Common Metrics
Fall 2019-Summer 2020 Exit Survey

Network for Excellence in Teaching (NExT)

NExT Super-Aggregate Report

January 2021

Prepared by
Stacy Duffield, Ph.D.
Jerry Dogbey-Gakpetor, M.Sc.
Network for Excellence in Teaching

Introduction

The Network for Excellence in Teaching (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.

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.

Administration of the spring 2020 Exit Survey was impacted by closing of campuses and K-12 schools in mid-March due to a world-wide pandemic caused by the highly contagious COVID-19. Responses varied by state, institution, school, and individual. Some student teachers' experiences were ended when the schools closed and moved to distance education. Others continued to work with their cooperating teachers to deliver distance education. It is probable that both response rates and feelings of preparedness were impacted by these changes.

Response Rate

The 2019-20 Exit Survey response rate for the institution was 81.7% (1851 out of 2266). 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 as reported by participating institutions.

The following institutions contributed to the results shared in this report: Augsburg University, Bethel University, Concordia University St. Paul, Hamline University, University of Minnesota Mankato, University of Minnesota Moorhead, North Dakota State University, St. Cloud State University, St. Catherine University, University of St. Thomas, University of Minnesota Twin Cities, University of South Dakota, Valley City State University, Winona State University, University of Alaska Fairbanks, University of Alaska Southeast, Alaska Pacific University, Colorado State University, Mayville State University, Minot State University, Turtle Mountain Community College, University of Jamestown, University of Mary, University of North Dakota, Nueta Hidatsa Sahnish College, Queens College, University of Minnesota Morris, Wayne State College, Bluefield State College, Concord University, Fairmont State University, Glenville State College, Marshal University, Shepherd University, West Liberty University, West Virginia State University, West Virginia University, and West Virginia University at Parkersburg.

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 = 1851	
	#	Percent of Cases
Early Childhood Education	169	9.13
Elementary Education	844	45.60
Special Education	344	18.58
K-12 Education	313	16.91
Secondary Education (5-12, 7-12, or 9-12)	484	26.15

Note. Data from item A1.

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

	n = 313	
	#	Percent of Cases
Art	50	15.97
English as a Second Language (ESL)	71	22.68
Library Media Specialist	1	0.32
Music	31	9.90
Physical Education	61	19.49
Reading	13	4.15
World Languages	21	6.71
Other	29	9.27

Note. Data from item A1.

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

	n = 484	
	#	**Percent of Cases**
Business	8	1.65
English	79	16.32
Health	31	6.40
Mathematics	78	16.12
Science	68	14.05
Social Studies	120	24.79
Technology	15	3.10
Other	28	5.79

Note. Data from item A1.

Table 4. 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.	1844	32	1.74	164	8.89	972	52.71	676	36.66
Advising on content course requirements.	1841	27	1.47	141	7.66	956	51.93	717	38.95
Quality of instruction in your teacher preparation courses.	1837	17	0.93	136	7.40	1001	54.49	683	37.18
Balance between theory and practice in your teacher preparation courses.	1843	28	1.52	229	12.43	1030	55.89	556	30.17
Integration of technology throughout your teacher preparation program.	1843	32	1.74	202	10.96	1021	55.40	588	31.90
Coherence between your coursework and field experiences prior to student teaching.	1843	36	1.95	211	11.45	997	54.10	599	32.50
Quality of field experiences prior to student teaching.	1838	24	1.31	159	8.65	894	48.64	761	41.40
Your student teaching placement site.	1834	25	1.36	56	3.05	468	25.52	1285	70.07

Note. Data from items A2a-h.

