



**OACTE (formerly TQP) GRADUATE SURVEY
PROGRESS REPORT – *Abbreviated version***

Dr. William Loadman
Dr. Rael Moore
Kevin Kula
Dr. Sonja Smith
Dirk Richter
Dr. JianFang Liu
Dr. Richard Lomax
Dr. Yonghee Kim
Dr. James Freeman
Dr. Yesim Capa
Dr. Kevin Loy

Please note that the table numbers correspond to the order presented in the full, state report. This is a shortened version of the report that is being given to institutions who elected to take part in the standard and institutional data analyses.

Partial support for funding of the Preservice and Inservice surveys was provided by the Martha Holden Jennings Foundation, the George Gund Foundation, and the Ohio Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.



Longitudinal and Cross-Sectional History of Survey Data Collection

OACTE Preservice Teacher Survey
OACTE Inservice Teacher Survey

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009
'03-'04 Cohort I	Pre-service Hard copy N=1,541	In-service HC/Web N=1,049	In-service Web N=565	In-service Web N = 255	In-service Web N = 181	In-service Web N = 216
'04-'05 Cohort II		Pre-service HC N=4,904	In-service HC/Web N=1,208	In-service Web N = 631	In-service Web N = 192	In-service Web N = 204
'05-'06 Cohort III			Pre-service HC/Web N=5,219	In-service HC/Web N = 1,159	In-service Web N = 362	In-service Web N = 325
'06-'07 Cohort IV				Pre-service HC/Web N = 5,306	In-service HC/Web N = 297	In-service Web N = 372
'07-'08 Cohort V					Pre-service HC/Web N = 4,310	In-service Web N = 463
'08-'09 Cohort VI						Pre-service HC/Web N = 2,621

* Please note that 53 respondents had missing (Inservice) Cohort affiliation
for the 2008-09 dataset.

2009 Table of Contents for Survey Reports (*Abbreviated version*)

- a. **Table 1** 2009 OACTE/TQP List of Institutional Participation
- b. List of Variables in Preservice, Inservice and Demographic data files
- c. List of Research Questions
- d. **Table 2** 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008 and 2009 TQP Preservice Survey: Descriptive Statistics and ANOVA by Cohort by Subscale
- e. **Table 3** 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008 and 2009 TQP Preservice Survey: Reliability Analyses by Cohort
- f. **Table 7** 2009 TQP Inservice Survey Cohorts I through V Descriptive Statistics and ANOVA
- g. **Table 8** 2009 TQP Inservice Survey: Cohorts I through V Reliability Analyses
- h. **Table 12** 2009 TQP Preservice Survey Cohort VI Correlation Matrix by Subscale
- i. **Table 13** 2009 Inservice Survey Cohorts I through V (aggregated) Correlation Matrix by Subscale
- j. Summary of Analyses

**Table 1 2009 OACTE/TQP List of Institutional Participation:
Agent Letter and Preservice Cohort VI responses**

NO	AGENT LETTER	# PRESERVICE RESPONSES
2	1	6
3		37
4		14
5		79
6	1	50
7	1	226
8	1	73
9	1	7
10	1	69
11		0
12		0
13		0
14	1	231
15		28
16		0
17		38
18		0
19	1	5
20	1	23
21		22
22	1	17
23		39
24	1	50
25		1
26		161
27		6
28	1	80
29		103
30		55
31		84
32		0
33		37
34	1	44
35		8
36		145
37	1	23
38	1	78

NO	AGENT LETTER	# PRESERVICE RESPONSES
39		36
40		13
41	1	15
42		16
43		7
44	1	55
45		0
46		0
47		3
48		157
49		71
50	1	248
51		8
52	n/a	0
53	n/a	0
54	n/a	1
55	n/a	0
56	n/a	5
57	n/a	36
58	n/a	3
59	n/a	104
Total	18	2,621

LIST of VARIABLES IN THE DEMOGRAPHIC DATABASE

1. Date of birth
2. Ethnicity
3. GPA
4. Gender
5. ACT/SAT
6. Praxis II PLT, Praxis II Specialty I, and Praxis II Specialty II
7. Last Four Digits of Social Security Number
8. High School Rank
9. High School Name
10. High School GPA

LIST OF PRESERVICE SURVEY VARIABLES

1. Demographic Information (beginning in 2005)
 - a. Last four digits of SSN
 - b. Institution
 - c. Year completion of teacher preparation program
 - d. Area of license
 - e. How degree earned
 - f. Gender
 - g. Ethnicity
 - h. Date of birth
2. Teacher preparation
 - a. Quality of teacher preparation program
 - b. Coherence within teacher preparation program
 - c. Characteristics of clinical experience
 - d. Faculty characteristics
 - e. Characteristics and perceived quality of cooperative teacher support
 - f. Program impact
 - g. Reading preparation
 - h. Math preparation
 - i. Pedagogical preparation
 - j. Diversity preparation
 - k. Preparation for student assessment
 - l. Perceived quality of courses taken during Preservice
 - m. Preservice program's coverage of current professional and competency standards

Source: Beginning Teacher Preparation Survey (Valli, Rath, & Rennert-Ariev, 2001)

3. Teachers' Sense of Efficacy
 - a. Personal teacher efficacy
 - b. General teacher efficacy
 - c. Efficacy for student engagement
 - d. Efficacy for instructional practices

- e. Efficacy for classroom management

Source: Teacher Efficacy Scale (Gibson & Dembo, 1984)
Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001)

4. Instructional Orientation

- a. Literacy orientation
- b. Mathematics orientation

Source: Beginning Teacher Preparation Survey (Valli, Rath, & Rennert-Ariev, 2001)

5. Concerns about Teaching

- a. Self-concerns
- b. Task concerns
- c. Impact concerns

Source: Teachers Concern Questionnaire (George, 1978)

LIST OF INSERVICE SURVEY VARIABLES

1. Demographic Information

- a. Last four digits of SSN
- b. Institution
- c. Year completion of teacher preparation program
- d. Area of license
- e. How degree earned (AEL, undergrad, grad, non-degree)
- f. Gender
- g. Ethnicity
- h. Date of birth
- i. Year of first regular teaching position
- j. Percent of teaching assignment within licensure area

2. Teacher preparation

- a. Quality of teacher preparation program
- b. Coherence within teacher preparation program
- c. Faculty characteristics
- d. Motivation Preparation
- e. Curriculum Preparation
- f. Special Education Preparation
- g. Math preparation
- h. Pedagogical preparation
- i. Diversity preparation
- j. Preparation for student assessment
- k. Perceived quality of courses taken during Preservice
- l. Preservice program's coverage of current professional and competency standards

Source: Beginning Teacher Preparation Survey (Valli, Rath, & Rennert-Ariev, 2001)

3. **Teachers' Sense of Efficacy**

- a. **Personal teacher efficacy**
- b. **General teacher efficacy**
- c. **Efficacy for student engagement**
- d. **Efficacy for instructional practices**
- e. **Efficacy for classroom management**

