

West Virginia Common Metrics 2018 Transition to Teaching Survey

Concord University

February 2019



Prepared by

Stacy Duffield, Ph.D.
Jingjun Zhao, M.S.
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

The Exit, Transition to Teaching, and Supervisor Surveys are all aligned with one another and the InTASC Standards. The InTASC Standards are used by CAEP, the nation’s largest accreditor of teacher preparation programs. Because the surveys are also aligned with one another, items and sections are able to be compared across surveys. The Exit Survey, Transition to Teaching Survey and Supervisor Survey were revised in 2016 in response to a psychometric analysis. The most recent validity and reliability analysis can be found in Appendix A.

This Report

The 2018 TTS collects information on recent graduates’ licensure and job status, perceptions of their teacher preparation programs, current school contexts, and personal demographics. This survey is administered to all completers from the previous academic year. Design logic used within the survey takes completers who are not teaching through a set of items that asks them what they are doing and why. Completers who are teaching are asked to rate satisfaction with their teacher preparation using the same items used in the Exit Survey and Supervisor Survey.

The findings section highlights useful data emerging from the TTS completed by the NExT aggregate graduates from the 2016-17 academic year. The ratings are on a 4-point scale and include the following descriptors: Agree, Tend to Agree, Tend to Disagree, and Disagree. Quantitative data for the institution are presented below in tabular format.

Copyright and Permission for Use

The NExT institutions hold the copyright on these surveys. Institutions are asked not to alter the surveys; however, items may be added to the end the surveys for individual institutional use. Appendix B presents guidelines for writing about the surveys and data.

Accreditation and Program Approval

The surveys support accreditation and program approval at both the state and national level through their alignment with both the [InTASC](#) and [CAEP](#) accreditation standards. The TTS is strong evidence for CAEP Standard 4.4, and provides evidence of stakeholder input on

preparation and program evaluation, which are required in CAEP Standards 2.1 and 5.5.

Survey Administration and Response Rate

The 2018 TTS was administered to completers who graduated from the institution's educator preparation program who were first year teachers in West Virginia during the 2018-19 academic year. To facilitate location of completers within West Virginia, the West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission and Department of Education provided lists of first-year teachers for each institution. The total number of responses for the TTS for Concord University is 12. The invitation to complete the survey was sent to 89 new teachers prepared by the institution who were teaching in West Virginia. The response rate for the institution is 13% (12/89).

Using this Report

Findings from the TTS can be compared to future cohorts in order to understand how shifts in IHE programs' coursework and clinical experiences affect completers' perceptions of and satisfaction with their teacher education programs. Findings from the Supervisor Survey, administered to supervisors of new teachers in their first year after graduation, may also shed light on whether supervisors' perceptions of and satisfaction with new teacher preparedness align with perceptions of the new teachers.

Findings

Survey Part A

Part A of the survey, Tables 2-26, asks completers about their licensure and employment status. Completers who are not teaching only complete Part A.

Survey Part B

Part B of the survey, Tables 27-34, asks completers to rate how well prepared they felt across multiple domains of teaching including instructional practices, diverse learners, learning environment, and professionalism. Completers were asked to respond using the following scale: disagree; tend to disagree; tend to agree; and agree.

Survey Part C

Part C of the survey, Tables 35-40, asks completers about the context of the schools where they are teaching, including the environment and available resources.

Survey Part D

Part D of the survey, Tables 41-42, asks completers if they would recommend their teacher preparation program and teaching profession to others.

**Table 1. Which communication method *most* prompted you to complete this survey today?
(Select one only.)**

	n = 13	
	#	Percent
Email	5	38.46
Mailing	0	0.00
Telephone	0	0.00
Text	0	0.00
Social media	0	0.00
Other	8	61.54

PART A. YOUR LICENSURE AND JOB STATUS

Table 2. Have you applied for a professional teaching license?

	n = 13	
	#	Percent
Yes	13	100.00
No	0	0.00

Note. Data from item A1.

Table 3. If no, why did you not apply for a teaching license? Mark ALL that apply.

	n = 0	
	#	Percent of Cases
I have not yet taken the state licensure exams.	0	0.00
I have not yet passed the state licensure exams.	0	0.00
I plan to teach in an organization that doesn't require a license.	0	0.00
I enrolled (or plan to enroll) in graduate school to pursue an additional teaching certification or endorsement.	0	0.00
I enrolled (or plan to enroll) in graduate school to pursue a non-teaching career.	0	0.00
I am not planning to pursue a career in teaching.	0	0.00
Other	0	0.00

Note. Data from item A1a. Includes respondents who answered “no” to the item in Table 3.

Table 4. Please identify the state(s) in which you applied for a teaching license. Mark ALL that apply.

	n = 12	
	#	Percent of Cases
West Virginia	12	100.00
Florida	0	0.00
Kentucky	0	0.00
Maryland	0	0.00
North Carolina	0	0.00
Ohio	0	0.00
Pennsylvania	0	0.00
South Carolina	0	0.00
Virginia	1	8.33
Other	0	0.00

Note. Data from item A2. Includes respondents who answered “yes” to the item in Table 3.

Table 5. In which state(s) do you hold a teaching license? Mark ALL that apply.

	n = 11	
	#	Percent of Cases
West Virginia	11	100.00
Maryland	0	0.00
North Carolina	0	0.00
South Carolina	0	0.00
Virginia	0	0.00
Pennsylvania	0	0.00
Ohio	0	0.00
Kentucky	0	0.00
Other	0	0.00

Note. Data from item A3. Includes respondents who answered “yes” to the item in Table 3.

