Ready2Teach
Tennessee Tech University
2015-2016 Data Collection Annual Report

Leslie Vanelli, B.A.
Margie King, M.S.
Elizabeth Goldfeder, Ph.D.

University of Memphis
Fall 2016

Driven by doing.

Note to Reader

The Ready2Teach Tennessee Tech University 2015-2016 Data Collection Annual Report was prepared under a contract with the Tennessee Board of Regents. Please note that this report contains data that have been collected by the Center for Research in Educational Policy at the University of Memphis for use by a limited audience. **Authorized users of this material are limited to the Dean of the College of Education at Tennessee Tech University and other designated individuals. Neither this document nor the data reported herein will be distributed to unauthorized users.**

The content of this report protects the anonymity of the R2T program participants, survey respondents, and interview participants; no names or other identifying characteristics have been included. If respondent data were not sufficient in number (i.e., 10 or more respondents), the data will not be reported in the university report, but will be reported in aggregate in the Ready2Teach Tennessee Board of Regents 2015-2016 Data Collection Annual Report. Additionally, university data have not been compared or contrasted with data from other universities in any other reports.

Table of Contents

Table of Tables

Executive Summary

The Center for Research in Educational Policy (CREP) at the University of Memphis, a Tennessee Center of Excellence, has assisted the Tennessee Board of Regents (TBR) since 2011 in collecting data from students, graduates, and school partners of the R2T programs in the six TBR universities. In addition, CREP has provided both program-level reports to the individual colleges and schools of education, and aggregate reports to TBR. This report provides the 2015-2016 data collection results for Tennessee Tech University (TTU).

In response to recommendations offered by the Tennessee Teaching Quality Initiative task force concerning the need for reform in teacher candidate preparation and practice, the Tennessee Board of Regents coordinated a redesign of its teacher preparation programs within its institutions of higher education (Tennessee Board of Regents, 2010). The Ready2Teach (R2T) transformational teacher preparation initiative is a four-year, clinically focused program, which was fully implemented in the TBR system beginning in the fall of 2013. The TBR system includes six universities: Austin Peay State University, East Tennessee State University, Middle Tennessee State University, Tennessee State University, Tennessee Tech University, and the University of Memphis. The key components of R2T include partnerships with schools and districts, teacher candidate Residency, culminating performance based assessment (edTPA), and curriculum redesign (Tennessee Board of Regents, 2010).

The overall purpose of the Ready2Teach teacher preparation initiative is to produce teacher candidates who demonstrate academic content knowledge aligned with Tennessee curriculum standards, and who are equipped to promote student academic success. In order to achieve this purpose, universities implementing R2T incorporate immersion in the P-12 setting, co-teaching, strong partnerships with schools, intensive mentoring, strong content knowledge,

university partnership in meeting district/school goals, and improvement of student academic performance. The R2T Program Completion Survey (R2TPCS) provided the perceptions of R2T teacher candidates as they completed their preparation program and Residency, and the R2T Graduate Teacher Survey (R2TGTS) was used to gain the perceptions of new teachers following their first year of teaching. In addition to the perceptual surveys, director of teacher education or designee semi-structured phone interviews provided supplementary data regarding R2T enrollment numbers, graduation numbers, and R2T Residency and program changes. The data collection summary for the 2015-2016 academic year at TTU is presented in Table 1; a detailed presentation of the data can be found in the Results section of this report.

Table 1. Summary of R2T Data Collection by Research Question

Data Summary by Research Question
1. What are the perceptions of the School Partners (i.e., district administrators, principals, assistant principals, and mentor teachers) regarding preparation of R2T teacher candidates who are ready to teach; university partner collaborations to meet district/school goals; and improvement of student performance?
R2T teacher candidate preparation: Overall, most school partners agreed that the R2T teacher candidates were prepared and demonstrated entry-level teaching abilities in the classroom. *University partnership:* The majority of school partners perceived that the R2T university partnership had a positive impact on students, mentor teachers, and schools. School partners also noted the need for further training and professional development. *Student academic performance:* The majority of school partners agreed that R2T teacher candidates would likely have a positive impact on student academic performance because by participating as another qualified teacher in the classroom, they were able to increase opportunities for small groups and one-on-one interventions, expose students to new teaching styles and ideas, differentiate instruction, and serve as positive role models for students.
2. What are the perceptions of the R2T program participants (i.e., R2T teacher candidates, R2T graduate teachers) regarding their readiness to teach upon completion of the R2T program?
R2T teacher candidates: Overall, R2T teacher candidates perceived that the R2T program was effective in preparing them as an entry-level classroom teacher. *R2T graduate teachers:* In order to honor confidentiality, the aggregate results are reported in the Ready2Teach Tennessee Board of Regents 2015-2016 Data Collection Annual Report.
3. What is the success rate of the R2T graduate teachers during their first, second, and third year of teaching as measured by the teacher's overall state score that includes a composite of TEAM, TVAAS, and other TN approved assessments? How does this compare with the success rate of other (non-R2T) first year, second, third year teachers in the same or similar schools?
Year 4 data were unavailable as of the writing of this report.
4. What is the attrition rate of first, second, and third year R2T graduate teachers? Do differences exist between attrition rates of first, second, and/or third year R2T teachers? How does this compare with the attrition rate of non-R2T new teachers (first, second, and third year)?
Year 4 data were unavailable as of the writing of this report.
5. What is the relationship between level of performance on key factors identified in the edTPA, TEAM scores, student achievement scores, and the attrition rate of R2T graduate teachers?
Year 4 data were unavailable as of the writing of this report.

