

# **West Virginia Common Metrics 2018-2019 Exit Survey**

University of Charleston

---

September 2019

**Developed by**

Stacy Duffield, Ph.D.  
Jerry Dogbey-Gakpetor, MSc.  
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**

This report presents the findings from the Exit Survey administered to student teachers during fall 2018 and spring 2019. The Exit Survey collects information on student teachers' perceptions of and satisfaction with their teacher education programs and student teaching experiences as well as their backgrounds and future plans. Quantitative data for the institution are presented in tabular format below. Each of the surveys has been found to be highly valid and reliable; the results of the analysis for the Exit Survey can be found beginning on page 6.

The Exit Survey was developed by the Network for Excellence in Teaching (NExT). NExT was 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

## **Survey Administration and Response Rate**

The Exit Survey is administered to candidates near the end of the student teaching experience. The 2018-19 Exit Survey response rate for the University of Charleston was 56% (5 out of 9). The response rate is calculated by dividing the number of respondents who completed the survey through at least Section A by the population of student teachers who could have completed the survey.

## **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.

## **Accreditation and Program Approval**

NExT 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 ND state program approval and CAEP standard 1.1. Additionally, the Exit Survey, Section C, focuses on 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. Appendix B presents guidelines for writing about the surveys and data.

## **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. 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. Responses to the open-ended item: “Would you recommend your teacher education program to another prospective teacher? Why or why not?” can be found in Appendix C.

### *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. 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.

### *Survey Section D*

Section D of the survey asks candidates about their future plans including how long they plan to teach and where.

### *Survey Section E*

Section E collects candidate demographics such as gender, age, and languages spoken.

#### **Notes:**

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.”

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 = 5	
	#	Percent of Cases
<b>Early Childhood Major (PreK-K)</b>	0	0.00
<b>Preschool Education Major (PreK)</b> See Table 4	0	0.00
<b>Elementary Education (K-6)</b> See Table 4	5	100.00
<b>Special Education (PreK, PreK-Adult, K-6, 5-Adult)</b> See Table 5	4	80.00
<b>PreK-Adult Education License</b> See Table 2	0	0.00
<b>Secondary Education License (5-Adult, 5-9, or 9-Adult)</b> See Table 3	0	0.00

Note. Data from item A1.

**Table 2. If you completed a K-12 licensure program, indicate your subject area. (Check all that apply.)**

	n = 0	
	#	Percent of Cases
<b>Art</b>	0	0.00
<b>English as a Second Language (ESL)</b>	0	0.00
<b>French</b>	0	0.00
<b>Health</b>	0	0.00
<b>Japanese</b>	0	0.00
<b>Music</b>	0	0.00
<b>Physical Education</b>	0	0.00
<b>Reading Endorsement</b>	0	0.00
<b>Reading Specialist</b>	0	0.00
<b>School Library-Media</b>	0	0.00
<b>Theatre</b>	0	0.00
<b>Wellness</b>	0	0.00
<b>Other</b>	0	0.00

Note. Data from item A1.

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

	n = 0	
	#	Percent of Cases
Agriculture	0	0.00
Art	0	0.00
Biology	0	0.00
Business Education	0	0.00
Chemistry	0	0.00
Chemistry/Physics	0	0.00
Driver Education	0	0.00
English	0	0.00
Family and Consumer Science	0	0.00
French	0	0.00
General Math	0	0.00
General Math through Algebra I	0	0.00
General Science	0	0.00
German	0	0.00
Health	0	0.00
Journalism	0	0.00
Marketing	0	0.00
Mathematics	0	0.00
Oral Communications	0	0.00
Physical Education	0	0.00
Physics	0	0.00
Reading Endorsement	0	0.00
Social Studies	0	0.00
Spanish	0	0.00
Other	0	0.00

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 = 5	
	#	Percent of Cases
Art	0	0.00
English (5-9)	0	0.00
Early Education (PreK-K)	1	20.00
French (5-9)	0	0.00
General Math through Algebra I	0	0.00
General Science	0	0.00
Middle Childhood Education	0	0.00
Reading Endorsement	0	0.00
Social Studies (5-9)	0	0.00
Spanish (5-9)	0	0.00
Preschool Special Needs	0	0.00
Multicategorical Special Needs Education	1	20.00
Other	0	0.00

Note. Data from item A1.

