

West Virginia Common Metrics 2016-17 Exit Survey

Concord University Report

August 2017

Prepared by

Stacy Duffield, Ph.D.
Keith Lehman
Anqing Zhang
North Dakota State University

With Support from

Keri Ferro, Ed.D.
Division of Academic Affairs
West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission
West Virginia Council for Community and Technical College Education

Introduction

The Network for Excellence in Teaching (NExT), founded in 2010, is a partnership of 14 institutions of higher education (IHEs) and the Bush Foundation. NExT collaborated to develop a set of common surveys to support teacher preparation programs in measuring the effectiveness of their programs. NExT shared the instruments with other teacher preparation programs, inviting them to contribute their data to an aggregate data set that will be used in future instrument analyses to strengthen the instruments and ensure their validity and reliability across diverse respondent pools. The surveys include the following:

- 1.) **Exit Survey**—administered to teacher candidates near the completion of student teaching
- 2.) **Transition to Teaching Survey (TTS)**—administered to program completers in the spring following the academic year of graduation
- 3.) **Supervisor Survey**—administered in the spring following the academic year of graduation to employers of program completers who are teaching

This report presents the findings from the Exit Surveys administered to Concord University student teachers during spring 2017. The Exit Survey collects information on student teachers' perceptions of and satisfaction with their teacher education programs and student teaching experiences as well as their backgrounds and future plans. Quantitative data for the institution are presented below in tabular format. Each of the surveys has been found to be highly valid and reliable; the results of the analysis for the Exit Survey can be found in Appendix A.

Survey Administration

The Spring 2017 Exit Survey was administered during class time to increase response rates. All eligible candidates were invited to take the survey in the Spring 2017 semester. The Exit Survey did not become available to WV IHEs until December 2016; therefore, fall administration was unable to be completed.

Response Rate

The 2016-2017 Exit Survey response rate for the institution was 94% (29 out of 31). In comparison, the response rate for the West Virginia aggregate was 71% (419 out of 589).

Using this Report

Findings from this Exit Survey can be compared to past and future cohorts in order to understand how shifts in IHE programs' coursework and clinical experiences affect candidates' perceptions of and satisfaction with their teacher education programs. Findings from the Transition to Teaching Survey, administered one year after graduation, may also shed light on whether completers' perceptions of and satisfaction with their preparedness at graduation align with perceptions of their instructional practice as student teachers.

Findings

Tables 1-3 provide contextual information.

Survey Section A

Section A of the survey asks candidates to rate their levels satisfaction with various aspects of their teacher preparation program (see tables 4-5). Candidates responded using the following scale: very dissatisfied; dissatisfied; satisfied; very satisfied. The final item in this section asks the candidates if they would recommend their teacher preparation program to others using a 4-point scale with the following descriptors: definitely yes, probably yes, probably no, definitely no.

Survey Section B

Section B of the survey asks candidates to rate their satisfaction with four areas of their teacher preparation: instructional practices, diverse learners, learning environment, and professional practices (see tables 7-16). Candidates responded using the following scale: does not apply; disagree; Tend to disagree; Tend to agree; and agree.

Survey Section C

Section C of the survey asks candidates to rate their quality of supervision by both the university supervisor and school-based cooperating teacher. Candidates responded using the following scale: does not apply; disagree; Tend to disagree; Tend to agree; and agree. Candidates were also asked to describe their supervision such as frequency of observations and who visited from the university (see tables 17-25).

Survey Section D

Section D of the survey asks candidates about their future plans including how long they plan to teach and where (see tables 26-27).

Survey Section E

Section E collects candidate demographics such as gender, age, and languages spoken (see tables 28-31).

Notes:

In some instances, Respondents do not complete a follow-up question after indicating a response to branching item (i.e., “if yes...,” “if no...”).

For any “mark all that apply” items, the total percentage may exceed 100 and the total # may exceed the number of Respondents.

In some instances, the number of descriptions of “other” may not match the number of Respondents that selected “other.”

