## Texas Education Agency (TEA) Principal (Employer) Satisfaction Survey 2022-2023

## Midwestern State University – West College of Education

The Principal (Employer) Satisfaction Survey is administered by the Texas Education Agency to the principals of first year teachers to determine their satisfaction with the teachers' preparation. Items included on the survey cover the areas of planning, instruction, learning environment, professional practices and responsibilities and if applicable, students with disabilities and English language learners. At the end of the survey, principals were asked to provide an overall evaluation and to rate each teacher's influence on student achievement. Each question (except for the final one) in the survey contained four response options: "Not At All Prepared," "Not Sufficiently Prepared," "Sufficiently Prepared," and "Well Prepared." Each option corresponds with numeric values of 0-3 in the same order as the responses listed. The results below are from the Employer Satisfaction Survey administered at the end of the 2022-2023 school year.

	To what extent was the first-year teacher prepared to		Not At All Prepared n (%) 0	Not Sufficiently Prepared n (%) 1	Sufficiently Prepared n (%) 2	Well Prepared n (%)3
10						
1.	design lessons that align with state content standards?	34	1 2.9%	6 17.6%	10 29.9%	17 50%
2.	design lesson that appropriate for diverse learning needs?	34	2 5.9%	5 14.7%	11 32.4%	16 47.1%
3.	design lessons that reflect research-based best practices?	34	1 2.9%	7 20.6%	10 29.4%	16 47.1%
4.	design lessons that are relevant to students?	34	1 2.9%	5 14.7%	10 29.4%	18 52.9%
5.	design lessons that integrate technology when appropriate to the lesson (to the extent technology is available at the school)?	34	1 2.9%	4 11.8%	13 38.2%	16 47.1%
6.	plan appropriate methods (formal and/or informal) to measure student progress?	34	1 2.9%	6 17.6%	12 35.3%	15 44.1%
7.	use a variety of student data to plan instruction?	34	1 2.9%	6 17.6%	13 38.2%	14 41.2%
8.	provide appropriate feedback to students, families, or other school personnel?	34	1 2.9%	4 11.8%	15 44.1%	14 41.2%
9.	plan lessons that encourage students to persist when learning is difficult?	34	1 2.9%	7 20.6%	12 35.3%	14 41.2%
10.	plan engaging questions that encourage complex or higher-order thinking?	34	1 2.9%	6 17.6%	12 35.3%	15 44.1%

To what extent was the first-year teacher prepared to		Not At All Prepared	Not Sufficiently Prepared	Sufficiently Prepared	Well Prepared
		n <b>(%) 0</b>	n <b>(%) 1</b>	n <b>(%) 2</b>	n <b>(%)3</b>
11. plan lessons that use student instructional groups to meet the needs of all students?	34	1 2.9%	6 17.6%	9 26.5%	18 52.9%
<b>12.</b> make sure all instructional resources, materials, and technology are aligned to instructional purposes?	34	1 2.9%	6 17.6%	9 26.5%	18 52.9%
13. use content-specific pedagogy to deliver lessons aligned with state standards?	34	2 5.9%	3 8.8%	13 38.2%	16 47.1%
14. explain content accurately to students in multiple ways?	34	3 8.8%	3 8.8%	15 44.1%	13 38.2%
15. demonstrate connections between the learning objectives and other disciplines?	34	2 5.9%	4 11.8%	15 44.1%	13 38.2%
<b>16.</b> provide opportunities for students to use different types of thinking such as: analytical, practical, creative, or research-based?	34	2 5.9%	4 11.8%	13 38.2%	15 44.1%
17. use technology when appropriate to the lesson (to the extent technology was available at the school)?	34	1 2.9%	3 8.8%	12 35.3%	18 52.9%
18. differentiate instruction?	34	2 5.9%	5 14.7%	17 50.0%	10 29.4%
19. consistently monitor the quality of student participation and performance?	34	3 8.8%	3 8.8%	17 50.0%	11 32.4%
20. work with a diverse student population?	34	2 5.9%	3 8.8%	14 41.2%	15 44.1%
21. work with a diverse parent and school community population?	34	2 5.9%	2 5.9%	15 44.1%	15 44.1%
22. collect student progress data during instruction?	34	2 5.9%	4 11.8%	14 41.2%	14 41.2%
23. adjust the lesson in progress based on data gathered during instruction?	34	2 5.9%	4 11.8%	16 47.1%	12 35.3%
<b>24.</b> maintain student engagement by adjusting instruction and activities based on student responses and behavior?	34	2 5.9%	4 11.8%	14 41.2%	14 41.2%
25. give appropriate time for the lesson from introduction to closure?	34	2 5.9%	4 11.8%	12 35.3%	16 47.1%
26. organize a safe classroom?	34	1 2.9%	2 5.9%	11 32.4%	20 58.8%

