West Virginia Common Metrics
2017-2018 Exit Survey

Concord University

August 2018

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

This report presents the findings from the surveys administered to teacher candidates after the completion of student teaching. The Exit Survey asks teacher candidates to assess how well prepared they felt for student teaching. Teacher candidates rate how well prepared they felt in the areas of instructional practices, abilities to work with diverse learners, abilities to establish positive classroom environment, and professional responsibilities. 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 items in the surveys are aligned with InTASC standards, and therefore, support state program approval and CAEP standard 1.1. Additionally, the Exit Survey, Section C, focuses the candidate's experience with student teaching and includes several items that allow the candidate to provide feedback about the cooperating teacher and university supervisor. These items can be used as evidence for CAEP standard 2.2. The Supervisor Survey is strong evidence for CAEP standard 4.3, and the Transition to Teaching survey can be used as evidence for CAEP standard 4.4.

Survey Administration and Response Rate
The 2017-2018 Exit Survey was administered to candidates who still had classes in session or were still in contact with their instructors online. The survey link was e-mailed directly to students or posted on an institutional website for candidates to access. The 2017-2018 Exit Survey response rate for the institution was 100% (70 out of 70). In comparison, the response rate for the West Virginia aggregate was 81% (566 out of 697).

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=70	
	#	**Percent of Cases**
Early Childhood Major (PreK-K)	0	0
Preschool Education Major (PreK) See Table 4	0	0
Elementary Education (K-6) See Table 4	32	45.7
Special Education (PreK, PreK-Adult, K-6, 5-Adult) See Table 5	5	7.1
PreK-Adult Education License See Table 2	3	4.3
Secondary Education License (5-Adult, 5-9, or 9-Adult) See Table 3	34	48.6

Note. Data from item A1.

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

	n = 3	
	#	**Percent of Cases**
Art	1	33.3
English as a Second Language (ESL)	0	0
French	0	0
Health	0	0
Japanese	0	0
Music	0	0
Physical Education	2	66.7
Reading Endorsement	0	0
Reading Specialist	0	0
School Library-Media	0	0
Theatre	0	0
Wellness	0	0
Other	0	0

Note. Data from item A1.

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

	n =34	
	#	**Percent of Cases**
Agriculture	0	0
Art	0	0
Biology	1	2.9
Business Education	4	11.8
Chemistry	0	0
Chemistry/Physics	0	0
Driver Education	0	0
English	7	20.6
Family and Consumer Science	0	0
French	0	0
General Math	0	0
General Math through Algebra I	0	0
General Science	2	5.9
German	0	0
Health	0	0
Journalism	0	0
Marketing	0	0
Mathematics	1	2.9
Oral Communications	0	0
Physical Education	0	0
Physics	0	0
Reading Endorsement	0	0
Social Studies	18	52.9
Spanish	1	2.9
Other	0	0

Note. Data from item A1.

Table 4. **If you completed a preschool education or an elementary education licensure program, include any additional licensure areas that you completed. (Mark all that apply.)**

	n = 32*	
	#	**Percent of Cases**
Art	0	0
English (5-9)	0	0
Early Education (PreK-K)	0	0
French (5-9)	0	0
General Math through Algebra I	0	0
General Science	0	0
Middle Childhood Education	0	0
Reading Endorsement	0	0
Social Studies (5-9)	0	0
Spanish (5-9)	0	0
Preschool Special Needs	0	0
Multicategorical Special Needs Education	0	0
Other	0	0

Note. Data from item A1.
*No respondents indicated a sub-area for preschool or elementary education.