Number of responses is represented by a “#” symbol in the tables below.

Due to rounding to the nearest hundredth, the percent column may not add up to 100.

SECTION A. YOUR PROGRAM

Table 1. For what licensure area did you prepare to teach? (Check all that apply.)

	n = 29	
	#	Percent of Cases
Early Childhood Major (PreK-K)	0	0.00
Preschool Education Major (PreK)	1	3.45
Elementary Education (K-6)	18	62.07
Special Education (PreK, PreK-Adult, K-6, 5-Adult)	3	10.34
PreK-Adult Education License	2	6.90
Secondary Education License (5-Adult, 5-9, or 9-Adult)	11	37.93

Note. Data from item A1.

Table 2. If you completed a K-12 licensure program, indicate your subject area. (Check all that apply.)

	n = 2	
	#	Percent of Cases
Art	0	0.00
English as a Second Language (ESL)	0	0.00
French	0	0.00
Health	0	0.00
Japanese	0	0.00
Music	0	0.00
Physical Education	2	100.00
Reading Endorsement	0	0.00
Reading Specialist	0	0.00
School Library-Media	0	0.00
Theatre	0	0.00
Wellness	0	0.00
Other ^a	0	0.00

Note. Data from item A1.

Table 3. If you completed a secondary education licensure program, indicate your subject area. (Check all that apply.)

	n = 11	
	#	Percent of Cases
Agriculture	0	0.00
Art	0	0.00
Biology	0	0.00
Business Education	0	0.00
Chemistry	0	0.00
Chemistry/Physics	0	0.00
Driver Education	0	0.00
English	4	36.36
Family and Consumer Science	0	0.00
French	0	0.00
General Math	0	0.00
General Math through Algebra I	0	0.00
General Science	0	0.00
German	0	0.00
Health	2	18.18
Journalism	0	0.00
Marketing	0	0.00
Mathematics	1	9.09
Oral Communications	0	0.00
Physical Education	0	0.00
Physics	0	0.00
Reading Endorsement	0	0.00
Social Studies	4	36.36
Spanish	0	0.00
Other ^a	0	0.00

Note. Data from item A1.

Table 4. If you completed a special education licensure program, indicate your subject area. (Mark all that apply.)

	n = 3	
	#	Percent of Cases
Autism Spectrum Disorder (K-6)	0	0.00
Autism Spectrum Disorder (5-Adult)	0	0.00
Deaf and Hard of Hearing	0	0.00
Emotional/Behavior Disorders	0	0.00
Gifted Education	0	0.00
Mentally Impaired (mild/moderate)	0	0.00
Multicategorical Special Ed (K-6)	2	66.67
Multicategorical Special Ed (5-Adult)	0	0.00
Preschool Special Needs	1	33.33
Severe/Multiple Disabilities	0	0.00
Specific Learning Disabilities	0	0.00
Visual Impairment	0	0.00
Other ^a	0	0.00

Note. Data from item A1.

Table 5. Teacher Education Program Satisfaction: Program Structure/Quality. How satisfied were you with the following aspects of your teacher preparation program?

	Total Respondents	Very Dissatisfied		Dissatisfied		Satisfied		Very Satisfied	
	n	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent
Advising on professional education program requirements.	29	0	0.00	4	13.79	15	51.72	10	34.48
Advising on content course requirements.	29	0	0.00	4	13.79	16	55.17	9	31.03
Quality of instruction in your teacher preparation courses.	29	0	0.00	2	6.90	11	37.93	16	55.17
Balance between theory and practice in your teacher preparation courses.	29	0	0.00	1	3.45	18	62.07	10	34.48
Integration of technology throughout your teacher preparation program.	29	1	3.45	4	13.79	14	48.28	10	34.48
Coherence between your coursework and field experiences prior to student teaching.	29	0	0.00	4	13.79	14	48.28	11	37.93
Quality of field experiences prior to student teaching.	29	0	0.00	2	6.90	13	44.83	14	48.28
Your student teaching placement site.	29	0	0.00	1	3.45	7	24.14	21	72.41

Note. Data from items A2a-h.