To what extent was the first-year teacher prepared to		Not At All Prepared	Not Sufficiently Prepared n <b>(%) 1</b>	Sufficiently Prepared n (%) 2	Well Prepared n <b>(%)3</b>
		n <b>(%) 0</b>			
27. organize a classroom learning environment that is accessible for all students?	34	0 0%	4 11.8%	11 32.4%	19 55.9%
28. organize a classroom in which procedures and routines are clear and efficient?	34	2 5.9%	3 8.8%	11 32.4%	18 52.9%
29. establish clear expectations for student behavior in the classroom?	34	2 5.9%	3 8.8%	10 29.4%	19 55.9%
30. maintain clear expectations for student behavior in the classroom?	34	2 5.9%	3 8.8%	12 35.3%	17 50.0%
31. implement campus behavior systems consistently and effectively?	34	2 5.9%	3 8.8%	12 35.3%	17 50.0%
32. provide support to students to meet expected behavior standards?	34	2 5.9%	3 8.8%	13 38.2%	16 47.1%
33. find and follow district expectations for professional standards?	34	0 0%	3 8.8%	13 38.2%	18 52.9%
34. understand and adhere to the Code of Ethics and Standard Practices for Texas Educators?	34	0 0%	1 2.9%	14 41.2%	19 55.9%
35. advocate for the needs of the students in the classroom?	34	1 2.9%	3 8.8%	16 47.1%	14 41.2%
36. reflect on your strengths and professional learning needs?	34	1 2.9%	3 8.8%	15 44.1%	15 44.1%
37. use data from self-assessment, reflection, and supervisor feedback to set professional goals?	34	1 2.9%	3 8.8%	15 44.1%	15 44.1%
38. prioritize goals to improve professional practice and student performance?	34	1 2.9%	3 8.8%	15 44.1%	15 44.1%
The following questions are only applicable for teachers that have students with disabilities as determined	by Texas	Education Cod	de §29.003 in hi	s/her classroom	
40. differentiate instruction to meet the academic needs of students with disabilities?	33	3 9.1%	3 9.1%	18 54.5%	9 27.3%
41. differentiate instruction to meet the behavioral needs of students with disabilities?	33	3 9.1%	3 9.1%	18 54.5%	9 27.3%
<b>42.</b> develop and/or implement appropriate formal and informal assessments for students with disabilities to demonstrate their learning?	33	3 9.1%	3 9.1%	18 54.5%	9 27.3%

To what extent was the first-year teacher prepared to		Not At All Prepared	Not Sufficiently Prepared	Sufficiently Prepared	Well Prepared
		n <b>(%) 0</b>	n <b>(%) 1</b>	n <b>(%) 2</b>	n <b>(%)3</b>
<b>43.</b> make appropriate instructional decisions based on a student's Individualized Education Program (IEP)?	33	2 6.1%	3 9.1%	18 54.5%	10 30.3%
<b>44.</b> collaborate with other relevant staff to meet the academic, developmental, and behavioral needs of students with disabilities?	33	1 3.0%	2 6.1%	15 45.5%	15 45.5%
45. understand and adhere to the federal and state laws that govern special education services?	33	1 3.0%	3 9.1%	13 39.4%	16 48.5%
The following questions are only applicable for teachers that have English language learners (ELLs) as determ classroom.	ined b	y Texas Admin	nistrative Code §	89.1203 in his/i	her
<b>47.</b> design lessons that adequately support ELLs to master the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS)?	27	1 1.8%	2 7.4%	17 51.5%	7 25.9%
<b>48.</b> develop and/or implement appropriate formal and informal assessments for ELLs to demonstrate their learning?	27	1 1.8%	3 11.1%	17 51.5%	6 17.6%
49. support ELLs in mastering the English Language Proficiency Standards (ELPS)?	27	1 1.8%	3 11.1%	15 55.6%	8 29.6%
50. understand and adhere to federal and state laws that govern education services for ELLs?	27	1 1.8%	2 7.4%	15 55.6%	9 33.3%
<b>51.</b> What is your <b>overall</b> evaluation of how well the educator preparation program prepared this teacher for the realities of the classroom as they exist on your campus?	27	1 1.8%	5 14.7%	12 44.4%	16 59.3%
<ul> <li>52. How would you rate this teacher's influence on student achievement?</li> <li>10 - The teacher is exceptional, in the top 2% of teachers I've supervised.</li> <li>9 - The teacher is excellent, in the top 5% of teachers I've supervised.</li> <li>8 - The teacher is very good.</li> <li>7 - The teacher is good.</li> <li>6 - The teacher is average.</li> <li>5 - The teacher is below average but will likely improve in time.</li> <li>4 - The teacher is below average but will need significant PD to improve.</li> <li>3 - The teacher is well below average.</li> <li>2 - The teacher is poor.</li> <li>1 - The teacher is unacceptable.</li> </ul>	34	1 (2.9%) rated at 10 2 (5.9%) rated at 9 12 (35.3%) rated at 8 7 (20.6%) rated at 7 7 (20.6%) rated at 6 1 (2.9%) rated at 5 1 (2.9%) rated at 4 1 (2.9%) rated at 3 0 (0.0%) rated at 2 2 (5.9%) rated at 1			

## **Analysis of Data**

During the 2020-2021 academic year the performance of 39 first-year teachers from the West College of Education (WCOE) was evaluated by their respective principals. In general, a large majority of WCOE completers were rated as sufficiently or well prepared on the 48 areas

surveyed. Completers were rated the highest in areas related to learning environment and professional practices and responsibilities. Areas rated the lowest included English language learners and students with disabilities although more than 80% of the completers were rated as sufficiently or well prepared in those areas. The WCOE will continue to evaluate the data from the survey to determine if issues arise.