



Unit Employer Survey: Report (Draft)

Section I. Survey Information

The current data are based on a pilot administration of the Unit Employer Survey, with one surrounding school district, conducted in May of 2018. The school district surveyed employs the largest number of our completers relative to other, surrounding districts. For the current survey administration, a total of 87 completers hired within the previous three years remained employed at the district. At the time of survey, these completers worked in 24 school buildings with a total of 23 principals supervising their performance. Responses were obtained from a total of 9 principals representing 38 employees/completers, reflecting an overall response and completion rate (in terms of the percentage of completers represented) of 43.68%.

Section II. Employer Survey Items

To assess employers' perceptions of our completers' performance, a 10-item measure was administered. The items were co-developed and endorsed by the Maryland Assessment Collaborative. The items were administered on a 4-point scale: 1-Not at all; 2-Minimally; 3-Inconsistently; 4-Consistently. Each of the items has been aligned with relevant InTASC and CAEP standards, supporting – in combination with the processes employed during committee creation and revision of the instrument – validity evidence based on test content (i.e., Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing, AERA, APA, NCME, 2014). To evaluate reliability evidence for the items used in the employer survey, internal consistency reliability was examined. Internal consistency reliability is commonly used to evaluate the reliability of a set of test or questionnaire items. Internal consistency reliability provides an indication of an instrument's reliability by estimating the extent to which items on an instrument consistently measure the same construct (e.g., intern performance).¹ Reliability of the items in the current administration was strong ($\alpha=0.90$).

Table 1. Employer Survey Items – Descriptive Information

Employer Survey Item	M	Mdn	SD
This educator:			
1. Understands the diverse needs of students (InTASC 2; CAEP 1.1, 4.3/A.4.1)	3.38	4.00	0.79
2. Plans for the diverse needs of students (InTASC 7; CAEP 1.1, 4.3/A.4.1)	3.50	4.00	0.79
3. Knows the required content (InTASC 4; CAEP 1.1, 4.3/A.4.1)	3.75	4.00	0.38
4. Teaches required content (InTASC 5; CAEP 1.1, 4.3/A.4.1)	3.88	4.00	0.38
5. Creates a respectful environment that supports learning for all students (InTASC 3; CAEP 1.1, 4.3/A.4.1)	3.88	4.00	0.38
6. Implements effective instruction that engages students in learning (InTASC 8; CAEP 1.1, 4.3/A.4.1)	3.75	4.00	0.49
7. Implements a range of assessments to measure progress of learners to improve instruction (InTASC 6; CAEP 1.1, 4.3/A.4.1)	3.75	4.00	0.76
8. Demonstrates professionalism (InTASC 9; MCEE; CAEP 1.1, 4.3/A.4.1)	3.88	4.00	0.38
9. Uses technology in ways that improve student learning (ISTE; CAEP 1.5, 4.3/A.4.1)	3.88	4.00	0.38

Descriptive information for each of the first nine items is presented in Table 1. As can be seen in Table 1, the majority of mean values for the items exceeded 3.50 and all median values equaled 4.00. These scores indicate positive appraisals of our completers' abilities to plan for, support, and assess learning among varied learners as well as use technology to improve student learning.

Item 10 addressed employers' perceptions of educators' impact on student learning using an open-ended response format (CAEP 4.1, 4.3/A.4.1; i.e., "Please comment on the educator's impact on student growth."). Responses to these items indicated, overall, positive impact of our completers on student learning and growth. For example, one supervisor/principal wrote: "Scores are improving in our PARCC Assessment. [...] Writing Diagnostic and Summative Assessments increased over 20% and was 10% or higher above the county. The teachers from SU have played a big part in this increase.". Another, more summary response was: "Students from SU come prepared to teach students and positively impact their student growth."

Section III. Employer Overall Satisfaction

To assess supervisors'/principals' overall satisfaction with the performance of our completers, a global item was administered. The item was administered using a 5-point scale: 1-Very dissatisfied; 2-Dissatisfied; 3-Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied; 4-Satisfied; 5-Very satisfied. Because one item was administered for this area, internal consistency reliability was not able to be assessed. Table 2 presents basic descriptive information for the item.

Table 2. Employer Overall Satisfaction – Descriptive Information

	<i>M</i>	<i>Mdn</i>	<i>SD</i>
Employer Satisfaction (CAEP 4.3/4.1)	4.63	5.00	0.49

Based on the findings, supervisors/principals indicated overall satisfaction with the performance of SU completers.

Section IV. Employer Overall Rating(s) of Quality

Finally, to assess supervisors'/principals' perceptions of the overall quality of our completers, a global item was administered. The item was administered using a 5-point scale: 1-Poor; 2-Fair; 3-Good; 4-Very good; 5-Excellent. Because one item was administered for this area, internal consistency reliability was not able to be assessed. Table 3 presents basic descriptive information for the item.

Table 3. Employer Overall Rating – Descriptive Information

	<i>M</i>	<i>Mdn</i>	<i>SD</i>
Employer Rating(s) of Preparation Quality (CAEP 4.3/4.1)	4.25	5.00	0.79

Based on the findings, supervisors/principals indicated strong ratings of the quality of SU completers.

Conclusions and Next Steps Based on the Employer Survey Results

The results of the Unit Employer Survey support a number of important conclusions and next steps for the Seidel School of Education to leverage to provide meaningful preparation experiences for its candidates:

1. Employers indicated positive appraisals of our completers' abilities to support and assess student learning.
2. Employers indicated overall satisfaction with and strong ratings of the quality of the preparation of our completers.

3. The unit needs to take steps to increase both the sample size and representativeness of the employers that are successfully surveyed. In future assessments, we will continue to employ targeted strategies to ensure strong response and completion rates and will survey employers from other, surrounding districts. Overall, the findings of this report provide a strong foundation against which to compare future examinations of employers' satisfaction with the performance of our completers.

References

American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, National Council on Measurement in Education, Joint Committee on Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing (U.S.). (2014). *Standards for educational and psychological testing*. Washington, DC: AERA.

Notes

¹Internal consistency reliability was evaluated through calculation of Cronbach's alpha as a lower-bound estimate of reliability. Cronbach's alpha effectively evaluates the mean of all possible split-half correlations among items in an instrument. Standardized item alpha values were also computed and compared with Cronbach's alpha values.