The material contained in the data collection reports has been prepared to encourage discussion that can inform program implementation, research, policy, and practice. This information should not be used in isolation to reach definitive conclusions. CREP staff are available to facilitate discussion, provide furt

Introduction

In response to recommendations offered by the Tennessee Teaching Quality Initiative task force concerning the need for reform in teacher candidate preparation and practice, the Tennessee Board of Regents (TBR) coordinated a redesign of its teacher preparation programs within its institutions of higher education (Tennessee Board of Regents, 2010). The Ready2Teach (R2T) transformational teacher preparation initiative is a four-year, clinically focused program, which was fully implemented in the TBR system beginning in the fall of 2013. The TBR system includes six universities: Austin Peay State University, East Tennessee State University, Middle Tennessee State University, Tennessee State University, Tennessee Tech University, and the University of Memphis. Th

Program Description

The Ready2Teach teacher preparation initiative is a clinically focused program with key elements that include: school partnerships, curriculum redesign, teacher candidate Residency, and the edTPA (Tennessee Board of Regents, 2010). The overall purpose of R2T is to produce teacher candidates who demonstrate academic content knowledge aligned with Tennessee curriculum standards, and who are equipped to promote student academic success. In order to achieve this purpose, universities implementing R2T incorporate immersion in the P-12 setting, co-teaching, strong partnerships with schools, intensive mentoring, strong content knowledge, and performance-based assessment into their teacher preparation programs (Tennessee Board of Regents, 2010). The primary goals of R2T are to prepare teacher candidates so that they have a positive impact on student performance from the first time the teacher candidates enter the classroom, and to work collaboratively with schools to improve outcomes for students, schools, and communities. The Tennessee Board of Regents' intention is for R2T to produce graduates with strong academic content knowledge; strong skills in instruction, assessment, and classroom management; and well-developed skills in meeting the academic and social needs of all students (Tennessee Board of Regents, 2010).

Research Questions

The six TBR universities collaboratively developed research questions to guide the cross-institutional data collection strategy regarding the implementation and effectiveness of the R2T initiative and provided these research questions to CREP. The research questions for Year 1 (i.e., final pilot year) were used to guide the data collection strategy during the 2012-2013 academic year and the results were reported in the 2012-2013 Data Collection Annual Report.

The data collection strategy for Years 2, 3, and 4 (i.e., full implementation) focused on the

following major research questions:

1.

preparation initiative at TTU. University staff provided the graduation baseline data, demographic data, edTPA scores, GPA, and Praxis PLT scores for each cohort (i.e., 2013-2014, 2014-2015, and 2015-2016) of R2T teacher candidates following their completion of the R2T program. The remainder of the R2T teacher candidate data are to be provided by TBR or the Tennessee Department of Education.

Graduate Teacher Survey (R2TGTS) was used to gain the perceptions of new teachers following their first year of teaching. In addition to the perceptual surveys, a director of teacher education (or designee) semi-structured phone interview provided supplementary data regarding R2T enrollment numbers, graduation numbers, and R2T Residency and program changes. Detailed descriptions of each of these instruments are presented in this report. The specific data collection methods implemented and how they align with each of the research questions are summarized below.

1. *What are the perceptions of the School Partners (i.e., district administrators, principals, assistant principals, and mentor teachers) regarding preparation of R2T teacher candidates who are ready to teach, university partner collaborations to meet district/school goals, and improvement of student performance?*

School partners were asked to complete the R2TSPS to gather their perceptions of R2T teacher candidate preparation, the university partnership, and the R2T teacher candidate impact on student performance.

