

# West Virginia Common Metrics 2020-2021 Exit Survey

University of Charleston

---

August 2021



**Developed by**

[Stacy Duffield](#), Ph.D.

Jerry Dogbey-Gakpetor, M.Sc.

[Network for Excellence in Teaching](#)

**With Support from**

Division of Academic Affairs

West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission

## **Introduction**

The Network for Excellence in Teaching (NExT) is a partnership of institutions of higher education (IHEs) that aim to transform how university-based teacher education programs prepare new, effective teachers. The NExT institutions collaborated to develop and administer a set of four common surveys to measure their progress toward this goal. Teacher candidates and graduates at the IHEs may complete three surveys: upon entry into the teacher education programs; at exit; and one year after graduation (known as the Transition to Teaching Survey). Supervisors of NExT graduates working in the teaching field also complete a survey during the graduates' first year of employment. This report presents the findings from the Exit Surveys distributed during the fall 2020 and spring 2021.

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 exploratory factor analysis and reliability analysis for the Exit Survey can be found in Appendix A. Confirmatory factor analyses are performed annually to verify continued validity and reliability of the survey. Guidelines for writing about the surveys can be found in Appendix B, and responses to the open-ended survey item can be found in Appendix C.

## **Survey Administration**

IHEs were responsible for administering the Exit Survey to all candidates who completed an initial teacher licensure program during the fall 2020-spring 2021 academic year. IHEs administered the survey to candidates toward the end of the candidates' final semester in their teacher licensure programs.

## **Response Rate**

The institution's response count was 7 for this survey.

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.

### *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 = 7	
	#	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	7	100.00
<b>Special Education (PreK, PreK-Adult, K-6, 5-Adult)</b> See Table 5	5	71.43
<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.)**

	<b>n = 0</b>	
	<b>#</b>	<b>Percent of Cases</b>
<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.)**

	<b>n = 0</b>	
	<b>#</b>	<b>Percent of Cases</b>
<b>Agriculture</b>	0	0.00
<b>Art</b>	0	0.00
<b>Biology</b>	0	0.00
<b>Business Education</b>	0	0.00
<b>Chemistry</b>	0	0.00
<b>Chemistry/Physics</b>	0	0.00
<b>Driver Education</b>	0	0.00
<b>English</b>	0	0.00
<b>Family and Consumer Science</b>	0	0.00
<b>French</b>	0	0.00
<b>General Math</b>	0	0.00
<b>General Math through Algebra I</b>	0	0.00
<b>General Science</b>	0	0.00
<b>German</b>	0	0.00
<b>Health</b>	0	0.00
<b>Journalism</b>	0	0.00
<b>Marketing</b>	0	0.00
<b>Mathematics</b>	0	0.00
<b>Oral Communications</b>	0	0.00
<b>Physical Education</b>	0	0.00
<b>Physics</b>	0	0.00
<b>Reading Endorsement</b>	0	0.00
<b>Social Studies</b>	0	0.00
<b>Spanish</b>	0	0.00
<b>Other</b>	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 = 0	
	#	Percent of Cases
<b>Art</b>	0	0.00
<b>English (5-9)</b>	0	0.00
<b>Early Education (PreK-K)</b>	1	0.00
<b>French (5-9)</b>	0	0.00
<b>General Math through Algebra I</b>	0	0.00
<b>General Science</b>	0	0.00
<b>Middle Childhood Education</b>	0	0.00
<b>Reading Endorsement</b>	0	0.00
<b>Social Studies (5-9)</b>	0	0.00
<b>Spanish (5-9)</b>	0	0.00
<b>Preschool Special Needs</b>	0	0.00
<b>Multicategorical Special Needs Education</b>	3	0.00
<b>Other</b>	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 = 5	
	#	Percent of Cases
<b>Autism Spectrum Disorder (K-6)</b>	0	0.00
<b>Autism Spectrum Disorder (5-Adult)</b>	0	0.00
<b>Deaf and Hard of Hearing</b>	0	0.00
<b>Emotional/Behavior Disorders</b>	2	40.00
<b>Gifted Education</b>	1	20.00
<b>Mentally Impaired (mild/moderate)</b>	1	20.00
<b>Multicategorical Special Ed (K-6)</b>	1	20.00
<b>Multicategorical Special Ed (5-Adult)</b>	0	0.00
<b>Preschool Special Needs</b>	0	0.00
<b>Severe/Multiple Disabilities</b>	0	0.00
<b>Specific Learning Disabilities</b>	1	20.00
<b>Visual Impairment</b>	0	0.00
<b>Other</b>	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
<b>Advising on professional education program requirements.</b>	7	0	0.00	1	14.29	0	0.00	6	85.71
<b>Advising on content course requirements.</b>	7	1	14.29	0	0.00	1	14.29	5	71.43
<b>Quality of instruction in your teacher preparation courses.</b>	7	0	0.00	2	28.57	3	42.86	2	28.57
<b>Balance between theory and practice in your teacher preparation courses.</b>	7	0	0.00	1	14.29	3	42.86	3	42.86
<b>Integration of technology throughout your teacher preparation program.</b>	7	1	14.29	1	14.29	1	14.29	4	57.14
<b>Coherence between your coursework and field experiences prior to student teaching.</b>	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	42.86	4	57.14
<b>Quality of field experiences prior to student teaching.</b>	7	0	0.00	1	14.29	2	28.57	4	57.14
<b>Your student teaching placement site.</b>	7	0	0.00	1	14.29	1	14.29	5	71.43

