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**Introduction**

The [Network for Excellence in Teaching](http://www.nexteachers.org/) (NExT) was founded in 2010 as 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. In 2016, NExT began sharing 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
 |

This report presents the findings from the Exit Surveys administered to student teachers during fall 2019 and spring 2020. 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 2019-spring 2020 academic year. IHEs administered the survey to candidates toward the end of the candidates’ final semester in their teacher licensure programs.

**Response Rate**

The 2019-20 Exit Survey response count for the institution was 85.

**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](http://www.ccsso.org/Resources/Publications/InTASC_Model_Core_Teaching_Standards_and_Learning_Progressions_for_Teachers_10.html) and [CAEP](http://caepnet.org/standards/introduction) 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**

For what licensure area did you prepare to teach? (Check all that apply.)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **n = 85** |
| **#**  | **Percent of Cases** |
| **Early Childhood Major** **(PreK-K)** | 0 | 0.00 |
| **Preschool Education Major (PreK)**See Table 4 | 0 | 0.00 |
| **Elementary Education** **(K-6)**See Table 4 | 52 | 61.18 |
| **Special Education** **(PreK, PreK-Adult, K-6, 5-Adult)**See Table 5 | 6 | 7.06 |
| **PreK-Adult Education License**See Table 2 | 13 | 15.29 |
| **Secondary Education License****(5-Adult, 5-9, or 9-Adult)**See Table 3 | 21 | 24.71 |

*Note.* Data from item A1.

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **n = 13** |
| **#**  | **Percent of Cases** |
| **Art** | 1 | 7.69 |
| **English as a Second Language (ESL)** | 0 | 0.00 |
| **French** | 0 | 0.00 |
| **Health** | 0 | 0.00 |
| **Japanese** | 0 | 0.00 |
| **Music** | 10 | 76.92 |
| **Physical Education** | 0 | 0.00 |
| **Reading Endorsement** | 0 | 0.00 |
| **Reading Specialist** | 0 | 0.00 |
| **School Library-Media** | 0 | 0.00 |
| **Theatre** | 0 | 0.00 |
| **Wellness** | 2 | 15.38 |
| **Other** | 0 | 0.00 |

*Note.* Data from item A1.

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **n = 21** |
| **#**  | **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** | 7 | 33.33 |
| **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** | 3 | 14.29 |
| **German** | 0 | 0.00 |
| **Health** | 0 | 0.00 |
| **Journalism** | 0 | 0.00 |
| **Marketing** | 0 | 0.00 |
| **Mathematics** | 3 | 14.29 |
| **Oral Communications** | 0 | 0.00 |
| **Physical Education** | 0 | 0.00 |
| **Physics** | 0 | 0.00 |
| **Reading Endorsement** | 0 | 0.00 |
| **Social Studies** | 6 | 28.57 |
| **Spanish** | 1 | 4.76 |
| **Other** | 0 | 0.00 |

*Note.* Data from item A1.

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 = 52** |
| **#**  | **Percent of Cases** |
| **Art** | 0 | 0.00 |
| **English (5-9)** | 0 | 0.00 |
| **Early Education (PreK-K)** | 2 | 3.85 |
| **French (5-9)** | 0 | 0.00 |
| **General Math through Algebra I** | 1 | 1.92 |
| **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** | 6 | 11.54 |
| **Other** | 0 | 0.00 |

*Note.* Data from item A1.

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **n = 6** |
| **#**  | **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)** | 0 | 0.00 |
| **Multicategorical Special Ed (K-6)** | 6 | 100.00 |
| **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.

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.**  | 85 | 1 | 1.18 | 3 | 3.53 | 41 | 48.24 | 40 | 47.06 |
| **Advising on content course requirements.** | 85 | 1 | 1.18 | 5 | 5.88 | 38 | 44.71 | 41 | 48.24 |
| **Quality of instruction in your teacher preparation courses.** | 85 | 0 | 0.00 | 2 | 2.35 | 39 | 45.88 | 44 | 51.76 |
| **Balance between theory and practice in your teacher preparation courses.** | 85 | 1 | 1.18 | 6 | 7.06 | 41 | 48.24 | 37 | 43.53 |
| **Integration of technology throughout your teacher preparation program.** | 85 | 0 | 0.00 | 11 | 12.94 | 43 | 50.59 | 31 | 36.47 |
| **Coherence between your coursework and field experiences prior to student teaching.** | 85 | 1 | 1.18 | 7 | 8.24 | 40 | 47.06 | 37 | 43.53 |
| **Quality of field experiences prior to student teaching.** | 85 | 0 | 0.00 | 6 | 7.06 | 34 | 40.00 | 45 | 52.94 |
| **Your student teaching placement site.** | 84 | 0 | 0.00 | 1 | 1.19 | 22 | 26.19 | 61 | 72.62 |

*Note.* Data from items A2a-h.

