

TAG: CAEP 1.1, 1.2, 1.5, 4.3, 4.4

Completer and Employer Surveys

Description

The Completer and Employer Surveys are a state proprietary instrument created in 2015 that is used to capture the perception of our teacher preparation program completers and employers. Both surveys are the same with the exception of the completers Likert questions starting with “My Educator Preparation Program Prepared me to...” and the principals’ Likert questions starting with “The teacher was prepared to...” Surveys are sent anonymously to encourage honest, unbiased responses.

Purpose

The purpose of the assessment is to obtain feedback from initial program completers and employers regarding their perception of their level of readiness as a result of the program preparation at Southern Miss, as well as their satisfaction with their program preparation. Questions are based on the 4 InTASC Domains: The Learner and Learning, Content, Instructional Practice, and Professional Responsibility. The survey consists of 18 Likert scale questions with responses ranging from Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, to Strongly Disagree. The first nine questions ask demographic type questions as well as questions regarding their employment. There is also an additional question at the end to provide an opportunity for open-ended responses relating to program strengths and weaknesses.

Administration

The survey is used by all state institutions within the state of Mississippi and data are shared via the website hosted by The University of Mississippi at <http://education.olemiss.edu/assessment/extras/epp/report.php>. The instruments are administered every May through an online platform by The University of Mississippi. The survey link is sent to recent graduates of initial programs who completed their degree the previous year and three years ago. This includes in-service teachers who are in their first and third year of teaching public or private schools as well as those who are not teaching but completed their degree requirements within the same cohort. The employer survey is sent to administrators of the completers.

The Mississippi Department of Education (MDE) is sent a list of completers for the targeted years in November. MDE then uses this information to identify those completers teaching in Mississippi schools sending the EPP placement information as well as their employer and email addresses by December. The MDE system will only provide employer emails leaving us to search for email addresses for completers by various means: online search of school email addresses, Facebook information, LinkedIn information, and email addresses collected from exit surveys. There are some issues with use of these emails, including school districts having

firewalls that may block delivery without sending bounce back messages. Surveys go to completers employed within and outside the state of Mississippi.

Instructions sent via email to completers a week before the Alumni Survey is released:

Dear <First Name>,

I hope this message finds you well and looking forward to wrap up the school year!

Sometime next week you will receive an email invitation to complete a survey from Ole Miss. Emails are being sent to all undergraduate completers from licensure programs across the state who have completed their programs one and three years ago. Please consider completing the survey for us. We are interested in your perception of how well Southern Miss prepared you as a teacher. By sharing this information with us, you are ensuring the continued improvement of teacher preparation programs at Southern Miss. The survey should take less than 10 minutes to complete and is organized into subsections: The Learner and Learning; Content; Instructional Practice; and Professional Responsibility.

Since we started the statewide survey three years ago, we have had the highest response rate as compared to the other institutions. Please do not let us down this year. We have enjoyed our bragging rights and would hate to give it up to one of our sister institutions. Thank you in advance for responding to the survey.

SMTTT!

Debbie Stoulig, Ph.D.
Assistant to the Dean – CAEP Assessments
The University of Southern Mississippi

Completer Response Rates: 46(23.47%) for 2016; 158(29.26%) for 2017; and 128(27.82%) for 2018. Data from the 2019 survey will be available onsite as well as posted at the link listed above.

Employer Response Rates: 28(24.35%) for 2016; 77(36.67%) for 2017; and 73(37.82%) for 2018. Data from the 2019 survey will be available onsite as well as posted at the link listed above.

Survey Content

The survey is aligned to these standards:

STANDARD	KEY ELEMENT	ELEMENT DESCRIPTION
CAEP	1.1	Candidates demonstrate an understanding of the 10 InTASC standards at the appropriate progression level(s) in the following categories: the learner and learning; content; instructional practice; and professional responsibility.

