heritage, experiential background and developmental level.

c) Preprofessional level. Drawing upon well established human development/learning theories and concepts and a variety of information about students, the preprofessional teacher plans instructional activities.

8. Accomplished Practice Eight – Knowledge of Subject Matter.

a) Accomplished level. The accomplished teacher demonstrates knowledge and understanding of the subject matter.

b) Professional level. The professional teacher has a basic understanding of the subjects she/he teaches and is beginning to understand that her/his subject is linked to other disciplines and can be applied in real world integrated settings. The teacher seeks out ways/sources to expand her/his knowledge. The commitment to learning about new
knowledge includes keeping abreast of sources which will enhance teaching. The teacher’s repertoire of teaching skills includes a variety of means to assist student acquisition of new knowledge.

c) Preprofessional level. The preprofessional teacher has a basic understanding of the subject field and is beginning to understand that the subject is linked to other disciplines and can be applied to real world integrated settings. The teacher’s repertoire of teaching skills includes a variety of means to assist student acquisition of new knowledge and skills using that knowledge.


a) Accomplished level. The accomplished teacher creates and maintains positive learning environments in which students are actively engaged in learning, social interaction, cooperative learning and self-motivation.

b) Professional level. The professional teacher understands the importance of setting up effective learning environments and begins to experiment with a variety of them, seeking to identify those which work best in a particular situation. The teacher provides the opportunities for student input into behavioral expectations by helping students develop a set of shared values and beliefs, by encouraging them to envision the environment in which they like to learn, by providing occasions for reflection upon the rules and consequences which would create such an environment, and by honoring dissent.

c) Preprofessional level. The preprofessional teacher understands the importance of setting up effective learning environments and has techniques and strategies to use to do so, including some that provide opportunities for student input into the processes. The teacher understands that she/he will need a variety of techniques and is working to increase her/his knowledge and skills.

10. Accomplished Practice Ten – Planning.

a) Accomplished level. The accomplished teacher plans, implements, and evaluates effective instruction in a variety of learning environments.

b) Professional level. The professional teacher sets high expectations for all students and uses concepts from a variety of concept areas, and plans individually with students and with other teachers to design learning experiences that meet students’ needs and interests. The teacher continues to seek advice/information from appropriate sources including feedback, interprets the information, and modifies plans. Comprehensible instruction is implemented in a creative environment using varied and motivating strategies and multiple resources. Outcomes are assessed using traditional and alternative approaches.
Upon reflection, the teacher continuously refines learning experiences.

c) Preprofessional level. The preprofessional teacher recognizes the importance of setting high expectations for all students and works with other professionals to design learning experiences that meet students’ needs and interests. The teacher candidate continually seeks advice/information from appropriate resources including feedback, interprets the information, and modifies her/his plans appropriately. Planned instruction will incorporate a creative environment and utilize varied and motivational strategies and multiple resources for providing comprehensible instruction for all students. Upon reflection, the teacher continuously refines outcome assessment and learning experiences.

11. Accomplished Practice Eleven – Role of the Teacher.

a) Accomplished level. The accomplished teacher works with various education professionals, parents, and other stakeholders in the continuous improvement of the educational experiences of students.

b) Professional level. The professional teacher establishes open lines of communication and works cooperatively with families, educational professionals and other members of the student’s support system to promote continuous improvement of the educational experience.

c) Preprofessional level. The preprofessional teacher communicates and works cooperatively with families and colleagues to improve the educational experiences at the school.


a) Accomplished level. The accomplished teacher uses appropriate technology in teaching and learning processes.

b) Professional level. The professional teacher uses technology (as appropriate) to establish an atmosphere of active learning with existing and emerging technologies available at the school site. She/he provides students with opportunities to use technology to gather and share information with others, and facilitates access to the use of electronic resources.

c) Preprofessional level. The preprofessional teacher uses technology as available at the school site and as appropriate to the learner. She/he provides students with opportunities to actively use technology and facilitates access to the use of electronic resources. The teacher also uses technology to manage, evaluate, and improve instruction.

Specific Authority 1004.04, 1004.85, 1012.56 FS. Law Implemented 1004.04, 1004.85, 1012.56 FS. History–New 7-2-98.
APPENDIX G

Teacher Survey Questions – 2009 Spring Survey

Thank you for your support in completing this survey. Please mark each item to the best of your knowledge and then click Next at the bottom of the page when you have finished to continue with the survey.