Source: Teacher Efficacy Scale (Gibson & Dembo, 1984)
Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001)

4. **Instructional Orientation**

- a. **Literacy orientation**
- b. **Mathematics orientation**

Source: Beginning Teacher Preparation Survey (Valli, Rath, & Rennert-Ariev, 2001)

5. **Classroom Activities and Instructional Materials**

- a. Reading
- b. Mathematics

Source: Beginning Teacher Preparation Survey (Valli, Rath, & Rennert-Ariev, 2001)

6. **Self-Assessment of Content Knowledge**

- a. Reading
- b. Mathematics

Source: Beginning Teacher Preparation Survey (Valli, Rath, & Rennert-Ariev, 2001)

7. **Teacher Satisfaction**

Source: National Survey of Teacher Education Graduates (Loadman, Brookhart, & Freeman, 1999)

8. **Organizational Climate**

- a. Collegial Leadership
- b. Academic Emphasis
- c. Institutional Vulnerability
- d. Professional Teacher Behavior

Source: Organizational Climate Index (Hoy, Smith, & Sweetland, 2002)

9. Collective Efficacy

Source: Collective Efficacy Scale (Goddard, Hoy, & Woolfolk Hoy, 2000)

10. Trust

- a. Trust in Students and Parents
- b. Trust in the Principal
- c. Trust in Colleagues

Source: Omnibus T-scale (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999)

11. **Concerns about Teaching**

- a. Self-concerns**
- b. Task-concerns**
- c. Impact-concerns**

Source: Teachers Concern Questionnaire (George, 1978)

12. Professional Development

- a. PD Coordinated
- b. PD Quality
- c. PD Impact

Source: Beginning Teacher Preparation Survey (Valli, Rath, & Rennert-Ariev, 2001)

13. Mentoring and Induction

- a. Quality of Mentor Program
- b. Entry Year Support

Source: Beginning Teacher Preparation Survey (Valli, Rath, & Rennert-Ariev, 2001)
Seidel and Newmann study

14. Working Conditions

- a. Adequate Instructional Materials
- b. School characteristics (“safety”)
- c. Respect for Subordinates/Others

Source: Survey of Chicago Public School Teachers

15. Parent Involvement

Source: Survey of Chicago Public School Teachers

**** Common variables in Preservice survey are bold faced**

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

For each of the Preservice and Inservice variables listed above, descriptive statistics will be generated. Inferential statistics will also be conducted to answer further research questions. Here is a sample of research questions:

1. What is the current profile of all teacher education completers?
2. What are the characteristics of teachers who do not choose to enter the profession, those who enter but depart within five years, and those who remain in the profession for at least five years?
3. How do pre-service program completers rate quality of preparation in the areas of content (reading and math), pedagogy, personal and system?
4. How do variables in the pre-service program relate to entry into and persistence in the profession?
5. What do the professional development experiences look like during the first years of Teaching?
6. What do the mentoring experiences look like during the first years of teaching?
7. What characterizes Inservice teachers' workload? What are the characteristics of classrooms where these teachers work?
8. What characterizes of institutional support provided to the teachers?
9. What is the level of self-efficacy beliefs of pre-service teachers and in-service teachers and how do these beliefs change over time?
10. What are the concerns of Preservice teachers? Do they relate to their perception of preparation in reading/math/pedagogy? How do their concerns change as they begin the profession?
11. How do these characteristics vary among teachers who do not choose to enter the profession, those who enter but depart within five years, and those who remain in the profession for at least five years?
12. Across all of the foregoing independent variables, what are the discriminating characteristics of teachers who do not choose to enter the profession, those who enter but depart within five years, and those who remain in the profession for at least five years?
13. How do the scores on the various subscales change over time from both a longitudinal and cross sectional perspective?
14. What is the reliability of each of the Preservice, Inservice, and Praxis III subscales?
15. Can the Preservice, Inservice, and Praxis III subscales be confirmed by factor analysis?
16. How might the foregoing independent variables in the Inservice and Preservice survey differ by teacher demographic information (gender, race, age, licensure area)?
17. How do Ohio teacher candidates/program completers perform on Praxis II PLT?
18. How do Ohio EYTs perform on Praxis III?
19. How does Praxis II PLT and Praxis III relate?
20. How does amount of mentor interaction relate to entry-year teachers perceptions of being helped by a mentor?
21. How do teachers' perception of teacher education program quality and coherence change over time?

**Table 2 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008 and 2009 TQP Preservice Survey
Descriptive Statistics and ANOVA by Cohort by Subscale**

Subscales	Scale	Cohort II			Cohort III			Cohort IV			Cohort V			Cohort VI			ANOVA	
		N	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	SD	Sig	Eta.
A - Coherence within program	5-point	4,900	4.30	0.68	5,196	4.33	0.68	5,290	4.33	0.72	4,297	4.38	0.68	2,476	4.41	0.74	< .001*	0.003
A - Program quality	5-point	4,897	3.96	0.68	5,179	4.00	0.66	5,283	4.04	0.67	4,288	4.07	0.66	2,476	4.17	0.73	< .001*	0.009
A - Field experiences	5-point	4,891	4.08	0.82	5,181	4.11	0.79	5,286	4.14	0.78	4,289	4.15	0.79	2,476	4.30	0.81	< .001*	0.006
A - Faculty characteristics	5-point	4,889	3.91	0.61	5,166	3.92	0.62	5,280	3.97	0.61	4,289	4.02	0.59	2,474	4.10	0.60	< .001*	0.010
A - Cooperating teacher characteristics	5-point	4,858	4.04	0.89	5,166	4.07	0.88	5,266	4.09	0.88	4,277	4.14	0.84	2,471	4.22	0.82	< .001*	0.004
B - Motivation preparation	5-point	4,867	3.86	0.7	5,155	3.89	0.7	5,269	3.94	0.7	4,279	3.97	0.69	2,475	4.10	0.69	< .001*	0.010
B - Curriculum preparation	5-point	4,866	4.14	0.61	5,143	4.17	0.62	5,262	4.21	0.61	4,279	4.23	0.6	2,474	4.37	0.60	< .001*	0.012
B - Special Education preparation	5-point	4,877	3.39	0.84	5,086	3.44	0.85	5,230	3.47	0.85	4,254	3.53	0.84	2,475	3.71	0.83	< .001*	0.012
B - Diversity preparation	5-point	4,847	3.45	0.81	5,111	3.52	0.81	5,247	3.55	0.81	4,260	3.59	0.8	2,473	3.79	0.79	< .001*	0.014
B - Preparation to teach reading and writing	5-point	4,826	3.81	0.87	5,080	3.89	0.85	5,243	3.93	0.83	4,266	3.95	0.82	2,471	4.09	0.81	< .001*	0.009
B - Preparation to teach mathematics	5-point	4,778	3.24	1.17	5,037	3.27	1.18	5,206	3.30	1.2	4,242	3.33	1.19	2,462	3.48	1.19	< .001*	0.003
B - Preparation for student assessment	5-point	4,836	3.95	0.72	5,110	4.03	0.73	5,252	4.07	0.7	4,275	4.11	0.69	2,473	4.25	0.68	< .001*	0.015