	1.2	Providers ensure that candidates use research and evidence to develop an understanding of the teaching profession and use both to measure their P-12 students' progress and their own professional practice.
	1.5	Providers ensure that candidates model and apply technology standards as they design, implement and assess learning experiences to engage students and improve learning; and enrich professional practice.
InTASC	2 (The Learner and Learning)	Learning Differences. The teacher uses understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards.
	3 (The Learner and Learning)	Learning Environments. The teacher works with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, and that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.
	4 (Content)	Content Knowledge. The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and creates learning experiences that make the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assure mastery of the content.
	5 (Content)	Application of Content. The teacher understands how to connect concepts and use differing perspectives to engage learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local and global issues.
	6 (Instructional Practice)	Assessment. The teacher understands and uses multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, and to guide the teacher's and learner's decision making.
	7 (Instructional Practice)	Planning for Instruction. The teacher plans instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and community context.
	8 (Instructional Practice)	Instructional Strategies. The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways.
	10 (Professional Responsibility)	Leadership and Collaboration. The teacher seeks appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to take responsibility for student learning, to collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, other school professionals, and community members to ensure learner growth, and to advance the profession.

TGR	1	Lessons are aligned to standards and represent a coherent sequence of learning.
	2	Lessons have high levels of learning for all students.
	3	The teacher assists students in taking responsibility for learning and monitors student learning.
	4	The teacher provides multiple ways for students to make meaning of content.
	5	The teacher manages a learning-focused classroom community.
	6	The teacher manages classroom space, time, and resources (including technology when appropriate) effectively for student learning.
	7	The teacher creates and maintains a classroom of respect for all students.
TIAI	1	The teacher candidate develops measurable and observable grade and subject level objectives that are aligned with appropriate state curricula frameworks.
	2	The teacher candidate develops meaningful and authentic learning experiences that accommodate developmental and individual needs of each learner in the group.
	3	The teacher candidate integrates core content knowledge across and within subject areas in lessons when appropriate.
	4	The teacher candidate plans appropriate and sequential teaching procedures that include innovative introductions and closures. Teaching procedures incorporate different teaching strategies that positively impact student learning and development.
	5	The teacher candidate's plans indicate use of appropriate assessments that effectively evaluate student learning and development.
	6	The teacher candidate's plans include technology that will engage students in analysis, creativity, and deeper learning experiences to improve student growth, development, and understanding.
	7	The teacher candidate communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to the students and provides feedback to students about academic performance.
	8	The teacher candidate uses formative and summative assessments to differentiate learning experiences that accommodate the learning and development of each learner in the group.
	13	The teacher candidate provides opportunities for all students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other to enhance learning.
	14	The teacher candidate demonstrates content knowledge and an understanding of how to teach the content.

	15	The teacher candidate uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies, including technology, to impact student learning and development.
	17	The teacher candidate engages all students in critical thinking through higher-order questioning.
	18	The teacher candidate adjusts instruction as needed based on student input, cues, and individual/group responses.
	20	The teacher candidate adjusts the classroom environment to enhance positive peer relationships, motivation, and learning.
	23	The teacher candidate creates a culturally inclusive environment that promotes fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students.

Completer Survey

Graduates of an Educator Preparation Program in Mississippi

This survey provides you an opportunity to assess the knowledge, skills, and dispositions you developed as a student in an educator preparation program in Mississippi. Please take a few minutes to complete the short survey to evaluate the effectiveness of your preparation. Our goal is continuous improvement in teacher preparation, and you play a vital role in that process. Honest and frank feedback from graduates is a primary mechanism we have available to identify changes to better prepare students for the demanding and challenging role of classroom teacher.

Thank you in advance for completing the survey and providing us with meaningful information to improve our educator preparation programs throughout the state.