Table 6. Did you apply for a job outside of teaching?

	n = 12	
	#	Percent
Yes	3	25.00
No	9	75.00

Note. Data from item A4.

Table 7. If yes, why did you apply for a job outside of teaching? Mark ALL that apply.

	n = 3	
	#	Percent of Cases
No teaching positions available in my field	0	0.00
A limited number of teaching positions available in my field	3	100.00
Ensure earnings until a teaching position is obtained	0	0.00
Family or personal reasons	0	0.00
More future prospects outside of teaching	0	0.00
Better location of jobs outside of teaching	0	0.00
Preferred work environment of jobs outside of teaching	0	0.00
Better salary or pay for jobs outside of teaching	0	0.00
Better benefits packages for jobs outside of teaching	0	0.00
Able to find adequate employment (full-time or part-time) outside of teaching	0	0.00
More certainty of job security for jobs outside of teaching	0	0.00
Better evaluation and accountability policies outside of teaching	0	0.00
Other	0	0.00

Note. Data from item A4a. Includes respondents who answered “yes” to the item in Table 7.

Table 8. Did you seek employment as a licensed teacher?

	n = 12	
	#	Percent
Yes	12	100.00
No	0	0.00

Note. Data from item A5.

Table 9. How many teaching job applications did you submit?

	n = 12	
	#	Percent
1-5	6	50.00
6-10	2	16.67
11-15	2	16.67
16-20	0	0.00
More than 20	1	8.33

Note. Data from item A5a. Includes respondents who answered “yes” to the item in Table 9.

Table 10. Where did you apply for teaching positions? Mark ALL that apply.

	n = 12	
	#	Percent of Cases
City in WV	4	33.33
Small Town in WV	5	41.67
Rural Area in WV	10	83.33
City in Ohio	1	8.33
Small Town in Ohio	0	0.00
Rural Area in Ohio	0	0.00
City in Kentucky	1	8.33
Small Town in Kentucky	1	8.33
Rural Area in Kentucky	1	8.33
Other urban area in the U.S.	0	0.00
Other suburban area in the U.S.	1	8.33
Other rural area in the U.S.	1	8.33
Outside the U.S.	0	0.00
Other	0	0.00

Note. Data from item A5b. Includes respondents who answered “yes” to the item in Table 9.

Table 11. How many requests for teaching job interviews did you receive?

	n = 12	
	#	Percent
None	0	0.00
1	0	0.00
2-3	4	33.33
4-5	3	25.00
6-10	2	16.67
More than 10	2	16.67

Note. Data from item A5c. Includes respondents who answered “yes” to the item in Table 9.

Table 12. How well prepared do you think you were for your teaching job interview(s)?

	n = 11	
	#	Percent
Very well prepared	5	45.45
Somewhat prepared	6	54.55
Not prepared	0	0.00

Note. Data from item A5d. Includes respondents who answered “yes” to the item in Table 10 and those that did not answer “none” in Table 12.

Table 13. Did you receive job offers for teaching positions?

	n = 11	
	#	Percent
Yes	9	81.82
No	2	18.18

Note. Data from item A6.

Table 14. If no, why do you think you did not receive any job offers? Mark ALL that apply.

	n = 2	
	#	Percent of Cases
Jobs in my licensure area are very competitive	1	50.00
My interview(s) did not go well	0	0.00
I have not passed the state licensure exams	0	0.00
I only applied for a limited number of positions	0	0.00
I limited my job search to a small geographic area	0	0.00
I started my job search late	0	0.00
My teaching portfolio did not reflect my abilities	1	50.00
Other	1	50.00

Note. Data from item A6a. Includes respondents who answered “no” to the item in Table 14.

Table 15. How many offers for a teaching position did you receive?

	n = 9	
	#	Percent
0	0	0.00
1	2	22.22
2	5	55.56
3	0	0.00
4	1	11.11
5	1	11.11
More than 5	0	0.00

Note. Data from item A7.

Table 16. Did you accept an offer for a teaching position?

	n = 9	
	#	Percent
Yes	11	122.22
No	0	0.00

Note. Data from item A8. Excludes respondents who answered “0” to the item in Table 16.

Table 17. If no, why did you turn down a teaching position offer? Mark ALL that apply.

	n = 0	
	#	Percent of Cases
Family or personal reasons	0	0.00
Other job offers	0	0.00
Location of the teaching position(s)	0	0.00
School environment of the teaching position(s) (i.e., school atmosphere, working relationships)	0	0.00
Few future career prospects in teaching	0	0.00
Salary or pay of the teaching position(s) inadequate	0	0.00
Benefits package inadequate	0	0.00
Percentage of appointment inadequate	0	0.00
Uncertainty in job security	0	0.00
Evaluation and accountability policies for teachers	0	0.00
Other	0	0.00

Note. Data from item A8a. Includes respondents who answered “no” to the item in Table 17.

Table 18. If no, do you plan to seek a licensed teaching position within the next 12 months?

	n = 0	
	#	Percent
Yes	0	0.00
No	0	0.00

Note. Data from item A8b. Includes respondents who answered “no” to the item in Table 17.

