

CAEP R2.2 Cooperating Teacher Survey of Candidate Preparedness

Cooperating Teacher Survey of Candidate Preparedness

Date of Administration: Fall 2025/Spring 2026 Reporting Cycle

Participants: P12 Cooperating Teachers (N=11)

Author: WVWC Educator Preparation Program (EPP)

Why Cooperating Teacher Feedback?

Including Cooperating Teachers surveys as a core data point for Measure 2 is a strategic choice for several reasons:

- **Real-Time Readiness:** Cooperating Teacher's feedback provides a "real-time" assessment of a candidate's pedagogical skills, professional dispositions, and ability to impact student learning before they enter the workforce full-time.
- **Bridge to Employment:** Cooperating Teachers serve as "proxy employers." In many cases, these Cooperating Teachers are department heads or lead teachers who influence hiring decisions, making their satisfaction a leading indicator of a graduate's employability.
- **Stakeholder Co-Construction:** CAEP Standard R5.3 emphasizes involving stakeholders in program design. By formalizing Cooperating Teacher feedback, we treat our K-12 partners as co-educators whose insights directly shape our curriculum and clinical requirements.
- **Granular Insight:** Unlike broad state-level employer data, Cooperating Teacher surveys often allow for more detailed feedback on specific InTASC standards, such as classroom management and instructional technology, which are critical for program refinement.

Description of Evidence

This evidence presents the results of a survey administered to 11 Cooperating Teachers (CTs) who mentored West Virginia Wesleyan College (WVWC) teacher candidates during their clinical practice. The survey evaluates candidate readiness across 21 indicators covering pedagogical content knowledge, differentiation, classroom environment, and professional responsibilities. The participant pool represents a cross-section of licensure areas, including Elementary Education, English, Music, and Social Studies.

WV Wesleyan School of Education is committed to continuous improvement through meaningful collaboration with our PK-12 partners. CAEP R2.2 focuses on how well our graduates meet the needs of their employers and how effectively we engage our stakeholders in the program's evaluation and development.

For the Fall 2025 cycle, our data includes feedback from the Cooperating Teacher Survey. This assessment captures the direct observations of experienced practitioners who work closely with our candidates in clinical settings.

Note on Data Privacy: Due to the small number of participants in this reporting cycle (small n), we are unable to disaggregate the data by specific licensure areas or demographics to protect the privacy of our candidates and partners. We have chosen to disaggregate by elementary and secondary (English, Music, and Social Studies).

Analysis of Data

The data reflects a generally positive perception of candidate readiness, with several areas of notable strength and specific opportunities for growth:

- **Professional Dispositions & Communication:** Candidates scored highest in professional behaviors; 100% of CTs rated candidates as "Adequately" or "Strongly" prepared to collaborate with peers and uphold professional expectations and ethical standards. Qualitative feedback reinforces this, citing "timeliness" and "professionalism" as major strengths.
- **Inclusive Environments:** A strong majority of candidates were rated as "Strongly Prepared" to model respectful, culturally responsive communication and create inclusive, supportive environments.
- **Instructional Variability:** Candidates demonstrated high proficiency in incorporating student interests and using a variety of instructional strategies, particularly in the Music and Secondary English specializations. One rCooperating Teacher highlighted a candidate's "extensive presentations" and use of "open-ended questioning" to engage students.
- **Identified Challenges:** The data reveals two specific instances (N=2) of candidates being rated as "Inadequately Prepared" across multiple instructional domains, specifically in differentiating plans and monitoring student behaviors. These ratings were primarily concentrated in one Elementary and one Secondary English placement, suggesting individual candidate variance rather than a systemic program-wide deficiency.

Disaggregated Findings

Elementary Education (n=6)

The elementary cohort shows a high degree of variance, containing both the program's highest and lowest individual ratings:

- **Strengths:** 100% of respondents felt candidates were at least "Adequately Prepared" in professionalism, ethics, and collaboration. 83% were rated "Strongly Prepared" in modeling respectful communication.
- **Areas for Growth:** This group contained one significant outlier rated "Inadequately Prepared" across nearly all instructional categories. Cooperating Teachers noted that while candidates are "adequately prepared" for lesson planning, they need more practice handling themselves in front of students.
- **Trends:** Elementary Cooperating Teachers used "Adequately Prepared" more frequently for analyzing student data and content pedagogy compared to secondary Cooperating Teachers.

Secondary & Specialty (n=5)

This group includes English (n=2), Social Studies (n=2), and Music (n=1):

- **Strengths:** This group shows a very high concentration of "Strongly Prepared" ratings, particularly in Music and English. Candidates excelled in technology integration and instructional variety. 100% of secondary Cooperating Teachers rated candidates as "Strongly Prepared" in upholding ethical standards.
- **Areas for Growth:** One Secondary candidate received "Inadequately Prepared" ratings across the board, suggesting classroom transitions and behavioral monitoring are cross-program challenges for specific individuals.

Interpretation & Qualitative Themes

The feedback indicates that WWWC teacher candidates enter clinical practice with a strong foundation in content pedagogy and professionalism. Qualitative comments suggest candidates are "very prepared in all areas" regarding content and "work well with students".

However, "Inadequately Prepared" marks and written comments highlight critical needs:

- **Classroom Management:** Cooperating Teachers noted that because candidates are placed in well-managed classrooms, they may gain "false confidence" and struggle to establish their own routines.
- **Special Education/IEPs:** One Cooperating Teacher suggested that while content knowledge is great, candidates could benefit from more specific knowledge on IEPs.
- **Current Practices:** Feedback indicated that some candidates are not fully updated on current behavior management techniques and district-specific practices like "iReady" or "PBIS".

Continuous Improvement Plan

To address the variance in candidate readiness, the EPP will implement the following:

- **Differentiated Instruction Workshop:** Strengthen the pre-clinical module on differentiation to ensure candidates can pivot plans for diverse learners in real-time, specifically addressing the "limited" prep noted when students are pulled for Special Education services.
- **Classroom Management Simulations:** Increase "low-stakes" simulations for monitoring student behavior and maintaining routines before final placements to combat the "false confidence" identified by Cooperating Teachers .
- **Updated Standards & Partnerships:** Explore forming a committee with local teachers to ensure candidates are trained in current classroom management and curriculum design used in schools today.
- **Enhanced Cooperating Teacher Orientation:** Better communicate EPP expectations to Cooperating Teachers to ensure consistent application of "Adequate" vs. "Strongly" prepared ratings across content areas.

In reflection, EPP notes that the host teacher feedback is gathered at the end of the experience, not allowing us to make on the spot modifications. To assist in a systematic system, we are reviewing when and how to create touch points with host teachers throughout the semester. One option that has been noted is a bi-weekly or monthly email asking for feedback. In addition to the areas noted on this survey, it would provide space for the host teacher to share any specific student concerns.

In regards to the unexpected notation regarding mental health, in the March 2026 EPPAC meeting (stakeholders), we are asking for feedback on the Disposition tool. This will give us stakeholder feedback on the tool but also the areas of implementation. For example, do we request the Disposition tool to be completed by host teachers during Clinical 1, 2, and 3 and by education faculty at various points? If a candidate is struggling with mental health or professional areas, the EPP might be able to intervene earlier and provide wellness resources and/or an improvement plan to ensure overall health.

Continuous Improvement (Standard 5)

This strategic response demonstrates the EPP's commitment to Standard 5: Quality Assurance

System and Continuous Improvement. By documenting these specific curricular pivots in response to Cooperating Teacher Feedback data, the EPP provides clear evidence of a functioning, data-driven feedback loop.