Table 6. Teacher Education Program Satisfaction: Program Structure/Quality. How satisfied were you with the following aspects of your teacher preparation program?

	#	Mean	SD
Advising on professional education program requirements.	29	3.20	0.67
Advising on content course requirements.	29	3.17	0.65
Quality of instruction in your teacher preparation courses.	29	3.48	0.63
Balance between theory and practice in your teacher preparation courses.	29	3.31	0.54
Integration of technology throughout your teacher preparation program.	29	3.13	0.78
Coherence between your coursework and field experiences prior to student teaching.	29	3.24	0.68
Quality of field experiences prior to student teaching.	29	3.41	0.62
Your student teaching placement site.	29	3.68	0.54

Note. Data from items A2a-h. Scale: 1 = Very Dissatisfied; 2 = Dissatisfied; 3 = Satisfied; 4 = Very Satisfied.

Table 7. Would you recommend your teacher education program to other prospective teachers?

	n = 28	
	#	Percent
Definitely yes	19	67.86
Probably yes	9	32.14
Probably no	0	0.00
Definitely no	0	0.00

Note. Data from item A3.

SECTION B. PREPARATION FOR TEACHING

Table 8. Preparation for Teaching: Instructional Practice. To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program gave you the basic skills to do the following?

	Total Respondents	Disagree		Tend to Disagree		Tend to Agree		Agree	
	n	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent
Effectively teach the subject matter in my licensure area.	29	0	0.00	1	3.45	2	6.90	26	89.66
Select instructional strategies to align with learning goals and standards.	29	0	0.00	3	10.34	2	6.90	24	82.76
Design activities where students engage with subject matter from a variety of perspectives.	29	0	0.00	2	6.90	4	13.79	23	79.31
Account for students' prior knowledge or experiences in instructional planning.	29	0	0.00	1	3.45	6	20.69	22	75.86
Design long-range instructional plans that meet curricular goals.	29	1	3.45	2	6.90	5	17.24	21	72.41
Regularly adjust instructional plans to meet students' needs.	29	0	0.00	1	3.45	5	17.24	23	79.31
Plan lessons with clear learning objectives/goals in mind.	29	0	0.00	1	3.45	3	10.34	25	86.21
Design and modify assessments to match learning objectives.	29	0	0.00	3	10.34	1	3.45	25	86.21
Provide students with meaningful feedback to guide next steps in learning.	29	0	0.00	1	3.45	4	13.79	24	82.76
Engage students in self-assessment strategies.	29	0	0.00	1	3.45	7	24.14	21	72.41
Use formative and summative assessments to inform instructional practice.	29	0	0.00	1	3.45	5	17.24	23	79.31

	Total Respondents	Disagree		Tend to Disagree		Tend to Agree		Agree	
	n	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent
Understand issues of reliability and validity in assessment.	29	0	0.00	2	6.90	5	17.24	22	75.86
Analyze appropriate types of assessment data to identify student learning needs.	29	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	17.24	24	82.76
Differentiate assessment for all learners.	29	0	0.00	1	3.45	5	17.24	23	79.31
Use digital and interactive technologies to achieve instructional goals.	29	0	0.00	5	17.24	2	6.90	22	75.86
Engage students in using a range of technology tools to achieve learning goals.	29	0	0.00	3	10.34	2	6.90	22	75.86
Help students develop critical thinking processes.	29	0	0.00	1	3.45	6	20.69	22	75.86
Help students develop skills to solve complex problems.	29	0	0.00	2	6.90	6	20.69	21	72.41
Understand how interdisciplinary themes connect to core subjects.	29	0	0.00	1	3.45	7	24.14	21	72.41
Know where and how to access resources to build global awareness and understanding.	29	2	6.90	1	3.45	5	17.24	21	72.41
Help students analyze multiple sources of evidence to draw sound conclusions.	29	1	3.45	0	0.00	7	24.14	21	72.41

Note. Data from items B1a-t.