**Table 2 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008 and 2009 TQP Preservice Survey
Descriptive Statistics and ANOVA by Cohort by Subscale (Continued)**

Subscales	Scale	Cohort II			Cohort III			Cohort IV			Cohort V			Cohort VI			ANOVA	
		N	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	SD	Sig	Eta.
G - Efficacy for classroom management	9-point	4,803	7.71	1.06	5,085	7.73	1.03	5,233	7.77	1.02	4,253	7.76	1.02	2,461	7.81	1.02	.001 *	0.001
G - Efficacy for student engagement	9-point	4,808	7.39	1.13	5,089	7.45	1.1	5,234	7.47	1.12	4,251	7.49	1.1	2,459	7.63	1.10	< .001*	0.004
G - Efficacy for instructional strategies	9-point	4,805	7.79	1	5,076	7.86	0.96	5,221	7.91	0.94	4,246	7.88	0.98	2,459	8.03	0.96	< .001*	0.005
H - General teacher efficacy	6-point	4,789	3.98	1.03	5,084	3.98	1.03	5,228	4.06	1	4,237	3.98	1.06	2,461	4.20	1.11	< .001*	0.005
H - Personal teacher efficacy	6-point	4,786	4.65	0.8	5,080	4.67	0.81	5,218	4.71	0.8	4,238	4.73	0.79	2,460	4.77	0.85	< .001*	0.002
I - Concerns – Self	4-point	4,777	2.62	0.8	5,056	2.62	0.81	5,218	2.61	0.8	4,225	2.64	0.81	2,463	2.72	0.77	< .001*	0.002
I - Concerns – Task	4-point	4,785	2.32	0.67	5,054	2.30	0.67	5,217	2.29	0.66	4,225	2.29	0.67	2,464	2.34	0.66	.005 *	0.001
I - Concerns – Impact	4-point	4,778	3.00	0.78	5,056	2.99	0.79	5,215	2.97	0.78	4,226	2.96	0.79	2,464	3.09	0.78	< .001*	0.002

* Denotes significance at $\alpha = .05$

** Please note that a discussion of significant subscales (post-hoc analyses) is included in the summary section at the end of this report.

**Table 3 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008 and 2009 TQP Preservice Survey
Reliability Analyses by Cohort**

Subscales	Source	Items	Scale	COHORT II		COHORT III		COHORT IV		COHORT V		COHORT VI	
				Rel.	N	Rel.	N	Rel.	N	Rel.	N	Rel.	N
A – Coherence within Program	1	1-4,6	5-point	0.83	4,754	0.84	5,104	0.86	5,195	0.85	4,325	0.90	2,574
A – Program Quality	1	5,7-13	5-point	0.81	4,701	0.81	5,035	0.82	5,104	0.82	4,122	0.88	2,508
A – Field Experience	1	15,17-19	5-point	0.76	4,844	0.73	5,138	0.75	5,234	0.77	4,267	0.81	2,586
A – Faculty Characteristics	1	20-28	5-point	0.78	4,746	0.78	5,047	0.79	5,167	0.78	4,198	0.79	2,522
A – Cooperating Teacher Characteristics	1	29-32	5-point	0.76	4,824	0.75	5,151	0.77	5,249	0.76	4,265	0.76	2,591
B – Motivation Preparation	1	1-4,6,10,15	5-point	0.90	4,771	0.90	5,060	0.90	5,203	0.91	4,222	0.91	2,570
B – Curriculum Preparation	1	5,7-9,11-14,16	5-point	0.89	4,762	0.90	5,049	0.90	5,170	0.90	4,221	0.92	2,524
B – Special Education Preparation	1	17,18,19,42,53	5-point	0.80	4,657	0.80	4,961	0.80	5,124	0.80	4,177	0.81	2,530
B – Pedagogical Preparation (Overall)	1	1-19	5-point	0.94	4,666	0.94	4,961	0.94	5,089	0.95	4,150	0.95	2,463
B – Diversity Preparation	1	20-28	5-point	0.92	4,759	0.92	5,018	0.93	5,162	0.93	4,182	0.93	2,550
B – Preparation to Teach Reading and Writing	1	29-41	5-point	0.96	4,648	0.96	4,957	0.96	5,125	0.96	4,165	0.96	2,505
B – Preparation to Teach Math	1	43-52	5-point	0.97	4,646	0.97	4,945	0.97	5,123	0.98	4,181	0.98	2,531
B – Preparation for Student Assessment	1	54-63	5-point	0.92	4,741	0.93	5,028	0.93	5,169	0.93	4,216	0.94	2,541

**Table 3 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008 and 2009 TQP Preservice Survey
Reliability Analyses by Cohort (Continued)**

Subscales	Source	Items	Scale	COHORT II		COHORT III		COHORT IV		COHORT V		COHORT VI	
				Rel.	N	Rel.	N	Rel.	N	Rel.	N	Rel.	N
G – Efficacy for Classroom Management	3	1,6-8	9-point	0.89	4,776	0.88	5,059	0.88	5,210	0.88	4,231	0.89	2,575
G – Efficacy for Student Engagement	3	2-4,11	9-point	0.83	4,752	0.83	5,042	0.84	5,195	0.84	4,220	0.85	2,569
G – Efficacy for Instructional Strategies	3	5,9,10,12	9-point	0.83	4,746	0.83	5,034	0.83	5,189	0.86	4,216	0.85	2,558
G – Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (Overall)	3	1-12	9-point	0.92	4,714	0.92	4,994	0.92	5,153	0.92	4,183	0.93	2,516
H – General Teacher Efficacy	4	1-4,9	6-point	0.75	4,706	0.76	5,037	0.75	5,172	0.78	4,198	0.81	2,567
H – Personal Teacher Efficacy	4	5-8	6-point	0.74	4,728	0.76	5,049	0.76	5,169	0.75	4,207	0.78	2,568
I – Concerns – Self	5	3,7,9,13,15	4-point	0.85	4,699	0.85	5,001	0.85	5,175	0.86	4,190	0.86	2,562
I – Concerns – Task	5	1,2,5,10,14	4-point	0.75	4,695	0.76	5,017	0.75	5,168	0.76	4,190	0.79	2,567
I – Concerns – Impact	5	4,6,8,11,12	4-point	0.88	4,711	0.89	4,995	0.88	5,175	0.86	4,196	0.90	2,551
I – Teacher Concerns (Overall)	5	1-15	4-point	0.91	4,593	0.91	4,917	0.91	5,095	0.92	4,133	0.92	2,491

- 1 - Valli, Raths, & Rennert-Ariev (2001) Beginning Teacher Preparation Survey
- 2 - TQP team, 2004
- 3 - Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk-Hoy (1999) Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale
- 4 - Hoy & Woolfolk (1993) Teacher Efficacy Scale
- 5 - George (1978) Teacher Concerns Questionnaire