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

	n = 4	
	#	Percent of Cases
Autism Spectrum Disorder (K-6)	0	0.00
Autism Spectrum Disorder (5-Adult)	0	0.00
Deaf and Hard of Hearing	0	0.00
Emotional/Behavior Disorders	0	0.00
Gifted Education	0	0.00
Mentally Impaired (mild/moderate)	1	25.00
Multicategorical Special Ed (K-6)	1	25.00
Multicategorical Special Ed (5-Adult)	0	0.00
Preschool Special Needs	0	0.00
Severe/Multiple Disabilities	0	0.00
Specific Learning Disabilities	0	0.00
Visual Impairment	0	0.00
Other	0	0.00

Note. Data from item A1.



**Table 6. 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.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	40.00	3	60.00
Advising on content course requirements.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	40.00	3	60.00
Quality of instruction in your teacher preparation courses.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	40.00	3	60.00
Balance between theory and practice in your teacher preparation courses.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	40.00	3	60.00
Integration of technology throughout your teacher preparation program.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	20.00	4	80.00
Coherence between your coursework and field experiences prior to student teaching.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	60.00	2	40.00
Quality of field experiences prior to student teaching.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	40.00	3	60.00
Your student teaching placement site.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	40.00	3	60.00

Note. Data from items A2a-h.

**Table 7. 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.	5	3.60	0.49
Advising on content course requirements.	5	3.60	0.49
Quality of instruction in your teacher preparation courses.	5	3.60	0.49
Balance between theory and practice in your teacher preparation courses.	5	3.60	0.49
Integration of technology throughout your teacher preparation program.	5	3.80	0.40
Coherence between your coursework and field experiences prior to student teaching.	5	3.40	0.49
Quality of field experiences prior to student teaching.	5	3.60	0.49
Your student teaching placement site.	5	3.60	0.49

Note. Data from items A2a-h. Scale: 1 = Very Dissatisfied; 2 = Dissatisfied; 3 = Satisfied; 4 = Very Satisfied.

**Table 8. Would you recommend your teacher education program to other prospective teachers?**

	n = 5	
	#	Percent
<b>Definitely yes</b>	4	80.00
<b>Probably yes</b>	1	20.00
<b>Probably no</b>	0	0.00
<b>Definitely no</b>	0	0.00

Note. Data from item A3.

**SECTION B. PREPARATION FOR TEACHING**

**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?**

	Total Respondents	Disagree		Tend to Disagree		Tend to Agree		Agree	
	n	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent
Effectively teach the subject matter in my licensure area.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	100.00
Select instructional strategies to align with learning goals and standards.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	100.00
Design activities where students engage with subject matter from a variety of perspectives.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	100.00
Account for students' prior knowledge or experiences in instructional planning.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	100.00
Design long-range instructional plans that meet curricular goals.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	20.00	4	80.00
Regularly adjust instructional plans to meet students' needs.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	40.00	3	60.00
Plan lessons with clear learning objectives/goals in mind.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	100.00
Design and modify assessments to match learning objectives.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	100.00
Provide students with meaningful feedback to guide next steps in learning.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	20.00	4	80.00
Engage students in self-assessment strategies.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	20.00	4	80.00
Use formative and summative assessments to inform instructional practice.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	20.00	4	80.00

	Total Respondents	Disagree		Tend to Disagree		Tend to Agree		Agree	
	n	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent
Understand issues of reliability and validity in assessment.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	20.00	4	80.00
Analyze appropriate types of assessment data to identify student learning needs.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	20.00	4	80.00
Differentiate assessment for all learners.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	40.00	3	60.00
Use digital and interactive technologies to achieve instructional goals.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	20.00	4	80.00
Engage students in using a range of technology tools to achieve learning goals.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	20.00	4	80.00
Help students develop critical thinking processes.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	100.00
Help students develop skills to solve complex problems.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	100.00
Understand how interdisciplinary themes connect to core subjects.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	20.00	4	80.00
Know where and how to access resources to build global awareness and understanding.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	100.00
Help students analyze multiple sources of evidence to draw sound conclusions.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	100.00

Note. Data from items B1a-t.