Table 5. 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.	1844	3.24	0.68
Advising on content course requirements.	1841	3.28	0.67
Quality of instruction in your teacher preparation courses.	1837	3.28	0.64
Balance between theory and practice in your teacher preparation courses.	1843	3.15	0.68
Integration of technology throughout your teacher preparation program.	1843	3.17	0.68
Coherence between your coursework and field experiences prior to student teaching.	1843	3.17	0.70
Quality of field experiences prior to student teaching.	1838	3.30	0.68
Your student teaching placement site.	1834	3.64	0.61

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

Table 6. Would you recommend your teacher education program to other prospective teachers?

	n = 1838	
	#	**Percent**
Definitely yes	998	54.30
Probably yes	679	36.94
Probably no	126	6.86
Definitely no	35	1.90

Note. Data from item A3. Respondents' reasons for recommending or not recommending their teacher education program are included in Appendix D.

SECTION B. PREPARATION FOR TEACHING

Table 7. 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.	1832	17	0.93	57	3.11	618	33.73	1140	62.23
Select instructional strategies to align with learning goals and standards.	1828	14	0.77	80	4.38	610	33.37	1124	61.49
Design activities where students engage with subject matter from a variety of perspectives.	1830	11	0.60	97	5.30	588	32.13	1134	61.97
Account for students' prior knowledge or experiences in instructional planning.	1829	10	0.55	96	5.25	637	34.83	1086	59.38
Design long-range instructional plans that meet curricular goals.	1831	29	1.58	215	11.74	710	38.78	877	47.90
Regularly adjust instructional plans to meet students' needs.	1829	14	0.77	126	6.89	631	34.50	1058	57.85

	Total Respondents	Disagree		Tend to Disagree		Tend to Agree		Agree	
	n	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent
Plan lessons with clear learning objectives/goals in mind.	1830	9	0.49	55	3.01	482	26.34	1284	70.16
Design and modify assessments to match learning objectives.	1830	23	1.26	125	6.83	608	33.22	1074	58.69
Provide students with meaningful feedback to guide next steps in learning.	1832	24	1.31	123	6.71	650	35.48	1035	56.50
Engage students in self-assessment strategies.	1827	33	1.81	223	12.21	704	38.53	867	47.45
Use formative and summative assessments to inform instructional practice.	1829	13	0.71	70	3.83	617	33.73	1129	61.73
Understand issues of reliability and validity in assessment.	1828	29	1.59	149	8.15	688	37.64	962	52.63
Analyze appropriate types of assessment data to identify student learning needs.	1828	24	1.31	167	9.14	704	38.51	933	51.04
Differentiate assessment for all learners.	1779	9	0.49	55	3.01	482	26.34	1284	70.16

	Total Respondents	Disagree		Tend to Disagree		Tend to Agree		Agree	
	n	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent
Use digital and interactive technologies to achieve instructional goals.	1830	35	1.97	173	9.72	678	38.11	893	50.20
Engage students in using a range of technology tools to achieve learning goals.	1828	43	2.35	169	9.23	697	38.09	921	50.33
Help students develop critical thinking processes.	1829	30	1.64	177	9.68	688	37.64	933	51.04
Help students develop skills to solve complex problems.	1825	14	0.77	131	7.16	709	38.76	975	53.31
Understand how interdisciplinary themes connect to core subjects.	1830	18	0.99	144	7.89	717	39.29	946	51.84
Know where and how to access resources to build global awareness and understanding.	1831	28	1.53	161	8.80	736	40.22	905	49.45
Help students analyze multiple sources of evidence to draw sound conclusions.	1827	28	1.53	190	10.38	745	40.69	868	47.41

Note. Data from items B1a-t

Table 8. 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.	1832	3.57	0.60
Select instructional strategies to align with learning goals and standards.	1828	3.56	0.62
Design activities where students engage with subject matter from a variety of perspectives.	1830	3.55	0.62
Account for students' prior knowledge or experiences in instructional planning.	1829	3.53	0.62
Design long-range instructional plans that meet curricular goals.	1831	3.33	0.74
Regularly adjust instructional plans to meet students' needs.	1829	3.49	0.66
Plan lessons with clear learning objectives/goals in mind.	1830	3.66	0.56
Design and modify assessments to match learning objectives.	1830	3.49	0.68
Provide students with meaningful feedback to guide next steps in learning.	1832	3.47	0.68
Engage students in self-assessment strategies.	1827	3.32	0.75
Use formative and summative assessments to inform instructional practice.	1829	3.56	0.60
Understand issues of reliability and validity in assessment.	1828	3.41	0.71
Analyze appropriate types of assessment data to identify student learning needs.	1828	3.39	0.71
Differentiate assessment for all learners.	1779	3.37	0.74