2. *What are the perceptions of the R2T program participants (i.e., R2T teacher candidates,*

University personnel submitted baseline R2T graduate teacher data into a secure online site. These data will be used by CREP staff in analyses of R2T graduate teachers and non-R2T

were undergraduate (100.0%) and traditional (100.0%) students. Table 2 summarizes the

demographic characteristics of the TTU 2014-2015 R2T teacher candidates.

Table 2. TTU R2T Teacher Candidate Demographics

R2T Teacher Candidate Demographics	Frequency	Percentage
Gender		
Female	202	79.2
Male	53	20.8
Race		
African American or Black	1	0.4
Asian	1	0.4
Caucasian or White	248	97.3
Two or more races	4	1.6
Undisclosed	1	0.4
Academic Degree		
Graduate	0	0.0
Undergraduate	255	100.0
Transfer or Non-Transfer Student		
Transfer student	233	91.4
Non-Transfer student	22	8.6

Note: **Item percentages may not total 100% because of missing input from some respondents.**

University personnel also provided the R2T teacher candidates' overall GPA, edTPA

scores, and Praxis PLT scores, which will be used for future data analyses and comparisons. The

TTU 2015-2016 R2T teacher candidates' overall

and Spring 2016 Program Completion Surveys completed by TTU R2T teacher candidates, and the frequency report can be viewed in Appendix B.

R2T graduate teachers. In 2015-2016, R2T graduate teachers who had been R2T teacher candidates during the 2014-2015 academic year were asked to submit demographic information in addition to their perceptions of how well the R2T program prepared them for their first year of teaching. Nine TTU R2T graduate teachers submitted the R2T Graduate Teacher Survey. Given the limited sample size, the aggregate results are reported in the Ready2Teach Tennessee Board of Regents 2015-2016 Data Collection Annual Report

School partners. School partners (i.e., district administrators, principals, assistant principals, and mentor teachers) who were in partnership with TTU during the 2015-2016 academic year were asked to submit demographic information in addition to their perceptions of preparation of R2T teacher candidates, effectiveness of partner collaborations in meeting district/school goals, and improvement of student performance. Of the 49 school partners who started the R2TSPS, two indicated that they did not work with R2T teacher candidates and exited the survey. The remaining 47 school partner respondents indicated their R2T roles as district administrator (0.0%), principal (8.5%), assistant principal (4.3%), and mentor teacher (87.2%), as shown in Table 4.

Table 4. TTU R2T School Partner Role

Ready2Teach Role	Percentage
District Administrator	0.0
Principal	8.5
Assistant Principal	4.3
Mentor Teacher	87.2

Note: **Item percentages may not total 100% because of missing input from some respondents.**

A majority of principal and assistant principal respondents (66.7%) indicated they had six to ten years of experience in their current position within the school district. Table 5 summarizes the length of service for the principal and assistant principal respondents.

Table 5. TTU Principal and Assistant Principal Length of Service

Principal and Assistant Principal	Percentage
Length of Service in Current Position (Principal and Assistant Principal)	
Less than 1 year	0.0
1-5 years	33.3
6-10 years	66.7
More than 10 years	0.0

Note: **Item percentages may not total 100% because of missing input from some respondents.**

A majority of mentor teachers (58.5%) indicated this was the first R2T teacher candidate placed in their classroom to complete their Residency. Of the remaining mentor teachers who had previous experience mentoring a R2T teacher candidate, over half (58.6%) of mentor teachers indicated having three or more R2T teacher candidates placed in their classroom since August 2012. A larger percentage of mentor teachers indicated the length of placement in their current school had been for more than 10 years (43.9%), they possessed more than 10 years of teaching experience (73.2%), and they held advanced degrees (68.3%), as shown in Table 6.

Table 6. TTU Mentor Teacher Characteristics

Mentor Teacher	Percentage

candidates, two demographic questions, and 17 Likert-type items that utilize a three-point scale.

For mentor teachers, the survey contains five open-ended items and 30 closed-ended items. The

closed-ended items are comprised of one contingency question, six demographic questions, and

23 Likert-type items that utili

teachers who did not graduate from the R2T program or who were not currently classroom teachers, three demographic questions, two background information questions, six school information questions, two questions involving plans to continue teaching, and 12 Likert-type items that utilize a four-point scale. The items focus on their perceptions of how well the R2T program prepared them as an entry-level classroom teacher. The survey was administered via CREP's online Survey Management System (SMS).