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.** | 85 | 3.41 | 0.62 |
| **Advising on content course requirements.** | 85 | 3.40 | 0.65 |
| **Quality of instruction in your teacher preparation courses.** | 85 | 3.49 | 0.55 |
| **Balance between theory and practice in your teacher preparation courses.** | 85 | 3.34 | 0.66 |
| **Integration of technology throughout your teacher preparation program.** | 85 | 3.24 | 0.66 |
| **Coherence between your coursework and field experiences prior to student teaching.** | 85 | 3.33 | 0.68 |
| **Quality of field experiences prior to student teaching.** | 85 | 3.46 | 0.62 |
| **Your student teaching placement site.** | 84 | 3.71 | 0.48 |

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

Would you recommend your teacher education program to other prospective teachers?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **n = 85** |
| **#**  | **Percent** |
| **Definitely yes** | 66 | 77.65 |
| **Probably yes** | 17 | 20.00 |
| **Probably no** | 1 | 1.18 |
| **Definitely no** | 1 | 1.18 |

*Note.* Data from item A3.

**SECTION B. Preparation for Teaching**

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.** | 85 | 0 | 0.00 | 1 | 1.18 | 17 | 20.00 | 67 | 78.82 |
| **Select instructional strategies to align with learning goals and standards.** | 85 | 0 | 0.00 | 4 | 4.71 | 13 | 15.29 | 68 | 80.00 |
| **Design activities where students engage with subject matter from a variety of perspectives.** | 85 | 1 | 1.18 | 3 | 3.53 | 14 | 16.47 | 67 | 78.82 |
| **Account for students’ prior knowledge or experiences in instructional planning.** | 84 | 0 | 0.00 | 2 | 2.38 | 20 | 23.81 | 62 | 73.81 |
| **Design long-range instructional plans that meet curricular goals.** | 85 | 1 | 1.18 | 4 | 4.71 | 26 | 30.59 | 54 | 63.53 |
| **Regularly adjust instructional plans to meet students’ needs.** | 85 | 0 | 0.00 | 5 | 5.88 | 18 | 21.18 | 62 | 72.94 |
| **Plan lessons with clear learning objectives/goals in mind.** | 85 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 14 | 16.47 | 71 | 83.53 |
| **Design and modify assessments to match learning objectives.** | 85 | 1 | 1.18 | 3 | 3.53 | 20 | 23.53 | 61 | 71.76 |
| **Provide students with meaningful feedback to guide next steps in learning.** | 84 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 21 | 25.00 | 63 | 75.00 |
| **Engage students in self-assessment strategies.** | 85 | 1 | 1.18 | 8 | 9.41 | 27 | 31.76 | 49 | 57.65 |
| **Use formative and summative assessments to inform instructional practice.** | 85 | 0 | 0.00 | 4 | 4.71 | 12 | 14.12 | 69 | 81.18 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Total Respondents** | **Disagree** | **Tend to** **Disagree** | **Tend to** **Agree** | **Agree** |
| **n** | **#** | **Percent** | **#** | **Percent** | **#** | **Percent** | **#** | **Percent** |
| **Understand issues of reliability and validity in assessment.** | 85 | 0 | 0.00 | 3 | 3.53 | 23 | 27.06 | 59 | 69.41 |
| **Analyze appropriate types of assessment data to identify student learning needs.** | 85 | 0 | 0.00 | 4 | 4.71 | 30 | 35.29 | 51 | 60.00 |
| **Differentiate assessment for all learners.** | 85 | 0 | 0.00 | 6 | 7.06 | 24 | 28.24 | 55 | 64.71 |
| **Use digital and interactive technologies to achieve instructional goals.** | 85 | 2 | 2.35 | 3 | 3.53 | 20 | 23.53 | 60 | 70.59 |
| **Engage students in using a range of technology tools to achieve learning goals.**  | 85 | 2 | 2.35 | 6 | 7.06 | 21 | 24.71 | 56 | 65.88 |
| **Help students develop critical thinking processes.** | 85 | 1 | 1.18 | 0 | 0.00 | 23 | 27.06 | 61 | 71.76 |
| **Help students develop skills to solve complex problems.** | 85 | 1 | 1.18 | 1 | 1.18 | 24 | 28.24 | 59 | 69.41 |
| **Understand how interdisciplinary themes connect to core subjects.** | 85 | 0 | 0.00 | 3 | 3.53 | 18 | 21.18 | 64 | 75.29 |
| **Know where and how to access resources to build global awareness and understanding.** | 85 | 1 | 1.18 | 6 | 7.06 | 25 | 29.41 | 53 | 62.35 |
| **Help students analyze multiple sources of evidence to draw sound conclusions.** | 85 | 0 | 0.00 | 2 | 2.35 | 25 | 29.41 | 58 | 68.24 |

*Note.* Data from items B1a-t.

