

## Employer Satisfaction Survey

### *Summary and Timeline:*

The purpose of the Employer Satisfaction Survey is to measure employers' satisfaction with our completer's preparation in their first few years of teaching. This data provides valuable insight and leads to program improvement, better relationships, and more robust preparation for future educators from the employer's perspective.

The timeline below details the collection, revision, and quality of both the "Employer Satisfaction Survey" and the data collected from it. Please note the "Employer Satisfaction Survey" mirrors the "Employed Alumni Satisfaction Survey" and "Candidate 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 CAEP Standard 4 Committee reviewed several NCATE and CAEP-approved surveys, including an employer satisfaction survey developed and implemented state-wide in the state of Missouri (in collaboration with Missouri's Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis (OSEDA)). Based upon this initial review, the group adopted and adapted the Missouri survey for use in the commonwealth of Virginia.

The Standard 4 Committee met to review the NCATE-approved employer satisfaction survey. "Content Validity" was constructed by:

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 practical value for EPP program improvement. 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. (See Appendix A below).

**October 2018:** Revised "Employer Satisfaction Survey" administered to employers of alumni who have completed years 1-3 years as an educator. 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 1<sup>st</sup> completed year of teaching. This list only includes completers who have are actively teaching in Virginia public schools, and who have not changed their name. This list is often incomplete. To supplement, the EPP collects information as candidates are hired during their internship year, and works to find them through social media and the Internet to determine their teaching status beyond.

Survey Dissemination: From the state and our own efforts we were able identify 143 employer emails. The survey was sent to them by October 31st, 2018 through Qualtrics. 49 employers returned the email, but only 48 completed each item below. The survey response rate was 34%. Of those responding we had representation across the years teaching completed. See below.

One limitation with the data is that we cannot differentiate between 5-year undergraduate-graduate and post-baccalaureate licensure students. Additionally, given the small number of post-baccalaureate licensure students who complete the program, we were able to find contact information for only 18 out of 143 We assume the results are reflective almost entirely of the 5-year undergraduate-graduate employed alumni.

### Demographics

Years Teaching Completed	Response	Percentage
1	8	16.3%
2	17	34.7%
3	22	44.9%
Unknown/Unsure	2	4.1%
	<b>49</b>	<b>100%</b>

<b>Learner Development (InTASC Standards 1, 2 and 3)</b>								
Prompt: "This teacher was prepared to..."								
Q#	Stem	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Reponses	Average Value
1	meet the developmental needs of students with IEPs.	2.2%	4.4%	4.4%	46.7%	42.2%	45	<b>4.2</b>
2	meet the developmental needs of students English language learners.	2.2%	6.5%	17.4%	41.3%	32.6%	46	<b>4.0</b>
3	meet the developmental needs of students gifted students.	2.3%	2.3%	11.4%	52.3%	31.8%	44	<b>4.1</b>
4	create a classroom environment that encourages student engagement.	4.2%	6.3%	2.1%	37.5%	50.0%	48	<b>4.2</b>
5	use a variety of classroom management strategies.	4.2%	12.5%	4.2%	31.3%	47.9%	48	<b>4.1</b>
6	foster positive student relationships.	2.1%	4.2%	2.1%	25.0%	66.7%	48	<b>4.5</b>
7	promote respect for diverse cultures, genders, and intellectual/physical abilities.	2.1%	2.1%	4.2%	27.1%	64.6%	48	<b>4.5</b>
	<b>Total Averages</b>	<b>2.8%</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	<b>6.5%</b>	<b>37.3%</b>	<b>48.0%</b>	<b>46.7</b>	<b>4.32</b>

**Learner Development Findings:** Overall, the average across all items for the category of Learner Development was a 4.32. This was a combined 85.3% “Strongly Agree” and “Agree” with an average of 46.7 employer responses. When reviewing each item, we note the strength in positive student relationships (item 6) and promoting respect for diversity (item 7). Working with students with IEPs (item 1) and creating an engaging classroom environment (item 4) also appear positive. Meeting the needs of gifted students (item 3), using a variety of classroom management strategies (item 5), and working with English Language Learners (item 2) all appear to be challenges. These findings did not surprise us because we provide nominal instruction on working with gifted and ELL students at the undergraduate level (if those employers are more likely to have completed the survey). While specifically, ELL instruction is included in the 5-year M.S. in Elementary Education program (see **Syllabus EDUC 510**), it is not included in the other 5-year undergraduate-

graduate programs. As we work to create new undergraduate programs, this deficiency has been identified for program development. In terms of classroom management strategies, two potential causes for this lower number are: the undergraduate courses were two credits during this time period in which these employed alumni were at UMW (and now they are three credits). Additionally, during the time these alumni would have been instructed, we had a series of issues with the quality of instruction by adjuncts. Only full-time faculty teach the management courses now.

