

# Characteristics of Public and Private Elementary and Secondary School Teachers in the United States:

Results From the 2017–18 National Teacher and Principal Survey

SEPTEMBER 2020

NCES 2020-142rev  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

*A Publication of the National Center for Education Statistics*



# Characteristics of Public and Private Elementary and Secondary School Teachers in the United States:

Results From the 2017–18 National Teacher and Principal Survey

SEPTEMBER 2020

NCES 2020-142rev  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

*A Publication of the National Center for Education Statistics*

**U.S. Department of Education**

Betsy DeVos

*Secretary***Institute of Education Sciences**

Mark Schneider

*Director***National Center for Education Statistics**

James L. Woodworth

*Commissioner*

The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) is the primary federal entity for collecting, analyzing, and reporting data related to education in the United States and other nations. It fulfills a congressional mandate to collect, collate, analyze, and report full and complete statistics on the condition of education in the United States; conduct and publish reports and specialized analyses of the meaning and significance of such statistics; assist state and local education agencies in improving their statistical systems; and review and report on education activities in foreign countries.

NCES activities are designed to address high-priority education data needs; provide consistent, reliable, complete, and accurate indicators of education status and trends; and report timely, useful, and high-quality data to the U.S. Department of Education, the Congress, the states, other education policymakers, practitioners, data users, and the general public. Unless specifically noted, all information contained herein is in the public domain.

We strive to make our products available in a variety of formats and in language that is appropriate to a variety of audiences. You, as our customer, are the best judge of our success in communicating information effectively. If you have any comments or suggestions about this or any other NCES product or report, we would like to hear from you. Please direct your comments to:

NCES, IES, U.S. Department of Education  
Potomac Center Plaza  
550 12th Street SW  
Washington, DC 20202

September 2020

The NCES Home Page address is <https://nces.ed.gov>.

The NCES Publications and Products address is <https://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch>.

This publication is only available online. To download, view, and print the report as a PDF file, go to the NCES Publications and Products address shown above.

This report was prepared for NCES under Contract No. ED-IES-12-D-005 with Westat. Mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations does not imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.

**Suggested Citation**

Taie, S., and Goldring, R. (2020). *Characteristics of Public and Private Elementary and Secondary School Teachers in the United States: Results From the 2017–18 National Teacher and Principal Survey First Look* (NCES 2020-142rev). U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved [date] from <https://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2020142rev>.

**Content Contact**

Maura Spiegelman

(202) 245-6581

[Maura.Spiegelman@ed.gov](mailto:Maura.Spiegelman@ed.gov)

# Contents

	Page
List of Tables .....	iv
Introduction .....	1
Selected Findings .....	3
References .....	5
Estimate Tables .....	6
Appendix A: Standard Error Tables .....	A-1
Appendix B: Methodology and Technical Notes .....	B-1
Appendix C: Description of Variables .....	C-1

## List of Tables

Table	Page
1. Percentage distribution of school teachers, by race/ethnicity, school type, and selected school characteristics: 2017–18 .....	7
2. Average and median age of school teachers and percentage distribution of teachers by age category, sex, school type, and selected school characteristics: 2017–18.....	9
3. Percentage distribution of school teachers based on years of teaching experience, average total years of teaching experience, percentage distribution of teachers based on years teaching at current school, and average years teaching at current school, by school type and selected school characteristics: 2017–18 .....	11
4. Percentage distribution of school teachers, by highest degree earned, school type, and selected school characteristics: 2017–18 .....	13
5. Among regular full-time school teachers, average base salary and earnings from all sources, percentage of teachers with earnings from various salary supplements, and among those teachers, the average amount earned from the supplement during the current school year, by school type and selected school characteristics: 2017–18 .....	15
6a. Average class size in public schools, by school level, class type, and selected school characteristics: 2017–18 .....	17
6b. Average class size in private schools, by school level, class type, and selected school characteristics: 2017–18 .....	18
7. Percentage of teachers who took graduate or undergraduate courses in selected subject areas prior to their first year of teaching, by course subject area, school type, and selected school characteristics: 2017–18.....	19
8. Percentage of teachers who were evaluated during the last school year, and among those teachers, percentage that agreed with different statements, by school type and selected school characteristics: 2017–18.....	21
9. Percentage of teachers who participated in any professional development during the last school year, and among all teachers, percentage of teachers who agreed with different statements about professional development at their school, by school type and selected school characteristics: 2017–18.....	23

## Appendix A: Standard Error Tables

Table	Page
A-1. Standard errors for Table 1: Percentage distribution of school teachers, by race/ethnicity, school type, and selected school characteristics: 2017–18.....	A-2
A-2. Standard errors for Table 2: Average and median age of school teachers and percentage distribution of teachers by age category, sex, school type, and selected school characteristics: 2017–18.....	A-4
A-3. Standard errors for Table 3: Percentage distribution of school teachers based on years of teaching experience, average total years of teaching experience, percentage distribution of teachers based on years teaching at current school, and average years teaching at current school, by school type and selected school characteristics: 2017–18.....	A-6
A-4. Standard errors for Table 4: Percentage distribution of school teachers, by highest degree earned, school type, and selected school characteristics: 2017–18 .....	A-8
A-5. Standard errors for Table 5: Among regular full-time school teachers, average base salary and earnings from all sources, percentage of teachers with earnings from various salary supplements, and among those teachers, the average amount earned from the supplement during the current school year, by school type and selected school characteristics: 2017–18.....	A-10
A-6a. Standard errors for Table 6a: Average class size in public schools, by school level, class type, and selected school characteristics: 2017–18.....	A-12
A-6b. Standard errors for Table 6b: Average class size in private schools, by school level, class type, and selected school characteristics: 2017–18.....	A-13
A-7. Standard errors for Table 7: Percentage of teachers who took graduate or undergraduate courses in selected subject areas prior to their first year of teaching, by course subject area, school type, and selected school characteristics: 2017–18.....	A-14
A-8. Standard errors for Table 8: Percentage of school teachers who were evaluated during the last school year, and among those teachers, percentage that agreed with different statements, by school type and selected school characteristics: 2017–18 .....	A-16
A-9. Standard errors for Table 9: Percentage of teachers who participated in any professional development during the last school year, and among all teachers, percentage of teachers who agreed with different statements about professional development at their school, by school type and selected school characteristics: 2017–18 .....	A-18

## Appendix B: Methodology and Technical Notes

B-1.	Weighted unit and overall response rates using initial base weight, by survey: 2017–18 .....	B-6
B-2.	Indication of potential sources of bias for public school teacher data at the national level based on comparisons between eligible teacher distribution and base-weighted or nonresponse-adjusted respondent distributions: 2017–18 .....	B-8
B-3.	Indication of potential sources of bias for private school teacher data at the national level based on comparisons between eligible teacher distribution and base-weighted or nonresponse-adjusted respondent distributions: 2017–18 .....	B-10
B-4.	Summary of weighted item response rates, by survey: 2017–18 .....	B-14

## Appendix C: Description of Variables

C-1.	Variables used in the <i>Characteristics of Public and Private Elementary and Secondary School Teachers in the United States: Results From the National Teacher and Principal Survey</i> report: 2017–18 .....	C-2
------	--	-----



# Introduction

The 2017–18 National Teacher and Principal Survey (NTPS)<sup>1</sup> is a nationally representative sample survey of public<sup>2</sup> and private<sup>3</sup> K–12 schools, principals, and teachers in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. State representative data are also available for public schools, principals, and teachers. NTPS collects data on core topics including teacher and principal preparation, classes taught, school characteristics, and demographics of the teacher and principal labor forces. It is developed by National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) of the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) within the U.S. Department of Education and conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau. This report presents selected findings from the Public School Teacher and Private School Teacher Data Files of the 2017–18 NTPS, representing results of the second collection of NTPS.

The purpose of NTPS is to collect information that can provide a detailed picture of U.S. elementary and secondary schools and their staff. This information is collected through school, principal, and teacher surveys. Information can be linked through all three surveys.

This report (NCES 2020-142rev) is revised from an earlier version of the report (NCES 2020-142) that was released in April 2020. Table 3 inadvertently excluded from the analyses a very small number of teachers (less than 100 out of approximately 51,000) in the less than 4 years category of the variable years teaching at current school. These were teachers who reported that the year they began teaching at this school was 2018. This exclusion had a small impact on the estimates and standard errors for years teaching at the current school presented in Tables 3 and A-3. The exclusion did not affect the estimates and standard errors for the total years of teaching experience in Tables 3 and A-3, and did not affect any of the findings about years of teaching experience in the report. This revised report presents the corrected estimates and standard errors for Tables 3 and A-3. All other estimates and all findings presented in the report remain unchanged.

The 2017–18 NTPS uses a school-based sample of public and private schools. All principals associated with sampled public and private schools were also included in the sample. Teachers associated with a selected school were sampled from a list of teachers that was provided by the school, collected from school websites, or purchased from a vendor. The selected samples include about 10,600 traditional and charter public schools and their principals, 60,000 public school teachers, 4,000 private schools and their principals, and 9,600 private school teachers. The samples for public schools and staff were drawn to support estimates by geography, grade span, and charter status for public schools; the samples for private schools were drawn to support estimates by geography, grade span, and affiliation group for a wide range of topics.

The data were collected via mailed questionnaires and internet instruments with telephone and in-person field follow-up. Data collection began in September 2017, when the first questionnaires were mailed, and data collection ended in August 2018. The weighted unit response rate computed before adjustments for nonresponse was 76.9 percent for public school teachers, and 75.9 percent for private school teachers. For detailed technical information about the 2017–18 NTPS, please see the technical notes in appendix B of this report or the *Survey Documentation for the 2017–18 National Teacher and Principal Survey* (Cox et al. forthcoming).

---

<sup>1</sup> NTPS is a redesign of the Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS). NTPS was introduced in the 2015–16 school year.

<sup>2</sup> Public schools include traditional public and charter schools.

<sup>3</sup> While SASS included both public and private sector schools, principals, and teachers, the 2015–16 administration of NTPS only included the public sector.



The purpose of this First Look report is to introduce new data through the presentation of tables containing descriptive information. Selected findings chosen for this report demonstrate the range of information available on the 2017–18 NTPS Public School Teacher and Private School Teacher Restricted-Use Data Files. The selected findings do not represent a complete review of all observed differences in the data and are not meant to emphasize any issue. This First Look report highlights findings from the NTPS public school teacher and private school teacher surveys. Findings from the school and principal surveys are presented in two companion First Look reports:

- *Characteristics of Public and Private Elementary and Secondary Schools in the United States: Results From the 2017–18 National Teacher and Principal Survey First Look* (NCES 2019-140); and
- *Characteristics of Public and Private Elementary and Secondary School Principals in the United States: Results From the 2017–18 National Teacher and Principal Survey First Look* (NCES 2019-141).

The tables in this report contain frequencies and percentages demonstrating bivariate relationships. All results have been weighted to reflect the sample design and to account for nonresponse and other adjustments. Comparisons drawn in the selected findings have been tested for statistical significance at the .05 level using Student's *t* statistics to ensure that the differences are larger than those that might be expected due to sampling variation. No adjustments were made for multiple comparisons. Although the selected findings include only statistically significant findings they do not include every statistically significant comparison. Many of the variables examined are related to one another, and complex interactions and relationships have not been explored. Statistical Analysis Software (SAS 9.4) and SUDAAN (11.1) were used to compute the statistics for this report. Tables of standard errors are provided in appendix A. Detailed information about the survey methodology is provided in appendix B. Appendix C contains a description of the variables used in this report.

More information about NTPS can be found at <https://nces.ed.gov/surveys/ntps>.

## Selected Findings

- About 79 percent of all public school teachers were non-Hispanic White, 7 percent were non-Hispanic Black, and 9 percent were Hispanic (table 1). Among private school teachers, about 85 percent were non-Hispanic White, 3 percent were non-Hispanic Black, and 7 percent were Hispanic.
- The average age of teachers in traditional public schools was 43 years, and 39 years in public charter schools. The average age of teachers in private schools was 44 years old (table 2).
- On average, public and private school teachers had about 14 years of teaching experience. Teachers in traditional public schools had 14 years of teaching experience, and public charter school teachers had 10 years of teaching experience, on average (table 3).
- In the 2017–18 school year, 49 percent of public school teachers had a master’s degree, 39 percent had a bachelor’s degree, 9 percent had higher than a master’s degree, and 3 percent had less than a bachelor’s as their highest degree earned. Among private school teachers, 40 percent had a master’s degree, 42 percent had a bachelor’s degree, 8 percent had higher than a master’s degree, and 10 percent had less than a bachelor’s as their highest degree earned (table 4).
- In the 2017–18 school year regular full-time teachers in public schools had a higher average base salary<sup>4</sup> (\$57,900) than regular full-time teachers in private schools (\$45,300) (table 5). About 18 percent of public school teachers and 21 percent of private school teachers had jobs outside their school system during the school year.
- Among public school teachers in self-contained classrooms, the average class size was 21 students in primary schools, 17 students in middle schools, 16 students for high schools, and 16 students for combined-grade schools. Among departmentalized teachers in public schools, the average class size was 26 for primary schools, 25 for middle schools, 23 for high schools, and 19 for combined-grade schools (table 6a).
- Among private school teachers in self-contained classrooms, the average class size was 17 students in elementary schools and 18 students in secondary schools. Among departmentalized teachers in private schools, the average class size was 18 for elementary and secondary schools (table 6b).
- Compared to public school teachers, a lower percentage of private school teachers had taken graduate or undergraduate courses in any of the following subjects prior to their first year of teaching: Lesson planning (79 percent vs. 65 percent), learning assessment (77 percent vs. 65 percent), classroom management techniques (74 percent vs. 62 percent), serving students with special needs (70 percent vs. 49 percent), serving students from diverse economic backgrounds (65 percent vs. 48 percent), using student performance data to inform instruction (56 percent vs. 49 percent), and teaching students who are limited-English proficient or English-language learners (41 percent vs. 28 percent) (table 7).
- In the 2017–18 school year, 78 percent of public school teachers and 69 percent of private school teachers were evaluated during the last school year. Among teachers who were evaluated, higher percentages of private school teachers than public school teachers agreed with statements about the positive impact of evaluations on their teaching. Eighty-three percent of private school teachers agreed that the evaluation process helped them determine their success with students, 84 percent agreed that the evaluation process positively affected their teaching, and 81 percent indicated that the evaluation process led to improved student learning. Comparable estimates for public school teachers were 72 percent, 73 percent, and 69 percent respectively (table 8).

---

<sup>4</sup> Average base salary is for the school year; summer earnings are not included. Teachers who reported a base salary of zero are excluded.

- About 99 percent of all public school teachers reported that they participated in any professional development, and about 94 percent of all private school teachers reported that they participated in any professional development during last school year (table 9).

## References

- Cochran, W.G. (1977). *Sampling Techniques*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Cox, S., Gilary, A., Simon, D., and Thomas, T. (forthcoming). *Survey Documentation for the 2017–18 National Teacher and Principal Survey*. U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.
- Goldring, R., Taie, S., Rizzo, L., and Riddles, M. (2019). *User's Manual for the 2017–18 National Teacher and Principal Survey Volumes 1–4* (NCES 2019-211 through 2019-213 and 2020-214). U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.
- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2012). *2012 Revision of NCES Statistical Standards: Final* (NCES 2014-097). U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved June 1, 2019, from <https://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2014097>.

## **Estimate Tables**

Table 1. Percentage distribution of school teachers, by race/ethnicity, school type, and selected school characteristics: 2017–18

School type and selected school characteristic	Percent of teachers by race/ethnicity						
	Hispanic, regardless of race <sup>1</sup>	White, non-Hispanic	Black or African American, non-Hispanic	Asian, non-Hispanic	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, non-Hispanic	American Indian/Alaska Native, non-Hispanic	Two or more races, non-Hispanic
All schools	9.1	80.0	6.3	2.2	0.2	0.5	1.7
All public schools	9.3	79.3	6.7	2.1	0.2	0.5	1.8
School classification							
Traditional public	9.0	80.0	6.5	2.1	0.2	0.5	1.7
Charter school	15.6	68.0	10.4	3.0	0.4	0.4 !	2.3
Community type							
City	14.0	68.5	11.8	3.1	0.2	0.3	2.1
Suburban	9.8	79.6	5.5	2.7	0.3	0.3	1.8
Town	5.8	86.8	3.7	0.9	0.3	0.9	1.7
Rural	3.8	89.7	3.6	0.5	0.1 !	1.0	1.3
School level							
Primary	10.5	78.2	6.7	2.2	0.3	0.5	1.6
Middle	8.9	79.2	7.7	1.9	0.1 !	0.5	1.6
High	8.0	80.7	6.2	2.3	0.3	0.3	2.2
Combined	7.4	81.6	6.5	1.6	0.2 !	1.0	1.7
Student enrollment							
Less than 100	5.2	83.9	5.7	1.3 !	0.5 !	1.2 !	2.2 !
100–199	5.6	83.3	7.3	1.4	‡	0.6	1.5
200–499	7.7	81.7	6.5	1.7	0.2	0.7	1.5
500–749	9.9	78.5	7.0	2.4	0.2	0.6	1.5
750–999	10.5	78.3	7.1	1.6	0.1 !	0.4	1.9
1,000 or more	10.8	77.0	6.6	2.8	0.3	0.3	2.3
Percent of K–12 students who were approved for free or reduced-price lunches							
0–34	4.8	88.9	2.4	2.0	0.2	0.4	1.4
35–49	6.0	87.1	3.4	1.6	0.2 !	0.3	1.4
50–74	8.0	81.8	5.8	1.8	0.3	0.4	2.0
75 or more	16.8	63.5	13.5	2.9	0.3	0.9	2.1

See notes at end of table.