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
<b>Advising on professional education program requirements.</b>	7	3.71	0.70
<b>Advising on content course requirements.</b>	7	3.43	1.05
<b>Quality of instruction in your teacher preparation courses.</b>	7	3.00	0.76
<b>Balance between theory and practice in your teacher preparation courses.</b>	7	3.29	0.70
<b>Integration of technology throughout your teacher preparation program.</b>	7	3.14	1.12
<b>Coherence between your coursework and field experiences prior to student teaching.</b>	7	3.57	0.49
<b>Quality of field experiences prior to student teaching.</b>	7	3.43	0.73
<b>Your student teaching placement site.</b>	7	3.57	0.73

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?**

	<b>n = 7</b>	
	<b>#</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>Definitely yes</b>	3	42.86
<b>Probably yes</b>	2	28.57
<b>Probably no</b>	2	28.57
<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.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	42.86	4	57.14
Select instructional strategies to align with learning goals and standards.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	28.57	5	71.43
Design activities where students engage with subject matter from a variety of perspectives.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	14.29	6	85.71
Account for students’ prior knowledge or experiences in instructional planning.	7	0	0.00	1	14.29	2	28.57	4	57.14
Design long-range instructional plans that meet curricular goals.	7	1	14.29	0	0.00	2	28.57	4	57.14
Regularly adjust instructional plans to meet students’ needs.	7	0	0.00	1	14.29	2	28.57	4	57.14
Plan lessons with clear learning objectives/goals in mind.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	14.29	6	85.71
Design and modify assessments to match learning objectives.	7	1	14.29	0	0.00	0	0.00	6	85.71
Provide students with meaningful feedback to guide next steps in learning.	7	1	14.29	0	0.00	1	14.29	5	71.43
Engage students in self-assessment strategies.	7	1	14.29	0	0.00	3	42.86	3	42.86
Use formative and summative assessments to inform instructional practice.	7	0	0.00	1	14.29	2	28.57	4	57.14

	Total Respondents	Disagree		Tend to Disagree		Tend to Agree		Agree	
	n	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent
<b>Understand issues of reliability and validity in assessment.</b>	7	1	14.29	1	14.29	2	28.57	3	42.86
<b>Analyze appropriate types of assessment data to identify student learning needs.</b>	7	1	14.29	0	0.00	3	42.86	3	42.86
<b>Differentiate assessment for all learners.</b>	7	1	1.00	14.2857	0.00	0	2.00	28.5714	4.00
<b>Use digital and interactive technologies to achieve instructional goals.</b>	7	1	14.29	0	0.00	1	14.29	5	71.43
<b>Engage students in using a range of technology tools to achieve learning goals.</b>	7	1	14.29	0	0.00	2	28.57	4	57.14
<b>Help students develop critical thinking processes.</b>	7	1	14.29	0	0.00	2	28.57	4	57.14
<b>Help students develop skills to solve complex problems.</b>	7	0	0.00	2	28.57	0	0.00	5	71.43
<b>Understand how interdisciplinary themes connect to core subjects.</b>	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	42.86	4	57.14
<b>Know where and how to access resources to build global awareness and understanding.</b>	7	1	14.29	1	14.29	2	28.57	3	42.86
<b>Help students analyze multiple sources of evidence to draw sound conclusions.</b>	7	1	14.29	0	0.00	3	42.86	3	42.86