First, we would like to ask you a few questions about your background and current teaching position.

Please identify the type of program that you completed:

- District Alternative Certification Program
- Educator Preparation Institute at a Florida Community College
- Educator Preparation Institute at a Florida College or University
- Bachelor’s four year teacher education program at a Florida College or University
- Master’s or postbaccalaureate teacher education program at a Florida University
- Master’s or specialist’s program in one of the following:
  - Educational Leadership
  - School Psychology
  - Guidance and Counseling

For District Alternative Certification Program Teachers:

Please identify the school district from which you completed:

OR

For Educator Preparation Institute Teachers:

Please identify the EPI institution from which you completed:

OR

For Teacher Education Program Teachers:

Please identify the college or university from which you graduated:

1. Please indicate how many years you have been teaching.

- 0-1 year
- 1-2 years
- 2-3 years
- More than 3 years
2. Gender

- Male
- Female

3. Race/Ethnicity

- White
- Black
- Hispanic
- Asian
- American Indian
- Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander
- Other

4. Age

- 20-29 years
- 30-39 years
- 40-49 years
- 50-59 years
- 60 years or more

5. What is the highest degree you have earned?

- Bachelors
- Masters
- Educational Specialist
- Doctorate (Ph.D. or Ed.D.)

6. What was your main activity the year before you began teaching at the elementary or secondary level?

- Worked full-time
- Worked part-time
- Sought employment
- Unemployed
- Attended college or university
- Volunteered
- Stay-at-home-parent

7. What was your most recent professional job prior to beginning teaching at the elementary or secondary level?

- Business
- Substitute Teacher
• Paraprofessional
• Teacher
• Health Related Education
• Day care Worker
• Student
• Administrative Staff/Secretary
• Social Work
• Legal Related
• Military
• University/College
• Fine Arts
• Technical
• Librarian
• Government
• Stay-at-home parent/Guardian
• Science or Engineering
• Volunteer
• T.V/Radio news
• other
• If other please specify:

8. What grade level do you teach?

• Pre K
• K to 5
• 6 to 8
• 9 to 12

9. What is your main teaching assignment (e.g., elementary, math, science, social studies, etc.)

• Elementary Integrated
• ESE (Exceptional Student ed)
• Fine Arts
• Foreign Language
• Math
• PE/Health
• Language Arts/English
• Reading
• Sciences
• Social Sciences
• other
• If other, please specify:
Next, we would like to ask you some questions about your teacher preparation program (including district alternative certification program).

Rating Scale for each of the following items:

- 1- Highly effective
- 2-Effective
- 3-Not very effective
- 4-Ineffective

Planning:

How well did your teacher preparation program prepare you to do the following?

1. Identify strategies that expand students’ critical thinking.
2. Plan activities that require students to gather information and solve problems.
3. Incorporate activities that promote positive communication among students.
4. Provide opportunities for students to receive constructive feedback on individual work and behavior.
5. Use relevant materials and technologies to promote student learning.
6. Apply learning theories and knowledge of human development to first and second language acquisition processes.
7. Plan lessons with specific learning and performance outcomes that are based on the Sunshine State Standards and that meet the needs of all students.
8. Collaborate with other educators when planning lessons.
9. Develop technology enriched learning activities that meets the diverse needs of students.
10. Reflect on practice and modify instruction as needed.
11. Recognize and identify developmental differences among students.
12. Incorporate reading strategies in instructional planning in various subject areas.

Instruction:

How well did your teacher preparation program prepare you to do the following?

1. Establish classroom routines and procedures that promote a positive and safe learning environment.
2. Employ a variety of assessment strategies to determine students’ performance of specified outcomes such as Sunshine State Standards.
3. Maintain academic focus for all students through the use of various techniques that address differences in learning styles.
4. Use a variety of teaching techniques and strategies to effectively instruct all students, including students with diverse learning needs.
5. Use instructional time effectively.
7. Use technology in instructional delivery to enrich student learning experiences.
8. Use resources outside the classroom to enrich student learning experiences.
9. Demonstrate how knowledge can be applied to real-world settings.
10. Use assessment data to improve student achievement.
11. Use questions and activities that engage students in higher order thinking.
12. Use a variety of developmentally appropriate activities to engage and motivate students.
13. Demonstrate an understanding of how the subject is linked to other disciplines.
14. Use results from individual reading assessments to improve student academic performance.
15. Recognize signs of students' difficulty with the reading and use appropriate techniques to improve students' reading.
16. Prepare students for taking standardized tests by using aggregated data to create and assess instruction that focuses on improving student achievement.
17. Monitor student performance on core benchmarks throughout the year.