	#	Mean	SD
Use digital and interactive technologies to achieve instructional goals.	1830	3.36	0.75
Engage students in using a range of technology tools to achieve learning goals.	1828	3.38	0.73
Help students develop critical thinking processes.	1829	3.45	0.66
Help students develop skills to solve complex problems.	1825	3.42	0.68
Understand how interdisciplinary themes connect to core subjects.	1830	3.38	0.71
Know where and how to access resources to build global awareness and understanding.	1831	3.34	0.72
Help students analyze multiple sources of evidence to draw sound conclusions.	1827	3.39	0.71

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

Table 9. 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.	1827	24	1.31	140	7.66	706	38.64	957	52.38
Differentiate instruction for a variety of learning needs.	1830	20	1.09	122	6.67	659	36.01	1029	56.23
Differentiate for students at varied developmental levels.	1829	24	1.31	168	9.19	642	35.10	995	54.40
Differentiate to meet the needs of students from various socioeconomic backgrounds.	1827	28	1.53	198	10.84	672	36.78	929	50.85
Differentiate instruction for students with IEPs and 504 plans.	1830	70	3.83	240	13.11	633	34.59	887	48.47
Differentiate instruction for students with mental health needs.	1830	90	4.92	360	19.67	680	37.16	700	38.25
Differentiate instruction for gifted and talented students.	1828	95	5.20	339	18.54	676	36.98	718	39.28
Differentiate instruction for English-language learners.	1829	64	3.50	245	13.40	688	37.62	832	45.49
Access resources to foster learning for students with diverse needs.	1828	33	1.81	217	11.87	715	39.11	863	47.21

Note. Data from items B2a-j.

Table 10. 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.	1827	3.42	0.69
Differentiate instruction for a variety of learning needs.	1830	3.47	0.67
Differentiate for students at varied developmental levels.	1829	3.43	0.71
Differentiate to meet the needs of students from various socioeconomic backgrounds.	1827	3.37	0.74
Differentiate instruction for students with IEPs and 504 plans.	1830	3.28	0.83
Differentiate instruction for students with mental health needs.	1830	3.09	0.88
Differentiate instruction for gifted and talented students.	1828	3.10	0.88
Differentiate instruction for English-language learners.	1829	3.25	0.82
Access resources to foster learning for students with diverse needs.	1828	3.32	0.75

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

Table 11. 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.	1829	13	0.71	83	4.54	563	30.78	1170	63.97
Use effective communication skills and strategies to convey ideas and information to students.	1827	6	0.33	52	2.85	562	30.76	1207	66.06
Connect core content to real-life experiences for students.	1828	8	0.44	85	4.65	582	31.84	1153	63.07
Help students work together to achieve learning goals.	1826	7	0.38	65	3.56	557	30.50	1197	65.55
Develop and maintain a classroom environment that promotes student engagement.	1829	7	0.38	71	3.88	505	27.61	1246	68.12
Respond appropriately to student behavior.	1830	38	2.08	159	8.69	616	33.66	1246	55.57
Create a learning environment in which differences such as race, culture, gender, sexual orientation, and language are respected.	1829	10	0.55	61	3.34	543	29.69	1215	66.43
Help students regulate their own behavior.	1829	49	2.68	213	11.65	678	37.07	889	48.61
Effectively organize the physical environment of the classroom for instruction.	1744	34	1.95	140	8.03	555	31.82	1015	58.20

Note. Data from items B3a-i.

