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How can we better prepare and support new teachers to be successful in Philadelphia schools?

Teacher quality is one of the most challenging and important goals of education improvement. Among the many significant in-school factors that influence student achievement—including resources, curriculum, school leadership, and school climate—educators and policy makers agree that teacher quality has the greatest impact (National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future, 1996).

The challenges teachers face in urban settings like Philadelphia call into question whether the traditional model of teacher education ultimately prepares teachers for success in the settings they encounter. Our study started with the research questions:

- What is the relationship between teacher preparation and subsequent performance in the classroom?
- Does teacher performance in the classroom vary as a result of where teachers were prepared?
- Are there best practices in teacher preparation that better prepare teachers to succeed in Philadelphia schools?
- How much does school context influence teacher performance in the classroom?

In the 2015–2016 school year, we set out to study characteristics of eight programs that prepare teachers for Philadelphia schools and determine which program characteristics contribute to teacher success. Because the programs we studied all met the state requirements for accreditation— which are highly specific—they were more alike than different. Our analysis turned up few connections between where and how teachers were prepared and their performance in the classroom.

This is consistent with decades of research showing a lack of consensus about what pathway, type of preparation, and features of preparation programs most impact teachers’ ability to promote student learning (Cochran Smith, 2005), especially in the context of low-achieving urban schools.

Teacher preparation, it turns out, is not the sole or even overriding factor that determines the character and quality of teacher performance. Rather, the combination of teacher preparation and school setting impacts a teacher’s effectiveness. The teacher’s working conditions, in turn, determine the students’ learning environment in the classroom and ultimately have a critical influence on student achievement.

Our findings suggest that the knowledge and experience teachers need to succeed in these environments require much more time and practice in the classroom than current pathways to teaching offer. Our study is unique in that it features teacher voices, to create a deeper and more nuanced picture of their experiences.

Summary of findings

Despite the lack of discernible impact on objective outcome measures (student achievement and principal evaluations of classroom teachers), there is strong consensus among the teachers we studied that:

- The majority of new teachers graduate from schools of education feeling **underprepared to meet the challenge** of motivating and engaging students in learning in low-achieving urban schools.
- There is a **disconnect** between what they learn in teacher preparation and the working conditions teachers often find once they arrive in the classroom.
- The **context of the schools** where new teachers end up influences teacher practice more than what they learned in their preparation programs.
- New teachers tend to **leave their first schools quickly** and migrate from school to school.

In addition, we found that teachers who felt more prepared, in comparison to their peers, were those who:

- **valued their coursework and relationships with mentors and university supervisors**
- **had a strong a sense of “mission,”** that is, sought to promote social justice and educational equity
- **chose to teach in Philadelphia.**
As teachers enter new school settings and varied working conditions, they must rethink their practice and learn what their schools expect and require. Although teachers do report growing in their teaching abilities over time, a lack of leadership, community, and resources in schools negatively impacts their development and mastery of their job responsibilities.

Specifically, we learned from listening to teachers that they need:

- **extended time practicing** their teaching skills
- **tangible, hands-on supports**, including teacher collaboration, to assist them with day-to-day tasks in the classroom, such as lesson planning, classroom management, and differentiation
- **more information** and context about their students’ needs and diverse cultural and socioeconomic backgrounds
- **specific strategies** for teaching the students in their classrooms, who often don’t respond to the “ideal” strategies they learned during pre-service.