<b>Content Knowledge (InTASC Standards 4 and 5)</b>								
Prompt: "This teacher was prepared to..."								
Q#	Stem	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Responses	Average Value
8	demonstrate mastery of content area knowledge.	2.1%	4.2%	2.1%	47.9%	43.8%	48	4.3
9	make content engaging and meaningful to students.	2.1%	4.2%	6.3%	45.8%	41.7%	48	4.2
	<b>Total Averages</b>	<b>2.3%</b>	<b>2.6%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>43.7%</b>	<b>44.5%</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>4.25</b>

**Content Knowledge Findings:** Overall, the average across the two items for the category of Content Knowledge was a 4.25. This was a combined 88.2% "Strongly Agree" and "Agree" with an average of 48 employer responses. We note the above average scores for both content knowledge items (and although we would like to see Employers choose "Strongly Agree" more than "Agree"), we acknowledge the challenges of teaching one or more content courses within the first three years in the role.

<b>Instructional Practices (InTASC Standards 6, 7 and 8)</b>								
Prompt: "This teacher was prepared to..."								
Q#	Stem	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Responses	Average Value
10	for planning/designing lessons that integrate instruction across content areas.	2.1%	6.3%	6.3%	52.1%	33.3%	48	4.1

11	for planning/designing lessons include differentiated instruction to engage all learners.	2.1%	6.3%	8.3%	50.0%	33.3%	48	<b>4.1</b>
12	to deliver lessons that address curriculum standards.	2.1%	2.1%	2.1%	47.9%	45.8%	48	<b>4.3</b>
13	to deliver lessons that implement a variety of instructional strategies.	2.1%	2.1%	8.5%	40.4%	46.8%	47	<b>4.3</b>
14	to deliver lessons that use technology to enhance student learning.	2.1%	2.1%	2.1%	54.2%	39.6%	48	<b>4.3</b>
15	to deliver lessons that engage students in authentic learning, critical thinking, and problem solving.	2.1%	6.3%	4.2%	58.3%	29.2%	48	<b>4.1</b>
16	for data-driven instruction through using assessments to evaluate learning.	2.1%	4.2%	6.3%	56.3%	31.3%	48	<b>4.1</b>
17	for data-driven instruction through developing assessments to evaluate learning.	2.1%	4.2%	12.5%	50.0%	31.3%	48	<b>4.0</b>
18	for data-driven instruction through analyzing data to improve instruction.	2.1%	6.4%	10.6%	53.2%	27.7%	47	<b>4.0</b>
19	for data-driven instruction through helping students set learning goals based on assessment results.	2.1%	8.5%	8.5%	51.1%	29.8%	47	<b>4.0</b>
	<b>Total Averages</b>	<b>2.10%</b>	<b>4.80%</b>	<b>7.50%</b>	<b>51.90%</b>	<b>33.70%</b>	<b>47.6</b>	<b>4.1</b>

**Instructional Practices Finding:** Overall, the average across the items for the category of Instructional Practices was a 4.1. This was a combined 85.60% “Strongly Agree” and “Agree” with an average of 47.6 employer responses. When reviewing each item, we note positive employer feedback on the delivery of standards- based lessons (item 12), the use of a variety of instructional strategies (item 13), and the use of technology to engage student learning (item 14). We had some challenges with planning for instruction across content areas (item 10), differentiated instruction (item 11), engaging students with critical thinking (item 15) and making data-driven instruction using assessments (item 16). Evidence suggests we need to enhance instruction in methods courses focused on data-driven instruction (items 17, 18, 19). Currently, the only consistent instruction and practice with data across all EPP programs takes place during their Impact Study project. (See Impact Study). This challenge had been identified as a need to include data-driven decision making earlier in programs and is factored into the design of the new undergraduate program. (See new Undergraduate Program)