Table 12. 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.	1829	3.58	0.61
Use effective communication skills and strategies to convey ideas and information to students.	1827	3.63	0.56
Connect core content to real-life experiences for students.	1828	3.58	0.60
Help students work together to achieve learning goals.	1826	3.61	0.58
Develop and maintain a classroom environment that promotes student engagement.	1829	3.63	0.58
Respond appropriately to student behavior.	1830	3.43	0.74
Create a learning environment in which differences such as race, culture, gender, sexual orientation, and language are respected.	1829	3.62	0.58
Help students regulate their own behavior.	1829	3.32	0.78
Effectively organize the physical environment of the classroom for instruction.	1744	3.46	0.73

Note. Data from items B3a-i. Scale: 1 = Disagree; 2 = Tend to Disagree; 3 = Tend to Agree; 4 = Agree.

Table 13. 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.	1827	25	1.37	144	7.88	676	37.00	982	53.75
Access the professional literature to expand my knowledge about teaching and learning.	1828	22	1.20	145	7.93	689	37.69	972	53.17
Collaborate with parents and guardians to support student learning.	1827	66	3.61	248	13.57	675	36.95	838	45.87
Collaborate with teaching colleagues to improve student performance.	1827	21	1.15	84	4.60	591	32.35	1131	61.90
Use colleague feedback to support my development as a teacher.	1829	15	0.82	87	4.76	578	31.60	1149	62.82
Uphold laws related to student rights and teacher responsibility.	1827	26	1.42	88	4.82	594	32.51	1119	61.25
Act as an advocate for all students.	1825	7	0.38	41	2.25	478	26.19	1299	71.18

Note. Data from items B4a-f.

Table 14. 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.	1827	3.43	0.70
Access the professional literature to expand my knowledge about teaching and learning.	1828	3.43	0.69
Collaborate with parents and guardians to support student learning.	1827	3.25	0.82
Collaborate with teaching colleagues to improve student performance.	1827	3.55	0.64
Use colleague feedback to support my development as a teacher.	1829	3.56	0.62
Uphold laws related to student rights and teacher responsibility.	1827	3.54	0.66
Act as an advocate for all students.	1825	3.68	0.53

Note. Data from items B4a-f. Scale: 1 = Disagree; 2 = Tend to Disagree; 3 = Tend to Agree; 4 = Agree.

SECTION C. STUDENT TEACHING

Table 15. 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.	1828	17	0.93	51	2.79	270	14.77	1490	81.51
Acted as a liaison between me and the school.	1828	34	1.86	127	6.95	358	19.58	1309	71.61
Gave me constructive feedback on my teaching.	1829	16	0.87	63	3.44	277	15.14	1473	80.54
Helped me understand my roles and responsibilities as a student teacher.	1828	16	0.88	75	4.10	301	16.47	1436	78.56
Helped me develop as a reflective practitioner.	1826	14	0.77	59	3.23	288	15.77	1465	80.23

Note. Data from items C1a-e.

Table 16. 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.	1828	3.77	0.54
Acted as a liaison between me and the school.	1828	3.61	0.70
Gave me constructive feedback on my teaching.	1829	3.75	0.55
Helped me understand my roles and responsibilities as a student teacher.	1828	3.73	0.58
Helped me develop as a reflective practitioner.	1826	3.75	0.54

Note. Data from items C1a-e. Scale: 1 = Disagree; 2 = Tend to Disagree; 3 = Tend to Agree; 4 = Agree.

Table 17. 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 = 1826	
	#	Percent
0	38	2.08
1-2	310	16.98
3-4	737	40.36
5-6	487	26.67
7-8	125	6.85
9-10	63	3.45
More than 10	66	3.61

Note. Data from item C2.

Table 18. 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 = 1826	
	#	**Percent**
0	38	2.08
1-2	310	16.98
3-4	737	40.36
5-6	487	26.67
7-8	125	6.85
9-10	63	3.45
More than 10	66	3.61

Note. Data from item C3.

Table 19. Besides your university or college supervisor, did anyone else from your university or college visit you at your student teaching site?

	n = 1826	
	#	**Percent**
Yes	193	10.56
No	1634	89.44

Note. Data from item C4.