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.** | 85 | 3.78 | 0.44 |
| **Select instructional strategies to align with learning goals and standards.** | 85 | 3.75 | 0.53 |
| **Design activities where students engage with subject matter from a variety of perspectives.** | 85 | 3.73 | 0.58 |
| **Account for students’ prior knowledge or experiences in instructional planning.** | 84 | 3.71 | 0.50 |
| **Design long-range instructional plans that meet curricular goals.** | 85 | 3.56 | 0.64 |
| **Regularly adjust instructional plans to meet students’ needs.** | 85 | 3.67 | 0.58 |
| **Plan lessons with clear learning objectives/goals in mind.** | 85 | 3.84 | 0.37 |
| **Design and modify assessments to match learning objectives.** | 85 | 3.66 | 0.60 |
| **Provide students with meaningful feedback to guide next steps in learning.** | 84 | 3.75 | 0.43 |
| **Engage students in self-assessment strategies.** | 85 | 3.66 | 0.52 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **#** | **Mean** | **SD** |
| **Use formative and summative assessments to inform instructional practice.**  | 85 | 3.78 | 0.44 |
| **Understand issues of reliability and validity in assessment.** | 85 | 3.75 | 0.53 |
| **Analyze appropriate types of assessment data to identify student learning needs.** | 85 | 3.73 | 0.58 |
| **Differentiate assessment for all learners.**  | 84 | 3.71 | 0.50 |
| **Use digital and interactive technologies to achieve instructional goals.** | 85 | 3.56 | 0.64 |
| **Engage students in using a range of technology tools to achieve learning goals.** | 85 | 3.67 | 0.58 |
| **Help students develop critical thinking processes.** | 85 | 3.84 | 0.37 |
| **Help students develop skills to solve complex problems.** | 85 | 3.66 | 0.60 |
| **Understand how interdisciplinary themes connect to core subjects.** | 84 | 3.75 | 0.43 |
| **Know where and how to access resources to build global awareness and understanding.** | 85 | 3.46 | 0.71 |
| **Help students analyze multiple sources of evidence to draw sound conclusions.** | 85 | 3.66 | 0.52 |

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

1. 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.** | 85 | 1 | 1.18 | 8 | 9.41 | 30 | 35.29 | 46 | 54.12 |
| **Differentiate instruction for a variety of learning needs.** | 85 | 0 | 0.00 | 4 | 4.71 | 22 | 25.88 | 59 | 69.41 |
| **Differentiate for students at varied developmental levels.**  | 85 | 0 | 0.00 | 6 | 7.06 | 18 | 21.18 | 61 | 71.76 |
| **Differentiate to meet the needs of students from various socioeconomic backgrounds.** | 84 | 0 | 0.00 | 6 | 7.14 | 24 | 28.57 | 54 | 64.29 |
| **Differentiate instruction for students with IEPs and 504 plans.** | 85 | 1 | 1.18 | 7 | 8.24 | 27 | 31.76 | 50 | 58.82 |
| **Differentiate instruction for students with mental health needs.** | 85 | 1 | 1.18 | 12 | 14.12 | 25 | 29.41 | 47 | 55.29 |
| **Differentiate instruction for gifted and talented students.** | 85 | 2 | 2.35 | 10 | 11.76 | 27 | 31.76 | 46 | 54.12 |
| **Differentiate instruction for English-language learners.** | 85 | 4 | 4.71 | 15 | 17.65 | 27 | 31.76 | 39 | 45.88 |
| **Access resources to foster learning for students with diverse needs.**  | 85 | 0 | 0.00 | 7 | 8.24 | 28 | 32.94 | 50 | 58.82 |

*Note.* Data from items B2a-i.

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.** | 85 | 3.42 | 0.71 |
| **Differentiate instruction for a variety of learning needs.** | 85 | 3.65 | 0.57 |
| **Differentiate for students at varied developmental levels.**  | 85 | 3.65 | 0.61 |
| **Differentiate to meet the needs of students from various socioeconomic backgrounds.** | 84 | 3.57 | 0.62 |
| **Differentiate instruction for students with IEPs and 504 plans.** | 85 | 3.48 | 0.70 |
| **Differentiate instruction for students with mental health needs.** | 85 | 3.39 | 0.77 |
| **Differentiate instruction for gifted and talented students.** | 85 | 3.38 | 0.78 |
| **Differentiate instruction for English-language learners.** | 85 | 3.19 | 0.89 |
| **Access resources to foster learning for students with diverse needs.**  | 85 | 3.51 | 0.64 |