Table 9. Preparation for Teaching: Instructional Practice. To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program gave you the basic skills to do the following?

	#	Mean	SD
Effectively teach the subject matter in my licensure area.	29	3.86	0.44
Select instructional strategies to align with learning goals and standards.	29	3.72	0.64
Design activities where students engage with subject matter from a variety of perspectives.	29	3.72	0.59
Account for students' prior knowledge or experiences in instructional planning.	29	3.72	0.52
Design long-range instructional plans that meet curricular goals.	29	3.58	0.77
Regularly adjust instructional plans to meet students' needs.	29	3.75	0.51
Plan lessons with clear learning objectives/goals in mind.	29	3.82	0.46
Design and modify assessments to match learning objectives.	29	3.75	0.63
Provide students with meaningful feedback to guide next steps in learning.	29	3.79	0.49
Engage students in self-assessment strategies.	29	3.68	0.54

	#	Mean	SD
Use formative and summative assessments to inform instructional practice.	29	3.75	0.51
Understand issues of reliability and validity in assessment.	29	3.68	0.60
Analyze appropriate types of assessment data to identify student learning needs.	29	3.82	0.38
Differentiate assessment for all learners.	29	3.75	0.51
Use digital and interactive technologies to achieve instructional goals.	29	3.58	0.77
Engage students in using a range of technology tools to achieve learning goals.	29	3.58	0.77
Help students develop critical thinking processes.	29	3.72	0.52
Help students develop skills to solve complex problems.	29	3.65	0.61
Understand how interdisciplinary themes connect to core subjects.	29	3.68	0.54
Know where and how to access resources to build global awareness and understanding.	29	3.55	0.86
Help students analyze multiple sources of evidence to draw sound conclusions.	29	3.65	0.66

Note. Data from items B1a-u. Scale: 1 = Disagree; 2 = Tend to Disagree; 3 = Tend to Agree; 4 = Agree.

Table 11. Preparation for Teaching: Diverse Learners. To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program gave you the basic skills to do the following?

	Total Respondents	Disagree		Tend to Disagree		Tend to Agree		Agree	
	n	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent
Effectively teach students from culturally and ethnically diverse backgrounds and communities.	29	0	0.00	0	0.00	10	34.48	19	65.52
Differentiate instruction for a variety of learning needs.	29	0	0.00	0	0.00	7	24.14	22	75.86
Differentiate for students at varied developmental levels.	29	0	0.00	2	6.90	5	17.24	22	75.86
Differentiate to meet the needs of students from various socioeconomic backgrounds.	29	0	0.00	1	3.45	5	17.24	23	79.31
Differentiate instruction for students with IEPs and 504 plans.	29	0	0.00	3	10.34	7	24.14	19	65.52
Differentiate instruction for students with mental health needs.	29	0	0.00	3	10.34	6	20.69	20	68.97
Differentiate instruction for gifted and talented students.	29	0	0.00	2	6.90	8	27.59	19	65.52
Differentiate instruction for English-language learners.	29	1	3.45	5	17.24	8	27.59	15	51.72
Access resources to foster learning for students with diverse needs.	29	1	3.45	3	10.34	4	13.79	21	72.41

Note. Data from items B2a-i.

Table 12. Preparation for Teaching: Diverse Learners. To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program gave you the basic skills to do the following?

	#	Mean	SD
Effectively teach students from culturally and ethnically diverse backgrounds and communities.	29	3.65	0.48
Differentiate instruction for a variety of learning needs.	29	3.75	0.43
Differentiate for students at varied developmental levels.	29	3.68	0.60
Differentiate to meet the needs of students from various socioeconomic backgrounds.	29	3.75	0.51
Differentiate instruction for students with IEPs and 504 plans.	29	3.55	0.68
Differentiate instruction for students with mental health needs.	29	3.58	0.68
Differentiate instruction for gifted and talented students.	29	3.58	0.62
Differentiate instruction for English-language learners.	29	3.27	0.88
Access resources to foster learning for students with diverse needs.	29	3.55	0.82

Note. Data from items B2a-i. Scale: 1 = Disagree; 2 = Tend to Disagree; 3 = Tend to Agree; 4 = Agree.