**Professionalism:**

**How well did your teacher preparation program prepare you to do the following?**

1. Use technology tools to manage and evaluate student data.
2. Make reasonable efforts to protect students from harmful conditions that interfere with their learning.
3. Adhere to ethical standards expected of an educator in the classroom and in the school community.
5. Treat students equitably by fostering acceptance of diversity in the classroom.
6. Communicate effectively with families and students from culturally diverse backgrounds.
7. Adapt communication style based on the needs of individuals and groups.
8. Access relevant educational research.
9. Implement strategies acquired through professional growth opportunities.
10. Provide meaningful feedback regarding student performance to families.
11. Work with colleagues to improve students’ educational experiences.
12. Demonstrate knowledge of research-based, developmentally appropriate reading strategies.

Is there anything else you would like to tell us about your teacher preparation program?

[Text box response]

***For teachers with less than 1.5 (<1.5) years of teaching experience (as a result of response from question 1, page 1)***

Please answer the following questions about your first year as a classroom teacher.

1. When seeking your first teaching position for the 2007-08 school year, how many different positions did you apply for?
2. Which of the following factors was important to choosing your first teaching position? Check all that apply.

- When the contract was offered
- The salary amount offered
- The amount and types of benefits offered
- Where the district or school is located
- Change in residence
- Your teaching assignment, including the grade level and subject(s) you would teach
- The district or school’s reputation as being a “safe” place to work
- Overall levels of student achievement in the district or school
- The types of students served by the district or school
- Opportunities to lead extracurricular activities, such as sports, music, drama, or other academic clubs
- District or school administration and leadership
- Opportunities for new teacher induction and mentoring
- The people you met on your job interview
- Other (Specify)

3. Which of the following sources of information did you use when searching for your first teaching position? Check all that apply.

- On-campus recruitment or job fairs
- District Job Fair
- Great Florida Teach-In
- Job listings on the Florida DOE Website
- Job listings on district or school Websites
- Job listings on national teacher employment Websites
- School or district administrators
- Faculty or instructors in your teacher preparation program
- Applications for fellowships or other programs that place teachers (e.g., Teach for America)
- Word-of-mouth from family and friends
- Other (Specify)

4. What is your employment status for next year?

- Contract Signed
- Contract Expected
- Teaching in another district
- Teaching in another state
• Unsure
• Leaving teaching
• Not rehired

**If response to #4 is “Leaving Teaching” – answer only 4a, skip #5. If any other response, go to #5**

4a. If leaving teaching altogether, please indicate your reasons for doing so. Check all that apply.
• Low salary
• Lack of administrative support
• Required duties were too demanding
• Student behavior
• Dissatisfied with teaching as a career
• To take courses to improve career opportunities within the field of education
• Did not feel prepared to teach
• Pregnancy or child rearing
• Promotion within education
• Other (Specify)

5. How long do you plan to remain in the position of a PK – 12 teacher?
• As long as I am able to
• Until I am eligible for retirement benefits
• Until I am eligible for social security benefits
• Until a specific life event occurs (e.g., parenthood, marriage)
• Until a more desirable job opportunity comes along
• Definitely plan to leave as soon as I can
• Undecided at this time

6. Did you participate in a new teacher induction program?
• Yes
• No

*If response to Q6 is yes, answer (6a)*

6a. How would you rate your induction program?
• 1 – Highly effective
• 2 – Effective
• 3 – Not very effective
• 4 – Ineffective

7. Are you currently assigned a peer mentor (coach, tutor)?
• Yes
• No

(If response to Q7 is yes, answer 7a. thru 7c.)