*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.** | 85 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 14 | 16.47 | 71 | 83.53 |
| **Use effective communication skills and strategies to convey ideas and information to students.** | 85 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 13 | 15.29 | 72 | 84.71 |
| **Connect core content to real-life experiences for students.** | 85 | 0 | 0.00 | 4 | 4.71 | 19 | 22.35 | 62 | 72.94 |
| **Help students work together to achieve learning goals.** | 85 | 1 | 1.18 | 0 | 0.00 | 12 | 14.12 | 72 | 84.71 |
| **Develop and maintain a classroom environment that promotes student engagement.** | 85 | 0 | 0.00 | 1 | 1.18 | 9 | 10.59 | 75 | 88.24 |
| **Respond appropriately to student behavior.** | 85 | 1 | 1.18 | 3 | 3.53 | 20 | 23.53 | 75 | 71.76 |
| **Create a learning environment in which differences such as race, culture, gender, sexual orientation, and language are respected.** | 85 | 0 | 0.00 | 1 | 1.18 | 22 | 25.88 | 62 | 72.94 |
| **Help students regulate their own behavior.** | 85 | 0 | 0.00 | 7 | 8.24 | 19 | 22.35 | 59 | 69.41 |
| **Effectively organize the physical environment of the classroom for instruction.** | 85 | 0 | 0.00 | 3 | 3.53 | 16 | 18.82 | 66 | 77.65 |

*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.** | 85 | 3.84 | 0.37 |
| **Use effective communication skills and strategies to convey ideas and information to students.** | 85 | 3.85 | 0.36 |
| **Connect core content to real-life experiences for students.** | 85 | 3.68 | 0.56 |
| **Help students work together to achieve learning goals.** | 85 | 3.82 | 0.46 |
| **Develop and maintain a classroom environment that promotes student engagement.** | 85 | 3.87 | 0.37 |
| **Respond appropriately to student behavior.** | 85 | 3.66 | 0.60 |
| **Create a learning environment in which differences such as race, culture, gender, sexual orientation, and language are respected.** | 85 | 3.72 | 0.48 |
| **Help students regulate their own behavior.** | 85 | 3.61 | 0.63 |
| **Effectively organize the physical environment of the classroom for instruction.** | 85 | 3.74 | 0.51 |

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.** | 85 | 0 | 0.00 | 4 | 4.71 | 22 | 25.88 | 59 | 69.41 |
| **Access the professional literature to expand my knowledge about teaching and learning.** | 85 | 0 | 0.00 | 2 | 2.35 | 29 | 34.12 | 54 | 63.53 |
| **Collaborate with parents and guardians to support student learning.**  | 85 | 2 | 2.35 | 7 | 8.24 | 28 | 32.94 | 48 | 56.47 |
| **Collaborate with teaching colleagues to improve student performance.** | 84 | 0 | 0.00 | 3 | 3.57 | 14 | 16.67 | 67 | 79.76 |
| **Use colleague feedback to support my development as a teacher.** | 85 | 1 | 1.18 | 1 | 1.18 | 16 | 18.82 | 67 | 78.82 |
| **Uphold laws related to student rights and teacher responsibility.** | 85 | 0 | 0.00 | 1 | 1.18 | 9 | 10.59 | 75 | 88.24 |
| **Act as an advocate for all students.** | 84 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 7 | 8.33 | 77 | 91.67 |

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.** | 85 | 3.65 | 0.57 |
| **Access the professional literature to expand my knowledge about teaching and learning.** | 85 | 3.61 | 0.53 |
| **Collaborate with parents and guardians to support student learning.**  | 85 | 3.44 | 0.74 |
| **Collaborate with teaching colleagues to improve student performance.** | 84 | 3.76 | 0.50 |
| **Use colleague feedback to support my development as a teacher.** | 85 | 3.75 | 0.53 |
| **Uphold laws related to student rights and teacher responsibility.** | 85 | 3.87 | 0.37 |
| **Act as an advocate for all students.** | 84 | 3.92 | 0.28 |

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.** | 85 | 4 | 4.71 | 3 | 3.53 | 4 | 4.71 | 74 | 87.06 |
| **Acted as a liaison between me and the school.** | 85 | 6 | 7.06 | 2 | 2.35 | 10 | 11.76 | 67 | 78.82 |
| **Gave me constructive feedback on my teaching.** | 84 | 2 | 2.38 | 3 | 3.57 | 7 | 8.33 | 72 | 85.71 |
| **Helped me understand my roles and responsibilities as a student teacher.** | 84 | 4 | 4.76 | 2 | 2.38 | 9 | 10.71 | 69 | 82.14 |
| **Helped me develop as a reflective practitioner.** | 84 | 5 | 5.95 | 1 | 1.19 | 11 | 13.10 | 67 | 79.76 |