**Table 10. 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.	5	4.00	0.00
Select instructional strategies to align with learning goals and standards.	5	4.00	0.00
Design activities where students engage with subject matter from a variety of perspectives.	5	4.00	0.00
Account for students' prior knowledge or experiences in instructional planning.	5	4.00	0.00
Design long-range instructional plans that meet curricular goals.	5	3.80	0.40
Regularly adjust instructional plans to meet students' needs.	5	3.60	0.49
Plan lessons with clear learning objectives/goals in mind.	5	4.00	0.00
Design and modify assessments to match learning objectives.	5	4.00	0.00
Provide students with meaningful feedback to guide next steps in learning.	5	3.80	0.40
Engage students in self-assessment strategies.	5	4.00	0.00

	#	Mean	SD
<b>Use formative and summative assessments to inform instructional practice.</b>	5	4.00	0.00
<b>Understand issues of reliability and validity in assessment.</b>	5	4.00	0.00
<b>Analyze appropriate types of assessment data to identify student learning needs.</b>	5	4.00	0.00
<b>Differentiate assessment for all learners.</b>	5	4.00	0.00
<b>Use digital and interactive technologies to achieve instructional goals.</b>	5	3.80	0.40
<b>Engage students in using a range of technology tools to achieve learning goals.</b>	5	3.60	0.49
<b>Help students develop critical thinking processes.</b>	5	4.00	0.00
<b>Help students develop skills to solve complex problems.</b>	5	4.00	0.00
<b>Understand how interdisciplinary themes connect to core subjects.</b>	5	3.80	0.40
<b>Know where and how to access resources to build global awareness and understanding.</b>	5	3.80	0.40
<b>Help students analyze multiple sources of evidence to draw sound conclusions.</b>	5	4.00	0.00

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

**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?**

	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.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	100.00
Differentiate instruction for a variety of learning needs.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	20.00	4	80.00
Differentiate for students at varied developmental levels.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	100.00
Differentiate to meet the needs of students from various socioeconomic backgrounds.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	20.00	4	80.00
Differentiate instruction for students with IEPs and 504 plans.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	40.00	3	60.00
Differentiate instruction for students with mental health needs.	5	0	0.00	1	20.00	1	20.00	3	60.00
Differentiate instruction for gifted and talented students.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	40.00	3	60.00
Differentiate instruction for English-language learners.	5	0	0.00	1	20.00	2	40.00	2	40.00
Access resources to foster learning for students with diverse needs.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	100.00

Note. Data from items B2a-i.



**Table 12. 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.	5	4.00	0.00
Differentiate instruction for a variety of learning needs.	5	3.80	0.40
Differentiate for students at varied developmental levels.	5	4.00	0.00
Differentiate to meet the needs of students from various socioeconomic backgrounds.	5	3.80	0.40
Differentiate instruction for students with IEPs and 504 plans.	5	3.60	0.49
Differentiate instruction for students with mental health needs.	5	3.40	0.80
Differentiate instruction for gifted and talented students.	5	3.60	0.49
Differentiate instruction for English-language learners.	5	3.20	0.75
Access resources to foster learning for students with diverse needs.	5	4.00	0.00

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

**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?**

	Total Respondents	Disagree		Tend to Disagree		Tend to Agree		Agree	
	n	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent
Clearly communicate expectations for appropriate student behavior.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	100.00
Use effective communication skills and strategies to convey ideas and information to students.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	100.00
Connect core content to real-life experiences for students.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	20.00	4	80.00
Help students work together to achieve learning goals.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	100.00
Develop and maintain a classroom environment that promotes student engagement.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	20.00	4	80.00
Respond appropriately to student behavior.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	20.00	4	80.00
Create a learning environment in which differences such as race, culture, gender, sexual orientation, and language are respected.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	100.00
Help students regulate their own behavior.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	20.00	4	80.00
Effectively organize the physical environment of the classroom for instruction.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	20.00	4	80.00

Note. Data from items B3a-i.