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
<b>Effectively teach the subject matter in my licensure area.</b>	7	3.57	0.49
<b>Select instructional strategies to align with learning goals and standards.</b>	7	3.71	0.45
<b>Design activities where students engage with subject matter from a variety of perspectives.</b>	7	3.86	0.35
<b>Account for students' prior knowledge or experiences in instructional planning.</b>	7	3.43	0.73
<b>Design long-range instructional plans that meet curricular goals.</b>	7	3.29	1.03
<b>Regularly adjust instructional plans to meet students' needs.</b>	7	3.43	0.73
<b>Plan lessons with clear learning objectives/goals in mind.</b>	7	3.86	0.35
<b>Design and modify assessments to match learning objectives.</b>	7	3.57	1.05
<b>Provide students with meaningful feedback to guide next steps in learning.</b>	7	3.43	1.05
<b>Engage students in self-assessment strategies.</b>	7	3.14	0.99

	#	Mean	SD
<b>Use formative and summative assessments to inform instructional practice.</b>	7	3.57	0.49
<b>Understand issues of reliability and validity in assessment.</b>	7	3.71	0.45
<b>Analyze appropriate types of assessment data to identify student learning needs.</b>	7	3.86	0.35
<b>Differentiate assessment for all learners.</b>	7	3.43	0.73
<b>Use digital and interactive technologies to achieve instructional goals.</b>	7	3.29	1.03
<b>Engage students in using a range of technology tools to achieve learning goals.</b>	7	3.43	0.73
<b>Help students develop critical thinking processes.</b>	7	3.86	0.35
<b>Help students develop skills to solve complex problems.</b>	7	3.57	1.05
<b>Understand how interdisciplinary themes connect to core subjects.</b>	7	3.43	1.05
<b>Know where and how to access resources to build global awareness and understanding.</b>	7	3.14	0.99
<b>Help students analyze multiple sources of evidence to draw sound conclusions.</b>	7	3.14	0.99

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.	7	0	0.00	1	14.29	4	57.14	2	28.57
Differentiate instruction for a variety of learning needs.	7	0	0.00	1	14.29	2	28.57	4	57.14
Differentiate for students at varied developmental levels.	7	0	0.00	2	28.57	1	14.29	4	57.14
Differentiate to meet the needs of students from various socioeconomic backgrounds.	7	1	14.29	0	0.00	3	42.86	3	42.86
Differentiate instruction for students with IEPs and 504 plans.	7	1	14.29	1	14.29	2	28.57	3	42.86
Differentiate instruction for students with mental health needs.	7	1	14.29	1	14.29	3	42.86	2	28.57
Differentiate instruction for gifted and talented students.	7	1	14.29	1	14.29	2	28.57	3	42.86
Differentiate instruction for English-language learners.	7	1	14.29	1	14.29	2	28.57	3	42.86
Access resources to foster learning for students with diverse needs.	7	1	14.29	0	0.00	3	42.86	3	42.86

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
<b>Effectively teach students from culturally and ethnically diverse backgrounds and communities.</b>	7	3.14	0.64
<b>Differentiate instruction for a variety of learning needs.</b>	7	3.43	0.73
<b>Differentiate for students at varied developmental levels.</b>	7	3.29	0.88
<b>Differentiate to meet the needs of students from various socioeconomic backgrounds.</b>	7	3.14	0.99
<b>Differentiate instruction for students with IEPs and 504 plans.</b>	7	3.00	1.07
<b>Differentiate instruction for students with mental health needs.</b>	7	2.86	0.99
<b>Differentiate instruction for gifted and talented students.</b>	7	3.00	1.07
<b>Differentiate instruction for English-language learners.</b>	7	3.00	1.07
<b>Access resources to foster learning for students with diverse needs.</b>	7	3.14	0.99