Table 1. Percentage distribution of school teachers, by race/ethnicity, school type, and selected school characteristics: 2017–18—Continued

School type and selected school characteristic	Percent of teachers by race/ethnicity						
	Hispanic, regardless of race <sup>1</sup>	White, non-Hispanic	Black or African American, non-Hispanic	Asian, on-Hispanic	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, non-Hispanic	American Indian/Alaska Native, non-Hispanic	Two or more races, non-Hispanic
All private schools	7.2	85.1	3.2	2.7	0.1 !	0.3 !	1.3
School classification							
Catholic	7.6	85.9	2.8	2.5	‡	‡	0.8
Other religious	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Nonsectarian	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Community type							
City	8.0	80.9	4.9	3.8	0.2 !	0.2 !	1.9
Suburban	8.2	85.8	2.4	2.3	‡	0.2 !	1.0
Town	3.3	92.5	‡	‡	#	‡	1.1 !
Rural	3.1	93.8	1.2	0.8 !	#	‡	0.6 !
School level							
Elementary	7.8	84.5	3.2	3.0	‡	0.4 !	1.0
Secondary	6.2	86.7	2.8	2.6	‡	‡	1.3 !
Combined	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Student enrollment							
Less than 100	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
100–199	6.2	87.4	2.5	2.7	#	‡	0.9
200–499	6.8	86.3	3.0	1.9	‡	‡	1.6
500–749	7.4	86.1	3.3	1.7	‡	‡	1.2 !
750 or more	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡

# Rounds to zero.

! Interpret data with caution. The coefficient of variation (CV) for this estimate is between 30 percent and 50 percent (i.e., the standard error is at least 30 percent and less than 50 percent of the estimate).

‡ Reporting standards not met. The coefficient of variation (CV) for this estimate is 50 percent or greater (i.e., the standard error is 50 percent or more of the estimate) or the response rate is below 50 percent.

<sup>1</sup> Hispanic includes Latino.

NOTE: Teachers include both full-time and part-time teachers. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding and because some data are not shown.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, National Teacher and Principal Survey (NTPS), "Public School Teacher and Private School Teacher Data Files," 2017–18.



Table 2. Average and median age of school teachers and percentage distribution of teachers by age category, sex, school type, and selected school characteristics: 2017–18

School type and selected school characteristic	Average age of teachers	Median age of teachers	Age category				Sex	
			Less than 30 years	30–49 years	50–54 years	55 years or more	Male	Female
All schools	42.6	41.6	15.1	55.7	11.6	17.6	23.8	76.2
All public schools	42.4	41.4	15.0	56.9	11.6	16.5	23.5	76.5
School classification								
Traditional public	42.6	41.7	14.4	57.0	11.8	16.7	23.5	76.5
Charter school	39.5	37.2	23.9	55.3	8.3	12.5	23.5	76.5
Community type								
City	42.2	41.1	16.4	55.1	11.8	16.7	23.8	76.2
Suburban	42.5	41.6	13.7	58.6	11.4	16.2	22.5	77.5
Town	42.4	41.6	15.6	56.5	11.9	16.0	24.7	75.3
Rural	42.5	41.7	15.0	56.6	11.5	17.0	24.3	75.7
School level								
Primary	42.0	41.0	15.5	57.8	11.6	15.1	11.4	88.6
Middle	42.5	41.8	15.7	56.2	11.2	16.8	27.9	72.1
High	43.1	42.1	13.2	56.4	12.1	18.2	40.0	60.0
Combined	42.3	40.9	16.8	54.6	10.8	17.8	29.7	70.3
Student enrollment								
Less than 100	44.3	43.8	13.5	52.2	11.8	22.6	29.2	70.8
100–199	43.6	43.3	14.6	51.4	12.4	21.7	23.3	76.7
200–499	42.1	41.1	15.8	56.6	11.5	16.1	19.0	81.0
500–749	42.3	41.5	14.9	58.0	11.3	15.8	18.3	81.7
750–999	41.9	41.0	15.8	58.1	11.4	14.7	22.6	77.4
1,000 or more	42.8	41.8	13.8	56.7	12.0	17.5	34.5	65.5
Percent of K–12 students who were approved for free or reduced-price lunches								
0–34	42.7	41.8	13.3	58.7	11.9	16.1	24.3	75.7
35–49	41.9	40.6	14.9	59.1	11.0	15.0	25.4	74.6
50–74	42.6	41.8	14.5	56.5	12.0	17.0	23.0	77.0
75 or more	42.2	41.2	17.0	54.4	11.3	17.2	22.1	77.9

See notes at end of table.

Table 2. Average and median age of school teachers and percentage distribution of teachers by age category, sex, school type, and selected school characteristics: 2017–18—Continued

School type and selected school characteristic	Average age of teachers	Median age of teachers	Age category				Sex	
			Less than 30 years	30–49 years	50–54 years	55 years or more	Male	Female
All private schools	44.3	43.1	16.2	47.1	11.3	25.4	26.0	74.0
School classification								
Catholic	44.8	44.4	16.9	42.7	13.0	27.4	23.5	76.5
Other religious	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Nonsectarian	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Community type								
City	44.0	42.3	16.7	47.8	10.6	25.0	26.7	73.3
Suburban	44.5	43.7	16.3	45.5	12.7	25.6	25.4	74.6
Town	45.7	44.7	10.0	51.6	9.8	28.6	18.1	81.9
Rural	43.8	43.0	17.7	47.2	10.0	25.1	29.8	70.2
School level								
Elementary	44.3	43.0	16.3	46.3	10.5	26.8	15.9	84.1
Secondary	44.7	43.5	16.6	44.3	13.0	26.0	36.6	63.4
Combined	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Student enrollment								
Less than 100	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
100–199	44.0	42.9	18.4	45.1	10.8	25.7	19.4	80.6
200–499	44.5	43.5	15.9	47.2	12.0	24.8	25.5	74.5
500–749	44.7	43.2	13.8	47.7	11.9	26.6	32.1	67.9
750 or more	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡

‡ Reporting standards not met. The response rate is below 50 percent.

NOTE: Teachers include both full-time and part-time teachers. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, National Teacher and Principal Survey (NTPS), "Public School Teacher and Private School Teacher Data Files," 2017–18.

Table 3. Percentage distribution of school teachers based on years of teaching experience, average total years of teaching experience, percentage distribution of teachers based on years teaching at current school, and average years teaching at current school, by school type and selected school characteristics: 2017–18

School type and selected school characteristic	Total years of teaching experience					Years teaching at current school				
	Less than 4 years	4–9 years	10–14 years	15 or more years	Average years teaching	Less than 4 years	4–9 years	10–14 years	15 or more years	Average years at current school
All schools	14.2	23.7	19.5	42.7	13.9	39.8	24.6	14.8	20.8	8.2
All public schools	13.6	23.6	19.8	43.0	13.8	39.2	24.7	15.3	20.9	8.2
School classification										
Traditional public	12.9	23.0	19.9	44.1	14.1	37.9	24.7	15.7	21.7	8.4
Charter school	24.9	33.5	17.9	23.7	10.0	59.2	24.5	8.9	7.4	4.7
Community type										
City	16.0	25.2	18.9	39.9	13.2	44.3	25.7	13.5	16.6	7.1
Suburban	11.9	22.7	20.7	44.6	14.1	36.2	24.4	16.7	22.6	8.6
Town	14.1	23.8	19.0	43.1	14.0	38.4	23.6	15.5	22.5	8.7
Rural	13.2	23.0	19.7	44.1	14.2	37.9	24.2	15.0	22.9	8.7
School level										
Primary	13.8	24.2	19.5	42.5	13.7	40.5	25.0	14.4	20.1	8.0
Middle	14.0	22.7	19.0	44.3	13.9	39.9	23.7	15.3	21.0	8.0
High	12.5	22.6	20.8	44.1	14.2	35.3	24.4	17.3	22.9	8.8
Combined	15.7	26.7	19.3	38.3	13.2	43.6	25.6	12.8	17.9	7.6
Student enrollment										
Less than 100	17.1	23.6	15.8	43.5	13.9	48.0	22.9	14.0	15.0	7.0
100–199	13.7	24.1	22.5	39.7	14.0	42.8	25.0	13.6	18.6	8.1
200–499	14.6	24.6	18.7	42.0	13.7	40.7	24.5	14.0	20.8	8.1
500–749	13.4	23.2	19.7	43.7	13.9	39.2	24.8	14.8	21.2	8.1
750–999	14.1	23.7	19.7	42.5	13.5	39.6	25.7	15.0	19.7	7.9
1,000 or more	12.3	22.8	21.0	43.9	14.1	35.9	24.3	17.7	22.1	8.5
Percent of K–12 students who were approved for free or reduced-price lunches										
0–34	11.0	22.0	20.8	46.2	14.5	34.9	25.1	16.4	23.5	8.7
35–49	11.7	24.4	20.3	43.6	14.0	36.3	25.3	16.9	21.5	8.5
50–74	13.7	23.7	19.3	43.3	14.0	39.3	24.4	14.8	21.6	8.4
75 or more	17.2	24.8	18.9	39.1	13.0	44.8	24.1	13.7	17.4	7.3

See notes at end of table.

Table 3. Percentage distribution of school teachers based on years of teaching experience, average total years of teaching experience, percentage distribution of teachers based on years teaching at current school, and average years teaching at current school, by school type and selected school characteristics: 2017–18—Continued

School type and selected school characteristic	Total years of teaching experience					Years teaching at current school				
	Less than 4 years	4–9 years	10–14 years	15 or more years	Average years teaching	Less than 4 years	4–9 years	10–14 years	15 or more years	Average years at current school
All private schools	17.9	24.0	17.4	40.6	14.3	44.4	23.7	11.5	20.4	8.2
School classification										
Catholic	18.7	22.1	16.1	43.1	15.0	43.8	21.3	12.2	22.7	8.9
Other religious	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Nonsectarian	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Community type										
City	17.5	24.7	17.6	40.1	14.4	45.3	24.5	10.7	19.5	8.1
Suburban	18.1	22.7	17.7	41.5	14.4	42.3	23.0	12.3	22.3	8.6
Town	16.0	22.2	17.8	43.9	15.2	43.6	24.9	12.9	18.6	8.4
Rural	19.6	26.9	15.4	38.1	13.4	48.3	22.6	10.9	18.2	7.4
School level										
Elementary	18.1	23.6	17.1	41.2	14.4	44.9	23.7	11.1	20.3	8.0
Secondary	17.2	22.3	18.0	42.5	15.3	41.0	23.3	13.1	22.6	9.1
Combined	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Student enrollment										
Less than 100	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
100–199	20.7	25.1	15.0	39.2	13.5	47.8	22.5	9.5	20.3	7.8
200–499	17.0	22.9	18.3	41.8	14.8	41.8	25.2	12.0	21.0	8.5
500–749	14.8	22.9	18.2	44.1	15.2	42.3	22.9	14.1	20.6	8.5
750 or more	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡

‡ Reporting standards not met. The response rate is below 50 percent.

NOTE: Teachers include both full-time and part-time teachers. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, National Teacher and Principal Survey (NTPS), "Public School Teacher and Private School Teacher Data Files," 2017–18.

Table 4. Percentage distribution of school teachers, by highest degree earned, school type, and selected school characteristics: 2017–18

School type and selected school characteristic	Less than a bachelor's degree	Bachelor's degree	Master's degree	Higher than a master's degree <sup>1</sup>
All schools	3.6	39.7	48.0	8.6
All public schools	2.7	39.3	49.2	8.8
School classification				
Traditional public	2.7	38.6	49.8	8.8
Charter school	3.2	50.3	38.6	7.8
Community type				
City	2.3	38.7	49.4	9.6
Suburban	2.5	35.8	52.0	9.7
Town	3.6	43.7	45.7	7.1
Rural	3.2	44.3	45.7	6.8
School level				
Primary	2.0	42.2	47.3	8.5
Middle	2.3	38.4	50.3	9.1
High	4.1	33.5	52.7	9.6
Combined	3.0	44.6	45.6	6.8
Student enrollment				
Less than 100	4.6	40.7	45.0	9.8
100–199	2.7	49.1	41.9	6.3
200–499	2.5	40.7	48.3	8.5
500–749	2.3	39.6	49.5	8.7
750–999	3.0	40.4	48.4	8.2
1,000 or more	3.1	35.3	51.7	9.9
Percent of K–12 students who were approved for free or reduced-price lunches				
0–34	2.8	33.8	54.1	9.3
35–49	3.1	38.9	49.8	8.2
50–74	2.8	42.2	46.5	8.5
75 or more	2.4	42.6	46.2	8.9

See notes at end of table.

Table 4. Percentage distribution of school teachers, by highest degree earned, school type, and selected school characteristics: 2017–18—Continued

School type and selected school characteristic	Less than a bachelor's degree	Bachelor's degree	Master's degree	Higher than a master's degree <sup>1</sup>
All private schools	10.0	42.4	40.0	7.7
School classification				
Catholic	7.9	46.0	39.8	6.3
Other religious	‡	‡	‡	‡
Nonsectarian	‡	‡	‡	‡
Community type				
City	8.4	42.1	41.9	7.5
Suburban	9.1	40.5	42.0	8.4
Town	12.5	53.3	28.1	6.1
Rural	16.8	43.8	32.8	6.6
School level				
Elementary	11.2	47.3	34.8	6.7
Secondary	7.5	36.0	47.3	9.2
Combined	‡	‡	‡	‡
Student enrollment				
Less than 100	‡	‡	‡	‡
100–199	11.8	47.9	32.6	7.6
200–499	7.1	45.3	40.4	7.1
500–749	5.1	39.8	47.2	7.9
750 or more	‡	‡	‡	‡

‡ Reporting standards not met. The response rate is below 50 percent.

<sup>1</sup> Higher than a master's degree is defined as a teacher who completed any of the following: an educational specialist or professional diploma, a certificate of advanced graduate studies, or a doctorate or first professional degree.

NOTE: Teachers include both full-time and part-time teachers. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, National Teacher and Principal Survey (NTPS), "Public School Teacher and Private School Teacher Data Files," 2017–18.

Table 5. Among regular full-time school teachers, average base salary and earnings from all sources, percentage of teachers with earnings from various salary supplements, and among those teachers, the average amount earned from the supplement during the current school year, by school type and selected school characteristics: 2017–18

School type and selected school characteristic	Average base teaching salary of regular full-time teachers	Average school year earnings from all sources <sup>1</sup>	Salary supplements							
			Extracurricular or additional activities in same school system		Additional compensation based on students' performance		Other school system sources (state supplement, etc.)		Job outside the school system	
			Percent of teachers	Average amount	Percent of teachers	Average amount	Percent of teachers	Average amount	Percent of teachers	Average amount
All schools	\$56,600	\$59,100	41.4	\$2,800	7.4	\$1,400	8.0	\$3,100	18.1	\$5,900
All public schools	57,900	60,500	42.8	2,800	8.2	1,400	7.8	3,200	17.8	5,800
School classification										
Traditional public	58,400	61,000	43.2	2,800	7.7	1,400	7.9	3,200	17.8	5,800
Charter school	50,400	52,900	37.7	2,300	15.8	1,700	7.4	2,500	19.0	6,300
Community type										
City	59,400	61,900	38.9	2,600	9.1	1,700	8.1	3,400	17.3	5,900
Suburban	62,800	65,500	43.1	2,900	8.7	1,400	6.9	3,600	17.9	5,700
Town	50,600	53,300	45.1	3,000	6.5	1,100	7.8	2,500	18.5	6,000
Rural	50,800	53,400	46.6	2,800	6.9	1,000	9.2	2,500	18.0	5,700
School level										
Primary	57,000	58,700	32.4	1,700	9.1	1,400	7.0	3,000	14.1	5,000
Middle	58,900	61,900	50.8	2,800	6.8	1,300	8.4	3,200	19.2	6,000
High	60,400	64,300	53.5	3,800	7.6	1,500	8.7	3,400	22.2	6,400
Combined	51,100	54,300	48.9	3,000	8.8	1,400	8.2	3,000	21.3	6,300
Student enrollment										
Less than 100	54,500	57,500	35.1	2,300	4.4	1,300	8.4	3,400	23.5	8,100
100–199	50,600	53,000	44.8	2,500	6.8	1,100	7.8	2,500	17.5	5,800
200–499	55,300	57,500	41.3	2,400	6.5	1,400	6.3	2,900	16.0	5,400
500–749	57,800	60,000	38.6	2,400	8.8	1,400	7.6	3,300	16.4	5,600
750–999	59,000	61,500	42.0	2,700	8.7	1,200	8.3	2,800	17.7	5,600
1,000 or more	61,500	65,100	49.6	3,600	9.5	1,500	9.5	3,500	21.1	6,200
Percent of K–12 students who were approved for free or reduced-price lunches										
0–34	61,500	64,400	45.7	3,100	7.4	1,400	6.9	3,700	18.6	5,800
35–49	56,900	59,600	46.3	2,800	6.7	1,300	8.1	3,700	20.0	5,300
50–74	55,100	57,700	43.7	2,700	9.2	1,300	8.5	3,200	18.0	5,700
75 or more	57,300	59,600	37.5	2,500	9.0	1,500	8.1	2,400	15.8	6,200

See notes at end of table.