Table 19. Please describe your current employment situation by choosing the appropriate response.

	n = 11	
	#	Percent
Employed full-time in an educational setting	10	90.91
Employed part-time in an educational setting	1	9.09
Employed full-time in a field other than education^a	0	0.00
Employed part-time in a field other than education^a	0	0.00
Unemployed and seeking employment^a	0	0.00
Unemployed and not seeking employment^a	0	0.00

Note. Data from item A9.

^aRespondents employed in a field other than education and those who are unemployed did not complete the remainder of the survey.

Table 20. If employed part-time in an educational setting, what percentage of time do you spend in that setting?

	n = 1	
	#	Percent
20% or less	0	0.00
21-40%	0	0.00
41-60%	0	0.00
61-80%	1	100.00
81% or more	0	0.00

Note. Data from item A9a. Includes respondents who answered “Employed part-time in an educational setting” to the item in Table 20.

Table 21. If you are currently employed in an educational setting, which of the following best describes the type of position?

	n = 11	
	#	Percent
Full-time or part-time teacher	11	100.00
Short-term substitute^a	0	0.00
Long-term substitute^a	0	0.00
Paraprofessional^a	0	0.00
Other^a	0	0.00

Note. Data from item A10.

^aRespondents indicating short-term substitute, long-term substitute, and paraprofessional were directed to the “thank you” page and did not complete the remainder of the survey. Those that indicated “other” were able to complete the survey and then their response was reviewed to see if it could be considered within the full-time or part-time teacher classification.

Table 22. Type of school in which you are employed:

	n = 11	
	#	Percent
Traditional public school	8	72.73
Public charter school	0	0.00
Private school	0	0.00
Other	1	9.09

Note. Data from item A12.

Table 23. Is a formal mentoring/induction program available to you in your school or district?

	n = 11	
	#	Percent
Yes	8	72.73
No	1	9.09

Note. Data from item A13.

Table 24. How long do you plan on teaching?

	n = 11	
	#	Percent
1-2 years	1	9.09
3-5 years	0	0.00
6-10 years	0	0.00
11 or more years	8	72.73

Note. Data from item A14.

Table 25. What grade level(s) are you teaching? Mark ALL that apply.

	n = 9	
	#	Percent of Cases
Early Childhood	1	9.09
Elementary	6	54.55
Middle or Junior High	3	27.27
High School	0	0.00

Note. Data from item A15.

Table 26. Are you teaching any subject and/or grade level for which you are not licensed?

	n = 11	
	#	Percent
Yes	0	0.00
No	9	81.82

Note. Data from item A16.

PART B. YOUR TEACHER PREPARATION (COURSEWORK AND FIELD/CLINICAL EXPERIENCES): WHAT WERE YOU PREPARED TO DO?

Table 27. Preparation for Teaching: Instructional Practice. To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program prepared you 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.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	28.57	5	71.43
Select instructional strategies to align with learning goals and standards.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	28.57	5	71.43
Design activities where students engage with subject matter from a variety of perspectives.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	28.57	5	71.43
Account for students' prior knowledge or experiences in instructional planning.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	28.57	5	71.43
Design long-range instructional plans that meet curricular goals.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	28.57	5	71.43
Regularly adjust instructional plans to meet students' needs.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	14.29	6	85.71
Plan lessons with clear learning objectives/goals in mind.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	14.29	6	85.71
Design and modify assessments to match learning objectives.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	28.57	5	71.43
Provide students with meaningful feedback to guide next steps in learning.	7	0	0.00	1	14.29	1	14.29	5	71.43
Engage students in self-assessment strategies.	7	0	0.00	1	14.29	1	14.29	5	71.43

	Total Respondents	Disagree		Tend to Disagree		Tend to Agree		Agree	
	n	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent
Use formative and summative assessments to inform instructional practice.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	28.57	5	71.43
Identify issues of reliability and validity in assessment.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	28.57	5	71.43
Analyze appropriate types of assessment data to identify student learning needs.	7	0	0.00	1	14.29	1	14.29	5	71.43
Differentiate assessment for all learners.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	28.57	5	71.43
Use digital and interactive technologies to achieve instructional goals.	7	0	0.00	1	14.29	1	14.29	5	71.43
Engage students in using a range of technology tools to achieve learning goals.	7	0	0.00	1	14.29	1	14.29	5	71.43
Help students develop critical thinking processes.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	28.57	5	71.43
Help students develop skills to solve complex problems.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	28.57	5	71.43
Make interdisciplinary connections among core subjects.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	28.57	5	71.43
Know where and how to access resources to build global awareness and understanding.	7	0	0.00	1	14.29	1	14.29	5	71.43
Help students analyze multiple sources of evidence to draw sound conclusions.	7	0	0.00	1	14.29	1	14.29	5	71.43

Note. Data from items B1a-t.