Table 20. If yes, check all that apply.

	n = 193	
	#	**Percent of Cases**
Other university or college supervisor	44	22.80
University or college's field experience coordinator/supervisor	46	23.83
Teacher education faculty	68	35.23
Content faculty	27	13.99
Other faculty	13	6.74
Graduate student	9	4.66
Peer teacher candidate	28	14.51
Other	15	7.77

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

Table 21. If you experienced significant challenges during your student teaching, did you receive the help you needed?

	n = 1792	
	#	**Percent**
Yes	763	42.58
No	193	10.77
Does not apply	836	46.65

Note. Data from item C5.

Table 22. 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.	1825	7	0.38	12	0.66	161	8.82	1645	90.14
Provided adequate time for planning.	1826	20	1.10	59	3.23	227	12.43	1520	83.24
Helped me with classroom management.	1824	21	1.15	48	2.63	220	12.06	1535	84.16
Made me feel welcome.	1822	23	1.26	34	1.87	156	8.56	1609	88.31
Gave me constructive feedback on my teaching.	1822	27	1.48	66	3.62	255	14.00	1474	80.90
Let me experiment with my own teaching ideas.	1826	22	1.20	64	3.50	224	12.27	1516	83.02

	Total Respondents	Disagree		Tend to Disagree		Tend to Agree		Agree	
	n	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent
Included me in parent-teacher conferences, school meetings, and other professional experiences.	1826	12	0.66	23	1.26	176	9.64	1615	88.44
Shared ideas and materials.	1826	4	0.22	27	1.48	158	8.65	1637	89.65
Helped me develop as a reflective practitioner.	1825	19	1.04	62	3.40	221	12.11	1523	83.45
Helped me plan differentiated instruction for a variety of learning needs.	1825	39	2.14	92	5.04	275	15.07	1419	77.75
Helped me use student data to inform instruction.	1826	46	2.52	88	4.82	275	15.06	1417	77.60

Note. Data from items C6a-k.

Table 23. 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.	1825	3.89	0.37
Provided adequate time for planning.	1826	3.78	0.55
Helped me with classroom management.	1824	3.79	0.54
Made me feel welcome.	1822	3.84	0.50
Gave me constructive feedback on my teaching.	1822	3.74	0.59
Let me experiment with my own teaching ideas.	1826	3.77	0.56
Included me in parent-teacher conferences, school meetings, and other professional experiences.	1826	3.86	0.43
Shared ideas and materials.	1826	3.88	0.39
Helped me develop as a reflective practitioner.	1825	3.78	0.55
Helped me plan differentiated instruction for a variety of learning needs.	1825	3.68	0.67
Helped me use student data to inform instruction.	1826	3.68	0.68

Note. Data from items C6a-k. Scale: 1 = Disagree; 2 = Tend to Disagree; 3 = Tend to Agree; 4 = Agree.

SECTION D. FUTURE PLANS

Table 24. How long do you plan to teach?

	n = 1806	
	#	**Percent**
1-2 years	25	1.38
3-5 years	99	5.48
6-10 years	160	8.86
11 or more years	1492	82.61
I do not plan to teach	30	1.66

Note. Data from item D1.

Table 25. Where would you consider teaching? Mark all that apply.

	n = 1850	
	#	**Percent of Cases**
Minneapolis or St. Paul	890	48.11
Other city in Minnesota (20,000+)	1006	54.38
Suburban area in Minnesota	1180	63.78
Rural area in Minnesota	855	46.22
City in North Dakota (20,000+)	261	14.11
Suburban area in North Dakota	162	8.76
Rural area in North Dakota	216	11.68
City in South Dakota (20,000+)	176	9.51
Suburban area in South Dakota	160	8.65
Rural area in South Dakota	153	8.27
Other urban area in the U.S.	513	27.73
Other suburban area in the U.S.	592	32.00
Other rural area in the U.S.	406	21.95
Outside the U.S.	355	19.19
American Indian Reservation	203	10.97
Other	119	6.43

Note. Data from item D2.