Table 5. Among regular full-time school teachers, average base salary and earnings from all sources, percentage of teachers with earnings from various salary supplements, and among those teachers, the average amount earned from the supplement during the current school year, by school type and selected school characteristics: 2017–18—Continued

School type and selected school characteristic	Average base teaching salary of regular full-time teachers	Average school year earnings from all sources <sup>1</sup>	Salary supplements							
			Extracurricular or additional activities in same school system		Additional compensation based on students' performance		Other school system sources (state supplement, etc.)		Job outside the school system	
			Percent of teachers	Average amount	Percent of teachers	Average amount	Percent of teachers	Average amount	Percent of teachers	Average amount
All private schools	\$45,300	\$47,700	30.1	\$3,000	0.6	\$2,300	9.7	\$2,900	20.7	\$6,700
School classification										
Catholic	43,100	45,400	31.8	2,700	0.5	1,300	10.1	2,400	22.5	6,100
Other religious	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Nonsectarian	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Community type										
City	48,200	51,100	32.8	3,200	0.5	3,000	10.8	3,100	22.5	7,100
Suburban	46,500	48,800	31.1	2,900	0.7	800	9.1	2,400	18.7	7,300
Town	33,500	34,100	19.8	2,400	‡	7,700	9.6	3,900	22.4	3,600
Rural	37,100	38,600	22.6	2,700	‡	300	8.2	3,300	19.7	5,100
School level										
Elementary	41,700	43,500	19.4	2,600	0.7	3,000	9.2	2,900	19.3	5,300
Secondary	50,700	54,200	42.1	3,300	0.6	‡	11.8	3,100	22.4	8,100
Combined	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Student enrollment										
Less than 100	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
100–199	38,900	40,300	17.8	1,800	‡	700	10.2	2,700	18.1	5,700
200–499	45,100	47,900	31.9	2,900	0.6	2,400	9.9	3,100	21.8	7,200
500–749	50,300	53,500	38.6	3,100	1.0	3,400	10.5	2,700	21.9	7,500
750 or more	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡

! Interpret data with caution. The coefficient of variation (CV) for this estimate is between 30 percent and 50 percent (i.e., the standard error is at least 30 percent and less than 50 percent of the estimate).

‡ Reporting standards not met. The coefficient of variation (CV) for this estimate is 50 percent or greater (i.e., the standard error is 50 percent or more of the estimate) or the response rate is below 50 percent.

<sup>1</sup> Average earnings from all sources is defined as the weighted mean of the amount that regular full-time teachers earned from all sources during the school year. It does not include summer income or income from a retirement pension.

NOTE: For average base salary, teachers who reported zero are excluded from the table. Summer earnings are not included. A regular full-time teacher is any teacher whose primary position in a school is not an itinerant teacher, a long-term substitute, a short-term substitute, a student teacher, a teacher aide, an administrator, a library media or librarian, another type of professional staff (e.g., counselor, curriculum coordinator, social worker) or support staff (e.g., secretary), or a part-time teacher.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, National Teacher and Principal Survey (NTPS), "Public School Teacher and Private School Teacher Data Files," 2017–18.

Table 6a. Average class size in public schools, by school level, class type, and selected school characteristics: 2017–18

Selected school characteristic	Primary schools		Middle schools		High schools		Combined grade schools	
	Average class size for teachers in self-contained classes	Average class size for teachers in departmentalized instruction	Average class size for teachers in self-contained classes	Average class size for teachers in departmentalized instruction	Average class size for teachers in self-contained classes	Average class size for teachers in departmentalized instruction	Average class size for teachers in self-contained classes	Average class size for teachers in departmentalized instruction
All public schools	20.9	26.2	16.6	24.9	16.3	23.3	15.6	18.6
School classification								
Traditional public	20.9	26.2	16.1	24.9	15.8	23.4	13.8	17.5
Charter school	22.1	26.1	25.5	25.2	25.5	21.5	22.3	22.6
Community type								
City	21.4	28.1	17.6	25.3	17.7	24.5	15.2	20.6
Suburban	21.3	27.2	15.5	25.5	15.3	24.3	16.1	20.0
Town	20.5	25.1	18.3	23.9	16.8	21.3	17.1	18.5
Rural	19.5	23.2	16.0	23.3	15.9	20.8	15.4	17.0
Student enrollment								
Less than 100	14.8	15.7	‡	17.4	18.3	16.0	8.9	10.2
100–199	17.7	20.1	20.6	18.7	17.5	15.7	10.6	12.0
200–499	20.4	24.8	18.6	22.5	19.2	19.2	16.7	16.9
500–749	21.4	27.9	14.5	24.6	16.9	21.0	19.0	21.3
750–999	22.3	28.7	16.3	25.7	19.2	22.2	18.7	21.9
1,000 or more	22.1	26.4	16.5	27.1	14.9	25.0	22.5	23.7
Percent of K–12 students who were approved for free or reduced-price lunches								
0–34	21.0	25.8	16.2	22.8	22.1	20.0	21.5	18.9
35–49	20.8	24.8	14.5	24.9	14.5	23.2	16.6	18.8
50–74	20.5	26.1	19.1	24.8	16.4	23.1	14.1	17.3
75 or more	20.8	26.8	17.2	24.1	15.8	23.5	13.8	19.2

‡ Reporting standards not met. The coefficient of variation (CV) for this estimate is 50 percent or greater (i.e., the standard error is 50 percent or more of the estimate) or the response rate is below 50 percent.

NOTE: Self-contained classes are defined as instruction to the same group of students all or most of the day in multiple subjects, and departmentalized instruction is defined as instruction to several classes of different students most or all of the day in one or more subjects. Among all public school teachers, 25 percent teach self-contained classes in primary schools, 1 percent in middle schools, 1 percent in high schools, and 1 percent in combined schools; 8 percent teach departmentalized classes in primary schools, 14 percent in middle schools, 24 percent in high schools, and 4 percent in combined schools; 15 percent teach other types of classes, such as elementary subject specialist classes, team-taught classes, and “pull-out” or “push-in” classes in primary schools, 3 percent in middle schools, 3 percent in high schools, and 1 percent in combined schools.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, National Teacher and Principal Survey (NTPS), “Public School Teacher Data File,” 2017–18.

Table 6b. Average class size in private schools, by school level, class type, and selected school characteristics: 2017–18

Selected school characteristic	Elementary schools		Secondary schools		Combined grade schools	
	Average class size for teachers in self-contained classes	Average class size for teachers in departmentalized instruction	Average class size for teachers in self-contained classes	Average class size for teachers in departmentalized instruction	Average class size for teachers in self-contained classes	Average class size for teachers in departmentalized instruction
All private schools	16.7	17.6	17.8	17.7	‡	‡
School classification						
Catholic	18.4	19.6	21.3	20.2	‡	‡
Other religious	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Nonsectarian	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Community type						
City	17.7	19.5	19.3	18.8	‡	‡
Suburban	17.6	17.0	18.9	17.5	‡	‡
Town	14.8	16.4	11.9	15.5	‡	‡
Rural	12.2	13.0	14.7	14.7	‡	‡
Student enrollment						
Less than 100	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
100–199	16.4	16.0	17.6	14.7	‡	‡
200–499	19.8	20.5	19.5	17.2	‡	‡
500–749	23.0	23.2	19.7	19.6	‡	‡
750 or more	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡

‡ Reporting standards not met. The response rate is below 50 percent.

NOTE: Self-contained classes are defined as instruction to the same group of students all or most of the day in multiple subjects, and departmentalized instruction is defined as instruction to several classes of different students most or all of the day in one or more subjects. Among all private school teachers, 16 percent teach self-contained classes in elementary schools, and 3 percent in secondary schools; 12 percent teach departmentalized classes in elementary schools, and 19 percent in secondary schools; 10 percent teach other types of classes, such as elementary subject specialist classes, team-taught classes, and “pull-out” or “push-in” classes in elementary schools, and 3 percent in middle schools.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, National Teacher and Principal Survey (NTPS), “Private School Teacher Data File,” 2017–18.

Table 7. Percentage of teachers who took graduate or undergraduate courses in selected subject areas prior to their first year of teaching, by course subject area, school type, and selected school characteristics: 2017–18

School type and selected school characteristic	Classroom management techniques	Lesson planning	Learning assessment	Using student performance data to inform instruction	Serving students from diverse economic backgrounds	Serving students with special needs	Teaching students who are limited-English proficient (LEP) or English-language learners (ELLs)
All schools	72.4	77.0	75.1	55.1	62.4	67.3	39.3
All public schools	73.8	78.7	76.6	56.0	64.5	70.0	40.9
School classification							
Traditional public	74.1	79.1	76.9	56.0	64.5	70.3	40.5
Charter school	68.7	72.0	71.8	55.4	65.3	65.5	47.5
Community type							
City	71.2	76.5	74.3	55.7	64.3	68.3	45.1
Suburban	73.9	79.3	77.5	55.8	64.5	69.7	42.2
Town	76.5	80.7	78.1	56.8	66.5	72.5	37.7
Rural	75.7	79.4	77.4	56.2	63.9	71.5	34.4
School level							
Primary	75.1	79.8	78.5	57.8	66.4	72.4	43.8
Middle	72.7	79.0	75.5	54.0	63.4	69.7	38.9
High	72.3	77.0	74.5	54.6	62.2	66.2	38.1
Combined	73.4	76.7	75.1	54.7	63.9	69.1	37.4
Student enrollment							
Less than 100	73.4	78.2	77.0	57.5	62.9	73.2	39.1
100–199	73.9	77.9	76.9	57.8	64.8	70.5	37.4
200–499	74.8	80.1	78.1	56.0	64.9	71.8	38.2
500–749	74.2	78.6	76.5	55.9	64.7	70.8	42.7
750–999	73.3	78.5	76.7	56.7	64.5	69.6	42.6
1,000 or more	72.5	77.4	75.0	55.4	63.9	67.0	41.9
Percent of K–12 students who were approved for free or reduced-price lunches							
0–34	75.9	81.0	78.9	56.7	64.6	71.3	38.4
35–49	75.8	81.0	77.4	55.3	65.7	71.2	38.3
50–74	73.9	78.8	76.5	56.1	64.0	70.3	40.5
75 or more	70.5	75.0	74.1	55.6	64.2	67.8	45.1

See note at end of table.

Table 7. Percentage of teachers who took graduate or undergraduate courses in selected subject areas prior to their first year of teaching, by course subject area, school type, and selected school characteristics: 2017–18—Continued

School type and selected school characteristic	Classroom management techniques	Lesson planning	Learning assessment	Using student performance data to inform instruction	Serving students from diverse economic backgrounds	Serving students with special needs	Teaching students who are limited-English proficient (LEP) or English-language learners (ELLs)
All private schools	62.5	65.1	64.5	48.8	47.7	48.8	27.9
School classification							
Catholic	66.9	69.1	68.1	51.0	52.6	52.0	29.8
Other religious	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Nonsectarian	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Community type							
City	61.3	63.8	62.8	47.1	47.6	47.2	28.8
Suburban	63.6	66.6	66.4	50.6	48.7	50.7	28.7
Town	66.7	72.2	70.7	53.5	48.1	52.7	28.1
Rural	61.0	61.3	61.5	46.2	44.7	46.3	22.1
School level							
Elementary	67.7	70.8	70.5	52.7	53.2	54.5	32.8
Secondary	60.1	62.6	61.7	47.5	45.2	44.6	24.6
Combined	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Student enrollment							
Less than 100	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
100–199	63.9	68.5	67.4	52.3	53.0	53.1	31.1
200–499	64.6	66.8	66.3	49.7	47.0	49.1	27.2
500–749	58.4	61.6	62.9	44.2	44.9	46.1	28.6
750 or more	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡

‡ Reporting standards not met. The response rate is below 50 percent.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, National Teacher and Principal Survey (NTPS), "Public School Teacher and Private School Teacher Data Files," 2017–18.

Table 8. Percentage of teachers who were evaluated during the last school year, and among those teachers, percentage that agreed with different statements, by school type and selected school characteristics: 2017–18

School type and selected school characteristic	Percent of teachers who were evaluated last school year	Percent of evaluated teachers who agreed with different statements						
		Overall, the evaluation process was fair	The evaluation process was based on what is known about good teaching practice	I had a strong understanding of how I would be evaluated at this school	The evaluation process helped me to determine whether I had been successful with my students	The evaluation process had a positive effect on my teaching	Overall, the evaluation process led to improved student learning	The results of my evaluation were accurate
All schools	76.7	87.1	88.0	89.1	73.0	73.9	70.5	86.2
All public schools	77.9	86.6	87.8	89.4	71.7	72.6	69.2	85.7
School classification								
Traditional public	78.2	86.5	87.7	89.5	71.5	72.3	68.8	85.8
Charter school	72.9	86.8	89.0	87.3	76.4	77.3	74.5	84.5
Community type								
City	77.1	84.7	87.2	88.4	71.5	72.2	69.2	83.7
Suburban	78.4	86.9	87.4	89.8	70.8	71.7	67.6	86.0
Town	76.9	88.0	89.0	89.9	73.4	74.4	70.8	87.4
Rural	78.8	87.8	88.8	89.9	72.9	73.8	71.0	87.1
School level								
Primary	77.4	86.9	88.5	90.0	74.5	74.7	71.9	86.1
Middle	77.6	86.4	88.6	89.6	70.7	72.4	68.0	85.1
High	79.2	85.9	86.2	88.5	67.5	68.7	64.6	85.5
Combined	77.2	87.0	87.9	88.2	73.2	74.5	71.7	85.8
Student enrollment								
Less than 100	73.3	88.5	91.0	88.7	74.1	76.1	76.2	88.0
100–199	72.7	87.9	87.1	87.6	73.3	73.5	70.8	87.6
200–499	77.2	87.4	89.2	90.0	74.0	75.1	72.2	86.6
500–749	78.2	86.3	87.3	89.9	72.7	73.2	69.7	85.3
750–999	78.7	86.5	89.0	89.1	72.1	72.9	69.2	86.1
1,000 or more	79.0	85.6	86.1	88.6	67.7	68.5	64.5	84.6
Percent of K–12 students who were approved for free or reduced-price lunches								
0–34	78.4	88.2	88.8	90.6	71.7	72.7	69.1	87.9
35–49	79.0	86.9	87.6	89.3	71.5	72.0	69.5	86.6
50–74	78.4	86.4	87.5	89.0	71.0	72.3	68.1	85.3
75 or more	76.5	84.9	87.1	88.6	72.5	73.0	69.9	83.3

See notes at end of table.

Table 8. Percentage of teachers who were evaluated during the last school year, and among those teachers, percentage that agreed with different statements, by school type and selected school characteristics: 2017–18—Continued

School type and selected school characteristic	Percent of evaluated teachers who agreed with different statements							
	Percent of teachers who were evaluated last school year	Overall, the evaluation process was fair	The evaluation process was based on what is known about good teaching practice	I had a strong understanding of how I would be evaluated at this school	The evaluation process helped me to determine whether I had been successful with my students	The evaluation process had a positive effect on my teaching	Overall, the evaluation process led to improved student learning	The results of my evaluation were accurate
All private schools	68.6	91.1	89.9	86.5	82.7	84.2	81.0	89.8
School classification								
Catholic	75.5	89.8	89.7	86.6	81.3	83.1	80.3	88.9
Other religious	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Nonsectarian	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Community type								
City	70.1	91.8	90.3	86.3	81.2	84.1	80.4	90.3
Suburban	68.1	90.6	89.4	86.5	83.8	83.9	80.9	89.2
Town	66.7	90.6	89.9	85.9	85.3	84.9	83.0	89.4
Rural	65.6	90.5	90.5	87.7	83.5	85.2	82.4	90.5
School level								
Elementary	68.5	89.4	89.3	85.5	83.1	84.1	81.0	89.2
Secondary	70.4	92.1	89.7	86.3	82.0	82.4	80.0	90.8
Combined	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Student enrollment								
Less than 100	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
100–199	69.5	92.3	90.9	88.3	84.9	85.6	82.9	91.5
200–499	70.6	90.0	88.8	84.2	80.6	82.2	78.8	88.2
500–749	74.5	92.3	91.6	88.2	81.7	83.9	79.1	90.9
750 or more	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡

‡ Reporting standards not met. The response rate is below 50 percent.

NOTE: Response options included “strongly disagree,” “somewhat disagree,” “somewhat agree,” and “strongly agree.” Teachers who reported “somewhat agree,” or “strongly agree” were considered to have reported that they “agreed” with different statements.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, National Teacher and Principal Survey (NTPS), “Public School Teacher and Private School Teacher Data Files,” 2017–18.