1. Institution where you earned your education degree.

2. Program of Study at above Institution:

3. Area of Primary Certification for which you prepared at the above institution:

- ☐ 102 Art Education
- ☐ 105 Business
- ☐ 111 Computer Applications
- ☐ 117 Elementary Education (4-6)
- ☐ 117 Elementary Education (4-6) and 152 Elementary Education (K-4)
- ☐ 119 English
- ☐ 120 Elementary Ed (K-6)
- ☐ 130 French
- ☐ 132 Chinese
- ☐ 134 German
- ☐ 135 Latin

- ☐ 140 Spanish
- ☐ 143 Health Education
- ☐ 144 Physical Education
- ☐ 150 Nursery-Grade 1 (N-1)
- ☐ 152 Elementary Education (K-4)
- ☐ 154 Mathematics
- ☐ 165 Music Education Instrumental
- ☐ 166 Music Education Vocal
- ☐ 174 Reading
- ☐ 177 English as a Second Language
- ☐ 181 Biology Education
- ☐ 182 Physical Science
- ☐ 185 Chemistry
- ☐ 189 Physics
- ☐ 192 Social Studies
- ☐ 193 Economics
- ☐ 196 Speech Communications
- ☐ 207 Gifted
- ☐ 208 Hearing Disability K-12
- ☐ 208 Hearing Impaired (K-12)
- ☐ 221 Mild/Moderate Disability (K-12)
- ☐ 221 Special Ed (Mild/Mod K-12)
- ☐ 222 Severe Disability (K-12)
- ☐ 223 Mild/Moderate Disability (K-8)
- ☐ 224 Mild/Moderate Disability (7-12)
- ☐ 440 Library/Media
- ☐ 901 or 905 Math 7-8
- ☐ 902 Language Arts 7-8
- ☐ 903 Social Studies 7-8
- ☐ 904 or 908 Science 7-8
- ☐ 910 Special Education Fundamental Subjects

4. Area(s) of Endorsement for which you prepared at the above institution (choose all that apply):

- ☐ I have no additional endorsements
- ☐ 102 Art Education
- ☐ 105 Business
- ☐ 111 Computer Applications
- ☐ 117 Elementary Education (4-6)
- ☐ 117 Elementary Education (4-6) and 152 Elementary Education (K-4)
- ☐ 119 English
- ☐ 120 Elementary Ed (K-6)
- ☐ 123 Drama (Performing Arts)
- ☐ 130 French
- ☐ 132 Chinese
- ☐ 134 German
- ☐ 135 Latin
- ☐ 139 Russian
- ☐ 140 Spanish
- ☐ 143 Health Education
- ☐ 144 Physical Education
- ☐ 149 Journalism
- ☐ 150 Nursery-Grade 1 (N-1)
- ☐ 152 Elementary Education (K-4)
- ☐ 154 Mathematics
- ☐ 165 Music Education Instrumental
- ☐ 166 Music Education Vocal
- ☐ 174 Reading
- ☐ 177 English as a Second Language
- ☐ 181 Biology Education
- ☐ 182 Physical Science
- ☐ 185 Chemistry
- ☐ 188 General Science
- ☐ 189 Physics
- ☐ 192 Social Studies

- ☐ 193 Economics
- ☐ 196 Speech Communications
- ☐ 207 Gifted
- ☐ 208 Hearing Disability K-12
- ☐ 208 Hearing Impaired (K-12)
- ☐ 221 Mild/Moderate Disability (K-12)
- ☐ 221 Special Ed (Mild/Mod K-12)
- ☐ 222 Severe Disability (K-12)
- ☐ 223 Mild/Moderate Disability (K-8)
- ☐ 224 Mild/Moderate Disability (7-12)
- ☐ 440 Library/Media
- ☐ 901 or 905 Math 7-8
- ☐ 902 Language Arts 7-8
- ☐ 903 Social Studies 7-8
- ☐ 904 or 908 Science 7-8
- ☐ 910 Special Education Fundamental Subjects
- ☐ Other Endorsement

5. Current District of Employment.

6. Current School of Employment.

7. Are you currently enrolled in a Master's degree program?

8. Highest degree completed:

9. Current teaching assignment (all that apply):

- ☐ Grades 10-12
- ☐ Grades 4-6
- ☐ Grades 7-9
- ☐ Grades K-12
- ☐ Grades K-3
- ☐ Pre-K