Table 13. Preparation for Teaching: Learning Environment. To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program gave you the basic skills to do the following?

	Total Respondents	Disagree		Tend to Disagree		Tend to Agree		Agree	
	n	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent
Clearly communicate expectations for appropriate student behavior.	29	0	0.00	1	3.45	3	10.34	25	86.21
Use effective communication skills and strategies to convey ideas and information to students.	29	0	0.00	1	3.45	3	10.34	25	86.21
Connect core content to real-life experiences for students.	29	0	0.00	1	3.45	3	10.34	25	86.21
Help students work together to achieve learning goals.	29	0	0.00	1	3.45	5	17.24	23	79.31
Develop and maintain a classroom environment that promotes student engagement.	29	0	0.00	2	6.90	2	6.90	25	86.21
Respond appropriately to student behavior.	29	0	0.00	1	3.45	5	17.24	23	79.31
Create a learning environment in which differences such as race, culture, gender, sexual orientation, and language are respected.	29	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	17.24	24	82.76
Help students regulate their own behavior.	29	0	0.00	1	3.45	6	20.69	22	75.86
Effectively organize the physical environment of the classroom for instruction.	29	1	3.45	0	0.00	4	13.79	24	82.76

Note. Data from items B3a-i.

Table 14. Preparation for Teaching: Learning Environment. To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program gave you the basic skills to do the following?

	#	Mean	SD
Clearly communicate expectations for appropriate student behavior.	29	3.82	0.46
Use effective communication skills and strategies to convey ideas and information to students.	29	3.82	0.46
Connect core content to real-life experiences for students.	29	3.82	0.46
Help students work together to achieve learning goals.	29	3.75	0.51
Develop and maintain a classroom environment that promotes student engagement.	29	3.79	0.55
Respond appropriately to student behavior.	29	3.75	0.51
Create a learning environment in which differences such as race, culture, gender, sexual orientation, and language are respected.	29	3.82	0.38
Help students regulate their own behavior.	29	3.72	0.52
Effectively organize the physical environment of the classroom for instruction.	29	3.75	0.63

Scale: 1 = Disagree; 2 = Tend to Disagree; 3 = Tend to Agree; 4 = Agree.

Table 15. Preparation for Teaching: Professionalism. To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program gave you the basic skills to do the following?

	Total Respondents	Disagree		Tend to Disagree		Tend to Agree		Agree	
	n	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent
Seek out learning opportunities that align with my professional development goals.	29	0	0.00	3	10.34	3	10.34	23	79.31
Access the professional literature to expand my knowledge about teaching and learning.	29	0	0.00	4	13.79	3	10.34	22	75.86
Collaborate with parents and guardians to support student learning.	29	1	3.45	3	10.34	5	17.24	20	68.97
Collaborate with teaching colleagues to improve student performance.	29	1	3.45	2	6.90	3	10.34	23	79.31
Use colleague feedback to support my development as a teacher.	29	1	3.45	1	3.45	4	13.79	23	79.31
Uphold laws related to student rights and teacher responsibility.	29	1	3.45	2	6.90	3	10.34	23	79.31
Act as an advocate for all students.	29	0	0.00	1	3.45	4	13.79	24	82.76

Table 16. Preparation for Teaching: Professionalism. To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program gave you the basic skills to do the following?

	#	Mean	SD
Seek out learning opportunities that align with my professional development goals.	29	3.68	0.66
Access the professional literature to expand my knowledge about teaching and learning.	29	3.62	0.72
Collaborate with parents and guardians to support student learning.	29	3.51	0.82
Collaborate with teaching colleagues to improve student performance.	29	3.65	0.76
Use colleague feedback to support my development as a teacher.	29	3.68	0.71
Uphold laws related to student rights and teacher responsibility.	29	3.65	0.76
Act as an advocate for all students.	29	3.79	0.49

Scale: 1 = Disagree; 2 = Tend to Disagree; 3 = Tend to Agree; 4 = Agree.