Table 5. If you completed a special education licensure program, indicate your subject area. (Mark all that apply.)

	n = 5	
	#	**Percent of Cases**
Autism Spectrum Disorder (K-6)	0	0
Autism Spectrum Disorder (5-Adult)	0	0
Deaf and Hard of Hearing	0	0
Emotional/Behavior Disorders	0	0
Gifted Education	0	0
Mentally Impaired (mild/moderate)	0	0
Multicategorical Special Ed (K-6)	1	20.0
Multicategorical Special Ed (5-Adult)	3	60.0
Preschool Special Needs	2	40.0
Severe/Multiple Disabilities	0	0
Specific Learning Disabilities	0	0
Visual Impairment	0	0
Other	0	0

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.	70	0	0	2	2.9	31	44.3	37	52.9
Advising on content course requirements.	70	0	0	2	2.9	30	42.9	38	54.3
Quality of instruction in your teacher preparation courses.	70	3	4.3	2	2.9	28	40.0	37	52.9
Balance between theory and practice in your teacher preparation courses.	70	2	2.9	3	4.3	30	42.9	35	50.0
Integration of technology throughout your teacher preparation program.	70	1	1.4	6	8.6	27	38.6	36	51.4
Coherence between your coursework and field experiences prior to student teaching.	70	2	2.9	3	4.3	26	37.1	39	55.7
Quality of field experiences prior to student teaching.	70	1	1.4	1	1.4	24	34.3	44	62.9
Your student teaching placement site.	70	0	0	1	1.4	15	21.4	54	77.1

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.	70	3.5	0.554
Advising on content course requirements.	70	3.5	0.554
Quality of instruction in your teacher preparation courses.	70	3.4	0.746
Balance between theory and practice in your teacher preparation courses.	70	3.4	0.705
Integration of technology throughout your teacher preparation program.	70	3.4	0.705
Coherence between your coursework and field experiences prior to student teaching.	70	3.5	0.711
Quality of field experiences prior to student teaching.	70	3.6	0.597
Your student teaching placement site.	70	3.8	0.461

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 =70	
	#	**Percent**
Definitely yes	57	81.4
Probably yes	10	14.3
Probably no	3	4.3
Definitely no	0	0

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.	70	0	0	4	5.7	10	14.3	56	80.0
Select instructional strategies to align with learning goals and standards.	70	0	0	0	0	19	27.1	51	72.9
Design activities where students engage with subject matter from a variety of perspectives.	69	0	0	5	7.2	15	21.7	49	71.0
Account for students' prior knowledge or experiences in instructional planning.	70	1	1.4	0	0	18	25.7	51	72.9
Design long-range instructional plans that meet curricular goals.	70	1	1.4	4	5.7	12	17.1	53	75.7
Regularly adjust instructional plans to meet students' needs.	70	2	2.9	2	2.9	15	21.4	51	72.9
Plan lessons with clear learning objectives/goals in mind.	70	0	0	2	2.9	11	15.7	57	81.4
Design and modify assessments to match learning objectives.	69	0	0	3	4.3	17	24.6	49	71.0
Provide students with meaningful feedback to guide next steps in learning.	70	1	1.4	2	2.9	19	27.1	48	68.6
Engage students in self-assessment strategies.	70	1	1.4	7	10.0	14	20.0	48	68.6
Use formative and summative assessments to inform instructional practice.	70	1	1.4	1	1.4	13	18.6	55	78.6

	Total Respondents	Disagree		Tend to Disagree		Tend to Agree		Agree	
	n	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent
Understand issues of reliability and validity in assessment.	70	2	2.9	3	4.3	15	21.4	50	71.4
Analyze appropriate types of assessment data to identify student learning needs.	70	0	0	4	5.7	18	25.7	48	68.6
Differentiate assessment for all learners.	70	1	1.4	4	5.7	17	24.3	48	68.6
Use digital and interactive technologies to achieve instructional goals.	69	2	2.9	3	4.3	15	21.7	49	71.0
Engage students in using a range of technology tools to achieve learning goals.	70	1	1.4	4	5.7	13	18.6	52	74.3
Help students develop critical thinking processes.	70	0	0	2	2.9	19	27.1	49	70.0
Help students develop skills to solve complex problems.	70	1	1.4	2	2.9	18	25.7	49	70.0
Understand how interdisciplinary themes connect to core subjects.	69	0	0	2	2.9	17	24.6	50	72.5
Know where and how to access resources to build global awareness and understanding.	70	1	1.4	5	7.1	17	24.3	47	67.1
Help students analyze multiple sources of evidence to draw sound conclusions.	70	0	0	2	2.9	20	28.6	48	68.6