-
- ☐ Arts
 - ☐ Compensatory Mathematics
 - ☐ Compensatory Reading
 - ☐ Developmentally Delayed
 - ☐ English
 - ☐ Foreign Language/ESL
 - ☐ Functional Academics
 - ☐ Gifted
 - ☐ Health
 - ☐ Inclusion
 - ☐ Intervention Strategies
 - ☐ Language Arts/Spelling/Writing
 - ☐ Learning Strategies
 - ☐ Mathematics
 - ☐ Music
 - ☐ Occupational Development
 - ☐ Physical Education
 - ☐ Reading/Remedial Reading/Literacy
 - ☐ Science
 - ☐ Social Studies/History/Geography/ Government/Economics
 - ☐ Special Education
 - ☐ Technology/Keyboarding/Programming
 - ☐ Other Subject

The Learner and Learning

<i>My Educator Preparation Program prepared me to:</i>	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
<i>use knowledge of student backgrounds, interests, experiences, and prior knowledge (e.g., multicultural perspectives, pretests, interest inventories, surveys, and KWLs) to make instruction relevant and meaningful to diverse learners and positively impact K-12 student learning. (CAEP 1.1, InTASC 2, TGR 2, TIAI 2)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>analyze multiple sources of growth data (e.g., pre/post assessments, surveys, inventories, remediation and enrichment activities) to provide differentiated learning experiences to accommodate developmental and individual needs of diverse learners and positively impact K-12 student learning. (CAEP 1.1, InTASC 6, TGR 3, TIAI 8)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>monitor and adjust the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, individual motivation, and student learning outcomes. (CAEP 1.1, InTASC 3, TGR 5, TIAI 20)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>use a variety of strategies to effectively manage student behavior to create and maintain a classroom climate of</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

The Learner and Learning

<i>My Educator Preparation Program prepared me to:</i>	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
<i>fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students. (CAEP 1.1, InTASC 3, TGR 7, TIAI 23)</i>				

Content

<i>My Educator Preparation Program prepared me to:</i>	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
<i>demonstrate in-depth knowledge of content for the subject(s) taught. (CAEP 1.1, InTASC 4, TGR 4, TIAI 14)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>integrate core content knowledge from other subject areas in lessons. (CAEP 1.1, InTASC 4, TGR 4, TIAI 3)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>use higher-order questioning to engage students in analytical, creative, and critical thinking, providing opportunities for students to apply these skills in problem solving and critical thinking activities. (CAEP 1.1, InTASC 5, TGR 4, TIAI 17)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Instructional Practices

<i>My Educator Preparation Program prepared me to:</i>	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
<i>select developmentally appropriate, performance-based objectives that connect core content knowledge for lessons based on State and National Standards. (CAEP 1.1, InTASC 7, TGR 1, TIAI 1)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>plan lessons based on rigorous standards and best practices in the use of innovative and interesting methodologies, a variety of relevant teaching materials and current technology. (CAEP 1.1, InTASC 8, TGR 2, TIAI 4)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>use a variety of appropriate teaching strategies (e.g., cooperative learning, discovery learning, demonstration, discussion, inquiry, interactive learning, simulation, etc.) to enhance student learning outcomes. (CAEP 1.1, InTASC 8, TGR 4, TIAI 15)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>use available technology to design, implement, and assess learning experiences to engage students, improve learning, and enrich professional practice. (CAEP 1.5, InTASC 7, TGR 6, TIAI 6)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>elicit student input during lessons and allow sufficient wait time for students to expand and support their responses,</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Instructional Practices

