

Evidence	Employer Survey
What is it?	This evidence consists of two pieces of information. The first is an online survey form, which is completed by principals who have hired a CNU first-year teacher. The survey had fifteen items with opportunity for free response. The second item is a summary of mean responses to the items from 2016-2018.
What evidence is available regarding its quality?	<p>This survey was created based on the core objectives of the program goals and the course outcomes of major courses in the program. There is generally close to or over 40% response rate. The survey is reviewed by the Teacher Preparation Council Steering Committee every year and changes are made based on observed inconsistencies or lack of clarity. The survey is aligned with the First-Year Teacher Survey, which asks the same or similar questions, thus allowing comparison of the two.</p> <p>This particular survey does not lend itself to inter-rater reliability data. However, internal consistency (reliability) of the First-Year Employer Survey has been established with the data from 2014 and 2015. Reliability coefficients (Cronbach's alpha) range from $\alpha = .91$ to $\alpha = .96$.</p>
How are the data collected?	The names and contact information of first-year teacher hires and principals of the schools in which they are hired are collected in September-October. The online survey is distributed in mid-late June. The survey is sent to each principal individually, including the name of the completer hired; however, the survey itself does not require identification of the completer. The survey directions indicate that, if the principal were not the primary evaluator, then the survey should be forwarded to the primary evaluator. Two reminders are sent (end of June and mid-July) to encourage participation.
How are employers informed of the purpose of the survey?	When employers are sent the survey, a cover letter informs the principal that these surveys are anonymous and are used to improve the Teacher Preparation Program.
Who collects, analyzes, and reports the data?	Data is collected by the Director of Teacher Preparation, who does an initial analysis of the data, compares it to previous years' data, and makes initial recommendations, if appropriate. This is reported to the Teacher Preparation Council in the August meeting.
What criteria have been established for successful performance and why?	The data are summarized with means and standard deviation. The criterion for success is a mean of 3.2 or 80%. Areas with means below 3.2 or 80% are discussed by the Teacher Preparation Council, and at least one action item is created for program improvement aimed at that element.

What do the reported results mean?	Results indicate to what extent employers agree that CNU hires are prepared by the Teacher Preparation program for their first year of teaching.
How are results used for improvement?	The data are examined in the August meeting of the Teacher Preparation Council, including recommendations from the Director. The Council makes and approves recommendations for changes based on the data. If these changes require curricular or catalog language changes, they are referred to the Graduate Council for approval.

CNU First Year Employer Survey

1. To what school district do you belong?

2. What is the type of your school?

- Elementary School
- Middle School
- High School

3. If you are an administrator at an elementary school, to what subject or grade level was the CNU first-year teacher assigned this past year?

- Pre-Kindergarten
- Kindergarten
- Grade 1
- Grade 2
- Grade 3
- Grade 4
- Grade 5
- Art
- Music
- ESL

4. If you are an administrator at a middle/secondary school, to what subject(s) was the CNU first-year teacher assigned this year?

- Art
- Biology
- Chemistry
- Choral Music
- Computer Science
- English
- ESL
- History/Social Studies
- Instrumental Music
- Mathematics
- Physics
- Spanish

5. Please respond to the following statements:

My first-year teacher from Christopher Newport University was well-prepared for his/her first year of teaching.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

The teacher was knowledgeable about his/her content.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

The teacher was knowledgeable about his/her students.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

The teacher effectively planned for instruction.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

The teacher delivered instruction effectively, monitoring and adjusting as necessary.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

The teacher effectively assessed student performance.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

The teacher provided a safe and effective learning environment for students.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

The teacher established a classroom that valued diversity.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

The teacher effectively taught gifted or high-performing students.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

The teacher effectively taught students with disabilities.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

The teacher effectively taught English Language Learners.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

The teacher used appropriate and effective instructional technology.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

The teacher effectively dealt with discipline problems.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

The teacher worked collaboratively with families.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

The teacher exhibited professional dress and behaviors.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

What would you identify as the strengths of the CNU Teacher Preparation Program?

How would you like to see the CNU Teacher Preparation Program improved?

Did your district provide mentoring experiences for the first-year teacher?

- Yes
- No

If yes, please briefly describe.

Additional Comments:

First-Year Employer Survey Responses Mean and SD for Cohorts 2016-2018
The Employer Survey asks employers if their first-year teachers hired from CNU...