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.	70	3.7	0.553
Select instructional strategies to align with learning goals and standards.	70	3.7	0.445
Design activities where students engage with subject matter from a variety of perspectives.	69	3.6	0.613
Account for students' prior knowledge or experiences in instructional planning.	70	3.7	0.544
Design long-range instructional plans that meet curricular goals.	70	3.7	0.649
Regularly adjust instructional plans to meet students' needs.	70	3.6	0.677
Plan lessons with clear learning objectives/goals in mind.	70	3.8	0.475
Design and modify assessments to match learning objectives.	69	3.7	0.556
Provide students with meaningful feedback to guide next steps in learning.	70	3.6	0.613
Engage students in self-assessment strategies.	70	3.6	0.730

	#	Mean	SD
Use formative and summative assessments to inform instructional practice.	70	3.7	0.553
Understand issues of reliability and validity in assessment.	70	3.6	0.703
Analyze appropriate types of assessment data to identify student learning needs.	70	3.6	0.590
Differentiate assessment for all learners.	70	3.6	0.663
Use digital and interactive technologies to achieve instructional goals.	69	3.6	0.706
Engage students in using a range of technology tools to achieve learning goals.	70	3.7	0.652
Help students develop critical thinking processes.	70	3.7	0.527
Help students develop skills to solve complex problems.	70	3.6	0.610
Understand how interdisciplinary themes connect to core subjects.	69	3.7	0.519
Know where and how to access resources to build global awareness and understanding.	70	3.6	0.688
Help students analyze multiple sources of evidence to draw sound conclusions.	70	3.7	0.531

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

Table 10. **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.	70	1	1.4	5	7.1	24	34.3	40	57.1
Differentiate instruction for a variety of learning needs.	70	1	1.4	3	4.3	17	24.3	49	70.0
Differentiate for students at varied developmental levels.	70	1	1.4	3	4.3	18	25.7	48	68.6
Differentiate to meet the needs of students from various socioeconomic backgrounds.	70	1	1.4	2	2.9	21	30.0	46	65.7
Differentiate instruction for students with IEPs and 504 plans.	70	1	1.4	3	4.3	21	30.0	45	64.3
Differentiate instruction for students with mental health needs.	70	3	4.3	5	7.1	20	28.6	42	60.0
Differentiate instruction for gifted and talented students.	70	2	2.9	8	11.4	16	22.9	44	62.9
Differentiate instruction for English-language learners.	70	4	5.7	12	17.1	19	27.1	35	50.0
Access resources to foster learning for students with diverse needs.	70	1	1.4	2	2.9	21	30.0	46	65.7

Note. Data from items B2a-i.

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?**

	#	Mean	SD
Effectively teach students from culturally and ethnically diverse backgrounds and communities.	70	3.5	0.691
Differentiate instruction for a variety of learning needs.	70	3.6	0.636
Differentiate for students at varied developmental levels.	70	3.6	0.639
Differentiate to meet the needs of students from various socioeconomic backgrounds.	70	3.6	0.619
Differentiate instruction for students with IEPs and 504 plans.	70	3.6	0.645
Differentiate instruction for students with mental health needs.	70	3.4	0.804
Differentiate instruction for gifted and talented students.	70	3.5	0.805
Differentiate instruction for English-language learners.	70	3.2	0.924
Access resources to foster learning for students with diverse needs.	70	3.6	0.619

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

Table 12. 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.	70	0	0	2	2.9	15	21.4	53	75.7
Use effective communication skills and strategies to convey ideas and information to students.	70	0	0	1	1.4	14	20.0	55	78.6
Connect core content to real-life experiences for students.	70	0	0	1	1.4	13	18.6	56	80.0
Help students work together to achieve learning goals.	70	0	0	1	1.4	14	20.0	55	78.6
Develop and maintain a classroom environment that promotes student engagement.	70	1	1.4	2	2.9	13	18.6	54	77.1
Respond appropriately to student behavior.	70	1	1.4	4	5.7	17	24.3	48	68.6
Create a learning environment in which differences such as race, culture, gender, sexual orientation, and language are respected.	70	1	1.4	3	4.3	11	15.7	55	78.6
Help students regulate their own behavior.	70	1	1.4	7	10.0	18	25.7	44	62.9
Effectively organize the physical environment of the classroom for instruction.	69	1	1.4	3	4.3	21	30.4	44	63.8

Note. Data from items B3a-i.
.