<i>My Educator Preparation Program prepared me to:</i>	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
<i>making adjustments to lessons according to student input, cues, and individual/group responses. (CAEP 1.1, InTASC 8, TGR 4, TIAI 18)</i>				
<i>incorporate a variety of <u>informal and formal</u> assessments (ex. – pre/post assessments, quizzes, unit tests, checklists, rating scales, rubrics, remediation and enrichment activities) to differentiate learning experiences that accommodate individual differences in developmental and/or educational needs. (CAEP 1.1, InTASC 6, TGR 3, TIAI 5)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>prepare appropriate assessments (e.g., pre/post assessments, quizzes, unit tests, rubrics, and/or checklists) based on core content knowledge to effectively evaluate learner progress. (CAEP 1.2, InTASC 6, TGR 3, TIAI 7)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>provide an inclusion classroom setting that addresses the full spectrum of student needs (severe learning disabilities to gifted). (CAEP 1.1, InTASC 3, TGR 5, TIAI 13)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Professional Responsibility				
<i>My Educator Preparation Program prepared me to:</i>	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
<i>establish opportunities for communication with parents and/or guardians, professional colleagues, and community members (newsletters, positive notes, extracurricular activities, professional development opportunities, conferences, etc.) to enhance resources, learning, and the learning environment. (CAEP 1.1, InTASC 10, TGR 9, TIAI 25)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>demonstrate a spirit of inquiry and appreciation for research that promotes continuous improvement in my abilities to increase student learning outcomes. (CAEP 1.1, InTASC 9, TGR 8)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>recognize the importance of the Mississippi Educator Code of Ethical Conduct, professional dispositions, and my influence as an adult role model for students. (CAEP 1.1, InTASC 9, TGR 8)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments: Please consider adding any information that may help to improve the educator preparation program. Your input is vital and certainly appreciated.

Validity and Reliability

The Completer and Employer surveys originated from conversations occurring in the Mississippi Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (MACTE – an association of deans across the state) in 2015 who saw a need for a common shared instrument to survey completers and employers. The surveys are coordinated by the School of Education's Office at The University of Mississippi (Ole Miss). The drafts of the two surveys were shared with various stakeholders (Field Experience Directors, classroom teachers, and P-12 administrators) in the early spring 2016. Feedback was analyzed and used to make modifications to survey items and instructional language. Survey was piloted May 2016.

Reliability and validity evidence for both the Completer and Employer Surveys were completed using the data from spring 2016. The questionnaire consists of 18 statements grouped in four different domains: The Learner and Learning, Content, Instructional Practices, and Professional Responsibility. To be consistent with the terminology used in the analyses, the four domains will be referred to as factors. Each statement had the response set of Strongly Disagree (1), Disagree (2), Agree (3), and Strongly Agree (4). The analyses were completed separately for teachers (n=659) and principals (n=477) and are displayed in the tables. Means and standard deviations for factors are presented in Table 1.

The first step in the analysis was to calculate Cronbach's alpha for the factors. Table 2 presents Cronbach's alpha for each factor, which shows all alphas above .86, indicating high reliability.

The next step in the analysis was to conduct a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) to assess validity. The three fit statistics used were the CFI, TLI, and RMSEA. For the CFI and TLI, values above .90 are considered adequate and above .95 good. For the RMSEA, values below .05 are considered good, below .08 adequate, and above .10 not adequate. The CFA also produces factor loadings, which are in essence the correlation of the item to its factor. Loadings above .60 are considered strong.

The CFA has each item related to its respective factor (as detailed in Table 1) and each of the 4 factors are correlated with each other. For the teachers, the CFI was .94 the TU was .92, and the RMSEA was .095 (90% CI, .090 - .101). For the principals, the CFI was .96 the TLI was .94, and the RMSEA was .082 (90% CI, .075 - .089). Table 3 presents the standardized factor loadings, showing all at or above .80 with the exception of one at .73, indicating very strong loadings.

With CFA, alternative models (other explanations) can be tested to see if they fit better than the proposed model. Because the factors are highly correlated with each other (see Table 4), an alternative model is that the items may not be representative of four factors, but only one factor. This can be tested using a chi-square difference test, where the chi-square value of the alternative model is compared to the proposed model. If the change is significantly different, then that indicates the proposed model fits better than the alternative model. For both teachers and principals, the four factor model fit significantly better than the one factor model. The Cronbach alphas, CFIs, TUs, RMSEAs, factor loadings, and chi-square difference tests all provide positive reliability and validity evidence for the questionnaire and the four factor structure.