Table 28. Preparation for Teaching: Instructional Practice. To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program prepared you to do the following?

	n	Mean	SD
Effectively teach the subject matter in my licensure area.	7	3.71	0.45
Select instructional strategies to align with learning goals and standards.	7	3.71	0.45
Design activities where students engage with subject matter from a variety of perspectives.	7	3.71	0.45
Account for students’ prior knowledge or experiences in instructional planning.	7	3.71	0.45
Design long-range instructional plans that meet curricular goals.	7	3.71	0.45
Regularly adjust instructional plans to meet students’ needs.	7	3.86	0.35
Plan lessons with clear learning objectives/goals in mind.	7	3.86	0.35
Design and modify assessments to match learning objectives.	7	3.71	0.45
Provide students with meaningful feedback to guide next steps in learning.	7	3.57	0.73
Engage students in self-assessment strategies.	7	3.57	0.73
Use formative and summative assessments to inform instructional practice.	7	3.71	0.45
Identify issues of reliability and validity in assessment.	7	3.71	0.45
Analyze appropriate types of assessment data to identify student learning needs.	7	3.57	0.73
Differentiate assessment for all learners.	7	3.71	0.45
Use digital and interactive technologies to achieve instructional goals.	7	3.57	0.73

	n	Mean	SD
Engage students in using a range of technology tools to achieve learning goals.	7	3.57	0.73
Help students develop critical thinking processes.	7	3.71	0.45
Help students develop skills to solve complex problems.	7	3.71	0.45
Make interdisciplinary connections among core subjects.	7	3.71	0.45
Know where and how to access resources to build global awareness and understanding.	7	3.57	0.73
Help students analyze multiple sources of evidence to draw sound conclusions.	7	3.57	0.73

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

Table 29. Preparation for Teaching: Diverse Learners. To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program prepared you 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.	7	0	0.00	1	14.29	3	42.86	3	42.86
Differentiate instruction for a variety of learning needs.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	28.57	5	71.43
Differentiate for students at varied developmental levels.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	28.57	5	71.43
Differentiate to meet the needs of students from various socioeconomic backgrounds.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	28.57	5	71.43
Differentiate instruction for students with IEPs and 504 plans.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	28.57	5	71.43
Differentiate instruction for students with mental health needs.	7	0	0.00	1	14.29	3	42.86	3	42.86
Differentiate instruction for gifted and talented students.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	28.57	5	71.43
Differentiate instruction for English-language learners.	7	0	0.00	2	28.57	2	28.57	3	42.86
Access resources to foster learning for students with diverse needs.	7	0	0.00	1	14.29	1	14.29	5	71.43

Note. Data from items B2a-j.

Table 30. Preparation for Teaching: Diverse Learners. To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program prepared you to do the following?

	n	Mean	SD
Effectively teach students from culturally and ethnically diverse backgrounds and communities.	7	3.29	0.70
Differentiate instruction for a variety of learning needs.	7	3.71	0.45
Differentiate for students at varied developmental levels.	7	3.71	0.45
Differentiate to meet the needs of students from various socioeconomic backgrounds.	7	3.71	0.45
Differentiate instruction for students with IEPs and 504 plans.	7	3.71	0.45
Differentiate instruction for students with mental health needs.	7	3.29	0.70
Differentiate instruction for gifted and talented students.	7	3.71	0.45
Differentiate instruction for English-language learners.	7	3.14	0.83
Access resources to foster learning for students with diverse needs.	7	3.57	0.73

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

Table 31. Preparation for Teaching: Learning Environment. To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program prepared you 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.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	28.57	5	71.43
Use effective communication skills and strategies to convey ideas and information to students.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	28.57	5	71.43
Connect core content to students' real-life experiences.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	14.29	6	85.71
Help students work together to achieve learning goals.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	14.29	6	85.71
Develop and maintain a classroom environment that promotes student engagement.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	14.29	6	85.71
Respond appropriately to student behavior.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	14.29	6	85.71
Create a learning environment in which differences such as race, culture, gender, sexual orientation, and language are respected.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	28.57	5	71.43
Help students regulate their own behavior.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	28.57	5	71.43
Effectively organize the physical environment of the classroom for instruction.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	14.29	6	85.71

Note. Data from items B3a-i.

Table 32. Preparation for Teaching: Learning Environment. To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program prepared you to do the following?

	n	Mean	SD
Clearly communicate expectations for appropriate student behavior.	7	3.71	0.45
Use effective communication skills and strategies to convey ideas and information to students.	7	3.71	0.45
Connect core content to students’ real-life experiences.	7	3.86	0.35
Help students work together to achieve learning goals.	7	3.86	0.35
Develop and maintain a classroom environment that promotes student engagement.	7	3.86	0.35
Respond appropriately to student behavior.	7	3.86	0.35
Create a learning environment in which differences such as race, culture, gender, sexual orientation, and language are respected.	7	3.71	0.45
Help students regulate their own behavior.	7	3.71	0.45
Effectively organize the physical environment of the classroom for instruction.	7	3.86	0.35

Note. Data from items B3a-i. Scale: 1 = Disagree; 2 = Tend to Disagree; 3 = Tend to Agree; 4 = Agree.

Table 33. Preparation for Teaching: Professionalism. To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program prepared you 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.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	28.57	5	71.43
Access the professional literature to expand my knowledge about teaching and learning.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	14.29	6	85.71
Collaborate with parents and guardians to support student learning.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	14.29	6	85.71
Collaborate with teaching colleagues to improve student performance.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	28.57	5	71.43
Use colleague feedback to support my development as a teacher.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	14.29	6	85.71
Uphold laws related to student rights and teacher responsibility.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	14.29	6	85.71
Act as an advocate for all students.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	28.57	5	71.43

Note. Data from items B4a-g.