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.** | 85 | 3.74 | 0.74 |
| **Acted as a liaison between me and the school.** | 85 | 3.62 | 0.84 |
| **Gave me constructive feedback on my teaching.** | 84 | 3.77 | 0.62 |
| **Helped me understand my roles and responsibilities as a student teacher.** | 84 | 3.70 | 0.74 |
| **Helped me develop as a reflective practitioner.** | 84 | 3.67 | 0.78 |

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 = 85** |
| **#** | **Percent** |
| **0** | 2 | 2.35 |
| **1-2** | 5 | 5.88 |
| **3-4** | 33 | 38.82 |
| **5-6** | 25 | 29.41 |
| **7-8** | 13 | 15.29 |
| **9-10** | 3 | 3.53 |
| **More than 10** | 4 | 4.71 |

*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 = 85** |
| **#** | **Percent** |
| **0** | 1 | 1.18 |
| **1-2** | 15 | 17.65 |
| **3-4** | 23 | 27.06 |
| **5-6** | 22 | 25.88 |
| **7-8** | 15 | 17.65 |
| **9-10** | 4 | 4.71 |
| **More than 10** | 5 | 5.88 |

*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 = 80** |
| **#** | **Percent** |
| **Yes** | 12 | 15.00 |
| **No** | 68 | 85.00 |

*Note.* Data from itemC4.

Table 22. If yes, check all that apply.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **n = 12** |
| **#** | **Percent of Cases** |
| **Other university or college supervisor** | 4 | 33.33 |
| **University or college’s field experience coordinator/supervisor** | 7 | 58.33 |
| **Teacher education faculty** | 3 | 25.00 |
| **Content faculty** | 0 | 0.00 |
| **Other faculty** | 0 | 0.00 |
| **Graduate student** | 0 | 0.00 |
| **Peer teacher candidate** | 4 | 33.33 |
| **Other** | 1 | 8.33 |

*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 = 85** |
| **#** | **Percent** |
| **Yes** | 43 | 50.59 |
| **No** | 3 | 3.53 |
| **Does not apply** | 39 | 45.88 |

*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.** | 83 | 0 | 0.00 | 3 | 3.61 | 5 | 6.02 | 75 | 90.36 |
| **Provided adequate time for planning.** | 82 | 0 | 0.00 | 3 | 3.66 | 5 | 6.10 | 74 | 90.24 |
| **Helped me with classroom management.** | 83 | 2 | 2.41 | 2 | 2.41 | 5 | 6.02 | 74 | 89.16 |
| **Made me feel welcome.** | 83 | 2 | 2.41 | 2 | 2.41 | 2 | 2.41 | 77 | 92.77 |
| **Gave me constructive feedback on my teaching.** | 83 | 0 | 0.00 | 4 | 4.82 | 11 | 13.25 | 68 | 81.93 |
| **Let me experiment with my own teaching ideas.** | 83 | 0 | 0.00 | 2 | 2.41 | 6 | 7.23 | 75 | 90.36 |
| **Included me in parent-teacher conferences, school meetings, and other professional experiences.** | 83 | 1 | 1.20 | 2 | 2.41 | 6 | 7.23 | 74 | 89.16 |
| **Shared ideas and materials.** | 83 | 2 | 2.41 | 1 | 1.20 | 2 | 2.41 | 78 | 93.98 |
| **Helped me develop as a reflective practitioner.** | 83 | 1 | 1.20 | 3 | 3.61 | 10 | 12.05 | 69 | 83.13 |
| **Helped me plan differentiated instruction for a variety of learning needs.** | 83 | 3 | 3.61 | 2 | 2.41 | 11 | 13.25 | 67 | 80.72 |
| **Helped me use student data to inform instruction.** | 83 | 2 | 2.41 | 5 | 6.02 | 5 | 6.02 | 71 | 85.54 |

*Note.* Data from itemsC6.

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.** | 83 | 3.87 | 0.43 |
| **Provided adequate time for planning.** | 82 | 3.87 | 0.44 |
| **Helped me with classroom management.** | 83 | 3.82 | 0.58 |
| **Made me feel welcome.** | 83 | 3.86 | 0.56 |
| **Gave me constructive feedback on my teaching.** | 83 | 3.77 | 0.52 |
| **Let me experiment with my own teaching ideas.** | 83 | 3.88 | 0.39 |
| **Included me in parent-teacher conferences, school meetings, and other professional experiences.** | 83 | 3.84 | 0.50 |
| **Shared ideas and materials.** | 83 | 3.88 | 0.52 |
| **Helped me develop as a reflective practitioner.** | 83 | 3.77 | 0.57 |
| **Helped me plan differentiated instruction for a variety of learning needs.** | 83 | 3.71 | 0.69 |
| **Helped me use student data to inform instruction.** | 83 | 3.75 | 0.67 |

*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 = 83** |
| **#** | **Percent** |
| **1-2 years** | 3 | 3.61 |
| **3-5 years** | 4 | 4.82 |
| **6-10 years** | 5 | 6.02 |
| **11 or more years** | 71 | 85.54 |
| **I do not plan to teach** | 0 | 0.00 |

*Note.* Data from item D1.

