

Employed Alumni Satisfaction Survey

Summary and Timeline:

The purpose of the Employed Satisfaction Survey is to measure employers' satisfaction with our completer's preparation in their first few years of teaching. This data provides valuable insight into our graduates' level of preparation, better relationships with Pk-12 partners, and guides program improvement.

The timeline below details the collection, revision, and quality of both the "Employed Alumni Satisfaction Survey" and the data collected from it. Please note the "Employed Alumni Satisfaction Survey" mirrors the "Employer Satisfaction Survey" and "Completer Exit Survey", so content validity were determined concurrently.

Fall 2017: The College of Education faculty decided that we were not satisfied with our employer (and completer) satisfaction surveys. The surveys had not been reviewed or updated in several years and the information collected was not valuable for critical reflection on EPP practices and opportunities for change.

December 2017: The Standard 4 Committee reviewed several NCATE and CAEP-approved surveys. With a new Dean from Truman State University in Missouri, we determined that we would consider their state distributed (in collaboration with Missouri's Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis (OSEDA)), and NCATE-approved, survey for the use at UMW.

The Standard 4 Committee met to revised the CAEP-reviewed employer satisfaction survey. "Content Validity" was enhanced using the following process:

1. reviewing each survey item using suggested CAEP guidelines (CAEP Evidence Guide, p. 25-27),
2. coding survey item by InTASC standards, and,
3. determining if each survey item provided a valuable benefit to our EPP. The committee coded each item with an "Essential", "Helpful but Not Essential", or "Not Essential". While no wording was altered, this coding process omitted three questions.

October 2018: Revised "Employer Satisfaction Survey" administered to employers of alumni who have completed years 1-3 years as educators. This is our first cycle collecting this data.

Data Collection and Presentation

Sample: The Commonwealth of Virginia provides contact information for completers in the fall after their 1st completed year of teaching. This list only includes completers who are actively teaching in Virginia public schools, and who have not changed their name. This list is often incomplete. Additionally, the EPP has not been consistent in collecting completer work information upon graduation. To help address these issues, the EPP now collects information as students are hired during their internship year, and utilizes social media to better track its' graduates.

Survey Dissemination: From the state and our own efforts we were able identify 127 correct employed alumni emails. The survey was sent to them by October 31st, 2018 through Qualtrics. 36 employed alumni completed the survey. The survey response rate was 28%. Of those responding we had representation across the years teaching completed and licensure pathways. See below.

Demographics

Years Teaching Completed	Response	Percentage
1	11	30.6%
2	18	50.0%
3	7	19.4%
	36	100%

Licensure Pathway	Response	Percentage
5-Year Pathway	31	86.1%
Post-Baccalaureate Pathway	5	13.9%
	36	100%

The following survey data was shared with the faculty at a data analysis meeting. The faculty read the findings individually, then created a list of emergent themes in groups, and shared with the whole faculty as a group.

Learner Development (InTASC Standards 1, 2 and 3)								
Prompt: "Because of my UMW-COE preparation in my current position I was prepared to..."								
Q#	Stem	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Responses	Average Value
1	meet the developmental needs of students with IEPs.	5.6%	16.7%	13.9%	47.2%	16.7%	36	3.5
2	meet the developmental needs of students English language learners.	5.6%	30.6%	13.9%	33.3%	16.7%	36	3.3
3	meet the developmental needs of students gifted students.	2.8%	13.9%	22.2%	44.4%	16.7%	36	3.6
4	create a classroom environment that encourages student engagement.	0.0%	0.0%	2.8%	33.3%	63.9%	36	4.6
5	use a variety of classroom management strategies.	5.6%	11.1%	11.1%	30.6%	41.7%	36	3.9
6	foster positive student relationships.	0.0%	2.8%	0.0%	22.2%	75.0%	36	4.7
7	promote respect for diverse cultures, genders, and intellectual/physical abilities.	0.0%	2.8%	2.8%	19.4%	75.0%	36	4.7
	Total Averages	2.8%	11.1%	9.5%	32.9%	43.7%	36	4.02

Learner Development Findings: Overall, the average across all items for the category of Learner Development was a 4.02. This was a combined 76.6% "Strongly Agree" and "Agree" with an average of 36 employed alumni responses. Employed alumni expressed confidence in fostering positive relationships (item 6), promoting respect for diversity (item 7), creating a classroom environment that encourages student engagement (item 4). They present less confidence in preparation for using a variety of classroom management strategies (item 5), working with gifted students (item 3) and working with students with IEPs (item 4). They feel least confident when working with English Language Learners (item 2). Respondents consistently noted address the greater need for IEP instruction, strategies for working with ELL students in their constructed responses. They also suggested the inclusion of trauma-informed

instruction, responsive classroom, and positive behavior approach in management courses. These are all suggestions that have been included in the creation of the new undergraduate programs.