### Objectives of this report

This report aims to focus attention on a few critical aspects of teacher preparation that require collaboration between the programs that prepare teachers and the schools or school districts that hire them. The goals of such a collaboration would be to:

- **help colleges and universities** align their teacher education to the specific contexts of Philadelphia’s school environments/classrooms
- **offer guidance to schools in hiring** prepared teachers who will succeed and remain in their schools
- **increase job satisfaction** and self-efficacy for new teachers
- **stem the tide of new teacher migration** away from low-achieving schools.
II. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

New teachers need specialized training and support to feel prepared

Although some new teachers we surveyed reported that they did feel prepared to be effective in low-achieving schools, many said they felt unprepared for several specific aspects of teaching:

- 72% felt unprepared to work in an urban classroom
- 80% felt unprepared to teach unmotivated students
- 52% felt unprepared to plan and deliver instruction
- 48% felt unprepared to maintain high expectations for student learning
- 64% felt unprepared to engage students in meaningful learning
- 62% felt unprepared to teach culturally diverse students
Interviews with teachers reflect that these feelings of unpreparedness, which result in a low sense of self-efficacy, lead them to seek other school environments where they are more likely to feel successful. For a majority of those we interviewed in the School District of Philadelphia:

- The average tenure in a given school is just over two years.
- Teachers lasted less than a full school year when they began their careers in a low-achieving school.
- Teachers began thinking about migrating to a new school early in the school year and continued to contemplate a move throughout their time at that first school.

Our findings suggest to universities, as well as to schools and districts, several concrete ways to improve teacher preparation and teacher readiness to succeed in low-achieving schools:

- REDUCE “REALITY SHOCK”
- FOCUS ON SPECIFIC SCHOOL CONTEXTS
- REPLACE ISOLATION WITH COMMUNITY
- CREATE A CONTINUUM OF TEACHER LEARNING
New teachers need more exposure to the reality of low-achieving school settings

said their preparation programs placed too much emphasis on theory and not enough on classroom-ready skills

Even teachers who completed early field experiences and student teaching in Philadelphia schools were surprised by the contexts for their first permanent assignments. The most-commonly cited areas of surprise about their new environments were:

- lack of classroom resources, from technology to fundamentals such as books and paper
- student misbehavior
- insufficient school leadership and peer mentoring
- student experiences of trauma and violence
- classrooms with students who have a broad array of learning needs and needs for social/emotional support.

In some cases, these factors presented what new teachers experienced as overwhelming and seemingly insurmountable challenges.

Teachers are usually under the impression that the classrooms are going to be what the books are telling them, which is not true . . . Reality smacked me in the face.

JADA, 1st-YEAR ELEMENTARY TEACHER

You have to learn as you go. We face so many unknown circumstances [that] it’s hard to be fully prepared. Teaching shouldn’t be sugar-coated; teachers need to be prepared for the worst-case scenarios. The curriculum is not the problem—it’s surviving the politics, behaviors, and paperwork. New teachers are unaware of the time and effort that have to go into being an effective teacher.

ANONYMOUS SURVEY PARTICIPANT
New teachers need realistic expectations

42% found the first year of teaching “much more difficult” than they expected

Teachers we surveyed said that, upon completion of their teacher education programs, they expected to experience much more success than they did. They were often surprised by how hard it was to establish a positive classroom culture and to facilitate learning for students who may be several grade levels behind. When the reality they confronted seemed so at odds with the lessons learned during their pre-service teaching experiences, they began to doubt the validity of what they were taught and found themselves adapting.

I could have been better prepared . . . for [learning how to deal with] a good dose of failure those first couple of years.

DANIELLE, 2ND-YEAR HIGH SCHOOL SCIENCE TEACHER

So your expectations are really high, which they should be, because you learned all about these ideal circumstances and then you go, okay, now I need to adapt for the real world.

MARGARET, 8TH-YEAR ELEMENTARY TEACHER

KEY TAKEAWAY
Teacher preparation must focus on the realities of navigating challenging classroom environments, rather than working to implement best practices under optimal/ideal circumstances. This is especially vital in circumstances where a teacher is working with students who need both academic and behavioral support and in schools with high rates of teacher and leadership turnover.