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?

	#	Mean	SD
Clearly communicate expectations for appropriate student behavior.	70	3.7	0.505
Use effective communication skills and strategies to convey ideas and information to students.	70	3.8	0.453
Connect core content to real-life experiences for students.	70	3.8	0.444
Help students work together to achieve learning goals.	70	3.8	0.453
Develop and maintain a classroom environment that promotes student engagement.	70	3.7	0.589
Respond appropriately to student behavior.	70	3.6	0.663
Create a learning environment in which differences such as race, culture, gender, sexual orientation, and language are respected.	70	3.7	0.613
Help students regulate their own behavior.	70	3.5	0.732
Effectively organize the physical environment of the classroom for instruction.	69	3.6	0.648

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

Table 14. 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.	70	1	1.4	1	1.4	18	25.7	50	71.4
Access the professional literature to expand my knowledge about teaching and learning.	69	0	0	1	1.4	18	26.1	50	72.5
Collaborate with parents and guardians to support student learning.	70	1	1.4	4	5.7	17	24.3	48	68.6
Collaborate with teaching colleagues to improve student performance.	70	0	0	1	1.4	12	17.1	57	81.4
Use colleague feedback to support my development as a teacher.	70	0	0	1	1.4	12	17.1	57	81.4
Uphold laws related to student rights and teacher responsibility.	70	0	0	0	0	13	18.6	57	81.4
Act as an advocate for all students.	70	0	0	1	1.4	7	10.0	62	88.6

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?

	#	Mean	SD
Seek out learning opportunities that align with my professional development goals.	70	3.7	0.579
Access the professional literature to expand my knowledge about teaching and learning.	69	3.7	0.485
Collaborate with parents and guardians to support student learning.	70	3.6	0.663
Collaborate with teaching colleagues to improve student performance.	70	3.8	0.434
Use colleague feedback to support my development as a teacher.	70	3.8	0.434
Uphold laws related to student rights and teacher responsibility.	70	3.8	0.389
Act as an advocate for all students.	70	3.9	0.375

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

SECTION C. STUDENT TEACHING

Table 16. 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.	70	0	0	3	4.3	10	14.3	57	81.4
Acted as a liaison between me and the school.	70	0	0	4	5.7	17	24.3	49	70.0
Gave me constructive feedback on my teaching.	70	0	0	2	2.9	5	7.1	63	90.0
Helped me understand my roles and responsibilities as a student teacher.	70	1	1.4	2	2.9	7	10.0	60	85.7
Helped me develop as a reflective practitioner.	69	1	1.4	4	5.8	6	8.7	58	84.1

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…

	#	Mean	SD
Was available when I needed help.	70	3.8	0.512
Acted as a liaison between me and the school.	70	3.6	0.586
Gave me constructive feedback on my teaching.	70	3.9	0.411
Helped me understand my roles and responsibilities as a student teacher.	70	3.8	0.550
Helped me develop as a reflective practitioner.	69	3.8	0.623

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

Table 18. 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 =69	
	#	Percent
0	0	0
1-2	3	4.3
3-4	19	27.5
5-6	23	33.3
7-8	20	29.0
9-10	2	2.9
More than 10	2	2.9

Note. Data from item C2.

Table 19. 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 = 70	
	#	**Percent**
0	0	0
1-2	9	12.9
3-4	21	30.0
5-6	14	20.0
7-8	19	27.1
9-10	6	8.6
More than 10	1	1.4

Note. Data from item C3.

Table 20. Besides your university or college supervisor, did anyone else from your university or college visit you at your student teaching site?

	n = 68	
	#	**Percent**
Yes	10	14.7
No	58	85.3

Note. Data from item C4.

Table 21. If yes, check all that apply.

	n =10	
	#	**Percent of Cases**
Other university or college supervisor	2	20.0
University or college's field experience coordinator/supervisor	4	40.0
Teacher education faculty	8	80.0
Content faculty	0	0
Other faculty	1	10.0
Graduate student	0	0
Peer teacher candidate	1	10.0
Other	0	0

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

Table 22. If you experienced significant challenges during your student teaching, did you receive the help you needed?

	n = 69	
	#	**Percent**
Yes	30	43.5
No	3	4.3
Does not apply	36	52.2

Note. Data from item C5.

