

## Teacher Education Employer Survey Aggregated Data

The Teacher Education Employer Survey is offered as evidence in support of meeting: Standards 1.1 and 1.5, Content and Pedagogical Knowledge; Standard 4.1, Impact of Student Learning and Development, 4.2, Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness, and 4.3, Satisfaction of Employers; Standard 5.5, Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement. Selected items also address the cross-cutting themes of technology and diversity. These data are collected anonymously (without reference to a specific program completer or their major), thereby preventing disaggregation of the resulting data.

Local P-12 School Districts are surveyed using the Teacher Education Employer Survey at the end of their first year of employment. Employers are surveyed regarding the completer’s abilities in the areas of Knowledge, Planning and Preparation, Instruction and Assessment, Managing the Environment, Technology and Professionalism. A scoring rubric is utilized on which employers rate the candidate from 1 (Needs Improvement) to a 5 (Exceeds Expectations). Information from the surveys are used by the University, College of Education and faculty to evaluate program effectiveness and in monitoring program development in meeting P-12 school district’s needs and candidate development.

The following tables provide data related to employer ratings of completers for the three most recently surveyed cohorts. Employers of those who completed their programs in the 2010-2011 academic year were surveyed in the late spring of 2012; those who completed their programs in the 2011-2012 academic year were surveyed in the late spring of 2013; and those who completed their programs in the 2012-2013 academic year were surveyed in the late spring of 2014. No data for those completing their programs in 2013-2014 are currently available. Fifty-one percent (69 of a possible 134 employers) returned usable surveys.

Data are divided into six segments, each of which reflect one of the six components of the conceptual framework: Knowledge; Planning and Preparation; Instruction and Assessment; Managing the Environment; Technology; and Professionalism.

### Knowledge

<b>1-I. Knowledge: Demonstrate an understanding of the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the content/subject matter/disciplines s/he teaches.</b>										
	Needs Improvement		2		Meets Expectations		4		Exceeds Expectations	
Graduates in/N:	N	%	N	%	N	&	N	%	N	%
2010-2011 (23)	0	0	2	8.70	4	17.39	8	34.78	9	39.13
2011-2012 (18)	1	5.56	1	5.56	8	44.44	6	33.33	2	11.11
2012-2013 (21)	1	4.76	1	4.76	8	38.10	7	33.33	4	19.05
Sum/Average	2	3.23%	4	6.45%	20	32.26%	21	33.87%	15	24.19%
<b>2-I. Knowledge: Create learning experiences that make the content/subject matter/disciplines meaningful for learners.</b>										
	Needs Improvement		2		Meets Expectations		4		Exceeds Expectations	
Graduates in/N:	N	%	N	%	N	N	%	N	%	N

2010-2011 (23)	0	0	1	4.35	6	26.09	7	30.43	9	39.13
2011-2012 (18)	2	11.11	1	5.56	6	33.33	8	44.44	1	5.56
2012-2013 (21)	2	9.52	1	4.76	6	28.57	7	33.33	5	23.81
Sum/Average	4	6.45%	3	4.84%	18	29.03%	22	35.48%	15	24.19%

**3-I. Knowledge: Demonstrate an understanding of how students learn, construct knowledge, and how students develop.**

	Needs Improvement		2		Meets Expectations		4		Exceeds Expectations	
Graduates in/N:	N	%	N	%	N	N	%	N	%	N
2010-2011 (23)	0	0	2	8.70	6	26.09	8	34.78	7	30.43
2011-2012 (18)	1	5.56	2	11.11	7	38.89	7	38.89	1	5.56
2012-2013 (21)	1	4.76	2	9.52	6	28.57	8	38.10	4	19.05
Sum/Average	2	3.23%	6	9.68%	19	30.65%	23	37.10%	12	19.35%

**4-I. Knowledge: Demonstrate an understanding of how learners differ in their approaches to learning and the ability to create instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners.**

	Needs Improvement		2		Meets Expectations		4		Exceeds Expectations	
Graduates in/N:	N	%	N	%	N	N	%	N	%	N
2010-2011 (23)	0	0	4	17.39	6	26.09	7	30.43	6	26.09
2011-2012 (18)	1	5.56	2	11.11	6	33.33	9	50.00	0	0.00
2012-2013 (21)	1	4.76	3	14.29	6	28.57	8	38.10	3	14.29
Sum/Average	2	3.23%	9	14.52%	18	29.0%	24	38.7%	9	14.52%

Discussion: An analysis of the data in the area of Knowledge indicates that for the reporting years from 2010 – 2013 87.33 of Candidates met or exceeded expectations by the employers who rated them. A review of this section will confirm that the instrument is aligned with the following InTASC Standards: The Learner and Learning, Content, Instructional Practice (CAEP Standard 1.1 Content and Pedagogical Knowledge).