Table 34. Preparation for Teaching: Professionalism. To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program prepared you to do the following?

	n	Mean	SD
Seek out learning opportunities that align with my professional development goals.	7	3.71	0.45
Access the professional literature to expand my knowledge about teaching and learning.	7	3.86	0.35
Collaborate with parents and guardians to support student learning.	7	3.86	0.35
Collaborate with teaching colleagues to improve student performance.	7	3.71	0.45
Use colleague feedback to support my development as a teacher.	7	3.86	0.35
Uphold laws related to student rights and teacher responsibility.	7	3.86	0.35
Act as an advocate for all students.	7	3.71	0.45

Note. Data from items B4a-g. Scale: 1 = Disagree; 2 = Tend to Disagree; 3 = Tend to Agree; 4 = Agree.

PART C. YOUR SCHOOL CONTEXT: WHAT IS YOUR SCHOOL LIKE?

Table 35. School Climate: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

	Total Respondents	Disagree		Tend to Disagree		Tend to Agree		Agree	
	n	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent
The school is a physically safe and secure place.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	7	100.00
Teachers respect the dignity and worth of all students.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	7	100.00
The faculty and staff have positive relationships with students' parents/ guardians.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	14.29	6	85.71

Note. Data from items C1a-c.

Table 36. School Climate: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

	n	Mean	SD
The school is a physically safe and secure place.	7	4.00	0.00
Teachers respect the dignity and worth of all students.	7	4.00	0.00
The faculty and staff have positive relationships with students' parents/ guardians.	7	3.86	0.35

Note. Data from items C1a-c. Scale: 1 = Disagree; 2 = Tend to Disagree; 3 = Tend to Agree; 4 = Agree.

Table 37. Professional Environment: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

	Total Respondents	Disagree		Tend to Disagree		Tend to Agree		Agree	
	n	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent
I receive valuable professional guidance from faculty mentors or colleagues.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	14.29	6	85.71
The administration is responsive to the needs of teachers.	7	0	0.00	1	14.29	0	0.00	6	85.71
Teachers are continually learning and seeking new ideas to enhance their practice.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	14.29	6	85.71
Teachers have influence over establishing the curriculum.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	7	100.00

Note. Data from items C2a-d.

Table 38. Professional Environment: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

	n	Mean	SD
I receive valuable professional guidance from faculty mentors or colleagues.	7	3.86	0.35
The administration is responsive to the needs of teachers.	7	3.71	0.70
Teachers are continually learning and seeking new ideas to enhance their practice.	7	3.86	0.35
Teachers have influence over establishing the curriculum.	7	4.00	0.00

Note. Data from items C2a-d. Scale: 1 = Disagree; 2 = Tend to Disagree; 3 = Tend to Agree; 4 = Agree.

Table 39. Resources: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

	Total Respondents	Disagree		Tend to Disagree		Tend to Agree		Agree	
	n	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent
Teachers have time in their schedules for planning with colleagues.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	28.57	5	71.43
Teachers have the necessary technology resources.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	28.57	5	71.43
Teachers have appropriate instructional space.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	14.29	6	85.71
Teachers have curricular materials and supplies that are appropriate for students' developmental levels and learning needs.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	28.57	5	71.43

Note. Data from items C3a-d.

Table 40. Resources: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

	n	Mean	SD
Teachers have time in their schedules for planning with colleagues.	7	3.71	0.45
Teachers have the necessary technology resources.	7	3.71	0.45
Teachers have appropriate instructional space.	7	3.86	0.35
Teachers have curricular materials and supplies that are appropriate for students' developmental levels and learning needs.	7	3.71	0.45

Note. Data from items C3a-d. Scale: 1 = Disagree; 2 = Tend to Disagree; 3 = Tend to Agree; 4 = Agree.

PART D. PROGRAM RECOMMENDATION

Table 41. To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

	Total Respondents	Disagree		Tend to Disagree		Tend to Agree		Agree	
	n	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent
I would recommend my teacher preparation program to a prospective teacher.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	28.57	5	71.43
I am as happy about teaching as I thought I would be.	7	0	0.00	1	14.29	0	0.00	6	85.71
The rewards of teaching are worth the efforts I put into becoming a teacher.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	28.57	5	71.43
My teacher education program prepared me to be successful in my current teaching position.	7	1	14.29	0	0.00	1	14.29	5	71.43

Note. Data from items D1a-f.

Table 42. To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

	n	Mean	SD
I would recommend my teacher preparation program to a prospective teacher.	7	3.71	0.45
I am as happy about teaching as I thought I would be.	7	3.71	0.70
The rewards of teaching are worth the efforts required by my preparation program.	7	3.71	0.45
My teacher education program prepared me to be successful in my current teaching position.	7	3.43	1.05

Note. Data from items D1a-d. Scale: 1 = Disagree; 2 = Tend to Disagree; 3 = Tend to Agree; 4 = Agree.

Appendix A: TTS 2017 Validity and Reliability

An exploratory factor analysis was performed to test the validity and reliability of the Transition to Teaching Survey (TTS) data for Parts B, C, and D. The following sections were included: Part B “Your teacher preparation,” Part C “Your school context,” and Part D “Program recommendation.” Part A, “Your licensure and job status,” was not included in the analysis because the items do not provide scale level data. The data set used for this analysis included Network for Excellence in Teaching (NExT) and all affiliate institutions who contributed to the aggregate. An exploratory factor analysis informs decisions about retaining, revising, or eliminating survey items based on how well they contribute to the overall understanding of the construct.

The correlation, reliability matrix, and exploratory factor analysis were conducted using SAS 9.4, PROC CORR and PROC FACTOR procedures. Principal axis method with varimax rotation was used to identify the factors and evaluate the latent structure of the items for each part of the survey.

