

UK Teacher Education Program

Quality Assurance



TEP Stakeholder Surveys 2018-2019 Key Findings

Report prepared by:

Carolyn Oldham, MEd
Shannon Sampson, PhD
Josh Parsons, MA, EdM

July 30, 2019

205 Dickey Hall
Lexington, KY 40506
(859) 257-2628
EvaluationCenter@uky.edu
education.uky.edu/evaluationcenter/

INTRODUCTION

The University of Kentucky's College of Education contracted the Evaluation Center to design and administer graduating student (completer), alumni and employer surveys for quality improvement efforts and to provide data for accreditation reporting. With the input of the College's Quality Assurance Task Force and Institutional Research Office, and data gathered from benchmarking of similar institutions, the Evaluation Office created completer and alumni Qualtrics-administered surveys composed of : (a) 19 demographic questions, (b) three alumni affairs-related questions, (c) four matrixes for TEP-completers cross-walked with InTasc and CAEP standards, (d) three general feedback questions in alignment with CAEP Standard 5.5 and SACS 7.1: Institutional Effectiveness, and (e) department/program-specific questions; a total of four departments/programs submitted questions for inclusion. In addition to these stakeholder surveys, the Evaluation Office created an employer Qualtrics-administered survey composed of: (a) five demographic questions, (b) four matrixes which corresponded to completer and alumni instruments and were cross-walked with the same InTasc and CAEP Standards*, (c) one satisfaction matrix in alignment with CAEP Standard 4.3, (d) general feedback questions in alignment with CAEP Standard 5.5 and SACS 2.5: Institutional Effectiveness, and (e) department/program-specific questions; one department, Health and Promotion submitted questions for inclusion. At a January 2019 orientation meeting, all three survey instruments were distributed to all student teachers to review instruments for clarity and the extent to which the structure of the instruments gave these stakeholders the opportunity to provide feedback to the TEP.

Invitations to participate were sent via email and text to 851 alumni (2015-2016 academic year) on April 14, 2019, and 604 completers (graduating students) on April 21, 2019. Graduating students were asked to respond to the survey during their teaching practicum/seminar. The Completer Survey was closed on May 19, 2019, with a response rate of 54%. Approximately 147 of the possible 307 Teacher Education Program (TEP) graduates completed the survey, making an effective TEP response rate of 48%. The Alumni Survey was closed on May 28, 2019, with a response rate of 14%. A total of 147 TEP completers and 53 TEP alumni responded to the four matrices of interest for this report: those associated with InTASC and CAEP standards. Approximately 53 out of the potential TEP 434 alumni responded to the survey, making an effective TEP response rate of 12%. Invitations for Employer Survey participation were sent via email to the 197 identified employers of the alumni cohort on April 21, 2019. The survey was closed on July 2, 2019 with 50 responses, or a response rate of 25%.

* One question was inadvertently omitted from this survey: "The employee demonstrates appropriate assessment techniques to provide feedback to families."

KEY FINDINGS

Overall, a majority of completers, alumni and employers selected “agree” or “strongly agree” to all survey questions.

Completers, alumni and employers expressed high agreement to nearly every survey question. At least 92% of all completers selected “agree” or “strongly agree” to all survey questions. 99% of completers agreed they could adapt instruction based on a students’ individual differences and that they could implement assessment techniques to provide feedback to students. Alumni had lower overall agreement, but the majority of alumni agreed with all questions on the survey as well. Employers also expressed high levels of agreement to most items, agreeing at a rate of 100% to “the employee demonstrates appropriate assessment techniques to...” a) identify areas of student learning for improvement, b) provide feedback to students, and c) monitor student progress.

Table 1 at the end of the report provides percentage of completers, alumni and employers agreeing (selecting “agree or “strongly disagree”) to all survey questions.

Below are additional findings that the Evaluation Center felt stood out as important to share with the College in relation to accreditation requirements and to quality improvement for the College as a whole.

Completers, alumni and employers report high levels of satisfaction with the Education Preparation Program (CAEP Standards 4.3 and 4.4).

In response to the item “I am satisfied with the preparation I received through the University of Kentucky Educator Preparation Program,” 95.24% of completers and 90.57% of alumni agree. In response to the item “My training has prepared me to be an effective educator,” 95.92% of completers and 92.45% of alumni agree. And in response to the item “Overall, the employee was well prepared for their job duties,” 97% of employers agreed, with the remaining 3% (n= 1) likely due to response error based on an assessment of that employer’s responses to other items.

Both completers and alumni expressed relatively less confidence in *implementing assessment techniques to provide feedback to families and in using technology to analyze data*. Employers, on the other hand, report employees demonstrated ability in these areas.

8.16% of completers and 15.09% of alumni and disagreed with the item “I am confident that I can implement/I have successfully implemented assessment techniques to provide feedback to families.” 5.44% of completers and 18.87% of alumni disagreed with the item “I am confident that I can implement/I have successfully implemented assessment techniques by using technology to analyze data.” Employers, on the other hand, disagreed at lower rates of 0% and only 2% on these respective items.