Table 9. Percentage of teachers who participated in any professional development during the last school year, and among all teachers, percentage of teachers who agreed with different statements about professional development at their school, by school type and selected school characteristics: 2017–18

School type and selected school characteristic	Percent of teachers who agreed with different statements about their professional development at their school							
	Percent of teachers who participated in any professional development during last school year	I have sufficient resources available for my professional development	I have access to about the same amount of resources for professional development as other teachers	My professional development opportunities are aligned with this school's performance goals	The techniques I'm learning about in my professional development will help improve student achievement	I feel capable of incorporating the kinds of techniques I'm learning in my professional development	The types of professional development available to me are consistent with my own professional goals	I have the opportunity to provide feedback to school leaders about my professional development experience to determine its value and impact
All schools	98.8	76.3	80.0	83.5	84.2	88.9	76.2	73.5
All public schools	99.4	76.1	80.2	83.7	83.9	88.9	75.5	72.9
School classification								
Traditional public	99.5	76.2	80.4	83.7	83.8	88.9	75.5	72.7
Charter school	98.7	74.6	77.3	83.0	85.3	89.4	76.1	75.8
Community type								
City	99.5	74.5	78.7	82.7	83.8	89.0	75.0	72.3
Suburban	99.4	77.1	80.9	84.1	83.2	88.7	74.9	72.5
Town	99.3	75.9	80.3	83.1	83.3	87.9	75.4	72.9
Rural	99.4	76.7	80.9	84.7	85.7	89.6	77.3	74.6
School level								
Primary	99.6	77.1	80.8	85.1	86.4	90.1	77.7	73.9
Middle	99.4	75.4	78.7	82.8	82.6	89.0	74.7	72.0
High	99.3	75.2	80.6	82.6	80.1	86.8	72.1	71.4
Combined	98.8	74.7	78.3	81.2	85.2	88.7	76.1	74.4
Student enrollment								
Less than 100	98.3	79.0	78.8	83.4	88.1	90.1	79.2	79.4
100–199	99.3	74.6	77.8	80.7	84.8	89.0	77.0	75.9
200–499	99.5	75.9	80.0	83.8	85.5	89.5	75.9	73.7
500–749	99.5	76.8	80.4	84.4	84.8	89.4	77.0	73.0
750–999	99.3	76.2	79.7	83.6	83.9	88.7	75.2	72.6
1,000 or more	99.4	75.6	80.9	83.3	80.7	87.7	73.0	71.3
Percent of K–12 students who were approved for free or reduced-price lunches								
0–34	99.4	78.4	81.8	84.6	83.4	89.2	75.1	73.8
35–49	99.3	76.0	81.7	84.1	83.9	88.9	74.5	72.8
50–74	99.4	74.9	79.1	82.5	83.5	88.4	75.2	72.7
75 or more	99.5	74.8	78.6	83.5	84.7	89.0	76.6	72.3

See notes at end of table.

Table 9. Percentage of teachers who participated in any professional development during the last school year, and among all teachers, percentage of teachers who agreed with different statements about professional development at their school, by school type and selected school characteristics: 2017–18—Continued

School type and selected school characteristic	Percent of teachers who agreed with different statements about their professional development at their school							
	Percent of teachers who participated in any professional development during last school year	I have sufficient resources available for my professional development	I have access to about the same amount of resources for professional development as other teachers	My professional development opportunities are aligned with this school's performance goals	The techniques I'm learning about in my professional development will help improve student achievement	I feel capable of incorporating the kinds of techniques I'm learning in my professional development	The types of professional development available to me are consistent with my own professional goals	I have the opportunity to provide feedback to school leaders about my professional development experience to determine its value and impact
All private schools	94.5	78.0	78.5	82.1	86.2	89.0	81.0	77.6
School classification								
Catholic	97.2	76.8	77.0	81.8	85.6	88.1	79.4	74.6
Other religious	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Nonsectarian	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Community type								
City	95.5	79.4	79.1	83.4	86.2	89.2	81.0	77.0
Suburban	95.5	77.3	78.3	81.0	86.4	88.9	80.8	77.7
Town	91.3	73.9	77.3	79.7	84.7	88.1	80.1	76.2
Rural	89.1	77.6	77.4	81.8	86.5	89.3	81.6	80.2
School level								
Elementary	95.3	76.2	74.7	81.1	86.1	88.9	81.2	78.0
Secondary	94.8	78.6	80.9	82.1	85.4	88.2	79.1	75.6
Combined	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Student enrollment								
Less than 100	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
100–199	94.0	73.2	74.6	80.0	84.8	88.4	78.9	78.0
200–499	96.6	78.8	78.8	81.7	86.1	88.7	81.0	75.9
500–749	95.8	80.7	84.5	83.5	85.3	89.8	80.9	77.6
750 or more	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡

‡ Reporting standards not met. The response rate is below 50 percent.

NOTE: Response options included “strongly disagree,” “somewhat disagree,” “somewhat agree,” and “strongly agree.” Teachers who reported “somewhat agree” or “strongly agree” were considered to have reported that they “agreed” with different statements.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, National Teacher and Principal Survey (NTPS), “Public School Teacher and Private School Teacher Data Files,” 2017–18.

## **Appendix A: Standard Error Tables**

Table A-1. Standard errors for Table 1: Percentage distribution of school teachers, by race/ethnicity, school type, and selected school characteristics: 2017–18

School type and selected school characteristic	Percent of teachers by race/ethnicity						
	Hispanic, regardless of race	White, non-Hispanic	Black or African American, non-Hispanic	Asian, non-Hispanic	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, non-Hispanic	American Indian/Alaska Native, non-Hispanic	Two or more races, non-Hispanic
All schools	0.24	0.32	0.18	0.09	0.03	0.04	0.08
All public schools	0.26	0.35	0.20	0.10	0.03	0.05	0.09
School classification							
Traditional public	0.26	0.37	0.21	0.10	0.03	0.05	0.09
Charter school	0.90	1.20	0.79	0.31	0.12	0.13	0.21
Community type							
City	0.56	0.70	0.50	0.20	0.05	0.05	0.15
Suburban	0.42	0.63	0.34	0.19	0.06	0.07	0.16
Town	0.48	0.79	0.41	0.14	0.07	0.23	0.24
Rural	0.34	0.53	0.31	0.08	0.04	0.15	0.15
School level							
Primary	0.41	0.58	0.33	0.16	0.05	0.09	0.13
Middle	0.55	0.81	0.55	0.20	0.04	0.12	0.17
High	0.43	0.69	0.36	0.18	0.06	0.06	0.19
Combined	0.65	0.92	0.68	0.20	0.07	0.19	0.20
Student enrollment							
Less than 100	1.07	2.03	1.24	0.46	0.23	0.46	0.67
100–199	0.79	1.35	1.14	0.30	†	0.19	0.30
200–499	0.42	0.67	0.41	0.15	0.05	0.09	0.16
500–749	0.55	0.78	0.44	0.23	0.06	0.13	0.15
750–999	0.76	1.01	0.58	0.22	0.05	0.12	0.22
1,000 or more	0.55	0.75	0.39	0.21	0.06	0.05	0.20
Percent of K–12 students who were approved for free or reduced-price lunches							
0–34	0.27	0.47	0.22	0.18	0.05	0.08	0.15
35–49	0.49	0.72	0.43	0.19	0.06	0.07	0.16
50–74	0.47	0.64	0.42	0.17	0.06	0.07	0.20
75 or more	0.63	0.74	0.54	0.21	0.06	0.13	0.16

See notes at end of table.

Table A-1. Standard errors for Table 1: Percentage distribution of school teachers, by race/ethnicity, school type, and selected school characteristics: 2017–18—  
Continued

School type and selected school characteristic	Percent of teachers by race/ethnicity						
	Hispanic, regardless of race	White, non-Hispanic	Black or African American, non-Hispanic	Asian, non-Hispanic	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, non-Hispanic	American Indian/Alaska Native, non-Hispanic	Two or more races, non-Hispanic
All private schools	0.43	0.61	0.29	0.27	0.04	0.10	0.17
School classification							
Catholic	0.70	1.04	0.57	0.52	†	†	0.21
Other religious	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Nonsectarian	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Community type							
City	0.75	1.08	0.59	0.49	0.08	0.10	0.33
Suburban	0.78	0.91	0.37	0.33	†	0.09	0.19
Town	0.89	1.43	†	†	†	†	0.42
Rural	0.59	0.93	0.36	0.26	†	†	0.23
School level							
Elementary	0.75	0.99	0.49	0.46	†	0.21	0.24
Secondary	0.70	0.95	0.52	0.41	†	†	0.41
Combined	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Student enrollment							
Less than 100	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
100–199	0.84	1.11	0.55	0.53	†	†	0.25
200–499	0.65	0.97	0.49	0.34	†	†	0.37
500–749	1.38	1.93	0.81	0.52	†	†	0.36
750 or more	†	†	†	†	†	†	†

† Not applicable.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, National Teacher and Principal Survey (NTPS), "Public School Teacher and Private School Teacher Data Files," 2017–18.

Table A-2. Standard errors for Table 2: Average and median age of school teachers and percentage distribution of teachers by age category, sex, school type, and selected school characteristics: 2017–18

School type and selected school characteristic	Average age of teachers	Median age of teachers	Age category				Sex	
			Less than 30 years	30–49 years	50–54 years	55 years or more	Male	Female
All schools	0.07	0.11	0.22	0.29	0.20	0.22	0.26	0.26
All public schools	0.08	0.12	0.24	0.32	0.21	0.25	0.28	0.28
School classification								
Traditional public	0.08	0.12	0.25	0.34	0.22	0.26	0.29	0.29
Charter school	0.23	0.36	0.87	0.98	0.52	0.61	0.82	0.82
Community type								
City	0.14	0.20	0.45	0.54	0.40	0.41	0.50	0.50
Suburban	0.13	0.19	0.39	0.54	0.37	0.42	0.49	0.49
Town	0.21	0.32	0.66	0.80	0.54	0.67	0.88	0.88
Rural	0.15	0.24	0.55	0.71	0.45	0.49	0.70	0.70
School level								
Primary	0.13	0.20	0.41	0.53	0.37	0.37	0.32	0.32
Middle	0.17	0.22	0.55	0.76	0.47	0.61	0.64	0.64
High	0.14	0.20	0.38	0.59	0.38	0.50	0.57	0.57
Combined	0.26	0.41	0.77	0.79	0.52	0.79	0.85	0.85
Student enrollment								
Less than 100	0.56	0.88	1.75	2.27	1.38	1.87	2.09	2.09
100–199	0.40	0.98	1.14	1.59	0.90	1.39	1.22	1.22
200–499	0.14	0.22	0.45	0.61	0.40	0.43	0.46	0.46
500–749	0.15	0.23	0.43	0.62	0.43	0.51	0.47	0.47
750–999	0.21	0.33	0.69	0.97	0.58	0.66	0.80	0.80
1,000 or more	0.15	0.21	0.44	0.70	0.43	0.51	0.63	0.63
Percent of K–12 students who were approved for free or reduced-price lunches								
0–34	0.12	0.19	0.39	0.57	0.41	0.41	0.55	0.55
35–49	0.18	0.29	0.62	0.85	0.49	0.57	0.74	0.74
50–74	0.16	0.25	0.46	0.67	0.42	0.57	0.56	0.56
75 or more	0.14	0.19	0.45	0.60	0.38	0.46	0.50	0.50

See notes at end of table.

Table A-2. Standard errors for Table 2: Average and median age of school teachers and percentage distribution of teachers by age category, sex, school type, and selected school characteristics: 2017–18—Continued

School type and selected school characteristic	Average age of teachers	Median age of teachers	Age category				Sex	
			Less than 30 years	30–49 years	50–54 years	55 years or more	Male	Female
All private schools	0.22	0.38	0.65	0.83	0.47	0.72	0.63	0.63
School classification								
Catholic	0.42	0.71	1.02	1.57	0.96	1.37	1.02	1.02
Other religious	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Nonsectarian	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Community type								
City	0.34	0.49	0.99	1.25	0.71	1.03	0.97	0.97
Suburban	0.38	0.54	1.13	1.35	0.89	1.17	1.15	1.15
Town	0.66	1.16	1.62	2.43	1.31	2.24	1.72	1.72
Rural	0.54	0.71	1.59	1.97	1.17	1.63	1.58	1.58
School level								
Elementary	0.38	0.62	1.06	1.48	0.73	1.30	1.01	1.01
Secondary	0.39	0.63	1.23	1.44	1.11	1.28	1.26	1.26
Combined	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Student enrollment								
Less than 100	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
100–199	0.49	0.73	1.50	1.96	0.97	1.67	1.25	1.25
200–499	0.39	0.55	1.25	1.54	0.85	1.18	1.11	1.11
500–749	0.50	1.28	1.41	1.84	1.21	1.77	2.17	2.17
750 or more	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†

† Not applicable.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, National Teacher and Principal Survey (NTPS), "Public School Teacher and Private School Teacher Data Files," 2017–18.

Table A-3. Standard errors for Table 3: Percentage distribution of school teachers based on years of teaching experience, average total years of teaching experience, percentage distribution of teachers based on years teaching at current school, and average years teaching at current school, by school type and selected school characteristics: 2017–18

School type and selected school characteristic	Total years of teaching experience					Years teaching at current school				
	Less than 4 years	4–9 years	10–14 years	15 or more years	Average years teaching	Less than 4 years	4–9 years	10–14 years	15 or more years	Average years at current school
All schools	0.22	0.29	0.24	0.31	0.06	0.31	0.26	0.21	0.26	0.05
All public schools	0.24	0.31	0.26	0.33	0.06	0.34	0.27	0.23	0.29	0.06
School classification										
Traditional public	0.24	0.32	0.28	0.35	0.06	0.35	0.28	0.25	0.30	0.06
Charter school	0.92	0.85	0.71	0.92	0.20	1.10	0.79	0.62	0.63	0.15
Community type										
City	0.43	0.52	0.44	0.59	0.11	0.58	0.51	0.42	0.45	0.09
Suburban	0.37	0.50	0.45	0.57	0.11	0.62	0.48	0.41	0.56	0.10
Town	0.56	0.76	0.64	0.89	0.17	0.86	0.67	0.64	0.79	0.17
Rural	0.48	0.58	0.60	0.67	0.13	0.77	0.62	0.54	0.66	0.13
School level										
Primary	0.37	0.47	0.42	0.54	0.10	0.54	0.41	0.34	0.46	0.09
Middle	0.52	0.60	0.59	0.70	0.14	0.71	0.63	0.53	0.60	0.11
High	0.37	0.52	0.46	0.64	0.12	0.58	0.50	0.48	0.62	0.11
Combined	0.75	0.88	0.78	1.02	0.20	1.04	0.83	0.63	0.81	0.18
Student enrollment										
Less than 100	2.54	1.73	1.49	2.57	0.53	2.70	1.58	1.79	1.60	0.40
100–199	1.07	1.38	1.53	1.77	0.33	1.82	1.71	1.29	1.21	0.28
200–499	0.40	0.58	0.46	0.61	0.11	0.60	0.50	0.40	0.50	0.10
500–749	0.43	0.57	0.51	0.69	0.13	0.71	0.54	0.48	0.63	0.12
750–999	0.72	0.75	0.70	0.93	0.17	0.94	0.82	0.66	0.78	0.15
1,000 or more	0.37	0.62	0.51	0.66	0.13	0.66	0.58	0.50	0.66	0.12
Percent of K–12 students who were approved for free or reduced-price lunches										
0–34	0.38	0.53	0.49	0.60	0.11	0.61	0.53	0.44	0.64	0.11
35–49	0.49	0.67	0.66	0.74	0.14	0.75	0.64	0.61	0.62	0.13
50–74	0.48	0.63	0.53	0.73	0.13	0.71	0.62	0.48	0.59	0.12
75 or more	0.43	0.50	0.45	0.60	0.11	0.60	0.47	0.40	0.50	0.11

See notes at end of table.



Table A-3. Standard errors for Table 3: Percentage distribution of school teachers based on years of teaching experience, average total years of teaching experience, percentage distribution of teachers based on years teaching at current school, and average years teaching at current school, by school type and selected school characteristics: 2017–18—Continued

School type and selected school characteristic	Total years of teaching experience					Years teaching at current school				
	Less than 4 years	4–9 years	10–14 years	15 or more years	Average years teaching	Less than 4 years	4–9 years	10–14 years	15 or more years	Average years at current school
All private schools	0.58	0.68	0.61	0.79	0.20	0.72	0.62	0.46	0.66	0.16
School classification										
Catholic	1.02	1.13	1.11	1.41	0.35	1.27	1.00	0.82	1.24	0.30
Other religious	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Nonsectarian	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Community type										
City	0.88	1.15	0.97	1.22	0.30	1.20	0.99	0.64	1.02	0.26
Suburban	1.04	0.97	1.02	1.35	0.32	1.28	1.06	0.85	1.17	0.28
Town	1.68	1.92	2.34	2.53	0.56	2.57	2.39	2.07	2.09	0.53
Rural	1.53	1.74	1.28	1.86	0.42	1.87	1.58	1.39	1.52	0.34
School level										
Elementary	0.99	1.20	1.06	1.32	0.34	1.27	1.16	0.77	1.06	0.26
Secondary	1.10	1.21	1.17	1.32	0.36	1.50	1.26	0.92	1.21	0.29
Combined	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Student enrollment										
Less than 100	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
100–199	1.50	1.57	1.20	1.73	0.39	1.68	1.46	0.84	1.53	0.33
200–499	0.96	1.09	1.22	1.29	0.33	1.28	1.15	0.91	1.17	0.29
500–749	1.44	1.93	1.53	2.32	0.51	2.16	1.72	1.31	1.46	0.39
750 or more	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†

† Not applicable.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, National Teacher and Principal Survey (NTPS), "Public School Teacher and Private School Teacher Data Files," 2017–18.