Table 7 2009 TQP Inservice Survey Cohorts I through V Descriptive Statistics and ANOVA

Subscales	Cohort I, 5 th admin			Cohort II, 4 th admin			Cohort III, 3 rd admin			Cohort IV, 2 nd admin			Cohort V, 1 st admin			ANOVA	
	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	Sig.	Eta
B - MOTIVATION PREPARATION	179	3.54	0.91	177	3.58	0.84	274	3.65	0.81	310	3.62	0.77	367	3.69	0.78	.257	.004
B - CURRICULUM PREPARATION	179	3.82	0.83	177	3.94	0.78	274	4.04	0.76	310	4.05	0.70	367	4.07	0.70	<.001*	.012
B - SPECIAL EDUCATION PREPARATION	176	3.21	0.93	173	3.30	0.91	270	3.28	0.91	304	3.24	0.93	360	3.36	0.87	.336	.004
B - DIVERSITY PREPARATION	179	3.36	0.90	175	3.39	0.91	273	3.46	0.86	308	3.44	0.86	364	3.50	0.86	.456	.003
B - PREPARATION FOR STUDENT ASSESSMENT	177	3.66	0.93	173	3.82	0.82	271	3.86	0.86	308	3.91	0.85	364	3.90	0.83	.016 *	.009
B - PREPARATION TO TEACH MATH	170	2.99	1.09	173	3.18	1.21	267	3.18	1.11	301	3.12	1.28	350	3.07	1.21	.448	.003
B - PREPARATION TO TEACH READING AND WRITING	177	3.60	0.96	173	3.68	0.92	270	3.66	0.96	305	3.75	0.96	359	3.78	0.85	.207	.005
D - EFFICACY FOR CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT	174	7.77	1.20	168	7.64	1.19	262	7.85	1.02	295	7.58	1.19	351	7.42	1.26	<.001*	.018
D - EFFICACY FOR STUDENT ENGAGEMENT	175	7.06	1.40	168	7.21	1.26	262	7.24	1.25	295	7.09	1.31	351	7.10	1.22	.469	.003
D - EFFICACY FOR INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES	174	7.78	1.10	168	7.78	0.97	262	7.86	0.93	295	7.72	1.21	351	7.66	1.09	.198	.005
E - GENERAL TEACHER EFFICACY	174	4.03	1.08	168	4.25	1.03	262	4.27	0.96	295	4.25	0.99	351	4.17	0.98	.103	.006
E - PERSONAL TEACHER EFFICACY	174	4.71	0.83	168	4.60	0.93	262	4.69	0.76	295	4.55	0.84	351	4.49	0.88	.009 *	.011
Fa - LITERACY ORIENTATION 1	82	4.28	0.73	75	4.36	0.68	131	4.39	0.55	161	4.30	0.56	179	4.31	0.58	.621	.004
Fa - LITERACY ORIENTATION 2	82	4.28	0.69	75	4.46	0.63	131	4.50	0.52	161	4.55	0.46	179	4.43	0.57	.008 *	.022
Fb - LITERACY ACTIVITIES	82	4.23	0.56	75	4.24	0.55	130	4.23	0.53	160	4.18	0.48	178	4.19	0.51	.870	.002

Table 7 2009 TQP Inservice Survey Cohorts I through V Descriptive Statistics and ANOVA

Subscales	Cohort I, 5 th admin			Cohort II, 4 th admin			Cohort III, 3 rd admin			Cohort IV, 2 nd admin			Cohort V, 1 st admin			ANOVA	
	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	Sig.	Eta
Fc - LITERACY MATERIALS	79	2.90	0.70	76	2.76	0.70	130	2.74	0.57	161	2.80	0.59	179	2.77	0.61	.433	.006
Fd - LITERACY KNOWLEDGE	81	4.15	0.56	76	4.04	0.57	130	4.05	0.65	161	4.08	0.66	179	4.02	0.60	.566	.005
Ga - TRADITIONAL MATHEMATICS ORIENTATION	78	3.41	0.71	65	3.24	0.76	109	3.44	0.69	141	3.44	0.79	137	3.57	0.68	.052	.018
Ga - REFORM MATHEMATICS ORIENTATION	76	4.00	0.56	65	4.03	0.51	109	3.91	0.66	139	4.06	0.66	134	3.86	0.67	.071	.017
Gb - MATHEMATICS ACTIVITIES	78	4.12	0.62	64	4.13	0.56	110	4.04	0.63	141	4.16	0.48	136	4.23	0.56	.127	.014
Gc - STUDENT ACTIVITIES IN MATHEMATICS	77	3.36	0.71	64	3.42	0.66	109	3.36	0.69	141	3.38	0.64	137	3.36	0.62	.975	.001
Ge - MATHEMATICS KNOWLEDGE	70	3.81	0.76	52	3.87	0.69	94	3.83	0.64	124	3.90	0.73	125	3.89	0.67	.878	.003
I - CONCERNS – SELF	168	2.18	0.84	161	2.17	0.78	244	2.25	0.77	282	2.36	0.82	326	2.35	0.78	.028 *	.009
I - CONCERNS – TASK	168	2.25	0.69	161	2.22	0.66	244	2.12	0.68	282	2.11	0.66	326	2.05	0.69	.013 *	.011
I - CONCERNS – IMPACT	168	2.80	0.82	161	2.81	0.77	244	2.88	0.81	282	2.86	0.80	325	2.80	0.78	.700	.002
Ja COLLECTIVE EFFICACY	160	4.12	0.91	143	4.21	0.82	222	4.32	0.84	260	4.24	0.87	284	4.12	0.93	.082	.008
Jb - COLLEGIAL LEADERSHIP	159	2.84	0.73	143	2.97	0.71	223	2.97	0.74	258	3.06	0.78	281	2.94	0.79	.065	.008
Jb - PROFESSIONAL TEACHER BEHAVIOR	159	3.10	0.63	143	3.16	0.53	223	3.27	0.59	258	3.28	0.56	280	3.24	0.59	.010 *	.012
Jb - ACHIEVEMENT PRESS	159	2.72	0.58	143	2.72	0.55	223	2.85	0.51	257	2.85	0.54	281	2.76	0.56	.023 *	.011
Jb - INSTITUTIONAL VULNERABILITY	159	2.68	0.54	143	2.64	0.47	219	2.67	0.50	255	2.66	0.49	278	2.62	0.49	.670	.002
Jc - TRUST IN PRINCIPAL	156	4.18	1.21	141	4.40	1.21	223	4.44	1.27	258	4.56	1.29	277	4.33	1.32	.047 *	.009
Jc - TRUST IN COLLEAGUES	156	4.41	1.02	141	4.64	0.95	223	4.78	0.99	258	4.75	0.98	277	4.65	0.97	.004 *	.015
Jc - TRUST IN CLIENTS	155	3.76	1.04	141	3.73	1.00	223	3.93	0.91	257	3.88	1.07	277	3.79	1.03	.264	.005