7a. How often have you been in contact with your mentor?
• Not yet
• Once
• Once monthly
• A few times a month
• Weekly
• Nearly every day

7b. Is your mentor experienced in the same or similar subject area(s) which you are currently assigned to teach?
• Yes
• No

7c. How important has your mentor been in helping you develop as a teacher?
• Highly important
• Important
• Somewhat important
• Not very important

8. How often do you meet formally with other new teachers?
• Never
• Rarely
• Sometimes
• Frequently

9. How many times have you been formally observed in the classroom?
• Never
• 1-2 times
• 3-5 times
• More than five times

10. How often does your principal/assistant principal provide you with feedback about your teaching?
• Never
• Rarely
• Sometimes
• Frequently
11. Has your principal/assistant principal helped you understand the overall mission and vision of your school?

- Yes
- No
- Somewhat

12. Has your principal/assistant principal helped you become a valued member of the school community?

- Yes
- No
- Somewhat

13. How much are teachers involved in making important educational decisions in your school?

- Teachers are rarely involved in making important decisions.
- Teachers are involved in a few important decisions.
- Teachers are involved in some important decisions.
- Teachers are involved in most important decisions.
- I am not sure.

14. How often do the teachers in your school give each other feedback about teaching?

- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Frequently

15. How often do the teachers in your school work together to respond to student needs?

- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Frequently

16. How much do teachers at your school share common beliefs and values about what the mission of the school should be?

- They share very few values.
- They share some values.
- They share most values.
- I don't know.

17. How often is time scheduled at your school to work collaboratively (e.g., team meetings, learning communities, etc.)
- Never
- Only on staff development/teacher planning days
- Once a month
- Bi-weekly
- Once a week

18. Do the policies at your school contribute to or interfere with your ability to teach effectively?

- Interfere a lot
- Interfere a little
- Contribute a little
- Contribute a lot
- I don't know
**Rating scale for items 19-23**

- 1 - Not at all
- 2 - Not very well
- 3 - Fairly well
- 4 - Very well

19. How well are you able to control disruptive behavior in the classroom?

20. How well are you able to get children to follow classroom rules?

21. How well are you able to motivate students who show low interest in school work?

22. How well are you able to provide appropriate challenges for very capable students?

23. How well are you able to engage your students in classroom learning?

24. Overall, how effective do you feel as a teacher?

- 1 – Highly effective
- 2 – Effective
- 3 – Not very effective
- 4 – Ineffective

---

**Section for Teachers Who Have Taught 1.5 years or More (>1.5)**

(as a result of response to question 1 page1)

1. What is your employment status for next year?

- Contract Signed
- Contract Expected
- Teaching in another district
- Teaching in another state
- Unsure
- Leaving teaching
- Not rehired

**If response to #1 is “Leaving Teaching” – answer only 1a, skip #2. If any other response, go to #2**

1a. If leaving teaching altogether, please indicate your reasons for doing so. Check all that apply.

- Low salary
- Lack of administrative support
• Required duties were too demanding
• Student behavior
• Dissatisfied with teaching as a career
• To take courses to improve career opportunities within the field of education
• Did not feel prepared to teach
• Pregnancy or child rearing
• Promotion within education
• Other (Specify)

2. How long do you plan to remain in the position of a PK – 12 teacher?
• As long as I am able to
• Until I am eligible for retirement benefits
• Until I am eligible for social security benefits
• Until a specific life event occurs (e.g., parenthood, marriage)
• Until a more desirable job opportunity comes along
• Definitely plan to leave a soon as I can
• Undecided at this time

3. Are you teaching in the same school you were teaching during the 2007-2008 school year?
• Yes
• No

(If response to Q3 is no, answer 3a-3b)

3a. Why did you change schools?
• Lack of administrative support
• Student behavior
• Negative atmosphere among the teachers
• School policies regarding discipline and/or curriculum
• Location
• Was offered a job in a different assignment/grade level
• Other (Specify)

3b. Are you teaching the same subject and/or grade assignment that you were teaching during the 2007-2008 school year?
• Yes
• No

(If response to Q3b is No, go to 3c-3d. If response to Q3b is Yes, go directly to 3e-3g.)
3c. Please indicate the subject area and/or grade level you were teaching during the 2006-2007 school year.

3d. Please indicate why your teaching assignment changed.

- Personal choice
- Administrative request
- Other (Specify)

3e. When seeking a teaching position for the 2008-09 school year, how many different positions did you apply for?

- I only applied for one position.
- I applied for 2 positions
- I applied for 3 or more positions

3f. Which of the following factors was important to choosing your teaching position? Check all that apply?