Table 23. 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.	70	0	0	1	1.4	4	5.7	65	92.9
Provided adequate time for planning.	70	0	0	1	1.4	3	4.3	66	94.3
Helped me with classroom management.	70	0	0	1	1.4	6	8.6	63	90.0
Made me feel welcome.	70	0	0	0	0	5	7.1	65	92.9
Gave me constructive feedback on my teaching.	70	0	0	1	1.4	6	8.6	63	90.0
Let me experiment with my own teaching ideas.	70	0	0	0	0	5	7.1	65	92.9
Included me in parent-teacher conferences, school meetings, and other professional experiences.	69	0	0	1	1.4	5	7.2	63	91.3
Shared ideas and materials.	70	0	0	1	1.4	3	4.3	66	94.3
Helped me develop as a reflective practitioner.	70	0	0	1	1.4	2	2.9	67	95.7
Helped me plan differentiated instruction for a variety of learning needs.	70	0	0	1	1.4	8	11.4	61	87.1
Helped me use student data to inform instruction.	70	0	0	1	1.4	8	11.4	61	87.1

Note. Data from items C6.

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…

	#	Mean	SD
Provided adequate opportunities for me to observe the classroom.	70	3.9	0.327
Provided adequate time for planning.	70	3.9	0.308
Helped me with classroom management.	70	3.9	0.360
Made me feel welcome.	70	3.9	0.258
Gave me constructive feedback on my teaching.	70	3.9	0.360
Let me experiment with my own teaching ideas.	70	3.9	0.258
Included me in parent-teacher conferences, school meetings, and other professional experiences.	69	3.9	0.347
Shared ideas and materials.	70	3.9	0.308
Helped me develop as a reflective practitioner.	70	3.9	0.287
Helped me plan differentiated instruction for a variety of learning needs.	70	3.9	0.389
Helped me use student data to inform instruction.	70	3.9	0.389

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

SECTION D. FUTURE PLANS

Table 25. How long do you plan to teach?

	n = 69	
	#	**Percent**
1-2 years	0	0
3-5 years	4	5.8
6-10 years	2	2.9
11 or more years	63	91.3
I do not plan to teach	0	0

Note. Data from item D1.

Table 26. Where would you consider teaching? Mark all that apply.

	n = 70	
	#	**Percent of Cases**
West Virginia	65	92.9
Ohio	7	10.0
Kentucky	9	12.9
Virginia	40	57.1
Maryland	8	11.4
Pennsylvania	11	15.7
North Carolina	27	38.6
South Carolina	18	25.7
Florida	10	14.3
Other urban area in the U.S.	6	8.6
Other suburban area in the U.S.	7	10.0
Other rural area in the U.S.	9	12.9
Outside the U.S.	8	11.4
Other	0	0

Note. Data from item D2.

SECTION E. YOUR BACKGROUND

Table 27. What is your gender?

	n = 70	
	#	Percent
Male	19	27.1
Female	51	72.9

Note. Data from item E1.

Table 28. What is your race/ethnicity?

	n = 70	
	#	Percent of Cases
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1	1.4
Asian	1	1.4
Black or African American	1	1.4
Hispanic or Latino	1	1.4
Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander	0	0
White, non-Hispanic	69	98.6
Other	1	1.4

Note. Data from item E3.

Table 29. Is English your native language?

	n = 70	
	#	**Percent**
Yes	70	100.0
No	0	0

Note. Data from item E4.

Table 30. Do you fluently speak a language other than English?

	n = 68	
	#	**Percent**
Yes	4	5.9
No	64	94.1

Note. Data from item E5.

Appendix A: 2016-17 Exit Survey Exploratory Factor Analysis

An exploratory factor analysis was performed to test the validity and reliability of the Exit Survey data, which includes Part A, Your Program; Part B, Preparation for Teaching; and Part C, Student Teaching. Other sections of the survey were not included since they do not contain scale-level data. An exploratory factor analysis (EFA) helps to make decisions on which survey items should be retained, revised or eliminated from each section based on how well they contribute to the overall understanding of the construct.