Table 7 2009 TQP Inservice Survey Cohorts I through V Descriptive Statistics and ANOVA

Subscales	Cohort 1.5			Cohort 2.4			Cohort 3.3			Cohort 4.2			Cohort 5.1			ANOVA	
	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	Sig.	Eta
La – SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS 1	150	3.75	0.97	136	3.75	0.99	221	3.98	0.90	254	3.90	0.92	274	3.67	1.03	.003 *	.016
La – SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS 2	149	3.88	0.93	136	4.11	0.89	221	4.05	0.89	251	4.17	0.85	271	4.08	0.80	.024 *	.011
Lb – INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS	151	3.84	1.06	137	3.82	1.11	221	3.82	1.14	254	3.93	1.01	275	3.81	1.11	.715	.002
Oaa - PD QUALITY	48	3.66	0.67	36	3.75	0.67	65	3.43	0.77	64	3.65	0.75	91	3.72	0.75	.116	.024
Od - MENTORING QUALITY	7	2.99	0.74	6	2.99	1.17	14	3.57	1.16	29	4.02	1.15	202	3.74	1.13	.104	.030

* Denotes significance at $\alpha = .05$.

** Note that all items are on a 5-point scale (5=Strongly Agree, 1=Strongly Disagree) except the following sections/subscales: Section D (9-point), Section E (6-point), Section I (4-point), Collective Efficacy / Collegial Leadership / Trust in Colleagues / Trust in Clients (6-point), Professional Teacher Behavior / Achievement Press / Institutional Vulnerability / PD Coordination (4-point).

*** The sample size for the professional development and mentoring subscales are small. The professional development subscales have a small sample size because respondents were first asked whether they had exposure to such experiences. For those who indicated they had such experiences, responses were calculated and subscales generated.

**** Because of the similarity across Cohort status, these data have been aggregated for the remaining analyses.

Table 8 2008 and 2009 TQP Inservice Survey: Cohorts I through V Reliability Analyses

	Source	Items	Cohort II, 3 rd admin		Cohort III, 2 nd admin		Cohort IV, 1 st admin		2008-09 (Cohorts I through V)	
			Rel.	N	Rel.	N	Rel.	N	Rel.	N
B – MOTIVATION PREPARATION	1	1-4,6,10,15	0.93	149	0.92	287	0.90	253	0.92	1,311
B – CURRICULUM PREPARATION	1	5,7-9,11-14,16	0.91	151	0.92	283	0.90	255	0.93	1,286
B – SPECIAL EDUCATION PREPARATION	1	17-19,52,63	0.85	139	0.85	279	0.83	244	0.84	1,245
B – DIVERSITY PREPARATION	1	20-28	0.94	148	0.94	285	0.93	248	0.94	1,287
B – PREPARATION FOR STUDENT ASSESSMENT	1	29-38	0.94	143	0.95	286	0.94	244	0.95	1,267
B – PREPARATION TO TEACH READING AND WRITING	1	39-51	0.97	144	0.97	280	0.97	238	0.97	1,256
B – PREPARATION TO TEACH MATH	1	53-62,64-72	0.99	143	0.99	272	0.99	246	0.99	1,205
D – EFFICACY FOR CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT	3	1,6-8	0.91	143	0.93	286	0.88	240	0.91	1,267
D – EFFICACY FOR STUDENT ENGAGEMENT	3	2-4,11	0.86	143	0.86	286	0.86	240	0.87	1,265
D – EFFICACY FOR INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES	3	5,9,10,12	0.85	143	0.80	283	0.83	241	0.84	1,262
E – GENERAL TEACHER EFFICACY	4	1-4,9	0.78	143	0.73	280	0.74	239	0.77	1,265
E – PERSONAL TEACHER EFFICACY	4	5-8	0.75	143	0.74	283	0.70	240	0.75	1,269
Fa – LITERACY ORIENTATION 1	1	1,6-8	0.82	75	0.66	132	0.79	121	0.70	629
Fa – LITERACY ORIENTATION 2	1	2-5	0.83	79	0.79	128	0.88	121	0.78	631
Fb – LITERACY ACTIVITIES	1	1-14	0.87	74	0.79	122	0.86	116	0.82	591
Fc – LITERACY MATERIALS	1	1-10	0.48	74	0.73	126	0.65	119	0.67	604
Fd – LITERACY KNOWLEDGE	1	1-10	0.94	77	0.92	127	0.90	123	0.90	626
Ga – TRADITIONAL MATHEMATICS ORIENTATION	1	1,4-6,8	0.67	59	0.66	134	0.67	119	0.71	531
Ga – REFORM MATHEMATICS ORIENTATION	1	2,3,7	0.70	60	0.68	134	0.69	120	0.57	533
Gb - MATHEMATICS ACTIVITIES	1	1-12	0.70	60	0.74	133	0.85	118	0.79	516
Gc – STUDENT ACTIVITIES IN MATHEMATICS	1	1-9	0.83	60	0.73	132	0.78	119	0.78	529
Ge - MATHEMATICS KNOWLEDGE	1	1-16	0.92	42	0.94	102	0.92	100	0.92	387
I – CONCERNS – SELF	9	3,7,9,13,15	0.83	129	0.83	267	0.85	228	0.84	1,197
I – CONCERNS – TASK	9	1,2,5,10,14	0.72	128	0.72	268	0.75	227	0.73	1,194
I – CONCERNS – IMPACT	9	4,6,8,11,12	0.83	131	0.87	269	0.86	227	0.88	1,187
Ja COLLECTIVE EFFICACY	8	1-12	0.86	118	0.88	244	0.87	212	0.87	1,070
Jb – COLLEGIAL LEADERSHIP	6	1,3,5,10,13 20,27	0.91	117	0.93	248	0.92	212	0.92	1,061
Jb – PROFESSIONAL TEACHER BEHAVIOR	6	8,18,21,23,25,28- 30	0.93	110	0.93	241	0.93	208	0.92	1,051
Jb – ACHIEVEMENT PRESS	6	7,11,14- 17,19,22,24	0.86	118	0.89	247	0.88	208	0.86	1,043
Jb – INSTITUTIONAL VULNERABILITY	6	2,4,6,9,12,26	0.61	118	0.63	244	0.61	206	0.66	1,057
Jc – TRUST IN PRINCIPAL	7	1,4,7,9,11,15,18,23	0.94	116	0.95	245	0.92	210	0.94	1,051