**Planning and Preparation**

**5-II. Planning & Preparation: Provide learning opportunities that support the intellectual, social, and personal development of students.**

	Needs Improvement		2		Meets Expectations		4		Exceeds Expectations	
Graduates in/N:	N	%	N	%	N	&	N	%	N	%
2010-2011 (23)	0	0.00	0	0.00	6	26.09	6	26.09	11	47.83
2011-2012 (18)	1	5.56	2	11.11	6	33.33	6	33.33	3	16.67
2012-2013 (22)	1	4.55	2	9.09	4	18.18	11	50.00	4	18.18
Sum/Average	2	3.17%	4	6.35%	16	25.40%	23	36.51%	18	28.57%

**6-II. Planning & Preparation: Use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners' development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.**

	Needs Improvement		2		Meets Expectations		4		Exceeds Expectations	
Graduates in/N:	N	%	N	%	N	N	%	N	%	N
2010-2011 (23)	0	0.00	1	4.35	7	30.43	5	21.74	10	43.48

2011-2012 (18)	1	5.56	3	16.67	5	27.78	6	33.33	3	16.67
2012-2013 (21)	1	4.76	1	4.76	5	23.81	6	28.57	8	38.10
Sum/Average	2	3.23%	5	8.06%	17	27.42%	17	27.42%	21	33.87%

**7-II. Planning & Preparation: Plan instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, learners, the community, and curriculum goals.**

	Needs Improvement		2		Meets Expectations		4		Exceeds Expectations	
Graduates in/N:	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
2010-2011 (23)	0	0.00	3	13.04	4	17.39	7	30.43	9	39.13
2011-2012 (18)	1	5.56	2	11.11	7	38.89	6	33.33	2	11.11
2012-2013 (21)	0	0	1	4.76	7	33.33	6	28.57	7	33.33
Sum/Average	1	1.61%	6	9.68%	18	29.03%	19	30.65%	18	29.03%

Discussion: An analysis of the data in the area of Planning and Preparation indicates that for the reporting years from 2010 – 2013 89.30% of Candidates met or exceeded expectations by the employers who rated them. A review of this section will confirm that the instrument is aligned with the following InTASC Standards: The Learner and Learning, Content, Instructional Practice (CAEP Standard 1.1 Content and Pedagogical Knowledge).

**Instruction and Assessment**

**8-III. Instruction & Assessment: Use knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.**

	Needs Improvement		2		Meets Expectations		4		Exceeds Expectations	
Graduates in/N:	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
2010-2011 (23)	0	0.00	3	13.04	6	26.09	7	30.43	7	30.43
2011-2012 (18)	1	5.56	2	11.11	7	38.89	7	38.89	1	5.56
2012-2013 (22)	1	4.55	2	9.09	8	36.36	4	18.18	7	31.82
Sum/Average	2	3.17%	7	11.11%	21	33.33%	18	28.57%	15	23.81%

**9-III. Instruction & Assessment: Understand and use formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of the learner.**

	Needs Improvement		2		Meets Expectations		4		Exceeds Expectations	
Graduates in/N:	N	%	N	%	N	N	%	N	%	N
2010-2011 (23)	0	0.00	2	8.70	7	30.43	8	34.78	6	29.09
2011-2012 (17)	1	5.88	3	17.65	5	29.41	6	35.29	2	11.76
2012-2013 (20)	2	10.00	1	5.00	6	30.00	7	35.00	4	20.00
Sum/Average	3	5.00%	6	10.00%	18	30.00%	21	35.00%	12	20.00%

Discussion: In looking at the data, in the area of Instruction and Assessment, on average 85.35% of students met or exceeded expectations in the above areas.

Discussion: An analysis of the data in the area of Instruction and Assessment indicates that for the reporting years from 2010 – 2013 85.35% of Candidates met or exceeded expectations by the employers

who rated them. A review of this section will confirm that the instrument is aligned with the following InTASC Standards: The Learner and Learning, Content, Instructional Practice (CAEP Standard 1.1 Content and Pedagogical Knowledge).

## Managing the Environment

<b>10-IV. Managing the Environment: Use an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.</b>										
	Needs Improvement		2		Meets Expectations		4		Exceeds Expectations	
Graduates in/N:	N	%	N	%	N	&	N	%	N	%
2010-2011 (23)	1	4.35	2	8.70	6	26.09	7	30.43	7	30.43
2011-2012 (18)	4	22.22	1	5.56	3	16.67	9	50.00	1	5.56
2012-2013 (21)	2	9.52	2	9.52	4	19.05	4	19.05	9	42.86
Sum/Average	7	11.29%	5	8.06%	13	20.97%	20	32.26%	17	27.42%

Discussion: In looking at the data, in the area of Managing the Environment, on average 80.65% of students met or exceeded expectations in the above areas.

Discussion: An analysis of the data in the area of Managing the Environment indicates that for the reporting years from 2010 – 2013 80.65% of Candidates met or exceeded expectations by the employers who rated them. A review of this section will confirm that the instrument is aligned with the following InTASC Standards: The Learner and Learning, Instructional Practice (CAEP Standard 1.1 Content and Pedagogical Knowledge).