- When the contract was offered
- The salary amount offered
- Benefits offered
- Where the district or school is located
- Your teaching assignment, including the grade level and subject(s) you would teach
- The district or school’s reputation as being a “safe” place to work
- Overall levels of student achievement in the district or school
- The types of students served by the district or school
- Opportunities to lead extracurricular activities, such as sports, music, drama, or other academic clubs
- District or school administration and leadership
- Opportunities for new teacher induction and mentoring
- The people you met on your job interview
- Other (Specify)

3g. Which of the following sources of information did you use when searching for your teaching position? Check all that apply.

- On-campus recruitment or job fairs
- District job fair
- Great Florida Teach-In
- Job listings on the Florida DOE Website
- Job listings on district or school Websites
- Job listings on national teacher employment Websites
- School or district administrators
- Faculty or instructors in your teacher preparation program
• Applications for fellowships or other programs that place teachers (e.g., Teach for America)
• Word-of-mouth from family and friends
• Other (Specify)

4. When you were a first year teacher, did you participate in a new teacher induction program?

• Yes
• No

(If response to Q4 is yes, go to (4a))

4a. How would you rate your induction program?

• 1 – Highly effective
• 2 – Effective
• 3 – Not very effective
• 4 – Ineffective

5. Were you assigned a peer mentor (coach, tutor) during your first year of teaching?

• Yes
• No

(If response to Q5 is yes, answer 5a -5c. Otherwise, go directly to Q6.)

5a. How often were you in contact with your mentor?

• Once
• Once monthly
• A few times a month
• Weekly
• Nearly every day

5b. Was your mentor experienced in the same or similar subject area(s) which you were assigned to teach?

• Yes
• No

5c. How important was your mentor in helping you develop as a teacher?

• Very important
• Important
• Somewhat important
• Not very important

6. How often did you meet formally with other new teachers in your first year of teaching?
  • Never
  • Rarely
  • Sometimes
  • Frequently

7. How many times during your first year of teaching were you formally observed in the classroom?
  • Never
  • 1-2 times
  • 3-5 times
  • More than five times

8. How often during your first year of teaching did your principal/assistant principal provide you useful feedback about your teaching?
  • Never
  • Rarely
  • Sometimes
  • Frequently

9. Did your principal/assistant principal help you understand the overall mission and vision of your school?
  • Yes
  • No
  • Somewhat

10. Did your principal/assistant principal help you become a valued member of the school community?
    • Yes
    • No
    • Somewhat

11. How much are teachers involved in making important educational decisions in your school?
    • Teachers are rarely involved in making important decisions.
    • Teachers are involved in a few important decisions.
    • Teachers are involved in some important decisions.
    • Teachers are involved in most important decisions.
    • I am not sure.
12. How often do the teachers in your school give each other feedback about teaching?

- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Frequently

13. How often do the teachers in your school work together to respond to student needs?

- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Frequently

14. How much do teachers at your school share common beliefs and values about what the mission of the school should be?

- They share very few values.
- They share some values.
- They share most values.
- I don't know.

15. How often is time scheduled at your school to work collaboratively (e.g., team meetings, study groups, etc.)?

- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Frequently

16. Do the policies at your school contribute to or interfere with your ability to teach effectively?

- Interfere a lot
- Interfere a little
- Contribute a little
- Contribute a lot
- I don't know

**Rating scale for items 17-21**

- 1. - Not at all
- 2. - Not very well
- 3. - Fairly well
- 4. - Very well
17. How well are you able to control disruptive behavior in the classroom?

18. How well are you able to get children to follow classroom rules?

19. How well are you able to motivate students who show low interest in school work?

20. How well are you able to provide appropriate challenges for very capable students?

21. How well are you able to engage your students in classroom learning?

22. Overall, how effective do you feel as a teacher?

- 1 – Highly effective
- 2 – Effective
- 3 – Not very effective
- 4 – Ineffective
APPENDIX H

District Alternative Certification Program Teacher Completers

(Additional Questions)

Please answer the following questions about your District’s Alternative Certification Program.