Methodology

The correlation, reliability matrix, and exploratory factor analysis were conducted using SAS 9.4, PRCO CORR and PROC FACTOR procedures. To compute the factors and evaluate the latent structure of the items for each part of the survey, the principal axis method with varimax rotation was utilized. The determinant, Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO), and Bartlett test were conducted to test the assumptions before performing the factor analysis. 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.

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 Exit Survey. However, the determinant was lower than ideal for Parts B and C, which indicates potential problems with collinearity, indicating that some variables are highly correlated and are likely redundant. The test results were similar to the 2014-2015 Exit Survey data.

Part A

Correlations were calculated to determine relationships among items. According to Cohen (1988), correlation coefficients between 0.1 and 0.29 represent a weak correlation between two variables, 0.3 and 0.49 suggest a moderate correlation, and coefficients from 0.5 to 1.0 are strong correlations. Based on this guideline, most of the bivariate correlations among items in Part A were moderate, ranging from weak (.191) to strong (.736). Item a2h_site had weak correlations with all other items in Section A2, indicating this item might represent a separate construct from others in Section A2.

Two factors retained in Section A2. Items a2c_inst, a2d_bal, a2e_tech, a2f_cohe, a2g_prior, and a2h_site loaded onto Factor 1 (related to Program Quality) and items a2a_educ and a2b_cont loaded onto Factor 2 (related to Advising). All of the items had strong factor loadings ranging from .52 to .75.

Part B: Preparation for Teaching

An EFA was completed for Part B, which 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. Five factors were retained in the factor analysis, in total accounting 95% of the variance. The factor loadings were good for all retained items, ranging from .40 to .73.

Table 1. Section B: "Preparation for Teaching'' Factors

Factor	Items	Primary Topic	Variance Explained
1	b1a_subj, b1b_strat, b1c_pers, b1d_prior, b1e_goals, b1f_adj, b1g_plan, b1h_match, b1i_fdbk, b1j_self, b1k_assess, b1l_rel, b1m_approp, b1mm_diff, b1p_criti, b1q_complx, b1r_itdsp, and b1t_conc	Instructional Practice	28%
2	b2a_ethn, b2b_diff, b2c_dev, b2d_socio, b2e_IEP, b2f_mntl, b2g_gift, b2h_ELL, and b2i_resour	Diverse Learners	23%
3	b3a_expec, b3b_comm, b3c_real, b3d_work, b3e_envi, b3f_behav, b3g_diff, b3h_reg, b3i_phys, and b4g_advo	Learning Environment	20%
4	b4a_opp, b4b_lite, b4c_pare, b4d_coll, b4e_dev, and b4f_legal	Professionalism	13%
5	b1n_digi, b1o_range, and b1s_glbl	Technology and Resources ??	11%

Section B1: Instructional Practice
Eighteen items from Section B1, Instructional Practice, loaded onto Factor 1, as shown in Table 3. All of these items related to instructional practice. Items b1t_conc and b1s_glbl cross loaded with Factor 5, Technology and Resources, while b1mm_diff cross loaded with Factor 2, Learning Environment. These two cross-loaded items in Factor 1 may contribute to the ambiguous loading.

Three items b1n_digi b1o_range, and b1s_glbl, loaded onto Factor 5, Technology and Resources. This is similar with findings from the 2014-2015 Exit Survey factor analysis, except the item b1t_conc loaded onto Factor 1.

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 is no items cross loaded with other factors in Section B2.

Section B3: Learning Environment
All items from Section B3 and item b4g_advo from Section B4 loaded strongly onto Factor 3. This suggests that these items represent one scale related to learning environment. Item b4g_advo closely cross loaded with Factor 1, suggesting this item might be ambiguous loading onto either Factor 1 or Factor 3.

Section B4: Professionalism
All items in Section 4 cross loaded onto Factor 4, Professionalism, except the item b4g_advo loaded onto Section 3. This suggests that these items can be used to measure one Professionalism scale for future analysis. No items cross loaded onto other factors, indicating that these items make up on construct.