Table A-4. Standard errors for Table 4: Percentage distribution of school teachers, by highest degree earned, school type, and selected school characteristics: 2017–18

School type and selected school characteristic	Less than a bachelor's degree	Bachelor's degree	Master's degree	Higher than a master's degree
All schools	0.12	0.34	0.32	0.18
All public schools	0.10	0.36	0.36	0.20
School classification				
Traditional public	0.10	0.38	0.38	0.20
Charter school	0.40	1.10	0.97	0.59
Community type				
City	0.17	0.62	0.59	0.36
Suburban	0.18	0.61	0.63	0.34
Town	0.33	1.00	0.97	0.48
Rural	0.25	0.73	0.77	0.35
School level				
Primary	0.15	0.55	0.55	0.28
Middle	0.21	0.81	0.71	0.50
High	0.25	0.69	0.69	0.37
Combined	0.31	0.95	0.96	0.48
Student enrollment				
Less than 100	0.93	2.78	3.00	1.33
100–199	0.56	1.80	1.87	0.75
200–499	0.19	0.68	0.64	0.34
500–749	0.21	0.73	0.72	0.35
750–999	0.32	1.07	1.00	0.49
1,000 or more	0.24	0.74	0.74	0.39
Percent of K–12 students who were approved for free or reduced-price lunches				
0–34	0.23	0.68	0.70	0.34
35–49	0.27	0.84	0.92	0.46
50–74	0.22	0.71	0.67	0.39
75 or more	0.17	0.72	0.73	0.35

See notes at end of table.

Table A-4. Standard errors for Table 4: Percentage distribution of school teachers, by highest degree earned, school type, and selected school characteristics:  
2017–18—Continued

School type and selected school characteristic	Less than a bachelor's degree	Bachelor's degree	Master's degree	Higher than a master's degree
All private schools	0.53	0.83	0.80	0.37
School classification				
Catholic	0.77	1.47	1.28	0.58
Other religious	†	†	†	†
Nonsectarian	†	†	†	†
Community type				
City	0.78	1.26	1.35	0.61
Suburban	0.82	1.23	1.30	0.60
Town	2.76	2.81	2.67	1.17
Rural	1.97	1.99	1.91	1.10
School level				
Elementary	0.83	1.50	1.42	0.63
Secondary	0.83	1.54	1.58	0.72
Combined	†	†	†	†
Student enrollment				
Less than 100	†	†	†	†
100–199	1.21	1.73	1.56	0.99
200–499	0.79	1.50	1.48	0.62
500–749	0.93	2.31	2.20	0.92
750 or more	†	†	†	†

† Not applicable.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, National Teacher and Principal Survey (NTPS), "Public School Teacher and Private School Teacher Data Files," 2017–18.

Table A-5. Standard errors for Table 5: Among regular full-time school teachers, average base salary and earnings from all sources, percentage of teachers with earnings from various salary supplements, and among those teachers, the average amount earned from the supplement during the current school year, by school type and selected school characteristics: 2017–18

School type and selected school characteristic	Average base teaching salary of regular full-time teachers	Average school year earnings from all sources	Salary supplements							
			Extracurricular or additional activities in same school system		Additional compensation based on students' performance		Other school system sources (state supplement, etc.)		Job outside the school system	
			Percent of teachers	Average amount	Percent of teachers	Average amount	Percent of teachers	Average amount	Percent of teachers	Average amount
All schools	160	170	0.33	40	0.25	40	0.19	120	0.23	120
All public schools	170	180	0.36	40	0.28	40	0.20	130	0.24	130
School classification										
Traditional public	180	180	0.38	40	0.29	40	0.21	130	0.25	130
Charter school	390	410	1.08	100	1.01	100	0.53	300	0.75	710
Community type										
City	320	330	0.67	80	0.49	80	0.35	240	0.44	230
Suburban	360	370	0.65	70	0.51	70	0.31	240	0.44	210
Town	330	370	1.07	90	0.63	140	0.59	180	0.73	490
Rural	350	370	0.73	70	0.54	70	0.47	160	0.61	230
School level										
Primary	270	270	0.54	50	0.43	60	0.30	220	0.36	210
Middle	460	470	0.82	80	0.52	60	0.48	280	0.57	270
High	390	390	0.70	80	0.52	90	0.37	190	0.52	210
Combined	440	490	1.06	100	0.72	80	0.67	300	0.82	550
Student enrollment										
Less than 100	1,470	1,820	2.27	200	0.96	180	1.40	640	2.26	1,710
100–199	710	710	1.79	160	0.98	130	1.00	620	1.42	500
200–499	310	310	0.69	60	0.41	70	0.35	230	0.44	210
500–749	380	380	0.70	70	0.52	80	0.39	270	0.44	230
750–999	550	570	0.88	80	0.76	80	0.57	350	0.64	270
1,000 or more	420	420	0.76	80	0.64	80	0.41	190	0.59	260
Percent of K–12 students who were approved for free or reduced-price lunches										
0–34	390	390	0.75	80	0.55	60	0.34	300	0.52	240
35–49	450	460	0.94	80	0.59	120	0.51	350	0.63	200
50–74	330	340	0.76	70	0.64	80	0.39	190	0.53	300
75 or more	320	320	0.65	70	0.43	70	0.37	150	0.37	260

See notes at end of table.

Table A-5. Standard errors for Table 5: Among regular full-time school teachers, average base salary and earnings from all sources, percentage of teachers with earnings from various salary supplements, and among those teachers, the average amount earned from the supplement during the current school year, by school type and selected school characteristics: 2017–18—Continued

School type and selected school characteristic	Average base teaching salary of regular full-time teachers	Average school year earnings from all sources	Salary supplements							
			Extracurricular or additional activities in same school system		Additional compensation based on students' performance		Other school system sources (state supplement, etc.)		Job outside the school system	
			Percent of teachers	Average amount	Percent of teachers	Average amount	Percent of teachers	Average amount	Percent of teachers	Average amount
All private schools	500	550	0.89	110	0.12	540	0.53	250	0.74	380
School classification										
Catholic	580	610	1.42	130	0.18	640	0.91	370	1.34	500
Other religious	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Nonsectarian	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Community type										
City	850	990	1.39	190	0.16	790	0.89	380	1.20	660
Suburban	680	710	1.49	170	0.21	170	0.85	340	0.96	560
Town	980	1,450	2.59	420	†	2,630	1.66	1,290	2.77	410
Rural	830	920	2.24	240	†	40	1.00	800	1.91	730
School level										
Elementary	720	900	1.34	330	0.25	860	1.03	500	1.37	750
Secondary	940	990	1.77	150	0.20	†	1.02	400	1.42	590
Combined	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Student enrollment										
Less than 100	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
100–199	750	830	1.61	190	†	260	1.66	630	1.59	730
200–499	850	1,010	1.51	220	0.25	790	0.92	490	1.22	780
500–749	1,170	1,200	2.47	250	0.38	1,180	1.17	500	1.62	1,010
750 or more	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†

† Not applicable.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, National Teacher and Principal Survey (NTPS), "Public School Teacher and Private School Teacher Data Files," 2017–18.

Table A-6a. Standard errors for Table 6a: Average class size in public schools, by school level, class type, and selected school characteristics: 2017–18

Selected school characteristic	Primary schools		Middle schools		High schools		Combined grade schools	
	Average class size for teachers in self-contained classes	Average class size for teachers in departmentalized instruction	Average class size for teachers in self-contained classes	Average class size for teachers in departmentalized instruction	Average class size for teachers in self-contained classes	Average class size for teachers in departmentalized instruction	Average class size for teachers in self-contained classes	Average class size for teachers in departmentalized instruction
All public schools	0.08	0.44	1.00	0.19	0.58	0.13	0.42	0.32
School classification								
Traditional public	0.08	0.49	1.03	0.19	0.59	0.13	0.44	0.38
Charter school	0.32	0.75	2.69	1.04	3.18	0.64	0.85	0.50
Community type								
City	0.16	0.92	1.57	0.38	1.11	0.24	1.02	0.95
Suburban	0.14	0.91	1.56	0.25	1.03	0.20	1.35	0.79
Town	0.21	1.30	2.42	0.53	1.15	0.31	1.23	1.04
Rural	0.19	0.72	3.06	0.44	1.43	0.32	0.45	0.34
Student enrollment								
Less than 100	0.81	2.04	†	1.05	3.49	2.17	0.45	1.05
100–199	0.54	1.03	4.29	0.81	3.00	0.64	0.62	1.03
200–499	0.12	0.64	2.12	0.37	2.02	0.31	0.54	0.34
500–749	0.15	0.85	1.60	0.36	1.65	0.34	1.25	0.59
750–999	0.26	1.66	1.70	0.34	1.87	0.36	0.85	0.78
1,000 or more	0.56	1.06	2.90	0.36	0.71	0.17	1.36	0.62
Percent of K–12 students who were approved for free or reduced-price lunches								
0–34	0.70	1.83	2.89	0.82	1.95	0.62	1.47	1.24
35–49	0.20	1.33	1.77	0.41	0.84	0.32	1.06	0.68
50–74	0.17	0.85	2.77	0.36	1.16	0.27	0.64	0.63
75 or more	0.15	0.76	1.40	0.39	1.26	0.29	0.72	0.68

† Not applicable.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, National Teacher and Principal Survey (NTPS), "Public School Teacher Data File," 2017–18.

Table A-6b. Standard errors for Table 6b: Average class size in private schools, by school level, class type, and selected school characteristics: 2017–18

Selected school characteristic	Elementary schools		Secondary schools		Combined grade schools	
	Average class size for teachers in self-contained classes	Average class size for teachers in departmentalized instruction	Average class size for teachers in self-contained classes	Average class size for teachers in departmentalized instruction	Average class size for teachers in self-contained classes	Average class size for teachers in departmentalized instruction
All private schools	0.29	0.42	0.76	0.27	†	†
School classification						
Catholic	0.39	0.56	1.19	0.31	†	†
Other religious	†	†	†	†	†	†
Nonsectarian	†	†	†	†	†	†
Community type						
City	0.47	0.74	1.12	0.43	†	†
Suburban	0.38	0.51	1.12	0.50	†	†
Town	0.77	1.31	2.76	0.99	†	†
Rural	0.54	0.84	1.52	0.75	†	†
Student enrollment						
Less than 100	†	†	†	†	†	†
100–199	0.43	0.51	1.62	0.67	†	†
200–499	0.43	0.64	1.13	0.43	†	†
500–749	1.47	1.88	1.19	0.58	†	†
750 or more	†	†	†	†	†	†

† Not applicable.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, National Teacher and Principal Survey (NTPS), "Private School Teacher Data File," 2017–18.

Table A-7. Standard errors for Table 7: Percentage of teachers who took graduate or undergraduate courses in selected subject areas prior to their first year of teaching, by course subject area, school type, and selected school characteristics: 2017–18

School type and selected school characteristic	Classroom management techniques	Lesson planning	Learning assessment	Using student performance data to inform instruction	Serving students from diverse economic backgrounds	Serving students with special needs	Teaching students who are limited-English proficient (LEP) or English-language learners (ELLs)
All schools	0.29	0.25	0.26	0.31	0.30	0.30	0.29
All public schools	0.31	0.27	0.27	0.33	0.31	0.31	0.32
School classification							
Traditional public	0.31	0.27	0.28	0.34	0.32	0.32	0.34
Charter school	1.00	0.92	0.96	1.07	0.98	0.98	1.00
Community type							
City	0.56	0.46	0.47	0.60	0.59	0.58	0.59
Suburban	0.50	0.50	0.49	0.61	0.51	0.51	0.56
Town	0.70	0.65	0.75	0.85	0.79	0.77	0.83
Rural	0.61	0.56	0.58	0.66	0.70	0.68	0.68
School level							
Primary	0.46	0.41	0.43	0.53	0.48	0.50	0.54
Middle	0.72	0.63	0.65	0.79	0.69	0.66	0.71
High	0.55	0.50	0.59	0.61	0.63	0.62	0.61
Combined	0.83	0.75	0.79	0.92	0.87	0.82	0.93
Student enrollment							
Less than 100	2.16	2.05	2.20	3.03	2.48	2.63	2.31
100–199	1.35	1.35	1.31	1.47	1.53	1.59	1.54
200–499	0.52	0.46	0.48	0.58	0.50	0.52	0.60
500–749	0.57	0.54	0.55	0.63	0.60	0.64	0.70
750–999	0.80	0.76	0.76	0.99	0.87	0.89	0.91
1,000 or more	0.63	0.56	0.60	0.67	0.64	0.63	0.63
Percent of K–12 students who were approved for free or reduced-price lunches							
0–34	0.54	0.47	0.53	0.61	0.61	0.52	0.64
35–49	0.70	0.60	0.66	0.87	0.89	0.72	0.86
50–74	0.61	0.54	0.59	0.68	0.60	0.65	0.71
75 or more	0.53	0.48	0.47	0.58	0.55	0.61	0.64

See note at end of table.



Table A-7. Standard errors for Table 7: Percentage of teachers who took graduate or undergraduate courses in selected subject areas prior to their first year of teaching, by course subject area, school type, and selected school characteristics: 2017–18—Continued

School type and selected school characteristic	Classroom management techniques	Lesson planning	Learning assessment	Using student performance data to inform instruction	Serving students from diverse economic backgrounds	Serving students with special needs	Teaching students who are limited-English proficient (LEP) or English-language learners (ELLs)
All private schools	0.72	0.75	0.75	0.81	0.76	0.81	0.68
School classification							
Catholic	1.24	1.23	1.29	1.33	1.40	1.39	1.20
Other religious	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Nonsectarian	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Community type							
City	1.12	1.13	1.12	1.22	1.16	1.13	1.09
Suburban	1.21	1.14	1.11	1.26	1.19	1.35	1.16
Town	3.05	3.07	2.82	3.17	3.00	3.03	2.50
Rural	1.89	1.95	1.93	1.85	1.77	2.14	1.53
School level							
Elementary	1.32	1.20	1.27	1.37	1.43	1.41	1.25
Secondary	1.58	1.54	1.44	1.50	1.45	1.61	1.22
Combined	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Student enrollment							
Less than 100	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
100–199	1.83	1.61	1.50	1.74	1.77	1.82	1.58
200–499	1.23	1.18	1.30	1.47	1.34	1.49	1.22
500–749	2.14	2.14	2.04	2.12	2.15	2.08	1.82
750 or more	†	†	†	†	†	†	†

† Not applicable.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, National Teacher and Principal Survey (NTPS), "Public School Teacher and Private School Teacher Data Files," 2017–18.

Table A-8. Standard errors for Table 8: Percentage of teachers who were evaluated during the last school year, and among those teachers, percentage that agreed with different statements, by school type and selected school characteristics: 2017–18

School type and selected school characteristic	Percent of evaluated teachers who agreed with different statements							
	Percent of teachers who were evaluated last school year	Overall, the evaluation process was fair	The evaluation process was based on what is known about good teaching practice	I had a strong understanding of how I would be evaluated at this school	The evaluation process helped me to determine whether I had been successful with my students	The evaluation process had a positive effect on my teaching	Overall, the evaluation process led to improved student learning	The results of my evaluation were accurate
All schools	0.29	0.25	0.23	0.21	0.34	0.33	0.34	0.27
All public schools	0.31	0.27	0.25	0.23	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.29
School classification								
Traditional public	0.33	0.28	0.25	0.24	0.38	0.37	0.38	0.31
Charter school	0.96	0.77	0.73	0.75	0.91	0.94	0.98	0.81
Community type								
City	0.56	0.50	0.44	0.45	0.64	0.58	0.61	0.53
Suburban	0.54	0.45	0.45	0.35	0.59	0.60	0.63	0.47
Town	0.76	0.66	0.60	0.60	0.97	0.94	1.05	0.73
Rural	0.63	0.51	0.50	0.44	0.73	0.78	0.79	0.56
School level								
Primary	0.50	0.42	0.39	0.36	0.56	0.53	0.57	0.47
Middle	0.69	0.60	0.48	0.51	0.75	0.82	0.84	0.58
High	0.54	0.47	0.46	0.42	0.63	0.69	0.69	0.48
Combined	0.95	0.77	0.78	0.74	0.97	0.93	0.93	0.80
Student enrollment								
Less than 100	1.90	1.46	1.33	1.83	2.36	2.13	1.97	1.56
100–199	1.60	1.31	1.33	1.21	1.73	1.74	1.83	1.15
200–499	0.54	0.46	0.40	0.40	0.65	0.58	0.59	0.47
500–749	0.61	0.58	0.57	0.47	0.71	0.73	0.77	0.59
750–999	0.83	0.74	0.64	0.64	0.91	0.91	0.98	0.72
1,000 or more	0.61	0.51	0.51	0.46	0.68	0.71	0.72	0.56
Percent of K–12 students who were approved for free or reduced-price lunches								
0–34	0.57	0.44	0.42	0.37	0.62	0.65	0.66	0.47
35–49	0.80	0.60	0.56	0.53	0.84	0.83	0.83	0.65
50–74	0.65	0.57	0.56	0.50	0.81	0.79	0.81	0.60
75 or more	0.56	0.46	0.45	0.43	0.61	0.58	0.61	0.53

See notes at end of table.

Table A-8. Standard errors for Table 8: Percentage of teachers who were evaluated during the last school year, and among those teachers, percentage that agreed with different statements, by school type and selected school characteristics: 2017–18—Continued

School type and selected school characteristic	Percent of evaluated teachers who agreed with different statements							
	Percent of teachers who were evaluated last school year	Overall, the evaluation process was fair	The evaluation process was based on what is known about good teaching practice	I had a strong understanding of how I would be evaluated at this school	The evaluation process helped me to determine whether I had been successful with my students	The evaluation process had a positive effect on my teaching	Overall, the evaluation process led to improved student learning	The results of my evaluation were accurate
All private schools	0.78	0.48	0.55	0.69	0.67	0.69	0.72	0.52
School classification								
Catholic	1.09	0.95	0.97	1.12	1.25	1.23	1.22	1.00
Other religious	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Nonsectarian	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Community type								
City	1.17	0.82	0.90	1.06	1.06	1.04	1.13	0.90
Suburban	1.31	0.88	0.93	1.12	1.09	1.16	1.17	0.95
Town	3.03	1.76	1.85	2.23	2.46	2.11	2.36	1.97
Rural	2.31	1.29	1.22	1.46	1.53	1.52	1.50	1.21
School level								
Elementary	1.26	0.97	0.99	1.18	1.18	1.19	1.30	1.05
Secondary	1.37	0.76	0.94	1.30	1.21	1.35	1.41	0.82
Combined	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Student enrollment								
Less than 100	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
100–199	1.74	0.98	1.20	1.31	1.46	1.46	1.47	1.05
200–499	1.41	0.97	1.00	1.27	1.22	1.19	1.30	1.01
500–749	1.80	1.21	1.30	1.57	2.02	1.89	2.16	1.37
750 or more	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†

† Not applicable.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, National Teacher and Principal Survey (NTPS), "Public School Teacher and Private School Teacher Data Files," 2017–18.