Prior to the factor analysis, assumptions including determinant, Kaiser-Mayer-Olkin (KMO), and Bartlett were tested. In addition, cross loadings were checked to identify variables that are poor factor indicators. A difference in cross loading of less than 0.1 was set as the threshold. The determinant suggests whether items are too close to run the analysis; KMO ensures enough survey items are predicted by each factor; the Bartlett tests whether the items have sufficient correlations to perform the factor analysis. All the assumption tests were conducted in R program.

Results Summary

Test of Assumptions

Assumptions of sampling adequacy (KMO) and normal distribution across samples (Bartlett’s Test) were both met for all parts of the TTS. However, the determinant was lower than ideal for Part B, which indicates potential problems with collinearity, indicating that some variables are highly correlated and are likely redundant. The test results were similar to the 2015 TTS data.

Part B: Your teacher preparation

Correlations were calculated to check how related the items are to each other. According to Cohen (1988), correlation coefficients between 0.3 and 0.49 suggest a moderate correlation between two variables. Coefficients from 0.1 to 0.29 indicate weak correlations, 0.30 to 0.49 indicate moderate correlations, while 0.5 to 1.0 are strong correlations. Based on this guideline, most of the bivariate correlations among items in Part B were moderate, ranging from weak (.242) to strong (.821), which indicates that these items are all closely related to one another. Item b4g_adv0 has very low correlations, ranging from 0.09 to .262, with all other items in Part B, which suggests that item b4g_adv0 is not closely related with any other items in Part B.

Part B contains four sections: Section B1, Instructional Practice; Section B2, Diverse Learners; Section B3, Learning Environment; and Section B4, Professionalism. All 46 items in Part B were included in this analysis.

Four factors retained in the factor analysis, in total accounting for 91% of the variance. The first factor accounted for 33% of the variance, the second factor accounted for 22%, the third accounted for 20%, and the fourth factor accounted for 16% of the variance. Table 1 delineates a list of items that loaded on each factor, the primary topic for each factor, and the percentage of the variance explained. Table 2 shows the factor loading matrix after rotation; items that loaded onto the same factor are circled together. Further discussion of each factor follows the two tables.

Table 1. Part B: Teacher Preparation Factors

Factor	Items	Primary Topic	Variance Explained
1	b1a_lic, b1b_strat, b1c_pers, b1d_prior, b1e_long, b1f_adjust, b1g_clear, b1h_mod, b1i_fdbk, b1j_self, b1k_assess, b1l_rel, b1m_lrnds, B1mm_diff, b1n_tech, b1o_tools, b1p_crit, b1q_cmplx, b1r_intdsc, b1s_glbl, b1t_concl	Instructional Practice	33%
2	b2a_dvrs, b2b_diff, b2c_dev, b2d_soc, b2e_iep, b2f_mntl, b2g_gift, b2h_ell, b2i_access	Diverse Learners	22%
3	b3a_expec, b3b_strat, b3c_real, b3d_work, b3e_prom, b3f_resp, b3g_diff, b3h_self, b3i_org	Learning Environment	20%
4	b4a_pd, b4b_lit, b4c_pare, b4d_coll, b4e_fdbk, b4f_legal, b4g_advo	Professionalism	16%

Section B1: Instructional Practice

All 18 items from Section B1, Instructional Practice, loaded onto Factor 1. All of these items related to instructional practice, which indicates that Section B1 represents one scale related to Instructional Practice. Additionally, there are no items cross-loaded with other factors.

Section B2: Diverse Learners

All items in Section B2 loaded highest onto Factor 2, indicating that Section B2 represents one scale related to diverse learners. In addition, there are no items cross-loaded with other factors in Section B2.

Section B3: Learning Environment

All items from Section B3 loaded strongly onto Factor 3, suggesting that these items represent one scale related to learning environment. However, item b4g_advo loads nearly as strongly on Factors 1 and 3 making it difficult to determine with certainty to which of the two factors (if either) this item belongs.

Section B4: Professionalism

All items in Section 4 loaded onto Factor 4, Professionalism, with one concern that the item b4g_advo has a very low factor coefficient. Item b4g_advo has relatively low correlations with all other items, which suggests that this item should be revised or eliminated from the section. Overall, the factor analysis result suggests that all these items, except the item b4g_advo, can be

used to measure one Professionalism scale for future analysis. No items cross-loaded onto other factors, indicating that these items make up one construct.

Table 2. Part B: Teacher Preparation Factor Loading Matrix

	Factor			
	1	2	3	4
b1b_strat	0.67			
b1c_pers	0.67			
b1o_tools	0.67			
b1d_prior	0.63			
b1k_assess	0.63			
b1p_crit	0.63			
b1j_self	0.63			
b1q_cmplx	0.61			
b1h_mod	0.61			
b1i_fdbk	0.61			
b1s_glbl	0.61			
b1n_tech	0.61			
b1m_lrnds	0.60			
b1l_rel	0.59			
b1g_clear	0.58			
b1e_long	0.58			
b1f_adjust	0.57			
b1r_intdsc	0.56			
B1mm_diff	0.54			
b1a_lic	0.52			
b1t_concl	0.52			
b2f_mntl		0.72		
b2d_soc		0.71		
b2e_iep		0.71		
b2c_dev		0.66		
b2i_access		0.66		
b2h_ell		0.65		
b2b_diff		0.63		
b2a_dvrs		0.61		
b2g_gift		0.60		

b3a_expec			0.74	
b3e_prom			0.74	
b3f_resp			0.73	
b3h_self			0.64	
b3b_strat	0.46		0.66	
b3i_org			0.62	
b3d_work	0.44		0.59	
b3g_diff			0.54	
b3c_real	0.46		0.53	
b4d_coll				0.81
b4e_fdbk				0.81
b4b_lit				0.73
b4a_pd				0.72
b4c_pare				0.70
b4f_legal				0.70
b4g_advo				

Note: Some low factor loadings (less than 0.4) were removed to aid the interpretation of this table.