1. Did you know about the Alternative Certification option before you began teaching?
   • Yes
   • No
   (if yes, the following question pops up, if no it is skipped)

1a. Did knowing about the District’s Alternative Certification Program have an influence on your decision to teach?
   • Yes
   • No

2. Where did you first hear about the Alternative Certification Option?
   • During a teacher recruitment event
   • From a school or district administrator
   • From the Florida DOE Website
   • From any other website
   • Other [specify]

3. How long did it take to complete your District’s Alternative Certification Program?
   • Less than 6 months
   • 6 months to 1 year
   • 1 year to 2 years
   • 2 years to 3 years
   • more than 3 years

4. Did your school district conduct a pre-assessment of your skills on the 12 Florida Educator Accomplished Practices?
   • Yes
   • No
5. Was an individual plan or Individual Professional Development Plan (IPDP) for your alternative certification program developed for you by your Support Team?

- Yes
- No

*(If response to Q5 is yes, answer (5a). Otherwise, go to Q6.)*

5a. Was the individual plan or Individual Professional Development Plan (IPDP) for your alternative certification program maintained throughout your program participation?

- Yes
- No

6. When did you receive training in classroom management skills (survival skills)?

- Shortly after being hired and prior to beginning the teaching assignment
- Within one month of beginning the teaching assignment
- Two to three months after beginning the teaching assignment
- Three to six months after beginning the teaching assignment
- More than six months after beginning the teaching assignment
- I did not receive training in classroom management skills either before or during my first year of employment as a classroom teacher

*(IF RESPONSE TO Q6 WAS ANYTHING EXCEPT LAST BULLET – RESPOND TO QUESTION #6a …)*

6a. How useful was the training in classroom management skills (survival skills training)?

- Very useful
- Somewhat useful
- Not very useful
APPENDIX I

Teacher Survey for EPI Program Completers (Additional Questions)

1. Where did you earn your bachelors' degree?
   - Florida public state university
   - Florida public community college
   - Florida private college or university
   - Out-of-state college or university
   - Other [Specify]

2. Where did you first hear about the Educator Preparation Institute?
   - Newspaper
   - Radio
   - Local Information Session
   - School District
   - Florida DOE website
   - Other [specify]

3. Did knowing about Educator Preparation Institutes have an influence on your decision to teach?
   - Yes
   - No

4. What types of financial aid did you receive for the EPI program?
   - Critical Teacher Shortage Loan Forgiveness Program
   - Federal Pell Grant
   - Student Loan
   - Scholarship from institution you attended
   - State Employee Tuition Waiver
   - Troops to Teachers/Spouses to Teachers
   - I did not receive financial aid
   - Other [specify]

5. How long did it take to complete your Educator Preparation Institute program?
   - 3 months or less
   - 4-6 months
• 7-12 months
• More than 12 months

6. Did your Educator Preparation Institute conduct a pre-assessment of your skills on the 12 Florida Educator Accomplished Practices?
   • Yes
   • No

7. Was an individual plan for you Educator Preparation Institute program developed for you by an advisor?
   • Yes
   • No
APPENDIX J

Principals’ Survey Questions

INTRODUCTION – FIRST PAGE

The Florida Department of Education is seeking feedback from school principals on the effectiveness of our state’s teacher preparation program by asking you questions about the teachers at your school that have recently completed these programs. This information is aggregated and reported by institution annually. Your input on this survey is one opportunity for you to communicate to our institutions and your districts about how well they initially prepare teachers to meet your school’s needs. To view a copy of last year’s report, please visit www.teachinflorida.com/preparation.

The teachers we will be asking you about may have completed any one of three types of teacher preparation programs during the 2006-07 school year: (1) initial teacher preparation programs at colleges and universities; (2) district alternative certification programs; or (3) educator preparation institutes.

Below is a list of your teachers who completed one of Florida’s state-approved teacher preparation programs last academic year. If there is a teacher on this list who is no longer teaching at your school, please contact support@fcim.org with the name of the teacher. We will forward this information to the appropriate principal, if possible.

In rare instances, a teacher who completed one of these programs last year may not be on the list below. If you have such a teacher, please add that teacher by clicking the "Add a Teacher" button below and enter the teacher’s name.

Please click the "Next" button to begin the survey.

District: Alachua (1)

School: TEST

(If this information is incorrect, please update your district and/or school.)

Thank you for your support in completing this survey. First, we would like to ask you about this teacher’s performance in demonstrating the following competencies. Please mark each item as accurately as possible for each of your teachers identified for this survey and then click Next at the bottom of the page when you have finished in order to continue with the survey.