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **n = 85** |
| **#** | **Percent of Cases** |
| **West Virginia** | 79 | 92.94 |
| **Ohio** | 56 | 65.88 |
| **Kentucky** | 42 | 49.41 |
| **Virginia** | 29 | 34.12 |
| **Maryland** | 17 | 20.00 |
| **Pennsylvania** | 16 | 18.82 |
| **North Carolina** | 28 | 32.94 |
| **South Carolina** | 27 | 31.76 |
| **Florida** | 16 | 18.82 |
| **Other urban area in the U.S.** | 15 | 17.65 |
| **Other suburban area in the U.S.** | 22 | 25.88 |
| **Other rural area in the U.S.** | 23 | 27.06 |
| **Outside the U.S.** | 13 | 15.29 |
| **Other** | 11 | 12.94 |

*Note.* Data from item D2.

**SECTION E. Your Background**

Table 28. What is your gender?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **n = 85** |
| **#** | **Percent** |
| **Male** | 17 | 20.00 |
| **Female** | 68 | 80.00 |

*Note.* Data from itemE1.

Table 29. What is your race/ethnicity?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **n = 83** |
| **#** | **Percent of Cases** |
| **American Indian or Alaskan Native** | 0 | 0.00 |
| **Asian** | 1 | 1.20 |
| **Black or African American** | 3 | 3.61 |
| **Hispanic or Latino** | 1 | 1.20 |
| **Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander** | 0 | 0.00 |
| **White, non-Hispanic** | 82 | 98.80 |
| **Other** | 0 | 0.00 |

*Note.* Data from item E3.

Table 30. Is English your native language?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **n = 85** |
| **#** | **Percent** |
| **Yes** | 85 | 100.00 |
| **No** | 0 | 0.00 |

*Note.* Data from item E4.

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **n = 85** |
| **#** | **Percent** |
| **Yes** | 5 | 5.88 |
| **No** | 80 | 94.12 |

*Note.* Data from itemE5.