SECTION C. STUDENT TEACHING

Table 17. University or College Supervisor. (A university or college supervisor is the faculty member who is in charge of guiding, helping, and directing the teacher candidate.)

My university or college supervisor...

	Total Respondents	Disagree		Tend to Disagree		Tend to Agree		Agree	
	n	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent
Was available when I needed help.	29	0	0.00	2	6.90	3	10.34	24	82.76
Acted as a liaison between me and the school.	29	0	0.00	2	6.90	3	10.34	24	82.76
Gave me constructive feedback on my teaching.	29	1	3.45	0	0.00	5	17.24	23	79.31
Helped me understand my roles and responsibilities as a student teacher.	29	1	3.45	1	3.45	5	17.24	22	75.86
Helped me develop as a reflective practitioner.	29	1	3.45	0	0.00	6	20.69	22	75.86

Table 18. University or College Supervisor. (A university or college supervisor is the faculty member who is in charge of guiding, helping, and directing the teacher candidate.)

My university or college supervisor...

	#	Mean	SD
Was available when I needed help.	29	3.75	0.57
Acted as a liaison between me and the school.	29	3.75	0.57
Gave me constructive feedback on my teaching.	29	3.72	0.64
Helped me understand my roles and responsibilities as a student teacher.	29	3.65	0.72
Helped me develop as a reflective practitioner.	29	3.68	0.66

Scale: 1 = Disagree; 2 = Tend to Disagree; 3 = Tend to Agree; 4 = Agree.

Table 19. To the best of your knowledge, how many times did your university or college supervisor visit your student teaching classroom when you were actively teaching?

	n =29	
	#	Percent
0	0	0.00
1-2	0	0.00
3-4	5	17.24
5-6	22	75.86
7-8	2	6.90
9-10	0	0.00
More than 10	0	0.00

Note. Data from item C2.

Table 20. To the best of your knowledge, how many times did you discuss your student teaching in face-to-face conferences with your university or college supervisor? Include/count conversations longer than 10 minutes.

	n = 29	
	#	Percent
0	0	0.00
1-2	1	3.45
3-4	7	24.14
5-6	17	58.62
7-8	2	6.90
9-10	1	3.45
More than 10	1	3.45

Note. Data from item C3.

Table 21. Besides your university or college supervisor, did anyone else from your university or college visit you at your student teaching site?

	n = 27	
	#	Percent
Yes	4	14.81
No	23	85.19

Note. Data from item C4.

Table 22. If yes, check all that apply.

	n =4	
	#	Percent of Cases
Other university or college supervisor	2	50.00
University or college's field experience coordinator/supervisor	0	0.00
Teacher education faculty	2	50.00
Content faculty	0	0.00
Other faculty	0	0.00
Graduate student	0	0.00
Peer teacher candidate	1	25.00
Other	0	0.00

Note. Data from item C4. Includes Respondents who answered “yes” to the item in Table 21.

Table 23. If you experienced significant challenges during your student teaching, did you receive the help you needed?

	n = 29	
	#	Percent
Yes	17	58.62
No	0	0.00
Does not apply	12	41.37

Note. Data from item C5.

Table 24. Cooperating Teacher/Co-Teacher. (A cooperating teacher is the teacher in an educational setting who works with, helps, and advises the teacher candidate.) Please respond based on your most recent student teaching placement.

My cooperating teacher/co-teacher...