Ready2Teach Participant Data Tool (R2TPDT). The R2TPDT was developed by CREP staff to provide a method for university personnel to submit R2T teacher candidates' student ID number, overall GPA, teacher license number, recommended endorsement code(s), edTPA score, Praxis PLT score, and general demographic information. University personnel submitted the R2T teacher candidate data directly into a unique and secure online storage site designated for their university.

Semi-structured phone interview protocol. CREP staff developed a semi-structured phone interview protocol to guide the R2T director of teacher education (or designee) interview. The director of teacher education or designee semi-structured phone interview protocol was designed to obtain supplementary data regarding 2015-2016 R2T implementation and R2T Residency or program changes. The objective of the protocol was to give CREP staff a consistent format to guide the semi-structured phone interview while allowing the interviewee the freedom to convey their perceptions of the implementation and effectiveness during the 2015-2016 academic year. Table 7 summarizes the participants, data sources, and methods used within each research question.

Table 7. TTU Summary of Participants, Data Sources, and Method by Research Question

Research Questions	Participants	Data Sources	Method
1. What are the perceptions of the School Partners (i.e., district administrators, principals, assistant principals, and mentor teachers) regarding preparation of R2T teacher candidates who are ready to teach, university partner collaborations to meet district/school goals, and improvement of student performance?	School partners		

through May 2016. In an attempt to improve return rates, CREP offered the R2TPCS to each

TBR university in both paper and online formats. University personnel elected to administer the

online format of the R2TPCS to their December 2015 and May 2016 R2T teacher candidates

who fulfilled the R2T program and Residency requirements. A semi-structured phone interview

was held with the Director of Teacher Education and the Associate Dean of the College of

Education at TTU in April 2016.

All data were collected by July 2016, and analyses of the survey and semi-structured

phone interview data were initiated. All open-ended comments were summarized via a

structured, multi-step process. First, the original comments were grouped into categories, and

then the categories were grouped into overarching themes. Final analysis produced frequency

percentages for each theme that was observed in the dataset. Some comments contained multiple

themes and categories. These were separated and coded according to theme, as if they were

separate comments. Thus, the reported percentages reflect the total number of comments as

separated by theme, not the total number of comments received from participants.

University personnel were contacted in June 2016 regarding procedures for submitting

the R2T teacher candidate data. The R2TPDT was made available and all quantitative data were

submitted by July 2016. CREP staff followed up as necessary to clarify questions regarding

missing data. Table 8 provides a summary of the data collection strategy organized by

instrument, a general timeline, and the number of each instrument collected.

Table 8. TTU Data Collection Summary

Participants	Instrument	Timeline	Final (n)
School Partners	R2TSPS	April-May 2016	$n = 47^*$
R2T Graduate Teachers	R2TGTS	April-May 2016	$n = 7^{**}$
R2T Teacher Candidates	R2TPCS	December 2015 & May 2016	$n = 84^{**}$
Director of Teacher Education	Phone Interview	April 2016	$n = 2$
R2T Participant Data	R2TPDT	July 2016	$n = 255$

*Respondents who did not work with 2015-2016 R2T teacher candidates were excluded from analysis.
**Respondents who did not graduate from an R2T program or did not complete their first year of teaching were excluded from analysis. See results.

Results

The following section presents the data collected from TTU during the 2015-2016 academic year. First, a summary of the data is outlined for each instrument; and then the data are reported within each research questions.

Data by Instrument

Director of Teacher Education Semi-Structured Phone Interview. A semi-structured phone interview was conducted with the Director of Teacher Education and the Associate Dean of the College of Education at Tennessee Tech University. The objective was to gather data that would supplement the perceptual surveys and provide information regarding R2T implementation during the 2015-2016 academic year. In order to honor our anonymity and confidentiality agreement, the aggregate results are reported in the Ready2Teach Tennessee Board of Regents 2015-2016 Data Collection Annual Report.

Ready2Teach School Partner Survey (R2TSPS). School partners were asked to give their perceptions of the preparation of R2T teacher candidates, the effectiveness of partner collaborations in meeting district/school goals, and the improvement of student performance. Of the 49 school partners who started the R2TSPS, two indicated that they did not work with R2T teacher candidates and exited the survey, leaving 47 school partners who completed the

perceptual survey. The TTU R2TSPS frequency report—including respondents' comments—

can be found in Appendix A of this report.