STRATEGIES FOR SUCCESS
During both pre-service and early years of teaching:

• Provide student teachers with opportunities to observe and debrief effective practice in low-achieving/under-resourced schools

• Create systems to have new teachers begin their teaching careers in school settings that are orderly and conducive to learning, where they have built-in support, and where there is low teacher and principal turnover

• Provide new teachers with strategies to handle issues of student disengagement, challenging school climates, and lack of resources (books, technology, materials, and personnel)

• Pair new teachers with school-based mentors who excel at operating under challenging circumstances
II. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

FOCUS ON SPECIFIC SCHOOL CONTEXTS

New teachers want more knowledge of their students’ cultures and concrete needs

Many entered the classroom as new teachers with little experience or knowledge of the challenges poverty creates in school.

The majority of participants in the qualitative sample started their teaching careers at schools ranked in the bottom half of Philadelphia schools or at schools that focused on a particular population, such as adjudicated youth. The middle-class backgrounds of many study participants meant they were often unfamiliar with the day-to-day experiences of students from racial and class backgrounds very different from their own.

I really wish someone would have put it into perspective that no classroom is perfect, not all the children are on the same level, not all children have happy homes, [and] not all children have everything they need to be set up for success.

ANONYMOUS SURVEY PARTICIPANT

My first year here . . . was another huge cultural shift, both in terms of what the school is trying to do and how the school is trying to see learning and do learning. . . . The [students at my previous school] were much more middle class. The kids here are very, very, very poor.

KATE, 8TH-YEAR HIGH SCHOOL ENGLISH TEACHER

Many teachers felt overwhelmed by the level of responsibility for children’s lives entrusted to them right from the beginning. They came to understand that their students’ immediate needs for nutrition, health care, and safety directly impacted their motivation to learn.

I wasn’t prepared to deal with the harsh reality of urban education: poverty, crime, violence. I was plopped in a fourth-grade classroom where all of my students were reading on a kindergarten level. I cried every day to school and every day home. The only reason I didn’t quit that first year was because I had a newborn baby at home, and I needed the medical benefits.

ANONYMOUS SURVEY PARTICIPANT
New teachers need focused training in the complex sociological issues that impact urban education

In interviews, teachers reported performing better when they entered the classroom equipped with a broad understanding of the diverse contexts of the city and neighborhoods where their students live.

Teachers felt more prepared when they attended preparation programs that took time to identify and study issues their students are likely to face, such as race, class, poverty, hunger, trauma, and language and cultural barriers. Gaining a deeper understanding of these issues—from their own experiences, their program’s faculty, or courses in urban education—provided a framework for making sense of circumstances that could otherwise be overwhelming and incomprehensible.

In response to an open-ended question about what changes in teacher preparation would prepare them for the reality of their classrooms, dozens of teachers cited the need for not only more courses in urban education, but also the opportunity to build relationships with other teachers in Philadelphia schools and for more mentors who had worked in Philadelphia schools.

I’ve always been very political. I’m very into social issues . . . [W]hen I was at [my university], I took a bunch of classes that were really interesting to me about just inequalities in the school system and institutional racism, and it made me realize that’s where I wanted to focus my teaching.

BRIN, 1ST-YEAR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHER
**KEY TAKEAWAY**

Teachers need specific instruction on how to engage and motivate students in the actual contexts where they often begin their careers, which are frequently in low-achieving schools and schools striving to overcome the effects of poverty as well as issues of race and class.

**STRATEGIES FOR SUCCESS**

- Identify and select teachers with a sense of “mission” and who actively seek to begin their careers teaching in low-achieving schools
- Expose teachers, early on, to the challenges of many urban schools
- Provide contextual understanding of the conditions that create those challenges
- Provide instructional strategies to support specific student populations

New teachers succeed when they have a sense of “mission”

Among teachers we surveyed and interviewed, those with a strong sense of “mission” felt better prepared to teach effectively

A teacher’s sense of “mission” or social utility value—the desire to contribute to a greater social goal—was among the largest predictors of whether teachers reported feeling prepared in their current position. This result was evident in interviews and observations of teachers as well as in the analysis of survey and district data (see Appendix A).²

We also found that new teachers felt more prepared when they purposefully chose to teach in Philadelphia or came from backgrounds similar to those of their students.