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.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	42.86	4	57.14
Use effective communication skills and strategies to convey ideas and information to students.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	28.57	5	71.43
Connect core content to real-life experiences for students.	7	0	0.00	1	14.29	2	28.57	4	57.14
Help students work together to achieve learning goals.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	28.57	5	71.43
Develop and maintain a classroom environment that promotes student engagement.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	28.57	5	71.43
Respond appropriately to student behavior.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	42.86	5	57.14
Create a learning environment in which differences such as race, culture, gender, sexual orientation, and language are respected.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	14.29	6	85.71
Help students regulate their own behavior.	7	1	14.29	0	0.00	3	42.86	3	42.86
Effectively organize the physical environment of the classroom for instruction.	7	0	0.00	1	14.29	0	0.00	6	85.71

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
<b>Clearly communicate expectations for appropriate student behavior.</b>	7	3.57	0.49
<b>Use effective communication skills and strategies to convey ideas and information to students.</b>	7	3.71	0.45
<b>Connect core content to real-life experiences for students.</b>	7	3.43	0.73
<b>Help students work together to achieve learning goals.</b>	7	3.71	0.45
<b>Develop and maintain a classroom environment that promotes student engagement.</b>	7	3.71	0.45
<b>Respond appropriately to student behavior.</b>	7	3.57	0.49
<b>Create a learning environment in which differences such as race, culture, gender, sexual orientation, and language are respected.</b>	7	3.86	0.35
<b>Help students regulate their own behavior.</b>	7	3.14	0.99
<b>Effectively organize the physical environment of the classroom for instruction.</b>	7	3.71	0.70

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.	7	1	14.29	0	0.00	2	28.57	4	57.14
Access the professional literature to expand my knowledge about teaching and learning.	7	1	14.29	0	0.00	4	57.14	2	28.57
Collaborate with parents and guardians to support student learning.	7	0	0.00	1	14.29	0	0.00	6	85.71
Collaborate with teaching colleagues to improve student performance.	7	0	0.00	1	14.29	0	0.00	6	85.71
Use colleague feedback to support my development as a teacher.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	14.29	6	85.71
Uphold laws related to student rights and teacher responsibility.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	28.57	5	71.43
Act as an advocate for all students.	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	7	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
<b>Seek out learning opportunities that align with my professional development goals.</b>	7	3.29	1.03
<b>Access the professional literature to expand my knowledge about teaching and learning.</b>	7	3.00	0.93
<b>Collaborate with parents and guardians to support student learning.</b>	7	3.71	0.70
<b>Collaborate with teaching colleagues to improve student performance.</b>	7	3.71	0.70
<b>Use colleague feedback to support my development as a teacher.</b>	7	3.86	0.35
<b>Uphold laws related to student rights and teacher responsibility.</b>	7	3.71	0.45
<b>Act as an advocate for all students.</b>	7	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.	7	0	0.00	1	14.29	0	0.00	6	85.71
Acted as a liaison between me and the school.	7	1	14.29	0	0.00	0	0.00	6	85.71
Gave me constructive feedback on my teaching.	7	0	0.00	1	14.29	1	14.29	5	71.43
Helped me understand my roles and responsibilities as a student teacher.	7	1	14.29	0	0.00	1	14.29	5	71.43
Helped me develop as a reflective practitioner.	7	1	14.29	0	0.00	1	14.29	5	71.43

**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.	7	3.71	0.70
Acted as a liaison between me and the school.	7	3.57	1.05
Gave me constructive feedback on my teaching.	7	3.57	0.73
Helped me understand my roles and responsibilities as a student teacher.	7	3.43	1.05
Helped me develop as a reflective practitioner.	7	3.43	1.05