**Table 8 2008 and 2009 TQP Inservice Survey: Cohorts I through V
Reliability Analyses (Continued)**

	Source	Items	Cohort II, 3 rd admin		Cohort III, 2 nd admin		Cohort IV, 1 st admin		2008-09 (Cohorts I through V)	
			Rel.	N	Rel.	N	Rel.	N	Rel.	N
Jc - TRUST IN COLLEAGUES	7	2,5,8,12,13,16,19,21	0.96	116	0.95	242	0.95	213	0.94	1,052
Jc - TRUST IN CLIENTS	7	3,6,10,14,17,20,22,24-26	0.93	114	0.94	239	0.94	206	0.93	1,032
La - SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS 1	2	1-7	0.92	114	0.90	242	0.91	206	0.90	1,030
La - SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS 2	2	8-10	0.80	114	0.89	243	0.91	208	0.84	1,053
Lb - INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS	2	11-14	0.91	114	0.94	245	0.91	210	0.93	1,048
Oab - PD QUALITY	1	1-10	0.96	15	0.94	33	0.98	18	0.93	103
Ob - PD IMPACT	1	1-13	0.98	21	0.97	50	0.96	28	0.97	182
Od - MENTORING QUALITY	2	1-15	0.98	13	0.98	21	0.98	189	0.98	246

- 1 - Valli, Raths, & Rennert-Ariev (2001) Beginning Teacher Preparation Survey
- 2 - TQP team, 2004
- 3 - Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk-Hoy (1999) Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale
- 4 - Hoy & Woolfolk (1993) Teacher Efficacy Scale
- 5 - Loadman, Brookhart, & Freeman (1999) National Survey of Teacher Education Graduates
- 6 - Hoy, Smith, & Sweetland (2001) Organizational Climate Index (OCI)
- 7 - Hoy & Tschannen-Moran (1999) Omnibus T-Scale
- 8 - Goddard, Hoy, & Woolfolk-Hoy (2000) Collective Efficacy Scale
- 9 - George (1978) Teacher Concerns Questionnaire

**Table 12 2009 Preservice Survey
Cohort VI Correlation Matrix by Subscale**

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
1. A - Coherence within Program	1.00	0.81	0.53	0.54	0.25	0.41	0.44	0.29	0.32	0.32	0.21	0.43	0.21	0.21	0.25	0.08	0.21	-0.02	-0.10	0.00
2. A - Program Quality		1.00	0.56	0.54	0.23	0.49	0.49	0.45	0.43	0.45	0.40	0.48	0.24	0.28	0.30	0.08	0.26	-0.01	-0.07	0.00
3. A - Field Experiences			1.00	0.37	0.34	0.37	0.36	0.33	0.35	0.28	0.19	0.32	0.20	0.22	0.22	0.03	0.21	-0.02	-0.08	0.00
4. A - Faculty Characteristics				1.00	0.37	0.49	0.52	0.38	0.40	0.40	0.24	0.48	0.27	0.28	0.33	0.19	0.29	0.00	-0.12	0.04
5. A - Cooperating Teacher Characteristics					1.00	0.31	0.29	0.23	0.20	0.21	0.13	0.24	0.18	0.18	0.20	0.10	0.19	-0.01	-0.11	0.03
6. B - Motivation Preparation						1.00	0.83	0.76	0.71	0.58	0.41	0.65	0.43	0.49	0.43	0.02	0.45	0.00	-0.06	-0.01
7. B - Curriculum Preparation							1.00	0.65	0.66	0.60	0.41	0.71	0.39	0.42	0.45	0.07	0.41	0.02	-0.10	0.02
8. B - Special Education Preparation								1.00	0.72	0.64	0.61	0.58	0.34	0.42	0.35	-0.03	0.36	0.00	-0.03	-0.04
9. B - Diversity Preparation									1.00	0.57	0.40	0.59	0.34	0.43	0.37	-0.02	0.37	0.00	-0.03	-0.02
10. B - Preparation to Teach Reading and Writing										1.00	0.44	0.62	0.30	0.37	0.36	0.06	0.35	0.01	-0.05	0.04
11. B - Preparation to Teach Math											1.00	0.37	0.17	0.26	0.19	0.01	0.20	-0.03	-0.05	-0.04
12. B - Preparation for Student Assessment												1.00	0.37	0.40	0.46	0.07	0.39	0.00	-0.10	0.02
13. G - Efficacy for Classroom Management													1.00	0.72	0.70	0.10	0.52	-0.05	-0.08	0.01
14. G - Efficacy for Student Engagement														1.00	0.71	0.12	0.53	0.01	-0.04	0.02
15. G - Efficacy for Instructional Strategies															1.00	0.12	0.51	-0.01	-0.09	0.05
16. H - General Teacher Efficacy																1.00	-0.03	-0.10	-0.27	0.03
17. H - Personal Teacher Efficacy																	1.00	-0.03	-0.10	0.00
18. I - Concerns for Self																		1.00	0.58	0.77
19. I - Concerns for Task																			1.00	0.46
20. I - Concerns for Impact																				1.00

Table 13 2009 Inservice Survey Cohorts I through V (aggregated) Correlation Matrix by Subscale

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
1. B - MOTIVATION PREPARATION	1.00	0.84	0.79	0.74	0.72	0.46	0.66	0.34	0.48	0.44	0.03	0.39	0.18	0.15	0.12	0.24	0.33	0.19	0.09	0.15
2. B - CURRICULUM PREPARATION		1.00	0.69	0.74	0.79	0.47	0.67	0.31	0.41	0.47	0.03	0.33	0.19	0.25	0.11	0.17	0.36	0.10	0.15	0.17
3. B - SPECIAL EDUCATION PREPARATION			1.00	0.75	0.66	0.65	0.71	0.24	0.39	0.39	-0.01	0.32	0.15	0.09	0.15	0.26	0.31	0.19	0.10	0.17
4. B - DIVERSITY PREPARATION				1.00	0.65	0.48	0.65	0.26	0.40	0.39	0.02	0.29	0.14	0.20	0.11	0.20	0.31	0.08	0.13	0.13
5. B - PREPARATION FOR STUDENT ASSESSMENT					1.00	0.43	0.65	0.25	0.36	0.45	0.00	0.31	0.15	0.20	0.13	0.20	0.36	0.13	0.07	0.18
6. B - PREPARATION TO TEACH MATH						1.00	0.47	0.16	0.28	0.21	-0.01	0.19	0.10	0.08	0.25	0.23	0.25	0.08	0.19	0.23
7. B - PREPARATION TO TEACH READING AND WRITING							1.00	0.24	0.37	0.38	0.03	0.33	0.14	0.21	0.15	0.25	0.47	0.15	0.10	0.19
8. D - EFFICACY FOR CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT								1.00	0.67	0.63	0.24	0.51	0.14	0.18	0.23	0.18	0.27	-0.05	0.13	0.16
9. D - EFFICACY FOR STUDENT ENGAGEMENT									1.00	0.67	0.29	0.52	0.19	0.25	0.29	0.30	0.37	0.02	0.17	0.19
10. D - EFFICACY FOR INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES										1.00	0.21	0.49	0.20	0.28	0.28	0.25	0.46	-0.01	0.18	0.22
11. E - GENERAL TEACHER EFFICACY											1.00	0.17	-0.08	0.04	0.12	0.00	0.04	-0.24	-0.06	0.04
12. E - PERSONAL TEACHER EFFICACY												1.00	0.18	0.22	0.29	0.25	0.37	0.08	0.19	0.21
13. Fa - LITERACY ORIENTATION													1.00	0.59	0.23	0.17	0.21	0.19	0.26	0.17
14. Fa - LITERACY ORIENTATION														1.00	0.21	0.11	0.30	0.01	0.37	0.19
15. Fb - LITERACY ACTIVITIES															1.00	0.47	0.37	0.13	0.35	0.59
16. Fc - LITERACY MATERIALS																1.00	0.31	0.30	0.14	0.29
17. Fd - LITERACY KNOWLEDGE																	1.00	0.10	0.21	0.26
18. Ga - TRADITIONAL MATHEMATICS ORIENTATION																		1.00	0.08	0.28
19. Ga - REFORM MATHEMATICS ORIENTATION																			1.00	0.35
20. Gb - MATHEMATICS ACTIVITIES																				1.00