Table A-9. Standard errors for Table 9: Percentage of teachers who participated in any professional development during the last school year, and among all teachers, percentage of teachers who agreed with different statements about professional development at their school, by school type and selected school characteristics: 2017–18

School type and selected school characteristic	Percent of teachers who agreed with different statements about their professional development at their school							
	Percent of teachers who participated in any professional development during last school year	I have sufficient resources available for my professional development	I have access to about the same amount of resources for professional development as other teachers	My professional development opportunities are aligned with this school's performance goals	The techniques I'm learning about in my professional development will help improve student achievement	I feel capable of incorporating the kinds of techniques I'm learning in my professional development	The types of professional development available to me are consistent with my own professional goals	I have the opportunity to provide feedback to school leaders about my professional development experience to determine its value and impact
All schools	0.07	0.28	0.26	0.25	0.24	0.22	0.27	0.28
All public schools	0.05	0.30	0.30	0.26	0.27	0.23	0.30	0.31
School classification								
Traditional public	0.05	0.31	0.31	0.28	0.28	0.24	0.31	0.32
Charter school	0.19	0.87	0.79	0.71	0.70	0.62	0.91	0.90
Community type								
City	0.07	0.54	0.48	0.42	0.40	0.32	0.47	0.50
Suburban	0.08	0.49	0.48	0.45	0.47	0.41	0.52	0.54
Town	0.15	0.75	0.68	0.63	0.64	0.54	0.77	0.78
Rural	0.10	0.58	0.54	0.49	0.56	0.43	0.62	0.60
School level								
Primary	0.06	0.50	0.47	0.40	0.40	0.33	0.45	0.53
Middle	0.11	0.63	0.57	0.56	0.57	0.44	0.61	0.66
High	0.11	0.57	0.49	0.41	0.54	0.41	0.61	0.54
Combined	0.16	0.86	0.77	0.72	0.65	0.59	0.78	0.82
Student enrollment								
Less than 100	0.75	1.60	1.64	1.47	1.48	1.14	1.98	1.62
100–199	0.19	1.42	1.17	1.23	1.06	0.93	1.42	1.58
200–499	0.07	0.54	0.45	0.46	0.43	0.36	0.56	0.55
500–749	0.07	0.61	0.55	0.51	0.53	0.41	0.61	0.67
750–999	0.17	0.85	0.80	0.66	0.69	0.63	0.82	0.84
1,000 or more	0.10	0.66	0.57	0.51	0.56	0.44	0.61	0.58
Percent of K–12 students who were approved for free or reduced-price lunches								
0–34	0.09	0.52	0.49	0.47	0.50	0.39	0.52	0.52
35–49	0.14	0.68	0.60	0.57	0.66	0.57	0.69	0.67
50–74	0.10	0.66	0.63	0.55	0.50	0.45	0.60	0.63
75 or more	0.07	0.56	0.50	0.43	0.43	0.35	0.52	0.58

See notes at end of table.

Table A-9. Standard errors for Table 9: Percentage of teachers who participated in any professional development during the last school year, and among all teachers, percentage of teachers who agreed with different statements about professional development at their school, by school type and selected school characteristics: 2017–18—Continued

School type and selected school characteristic	Percent of teachers who agreed with different statements about their professional development at their school							
	Percent of teachers who participated in any professional development during last school year	I have sufficient resources available for my professional development	I have access to about the same amount of resources for professional development as other teachers	My professional development opportunities are aligned with this school's performance goals	The techniques I'm learning about in my professional development will help improve student achievement	I feel capable of incorporating the kinds of techniques I'm learning in my professional development	The types of professional development available to me are consistent with my own professional goals	I have the opportunity to provide feedback to school leaders about my professional development experience to determine its value and impact
All private schools	0.40	0.70	0.62	0.62	0.51	0.50	0.60	0.66
School classification								
Catholic	0.44	1.14	1.08	1.01	0.82	0.79	1.07	1.17
Other religious	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Nonsectarian	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Community type								
City	0.59	1.11	0.97	0.97	0.87	0.77	0.97	1.01
Suburban	0.53	1.06	0.97	1.03	0.79	0.77	0.98	1.04
Town	2.59	2.46	2.28	2.07	1.95	1.87	2.35	2.50
Rural	1.35	1.68	1.71	1.44	1.22	1.09	1.38	1.45
School level								
Elementary	0.57	1.17	1.21	1.09	0.88	0.83	1.13	1.18
Secondary	0.63	1.29	1.14	1.22	0.92	0.87	1.12	1.22
Combined	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Student enrollment								
Less than 100	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
100–199	0.81	1.55	1.41	1.37	1.20	1.13	1.45	1.37
200–499	0.44	1.15	1.06	1.05	0.91	0.88	1.04	1.19
500–749	1.06	1.74	1.56	1.55	1.29	1.35	1.57	1.68
750 or more	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†

† Not applicable.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, National Teacher and Principal Survey (NTPS), "Public School Teacher and Private School Teacher Data Files," 2017–18.

## **Appendix B: Methodology and Technical Notes**

## Overview of the NTPS Teacher Survey

The National Teacher and Principal Survey (NTPS) is sponsored by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) of the Institute of Education Sciences within the U.S. Department of Education and is conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau. NTPS is a state and nationally representative sample survey of public and private K–12 schools, principals, and teachers in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. The NTPS was first conducted during the 2015–16 school year, and 2017–18 is the second NTPS collection.

The 2017–18 NTPS consisted of questionnaires for six types of respondents: public schools, private schools, public school principals, private school principals, public school teachers, and private school teachers. The information can be linked across teachers, principals, and schools by each sector (public and private). There are separate questionnaires and data files for each type of respondent by sector (public school, private school, public school principal, private school principal, public school teacher, and private school teacher). For the content of the questionnaires, see <https://nces.ed.gov/surveys/ntps/question1718.asp>.

NTPS was designed to produce national, regional, and state estimates for public elementary and secondary schools, principals, and teachers, including public charter schools and the principals and teachers within them. For private schools, the sample supports national, regional, and affiliation strata estimates for schools, principals, and teachers. Comparisons between public and private schools and their principals and teachers are possible only at the regional and national levels, because private schools were selected for sampling by affiliation strata and region rather than state. Additionally, the teacher survey was designed to produce national estimates of teachers by subject matter taught and by full-time or part-time status.

For additional information on the specific NTPS-related topics discussed in this appendix, consult the *Survey Documentation for the 2017–18 National Teacher and Principal Survey* (Cox et al. forthcoming) or the *User's Manual for the 2017–18 National Teacher and Principal Survey, Volumes 1–4* (Goldring et al. NCES 2019-211 through 2019-213 and 2020-214). To access additional general information on NTPS or for electronic copies of the questionnaires, go to the NTPS home page (<https://nces.ed.gov/surveys/ntps>).

## Sampling Frames and Sample Selection

Teachers were defined as staff members who teach regularly scheduled classes to students in any of grades K–12. Teacher Listing Forms (TLF) (i.e., teacher rosters) were collected from sampled schools, by mail and online. Teacher lists were also purchased from an external vendor. Some schools received a prepopulated TLF, based on vendor data, and were asked to update or correct the lists. The goal was to increase the accuracy of the vendor lists while reducing respondent burden. When a school did not return either a blank or prepopulated TLF, teacher names were obtained by researching school websites or using vendor data. Along with the names and e-mail addresses of teachers, sampled schools were asked to provide information about each teacher's teaching status (full or part time) and subject matter taught (special education, general elementary, math, science, English/language arts, social studies, vocational/technical, or other).

Sampling was done on an ongoing basis throughout the roster collection period. Prior to allocating teachers to sampling strata, the Census Bureau first allocated an overall number of teachers to be selected. The maximum number of sampled teachers per school was set at 20, in order to avoid overburdening a school by sampling too large a proportion of its teachers. An average of seven to nine teachers were

selected per public school, depending on the school's grade range, school size, urbanicity, and poverty status. For private schools, an average of two to four teachers per school were selected, depending on affiliation, school size, and region. Within each sampled school (both public and private), teachers were stratified by subject, as follows: math, science, English/language arts, social studies, and everything else. No oversampling by subject was performed. Teachers within a school domain and teacher stratum were sorted by the subject matter taught and the teacher line number code. The teacher line number is a unique number assigned to identify the individual within the teacher list. Within each teacher stratum in each school, teachers were selected systematically with equal probability.

For 86 percent of eligible public schools and 74 percent of eligible private schools, teacher lists were obtained from either the school, a clerical operation, or a list purchased from a vendor. The remaining 14 percent of eligible public and 26 percent of eligible private schools did not provide teacher lists to use for sampling teachers. Teacher Listing Forms were collected from schools in the 2017–18 NTPS public and private schools sampling frame. The starting point of the public school sampling frame was the preliminary 2014–15 Common Core of Data (CCD) Nonfiscal School Universe data file.<sup>1</sup> The sampling frame was adjusted from the CCD to fit the definition of a school eligible for NTPS. To be eligible for NTPS, a school was defined as an institution or part of an institution that provides classroom instruction to students, has one or more teachers to provide instruction, serves students in one or more of grades 1–12 or the ungraded equivalent, and is located in one or more buildings apart from a private home. It was possible for two or more schools to share the same building; in that case, they were treated as different schools if they had different administrators (i.e., principal or school head). This definition is unchanged from the Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS).

The 2017–18 NTPS universe of schools is confined to the 50 states plus the District of Columbia and excludes the other jurisdictions, Department of Defense overseas schools, and CCD schools that do not offer teacher-provided classroom instruction in grades 1–12 or the ungraded equivalent. This last group includes schools that are essentially administrative units that may oversee entities that provide classroom instruction or may only provide funding and oversight. Although Bureau of Indian Education-funded (BIE) schools are eligible for NTPS, these schools were not oversampled and the data do not support separate BIE estimates.

The NTPS definition of a school is generally similar to the CCD definition, with some exceptions. NTPS allows schools to define themselves. During SASS collection, Census Bureau staff observed that in situations where two or more schools have the same administration, these schools were reported separately on CCD but generally reported as one entity for SASS. Thus, CCD schools with the same location, address, and phone number were collapsed during the frame building on the assumption that the respondent would consider them to be one school. Due to similarities with SASS, NTPS also followed the same type of collapsing procedure. A set of rules was applied to determine in which instances school records should be collapsed together. When school records were collapsed together, the student and teacher counts, grade ranges, and names as reported to CCD were all modified to reflect the change.

Finally, since CCD and NTPS differ in scope and their definition of a school, some records were deleted, added, or modified to provide better coverage and a more efficient sample design for NTPS. For a detailed list of frame modifications, see the *Survey Documentation for the 2017–18 National Teacher and Principal Survey* (Cox et al. forthcoming). After deleting, collapsing, and adding school records, the NTPS public school sampling frame consisted of about 86,800 traditional public schools and 6,800 public charter schools.

---

<sup>1</sup> For more information about CCD, see <https://nces.ed.gov/ccd/>.



Most of the NTPS private school sample comes from a list frame, which is constructed by matching various sources of private school lists at a national level. The 2017–18 NTPS list frame was formed by combining the 2015–16 Private School Survey (PSS) list frame and the 2015–16 PSS certainty area frame, which consists of schools found via area sampling in the eight certainty PSUs included in the 2015–16 PSS (for an explanation of PPS sampling, see Cochran 1977). In order to provide coverage of private schools founded since 2016 and to improve coverage of private schools existing in 2016, the Census Bureau collected membership lists during the summer of 2016 from private school associations and religious denominations. The associations were asked to list all schools meeting the PSS school definition. The 50 states and the District of Columbia were also asked to provide lists of private schools meeting the PSS definition of a school. These lists were matched and combined with the foundational list frame from the 2015–16 PSS and the noncertainty area frame from the 2015–16 PSS, consisting of all schools found in PSUs that were not selected with certainty to create the private school sampling frame for the 2017–18 NTPS. The area frame in the 2015–16 PSS, for both certainty and noncertainty PSUs, was constructed by clerical searches of sources such as yellow pages (yp.com), local Catholic dioceses, local education agencies, and local government offices.<sup>2</sup> The private school sampling frame consisted of about 24,860 private schools.

## Data Collection Procedures

The 2017–18 NTPS employed a combined mail-based and internet survey approach, with subsequent telephone and in-person follow-up. Data collection included the Teacher Listing Form (TLF), the Principal Questionnaire, the School Questionnaire, and the Teacher Questionnaire. This report focuses on the Teacher Questionnaire.

In preparation for school-level data collection, advance letters were mailed to the sampled schools in July 2017 to verify their addresses. Initial school packages were mailed in September 2017.<sup>3</sup> Next, schools were telephoned to verify school information, establish a survey coordinator, and follow up on the Teacher Listing Form if the school had not already provided an electronic teacher list. Teacher questionnaires were mailed to schools on a flow basis as teachers were sampled on an ongoing basis. The in-person follow-up period was preceded by phone calls from the telephone centers to remind the survey coordinators to have staff complete and return all forms. Nonresponding teachers were also called from the telephone centers and asked to complete the questionnaire by phone. Data collection ended in August 2018.

One of the main goals of the data collection plan for the 2017–18 NTPS was to target the schools that presented a challenge to data collection during previous administrations of SASS and NTPS. During the sampling stage, certain types of schools with historically low response rates were identified as well as schools with a potentially large impact on weighting. These schools were then placed on a priority track for data collection with additional strategies to improve response (priority schools).

Contact strategies that were more proactive were employed during the early phases of data collection of the 2017–18 NTPS to mitigate potential low response rates for these cases, such as in-person visits by Census field representatives. The data collection procedures also used survey coordinators to improve response. The role of the survey coordinator was to be the primary contact person at the school. A survey

---

<sup>2</sup> More details on the creation of the list and area frames for the 2015–16 PSS can be found in Broughman, S., Rettig, A., Peterson, J., and Westra, A., (2018). *Private School Universe Survey (PSS): Survey Documentation for School Year 2015–16 (NCES 2018-062)*. U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved 3/5/2020 from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch>.

<sup>3</sup> The NTPS school package contained a letter to the principal or survey coordinator, sealed envelope containing letter with login info for the Teacher Listing Form, sealed envelope containing letter with login info for the Principal Questionnaire, and sealed envelope containing letter with login info for the School Questionnaire.

coordinator’s duties included facilitating data collection by passing out questionnaires to the appropriate staff, reminding the staff to complete their questionnaires, and collecting the questionnaires to return. The data follow-up strategies for schools varied based on response propensity, with early field operations aimed at those schools least likely to respond to the TLF.

In addition to the targeted collection strategies mentioned above, the 2017–18 NTPS teacher data collection included a randomized incentive experiment. Treatments were randomly assigned at the school level, so that all sampled teachers in a sampled school received an incentive or no sampled teachers in a sampled school received an incentive. Teacher sampling took place in waves. As part of an experiment, teachers from schools in an experimental group received advance incentives for participation. Teachers from the first 12 waves of sampling in both priority and nonpriority schools received a \$5 incentive for completing the survey. For teachers sampled in waves 13 through 20, a combination of teachers, school coordinators, and principals received incentives (\$5 for nonpriority schools, \$10 for priority schools).<sup>7</sup>

The web was the primary mode of data collection for all questionnaire types for the 2017–18 NTPS. Paper questionnaires were introduced in later mailings, with some exceptions for the TLF.

## Data Processing and Imputation

For questionnaires completed on paper, Census Bureau checked the questionnaires, keyed the data, and implemented quality control procedures. These data were combined with responses from questionnaires completed online, and those that had a preliminary classification of a complete interview were submitted to a series of computer edits consisting of a range check, a consistency edit,<sup>4</sup> a blanking edit,<sup>5</sup> and a logic edit.<sup>6</sup> After these edits were implemented and reviewed by analysts, the records were put through another edit to make a final determination as to whether the case was eligible for the survey and whether sufficient data had been collected for the case to be classified as a complete interview.

After the final edits were run, cases with “not-answered” values for items remained. Values were imputed for these cases using two main approaches. First, donor respondent methods, such as hot-deck imputation, were used. Second, if no suitable donor case could be matched, the few remaining items were imputed using mean or mode from groups of similar cases to impute a value to the item with missing data. After each stage of imputation, computer edits were run again to verify that the imputed data were consistent with the existing questionnaire data. If that was not the case, an imputed value was blanked out by one of these computer edits due to inconsistency with other data within the same questionnaire or because it was out of the range of acceptable values. In these situations, Census Bureau analysts looked at the items and tried to determine an appropriate value. Edit and imputation flags, indicating which edit or imputation method was used, were assigned to each relevant survey variable. For further information, see the sections on data processing and imputation in the *Survey Documentation for the 2017–18 National Teacher and Principal Survey* (Cox et al. forthcoming).