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 = 7	
	#	Percent
<b>0</b>	1	14.29
<b>1-2</b>	1	14.29
<b>3-4</b>	3	42.86
<b>5-6</b>	0	0.00
<b>7-8</b>	1	14.29
<b>9-10</b>	0	0.00
<b>More than 10</b>	1	14.29

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 = 7	
	#	Percent
<b>0</b>	1	14.29
<b>1-2</b>	1	14.29
<b>3-4</b>	3	42.86
<b>5-6</b>	0	0.00
<b>7-8</b>	1	14.29
<b>9-10</b>	0	0.00
<b>More than 10</b>	1	14.29

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 = 7	
	#	Percent
<b>Yes</b>	4	57.14
<b>No</b>	3	42.86

Note. Data from item C4.

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

	n = 4	
	#	Percent of Cases
Other university or college supervisor	1	25.00
University or college’s field experience coordinator/supervisor	2	50.00
Teacher education faculty	3	75.00
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 = 6	
	#	Percent
Yes	5	83.33
No	1	16.67
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
<b>Provided adequate opportunities for me to observe the classroom.</b>	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	14.29	6	85.71
<b>Provided adequate time for planning.</b>	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	14.29	6	85.71
<b>Helped me with classroom management.</b>	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	42.86	4	57.14
<b>Made me feel welcome.</b>	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	28.57	5	71.43
<b>Gave me constructive feedback on my teaching.</b>	7	0	0.00	2	28.57	1	14.29	4	57.14
<b>Let me experiment with my own teaching ideas.</b>	7	1	14.29	1	14.29	0	0.00	5	71.43
<b>Included me in parent-teacher conferences, school meetings, and other professional experiences.</b>	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	14.29	6	85.71
<b>Shared ideas and materials.</b>	7	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	7	100.00
<b>Helped me develop as a reflective practitioner.</b>	7	0	0.00	1	14.29	2	28.57	4	57.14
<b>Helped me plan differentiated instruction for a variety of learning needs.</b>	7	1	14.29	0	0.00	2	28.57	4	57.14
<b>Helped me use student data to inform instruction.</b>	7	1	14.29	0	0.00	3	42.86	3	42.86

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
<b>Provided adequate opportunities for me to observe the classroom.</b>	7	3.86	0.35
<b>Provided adequate time for planning.</b>	7	3.86	0.35
<b>Helped me with classroom management.</b>	7	3.57	0.49
<b>Made me feel welcome.</b>	7	3.71	0.45
<b>Gave me constructive feedback on my teaching.</b>	7	3.29	0.88
<b>Let me experiment with my own teaching ideas.</b>	7	3.29	1.16
<b>Included me in parent-teacher conferences, school meetings, and other professional experiences.</b>	7	3.86	0.35
<b>Shared ideas and materials.</b>	7	4.00	0.00
<b>Helped me develop as a reflective practitioner.</b>	7	3.43	0.73
<b>Helped me plan differentiated instruction for a variety of learning needs.</b>	7	3.29	1.03
<b>Helped me use student data to inform instruction.</b>	7	3.14	0.99

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 = 6	
	#	Percent
<b>1-2 years</b>	0	0.00
<b>3-5 years</b>	0	0.00
<b>6-10 years</b>	0	0.00
<b>11 or more years</b>	6	100.00
<b>I do not plan to teach</b>	0	0.00

*Note.* Data from item D1.

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

	<b>n = 7</b>	
	<b>#</b>	<b>Percent of Cases</b>
<b>West Virginia</b>	4	57.14
<b>Ohio</b>	3	42.86
<b>Kentucky</b>	2	28.57
<b>Virginia</b>	2	28.57
<b>Maryland</b>	1	14.29
<b>Pennsylvania</b>	0	0.00
<b>North Carolina</b>	2	28.57
<b>South Carolina</b>	2	28.57
<b>Florida</b>	4	57.14
<b>Other urban area in the U.S.</b>	2	28.57
<b>Other suburban area in the U.S.</b>	3	42.86
<b>Other rural area in the U.S.</b>	1	14.29
<b>Outside the U.S.</b>	1	14.29
<b>Other</b>	1	14.29

Note. Data from item D2.