Overall, most principals and assistant principals (50.0-83.3% of 6 respondents) agreed

that the R2T teacher candidates were prepared and demonstrated entry level teaching abilities in

the classroom. The highest areas of agreement included "develop student-teacher relationships"

(83.3%), "collaborate with mentors and identified supervisors" (83.3%), "understand cultural and

individual diversity" (83.3%), "consider students' strengths and needs when planning lessons"

(83.3%), "utilize best practice instructional strategies" (83.3%), "analyze student performance

based on assessments" (83.3%), "consider the pacing and timing mandates for the

school/district" (83.3%), "manage classroom behavior through establishes techniques and

procedures" (83.3%), and "organize and manage time, space, and resources" (83.3%). The

lowest area of agreement among principals and assistant principals was "adjust instruction based

on assessment findings" (50.0%). Similarly, most mentor teachers (85.4-100.0% of 41

respondents) agreed that the R2T teacher candidates were prepared and demonstrated entry level

teaching abilities in the classroom. The highest areas of agreement included "create effective

learning segments" (100.0%), "develop instruction plans for lessons" (97.6%), "design

assessment plans for lessons" (97.6%), and "understand cultural and individual diversity"

(97.6%). The lowest area of agreement among mentor teachers was "develop parent-student-

teacher relationships" (85.4%). Some school partner survey respondents selected *Disagree* or

Don't Know on some of the preparation items. School partner perceptions of R2T teacher

candidate preparation are summarized in Table 9 and Table 10.

Table 9. TTU Principal and Assistant Principal Perceptions of Preparation

Most principals and assistant principals (83.3%) agreed with three of the four closed-ended items that focused on school partners' perceptions regarding the Ready2Teach university partnership. These items were "helps meet the goals and address the needs of our school" (83.3%), "provides consistent criteria for identifying school-based mentor teachers" (83.3%), and "effectively communicates with me regarding the R2T teacher candidate Residency requirements and edTPA requirements" (83.3%). The lowest area of agreement among principals and assistant principals was "provides or offers professional development that is beneficial for our faculty" (50.0%). Most mentor teachers (85.4-90.2% of 41 respondents) agreed with three of the five closed-ended items that focused on school partners' perceptions regarding the Ready2Teach

Table 11. TTU Principal Perceptions of Partnership

During the 2015-2016 academic year, the R2T university partnership....	% Agree	% Disagree	% Don't know

partnership had on student academic support (38.4% of comments). In particular, school

partners noted that the academic benefits included two qualified teachers in the classroom,

opportunities for small groups, increased individualized lesson planning/instruction, and

beneficial relationships that develop between students and R2T teacher candidates. Some

respondents (4.8% of comments) indicated the partnership with the university as an important

benefit, specifically noting the collaborations and supportive relationships developed with

clinical supervisors and other university staff. A few survey respondents (2.4% of comments)

stated they were unsure or that they experienced no benefits from the partnership.

When respondents were asked, "Share with us the challenges that your school has

experienced by participating in the 2015-2016 R2T partnership," responses were mainly split

among four themes: no challenges (28.3% of comments), university partnership/R2T program

(26.9% of comments), Residency (25.4% of comments), and teacher candidate preparation

(19.4% of comments). School partner respondents that indicated having encountered no

challenges by participating in the 2015-2106 R2T partnership often mentioned that participating

in the R2T program was a positive experience. With respect to the university partnership and

R2T program, survey respondents expressed that the university supervisors were not effective,

were unfamiliar with edTPA, and did not set a good example for teacher candidates. In addition,

respondents described unclear program expectations, a lack of communication and support from

as an entry-level classroom teacher upon completion of the TTU R2T program. The areas where

Fall 2015 and Spring 2016 R2T teacher candidates felt most prepared included "understanding of

and respect for the cultural and individual diversity of students" (93.1%), and "development of

clear learning objectives and instruction plans for lessons" (90.7%). While most of the R2T

teacher candidates specified that they were *Very Well Prepared* or *Adequately Prepared* on all

items, there were some respondents (4.7-19.8%) who expressed that they were only *Somewhat*

Prepared. There were also Fall 2015 and Spring 2016 R2T teacher candidate respondents (1.2-

12.8%) who indicated *Not Prepared* on most of the survey items. R2T teacher candidate

R2T teacher candidate preparation: Overall, most school partners agreed that the

R2T teacher candidates were prepared and demonstrated entry-level teaching abilities

composite of TEAM, TVAAS, and other TN approved assessments? How does this

compare with the success rate of other (non-Ready2Teach) first, second, and third year

teachers in the same or similar schools?

University personnel submitted baseline data into a secure online site for each R2T

teacher candidate cohort. Additional R2T graduate teacher and non-Ready2Teach teacher data

had not been provided for analyses as of the writing of the 2015-2016 annual report.