Part C
All items in Section C1 had strong bivariate correlations ranging from .665 to .819, potentially indicating student teachers who perceived their supervisors to be strong in one area also perceived them to be strong in other areas. Section C6 items all had moderate to strong bivariate correlations ranging from .430 to .791. Correlations between the two sections (C1 & C6) are weak, suggesting student teachers' perceptions of their faculty supervisor and cooperating teacher might not correlate with each other. Two factors were retained in the factor analysis. Factor 1 accounted 64% of the variance and Factor 2 accounted 35% of the variance. Factor loadings were strong, ranging from .62 to .89.

Table 2. Part C: "Student Teaching" Factors

Factor	Items	Primary Topic	Variance Explained
1	c6a_opp, c6b_time, c6c_clas, c6d_welc, c6e_fdbk, c6f_exp, c6g_incl, c6h_shar, c6i_dev, c6j_plan, and c6k_data	Cooperating Teaching	64%
2	c1a_avail, c1b_liais, c1c_fdbk, c1d_role, and c1e_refl	University/College Supervisor	35%

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 3. Reliability Analysis

Part	Scale	Cronbach's Alpha
	Section A2: Program Structure/Quality—Overall	0.85
A	Advising	0.85
	Program Quality	0.82
	Part B: Preparation for Teaching—Overall	0.97
	Instructional Practice	0.91
	Learning Environment	0.94
B	Diverse Learners	0.94
	Professionalism	0.92
	Technology and Resources	0.86
	Sections C1: University/College Supervisor and C6: Cooperating Teacher/Co-teacher—Overall	0.92
C	Cooperating Teacher	0.94
	University/College Supervisor	0.93

The alpha coefficients are all greater than .70, indicating good internal consistency for these constructs.

The factor analysis conducted suggests that the scales identified by the 2016-2017 Exit Survey data have relatively good reliability as a measure of these constructs. As discussed in the previous sections, revising and eliminating some items could potentially increase the validity and reliability of the instrument. All the possible revisions depend on the survey purpose.

References

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis* (2nd ed.). Hillside, NJ: Erlbaum.

Prepared by
Anqing Zhang, North Dakota State University
Mark Baron, Wayne State College
Stacy Duffield, North Dakota State University
December 2017

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 Item

Would you recommend your teacher education program to another prospective teacher? Why or why not?*

- This is an amazing program and I feel that it has prepared me for a position as a full time teacher
- I was very prepared for both tests I had to take to become certified and didn't have to study due to the great program that Concord has.
- I did the online MAT program. The courses and requirements were well laid-out and clear and professors were always reachable for questions or problems. The material learned in the courses is relevant to real-world teaching situations.
- I feel as though Concord University has prepared me for my future job. The professors, specifically [Faculty Members] not only taught me what I needed to know but how I needed to be with my future students. I would recommend Concord University's education program due to those three professors alone. There were other great professors as well, but those three stood out and went above and beyond.
- Yes, because the online classes are convenient and the field placement and student teaching provides practical, hands-on experience.
- I would recommend the teacher education program to another prospective teacher because I do believe that they did a great job preparing me for my future teaching. I had a lot of experience and knowledge that allowed me to build confidence in myself and in turn become a confident teacher.
- For the most part, this program was able to successfully prepare me to enter the world of teaching.
- I would because Concord has some of the most supportive professors. I have received so much love and support throughout my time at Concord. I love Concord and had such a good experience that I decided to get my masters there also.
- Before I began student teaching all of my fellow classmates were nervous. I wasn't nervous because I know I had been prepared by a university that is the best in the state. I knew that Concord gave me every opportunity to succeed.
- My experience was wonderful! I wouldn't change anything.
- I think it's a great program that prepares us well.
- I have learned so much and have been exposed to a variety of teaching experiences. I have been very blessed with the knowledge I have gained and with the wonderful teachers that have taken the time to work with me. Everyone is willing to help and they want you to succeed.
- The teacher education program at Concord has properly prepared me to become an insightful, caring and skillful teacher. They made sure that I was ready for the workplace and that my skills were up to par.