**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, PRCO 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 |
|   | Part B: Preparation for Teaching—Overall  | 0.97 |
| **B** | Instructional Practice  | 0.91 |
| Learning Environment  | 0.94 |
| Diverse Learners  | 0.94 |
| Professionalism  | 0.92 |
| Technology and Resources  | 0.86 |
|   | Sections C1: University/College Supervisor and C6: Cooperating Teacher/Co-teacher—Overall  | 0.92 |
| **C** | 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.
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**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: Narrative Responses to Item 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 believe Marshall is one of the top, if not the top, education program in the state. Although I feel improvements could be made in several areas after going through student teaching, I’m satisfied overall.
* The program prepares us in more ways than once and allows us to enter a classroom our freshman year.
* I felt like it helped me prepare for the classroom.
* I feel as prepared as college can prepare someone to enter the workforce.
* The Marshall COEPD prepared me for almost everything I saw and experienced out in the schools during my student teaching. I feel confident and prepared moving forward to teach.
* I felt like the guidance throughout this journey was amazing! I always felt I had somewhere to turn when I needed help.
* The program at Marshall has helped me grow as an educator and a person in general. I've had amazing experiences.
* It was a wonderful program to prepare me for my career.
* I feel like this program efficiently prepared me to become a teacher.
* The program prepares the teacher candidates for the real world classroom. Numerous classes help with learning new strategies and keeping up with trends and educational law.
* I would recommend Marshall University's education program for many reasons. The main reason I would recommend this program is because it is a family, and everyone in the program is willing to help at all times.
* I think this program prepared me for teaching in the future.
* The program offered me knowledge and resources I needed to be successful in the education field.
* This is one of the better education programs in the state.
* I’ve learned so much both as a student and a teacher. I’ve gained invaluable teaching experience and grown so much as an educator. The COEPD is like one big family, and I wouldn’t trade my college experience for anything.
* I have enjoyed my time in this program. I feel like I have learned a lot during my time here. I have formed many relationships with the staff, peers, and community.
* I feel like I am prepared to be a teacher after going through this program. The education classes that I had to take gave me great ideas and insights about teaching. The only thing I can think of to change would be the requirement of physics and chemistry. I feel as if these classes did not benefit me personally and would not help in any future teaching.
* I felt that the program provided excellent courses to learn and discuss the developmental domains (physical, emotional, social, and cognitive) of students at any age (i.e. infant to elder). Additionally, the program provided excellent courses in students' language and reading development. This included [Faculty Member] who provided me with the most success in preparation and knowledge of students' language and reading development. I felt that the program provided necessary resources that were meaningful and research-based. However, it is only when a student becomes an educator that he or she can apply this knowledge and become an effective educator in the profession.
* I believe that the education program at Marshall has prepared me to teach in the real world. If a person is willing to put in the work to complete all of the tasks presented by the curriculum, they will learn a lot about children, learning theory, and teaching.
* It is an encouraging and well-rounded program wherein students are given the resources and guidance needed to succeed.
* All of my professors were knowledgable and helpful. I believe that they genuinely cared about me and wanted me to be the best educator I could be.
* I feel like the student teaching program is one that allowed me to experience different types of classrooms that I would not usually.
* I have had a wonderful experience with everything the school has offered up until my teacher in residence placement which is on me.
* The College of Education at Marshall University is so phenomenal; I would highly recommend this program to a prospective teacher. It it evident that every professor and staff member at Marshall are effective and amazing teachers and care deeply about their students. The classroom teaching is superb, with teachers going above and beyond to provide quality instruction to their students. I cannot imagine my teaching experience without the support and encouragement from the staff in the COEPD at Marshall University.
* It offers a good balance of clinical experiences. I would recommend more opportunities at an Elementary placement outside of the Student Teaching semester being the only elementary experience received.
* My teacher was insightful in preparing a student teacher for the real experiences of being a teacher beyond the classroom.
* There are some great professors that I felt were very supportive of me and my growth as an educator.
* Marshall's professors are very supportive and help anytime a student needs it
* I was prepared by my coursework and my clinical experiences. I had a wonderful experience.
* Caring Professors
* it is a good program
* It’s a good program and I learned a lot.
* While almost all programs can be improved (including Marshall’s), I do feel as though the staff had my best interests at heart. It is definitely a good program compared to others in the area.
* Based on my professional experiences this semester, the reading courses are superior to many other universities’ programs. In addition, I feel that I am well-prepared with teaching strategies that other universities may not be able to provide. I have had an excellent experience with Marshall University’s COEPD!
* Students are made to feel prioritized and cared for through every step of the program!
* Professors truly want to see you learn, everyone in the education department is very friendly and helpful. Overall it was a great program to be in and it provided me with tons of friends who inspire to do the same thing.
* It was an amazing. I would go through this program any time. Over again!
* I feel like I’ve learned a lot through the teacher education program. I have also loved my time I’ve spent at Marshall.
* I truly feel that Marshall's College of Education has prepared me for a life of teaching. I have received quality education and preparation. Not only that, but the teachers within the program have been my number one support team throughout obtaining my degree; I never felt alone.
* Yes, I think the teacher education program allows for multiple great experiences in the classroom and professors that care deeply.
* The professors are amazing and take the time and effort to assist in any way possible.
* I would recommend Marshall’s Elementary Education Program to another prospective teacher because I think this program does a great job at preparing their students for a future in their own classroom. While being enrolled in the Elementary Education Program at Marshall, I have not only become confident in maintaining my own classroom, but I have also learned how to make learning fun for students by teaching through a hands-on approach. Overall, this program has taught me a variety of ways to make learning fun and creative for my students, and prepare me for a successful teaching career.
* The professors in this program care so much about their students. They took my unique passions and turned them into learning experiences. They have given me an education that I could not find anywhere else.
* Everyone involved with the college of education provides support and encouragement. The professors have developed their classes to prepare us for not only teaching the content but meeting the needs of our students. Not only did they teach us how we should be in the school they modeled the content in their own teaching methods. I would tell anyone looking for a future in education to check into Marshall University's College of Education.
* It’s great but has a lot of flaws too. It’s a fair program for in state.