4. *What is the attrition rate of first, se*

Reference

Tennessee Board of Regents. (2010). Redefining teacher education: Ready2Teach overview.

Retrieved from http://www.ready2teach.org/ready2teach-overview

Tennessee Tech University Ready2Teach School Partner Survey (R2TSPS)

The R2T teacher candidate(s) placed in your school for their 2015-2016 Residency demonstrate or possess the entry-level ability to…	% Agree	% Disagree	% Don't know
techniques and procedures.			
Organize and manage time, space, and resources.	83.3	0.0	16.7

District Administrator, Principal, Assistant Principal

During the 2015-2016 academic year, the R2T university partnership...	% Agree	% Disagree	% Don't know
Helps meet the goals and address the needs of our school.	83.3	16.7	0.0
Provides or offers professional development that is beneficial for our faculty.	50.0	33.3	16.7
Provides consistent criteria for identifying school-based mentor teachers.	83.3	16.7	0.0
Effectively communicates with me regarding the R2T teacher candidate Residency requirements and edTPA requirements.	83.3	16.7	0.0

R2T Mentor Teacher

How long have you been placed in this school?	
Less than 1 year	0.0
1 - 5 years	29.3
6 - 10 years	26.8
More than 10 years	43.9

R2T Mentor Teacher

How many total years of teaching experience do you have?	
Less than 1 year	0.0
1 - 5 years	7.3
6 - 10 years	19.5
More than 10 years	73.2

R2T Mentor Teacher

Educational Attainment	
Bachelor's degree	29.3
Master's degree	56.1
Master's plus 30 hours	2.4
Education Specialist degree	9.8
Doctoral degree	0.0

R2T Mentor Teacher

Is this the first R2T teacher candidate that has been placed with you for their Residency?	
Yes	58.5
No	41.5

R2T Mentor Teacher

How many R2T teacher candidates have been placed with you for their Residency since August 2012?	
2	41.2
3	41.2
4 or more	17.6

R2T Mentor Teacher

The R2T teacher candidate placed in your classroom for their 2015-2016 Residency demonstrates or possesses the entry level ability to...	% Agree	% Disagree	% Don't know
Develop clear learning objectives for lessons.	95.1	4.9	0.0
Create effective learning segments.	100.0	0.0	0.0
Consider students' strengths and needs when planning lessons.	95.1	4.9	0.0
Develop instruction plans for lessons.	97.6	2.4	0.0
Design assessment plans for lessons.	97.6	2.4	0.0
Utilize best practice in their (rate split Tginessegm)nans.2	90.2	7.3	0.0
Maintain student engagement throughout lessons.	92.7	4.9	2.4
Manage classroom behavior through established techniques and procedures.	87.8	12.2	0.0

R2T Mentor Teacher

During the 2015-2016 academic year, the R2T university partnership...	% Agree	% Disagree	% Don't know
Supplies initial and ongoing training for school-based mentor teachers.	61.0	24.4	14.6
Provides or offers professional development that is beneficial for our faculty.	43.9	29.3	26.8
Adequately supervises the R2T teacher candidate in my classroom.	90.2	7.3	0.0
Successfully supports R2T teacher candidates in my classroom in a manner that benefits our school.	90.2	9.8	0.0
Effectively communicates with me regarding the R2T teacher candidate Residency requirements, timelines, and edTPA requirements.	85.4	14.6	0.0

In your opinion, what impact do you think the R2T teacher candidate(s) will have on your students' academic performance in your classroom?
I think that my students' will perform very well.
I think the candidate will have a big impact on a more individual perspective because of the ability to help with below level groups.
Improved academic performance due to her additional support, attention, and further ability to differentiate among student groups. [sic]
It is absolutely PRICELESS! [Name removed] has been a blessing for my classroom. She has helped to manage behaviors while I am teaching, she has planned engaging lessons that excite me and my students.Most importantly, she has ran small groups in such a way that allows me to meet with every student every day to develop their individual needs. I believe the differentiating abilities will directly affect test scores in a positive way. [sic]
More higher level thinking skills. [sic]
[Name removed] has impacted the Students of [name removed], with his professionalism, and very creative lessons. He has made understanding where music has come from and will move toward easy to learn with the general music class. He has shown how professional musicians practice by performing [name removed].[sic]
My classes have benefited from our R2T teacher candidate being in the classroom. She has brought fresh ideas and creativity to teaching students!
My struggling students received more one on one instruction. [sic]
My student teacher has done an excellent job and I think my students' academic performance was enhanced by her presence.
My students have enjoyed the time that they were taught by our current teacher candidate. He effectively communicates and assesses the concepts that need to presented. [sic]
My students' will definitely remember her willingness to learn along with them and her eagerness to provide activities which are accommodated per each common core standard.
Not as much as myself because we team taught [sic]
Positive effect. [sic]
She has given another perspective and additional support.
She has inspired my students to love to learn. Hopefully this attitude will continue to carry on to the next grade.
Spring benchmarks have recently been completed on our kindergarten class. All students made significant growth based on the online assessment for both math and literacy. Of 20 students, all but 2 are above the grade level average, and these two students entered late in the year. Due to small group instruction, we were able to effectively move the students according to individual needs.
Students will perform well on State Testing [sic]
The candidate has had a positive effect.
The few lessons that the student teacher taught had to be retaught by me because the students came to me later in the day asking me to cover it again because it did not make any sense. After this happened a few times during the student teacher evaluation days, I could not let the student teacher lead my classroom lessons anymore. It was negatively affecting the students to where they would sigh when they came in and saw that the student teacher was going to be teaching that day instead of me.

