

Review of: "A Systematic Review of Factors Associated with Special Education Teacher Recruitment"

Maria Sciuchetti¹

¹ Ball State University

Potential competing interests: The author(s) declared that no potential competing interests exist.

I think this is an important and timely topic, given the special education shortages we are seeing in the field in the USA. I have included additional feedback below for your consideration.

Abstract

You note the teacher shortage is a long-standing need and discuss this from a “national” perspective. Since this publication is read by international readers, it would be helpful to readers if you were specific (i.e., USA) at the onset and throughout the manuscript.

Introduction

The introduction, in general, provides an overview that allows readers to get a sense of the scope of the problem. However, the flow from section to section would benefit from transitions. Some sections warrant elaboration. For example, Rise of Alternate Pathways needs a discussion of what those pathways are; an explanation of “high-needs” schools, etc. Your conceptual framework section includes a statement of the purpose of your study; consider including a brief statement earlier in the introduction.

See my comment above as it is relevant to your first sentence in this section, too.

You mention classrooms being staffed by “unqualified educators.” Being familiar with the US education system, licensing requirements, etc., I may have an understanding of what you were eluding to when you say *unqualified*; however, it would be helpful if you elaborated and included examples for your readers.

You stated, “According to the 2020 Title II reports for the United States Department of Education, incoming teachers may *prefer* different routes to licensure based on their race and ethnicity.” I recommend reviewing Carver-Thomas (2018) and others, they identify factors that influence licensure routes (e.g., financial barriers) that may limit access to traditional certification routes for people of color.

Including a discussion of if this is the first review of its kind or not. If there are prior reviews, presenting a discussion of those findings serves as a framework to discuss your findings later in your manuscript.

Method

You provided a good summary of your search procedures. You can strengthen this section by providing details of your coding procedures and how those varied for qualitative vs. quantitative studies.

Additionally, did you conduct an ancestral search, search for additional articles from the reference lists of the articles you included, to ensure that you included all relevant studies? If so, mentioning it in your procedures is important. If not, conducting the ancestral search may strengthen your review and result in additional articles to include.

Results/Discussion

Your results provide a succinct discussion of the findings across all studies.

Your results and discussion would benefit from elaborating and providing more details and explanations across the various sections (e.g., Quality of Studies). For example, when discussing the quality of studies, you mentioned conducting a thorough review but did not include the procedures/indicators you use to evaluate the rigor of each study? Your discussion would benefit from talking through your findings as they relate to prior/existing literature on this topic. For example, do your findings support or refute prior research on this topic (e.g., Carver-Thomas, 2018). Including more of this prior research in this section would also require adding a discussion of prior, single study and/or literature review, findings to your introduction section.

General Feedback

Review the manuscript for typos (e.g., line above the research question, "...initiatives for *attractions* and retaining special education teachers"; "I.E." should be "i.e.,"). Include citations for reports (e.g., OSEP report guiding your conceptual framework).