<b>Professional Responsibility (InTASC Standards 9 and 10)</b>								
Prompt: “This teacher was prepared to...”								
Q#	Stem	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Responses	Average Value
20	communicate effectively with families.	4.2%	2.1%	4.2%	41.7%	47.9%	48	4.3
21	communicate effectively with staff/colleagues.	2.1%	4.2%	6.3%	29.2%	58.3%	48	4.4
22	determine areas of professional growth using analysis of student data.	2.1%	6.3%	10.4%	47.9%	33.3%	48	4.0
23	determine areas of professional growth using reflection on their practices.	2.1%	8.5%	4.3%	40.4%	44.7%	47	4.2
24	support student learning by collaborating with families.	4.2%	4.2%	10.4%	39.6%	41.7%	48	4.1
25	support student learning by collaborating with staff/colleagues.	2.1%	4.2%	4.2%	33.3%	56.3%	48	4.4
27	participate in professional	2.6%	0.0%	17.9%	30.8%	48.7%	39	4.2

	organizations.							
	Total Averages	2.8%	4.2%	8.2%	37.6%	47.3%	46.6	4.2

**Professional Responsibility Findings:** Overall, the average across the items for the category of Instructional Practices was a 4.1. This was a combined 84.9% “Strongly Agree” and “Agree” with an average of 46.6 employer responses. Employers appear to be most satisfied with completer communication skills (item 20 and item 21), and collaborating with staff/colleagues (item 25). Perception are more toward average with considering professional growth using reflection (item 23) and participation in professional organizations (item 27). Our completers’ biggest challenges appear to be collaborating with families (item 24), and determining areas of professional growth using analysis of student data (item 22). These last four items need to be more explicitly included in our current programs and is factored into the design of the new undergraduate program. (See new Undergraduate Program)

**Additional Question:**

<b>Impact on Student Learning</b>							
Prompt: “Based upon the performance based evaluation of this early career teacher, this teacher was prepared to make a positive impact on student learning.”							
Q#	Stem	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Responses
28	(Above)	4.2%	2.1%	8.3%	37.5%	47.9%	48

**Impact Findings:** Employers appear to be satisfied with our employed alumni; 85.4% of administrators responded that they “Strongly Agree” or “Agree” with the prompt: “Based upon the performance based evaluation of this early career teacher, this teacher was prepared to make a positive impact on student learning.”

## Appendix A – Content Validity Activity

Learner Development	
Missouri Phrasing	Accepted Suggestions
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I was prepared to implement instruction based on a student's IEP. (now 1a)</li> <li>2. I was prepared to modify instruction for English language learners. (now 1b)</li> <li>3. I was prepared to modify instruction for gifted learners. (now 1c)</li> <li>4. I was prepared to create a classroom environment that encourages student engagement. (now 2)</li> <li>5. I was prepared to use a variety of classroom management strategies. (now 3)</li> <li>6. I was prepared to manage a variety of discipline issues. (under 3)</li> <li>7. I was prepared to motivate my students to learn. (under 2)</li> <li>8. I was prepared to keep my students on task. (under 2)</li> <li>9. I was prepared to foster positive student relationships. (now 4)</li> <li>10. I was prepared to facilitate smooth transitions for my students. (under 2)</li> <li>11. I was prepared to promote respect for diverse cultures, genders, and intellectual/physical abilities. (now 5)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I was prepared to meet the developmental needs of groups of students, including:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. students with IEPs.</li> <li>b. English language learners.</li> <li>c. gifted students.</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. I was prepared to create a classroom environment that encourages student engagement.</li> <li>3. I was prepared to use a variety of classroom management strategies.</li> <li>4. I was prepared to foster positive student relationships.</li> <li>5. I was prepared to promote respect for diverse cultures, genders, and intellectual/physical abilities.</li> </ol> <p>Narrative:</p>
Content Knowledge	
Missouri Phrasing	Accepted Suggestions
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I was prepared in my content area. (now 1)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I was prepared to demonstrate mastery of content area knowledge.</li> </ol>