Table 13 2009 Inservice Survey Cohorts I through V (aggregated) Correlation Matrix by Subscale (Continued)

	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38
1. B - MOTIVATION PREPARATION	0.10	0.19	-0.05	-0.11	-0.09	0.23	0.22	0.23	0.26	0.26	0.18	0.23	0.26	0.23	0.16	0.21	0.34	0.28
2. B - CURRICULUM PREPARATION	0.15	0.28	-0.01	-0.11	-0.03	0.22	0.23	0.26	0.25	0.30	0.17	0.24	0.24	0.19	0.17	0.22	0.37	0.31
3. B - SPECIAL EDUCATION PREPARATION	0.11	0.24	-0.02	-0.06	-0.08	0.12	0.17	0.16	0.14	0.21	0.14	0.16	0.15	0.12	0.14	0.16	0.32	0.26
4. B - DIVERSITY PREPARATION	0.14	0.22	-0.01	-0.05	-0.05	0.13	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.22	0.14	0.17	0.17	0.11	0.12	0.15	0.34	0.23
5. B - PREPARATION FOR STUDENT ASSESSMENT	0.10	0.28	-0.02	-0.08	-0.03	0.14	0.14	0.24	0.18	0.24	0.11	0.21	0.15	0.10	0.14	0.14	0.35	0.28
6. B - PREPARATION TO TEACH MATH	0.16	0.45	-0.06	-0.08	-0.06	0.11	0.12	0.14	0.12	0.10	0.09	0.13	0.13	0.07	0.11	0.15	0.25	0.19
7. B - PREPARATION TO TEACH READING AND WRITING	0.14	0.11	-0.02	-0.03	-0.04	0.15	0.17	0.21	0.17	0.20	0.14	0.18	0.16	0.12	0.14	0.17	0.32	0.21
8. D - EFFICACY FOR CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT	0.20	0.21	-0.19	-0.17	-0.07	0.21	0.15	0.13	0.23	0.10	0.09	0.13	0.25	0.26	0.10	0.18	0.22	0.14
9. D - EFFICACY FOR STUDENT ENGAGEMENT	0.23	0.18	-0.14	-0.15	-0.10	0.26	0.18	0.19	0.30	0.15	0.11	0.16	0.31	0.24	0.11	0.21	0.33	0.19
10. D - EFFICACY FOR INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES	0.26	0.26	-0.11	-0.13	-0.03	0.16	0.15	0.21	0.22	0.19	0.09	0.18	0.21	0.18	0.15	0.18	0.37	0.27
11. E - GENERAL TEACHER EFFICACY	0.07	-0.04	-0.08	-0.17	0.00	0.18	0.08	0.10	0.14	-0.09	0.08	0.06	0.19	0.19	0.10	0.09	0.09	-0.04
12. E - PERSONAL TEACHER EFFICACY	0.25	0.20	-0.15	-0.11	-0.06	0.14	0.13	0.12	0.16	0.07	0.09	0.08	0.17	0.15	0.06	0.11	0.29	0.12
13. Fa - LITERACY ORIENTATION	0.16	0.14	0.07	0.03	0.04	0.04	0.05	0.14	0.09	0.07	0.01	0.13	0.09	-0.04	0.03	0.14	0.27	0.07
14. Fa - LITERACY ORIENTATION	0.24	0.21	0.06	-0.02	0.08	0.07	0.12	0.17	0.13	0.07	0.10	0.16	0.11	0.02	0.09	0.14	0.27	0.09
15. Fb - LITERACY ACTIVITIES	0.58	0.22	-0.04	-0.03	0.01	0.13	0.10	0.17	0.20	0.08	0.03	0.12	0.19	0.06	0.08	0.17	0.17	0.25
16. Fc - LITERACY MATERIALS	0.33	0.06	0.01	0.07	-0.02	0.08	0.08	0.14	0.17	0.12	0.03	0.11	0.12	0.03	0.04	0.09	0.19	0.20
17. Fd - LITERACY KNOWLEDGE	0.28	0.36	-0.11	-0.06	-0.02	0.11	0.10	0.20	0.12	0.15	0.08	0.20	0.13	0.03	0.10	0.12	0.24	0.24
18. Ga - TRADITIONAL MATHEMATICS ORIENTATION	0.13	0.06	0.03	0.03	-0.10	0.05	0.06	0.08	0.09	0.01	0.02	0.05	0.06	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.19	0.07
19. Ga - REFORM MATHEMATICS ORIENTATION	0.45	0.25	0.00	-0.02	0.10	0.03	0.13	0.09	0.08	-0.01	0.05	0.09	0.08	-0.02	0.04	0.10	0.15	0.02
20. Gb - MATHEMATICS ACTIVITIES	0.66	0.28	-0.05	-0.05	0.02	0.04	0.15	0.12	0.13	0.08	0.05	0.07	0.08	-0.01	0.09	0.16	0.28	-0.02

Table 13 2009 Inservice Survey Cohorts I through V (aggregated) Correlation Matrix by Subscale (Continued)