Table 1. Means (standard deviation) for factors.

Factor/Domain	Teacher Mean (SD)	Principal Mean (SD)
The Learner and Learning	3.33 (0.67)	3.24 (0.67)
Content	3.45 (0.64)	3.26 (0.64)
Instructional Practices	3.39 (0.63)	3.25 (0.58)
Professional Responsibilities	3.39 (0.65)	3.36 (0.59)

Table 2. Cronbach's alpha for factors.

Factor/Domain	Teacher	Principal
The Learner and Learning	0.89	0.92
Content	0.91	0.92
Instructional Practices	0.95	0.96
Professional Responsibilities	0.87	0.89

Table 3. Standardized factor loadings.

Factor/Domain	Teacher	Principal
The Learner and Learning		
1. use knowledge of student backgrounds, interests, experiences, and prior knowledge.	0.86	0.88
2. analyze multiple sources of growth data	0.80	0.88
3. monitor and adjust the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, individual motivation, and student learning outcomes.	0.85	0.86
4. uses a variety of strategies to effectively manage student behavior to create and maintain a classroom climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students.	0.81	0.84
Content		
5. demonstrate in-depth knowledge of content for the subject(s) taught.	0.85	0.86
6. integrate core content knowledge from other subject areas in lessons.	0.89	0.91
7. use higher-order questioning to engage students in analytical, creative, and critical thinking, providing opportunities for students to apply these skills in problem solving and critical thinking activities	0.89	0.89
Instructional Practices		
8. select developmentally appropriate, performance-based objectives that connect core content knowledge for lessons based on State and National Standards.	0.88	0.86
9. plan lessons based on rigorous standards and best practices in the use of innovative and interesting methodologies, a variety of relevant teaching materials and current technology.	0.88	0.89
10. use a variety of appropriate teaching strategies	0.87	0.89
11. use available technology to design, implement, and assess learning experiences to engage students, improve learning, and enrich professional practice.	0.81	0.82

12. elicit student input during lessons and allow sufficient wait time for students to expand and support their responses, making adjustments to lessons according to student input, cues, and individual/group responses.	0.87	0.89
13. incorporate a variety of informal and formal assessments	0.89	0.89
14. prepare appropriate assessments based on core content knowledge to effectively evaluate learner progress.	0.86	0.88
15. provide an inclusion classroom setting that addresses the full spectrum of student needs.	0.73	0.85
Professional Responsibilities		
16. establish opportunities for communication with parents and/or guardians, professional colleagues, and community members to enhance resources, learning, and the learning environment.	0.82	0.82
17. demonstrate a spirit of inquiry and appreciation for research that promotes continuous improvement in my abilities to increase student learning outcomes.	0.90	0.91
18. recognize the importance of the Mississippi Educator Code of Ethical Conduct, professional dispositions and my influence as an adult role model for students.	0.82	0.82

Table 4. Factor correlations.

Teachers	The Learner and Learning	Content	Instructional Practices
Content	0.85		
Instructional Practices	0.90	0.93	
Professional Responsibilities	0.90	0.86	0.92

Principals	The Learner and Learning	Content	Instructional Practices
Content	0.89		
Instructional Practices	0.95	0.92	
Professional Responsibilities	0.87	0.85	0.89

Analysis of Data Findings

Data from the survey are shared with each institution via the link that was posted above in this narrative. EPP data from both surveys are disaggregated and shared with the Professional Education Council, the various advisory boards, and reviewed at the Data Reflections Day retreat. All data are anonymous. Survey rates as quoted earlier are above the required 20% response rate. Data from the employers are presented in evidence 4.3 EPP Employer Data 2016-2018 and data from the completers are presented in evidence 4.4 EPP Completer Data 2016-2018. Because of the low “N” count across all programs, it was easier to analyze the data from both year one and year three together to get an overall analysis of the perception. For the percentage of responses, we have established a self-imposed minimum expectation of 80% of responses in the Strongly Agree/Agree category.