² In the multivariate models we ran depicting effects on self-reported level of preparedness to teach, for example, several teacher and program characteristics were statistically significant: “social utility value,” “coursework was helpful,” “number of weeks with cooperating teacher,” “support from university supervisor,” and “teaching in Philadelphia was my choice.” Among these, social utility value had the third-largest coefficients (β=.217; t=3.419), behind “coursework” (β=.265; t=4.492), and “support from university supervisor” (β=.299; t=4.561). The latter were significant predictors of whether teachers reported being prepared to teach during the first year, whereas “social utility value” influenced whether teacher said they are now prepared (see Appendix B).
New teachers value relationships with mentors

52% cited student teaching or other hands-on classroom experience as the most influential experience in their pre-service programs—significantly more than they cited any other factor.

It was the relationships that new teachers formed with their university supervisors and school-based mentors—rather than any specific strategies—that seemed to matter the most in helping them feel prepared for their first year of teaching. Many others spoke of the value of hands-on classroom experience. Some maintained relationships with cooperating teachers or mentors in their programs and continued to seek and benefit from their advice over time (see Appendix C).

“[Finding a mentor] had . . . opened me up to this whole world of science teaching and just the kind of teacher she was made me want to be like her. She always encouraged me to keep in touch with her, and I’ve used her as a mentor from that point on. That was huge as far as figuring out . . . the kind of teacher that I wanted to be.”

-Lacie, 3rd-year middle grades science teacher

“I still have a very strong connection with the education department [at my university], and I have a very large network of educators in Philadelphia. I feel like the best support comes from other teachers, and so the best thing you can do as an institution of higher learning is connect [new] teachers with veteran teachers.”

-Kate, 8th-year high school English teacher

Many recommended more time in student teaching, in supervised practice, or under the guidance of mentors in urban school settings. New teachers also valued the supports they received as student teachers in that it provided them the room they felt they needed to make mistakes—and learn from them.

3. In response to an open-ended question.
New teachers need more ongoing support from mentors

51% reported spending adequate time with supervisors during their student teaching

60% reported spending adequate time with mentor teachers during their student teaching

New teachers craved more time with mentors and coaches and spoke of feeling isolated and unprepared for the degree of autonomy they experienced behind the closed doors of their classrooms. They often felt cut off from support once they arrived at a school, because they were suddenly functioning with minimal supervision. A lack of relationships with supportive mentors tended to make their first year—and sometimes the years after—a struggle.

The reason I filled out [the survey instrument] was to tell you guys that it’s hard. Say goodbye to your professors. You’re on your own.

JOAN, 10th-YEAR ELEMENTARY TEACHER

I was prepared well, but a lot of it is [getting] thrown to the wolves. And you figure it out or you don’t.

DANIELLE, 2nd-YEAR HIGH SCHOOL SCIENCE TEACHER

Even those who participated early in the School District of Philadelphia’s induction program and had a helpful new teacher coach (who came to visit them in the classroom) felt they would like more frequent guidance and school-based support.
New teachers rely on their peers for guidance

Teachers we interviewed said that, in the absence of ongoing contact with their pre-service programs and/or direction from school administrators, they turned to their peers for guidance.

Once new teachers were placed in schools, they depended on their new peers to guide them. Lacking that peer support, new teachers often struggled. We learned in interviews that in many schools, new teachers sought help from grade partners and department chairs, who varied in levels of support and their own expectations of student learning. When these colleagues reinforced stereotypes about students, new teachers tended to accept negative behavior as the norm and were more vulnerable to developing low expectations for student performance.

Seeing experienced teachers perform effectively, on the other hand, helped new teachers stay positive and resist lowering expectations, or even blaming students for low performance.