	Total Respondents	Disagree		Tend to Disagree		Tend to Agree		Agree	
	n	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent
Provided adequate opportunities for me to observe the classroom.	29	1	3.45	0	0.00	0	0.00	28	96.55
Provided adequate time for planning.	29	0	0.00	1	3.45	1	3.45	27	93.10
Helped me with classroom management.	29	0	0.00	1	3.45	1	3.45	27	93.10
Made me feel welcome.	29	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	3.45	28	96.55
Gave me constructive feedback on my teaching.	29	0	0.00	1	3.45	1	3.45	27	93.10
Let me experiment with my own teaching ideas.	29	0	0.00	1	3.45	2	6.90	26	89.66
Included me in parent-teacher conferences, school meetings, and other professional experiences.	29	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	3.45	28	96.55
Shared ideas and materials.	29	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	29	100.00
Helped me develop as a reflective practitioner.	29	0	0.00	1	3.45	1	3.45	27	93.10
Helped me plan differentiated instruction for a variety of learning needs.	29	0	0.00	1	3.45	2	6.90	26	89.66
Helped me use student data to inform instruction.	29	0	0.00	2	6.90	0	0.00	27	93.10

Note. Data from items C6.

Table 25. Cooperating Teacher/Co-Teacher. (A cooperating teacher is the teacher in an educational setting who works with, helps, and advises the teacher candidate.) Please respond based on your most recent student teaching placement.

My cooperating teacher/co-teacher...

	#	Mean	SD
Provided adequate opportunities for me to observe the classroom.	29	3.89	0.55
Provided adequate time for planning.	29	3.89	0.40
Helped me with classroom management.	29	3.89	0.40
Made me feel welcome.	29	3.96	0.18
Gave me constructive feedback on my teaching.	29	3.89	0.40
Let me experiment with my own teaching ideas.	29	3.86	0.44
Included me in parent-teacher conferences, school meetings, and other professional experiences.	29	3.96	0.18
Shared ideas and materials.	29	4.00	0.00
Helped me develop as a reflective practitioner.	29	3.89	0.40
Helped me plan differentiated instruction for a variety of learning needs.	29	3.86	0.44
Helped me use student data to inform instruction.	29	3.86	0.51

Note. Data from items C6. Scale: 1 = Disagree; 2 = Tend to Disagree; 3 = Tend to Agree; 4 = Agree.

SECTION D. FUTURE PLANS

Table 26. How long do you plan to teach?

	n = 29	
	#	Percent
1-2 years	0	0.00
3-5 years	0	0.00
6-10 years	1	3.45
11 or more years	28	96.55
I do not plan to teach	0	0.00

Note. Data from item D1.

Table 27. Where would you consider teaching? Mark all that apply.

	n = 29	
	#	Percent of Cases
West Virginia	28	96.55
Ohio	5	17.24
Kentucky	6	20.69
Virginia	16	55.17
Maryland	5	17.24
Pennsylvania	4	13.79
North Carolina	17	58.62
South Carolina	17	58.62
Florida	7	24.14
Other urban area in the U.S.	5	17.24
Other suburban area in the U.S.	5	17.24
Other rural area in the U.S.	5	17.24
Outside the U.S.	5	17.24
Other	2	6.90

Note. Data from item D2.

SECTION E. YOUR BACKGROUND

Table 28. What is your gender?

	n = 29	
	#	Percent
Male	5	17.24
Female	24	82.76

Note. Data from item E1.

Table 29. What is your race/ethnicity?

	n = 29	
	#	Percent of Cases
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0	0.00
Asian	0	0.00
Black or African American	0	0.00
Hispanic or Latino	1	3.45
Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander	0	0.00
White, non-Hispanic	28	96.55
Other	0	0.00

Note. Data from item E3.

Table 30. Is English your native language?

	n = 29	
	#	Percent
Yes	29	100.00
No	0	0.00

Note. Data from item E4.

Table 31. Do you fluently speak a language other than English?

	n = 28	
	#	Percent
Yes	1	3.57
No	27	96.43

Note. Data from item E5.