**Table 14. 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.	5	4.00	0.00
Use effective communication skills and strategies to convey ideas and information to students.	5	4.00	0.00
Connect core content to real-life experiences for students.	5	3.80	0.40
Help students work together to achieve learning goals.	5	4.00	0.00
Develop and maintain a classroom environment that promotes student engagement.	5	3.80	0.40
Respond appropriately to student behavior.	5	3.80	0.40
Create a learning environment in which differences such as race, culture, gender, sexual orientation, and language are respected.	5	4.00	0.00
Help students regulate their own behavior.	5	3.80	0.40
Effectively organize the physical environment of the classroom for instruction.	5	3.80	0.40

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

**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?**

	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.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	100.00
Access the professional literature to expand my knowledge about teaching and learning.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	60.00	2	40.00
Collaborate with parents and guardians to support student learning.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	40.00	3	60.00
Collaborate with teaching colleagues to improve student performance.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	40.00	3	60.00
Use colleague feedback to support my development as a teacher.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	40.00	3	60.00
Uphold laws related to student rights and teacher responsibility.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	20.00	4	80.00
Act as an advocate for all students.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	100.00

**Table 16. 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.	5	4.00	0.00
Access the professional literature to expand my knowledge about teaching and learning.	5	3.40	0.49
Collaborate with parents and guardians to support student learning.	5	3.60	0.49
Collaborate with teaching colleagues to improve student performance.	5	3.60	0.49
Use colleague feedback to support my development as a teacher.	5	3.60	0.49
Uphold laws related to student rights and teacher responsibility.	5	3.80	0.40
Act as an advocate for all students.	5	4.00	0.00

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

**SECTION C. STUDENT TEACHING**

**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...

	Total Respondents	Disagree		Tend to Disagree		Tend to Agree		Agree	
	n	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent
Was available when I needed help.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	100.00
Acted as a liaison between me and the school.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	40.00	3	60.00
Gave me constructive feedback on my teaching.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	40.00	3	60.00
Helped me understand my roles and responsibilities as a student teacher.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	100.00
Helped me develop as a reflective practitioner.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	100.00

**Table 18. 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.	5	4.00	0.00
Acted as a liaison between me and the school.	5	3.60	0.49
Gave me constructive feedback on my teaching.	5	3.60	0.49
Helped me understand my roles and responsibilities as a student teacher.	5	4.00	0.00
Helped me develop as a reflective practitioner.	5	4.00	0.00

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

**Table 19. 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 = 5	
	#	Percent
0	0	0.00
1-2	0	0.00
3-4	1	20.00
5-6	4	80.00
7-8	0	0.00
9-10	0	0.00
More than 10	0	0.00

Note. Data from item C2.

**Table 20. 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 = 5	
	#	Percent
<b>0</b>	0	0.00
<b>1-2</b>	0	0.00
<b>3-4</b>	2	40.00
<b>5-6</b>	0	0.00
<b>7-8</b>	2	40.00
<b>9-10</b>	0	0.00
<b>More than 10</b>	1	20.00

Note. Data from item C3.

**Table 21. Besides your university or college supervisor, did anyone else from your university or college visit you at your student teaching site?**

	n = 5	
	#	Percent
<b>Yes</b>	1	20.00
<b>No</b>	4	80.00

Note. Data from item C4.



**Table 22. If yes, check all that apply.**

	n = 1	
	#	Percent of Cases
Other university or college supervisor	0	0.00
University or college's field experience coordinator/supervisor	0	0.00
Teacher education faculty	0	0.00
Content faculty	0	0.00
Other faculty	0	0.00
Graduate student	0	0.00
Peer teacher candidate	0	0.00
Other	0	0.00

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

**Table 23. If you experienced significant challenges during your student teaching, did you receive the help you needed?**

	n = 5	
	#	Percent
Yes	5	100.00
No	0	0.00
Does not apply	0	0.00

Note. Data from item C5.