wBT

Share with us the benefits that your school has experienced as a school partner during the 2015-2016 R2T partnership.
Student teachers can give a fresh approach to situations, problems or everyday teaching.
Teachers are happy to work with future teachers.
The benefits with partnering is giving the teacher candidates hands-on experience with a high quality mentor to help prepare them for the teaching profession. Benefits for the school is having extra hands on deck to help support teachers and students. [sic]
The overall environment of our school welcomes student teachers to bring new ideas and coteaching models into the classroom. We have a few student teachers elsewhere in the building that have made a positive impact on both the kids and the fellow teachers. When issues arose with my particular student teacher, the director of the program ended up being the one that kindly stepped in and made things right and I appreciated her willingness and enthusiasm in wanting to make our school partnership the best it could be. [sic]
The R2T teacher candidate has helped provide more one on one teaching activities. [sic]
The students have shared new teaching tools with teachers. They have worked with whole group and small groups of students. They provide ideas and feedback as well as behavior support.
The teacher candidate cares about the students and works hard to assist students who are in need. In addition, because of his expertise in mathematics he has allowed our students to advance more in their mathematics skills.
The teacher candidate was able to help proctor during state mandated testing. In my class, the candidate was an extra pair of hands.

nTw .4(e)-.ands.

Please share any recommendations you have that may allow the R2T teacher preparation program to better serve your school.
I believe the there should be an interview process with the building principal so that the principal can place the teacher candidate with a mentor teacher that will best meet the candidates needs. [sic]
I don't have any recommendations at this time. I appreciated the reminders to complete the candidate's electronic evaluation.
I don't know.
I have thoroughly enjoyed having the teacher candidate in my room; however, it is a long time for teachers to turn their classrooms over to teacher candidate when the stakes are so high for teachers.

I think the lesson plans that are required by the students are unrealistic in the classroom. They are too long and detailed. My lesson plans for my

Please share any recommendations you have that may allow the R2T teacher preparation program to better serve your school.

investigation into student teacher "wants" and mentor teacher "willingness", the placements might work out better which would result in the student teachers getting a lot more out of the year. They all seemed fairly well prepared on how to do the actual lesson plans and work, but just an overall lack of motivation to be in their placement and learn from the mentors and be an actual part of the classroom. (i.e. not sitting at a desk all day when the mentor teacher is up

Please share any recommendations you have that may allow the R2T teacher preparation program to better serve your school.
The thing that would be most beneficial would be for them to provide us with a face-to-face explanation of our roles as mentoring teachers and also the residency students', rather than just being provided a book.
We love our partnership with [name removed] and look forward to working with you in the future.

Working with students in a very engaging lesson where students are challenged to find their own

Tennessee Tech University
Fall 2015 and Spring 2016 Ready2Teach Program Completion Survey (R2TPCS)

What elements of the Ready2Teach program di

Please share any recommendations that you may have that would improve the Ready2Teach program in preparing entry-level classroom teachers.
It would be very beneficial to have a college course that taught us how to use quick and efficient way to assess the students. [sic]
less "busy" work in freshman/sophomore education classes (i.e. work that doesn't matter and isn't helpful long-term) [sic]
More classes about special education and RTI and maybe a marketing class. The reseson for the marketing class, I believe if you can market learning to children as McDonalds markets happy meals, then children will have more motivation to learn. [sic]
More preparation on what actually happens in classrooms, such as: parent-contact, emergency situations, and familiarity with curriculum (not standards).
More secondary instruction for adaptations to student's individual needs. Examples of scaffolded instruction, creating lesson plans with differentiation to know what is expected. More time in SPED 3000, or special education. [sic]
Possibly adding a class or something that helps with classroom management/behavior - That is something they do not teach you in school that you just have to learn on the job.
Prepare us more for the day-to-day instead of drilling the TEAM rubric into us.
Preparing you for the unknowns of teaching, or briefing them and what could happen. [sic]
Quiet spending time having me write about how I am going to teach and come watch me teach without having me make some crazy lesson plan. Just come watch how I teach, watch me without evaluating me every time someone comes and watches. [sic]