Content Knowledge (InTASC Standards 4 and 5)								
Prompt: "Because of my UMW-COE preparation in my current position I was prepared to..."								
Q#	Stem	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Responses	Average Values
8	demonstrate mastery of content area knowledge.	2.8%	11.1%	5.6%	22.2%	58.3%	36	4.2
9	make my content engaging and meaningful to students.	0.0%	2.8%	8.3%	33.3%	55.6%	36	4.4
	Total Averages	1.2%	7.0%	7.0%	27.8%	57.0%	36	4.3

Content Knowledge: Overall, the average across all items for the category of Content Knowledge was a 4.3. This was a combined 84.7% "Strongly Agree" and "Agree" with an average of 36 employed alumni responses. Employed alumni show confidence in their likert scale responses; in the constructed response section some display a wish for greater opportunities to translate content, pedagogy, into practice.

Instructional Practices (InTASC Standards 6, 7 and 8)								
Prompt: "Because of my UMW-COE preparation in my current position I was prepared to..."								
Q#	Stem	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Responses	Average Values
10	for planning/designing lessons that integrate instruction across content areas.	0.0%	2.9%	5.7%	54.3%	37.1%	35	4.3
11	for planning/designing lessons include differentiated	0.0%	5.6%	0.0%	44.4%	50.0%	36	4.4

	instruction to engage all learners.							
12	to deliver lessons that address curriculum standards.	0.0%	5.6%	0.0%	47.2%	47.2%	36	4.4
13	to deliver lessons that implement a variety of instructional strategies.	2.8%	2.8%	2.8%	41.7%	50.0%	36	4.3
14	to deliver lessons that use technology to enhance student learning.	0.0%	5.6%	19.4%	41.7%	33.3%	36	4.0
15	to deliver lessons that engage students in authentic learning, critical thinking, and problem solving.	2.8%	8.3%	5.6%	58.3%	25.0%	36	3.9
16	for data-driven instruction through using assessments to evaluate learning.	5.6%	5.6%	16.7%	47.2%	25.0%	36	3.8
17	for data-driven instruction through developing assessments to evaluate learning.	5.6%	8.3%	19.4%	36.1%	30.6%	36	3.8
18	for data-driven instruction through analyzing data to improve instruction.	5.6%	13.9%	16.7%	33.3%	30.6%	36	3.7
19	for data-driven instruction through helping students set learning goals based on assessment results.	5.6%	13.9%	19.4%	33.3%	27.8%	36	3.6
	Total Averages	2.8%	7.3%	10.6%	43.8%	35.7%	35.9	4.02

Instructional Practices Findings: Overall, the average across all items for the category of Instructional Practices was a 4.02. This was a combined 79.41% “Strongly Agree” and “Agree” with an average of 36 employed alumni responses. Respondents were most

confident with their preparation to plan and design lesson across content areas (item 10), plan for differentiation (item 11), liver lesson across standards (item 12), deliver lessons using multiple strategies (item 13) and with technology (item 14). They show a little less than average confidence in delivering lessons that engage students in authentic learning, critical thinking, and problem solving (item 15). Where they show the least confidence in their preparation, and an area that we have identified as an area of weakness, is data-driven instruction (items 16-19). It is not until later in the program when they create their Impact Study that they are introduced to this practice. In their constructed responses, they ask for data-drive decision-making, instruction, and assessment to be integrated throughout earlier courses in the programs and not just the last year. These are all suggestions that have been included in the creation of the new undergraduate programs and are in discussion to be integrated in the post-baccalaureate programs.

Professional Responsibility (InTASC Standards 9 and 10)								
Prompt: "Because of my UMW-COE preparation in my current position I was prepared to..."								
Q#	Stem	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Responses	Average Values
20	communicate effectively with families.	2.8%	13.9%	30.6%	36.1%	16.7%	36	3.5
21	communicate effectively with staff/colleagues.	2.8%	2.8%	8.3%	41.7%	44.4%	36	4.2
22	determine areas of professional growth using analysis of student data.	2.8%	11.1%	19.4%	36.1%	30.6%	36	3.8
23	determine areas of professional growth using reflection on my practices.	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%	44.4%	47.2%	36	4.4
24	support student learning by collaborating with families.	5.6%	13.9%	27.8%	41.7%	11.1%	36	3.4
25	support student learning by collaborating with staff/colleagues.	2.8%	0.0%	16.7%	38.9%	41.7%	36	4.2
27	participate in professional organizations.	2.8%	8.3%	19.4%	41.7%	27.8%	36	3.8

Total Averages	2.8%	7.1%	18.6%	40.1%	31.4%	36	3.9
----------------	------	------	-------	-------	-------	----	-----

Professional Responsibility Findings: Overall, the average across all items for the category of Professional Responsibility was a 3.9. This was a combined 71.5% “Strongly Agree” and “Agree” with an average of 36 employed alumni responses. Respondents were most confident with their preparation determine areas of professional growth using reflection on my practices (item 23), communicate with staff/colleagues (item 21) as well as collaborating with them (ite, 25). They show less prepared to participate in professional organizations (item 27) and least prepared using student to determine professional growth (item 22), communicating with families (item 20) and even less when collaborating with them (item 24). In their constructed responses, they suggest adding instruction for communicating, and building positive relationships, with families. These are all suggestions that have been included in the creation of the new undergraduate programs and are in discussion to be integrated in the post-baccalaureate programs, specifically in classroom management courses.