- Concord has prepared me to be a successful teacher. I witnessed a tough yet rewarding education at Concord. I had professors that pushed me to do more than I ever imagined I could do. I went through a period about a year ago where I began to get scared and ask myself, "can I really do this?" Luckily I had professors that knew what I was capable of!
- Concord does an amazing job of answering all questions and facilitating a positive experience.
- Concord has great professors who are always there for you and willing to help in any way that they can.
- I love teaching, but the classes are really what would make me not recommend. Many of the education classes did not practice what they preached (would solely lecture, no checking for understanding, we students were not individualized).
- I would recommend the teacher education program because the field experience and the number of field experiences required helped prepare me for teaching.
- Great Masters program offered here
- The professors are wonderful and truly prepare you to teach when you graduate.
- I feel that Concord has an outstanding Teacher Education Program, and would recommend Concord to any and all future educators.
- The classes were great and I felt that they prepared me for teaching.
- From the beginning of your educational teaching journey, Concord puts you into schools to get a hands on, real life approach to what being in a school will be like. Starting placements early on in a student's career is super beneficial and really helps them grasp what their job will be like once they graduate.
- The quality of the program overall met all my expectations.
- While the program "gets the job done," it is incredibly impractical. A majority of my classes revolved around theory (which there is nothing wrong with, but this theory was rarely integrated into daily practice).
- I have friends in various universities around the state who have not dealt with the stress I have had to with Concord. I thought the only saving grace was the education department, however this is not the case. The TPA is taken too seriously when assigned. I have lost countless hours of sleep over anxiety attacks brought on from it. On top of this, mine still has not been graded and as of today it is 13 days past when it was supposed to. I nearly gave myself a stroke over it, only to not know my fate because of it. The professors in the program are exceptional, however the coherence and organization of it as a whole is not. I don't want to sound like a child in saying there was too much asked of me, but there was. I am now five days from graduation and unsure if I will be graduating at all. I did my job, someone else did not.
- The program is actually really insightful and helpful, especially when it comes too developing a professional vocabulary

- The professors at Concord University were always eager to explain material again as needed. I feel the education program has helped me prepare for teaching because of the vast amount of field experience.
- I would recommend this program because there few options in the area. This decision is based mostly on accessibility over quality.
- I would recommend this program because the quality of education was wonderful. This teacher education program provided many opportunities for me in the education field. As a student athlete, both mentor teachers and professors were very accommodating with my hectic schedule.
- Concord seemed to take great leaps, in order to prepare me for the PRAXIS test and teaching in general. Most of the professors were extremely helpful and generous, and took the time to help me in my studies.
- I believe that this is one of the greatest Teacher Education Programs in the country, I would definitely recommend a prospective teacher education student to this institution.
- Concord has taught me a tremendous amount, and with the abundance of practice that I have been given, I feel that I can confidently say that I will be a great educator.
- I like field placements prior to student teaching. It lets you know early on if teaching is right for you.
- The professors were extremely helpful and caring and did their best to ensure that I would be a successful teacher.
- This program is challenging and thorough. I feel like this program prepares me more than most others for a career in the teaching field.
- The student teaching program at Concord University is vigorous and prepares you for a career in teaching. I feel over the course of my education, the professors were top notch and the assisting staff members very helpful. I would highly recommend Concord to any person seeking teaching as a profession.
- The connections formed with professors is extremely beneficial . Also, the understanding and empathy shown is extremely helpful!
- Overall, it is a great program. I liked the balance between theory and practice in the courses. Most professors go above and beyond and are helpful and supportive.
- Because it got me to where i needed to be. It was quality education.
- This education program help give students much familiarity with the school setting and giving adequate placement opportunities.
- Communication was not very easy within the program, which was really frustrating. The professors are not engaged in the online classes and it feels very disconnected. Every semester I had issues getting started with my placements, because of disorganization. It was a frustrating program.
- This program gave me opportunities for a career to provide for my family. For this, I am very grateful. Anyone interested in teaching, I will recommend to consider Concord.

- Concord's staff is attentive and caring. You receive a quality education at a reasonable rate with a level of personal attention that cannot be matched anywhere else.

Names of individuals were redacted; entries were not edited for spelling or grammar.