Part C: Your school context

The intent of Part C is to measure School Context using items categorized by the following sub-constructs: (a) School Climate, (b) Professional Environment, and (c) Resources. In analyzing the data, the 11 items in Part C loaded on two factors, which were partially aligned with the intended sub-constructs. Sections C1 (School Climate) and C2 (Professional Environment) items loaded on one factor, suggesting they may create one School Environment construct. Items from C2 (Professional Environment) cross-loaded onto a factor with items from section C3 (Resources), indicating the wording or underlying construct of those items may not be specific enough for the respondents to make a distinction between the two constructs.

Exploratory factor analysis was completed for Part C, which contains three sections: C1, C2, and C3. All of the items in Part C: School Context were included in this analysis to determine if the constructs suggested by the sections were supported by the statistical analysis. Again, the correlations between the items were calculated to observe how well the items are related to each other. The correlation explanation use Cohen’s (1988) guideline.

All items in Part C: School Context had moderate to strong bivariate correlations. The items from section C1 had moderate to strong bivariate correlations ranging from .468 to .699. Items from section C2 and section C3 had moderate to strong bivariate correlations between items of the same section ranging from .411 to .632 and .402 to .557, respectively. Moderate to strong correlations were found between all of the variables within each of the individual sections of Part C: School Context, indicating 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. This result is similar with 2015 TTS data.

The two factors retained in the factor analysis accounted for 99% of the variance. Factor 1 accounted for 55% of the variance, and Factor 2 accounted for 44% of the variance. Table 3

shows the two factors and the lists of items that loaded on each factor, the primary topic of each factor, and the percentage of the variance explained. Table 4 shows the factor analysis results with circles indicating items’ loadings on the two factors. Further discussion follows the two tables.

Table 3. Part C: School Context Factors

Factor	Items	Primary Topic	Variance Explained
1	c1a_safe, c1b_dig, c1c_pos, c2a_val, c2b_needs, c2c_seek, c2d_infl	School Environment	55%
2	c3a_sched, c3b_tech, c3c_space, c3d_supp	Resources	44%

Table 4. Part C: School Context Factor Loading Matrix

	Factor	
	1	2
c1c_pos	0.76	
c1b_dig	0.73	
c2c_seek	0.63	
c2b_needs	0.59	0.45
c2a_val	0.58	0.41
c1a_safe	0.54	
c2d_infl	0.49	
c3d_supp		0.70
c3b_tech		0.65
c3c_space		0.61
c3a_sched		0.58

Note: Some low factor loadings (less than 0.4) were removed to aid the interpretation of this table.

Section C1: School Climate

All Section C1 items loaded onto Factor 1, School Environment with all the items from section C2, which suggests that Section C1, School Climate, and Section C2, Professional Environment may not be distinct constructs. The two section items loaded onto one factor, indicating these items could be combined into one School Environment construct for further analysis.

Section C2: Professional Environment

All items in Section C2 loaded onto Factor 1, School Environment. However, items c2a_val and c2b_needs cross-loaded onto Factor 2, Resources, with the items from Section C3. While section C2 items relate to the school environment, new teachers may not have spent enough time in their respective schools to make accurate judgments about teachers school-wide. These results are similar to 2015 TTS data.

Section C3: Resources

All section C3 items loaded onto Factor 2, Resources, which also occurred in the 2015 TTS

analysis. The loading of all C3 items together suggests that these items represent one construct. In addition, no items in Section C3 cross loaded with Factor 1. These findings suggest items in section C3 represent one construct.

Part D: Program Recommendation

Based on Cohen’s (1988) guidelines, items in Part D exhibited a wide range of bivariate correlations, from 0.295 to 0.702, which indicates that the items were differentially correlated. Item d1a_rec and item d1d_prep are strongly correlated with each other, with the correlation coefficient 0.702; item d1b_happy and d1c_rwds are strongly correlated with one another, with the correlation coefficient 0.70. While, item d1a_rec had weak correlation with item d1b_happy with a very low coefficient 0.295; item d1b_happy and item d1d_prep had moderate correlation with the low coefficient 0.465. These findings suggested that Part D items would likely split into two factors.

The factor analysis shows that the 4 items in Part D loaded on two factors, which were related to the one intended construct. Each of the two factors consisted of two items. Each factor accounted for 49% of the variance, in total accounting for 98%. Table 5 shows the two factor loadings of Part D. The result from the factor analysis are included in Table 6 with circles indicating items’ loadings on the two factors.

Table 5. Part D: Program Recommendation Factors

Factor	Items	Primary Topic	Variance Explained
1	d1a_rec, d1d_prep	Teacher Preparation Program	49%
2	d1b_happy, d1c_rwds	Teaching Profession	49%

Table 6. Part D: Program Recommendation Factor Loading Matrix

	Factor	
	1	2
d1a_rec	0.73	
d1d_prep	0.73	
d1b_happy		0.72
d1c_rwds		0.72

Note: Some low factor loadings (less than 0.4) were removed to aid the interpretation of this table.