Nothing prepared me for teaching in Philadelphia. I relied heavily on the experience and expertise of the seasoned teachers and staff at my first school.

**ANONYMOUS SURVEY PARTICIPANT**

I had an amazing cooperating teacher who taught me so much about teaching in general and in an urban setting. She also supported me during my first years of teaching in West Philadelphia and would come and volunteer in my classroom.

**ANONYMOUS SURVEY PARTICIPANT**

---

**KEY TAKEAWAY**

Teachers benefit from maintaining relationships with their university instructors and cooperating teachers. Once in schools, they need supportive new mentors with high expectations for student performance.

**STRATEGIES FOR SUCCESS**

- Design student teaching experiences that offer greater access to strong role models and mentors.
- Create mechanisms or programs for ongoing interactions with university mentors and pre-service cooperating teachers.
- Place new teachers in schools that are more supportive of best practices and where there is an established group of supportive and experienced peers.
- Connect new teachers to peers from the teacher preparation programs they attended through new teacher networks.
CREATE A CONTINUUM OF TEACHER LEARNING

New teachers learn over time as they gain experience

- 18% felt “prepared” during their first year to use student data to improve instruction (whereas at the time of our survey 78% felt “prepared” to use student data)  
- 45% felt “prepared” during their first year to use reflective practice to improve instruction (whereas at the time of our survey 91% felt “prepared” to use reflective practice)

Teachers repeatedly spoke of their first years as learning years. Many reported feeling better able to teach effectively over time than they had when they started out. Their level of comfort with content and school context—as well as managing students—improved from year to year.

Teachers do not complete their learning when they obtain certification and take over their own classrooms; this happens over time, with in-service experiences, access to professional networks, and ongoing enrichment opportunities in real-world settings. For the teachers we interviewed, such on-the-job experiences fueled teacher learning during their first few years in the classroom. Those lessons emerged as more influential than what new teachers learned in pre-service programs.

Nothing prepares you for teaching the way doing it does, seeing other people do it, talking to people about the preparation that goes into it, and then actually just being able to do it.  

KENT, 6TH-YEAR HIGH SCHOOL SCIENCE AND MATH TEACHER

I felt fully prepared. The real learning, however, takes place once you are on your own and as you grow as an educator.  

ANONYMOUS SURVEY PARTICIPANT

Teaching is something that it takes a really long time to get good at.  

LACIE, 3RD-YEAR MIDDLE GRADES SCIENCE TEACHER

4. Half the teachers we interviewed had been teaching for five years or more, and the other half for fewer than five years (overall, an average of 5.5 years; see Appendix B).
New teachers ask for extended time under supervision

Specifically, teachers suggested more time in field experiences, doing hands-on work in real-world settings and under supervision, as part of their pre-service preparation.5

Several respondents specifically asked for ongoing supports in the first two years of teaching, although some teachers emphasized the value of simply getting into the classroom and learning from experience.

Working side-by-side with an experienced teacher was by far the most useful part of my teaching preparation. My supervising teacher and college professor were excellent. However, it would have been extremely beneficial to have close supervision and guidance at least through my first two years in the classroom.

Anonymous Survey Participant

Key Takeaway

New teachers need a deliberate and intentional period of guided learning and supervised transition, over the first two or three years of their careers.

Strategies for Success

Schools, districts, and schools of education need to work together to increase the success and effectiveness of new teachers, as well as their job satisfaction, which will help stem the tide of teacher migration. That collaborative work could take various forms:

• Devise partnerships between schools of education and schools in supporting teachers as they transition into their professional roles
• Cultivate strategies for teacher training that borrow from the medical school model, with a closely monitored internship and residencies
• Provide a more gradual transition from student teaching to full-time classroom teaching
• Foster ongoing dialogue between schools, districts, and schools of education, leading to shared understandings of the teaching practices required to succeed in classrooms
• Provide collaborative supports for induction and ongoing learning during the first two years of teaching

5. This is by far the highest percentage that agreed on proposed program changes.
CONCLUSION

New teachers need to feel well prepared and well supported by the schools they enter for the demanding work that effective teaching requires. The results of this study highlight the need for (a) new teacher preparation and support that include information about the school context as well as the students that teachers encounter in the classroom, and for (b) close collaboration between preparation programs and schools.