Rating Scale for each of the following items:

1- Highly effective

2-Effective
3-Not very effective

4-Ineffective

1. Please rate this teacher’s performance in the area of **Assessment**.
   - Employs a variety of assessment strategies to determine students’ performance of specified outcomes.
   - Uses assessment data to improve student achievement.
   - Modifies instruction based upon assessed student performance.

2. Please rate this teacher’s performance in the following areas of **Communication**.
   - Adapts communication style based on the needs of individuals and groups.
   - Incorporates activities that promote positive communication among students.
   - Provides opportunities for students to receive constructive feedback on individual work and behavior.

3. Please rate this teacher’s performance in the area of **Continuous Improvement**.
   - Accesses relevant educational research.
   - Implements strategies acquired through professional growth opportunities.
   - Reflects on professional practice to improve student learning.

4. Please rate this teacher’s performance in the area of **Critical Thinking**.
   - Identifies strategies that expand students’ critical thinking.
   - Plans activities that require students to gather information and solve problems.
   - Uses questions and activities that engage students in higher order thinking.

5. Please rate this teacher’s performance in the area of **Diversity**.
   - Treats students equitably by fostering acceptance of diversity in the classroom.
   - Communicates effectively with families and students from culturally diverse backgrounds.
   - Uses a variety of teaching techniques and strategies to effectively instruct all students, including students with diverse learning needs.

6. Please rate this teacher’s performance in the area of **Ethics**.
   - Adheres to ethical standards expected of an educator in the classroom and in the school community
   - Adheres to the Code of Ethics and Principles of Professional Conduct of the Education Profession in Florida.
   - Makes reasonable efforts to protect students from harmful conditions that interfere with their learning.

7. Please rate this teacher’s performance in the area of **Human Development and Learning**.
• Uses a variety of developmentally appropriate activities to engage and motivate students.
• Uses knowledge of human development, learning theories, and first and second language acquisition processes.
• Recognizes developmental levels of students and identify differences within a group of students.

8. Please rate this teacher’s performance in the area of **Knowledge of Subject Matter**.
• Demonstrates knowledge of Sunshine State Standards in the subject area.
• Demonstrates how knowledge can be applied to real-world settings.
• Demonstrates an understanding of how the subject is linked to other disciplines.

9. Please rate this teacher’s performance in the following areas of **Learning Environment**.
• Uses instructional time effectively.
• Establishes classroom routines and procedures that promote a positive and safe learning environment.
• Maintains academic focus through the use of various techniques.

10. Please rate this teacher’s performance in the area of **Planning**.
• Plans and conduct lessons with specific learning and performance outcomes that meet the needs of all students.
• Collaborates with other educators when planning lessons.
• Reflects on practice and modify instruction as needed.

11. Please rate this teacher’s performance in the area of **Role of the Teacher**.
• Provides meaningful feedback regarding student performance to families.
• Works with colleagues to improve students’ educational experiences.
• Uses resources outside the classroom to enrich student learning experiences.

12. Please rate this teacher’s performance in the area of **Technology**.
• Uses technology in instructional delivery to enrich student learning experiences.
• Develops technology enriched learning activities that meets the diverse needs of students.
• Uses technology tools to manage and evaluate student data.

13. Please rate this teacher’s performance in the area of **Reading**.
• Incorporates reading strategies in instructional planning in various subject areas.
• Uses individual reading assessments to improve student academic performance.
• Demonstrates knowledge of research-based, developmentally appropriate reading strategies.

14. Please rate this teacher’s performance in the area of **Testing-Taking Strategies**.
• Prepares students for taking standardized tests by using aggregated data to create and assess instruction that focuses on improving student achievement.
• Monitors student performance on core benchmarks throughout the year.
• Provides students with strategies to improve test-taking skills.

15. Does this teacher meet your criteria for rehiring?

• Yes
• No

16. Is there any other information you would like to share regarding this teacher’s strengths or weaknesses.

(Text box for each selected teacher)
APPENDIX K

Mentor Survey

Please answer the following questions about your experiences as a mentor for your school district.