## Technology

<b>11-V. Technology: Demonstrate an understanding of the capabilities of technology and its impact on education.</b>										
	Needs Improvement		2		Meets Expectations		4		Exceeds Expectations	
Graduates in/N:	N	%	N	%	N	&	N	%	N	%
2010-2011 (23)	0	0.00	0	0.00	6	26.09	5	21.75	12	52.17
2011-2012 (18)	0	0.00	0	0.00	10	55.56	3	16.67	5	27.78
2012-2013 (22)	0	0	1	4.55	5	22.73	5	22.73	11	50.00
Sum/Average	0	0.00%	1	1.59%	21	33.33%	13	20.63%	28	44.44%

  

<b>Q12-V. Technology: Integrate technology into the teaching and learning process.</b>										
	Needs Improvement		2		Meets Expectations		4		Exceeds Expectations	
Graduates in/N:	N	%	N	%	N	N	%	N	%	N
2010-2011 (23)	0	0.00	2	8.70	5	21.74	4	17.39	12	52.17
2011-2012 (18)	0	0.00	3	16.67	7	38.89	4	22.22	4	22.22
2012-2013 (22)	1	4.55	2	9.09	3	13.64	4	18.18	12	54.55
Sum/Average	1	1.59%	7	11.11%	15	23.81%	12	19.05%	28	44.44%

**Q13-V. Technology: Demonstrate appropriate moral, legal, ethical, and political judgments in professional decisions.**

	Needs Improvement		2		Meets Expectations		4		Exceeds Expectations	
	N	%	N	%	N	N	%	N	%	N
2010-2011 (23)	0	0.00	0	0.00	6	26.09	3	13.04	14	60.87
2011-2012 (18)	0	0.00	0	0.00	8	44.44	3	16.67	7	38.89
2012-2013 (22)	0	0.00	2	9.09	3	13.64	4	18.18	13	59.09
Sum/Average	0	0.00%	2	3.17%	17	26.98%	10	15.87%	34	53.97%

Discussion: An analysis of the data in the area of Technology indicates that for the reporting years from 2010 – 2013, 94.18% of Candidates met or exceeded expectations by the employers who rated them. A review of this section will confirm that the instrument is aligned with the following InTASC Standards: The Learner and Learning, Content, Instructional Practice (CAEP Standard 1.1 Content and Pedagogical Knowledge).

**Professionalism**

**Q14-VI. Professionalism: Reflect on and evaluate the effects of their choices and action on others (students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community).**

	Needs Improvement		2		Meets Expectations		4		Exceeds Expectations	
	N	%	N	%	N	&	N	%	N	%
2010-2011 (23)	0	0.00	2	8.70	4	17.39	6	26.09	11	47.83
2011-2012 (18)	2	11.11	0	0.00	7	38.89	8	44.44	1	5.56
2012-2013 (21)	2	9.52	2	9.52	1	4.76	6	28.57	10	47.62
Sum/Average	4	6.45%	4	6.45%	12	19.35%	20	32.26%	22	35.48%

**Q15-VI. Professionalism: Seek opportunities for professional growth and responsibility.**

	Needs Improvement		2		Meets Expectations		4		Exceeds Expectations	
	N	%	N	%	N	N	%	N	%	N
2010-2011 (23)	0	0.00	2	8.70	6	26.09	4	17.39	11	47.83
2011-2012 (18)	0	0.00	3	16.67	4	22.22	11	61.11	0	0.00
2012-2013 (22)	1	4.55	3	13.64	3	13.64	5	22.73	10	45.45
Sum/Average	1	1.59%	8	12.70%	13	20.63%	20	31.75%	21	33.33%

**Q16-VI. Professionalism: Collaborate with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students' learning and well-being.**

	Needs Improvement		2		Meets Expectations		4		Exceeds Expectations	
	N	%	N	%	N	N	%	N	%	N
2010-2011 (23)	0	0.00	1	4.35	6	26.09	5	21.74	11	47.83
2011-2012 (18)	2	11.11	1	5.56	5	27.78	9	50.00	1	5.56
2012-2013 (22)	2	9.09	2	9.09	2	9.09	7	31.82	9	40.91
Sum/Average	4	6.35%	4	6.35%	13	20.63%	21	33.33%	21	33.33%

Discussion: An analysis of the data in the area of Professionalism indicates that for the reporting years from 2010 – 2013 86.69% of Candidates met or exceeded expectations by the employers who rated them. A review of this section will confirm that the instrument is aligned with the following InTASC Standards: Professional Responsibility (CAEP Standard 1.1, 1.5 Content and Pedagogical Knowledge).

Summary: Employers use the Teacher Education Employer Survey to rate the performance of DSU graduates whom they have hired at the end of their first year of employment. This is done by administrators on a voluntary basis. A total of 50 first year teachers spanning the academic years of 2010 – 2013 were included in the data that was summarized in this report. The low numbers of surveys is a consideration when looking at the data. Overall, however, Candidates/graduates from DSU attained ratings between 80.65% (Classroom Management) and 94.18% (Technology). All education candidates take a classroom management course as part of their major. They also take several technology courses and most students graduate with a Technology endorsement or minor.