## Response Rates

**Unit response rates.** The unit response rate indicates the percentage of sampled cases that met the definition of a complete interview. The weighted NTPS unit response rate was produced by dividing the

---

<sup>4</sup> The consistency edits identified inconsistent entries within each case and, whenever possible, corrected them. If the inconsistencies could not be corrected, the inconsistent entries were deleted.

<sup>5</sup> Blanking edits delete answers to questions that should not have been filled in (e.g., if a respondent followed a wrong skip pattern).

<sup>6</sup> Data were added to questionnaire records during the logic edits, which filled in some items where data were missing or incomplete using other information on the same questionnaire or from other related data sources.

weighted number of respondents who completed questionnaires by the weighted number of eligible sampled cases, using the initial base weight (the inverse of the probability of selection).<sup>7</sup> Table B-1 summarizes the weighted unit response rates for each survey type.

Table B-1. Weighted unit and overall response rates using initial base weight, by survey: 2017–18

Survey	Unit response rate (percent)	Overall response rate (percent) <sup>1</sup>
Public School Teacher Listing Form	87.1	†
Private School Teacher Listing Form	71.0	†
Public School Teacher	76.9	67.0
Private School Teacher	75.9	53.9

† Not applicable.

<sup>1</sup> Weighted Teacher questionnaire response rate times the weighted Teacher Listing Form response rate.

NOTE: Response rates were weighted using the inverse of the probability of selection (initial base weight).

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, National Teacher and Principal Survey (NTPS), "Public School Teacher and Private School Teacher Documentation Data Files," 2017–18.

**Overall response rate.** The overall response rate represents the response rate to the survey taking into consideration each stage of the survey. For teachers, the overall response rate is calculated as the product of the response rate to two stages: the TLF and the teacher questionnaire.<sup>8</sup> The weighted overall response rate using the initial base weight for public school teachers was 67.0 percent, and for private school teachers was 53.9 percent.

**Unit nonresponse bias analysis.** Because the *NCES Statistical Standards* (4-4) require analysis of nonresponse bias for any survey stage with a base-weighted response rate less than 85 percent, the NTPS teacher file was evaluated for potential bias. National-level estimates were first examined for potential bias. The base-weighted<sup>9</sup> unit response rate was calculated. The following frame characteristics were used for the Public School Teachers Data File:

- *Charter status:* noncharter, charter;
- *Enrollment:* less than 100, 100 to less than 200, 200 to less than 500, 500 to less than 750, 750 to less than 1,000, 1,000 or more;
- *Percent of enrollment with race other than White:* less than 5 percent, 5 to less than 10 percent, 10 to less than 20 percent, 20 to less than 30 percent, 30 to less than 50 percent, 50 percent or more;
- *Percent free or reduced-price lunch eligible:* less than 35 percent, 35 to less than 50 percent, 50 to less than 75 percent, 75 percent or more;
- *Community type (locale):* city, suburb, town, rural;
- *Pupil-teacher ratio:* less than 10, 10 to less than 15, 15 to less than 20, 20 or more;
- *Grade level:* primary, middle, high, combined;
- *Region:* Northeast, Midwest, South, West;
- *Number of teachers:* less than 10, 10 to less than 25, 25 to less than 50, 50 to less than 75, 75 or more;

<sup>7</sup> For the formula used to calculate the unit response rate, see *2012 Revision of NCES Statistical Standards: Final* (NCES 2014-097).

<sup>8</sup> For the formula used to calculate the overall response rate, see *2012 Revision of NCES Statistical Standards: Final* (NCES 2014-097).

<sup>9</sup> Unit nonresponse bias analysis for the TLF stage was conducted using the base weight, defined as the product of the initial base weight (the inverse of the probability of selection) and the sampling adjustment factor. The sampling adjustment factor is an adjustment that accounts for circumstances that affect the school's probability of selection that are identified after the data collection has begun, such as a merger, duplication, or incorrect building-level collapsing (e.g., a junior high school and a senior high school merge to become a junior/senior high school). Unit nonresponse bias analysis at the teacher level used the base weights of the teacher's school, multiplied by a factor to account for TLF nonresponse at the school level and divided by the teacher's selection probability within the school.

- *Title I status:* Title I program, Title I noneligible, Title I eligible but no Title I program;
- *Teacher status:* full-time, part-time, not reported;
- *Subject taught:* special education, general elementary, math, science, English/language arts, social studies, vocational/technical, other, not reported; and
- *State:* 50 U.S. states and District of Columbia.

The following frame characteristics were used for the Private School Teachers Data File:

- *Affiliation:* Catholic—Parochial, Catholic—Diocesan, Catholic—Private, Baptist, Jewish, Lutheran, Seventh-Day Adventist, Other religious, Nonsectarian—Regular, Nonsectarian—Special Emphasis, Nonsectarian—Special Education;
- *Enrollment:* less than 100, 100 to less than 200, 200 to less than 500, 500 to less than 750, 750 to less than 1,000, 1,000 or more;
- *Community type (locale):* city, suburb, town, rural;
- *Grade level:* elementary, secondary, combined;
- *Region:* Northeast, Midwest, South, West; and
- *Number of teachers:* less than 5, 5 to less than 15, 15 to less than 30, 30 to less than 50, 50 to less than 75, 75 or more.

As shown in table B-1, the weighted response rate using the initial base weight for the Teacher Listing Form (TLF) was 87.1 percent for public schools and 71.0 percent for private schools. The weighted questionnaire response rate using the initial base weight for the teacher survey was 76.9 percent for public school teachers and 75.9 percent for private school teachers. The overall response rate was 67.0 percent for public school teachers and 53.9 percent for private school teachers.

For the teacher survey, nonresponse can occur both at the school level and at the teacher level. For some schools, no TLF was obtained and teachers could not be sampled from these schools. Some sampled teachers from schools that provided a TLF did not participate in the survey. To reflect this, national estimates were examined for potential bias at the school level and at the teacher level.

For the TLF, the school base-weighted distribution of TLF respondents was compared to the base-weighted distribution of eligible schools through *t* tests to find any school groups with potential bias prior to TLF nonresponse adjustments. All *t* tests were repeated using the nonresponse-adjusted final weights for TLF respondents to assess the effect of these weighting adjustments.

Similar analyses were conducted for the teacher questionnaire. The weighted distribution of teacher respondents was compared to the weighted distribution of eligible teachers through *t* tests to find any school or teacher groups with potential bias prior to teacher weighting adjustments. This analysis used the teacher base weight multiplied by a TLF nonresponse adjustment factor, in order to examine the impact of teacher-level nonresponse after accounting for TLF nonresponse. As for the TLF, all *t* tests were repeated using the nonresponse-adjusted final teacher weights for teacher respondents.

Tables B-2 and B-3 identify national-level school and teacher groups with a statistically significant difference in base-weighted percentages between the eligible cases and respondents for public and private schools, respectively. Each table also identifies any groups with a statistically significant difference between base-weighted eligible cases and final-weighted respondents.

Table B-2. Indication of potential sources of bias for public school teacher data at the national level based on comparisons between eligible teacher distribution and base-weighted or nonresponse-adjusted respondent distributions: 2017–18

Potential source of bias		Teacher Listing Form respondent distribution		Teacher Questionnaire respondent distribution	
Characteristic	Value	Base- weighted distribution	Nonresponse- adjusted distribution	Weighted distribution prior to weighting adjustment	Final-weighted distribution
Charter status	Noncharter	x	x		x
Charter status	Charter	x	x		x
Enrollment	Less than 100	x	x		
Enrollment	100 to less than 200			x	
Enrollment	200 to less than 500			x	
Enrollment	750 to less than 1,000			x	
Enrollment	1,000 or more		x	x	
Community type	City	x	x	x	x
Community type	Suburban			x	x
Community type	Town	x		x	
Community type	Rural	x	x	x	
Number of teachers	Less than 10	x	x		
Number of teachers	10 to less than 25			x	
Number of teachers	25 to less than 50	x			
Number of teachers	50 to less than 75	x	x		
Number of teachers	75 or more		x	x	
Percent free lunch eligible	Less than 35%		x		x
Percent free lunch eligible	35% to less than 50%	x			
Percent free lunch eligible	50% to less than 75%	x		x	x
Percent free lunch eligible	75% or more	x		x	
Percent non-White	Less than 5%	x		x	
Percent non-White	5% to less than 10%	x		x	
Percent non-White	10% to less than 20%	x		x	
Percent non-White	30% to less than 50%	x	x		
Percent non-White	50% or more	x		x	
Pupil-teacher ratio	Less than 10	x	x		
Pupil-teacher ratio	10 to less than 15	x			
Pupil-teacher ratio	20 or more	x		x	x
Grade level	Primary			x	
Grade level	Middle	x			
Grade level	High			x	
Grade level	Combined	x	x	x	x
Region	Northeast	x		x	
Region	Midwest	x		x	
Region	South				
Region	West	x		x	
Title I status	Title I program		x		x
Title I status	Noneligible	x	x		
Title I status	Eligible, but no program				x
Teacher status	Full-time teachers			x	
Teacher status	Part-time teachers			x	
Teacher status	Not reported			x	
Subject taught	Special education			x	x
Subject taught	General elementary				x

See notes at end of table.

Table B-2. Indication of potential sources of bias for public school teacher data at the national level based on comparisons between eligible teacher distribution and base-weighted or nonresponse-adjusted respondent distributions: 2017–18—Continued

Potential source of bias		Teacher Listing Form respondent distribution		Teacher Questionnaire respondent distribution	
Characteristic	Value	Base- weighted distribution	Nonresponse- adjusted distribution	Weighted distribution prior to weighting adjustment	Final-weighted distribution
Subject taught	Other			x	x
Subject taught	Not reported				x
State	Alaska	x			
State	Arkansas	x		x	
State	California	x		x	
State	Colorado	x	x		
State	Connecticut			x	
State	District of Columbia	x		x	x
State	Florida		x		
State	Georgia	x	x		
State	Hawaii	x	x	x	
State	Idaho			x	
State	Indiana			x	
State	Iowa	x		x	
State	Kansas	x	x	x	
State	Kentucky	x		x	
State	Maine			x	
State	Maryland	x	x	x	
State	Massachusetts		x		
State	Michigan			x	
State	Mississippi	x			
State	Montana			x	
State	Nebraska	x	x	x	
State	Nevada		x		
State	New Hampshire	x			
State	New Jersey			x	
State	New Mexico	x	x		
State	New York	x	x	x	
State	North Carolina			x	
State	North Dakota			x	
State	Ohio			x	
State	Oklahoma	x		x	
State	Pennsylvania	x		x	
State	Rhode Island	x	x		
State	South Carolina	x	x	x	
State	South Dakota			x	
State	Tennessee	x	x		
State	Texas	x	x	x	
State	Utah	x	x	x	
State	Vermont			x	
State	Virginia	x	x	x	
State	West Virginia			x	

See notes at end of table.

Table B-2. Indication of potential sources of bias for public school teacher data at the national level based on comparisons between eligible teacher distribution and base-weighted or nonresponse-adjusted respondent distributions: 2017–18—Continued

Potential source of bias		Teacher Listing Form respondent distribution		Teacher Questionnaire respondent distribution	
Characteristic	Value	Base- weighted distribution	Nonresponse- adjusted distribution	Weighted distribution prior to weighting adjustment	Final-weighted distribution
State	Wisconsin	x			
State	Wyoming	x		x	

NOTE: x denotes comparisons that are a potential source of bias.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, National Teacher and Principal Survey (NTPS), "Public School Teacher Listing Form; and Public School Teacher Documentation Data Files," 2017–18.

Table B-3. Indication of potential sources of bias for private school teacher data at the national level based on comparisons between eligible teacher distribution and base-weighted or nonresponse-adjusted respondent distributions: 2017–18

Potential source of bias		Teacher Listing Form respondent distribution		Teacher Questionnaire respondent distribution	
Characteristic	Value	Base- weighted distribution	Nonresponse- adjusted distribution	Weighted distribution prior to weighting adjustment	Final- weighted distribution
School classification	Catholic	x		x	
School classification	Other religious	x		x	
School classification	Nonsectarian	x	x		
Affiliation	Catholic—Parochial	x		x	
Affiliation	Catholic—Diocesan	x		x	
Affiliation	Baptist	x			
Affiliation	Jewish	x	x	x	
Affiliation	Lutheran	x		x	
Affiliation	Other Religious	x		x	
Affiliation	Nonsectarian—Regular	x	x		
Affiliation	Nonsectarian—Special Education	x		x	
Enrollment	less than 100	x	x		
Enrollment	100 to less than 200	x		x	
Enrollment	200 to less than 500	x			
Enrollment	500 to less than 750	x	x		
Enrollment	750 or more			x	
Community	Town	x			
Grade level	Elementary	x		x	
Grade level	Combined	x		x	
Region	Northeast	x		x	
Region	Midwest	x		x	
Number of teachers	less than 5	x			
Number of teachers	5 to less than 15	x			
Number of teachers	15 to less than 30			x	
Number of teachers	30 to less than 50		x	x	
Number of teachers	50 or more	x		x	
Teacher status	Full-time			x	
Teacher status	Not reported			x	

See notes at end of table.

Table B-3. Indication of potential sources of bias for private school teacher data at the national level based on comparisons between eligible teacher distribution and base-weighted or nonresponse-adjusted respondent distributions: 2017–18—Continued

Potential source of bias	Teacher Listing Form respondent distribution		Teacher Questionnaire respondent distribution	
	Base- weighted distribution	Nonresponse- adjusted distribution	Weighted distribution prior to weighting adjustment	Final-weighted distribution
Characteristic	Value			
Teacher status	Not reported		x	
Subject taught	Special education		x	
Subject taught	Vocational/technical		x	

NOTE: x denotes comparisons that are a potential source of bias.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, National Teacher and Principal Survey (NTPS), "Private School Teacher Listing Form; and Private School Teacher Documentation Data Files," 2017–18.

Weighting adjustments at both the TLF (i.e., school) and teacher levels were designed to reduce or eliminate nonresponse bias and to reduce the variance introduced due to sampling by adjusting the sample estimates to known totals from the frame. The final-weighted comparisons to eligible cases shown in tables B-2 and B-3 reflect the effect of weighting adjustment. Table B-2 shows that nonresponse adjustments eliminated most but not all evidence of potential bias for public school TLFs and introduced potential bias for some items. Evidence of potential bias remains for public schools after TLF nonresponse adjustments for the following national-level items included in the analysis:

- Charter school status, for charter and noncharter schools;
- Community type, for city and rural schools;
- Enrollment, for schools with less than 100 students;
- Grade level, for combined schools;
- Number of teachers, for schools with less than 10 teachers and with 50 to 75;
- Percent non-White, for schools where 30 to less than 50 percent of students were non-White;
- Pupil-teacher ratio, for schools with a pupil-teacher ratio of less than 10; and
- State, for schools in Colorado, Georgia, Hawaii, Kansas, Maryland, Nebraska, New Mexico, New York, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, and Virginia; and Title I status, for schools that are not eligible for Title I.

Evidence of potential bias formed for public schools after TLF nonresponse adjustments for the following national-level items included in the analysis:

- Enrollment, for schools with 1,000 or more students;
- Number of teachers, for schools with 75 or more teachers;
- Percent free or reduced-price lunch eligible, for schools where less than 35 percent of students were eligible for free or reduced-price lunches;
- State, for schools in Florida, Massachusetts, and Nevada; and
- Title I status, for Title I schools.

Table B-3 shows that nonresponse adjustments eliminated most but not all evidence of potential bias for private school TLFs and introduced potential bias for some items. Evidence of potential bias remains for private schools after TLF nonresponse adjustments for the following national-level items included in the analysis:



- School classification, for Nonsectarian;
- Affiliation, for Jewish and Nonsectarian—Regular schools; and
- Enrollment, for schools with less than 100 and with 500 to less than 750 students.

Evidence of potential bias formed for private schools after TLF nonresponse adjustments for the following national-level item included in the analysis:

- Number of teachers, for schools with 30 to less than 50 teachers.

For the teacher questionnaire, the final-weighted comparisons to eligible cases shown in tables B-2 and B-3 reflect the effect of teacher weighting adjustments after adjusting for TLF nonresponse. Table B-2 shows that weighting adjustments eliminated some but not all evidence of potential bias for public school teachers and introduced potential bias for some items. Evidence of potential bias remains for public school teachers after weighting adjustments for the following national-level items included in the analysis:

- Community type, for teachers in city schools and suburban schools;
- Grade level, for teachers in combined schools;
- Percent free or reduced-price lunch eligible, for teachers in schools where 50 to less than 75 percent of students were eligible for free or reduced-price lunches;
- Pupil-teacher ratio, for teachers in schools with a pupil-teacher ratio of 20 or more;
- Subject taught, for teachers with a main subject of special education and other; and
- State, for teachers in schools in the District of Columbia.

Evidence of potential bias formed for public school teachers after nonresponse adjustments for the following national-level for teacher items included in the analysis:

- Charter status, for teachers in charter schools and noncharter schools;
- Percent free or reduced-price lunch eligible, for teachers in schools where less than 35 percent of students were eligible for free or reduced-price lunches;
- Title I status, for teachers in schools with a Title I program and in schools that are eligible for Title I but are not Title I schools; and
- Subject taught, for teachers with a main subject of general elementary or that did not report a main subject.