	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	
21. Gc - STUDENT ACTIVITIES IN MATH	1.00	0.28	-0.03	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.12	0.11	0.16	0.11	0.00	0.07	0.10	0.00	0.04	0.09	0.19	-0.01	
22. Ge - MATHEMATICS KNOWLEDGE		1.00	-0.18	-0.17	-0.11	-0.03	0.02	0.07	0.00	0.02	0.02	0.12	0.04	-0.09	0.04	0.16	0.17	0.15	
23. I - CONCERNS SELF			1.00	0.45	0.68	-0.13	-0.10	-0.09	-0.05	0.08	-0.11	-0.12	-0.14	-0.14	-0.08	-0.09	-0.05	-0.14	
24. I - CONCERNS TASK				1.00	0.40	-0.32	-0.22	-0.20	-0.24	0.11	-0.25	-0.21	-0.30	-0.32	-0.22	-0.36	-0.17	-0.20	
25. I - CONCERNS IMPACT					1.00	-0.14	-0.10	-0.09	-0.09	0.07	-0.11	-0.08	-0.15	-0.15	-0.06	-0.11	-0.03	-0.15	
26. Ja - COLLECTIVE EFFICACY						1.00	0.36	0.56	0.73	0.09	0.38	0.49	0.78	0.65	0.44	0.38	0.28	0.23	
27. Jb - COLLEGIAL LEADERSHIP							1.00	0.44	0.41	0.04	0.87	0.39	0.33	0.31	0.50	0.27	0.37	0.20	
28. Jb - PROFESSIONAL TEACHER BEHAVIOR								1.00	0.56	0.08	0.42	0.84	0.52	0.31	0.47	0.29	0.35	0.33	
29. Jb - ACHIEVEMENT PRESS									1.00	0.30	0.35	0.45	0.78	0.61	0.40	0.38	0.34	0.19	
30. Jb - INSTITUTIONAL VULNERABILITY										1.00	-0.08	0.02	0.15	0.07	-0.02	0.06	0.12	0.04	
31. Jc - TRUST IN PRINCIPAL											1.00	0.43	0.34	0.35	0.52	0.27	0.30	0.23	
32. Jc - TRUST IN COLLEAGUES												1.00	0.52	0.30	0.45	0.26	0.30	0.32	
33. Jc - TRUST IN CLIENTS													1.00	0.68	0.40	0.37	0.33	0.24	
34. La - SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS 1														1.00	0.36	0.36	0.17	0.22	
35. La - SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS 2															1.00	0.26	0.23	0.20	
36. Lb - INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS																1.00	0.32	0.20	
37. Oaa - PD QUALITY																		1.00	0.32
38. Od - MENTORING QUALITY																			1.00

SUMMARY OF ANALYSES

PRESERVICE SURVEY

Frequencies, means and standard deviations at the item and subscale level were presented for Cohorts II, III, IV, V, and VI. Analysis of variance, assessing the statistical difference between the five cohorts' means, found little differences at both the item and subscale level. Although all of the twenty confirmed subscales were significant, it was decided, with small partial eta scores (.015 or smaller), scores across cohorts are similar and any differences are due to chance or a selective population of respondents. The latter is worthy to note since there were notably fewer responding teacher education institutions for the state level 2008-09 data.

Reliability analyses were conducted for Cohorts II, III, IV, V, and VI in evaluating the confirmed twenty subscales. Overall, subscales had similar and high reliability scores across all five cohorts. In addition, the Confirmatory Factor Analysis displayed that five models fit the data well – Teachers Perception of Teacher Preparation Program, Professional Knowledge and Skills, Teacher Efficacy – Part a, Teacher Efficacy – Part b, and Concerns about Teaching. The fit indices, assessing model fit, are similar across the five cohorts.

Analysis of variance was conducted to determine if respondents enrolled in public and private institutions differed on their mean score for Cohort VI. Twelve of the subscales were statistically different with private institutions consistently having a higher mean relative to public institutions. However, respondents from public institutions responded more favorably on the Preparation to Teach Math subscale. Effect sizes for each of the significant differences yielded only a few at a low level; all other effect sizes were trivial. A second analysis of variance was conducted to determine if respondents in one of the five licensure status categories (*Early Education, Middle, AYA, Intervention Specialist, and Other*) were statistically different. All subscales displayed a statistically significant difference across licensure except for the Concerns for Self, Concerns for Task, and Concerns for Impact subscales. Significant differences were followed up using Scheffe post hoc procedures; however, no licensure status category was consistently different from the other categories across subscales.

INSERVICE SURVEY

Frequencies, means and standard deviations at the item and subscale level were generated for all five cohorts represented in 2008-09. Analysis of variance was conducted to determine if cohorts' subscale means were statistically different from each other. While thirteen of the confirmed subscales were statistically significant, most of these displayed small eta square values. Since all means across the five cohorts are relatively similar and had low effect sizes, it was concluded that means are similar across cohorts for each of the subscales. Due to the smaller response rate and similarity across cohorts, it was decided, for clarity of interpretation, to aggregate the five cohorts. Frequencies, means, and standard deviations at the item and subscale level were generated for the aggregate 2008-09 Inservice dataset.

Total reliability analyses (comparing the aggregated 2008-09 to that collected the previous year) were presented, and displayed a similar internal consistency across cohorts. Low reliabilities were evident in the General and Personal Teacher Efficacy, Literacy Materials, and Reform Mathematics Orientation

subscales. Due to the low response rate, confirmatory factor analysis was not conducted for the 2008-09 Cohorts I through V data. However, past year's analyses confirmed eleven models: Professional Knowledge & Skills, Teacher Efficacy (Part A and B), Instructional Orientation – Literacy, Instructional Orientation- Mathematics, Teacher Concerns, School Context, Working Conditions, Workload, and Professional Development & Instructional Experiences.

Analysis of variance was conducted to determine whether respondents enrolled in private and public institutions differed on any of the subscale mean scores in the aggregated dataset. As displayed in the Preservice data, respondents from private institutions reported higher means than those from public institutions; however, only one-fourth of the subscales were statistically significant, mostly across the Professional Knowledge and Skills (Section B) scales. Analysis of variance methods were also conducted to determine if respondents in one of the five licensure status categories were statistically different on any of the thirty-eight subscales. In the aggregated dataset, twenty-seven of the subscales were statistically significant. Most of these statistically significant differences by licensure were found in the Professional Knowledge and Skills (Section B), Literacy and Math Instructional Orientation (Sections E and F), Teacher Efficacy - Part b (Section G), and School Context (Section J) subscales. It is worthy to note that the (a) small Inservice sample size, notably in the *Other* licensure category and (b) trivial effect sizes for several of the scales suggests that some of these differences should be interpreted with caution.

BOX AND WHISKER PLOTS –With Institution as the Unit of Analysis (presented in full report)

Box and whisker plots were generated to understand the distribution of both Preservice (Cohort VI) and Inservice (Cohorts I through V aggregated) subscales scores when institution is the unit of analysis. The majority of Preservice and Inservice scores for each subscale are relatively normally distributed. Comparing box plots across Preservice subscales (N = 40 institutions) finds that institutions score similarly on those subscales with the same range of possible responses. Three subscales that have a lower median than the others in their section include Preparation to Teach Math, General Teacher Efficacy, and Concerns for Task. Alternatively, comparing box plots across the 2008-09 Inservice subscales (N = 43 institutions) finds that institutions score similarly on those subscales with the same range of possible responses with the exception of the subscales Preparation to Teach Math, Efficacy for Student Engagement, Literacy Materials, Concerns for Self, Concerns for Task, and Trust in Clients – all of which have a lower median score than the other subscales in their respective section. Institutions are encouraged to evaluate these various distributions, by subscale, to observe where their institution mean falls as an additional way to assist with interpretation of the 2008-09 data.