Some sort of compromise is desperately need for performing arts teachers. Not every teacher hopes to enter the general classroom. The current state of ready2teach leaves music students in a particularly hapless scenario. The requirements of the music department are quite rigorous, and in combination with the extreme overkill of the education department, students are left inherently under prepared, oversstressed and inadequate to all their mentors. It is ridiculous what is expected to be done by these students. Ridiculous and inhuman. The current "solutions" that have been proposed to keep music departments running while increasing the difficulty of the already strenuous education perameters are absolutely disfunction, and has resulted in a dramatic fall in the over all quality of techer candidates as plainky observed by mentor teachers,

Please share any recommendations that you may have that would improve the Ready2Teach program in preparing entry-level classroom teachers.
The use of more teaching strategies would be useful.
THERE WAS ZERO BEHAVIOR MANAGEMENT!   Students need to be more prepared to teach their subject specifically [sic]
1. They need to have a job shadowing or a practicum freshman year. Too many teacher candidates are making it to their senior year and then discovering that they do not want to teach. This is a waste of their time and money, and it takes valuable resources away from teacher candidates who want to pursue this degree.   2. They need advisors who actually KNOW what they are talking about. Too many advisors are unorganized and tell you to sign up for the wrong classes. This causes students to waste their time and money on classes they don't need, and it often puts them behind in their courses because they are taking unnecessary classes.   3. SPED should be more than the half semester before Residency. This was the most beneficial class we had, and it would have been helpful before we even began practicum. Sophomore year would have been the ideal time for this class.   4. The SEED class was an utter waste of time. Had they actually prepared us for the dreaded EdTPA, our scores would have been higher and our sanity would have remained intact. Unfortunately, we were told nothing about EdTPA except what the letters stood for.   5. The EdTPA seminar was unorganized and inefficient. On at least 2 occasions we were given incorrect information about completing our task. Each clinician gave different answers to the same questions, which made it obvious that someone wasn't clear about what the correct answer was. In addition, our clinicians were slow on giving feedback and even slower in responding to our emails. Considering this was a program that my future career depended on, I was very unhappy about this. [sic]
An assessment class would be nice as well as more time spent on classroom management skills and approaches [sic]
Give students in their practicum placements more time to experience teaching, as this will help them immensely when they get to Residency.
I believe that an assessment course would be essential in the program. Today, it is all about test scores. I think it would be   very beneficial for it to be offered as a course. [sic]

Please share any recommendations that you may have that would improve the Ready2Teach program in preparing entry-level classroom teachers.
Quit making me make all these lesson plans to be evaluated and doing this stupid EDTPA. It about Pearson the book company making money and not about how qualified I am. Let me spend my time in the classroom getting hands on experience without all this stuff so a company can make a bunch of money. [sic]
Residency lasted too long. One semester should be enough time to achieve all the coursework we students had to do in the semester and a half residency.
The knowledge of teaching strategies would be useful.
There should be more concentration on how to interact with effectively interact with parents, especially upset parents. [sic]
While I understand that Residency is beneficial as a one year stay, I think the same learning could be achieved in one semester. It is crystal clear after one semester if someone wants to be a teacher or does not.

Do you have any additional comments you would like to share with us?
Communication between supervisors, the school, and residency mentors should be improved for the benefit of the mentors.
I enjoyed this program and thought it was very helpful when getting me prepared for teaching in the real world.
I feel that there should have been more preparation for Tasks 2 & 3 for EdTPA. I felt really prepared and comfortable with task 1, but really struggled with tasks 2 and 3. I also feel that the seminars and EdTPA information could be given in a more organized way.
I have no further comments.

I think it would be a fabulous idea to have students that are freshmen/sophomores have a chance to shadow teachers in their area for a few days. Full on days. You have no idea how much work teaching is until you get to your upper-level classes.

University of Memphis
College of Education
Center for Research in Educational Policy
325 Browning Hall
Memphis, TN 38152