METHODOLOGY

At a glance

- Mixed-methods approach
- 8-month study, beginning in the 2015–16 school year
- Sent surveys to 1,000 graduates from 8 local institutions who taught in Philadelphia (and had received certification within the past 10 years), and received 395 usable surveys
- Merged teacher evaluations and standardized test scores with survey data
- Qualitative component analyzed data from 20 teachers as “key informants,” interviewing them each in depth twice for qualitative findings, as well as 160 hours of classroom observations.

We investigated the experiences and reflections of Philadelphia teachers beginning with their first year of teaching. Eight local institutions and their alumni participated: Bryn Mawr/Haverford, Drexel, Eastern, Holy Family, LaSalle, St. Joseph’s, Swarthmore, and Temple. We questioned teachers about their early career trajectories, asking about their experiences as:
1. pre-service teachers
2. first-year teachers
3. more experienced teachers

We studied teacher preparation programs by:
- gathering information about how teachers transitioned into the urban classroom
- identifying which features of their preparation programs most impacted their teaching and their effectiveness
- documenting influences on their growth over time
- exploring connections between how they were prepared and student learning.

III. METHODOLOGY

At a glance

- Mixed-methods approach
- 8-month study, beginning in the 2015–16 school year
- Sent surveys to 1,000 graduates from 8 local institutions who taught in Philadelphia (and had received certification within the past 10 years), and received 395 usable surveys
- Merged teacher evaluations and standardized test scores with survey data
- Qualitative component analyzed data from 20 teachers as “key informants,” interviewing them each in depth twice for qualitative findings, as well as 160 hours of classroom observations.

We investigated the experiences and reflections of Philadelphia teachers beginning with their first year of teaching. Eight local institutions and their alumni participated: Bryn Mawr/Haverford, Drexel, Eastern, Holy Family, LaSalle, St. Joseph’s, Swarthmore, and Temple. We questioned teachers about their early career trajectories, asking about their experiences as:
1. pre-service teachers
2. first-year teachers
3. more experienced teachers

We studied teacher preparation programs by:
- gathering information about how teachers transitioned into the urban classroom
- identifying which features of their preparation programs most impacted their teaching and their effectiveness
- documenting influences on their growth over time
- exploring connections between how they were prepared and student learning.
Research methods

In this study we investigated empirical linkages between pre-service experiences and later outcomes—such as effects on student achievement and teacher performance—as well as teachers’ perceptions of their lived experiences in their own voices employing a sequential mixed-methods approach. We collaborated with eight university partners whose teacher-education graduates often take jobs in the School District of Philadelphia. We gathered information about each program, highlighting their curriculum, mission, demographics, and signature pedagogies. We compiled profiles of each program, which provided rich descriptions of their similarities and differences.

We then surveyed graduates of the eight programs who were employed as Philadelphia teachers. We aimed to recruit only teachers who graduated within 10 years and served in Philadelphia for at least one year. The survey sample included charter school teachers.

Next we linked the survey data to School District of Philadelphia data containing information on teacher effectiveness and student achievement. Specifically, we obtained standardized test scores of students and principal evaluations of teachers. We used these data primarily as dependent variables in the initial multivariate model.

We drew the qualitative sample from the survey data using conceptual criteria. From the 395 survey respondents, we chose 20 teachers as key informants based on specific survey responses (for example, we selected for high and low values on “sense of mission” and “teacher self-efficacy”), along with background demographic characteristics. We interviewed each key informant twice, and a team of researchers spent a full school day in each teacher’s classroom.