Both completers and alumni expressed less confidence in their *ability to connect with stakeholders to increase relevancy of instruction*. This item also generated disagreement from employers.

5.44% of completers and 20.75% of alumni disagreed with the item “In planning for instruction, I can/I typically connect with relevant stakeholders (i.e., parents, colleagues, community members, administration...) to increase relevancy of lessons (i.e., through home visits, community events...)” 6% of employers disagreed that their employees develop lesson plans with evidence of connection with relevant stakeholders.

Alumni reported comparably higher levels of disagreement than completers on *using data and technology and integrating interdisciplinary units of study when planning for instruction*. Alumni also communicated higher levels of disagreement than completers in the implementation of certain assessment techniques. Employers, on the other hand, reported no or low levels of disagreement on all these items.

In the stem “In planning for instruction, I typically...” 11.32% of alumni disagreed with the item “identify patterns in student learning using data” and 9.43% of alumni disagreed with the item “use technology”; completers disagreed at rates of 2% and 5%, with employers at 4% and 0%, respectively. 16.98% of alumni disagreed that they typically “integrate interdisciplinary units of study” in planning for instruction while 2% of completers and 2% of employers disagreed. 7.55% of alumni disagreed to two items in the stem “I have successfully implemented assessment techniques...”: to “identify areas of student learning for improvement” and “self-assess for professional growth.” Completer disagreement with these items was < 3.5%. While 100% of employers communicated agreement with the employee’s demonstrated use of assessment techniques to identify areas of student learning, 4% disagreed and an additional 4% had not observed the employee using assessment techniques to self-assess for professional growth.

Employers communicated their highest levels and a comparably higher level of disagreement to three items in the areas of adaptation of instruction.

In response to the stem, “the employee adapts instruction to student learning needs by using...” 6% of employers disagreed with item “environmental factors such as school or community culture(s)”, in comparison to 1% of completers and 6% of alumni, and 6% of employers disagreed to the item “using technology,” in comparison to 9% of completers and 3% of alumni. The only item employers rated at a higher level of disagreement than the other stakeholders was on the adaptation of instruction to student learning needs by using foundations of major or certification area (historical, philosophical, social, and cultural). 4% of employers, in contrast to 2% of completers and 2% of alumni, reported disagreement with this item.

Employers communicated industry needs to drive the College's preparation of future teacher candidates.

In response to qualitative survey items, employers identified the following as emerging issues the university should address to best prepare future teacher candidates: 1) student mental health; 2) classroom behavior management; 3) inclusive and culturally responsive teaching and learning; 4) differentiation; 5) technology integration; and 6) data-driven instruction.

SURVEY

Survey instruments available upon request.

DATA TABLE 1: LIST OF QUANTITATIVE QUESTIONS

Question	Completer Survey		Alumni Survey		Employer Survey	
	n=	Agree	n=	Agree	n=	Agree
Ability to adapt instruction to student learning needs by using:						
the foundations of my major or certification area (historical, philosophical, social, and cultural)	147	97%	53	98%	50	96%
my knowledge of learner development (both typical and exceptional)	147	95%	53	96%	50	98%
environmental factors such as school or community culture(s)	147	98%	53	92%	49	92%
authentic (i.e. "real-world") issues	147	97%	53	94%	50	96%
technology	147	96%	53	89%	50	90%
Students' individual differences related to family or life experiences (culture, race, socioeconomic status, language, etc.)	147	99%	53	91%	50	94%
Confidence and demonstration of appropriate assessment techniques to:						
to identify areas of student learning for improvement	147	98%	53	92%	50	100%
to provide feedback to students	147	99%	53	94%	50	100%
to monitor student progress	147	98%	53	91%	50	100%
to set goals (for learners/students)	147	97%	53	91%	49	98%
to provide feedback to families	147	92%	53	81%		
by using technology to analyze data	147	94%	53	81%	49	96%
to self-assess for professional growth	147	97%	53	92%	50	92%
Development of lesson plans with evidence of ability to:						
identify patterns in student learning using data	147	97%	53	89%	50	88%
integrate interdisciplinary units of study	147	97%	53	83%	50	92%
collaborate with colleagues to develop learner supports	147	95%	53	94%	50	98%
connect with relevant stakeholders to increase relevancy of lessons	147	95%	53	79%	50	86%
use technology	147	95%	53	89%	50	96%
use research-based best practices in developing units of instruction	147	96%	53	96%	50	96%
Completer and Alumni-Specific Items						
I am satisfied with the preparation I received through the University of Kentucky Educator Preparation Program.	147	95%	53	91%		
My training program has prepared me to be an effective educator.	147	96%	53	92%		
Employer-Specific Item						
Overall, the employee was well prepared for their job duties					47	97%