Appendix A: Exit Survey Validity and Reliability Information

Hezel Associates researchers performed an exploratory factor analysis using 2014-15 data from the Exit Survey Parts A, B, and C. A principal axis factor analysis with varimax rotation was used to compute the factors and evaluate the underlying structure of the items. Varimax rotation was used to ensure clear delineations of factors. Several assumptions must be met to ensure that factor analysis is appropriate for these data. The determinant, Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO), and Bartlett were used to test these assumptions. The determinant identifies whether items are too similar for the analysis to work well; KMO ensures that there are enough items predicted by each factor; the Bartlett test determines if the items are sufficiently correlated to run the factor analysis. The factor analysis suggests which items could potentially be retained, revised, or eliminated from each section based on how well they contribute to the overall understanding of the construct. The NExT Common Metrics Group used this analysis to make revisions; this version was implemented for the 2016-17 administration. The results of the analysis are presented below for each of the analyzed sections.¹

Section A2 includes seven items, six of which loaded clearly on two factors, using a correlation threshold of .30. Factor 1: Program Quality (items a2f, a2d, a2c, a2g, a2e) ranged from .763 to .482. Factor 2: Advising (items a2b, a2a) ranged from .783 to 7.68.

Part B, Preparation for Teaching, is comprised of four sections: B1, Instructional Practice; B2, Diverse Learners; B3, Learning Environment; and B4, Professionalism. All of the items in Part B were included in this analysis. Analyzing all sections together provided information about the underlying factor structure of Part B, which may uncover relationships among variables that would not be found if the sections were analyzed separately.

Using Cohen's (1988) guidelines, moderate to strong correlations, ranging from .33 to .83, were found between all of the variables within each of the individual sections of Part B. The large number of moderate to strong correlations indicates that these items are all closely related to one another. When items intended for separate constructs are closely related, it can be concluded that the constructs the items are measuring are also closely related. Five factors emerged in this factor analysis, accounting for 60% of the variance. Factor 1: Instructional Practice (items B1h, B1b, B1g, B1k, B1c, B1d, B1f, B1a, B1e, B1m, B1i, B1l, B1r, B1p, B1j, B1q) ranged from .670 to .447. Factor 2: Learning Environment (items B3h, B3f, B3a, B3e, B3b, B3i, B3d, B3g, B3c) ranged from .707 to .478. Factor 3: Diverse Learners (items B2f, B2e, B2h, B2g, B2d, B2b, B2a, B2i, B2c, B2j) ranged from .706 to .443. Factor 4: Professionalism (items B4e, B4d, B4b, B4a, B4c, B4f) ranged from .665 to .529. Factor 5: Technology and Resources (items B1o, B1n, B1s, B1t) ranged from .669 to .484.

Part C, Student Teaching, Section C1, includes two sections: University or College Supervisor, and Section C6, Cooperating Teacher/Co-teacher. All of the items in these two sections were included in this analysis. Using Cohen's (1988) guidelines, all items in Section C1 had strong bivariate correlations ranging from .646 to .814. The factor analysis suggests a two-factor solution. The first factor accounted for 39% of the variance and the second accounted for 23%. Factor 1: Cooperating Teacher (items C6i, C6e, C6j, C6k, C6c, C6d, C6b, C6h, C6f, C6a, C6g) ranged from .842 to .571. Factor 2: University/College Supervisor (items C1d, C1e, C1c, C1a, C1b) ranged from .895 to .785.

Instrument Reliability

The reliability of the scales suggested by the factor loadings was assessed using Cronbach’s alpha. The alpha coefficients, all greater than .70, signify good internal consistency for these constructs. The results are displayed in Table 1.

Table 1. Reliability Analysis

Part	Scale	Cronbach’s Alpha
A	Section A2: Program Structure and Quality	.81
	Advising	.80
	Program Quality	.78
B	Part B: Preparation for Teaching	.98
	Instructional Practice	.95
	Learning Environment	.94
	Diverse Learners	.92
	Technology and Resources	.85
	Professionalism	.91
C	Sections C1: University/College Supervisor and C6: Cooperating Teacher	.91
	Cooperating Teacher	.93
	University/College Supervisor	.92

¹A more detailed report is available upon request from Stacy.Duffield@ndsu.edu.