1. What is your professional status?
   - Currently teaching
   - Retired teacher
   - Retired school administrator
   - Other: Please specify

2. How many years have you been working in education?

3. Please specify all the degrees you have earned. (Check all that apply.)
   - ___ Bachelors – Major: (text box)
   - ___ Masters – Major (text box)
   - ___ Ed. Specialist – Major (text box)
   - ___ PhD/Ed.D. – Major (text box)

4. Do you hold a certificate from the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards?
   - Yes
   - No

5. Which of the following best describes your role as a mentor?
   - Classroom coach
   - Formal assessor of teacher’s competency
   - Both

6. Have you had training to prepare you for being a mentor? (Mark all that apply.)
   - Not Yet
   - Clinical Educator Training
   - Online mentor training
   - District mentor training
   - Other (specify)

7. If you received training, how effective was your training in preparing you to be a mentor?
   - Not at all effective
• Somewhat effective
• Effective
• Very Effective

8. What type of credit or compensation do you receive as a mentor (Mark all that apply)?

• District stipend
• Release Time
• NBPTS (National Board) mentoring hours credit
• No compensation
• Other
• (If “Stipend” is checked, add… Amount of stipend ___)


10. Specify the types of activities your mentoring assignment included (mark all that apply)

• One-on-one counseling
• Classroom modeling
• Classroom evaluation
• Group instruction (teaching to more than one mentee at a time)
• Other (please specify)

11. Of the teachers you mentored, how many were: (mark all that apply):

• Completers of or Enrolled in the District’s Alternative Certification Program: ___ (TEXT BOX to fill in a number)
• Completers of or Enrolled in Educator Preparation Institutes: ___ (TEXT BOX to fill in a number)
• Completers of Initial Teacher Preparation Programs (traditional teacher education programs): ___ (TEXT BOX to fill in a number)

For Q12-Q13, use the following response set:

• Not yet
• Once
• Once monthly
• A few times a month
• Weekly
• Nearly every day

12. How often did you meet with the teachers(s) whom you mentored?

13. How often were you in contact with the building administrator regarding your mentee(s)?
For the next three questions, use the following scale, but it needs to be adapted to fit each question. See question 14 for format.

NOTE: Questions 14 through 16 are answered based on the response to 11 a, 11b, 11c. If 11a is marked, question 14 is offered. If 11b is marked, question 15 is offered, if 11c is marked, question 16 is offered.

14. From your observations, how would you compare teachers who have completed District Alternative Certification Programs with other beginning teachers?

Rating Scale: 1 through 7 where 1 = Overall, DACP teachers compare poorly with other beginning teachers, 4 = Overall, DACP teachers perform as well as other first year teachers, and 7 = Overall, DACP teachers are some of the best new teachers I have seen.

15. From your observations, how would you compare teachers who have completed Educator Preparation Institutes with other beginning teachers?

Rating Scale: 1 through 7 where 1 = Overall, EPI teachers compare poorly with other beginning teachers, 4 = Overall, EPI teachers perform as well as other first year teachers, and 7 = Overall, EPI teachers are some of the best new teachers I have seen.

16. From your observations, how would you compare teachers who have completed Florida Initial Teacher Preparation Programs (traditional college education programs) with other beginning teachers?

Rating Scale: 1 through 7 where 1 = Overall, ITP teachers compare poorly with other beginning teachers, 4 = Overall, ITP teachers perform as well as other first year teachers, and 7 = Overall, ITP teachers are some of the best new teachers I have seen.

[1] For a brief description of all of Florida’s pathways to certification and the options for demonstrating mastery in each of the three required areas, please see the Pathways to Certification document in Appendix E.

[2] ITP completers in Educational Leadership, Guidance and Counseling, and School Psychology were excluded from the analysis since the report focuses on programs that prepare individuals for teaching.

[3] Where individuals do not report any of their characteristics, those individuals are omitted from the calculation for that characteristic. This is the reason for differing totals in each table.

[4] 2008 data are based on actual completers; previous years’ data were based on survey respondents.

For the Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA), respondents from all teacher preparation routes were grouped together. A Varimax rotation was used. This rotation computes orthogonal, or uncorrelated, factors. The criterion for extraction was based on the Eigenvalues greater than one. A factor loading criterion of .3 was used as a cutoff value for inclusion in the factor. Results are presented in Table 8 below.

Standardized scores represent the number of standard deviations a given score deviates from the mean. A score which is equal to the mean receives a zero. Other scores typically range from three points below zero to three points above zero. The distribution of these scores is defined to have a mean of zero and a standard deviation of one.

A logistic regression model was analyzed to predict the odds of meeting the criteria for rehiring according to principal evaluations of teachers’ effectiveness on the FEAPs.