For public school TLFs, a limited set of characteristics (community type and grade level) were also examined for potential nonresponse bias at the state level. Before weighting adjustments, 91 out of the 408 state by characteristic cells showed a significant difference between the distribution of respondents and the distribution of all eligible cases; after weighting adjustments, this was reduced to only 65 cells. The following 21 states had multiple significant differences in community type and/or grade level domains after weighting adjustments, which is evidence of potential bias at the state level: Alaska, California, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

For public school teachers, the same two characteristics (community type and grade level) were also examined for potential nonresponse bias at the state level, as well as teacher subject. Before weighting adjustments, 105 out of the 867 state by characteristic cells showed a significant difference between the distribution of respondents and the distribution of all eligible cases; after weighting adjustments, this was reduced to 41 cells. The following 8 states had multiple significant differences in community type, grade

level, and/or teacher subject domains, which is evidence of potential bias at the state level: California, Colorado, Delaware, Maryland, Massachusetts, New York, South Carolina, and Utah.

For private school TLFs, a limited set of characteristics (region and grade level) were also examined for potential nonresponse bias within school classification (Catholic, other religious, nonsectarian) and affiliation strata (Catholic—Parochial, Catholic—Diocesan, Catholic—Private, Baptist, Jewish, Lutheran, Seventh-Day Adventist, Other religious, Nonsectarian—Regular, Nonsectarian—Special Emphasis, Nonsectarian—Special Education). Before weighting adjustments, 8 out of the 21 affiliation by characteristic cells showed a significant difference in response rate; after weighting adjustments, this was reduced to two cells. The Catholic affiliation had multiple significant differences in region and/or grade level domains after weighting adjustments.

For private school teachers, the same two characteristics (region and grade level) were also examined for potential nonresponse bias within school classification (Catholic, other religious, nonsectarian) and affiliation strata (Catholic—Parochial, Catholic—Diocesan, Catholic—Private, Baptist, Jewish, Lutheran, Seventh-Day Adventist, Other religious, Nonsectarian—Regular, Nonsectarian—Special Emphasis, Nonsectarian—Special Education), as well as teacher subject. Before weighting adjustments, 7 out of the 48 affiliation by characteristic cells showed a significant difference between the distribution of respondents and the distribution of all eligible cases; after weighting adjustments, this was reduced to one cell. No affiliations had multiple significant differences in region, grade level, and/or teacher subject domains after weighting adjustments.

For further information on unit response rates and nonresponse bias analysis, see the *Survey Documentation for the 2017–18 National Teacher and Principal Survey* (Cox et al. forthcoming).

**Item response rates.** The item response rate indicates the percentage of respondents who answered a given survey question or item. The weighted NTPS item response rate is calculated by dividing the weighted number of respondents who provided an answer to an item by the weighted number of respondents who were eligible to answer that item.<sup>10</sup> Table B-4 provides a summary of the weighted item response rates.

For the public school teacher data, four of the survey items included in this report have item response rates less than 85 percent. Those items were (1) number of students in 8<sup>th</sup> class period (question 2-13d(8)), with an item response rate of 78.4 percent; (2) number of students in 9<sup>th</sup> class period (question 2-13d(9)), with an item response rate of 76.6 percent; (3) number of students in 10<sup>th</sup> class period (question 2-13d(10)), with an item response rate of 74.4 percent; and (4) additional compensation earned from working in any job outside this school system (question 8-7a-amount), with an item response rate of 84.3 percent.

For the private school teacher data, four of the survey items included in this report have item response rates less than 85 percent. Those items were (1) number of students in 8<sup>th</sup> class period (question 2-13d(8)), with an item response rate of 84.9 percent; (2) number of students in 9<sup>th</sup> class period (question 2-13d(9)), with an item response rate of 82.1 percent; (3) number of students in 10<sup>th</sup> class period (question 2-13d(10)), with an item response rate of 78.5 percent; and (4) additional compensation earned from working in any job outside this school system (question 8-7a-amount), with an item response rate of 83.6 percent. For further information on item response rates and bias analysis, see the *Survey Documentation for the 2017–18 National Teacher and Principal Survey* (Cox et al. forthcoming).

---

<sup>10</sup> For the formula to calculate the item response rate, see *2012 Revision of NCES Statistical Standards: Final* (NCES 2014-097).

Table B-4. Summary of weighted item response rates, by survey: 2017–18

Survey	Percent of items with a response rate of 85 percent or more	Percent of items with a response rate of less than 85 percent
Public School Teacher	93.3	6.7
Private School Teacher	91.1	8.9

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, National Teacher and Principal Survey (NTPS), "Public School Teacher and Private School Teacher Listing Forms; and Public School Teacher and Private School Teacher Documentation Data Files," 2017–18.

## Weighting

The general purpose of weighting is to scale up the sample estimates to represent the target survey population. For NTPS, the base weight for teacher sampling is generated by taking the base weight for school sampling (representing the reciprocal of the probability of selection of the school), adjusted for sample schools for which a TLF is not obtained, and multiplying this by the reciprocal of the probability of selection of the teacher within the school (from the TLF). Teacher samples are only drawn from schools for which a TLF is obtained, so adjustment needs to be made for schools for which TLFs are not obtained.

Next, a nonresponse adjustment factor for teacher nonresponse is calculated and applied based on a weighting cell adjustment. Weighting cells for teacher nonresponse are developed using tree search algorithms. These cells are selected to be homogeneous in response propensity within cells and heterogeneous in response propensity across cells (response propensity is the underlying “chance” that a particular sample unit will respond by completing the questionnaire: its individual response rate). The adjustment is the inverse of the weighted teacher response rate within each cell, and each respondent in the cell receives this adjustment. Nonrespondents are given weights of zero: the respondents are reweighted to represent the nonrespondents. The variables examined for potential bias were the same as those used by the tree search algorithms. All subgroups that showed potential bias as given in table B-2 above were used as cell generators by the tree search algorithms, as well as other subgroups which are related, and may show differential response conditional on other subgroups (i.e., they may be chosen as cell generators by the tree search algorithm within particular branches).

For the Public School Teacher Data File, a raking factor is calculated and applied to the sample to adjust the sample totals to CCD frame totals for FTE teachers, so that the sum of the weights within each of the specified cells is equal to the corresponding CCD frame total for the cell. Raking is an iterative process that is repeated until the weights simultaneously aggregate to be equal to each set of frame totals. In some cases, extreme weights may be trimmed back to a cutoff value. This all improves the precision of survey estimates. The raking cells are defined based on school level, urbanicity, and percentage of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch. The first dimension combines school level and the percentage of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch. The second dimension combines school level and urbanicity. A final adjustment factor is then applied to resolve any inconsistencies between the estimated number of teachers on the NTPS Public School and Public School Teacher data files, so that the sum of the weights within each cell is equal to the corresponding weighted estimate of the number of teachers from the school questionnaire. A tree search algorithm is used to define the adjustment cells, using the same list of cell generators as for the nonresponse adjustment factor.

For the Private School Teacher Data File, a raking factor is calculated and applied to the sample to adjust the sample totals to PSS frame totals for FTE teachers, so that the sum of the weights within each of the specified cells is equal to the corresponding PSS frame total for the cell. These cells are defined based on

school level, urbanicity, and affiliation. The first dimension combines school level and affiliation. The second dimension combines school level and urbanicity. As with the Public School Teacher Data File, extreme weights may be trimmed back to a cutoff value to improve the precision of survey estimates. A final adjustment factor is then applied to resolve any inconsistencies between the estimated number of teachers on the NTPS Private School and Private School Teacher data files, so that the sum of the weights within each cell is equal to the corresponding weighted estimate of the number of teachers from the school questionnaire. A tree search algorithm is used to define the adjustment cells, using the same list of cell generators as for the nonresponse adjustment factor.

The product of these factors is the final weight for each NTPS respondent, which appears as TFNLWGT on the NTPS Public School Teacher and Private School Teacher Data Files.

## **Variance Estimation**

In surveys with complex sample designs, such as NTPS, direct estimates of sampling errors that assume a simple random sample typically underestimate the variability in the estimates. The NTPS sample design and estimation include procedures that deviate from the assumption of simple random sampling, such as sampling with differential probabilities.

NTPS uses jackknife replication to calculate appropriate sampling errors that account for the complex sample design. Jackknife replication methods involve dropping a small portion of the sample from the full sample and computing the statistic of interest for the retained and reweighted sample (the jackknife replicate). The sum of squares of the replicate estimates around the full sample estimate provides an estimate of the variance of the statistic. The NTPS teacher data files include a set of 200 replicate weights designed to produce variance estimates. The set of replicate weights for each file should be applied to the respondents in that file. The replicate weights for NTPS respondents are TREPWT1–TREPWT200 for teachers.

## **Reliability of Data**

A survey estimate is subject to two types of errors: nonsampling and sampling. Nonsampling errors are attributed to many sources, including definitional difficulties, the inability or unwillingness of respondents to provide correct information, differences in the interpretation of questions, an inability to recall information, errors made in collection (e.g., in recording or coding the data), errors made in processing the data, and errors made in estimating values for missing data. Quality control and edit procedures were used to reduce errors made by respondents, coders, and interviewers. In contrast, sampling errors result from the collection of data from a sample of the population rather than the full target population, and estimates of the magnitude of sampling error for NTPS data can be derived or calculated. Because of both types of errors, the survey estimates may differ from the values that would be obtained from the target population using the same questionnaire, instructions, and field representatives.

## **Caution Concerning Changes in Estimates**

The 2017–18 NTPS collects and reports information on the National School Lunch Program differently than previous years of both NTPS and SASS. Rather than asking for a count of K–12 students approved for the program, schools were asked to report the percentage of K–12 students approved for the program. Additionally, schools that did not participate in the program used to be treated as a separate category for reporting purposes but, in this report, are grouped with schools that participated in the program but had no students approved for the program. This decision was based on the small size of the number of schools

that did not participate and the categories used for sampling, calculating response rates, and conducting bias analyses. Due to both the change in the question and the change in categorization of non participating schools, 2017–18, users should exercise caution when comparing estimates for, or reported by, the percentage of students approved for free and reduced-price lunches.

## **Appendix C: Description of Variables**

## Description of Variables

The variables that are included in this report are listed in table C-1. Those with variable names that begin with “T” and are followed by four digits are survey variables that come from items on the public school teacher and private school teacher questionnaires. The variables without the letter plus four digit names are “derived variables,” meaning they were created using survey variables, frame variables (variables taken from the sampling frame), other created variables, or a combination of these. They are frequently used in National Center for Education Statistics publications and have been added to the data files to facilitate data analysis. The definitions for the created variables follow table C-1.

Table C-1. Variables used in the *Characteristics of Public and Private Elementary and Secondary School Teachers in the United States: Results From the National Teacher and Principal Survey* report: 2017–18

Variable	Variable name in data files
Agreement with evaluation statement, overall was fair	T2502
Agreement with evaluation statement, based on what I know	T2503
Agreement with evaluation statement, had strong understanding	T2504
Agreement with evaluation statement, determine whether I had been successful	T2505
Agreement with evaluation statement, positive effect on my teaching	T2506
Agreement with evaluation statement, led to improved student learning	T2507
Agreement with evaluation statement, results were accurate	T2508
Agreement with professional development statement, sufficient resources available	T2625
Agreement with professional development statement, access to same resources as other teachers	T2626
Agreement with professional development statement, opportunities aligned with performance goals	T2627
Agreement with professional development statement, techniques will help improve students	T2628
Agreement with professional development statement, capable of incorporating techniques	T2629
Agreement with professional development statement, available type consistent with my own goals	T2630
Agreement with professional development statement, have opportunity to provide feedback to school	T2631
Any professional development during last school year	T2616
Average amount of salary supplements from additional compensation based on students' performance	T0913
Average amount of salary supplements from extracurricular activities in same school system	T0911
Average amount of salary supplements from jobs outside the school system	T0917
Average amount of salary supplements from other school system sources	T0915
Average class size for teachers in departmentalized instruction <sup>1</sup>	<i>Not in file</i>
Average class size for teachers in self-contained classes	T0223
Average base teaching salary of regular full-time teachers	T0909
Average school year earnings from all source <sup>1</sup>	<i>Not in file</i>
Charter school identifier <sup>1</sup>	CHARFLAG

See notes at end of table.

Table C-1. Variables used in the *Characteristics of Public and Private Elementary and Secondary School Teachers in the United States: Results From the National Teacher and Principal Survey* report: 2017–18—Continued

Variable	Variable name in data files
Collapsed school locale code <sup>1</sup>	URBANS12
Four-category school level <sup>1</sup>	SCHLEV_4CAT
Highest degree earned <sup>1</sup>	HIDEGR
Number/percent of regular full-time teachers	T0100
Number of years of experience as an elementary or secondary teacher in public and private schools	T0110
Number of years teaching at current school	T0105
Percentage of students in the school approved for the National School Lunch Program <sup>1</sup>	NSLAPP_S
Percentage of teachers who took courses before their first year in classroom management techniques	T0340
Percentage of teachers who took courses before their first year in lesson planning	T0341
Percentage of teachers who took courses before their first year in learning assessment	T0342
Percentage of teachers who took courses before their first year in using student performance data to inform instruction	T0343
Percentage of teachers who took courses before their first year in serving students from diverse economic backgrounds	T0344
Percentage of teachers who took courses before their first year in serving students with special needs	T0345
Percentage of teachers who took courses before their first year in teaching students who are limited-English proficient students or English-language learners	T0346
Percentage of teachers with salary supplement from additional compensation based on students' performance	T0912
Percentage of teachers with salary supplement from extracurricular activities in same school system	T0910
Percentage of teachers with salary supplement from jobs outside the school system	T0916
Percentage of teachers with salary supplement from other school system sources	T0914
Student enrollment in K–12 and ungraded <sup>1</sup>	SCHSIZE
Teacher evaluation during the last school year	T2500
Teacher's age <sup>1</sup>	AGE_T
Teacher's race/ethnicity	T0928–T0933
Teacher's sex	T0924
Three-category school level <sup>1</sup>	SCHLEV_3CAT
Three-category private school typology <sup>1</sup>	RELIG
Way the teacher's class are organized	T0221

<sup>1</sup> The definition for this variable can be found below.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, National Teacher and Principal Survey (NTPS), "Public School Teacher and Private School Teacher Data Files," 2017–18.



**Average school year earnings from all sources:** A variable that combines the amount a teacher earned from all possible sources during the school year (T0909, T0911, T0913, T0915, T0917).

**Average class size for teachers in departmentalized instruction:** This variable is a combination of all possible class size responses for teachers with departmentalized instruction (T0260, T0261, T0262, T0263, T0264, T0265, T0266, T0267, T0268, T0269) divided by the number of classes taught.

**Charter school identifier (CHARFLAG):** A flag variable taken from the Public School Data File that identifies charter schools. 1 = School is a public charter school, 2 = School is a traditional public school. A charter school is a public school that, in accordance with an enabling state statute, has been granted a charter exempting it from selected state or local rules and regulation. CHARFLAG is based on S0500 from the Public School Data File.

**Four-category school level (SCHLEV\_4CAT):** Taken from the Public School Data File, SCHLEV\_4CAT is a four-category variable based on grades reported by the school: primary, middle, high, and combined. Primary schools are those with at least one grade lower than 5 and no grade higher than 8. Middle schools have no grade lower than 5 and no grade higher than 8. High schools have no grade lower than 7 and at least one grade higher than 8. Combined schools are those with at least one grade lower than 7 and at least one grade higher than 8, or with all students in ungraded classrooms.

**Highest degree earned (HIDEGR):** A variable that indicates the highest degree a teacher has earned. Computed using the variables T0300, T0312, T0328, T0331, and T0334.

**Percentage of students in school approved for the National School Lunch Program (NSLAPP\_S):** Taken from the Public and Private School Data Files, NSLAPP\_S is a continuous variable for the percentage of K–12 students (S0427) approved for the National School Lunch Program, among schools that participated in the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) (S0409=1). For this report, NSLAPP\_S is recoded as a categorical variable describing the proportion of students approved for free or reduced-price lunches. Schools that did not participate in the NSLP have valid skip values, but were categorized as having no approved students for the purposes of this report.

**Student enrollment in K–12 and ungraded (SCHSIZE):** Taken from the Public School and Private School Data Files, SCHSIZE is a categorical variable based on the number of K–12 and ungraded students enrolled in the school (S0115 for public and S0115 subtracted by S0151 for private). For this report, SCHSIZE was recoded into six categories for public schools and five categories for private schools.

**Teacher's age (AGE\_T):** A variable based on a respondent's reported year of birth. AGE\_T is a continuous variable that was created by subtracting the teacher's reported year of birth (T0934) from the year of data collection (2017).

**Three-category private school typology (RELIG):** Taken from the Private School Data File, RELIG is a three-category variable based on the variables that identify the religious or nonreligious orientation of a private school (S0186–S0297): Catholic, Other religious, or Nonsectarian.

**Three-category school level (SCHLEV\_3CAT):** Taken from Private School Data File, SCHLEVEL is a three-category variable based on grades reported by the school: elementary, secondary, and combined. Elementary schools are those with any of grades K–6 and none of grades 9–12. Secondary schools have any of grades 7–12 and none of grades K–6. Combined schools are those schools with grade levels in both elementary and secondary grade levels, or with all students in ungraded classrooms.

**Urban-centric school locale code (URBANS12):** Taken from the Public and Private School Data Files, URBANS12 is a created variable collapsed from the 12 category urban-centric school locale code (SLOCP12) which was updated to incorporate Census population and geography information and recoded into four categories, as follows:

- City: includes city, large; city, midsize; city, small.
- Suburban: includes suburb, large; suburb, midsize; suburb, small.
- Town: includes town, fringe; town, distant; town, remote.
- Rural: includes rural, fringe; rural, distant; rural, remote.