Reviewing the data from the Employer Survey, within the domain of The Learner and Learning, there were no response level below the 80% minimum expectation of responses in the Strongly Agree/Agree categories. The highest level of Agree/Strongly Agree was from 2016 for question #8 *The teacher was prepared to select developmentally appropriate, performance-based objectives that connect core content knowledge for lessons based on the State and National Standards* (100%). The lowest occurred in 2017 and 2018 for question #4 *The teacher was prepared to use a variety of strategies to effectively manage student behavior to create and maintain a classroom climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students* (2017, 87%; 2018, 88%).

Completers did not rate their preparation as high as the employers. There was one area where the responses for Agree/Strongly Agree dipped below 80% satisfaction: question #15 *My EPP prepared me to provide an inclusion classroom setting that addresses the full spectrum of student needs* (2016, 76%; 2017, 79%). In 2018, we saw an increase to 86%. The lowest in 2018 was question #16 *My EPP prepared me to establish opportunities for communication with parents and/or guardians, professional colleagues, and community members to enhance resources, learning, and the learning environment* (81%).

As far as what we did well, completers across the three semesters could not agree. In 2016, questions #8 *My EPP prepared me to select developmentally appropriate, performance-based objectives that connect core content knowledge for lessons based on State and National Standards* and #10 *My EPP prepared me to use a variety of appropriate teaching strategies to enhance student learning outcomes* (96%) were high. In 2017, questions #9 *My EPP prepared me to plan lessons based on rigorous standards and best practices in the use of innovative and interesting methodologies, a variety of relevant teaching materials and current technology* and question #18 *My EPP prepared me to recognize the importance of the Mississippi Educator Code of Ethical Conduct, professional dispositions, and my influence as an adult role model for students* (97%) were high. Lastly, in 2018, completers rated questions #1 *My EPP prepared me to use knowledge of student backgrounds, interests, experiences, and prior knowledge to make instruction relevant and meaningful to diverse learners and positively impact K-12 student learning* and question #13 *My EPP prepared me to incorporate a variety of informal and formal assessments to differentiate learning experiences that accommodate individual differences in developmental and /or educational needs* (97%).

Discussion of Interpretation of Data

It is interesting to compare the perceptions of the employers with that of our completers. Employers rated classroom management skills as low. Classroom management is always a challenge for beginning teachers. Managing classroom behaviors is one of those factors in education that requires experience, and is one of the toughest challenges in the classroom. We address classroom management through a dedicated course and provide multiple opportunities for application during clinical experiences. Our stakeholders added that we need to include discussions on parental management, managing personalities in the classroom, and soft skills in our classroom management courses. We will work with our instructors to add this to the curriculum.

On the other hand, completers view their preparation as lacking in the ability to provide an inclusion classroom setting for the needs of all students from gifted to severe learning disabilities. Differentiated instructional activities is something that we have recently our attention. Because of the high needs of a Special Education teacher, more students with disabilities have been mainstreamed into a regular education classroom. As a result, discussions in the classroom have focused on alternative instruction focusing on strengths and needs cognitively, socially, emotionally, and linguistically of the students in their classroom as well as addressing biases (pre-conceived beliefs), and identifying resources/strategies that might work well. As a result, perception results in 2018 were higher. Our stakeholders also made the suggestion to prepare teachers on how to utilize Special Education teachers as well as preparing Special Education teachers to become an advocate for their students. We will continue to monitor this and look for opportunities to include this in the curriculum.

When discussing the surveys during our Data Reflection Day Retreat, our stakeholders noted that even in the aggregate scores, there is not enough “N” to denote trends and the difficulty in tracking our completers once they have graduated. We are doing well with content, relating to students, comfortability with technology, and where our biggest strength lies is the preparedness. The issue lies providing by more opportunities with the different age groups, and learning to deal with parents (Q 17-18).

The main discussion was around getting enough surveys completed to make the decisions based on data. Interesting enough, one of our stakeholders admitted that she did not complete her surveys this year and promised to do better next year. The response rate is good, we just need to do a better job tracking our students. The other comment was that we need to grow enrollment!