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. I was prepared to engage students in my content area. (now 2)</li> <li>3. I was prepared to make my content meaningful to students. (now 2)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. I was prepared to make my content engaging and meaningful to students.</li> </ul> <p>Narrative:</p>
<b>Instructional Practices</b>	
<b>Missouri Phrasing</b>	<b>Accepted Suggestions</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I was prepared to incorporate interdisciplinary instruction. (now 1a)</li> <li>2. I was prepared to design lessons that include differentiated instruction. (now 1b)</li> <li>3. I was prepared to create lesson plans to engage all learners. (now 1b)</li> <li>4. I was prepared to deliver lessons based on curriculum standards. (now 2a)</li> <li>5. I was prepared to deliver lessons for diverse learners. (under 2b)</li> <li>6. I was prepared to implement a variety of instructional strategies. (now 2b)</li> <li>7. I was prepared to engage students in critical thinking. (now 2d)</li> <li>8. I was prepared to model critical thinking and problem solving. (now 2d)</li> <li>9. I was prepared to use technology to enhance student learning. (now 2c)</li> <li><del>10. I was prepared to use effective communication strategies to foster learning. (omit)</del></li> <li><del>11. I was prepared to enhance students' skills in using technology as a communication tool. (omit)</del></li> <li>12. I was prepared to use assessments to evaluate learning. (now 3a)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I was prepared for planning/designing lessons that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. integrate instruction across content areas.</li> <li>b. include differentiated instruction to engage all learners.</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. I was prepared to deliver lessons that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. address curriculum standards.</li> <li>b. implement a variety of instructional strategies.</li> <li>c. use technology to enhance student learning.</li> <li>d. engage students in authentic learning, critical thinking, and problem solving.</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. I was prepared for data-driven instruction through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. using assessments to evaluate learning.</li> <li>b. developing assessments to evaluate learning.</li> <li>c. analyzing data to improve instruction.</li> <li>d. helping students set learning goals based on assessment results.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Narrative:</p>

<p>13. I was prepared to develop assessments to evaluate learning. (now 3b)</p> <p>14. I was prepared to analyze data to improve instruction. (now 3c)</p> <p>15. I was prepared to help students set learning goals based on assessment results. (now 3d)</p> <p>16. I was prepared to work with colleagues to set learning goals using assessment results. (under Professional Responsibility, 3b)</p>	
<b>Professional Responsibility</b>	
<b>Missouri Phrasing</b>	<b>Accepted Suggestions</b>
<p>1. I was prepared to effectively communicate with parents. (now 1a)</p> <p>2. I was prepared effectively to communicate with all staff. (now 1b)</p> <p><del>3. I was prepared to use technology as a communication tool. (omit)</del></p> <p>4. I was prepared to analyze data to reflect on areas of professional growth. (now 2a)</p> <p>5. I was prepared to reflect on my practices for professional growth. (now 2b)</p> <p>6. I was prepared to collaborate with colleagues to support student learning. (now 3b)</p> <p>7. I was prepared to collaborate with parents to support student learning. (now 3a)</p> <p>8. I was prepared to participate in professional organizations. (now 4)</p>	<p>1. I was prepared to communicate effectively with:</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">a. families.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">b. staff/colleagues.</p> <p>2. I was prepared determine areas of professional growth using:</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">a. analysis of student data.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">b. reflection on my practices.</p> <p>3. I was prepared support student learning by collaborating with:</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">a. families.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">b. staff/colleagues.</p> <p>4. I was prepared to participate in professional organizations.</p> <p>Narrative:</p>
<b>Other Category</b>	
<b>Our Original Survey</b>	<b>Accepted Suggestions</b>
Q2: What would you identify as the strengths of	Q2: What would you identify as the strengths of

<p>this teacher's preparation?</p> <p>Q3: What would you identify as area(s) of additional preparation that would have benefitted this teacher and/or your school?</p> <p>Q4: What differentiates UMW graduates from other teacher preparation institutions?</p>	<p>your preparation?</p> <p>Q3: What can we do to improve our preparation?</p> <p>Q4: What differentiates you as a UMW graduate from your teaching peers/colleagues from other teacher preparation institutions?</p>
--	--