Instrument Reliability

The reliability of the scales suggested by the factor loadings was assessed using Cronbach’s alpha. All reliability estimates are included in Table 7.

Table 7. Reliability Analysis

Part	Scale	Cronbach's Alpha
	Part B: Teacher Preparation—Overall	0.98
B	Instructional Practice	0.96
	Learning Environment	0.93
	Diverse Learners	0.94
	Professionalism	0.89
	Part C: School Context—Overall	0.89
C	School Environment	0.87
	Resources	0.80
	Program Recommendation—Overall	0.82
D	Teacher Preparation Program	0.82
	Teaching Profession	0.81

The alpha coefficients, all greater than .70, indicates good internal consistency for these constructs. If the alpha coefficient is higher than 0.9, some items might be repetitive and could be deleted. Similar as the 2015 TTS analysis results, the overall coefficient alpha in Part B, Preparation for Teaching, is 0.98, which is too high, indicating some repetitive items exist. The alpha reduced to .96 for the Instructional Practice suggesting that some selective deletions in this section may make the instrument less repetitive overall.

For Part C, School Context, and Part D, Program Recommendation, the overall alpha scores are 0.89 and 0.82, which indicates good internal consistency. For Part C, the alpha coefficient reduced into 0.87 and 0.80 for the two factors, suggesting elimination of repetitive items would likely strengthen the instrument. Not much difference was observed for the alpha coefficient in Part D, suggesting that these items measure two distinct constructs.

Conclusion

Part B: Teacher Preparation

Factor 3 items b3b_strat, b3d_work and b3c_real highly crossed loaded onto Factor 1, which indicates ambiguous loading onto either Factor 1 or Factor 3. They should be reworded or eliminated so that the items are more consistent in Factor 3. Even though the item b4g_advo loaded onto Factor 4, it had very low correlation with others. To enhance the consistency, it should be either removed or revised to fit Section 4.

Another option to enhance reliability and construct validity would be to increase the number of options in the response scale. More options in the response scale could have a positive impact on the factor loadings.

Part C: School Context

The items in C1 (School Climate) and C2 (Professional Environment) could be grouped together

and more clearly defined as one construct. Alternatively, items in sections C1 and C2 could be revised to be more conceptually different enough for respondents to distinguish between them.

Part D: Program Recommendation

Despite the items designed as one section, the factor loading, correlation matrix, and percent of variance accounted for clearly indicate two factors, suggesting these items could potentially make two distinct scales.

Note: If items are revised, additional factor analysis should be conducted to determine if factor loadings change as a result of any revisions.

Prepared by
Anqing Zhang, North Dakota State University
Mark Baron, Wayne State College
Stacy Duffield, North Dakota State University



Appendix B: Guidelines for Writing about Common Metrics Data and Surveys

The NExT Common Metrics group supports excellence in teacher preparation through research and use of valid and reliable instruments for program improvement. The Common Metrics data offer numerous opportunities to researchers, and we are excited to promote this work. The following list provides guidelines for appropriate reference and citations when referring to the data and surveys. These guidelines apply to both formal and informal writing about Common Metrics data and surveys.

- The surveys may not be presented in full or part (i.e., the survey may not be provided in the appendices or a list of survey items in a results table).
- Survey items may not be presented word-for-word; rather, the topic of the item can be presented (e.g., instructing English learners or providing feedback). Sharing of specific items is a violation of copyright.
- When reporting about single items, make clear that the items were extracted from an instrument that is meant to be used in whole and that the items are part of factors that include multiple items. Validity and reliability data only apply to intact factors and surveys.
- Reporting should focus on outcomes. We recommend that results are presented by factor. (See factor analysis reports.)
- Please note that while the data belong to the institution, the surveys are owned by NExT. NExT surveys should be cited in formal and informal writing and presentations. This is the citation format recommended by NExT complying with APA guidelines:

Network for Excellence in Teaching (NExT, 2016). *NExT Common Metrics Entry Survey*.
NExT: Author.

Network for Excellence in Teaching (NExT, 2016). *NExT Common Metrics Exit Survey*. NExT:
Author.

Network for Excellence in Teaching (NExT, 2016). *NExT Common Metrics Transition to Teaching Survey*. NExT: Author.

Network for Excellence in Teaching (NExT, 2016). *NExT Common Metrics Supervisor Survey*.
NExT: Author.



Appendix C: Responses to Open-Ended Items

Note. The responses were not cleaned for spelling or grammar.

Which communication method most prompted you to complete this survey today? (Select one only.)

- *WVEIS*
- *My Administrator told me to check my review*
- *pop up*

A6a. Did you receive job offers for teaching positions? If no, why do you think you did not receive any job offers?

- *I'm a beginner teacher*

A12. Type of school in which you are employed?

- *Alternative school*

D2. In what area(s) do you most need professional development or support as a new teacher?

- *N/A*
- *layers of resources available to us to use with our students!*
- *I need classroom management.*
- *Classroom management*
- *As a special education teacher, my education at Concord University did not prepare me at all for being in the classroom. I was received no preparation for IEP's or preparing for a meeting. My job revolves around student IEPs and IEP meetings.*