

Table 1: Summary Data of Employer Survey

Employer Survey Results										
#	Question	Claim	Component	Range	Responses	Min	Max.	STDV	RC	% Meet
1	How well did RC prepare completer in basic knowledge of subject?	1	1.1	1-5	8	1	5	0.6	Average 3	100%
2	How well did RC prepare completer to evaluate growth and learning?	2	1.1 1.2 4.1	1-5	8	1	5	0.6	Average 3	100%
3	How well did RC prepare completer to meet needs of individual student by differentiating instruction?	1,2,3,4	1.1 2.3	1-5	8	3	5	0.5	Average 3	100%
4	How well did RC prepare completer to work in inclusive classroom situations	1,2,3,4	1.1 2.3	1-5	8	3	5	0.5	Average 3	100%
5	How well did RC prepare completer to involve pupils in varied learning experiences?	1,2	1.4 2.3	1-5	8	2	5	0.6	Average 3	100%
6	How well did RC prepare completer to manage the classroom efficiently?	2,3	2.3 4.1	1-5	8	2	6	0.5	Average 3	100%
7	How well did RC prepare completer to plan on daily and long-term basis?	1,2	1.1 2.3	1-5	8	1	7	0.5	Average 3	100%

8	How well did RC prepare completer to present lessons skillfully?	2	1.1 2.3	1-5	8	3	5	0.5	Average 3	100%
9	How well did RC prepare completer to practice professional ethics?	1	1.1	1-5	8	3	5	0.5	Average 3	100%
10	How well did RC prepare completer to understand how to work with parents and the community?	1,2	1.1	1-5	8	2	5	0.5	Average 3	100%
11	How well did RC prepare completer to use a broad variety of teaching resources?	1,2	1.1	1.1 1-5	8	1	5	0.64087	Average 3	100%
12	How well did RC prepare completer to show empathy for and sensitivity to all learners?	1,3	1.1 2.3	1-5 2.3	8	1	4	0.7	Average 3	100%
13	How well did RC prepare completer to demonstrate leadership, initiative and professional growth?	1,2	1.1 1.4	1-5	8	1	5	0.6	Average 3	100%
14	How well did RC prepare completer to be creative, flexible, and imaginative?	2	1.1	1-5	8	3	5	0.5	Average 3	100%

15	How well did RC preparer to communicate orally?	2	1.1	1-5	8	1	4	0.7	Average 3	100%
16	How well did RC preparer to communicate in writing?	1,2	4.2	1-5	8	3	5	0.5	Average 3	100%
17	How well did RC preparer to use technology effectively?	4	1.5 2.3	1-5	8	3	5	0.5	Average 3	100%
18	How well did RC preparer to teach state required standards?	1,2	1.3 1.1 1.2	1-5	8	3	5	0.4	Average 3	100%
19	How well did RC preparer to reflect, monitor and adjust?	2	1.1	1-5	8	1	7	0.5	Average 3	100%
20	How well did RC preparer to create a caring environment?	3	2.3	1-5	8	4	4	0.5	Average 3	100%

A Likert scale was provided to each principal of program completers from 2011-2015. The 20 question survey included questions based on the InTASC standards. A five point scale was used: 5=Very High, 4=Above Average, 3=Average, 2=Below Average, 1=Low. The target was 3 or average for each question and 90% benchmark for combined above average (4) and high (5). Employer survey response rate the first attempt resulted in one principal sending in a completed follow-up survey. Principals were contacted via phone calls and visits by college faculty when the faculty were observing candidates during field placements. These surveys do not represent a random sample. We have selected and trained the sample to perform to the InTASC and state standards, therefore we expect the principals to rate the Randolph Completers consistently as a check of our program. A low standard deviation implies consistency across the scores. Results of the surveys are shown below including question-by-question analysis. Means and standard deviations are provided. In addition, a pie chart for each survey question provides the percentage response rate for each question. A low standard deviation implies consistency across the scores; little variation among the principals (normally + or - 2 standard deviations is 95% of the occurrences). As shown in Table 1 above, the principals' ratings were consistent and provided information useful to the EPP for program improvement.

Use of Results for Program Improvement

The follow-up survey provides the EPP with information from principals who hire our candidates and from the program completers about their perceptions of our program. The categories reflect the overview of how well our candidates are prepared to enter the classroom. No principal rated any of the completers below a 3 (our target), similarly no completer scored any of the areas below a 3 when they rated the program. The following areas received ratings of 3 and we reflected on what we could do to improve in these areas:

Principals rated a few completers a 3 in the following areas: pupil growth and learning, varied learning experiences, use of resources, shows empathy, leadership, and oral communication. A textbook focused on adolescent growth and development has been added to the EDUC 203 and 203L class. To improve candidates' ability to provide varied learning experiences, we provide workshops for our candidates to model varied learning experiences, including Agriculture in the Classroom, Tri-college Colloquium workshops which focus on technology, classroom management, inquiry science, the flipped classroom and hands-on math. We continue encourage candidates to familiarize themselves with the resources at their intern placements and the school division. Our newly formed partnerships will assist in facilitating this process. We use the reflective process to encourage candidates to examine their responses to children (empathy). In addition, we talk about paradigm shifts – viewing children's situations from all points of view and treating children the way you would treat your peers/friends. The EPP has revitalized SVEA providing opportunities for candidate leadership in organizing and presenting workshops, organizing community events, and providing information workshops for the teacher education candidates.

Recommendations for Employer/Principal Survey

Areas for improvement on the survey. Align the surveys to the CAEP components. In addition, to ensure raters are reading all items carefully and understanding the intent of the question, we need to re-ask the question in a different way and then compare the repeated responses for differences that are statistically significant. The drawback to this method is that it increases the length of the survey and may decrease the response rate that is already low.

Based on the survey feedback, the Randolph EPP examined the surveys and noted that biology and HPE were scored low in completers' content knowledge. The EPP faculty will meet with the faculty who teach the content classes in biology and HPE to discuss improvements to the curriculum. In addition, we will explore developing online modules that students may complete on an individual basis. These modules will focus on areas of concern voiced by the clinical instructors we will interview. Principals scored completers' assessment skill at 87%. There is an assessment course at the graduate level, however not at the undergraduate level. We will explore the addition of an assessment course at the undergraduate level. In the meantime, we will increase the number of assessment lesson inclusions throughout the undergraduate course work. The focus will be in the reading classes and in the math and science methods course.