SECTION E. YOUR BACKGROUND

Table 26. What is your gender?

	n = 1808	
	# of Responses	**Percent**
Male	622	34.40
Female	1180	65.27
Transgender Male	1	0.06
Transgender Female	4	0.22
Gender non-binary	1	0.06
Gender identity not listed here	622	34.40

Note. Data from item E1.

Table 27. What is your race/ethnicity?

	n =1851	
	#	**Percent of Cases**
American Indian or Alaskan Native	18	0.97
Asian	79	4.27
Black or African American	40	2.16
Hispanic or Latino	59	3.19
Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander	4	0.22
White, non-Hispanic	1639	88.55
Other	22	1.19

Note. Data from item E3.

Table 28. Is English your native language?

	n = 1823	
	#	**Percent**
Yes	1751	96.05
No	72	3.95

Note. Data from item E4.

Table 29. Do you fluently speak a language other than English?

	n = 1815	
	#	**Percent**
Yes	647	35.65
No	1168	64.35

Note. Data from item E5.

Appendix A: 2016-17 Exit Survey Exploratory Factor Analysis

An exploratory factor analysis was performed to test the validity and reliability of the Exit Survey data, which includes Part A, Your Program; Part B, Preparation for Teaching; and Part C, Student Teaching. Other sections of the survey were not included since they do not contain scale-level data. An exploratory factor analysis (EFA) helps to make decisions on which survey items should be retained, revised or eliminated from each section based on how well they contribute to the overall understanding of the construct.

Methodology

The correlation, reliability matrix, and exploratory factor analysis were conducted using SAS 9.4, 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
B	Part B: Preparation for Teaching—Overall	0.97
	Instructional Practice	0.91
	Learning Environment	0.94
	Diverse Learners	0.94
	Professionalism	0.92
	Technology and Resources	0.86
C	Sections C1: University/College Supervisor and C6: Cooperating Teacher/Co-teacher—Overall	0.92
	Cooperating Teacher	0.94
	University/College Supervisor	0.93

The alpha coefficients are all greater than .70, indicating good internal consistency for these constructs.

The factor analysis conducted suggests that the scales identified by the 2016-2017 Exit Survey data have relatively good reliability as a measure of these constructs. As discussed in the previous sections, revising and eliminating some items could potentially increase the validity and reliability of the instrument. All the possible revisions depend on the survey purpose.

References

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

Prepared by
Anqing Zhang, North Dakota State University
Mark Baron, Wayne State College
Stacy Duffield, North Dakota State University
December 2017

Appendix B: Guidelines for Writing about Common Metrics Data and Surveys

The NExT Common Metrics group supports excellence in teacher preparation through research and use of valid and reliable instruments for program improvement. The Common Metrics data offer numerous opportunities to researchers, and we are excited to promote this work. The following list provides guidelines for appropriate reference and citations when referring to the data and surveys. These guidelines apply to both formal and informal writing about Common Metrics data and surveys.

- The surveys may not be presented in full or part (i.e., the survey may not be provided in the appendices or a list of survey items in a results table).

- Survey items may not be presented word-for-word; rather, the topic of the item can be presented (e.g., instructing English learners or providing feedback). Sharing of specific items is a violation of copyright.

- When reporting about single items, make clear that the items were extracted from an instrument that is meant to be used in whole and that the items are part of factors that include multiple items. Validity and reliability data only apply to intact factors and surveys.

- Reporting should focus on outcomes. We recommend that results are presented by factor. (See factor analysis reports.)

- Please note that while the data belong to the institution, the surveys are owned by NExT. NExT surveys should be cited in formal and informal writing and presentations. This is the citation format recommended by NExT complying with APA guidelines:

Network for Excellence in Teaching (NExT, 2016). *NExT Common Metrics Entry Survey*. NExT: Author.

Network for Excellence in Teaching (NExT, 2016). *NExT Common Metrics Exit Survey*. NExT: Author.

Network for Excellence in Teaching (NExT, 2016). *NExT Common Metrics Transition to Teaching Survey*. NExT: Author.

Network for Excellence in Teaching (NExT, 2016). *NExT Common Metrics Supervisor Survey*. NExT: Author.