KEY PROGRAM COMPONENTS

Because the Pennsylvania Department of Education has highly specific requirements for teacher certification programs, we found that the programs were more alike than different. They all required similar courses and similar numbers of hours in the field, including a semester of full-time student teaching. There were some differences:

- For elementary education students, LaSalle requires a major in American Studies along with the Education major, as well as approximately 150 more hours in the field than any other institution.
- Bryn Mawr/Haverford and Swarthmore focus more explicitly on the sociology of urban environments and concerns about social justice.
- Drexel offers a complete certification program online.
- St. Joseph’s features a special emphasis on literacy, is accredited by the International Dyslexia Association, and offers the Wilson Reading Program online.
- Temple expects all graduates to demonstrate competency on the six Temple Teaching Standards.

Because each institution had students enrolled in many different programs, it was difficult to pinpoint significant features that might impact teacher performance.
IV.
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### Appendix A

**Sense of “mission” or social utility value:**
This table presents self-reports on respondents’ reasons for becoming a teacher.

Item: “Please tell us how important each of the following were in your decision to become a teacher by completing the statement, ‘I chose to become a teacher because . . .’. ” (Percent “extremely important” shown)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A teaching career is suited to my abilities</td>
<td>69.07</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like teaching</td>
<td>81.45</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching allows me to influence the next generation</td>
<td>76.41</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching allows me to work against social disadvantage</td>
<td>65.32</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers make a worthwhile social contribution</td>
<td>80.65</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wanted a job that involves working with children</td>
<td>73.73</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had good teachers as role models</td>
<td>62.53</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The subject(s) that I teach interest me deeply</td>
<td>65.15</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(8-items, Cronbach’s alpha = .745)
Appendix B

Feelings of preparedness:
This table presents standardized regression coefficients depicting effects on teachers feeling prepared to teach first year, and prepared to teach at the time of the survey (an average of 5.5 years after the participant began teaching).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Prepared to teach First Year Model III</th>
<th>Prepared to teach First Year Instruction Model III</th>
<th>Prepared to teach Now Model III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>3.389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model I: Teacher Background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>-.704</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-.074</td>
<td>-1.362</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>2.969***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>1.252</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model II: Teacher and Program Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social utility value</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coursework was helpful</td>
<td>.265</td>
<td>4.492***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N field experiences</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.935</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks with cooperating teacher</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>1.893~</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time with University Supervisor</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>1.366</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from cooperating teacher</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.886</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from university supervisor</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>4.517***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching in School District of Philadelphia was 1st choice</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>-.175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model III: (all nonsignificant) Bryn Mawr, Drexel, Eastern, Holy Family, LaSalle, St. Joseph’s, Swarthmore, and Temple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.372</td>
<td>.385</td>
<td>.263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard error of the estimate</td>
<td>.690</td>
<td>.689</td>
<td>.567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of freedom</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant levels of $P$: $p<.10$~; $p<.05$*; $p<.01$**; $p<.001$***
Appendix C

Support from mentors:
This table depicts respondents’ ratings of cooperating teachers and university supervisors. It collapses the rankings of “excellent” and “good.” While it rates cooperating teachers more highly, university supervisors have more explanatory power in the multivariate models.

Item: “How would you rate the support you received from your cooperating teacher and supervisor (with whom you spent the most time) in the following areas?” (Percent responding “excellent or good” shown)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Cooperating Teacher</th>
<th>University Supervisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managing the classroom</td>
<td>76.97</td>
<td>58.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handling student misbehavior</td>
<td>71.05</td>
<td>52.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing differentiated instruction to students</td>
<td>62.50</td>
<td>51.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping students overcome learning problems</td>
<td>59.54</td>
<td>45.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with special needs students</td>
<td>52.84</td>
<td>40.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging academically strong students</td>
<td>55.30</td>
<td>45.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To access the full report and the digital version of this summary, visit
WILLIAMPENNFOUNDATION.ORG/PREPARING-TEACHERS