## SECTION E. YOUR BACKGROUND

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

	n = 6	
	#	Percent
<b>Male</b>	0	0.00
<b>Female</b>	6	100.00

Note. Data from item E1.

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

	n = 7	
	#	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>	0	0.00
<b>Hispanic or Latino</b>	0	0.00
<b>Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander</b>	0	0.00
<b>White, non-Hispanic</b>	7	100.00
<b>Other</b>	0	0.00

Note. Data from item E3.

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

	n = 7	
	#	Percent
<b>Yes</b>	7	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 = 7	
	#	Percent
<b>Yes</b>	7	100.00
<b>No</b>	0	0.00

Note. Data from item E5.



## **Appendix A**

### **Exit Survey 2020 Validity and Reliability**

The Network for Excellence in Teaching, formed in 2010, is a collaborative of higher education teacher preparation programs who aim to support continuous improvement of teacher education through research-based best practice and the use of valid and reliable measures. The Exit Survey is administered to student teachers at the end of their program to determine how prepared these student teachers were for clinical practice. First created in 2010, the Exit Survey has undergone rigorous design and testing, with several major revisions based upon internal validity and reliability testing, expert review, and respondent feedback. This report presents the most recent internal validity and reliability 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 because 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 (1.48E-17) and C (4.08E-06), an indication of potential problems with collinearity, indicating that some variables are highly correlated and are likely redundant.

##### **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 these guidelines, the bivariate correlations among items in Part A, consisting of 46.43% of item pairs were moderate, ranging from weak (.203) to strong (.732). Item a2h\_site had weak correlations with all other items in Section A2 except a2g\_prior, indicating this item might represent a separate construct from others in Section A2. Using the scree plot, two factors, explaining 63.53% of the variance, were retained. Items a2c\_inst, a2d\_bal, a2e\_tech, a2f\_cohe, a2g\_prior, and a2h\_site loaded heavily onto Factor 1 (related to Program Quality) and items a2a\_educ and a2b\_cont loaded onto Factor 2 (related to Advising). These factor loadings range from .60 to .88. See Appendix A for the factor loadings.

##### **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 66.45% of the variance using the minimum eigenvalue of 1. The factor loadings were good for all retained items, ranging from .400 to .735. Items a2c\_inst and a2e\_tech cross loaded. See Appendix A for the factor loadings.

**Table 1. Section B: “Preparation for Teaching” Factors**

Factor	Items	Primary Topic	Variance Explained
1	b1e_goals, b1j_self, b1l_rel, b1m_approp, b1mm_diff, b1n_digi, b1o_range, b1p_criti, b1q_complx, b1r_itdsp, b1s_glbl and b1t_conc	Instructional Practice	53.19%
2	b2a_ethn, b2b_diff, b2c_dev, b2d_socio, b2e_IEP, b2f_mntl, b2g_gift, b2h_ELL, and b2i_resour	Diverse Learners	4.22%
3	b1a_subj, b1b_strat, b1c_pers, b1d_prior, b1f_adj, b1g_plan, b1h_match, b1i_fdbk, and b1k_assess	Instructional Planning	2.66%
4	b3a_expec, b3b_comm, b3c_real, b3d_work, b3e_envi, b3f_behav, b3g_diff, b3h_reg, and b3i_phys	Learning Environment	4.10%
5	b4a_opp, b4b_lite, b4c_pare, b4d_coll, b4e_dev, b4f_legal, and b4g_advo	Professionalism	2.66%

**Section B1: Instructional Practice**

Twelve items from Section B1, Instructional Practice, loaded onto Factor 1, as shown in Table 1. These items are related to both instructional practice and technology and resources. Items b1e\_goals, b1h\_match, b1i\_fdbk, b1k\_assess, b1m\_approp and b1p\_criti cross loaded with Factor 3, while b1mm\_diff cross loaded with Factor 2, diverse learning. These cross-loaded items in Factor 1 may contribute to the ambiguous loading.