**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...**

	Total Respondents	Disagree		Tend to Disagree		Tend to Agree		Agree	
	n	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent
Provided adequate opportunities for me to observe the classroom.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	20.00	4	80.00
Provided adequate time for planning.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	20.00	4	80.00
Helped me with classroom management.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	20.00	4	80.00
Made me feel welcome.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	20.00	4	80.00
Gave me constructive feedback on my teaching.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	20.00	4	80.00
Let me experiment with my own teaching ideas.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	20.00	4	80.00
Included me in parent-teacher conferences, school meetings, and other professional experiences.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	40.00	3	60.00
Shared ideas and materials.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	20.00	4	80.00
Helped me develop as a reflective practitioner.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	40.00	3	60.00
Helped me plan differentiated instruction for a variety of learning needs.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	40.00	3	60.00
Helped me use student data to inform instruction.	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	40.00	3	60.00

Note. Data from items C6.

**Table 25. 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.	5	3.80	0.40
Provided adequate time for planning.	5	3.80	0.40
Helped me with classroom management.	5	3.80	0.40
Made me feel welcome.	5	3.80	0.40
Gave me constructive feedback on my teaching.	5	3.80	0.40
Let me experiment with my own teaching ideas.	5	3.80	0.40
Included me in parent-teacher conferences, school meetings, and other professional experiences.	5	3.60	0.49
Shared ideas and materials.	5	3.80	0.40
Helped me develop as a reflective practitioner.	5	3.60	0.49
Helped me plan differentiated instruction for a variety of learning needs.	5	3.60	0.49
Helped me use student data to inform instruction.	5	3.60	0.49

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

## SECTION D. FUTURE PLANS

**Table 26. How long do you plan to teach?**

	n = 5	
	#	Percent
1-2 years	0	0.00
3-5 years	0	0.00
6-10 years	0	0.00
11 or more years	4	80.00
I do not plan to teach	1	20.00

Note. Data from item D1.

**Table 27. Where would you consider teaching? Mark all that apply.**

	n = 5	
	#	Percent of Cases
West Virginia	5	100.00
Ohio	1	20.00
Kentucky	3	60.00
Virginia	0	0.00
Maryland	0	0.00
Pennsylvania	3	60.00
North Carolina	3	60.00
South Carolina	1	20.00
Florida	0	0.00
Other urban area in the U.S.	1	20.00
Other suburban area in the U.S.	1	20.00
Other rural area in the U.S.	1	20.00
Outside the U.S.	0	0.00
Other	0	0.00

Note. Data from item D2.

## SECTION E. YOUR BACKGROUND

**Table 28. What is your gender?**

	n = 5	
	#	Percent
<b>Male</b>	0	0.00
<b>Female</b>	5	100.00

Note. Data from item E1.

**Table 29. What is your race/ethnicity?**

	n = 5	
	#	Percent of Cases
<b>American Indian or Alaskan Native</b>	0	0.00
<b>Asian</b>	0	0.00
<b>Black or African American</b>	1	20.00
<b>Hispanic or Latino</b>	0	0.00
<b>Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander</b>	0	0.00
<b>White, non-Hispanic</b>	5	100.00
<b>Other</b>	0	0.00

Note. Data from item E3.

**Table 30. Is English your native language?**

	n = 5	
	#	Percent
<b>Yes</b>	5	100.00
<b>No</b>	0	0.00

Note. Data from item E4.

**Table 31. Do you fluently speak a language other than English?**

	n = 5	
	#	Percent
<b>Yes</b>	0	0.00
<b>No</b>	5	100.00

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, PROC 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
B	Part B: Preparation for Teaching—Overall	0.97
	Instructional Practice	0.91
	Learning Environment	0.94
	Diverse Learners	0.94
	Professionalism	0.92
	Technology and Resources	0.86
C	Sections C1: University/College Supervisor and C6: Cooperating Teacher/Co-teacher—Overall	0.92
	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.). Hillsdale, 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 A3**

*Note: Names of individuals identified in responses are redacted.*

- The University of Charlestons Education Department was not extremely big so we got a lot of one on one help. Any time I had a question they were there to help me answer It. It was a phenomenal program.
- The University of Charleston places prospective teachers in the classroom in the first semester of their career. This is a rarity for other universities and it is the aspect that allowed me to be better prepared for the time I was student teaching. The staff of the program and department is also friendly, welcoming, and extremely helpful with any questions or concerns you may have.