

Graduate Survey Report

2016-2019

Mississippi Valley State University

Purpose: The purpose of the Graduate Survey in Mississippi is to evaluate the satisfaction level of the employers of Mississippi State University College of Education's (COE) initial teacher education completers in the workforce as well as the preparedness (knowledge, skills, and dispositions) of these completers' assigned responsibilities in working with P-12 students. This survey serves as a component of the Teacher Education Department overall plan to assess institutional effectiveness and compliance for the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) Standard 4 (4.3-Satisfaction of Employers). The Data was collected from MAT candidates who were admitted during the Fall and Spring of 2017-18.

Methodology: In 2016, a statewide web survey "Graduate Survey" was developed by the Mississippi Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (MACTE) members. MACTE is a statewide organization and its members include the departments and schools of Mississippi's regionally accredited colleges and universities engaged in the preparation of professional school personnel. As a consortium of teacher education schools, MACTE is vitally interested in the support and enhancement of all aspects of education in Mississippi. Its members work cooperatively within the organization, as well as with the Mississippi Department of Education and other statewide education groups.

Dr. Richard Mohn, Associate Professor of Educational Research at the University of Southern Mississippi, provided reliability and validity evidence of the survey. Cronbach's alpha was used to measure the reliability and provide evidence that the items were related to each other. Cronbach's alpha values above .70 are considered to show adequate internal consistency. Within this survey, Cronbach's alpha for each factor, showed all alphas above .86, indicating high reliability. A confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted to assess validity. CFA uses fit statistics to determine how good the match is between the proposed model and actual data. 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. For the principals, the CFI was .96, the TLI was .94, and the RMSEA was .082 (90% CI, .075 - .089). CFA also produces factor loadings, which are in essence the correlation of the item to its factor. Loadings above .60 are considered strong. For the principals, all showed at or above .80 indicating very strong loading. The chi-square difference test was used where the chi-square value of the alternative model is compared to the proposed model. The four factor model fit significantly better than the one factor model.

The degree awarded files of 2016-2017 Completers by Initial Elementary, Secondary and MAT completers. Data were provided by the Office of Field Placement and Clinical Experiences. A public records request was submitted to the Mississippi Department of Education to confirm the schools in which these completers were employed and to determine the employer (principal).

The following are the Graduate Survey Results:

Teacher Submissions:13

Number of Teacher submissions by Program:

Elementary Education and Teaching => 7

Middle Level Alternate Route => 1

Secondary Education and Teaching => 4

Teacher Education, Multiple Levels (Alternate Route) => 1

Teaching Assignments by Teachers:

Grades K-3 => 3

Science => 4

Mathematics => 4

Grades 7-9 => 6

Grades 4-6 => 2

The teacher was prepared to be able to:	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. 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.	1 (7.69%)	0 (0%)	3 (23.08%)	8 (61.54%)
2. 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.	1 (7.69%)	0(0%)	6 (46.15%)	5 (38.46%)
3. Monitor and adjust the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, individual motivation, and student learning outcomes.	1(7.69%)	0(0%)	6 (46.15%)	5 (38.46%)
4. 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.	1(7.69%)	1(7.69%)	4(30.77%)	6 (46.15%)
5. Demonstrate in-depth knowledge of content for the subject(s) taught.	1(7.69%)	1(7.69%)	5(38.46%)	5(38.46%)
			3(23.08%)	

6. Integrate core content knowledge from other subject areas in lessons.	1(7.69%)			8(61.54%)
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.	1(7.69%)	1 (7.69%)	5(38.46%)	5(38.46%)
8. Select developmentally appropriate, performance based objectives that connect core content knowledge for lessons based on State and national Standards.	1(7.69%)	0(0%)	6 (46.15%)	5(38.46%)
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.	1(7.69%)	0(0%)	4(30.77%)	7(53.85%)
10. 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.	1(7.69%)	0(0%)	5(38.46%)	6 (46.15%)
11. Use available technology to design, implement, and assess learning experiences to engage students, improve learning, and enrich professional practices.	1(7.69%)	0(0%)	4(30.77%)	7(53.85%)
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.	1(7.69%)	0(0%)	6 (46.15%)	5(38.46%)
13. Incorporate a variety of informal and formal assessments (ex.- pre/post assessments, quizzes, unit tests, checklists, rating scales, rubrics, and remediation and enrichment activities) to differentiate learning experiences that accommodate individual differences in developmental and/or educational needs.	1(7.69%)	0(0%)	3(23.08%)	8(61.54%)
14. Prepare appropriate assessments (e.g., pre/post assessments, quizzes, unit test, rubrics, and/or checklists) based on core content knowledge to effectively evaluate learner progress.	1(7.69%)	0(0%)	3(23.08%)	6 (46.15%)

15. Provide an inclusion classroom setting that addresses the full spectrum of student needs (severe learning disabilities to gifted).	1(7.69%)	0(0%)	4(30.77%)	7(53.85%)
16. 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.	1(7.69%)	3(23.08%)	3(23.08%)	5(38.46%)
17. Demonstrate a spirit of inquiry and appreciation for research that promotes continuous improvement in my abilities to increase student learning outcomes.	1(7.69%)	1(7.69%)	3(23.08%)	7(53.85%)
18. Recognize the importance of the Mississippi Educator Code of Ethical conduct, professional dispositions, and my influence as an adult role model for students.	1(7.69%)	0(0%)	2(15.38%)	9(69.23%)

Data Analysis and Interpretation:

The survey was deployed through the University of Mississippi in June 2019. Of the 13 unduplicated potential graduate respondents, 12 completed the web survey for an overall response of 100% response rate.

Overall Survey Results: The survey had 18 statements grouped in four different topics:

The Survey items are aligned with the INTASC standards-

- 1) The Learner and Learning - Statements 1-4
- 2) Content - Statements 5-7
- 3) Instructional Practices - Statements 8-15
- 4) Professional Responsibility - Statements 16-18 each statement had the response set of Strongly Disagree (1), Disagree (2), Agree (3), and Strongly Agree (4).

The results of the survey data were very surprising to the EPP. Although we are acutely aware of the need to strengthen our program, responses that fail within the strongly disagree category reveals a strong need to address the completers responses.

The mean score for each INTASC Domains are as follows:

Domain I: completer mean score for each descriptor was as follows: Strongly disagree -7.69%, disagree- 7.69, agree- 34.62 and strongly agree- 46.15.

Domain II: mean scores were as follows: Strongly disagree- 7.69, disagree-7.69, agree- 35.90 and strongly agree-41.15

Domain III: mean scores were as follows: Strongly disagree-7.69, disagree-2.89, agree-30.77 and strongly agree-50.96

Domain IV: Mean scores were as follows: strongly disagree-7.69, disagree-7.69, agree-20.51 and strongly agree-58.98.

Overall, completers rated the EPP proficient (75% or higher) with agree and strongly agree combined. Domain IV: Professional Responsibility had the highest agree/strongly agree rating for the EPP and Domain II: Content had the lowest agree/strongly agree rating. In all domains, the EPP did not receive more than 7.69% strongly disagree in any category. The EPP has initiated plans to revise its method courses to strengthen teacher preparations in all areas of the survey beginning Spring 2020.