Nine items; b1a\_subj, b1b\_strat, b1c\_pers, b1d\_prior, b1f\_adj, b1g\_plan, b1h\_match, b1i\_fdbk, and b1k\_assess, loaded onto Factor 3. This is a new finding for this year’s data. Eight of the nine items are related in planning for instruction; therefore, this new factor was labeled instructional planning.

**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 loaded strongly onto Factor 4. This suggests that these items represent one scale related to learning environment. Item b3\_work cross loaded with Factor 3.

**Section B4: Professionalism**

All items in Section 4 loaded onto Factor 5, Professionalism with b4a\_opp and b4b\_lite cross loading onto Factor 1. This suggests that these items can be used to measure one Professionalism scale for future analysis.

**Part C**

All items in Section C1 had strong bivariate correlations ranging from .642 to .810, 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 .446 to .820. Correlations between the two sections (C1 and C6) are weak, suggesting student teachers’ perceptions of their faculty supervisor and cooperating teacher do not correlate with each other. Two factors were retained using the minimum eigenvalue criteria in the factor analysis. Factor 1 accounted 46.48% of the variance and Factor 2 accounted 22.22% of the variance. Retained factor loadings range from .688 to .913.

**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	46.48%
2	c1a_avail, c1b_liais, c1c_fdbk, c1d_role, and c1e_refl	University/College Supervisor	22.22%

**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	0.858
A	Advising	0.846
	Program Quality	0.829
B	Part B: Preparation for Teaching—Overall	0.980
	Instructional Practice (Factor 1)	0.946
	Learning Environment	0.937
	Diverse Learners	0.937
	Professionalism	0.913
	Instructional Planning (Factor 3)	0.930
C	Sections C1: University/College Supervisor and C6: Cooperating Teacher/Co-teacher—Overall	0.917
	Cooperating Teacher	0.944
	University/College Supervisor	0.931

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 2019-2020 Exit Survey data have relatively good reliability as a measure of these constructs.

**References**

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

Zhang, A., Baron, M., & Duffield, S. (2017). *Exit Survey 2017 validity and reliability*. Retrieved from Network for Excellence in Teaching <https://www.nextteachers.org/services>

Prepared by  
 Jerry Dogbey-Gakpetor, M.Sc., North Dakota State University  
 Stacy Duffield, Ph.D., North Dakota State University  
 January 2021

## **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 offers 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. (eg. 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 (eg. instructing English learners or providing feedback). Sharing of specific items is a violation of copyright.
- If reporting about single items, it needs to be made clear that the items are being extracted from an instrument that is meant to be used in whole and that the items are part of factors that include multiple items.
- Reporting should be about outcomes. We recommend that results are presented by factor. (See factor analysis reports)
- Please note that while the data belongs 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 QUESTION A3**

#### **A3. Would you recommend your teacher education program to other prospective teachers?\***

*Note.* The responses were not cleaned for spelling or grammar, and names of individuals were redacted.

- I spent more time learning about physical education than I did learning about IEPs and how to help students with specific needs. I spent more time learning about food labels and nutrition than I did how to give appropriate assessments
- Since UC's education program is so small, it is very easy to get help if you need it. It is a very friendly environment and professors get to know you over time, which makes it a good experience.
- I was not satisfied with the professor that taught me the majority of my coursework throughout my time in the Education Program. I was very satisfied with the material I learned from [Faculty Member] and [Faculty Member] but I feel as though the material taught by [Faculty Member] was extremely unsatisfactory. I learned mostly everything through either [Faculty Member] or [Faculty Member] or my field placements.
- When it comes to the teacher education program, I would recommend to other prospective teachers because I felt I was granted the proper knowledge before stepping into the classroom. Although I did not feel comfortable due to previous placements, the class work and relationships with peers and staff allowed me to feel confident.
- The program got us into the classroom quick and more than others so that gave us experience to help us in student teaching and letting us know this is the program for us. The program also gave us a lot of preparation for student teaching with classroom management and a lot of practice with making lesson plans.
- The head of the department did a good job of communicating with students, along with explaining all of the material well. They were also always willing to help and answered questions quickly and efficiently.
- This is a phenomenal program! The education team truly cares about your success. My professors were there with me every step of the way!! 10/10