* I would recommend the teacher education program to another prospective teacher because it was well rounded and the professors are very knowledgeable.
* The professors at Marshall truly care about their students and want them to reach their full potential.
* Yes. Marshall University really prepared me for this profession through the student teaching experience. Before this experience, I had some preconceived ideas on how the placement would go. Some information taught in the classroom is not realistic to what actually happens in elementary school classrooms today. I was confused to see how strict orders teachers are put on for their teaching. Some of my professors at Marshall had me to believe I could create as many lessons as I wanted in my own classroom, that was seen to not be true. If this is was looked into the program as a whole would be incredible. That is my only complaint.
* This program is thorough is I feel it has adequately prepared me for my future teaching opportunities. The people at the COEPD genuinely care about the success of their students and do everything they can to make them successful future educators.
* I absolutely loved my courses at Marshall University. I feel very prepare to go into the classroom next year!
* For elementary education, I would highly recommend the teacher education program because it truly made me prepared in how to be flexible in different situations and learning the content necessary to teach the grade levels. However, I would advise definitely no for the 5-9 math endorsement because it does not prepare you at all. This is due to a miscommunication between the math department and education department on teaching standards and no promotion for students to do more than "take the Praxis".
* The College of Ed was super helpful and prepared me for clinical as much as classes can.
* Every professor has been extremely helpful with whatever I needed. Whether it was class related or even some personal issue. I believe I am fully prepared to go out and have a classroom of my own. I know if I need anything, my professors will be there to help me.
* Marshall’s English education program is top quality and filled with vibrant, passionate professors who help you prepare not only for the practical aspects of teaching, but the legal, emotional, and mental aspects of it as well.
* It is a great program that compliments your desired content area.
* For the most part the professors are very knowledgeable and willing to help. The field experiences are usually with great teachers who will give you amazing resources. My only issue was a disconnect between content area and teaching specific courses.
* There is a prominent disconnect between those in the education department and those in my specific area of study (science). I was left to sink or swim in regard to actually delivering content to my students. The courses focused on historical aspects of teaching while leaving out alternative methods of content delivery. I would love there to be a few courses that showed how to come up with science labs or hands-on activities. I was left to make connections between general teaching principles and common scientific practices. I feel that there was a gaping hole in my preparation to be an instructor that is able to handle the everyday fluctuations of teaching. Also, there was absolutely no preparation for the TPA. By the time I was tasked with finishing the TPA, I had written approx. 10 days of lesson plans total. I hadn’t heard what TPA stood for until the semester that I was asked to complete it. Many changes need to be made!
* I felt like the teacher education program at Marshall provided me with the courses, support, and resources that I needed to not only successfully complete the program but to prepare me to become an educator while knowing that I will have the support from the COEPD when beginning my career and in all my future endeavors.
* I would recommend my teacher education program to another prospective teacher, because Marshall is the best equipped to fill the need for math teachers in our state. However, the math education program seems significantly more disjointed between the college of education and the math department than most other subjects. Many students in the program struggle with understanding course requirements in the math department, and many do not understand the process of obtaining a secondary applied math degree until late in college, and do not understand how it is built to work best with the math education degree, and the professional benefits of obtaining a full math degree when becoming a teacher. During my time there, the math methods course was also somewhat of a disaster because of a situation beyond the university’s control, which is unfortunate because it is one of the most important classes math education majors will take. If I could have changed anything in my teaching classes I would have wanted more emphasis on creating and modifying lessons, and more content specific information on how students learn. At least with the math education program, students could benefit from possibly even two math methods courses rather than cramming as much information as possible into one semester. Math education students could also benefit from having some kind of class or seminar before they get too far into the major that explains the reasoning behind required math courses, and directly links them with topics they will encounter while teaching. I was able to make these connections myself through my studies and what I observed in the classroom, but many of my peers struggled to make this connection while struggling with what they viewed as pointlessly difficult math classes. Marshall did a great job with preparing me to work with students with exceptionalities and from diverse backgrounds. I also appreciated being able to see a variety of different schools and grade levels through my clinical experiences, and the amount of time I was able to spend in the classroom before student teaching. I also would recommend Marshall because the college of education has so many opportunities for students to build professional connections, and has an emphasis on student professional development.
* The education department always helped any way they could if I had a problem. They seem to genuinely care about the success of each student.
* Throughout my time at Marshall, I had I great deal of "had someone just advised me properly" moments, I would have done "X" better. The music department and education department have many communication problems. The course load between the two departments is problematic as well. There was no way I could reasonably complete the degree in 4 years. However, the professors of both departments are absolutely wonderful, helpful people at the same time. It was not by no means a bad experience, but finding the funding for this extra year has been difficult. During my student teaching, I was not observed enough which was upsetting especially given the current state of the world. I was only observed twice during my first placement, so I did not get much feedback from the University for personal growth. The TPA itself is also repetitive in it's questions. The document needs slimmed down.
* All my teachers were great and a lot of the content and theory stuff was good but I would much rather have had earlier experience delivering lessons and more methods training than I did.
* With the addition of [Faculty Member], this program will only soar higher than what it was beforehand. This professor not only taught excellently one the courses, but would instill on each student that he will be there for any needs throughout their time in the program. I believe I learned the most from [Faculty Member] in regards to content and how to teach, other than [Faculty Member]. This is not a bad program, however there are certain classes and course requirements I do not agree with; such as requiring the Wellness students to complete functional biomechanics on a higher scale where pre-med students even struggle. I believe that this course requirement should stay, but should have a different instructor for those that do not need to know every bone, muscle, origin, insertion and attachment to every part of the body but instead should focus on the arthro- and osteo- kinematic did the body while putting some emphasis on the bones and muscles of the body.
* This was a great place to learn. I am very pleased to complete a wonderful program.