4 = agree 3=neutral 2=disagree 1= strongly disagree

Criteria 3.20 (80%)

2016			2017			2018		
	Mean	SD		Mean	SD		Mean	SD
1. Were well-prepared for the first year of teaching								
Overall n = 32	3.59	0.49	Overall n = 27	3.41	0.64	Overall n = 24	3.58	.64
Elementary n = 20	3.50	0.51	Elementary n = 20	3.35	0.67	Elementary n = 20	3.65	.57
Secondary n = 12	3.75	0.45	Secondary n = 7	3.57	0.53	Secondary n = 4	3.25	.83
2. Had knowledge of content								
Overall n = 32	3.56	0.50	Overall n = 27	3.41	0.64	Overall n = 24	3.42	.57
Elementary n = 20	3.50	0.51	Elementary n = 20	3.30	0.66	Elementary n = 20	3.40	.58
Secondary n = 12	3.66	0.49	Secondary n = 7	3.71	0.49	Secondary n = 4	3.50	.50
3. Had knowledge of students								
Overall n = 32	3.56	0.56	Overall n = 27	3.48	0.50	Overall n = 24	3.42	.76
Elementary n = 20	3.60	0.50	Elementary n = 20	3.40	0.50	Elementary n = 20	3.50	.67
Secondary n = 12	3.60	0.50	Secondary n = 7	3.71	0.53	Secondary n = 4	3.00	.10
4. Planned for instruction								
Overall n = 32	3.59	0.49	Overall n = 27	3.41	0.57	Overall n = 24	3.37	.63
Elementary n = 20	3.50	0.51	Elementary n = 20	3.35	0.59	Elementary n = 20	3.40	.66
Secondary n = 12	3.75	0.45	Secondary n = 7	3.57	0.53	Secondary n = 4	3.25	.43
5. Delivered instruction effectively								
Overall n = 32	3.62	0.49	Overall n = 27	3.33	0.62	Overall n = 24	3.37	.70
Elementary n = 20	3.55	0.51	Elementary n = 20	3.25	0.64	Elementary n = 20	3.45	.67
Secondary n = 12	3.75	0.45	Secondary n = 7	3.57	0.53	Secondary n = 4	3.25	.43
6. Assessed student performance								
Overall n = 32	3.50	0.50	Overall n = 27	3.33	0.62	Overall n = 24	3.42	.64
Elementary n = 20	3.50	0.51	Elementary n = 20	3.25	0.64	Elementary n = 20	3.50	.59
Secondary n = 12	3.50	0.52	Secondary n = 7	3.57	0.53	Secondary n = 4	3.00	.70

2016			2017			2018		
7. Provided a safe and effective learning environment								
Overall n = 32	3.59	0.55	Overall n = 27	3.37	0.69	Overall n = 24	3.29	.73
Elementary n = 20	3.55	0.60	Elementary n = 20	3.30	0.73	Elementary n = 20	3.35	.73
Secondary n = 12	3.66	0.49	Secondary n = 7	3.57	0.53	Secondary n = 4	3.00	.70
8. Valued Diversity								
Overall n = 32	3.65	0.54	Overall n = 27	3.41	0.50	Overall n = 24	3.46	.64
Elementary n = 20	3.75	0.44	Elementary n = 20	3.40	0.50	Elementary n = 20	3.50	.59
Secondary n = 12	3.50	0.67	Secondary n = 7	3.42	0.53	Secondary n = 4	3.25	.83
9. Taught gifted/high performing students effectively								
Overall n = 17	3.35	0.50	Overall n = 19	3.36	0.50	Overall n = 16	3.50	.50
Elementary n = 10	3.30	0.48	Elementary n = 12	3.26	0.46	Elementary n = 13	3.46	.50
Secondary n = 7	3.42	0.53	Secondary n = 7	3.50	0.55	Secondary n = 3	3.67	.47
10. Taught students with disabilities effectively								
Overall n = 26	3.42	0.50	Overall n = 19	3.26	0.56	Overall n = 14	3.21	.77
Elementary n = 14	3.20	0.51	Elementary n = 12	3.33	0.65	Elementary n = 10	3.30	.78
Secondary n = 12	3.33	0.49	Secondary n = 7	3.14	0.38	Secondary n = 4	3.33	.47
11. Effectively taught English Language Learners (Added for Cohort 16)								
Overall n = 18	3.27	0.47	Overall n = 10	3.40	0.52	Overall n = 10	3.30	.46
Elementary n = 11	3.27	0.46	Elementary n = 9	3.33	0.50	Elementary n = 9	3.33	.47
Secondary N = 7	3.28	0.48	Secondary n = 1	4.0	0.00	Secondary n = 1	3.00	0
12. Used instructional technology appropriately/effectively.								
Overall n = 32	3.59	0.49	Overall n = 27	3.37	0.49	Overall n = 24	3.50	.50
Elementary n = 20	3.55	0.51	Elementary n = 20	3.35	0.50	Elementary n = 20	3.55	.50
Secondary n = 12	3.66	0.49	Secondary n = 7	3.43	0.53	Secondary n = 4	3.25	.43
13. Dealt with discipline problems effectively								
Overall n = 32	3.28	0.63	Overall n = 27	3.07	0.78	Overall n = 24	3.08	.86
Elementary n = 20	3.25	0.63	Elementary n = 20	3.19	0.70	Elementary n = 20	3.05	.86
Secondary n = 12	3.33	0.65	Secondary n = 7	3.00	0.81	Secondary n = 4	3.25	.83

2016			2017			2018		
14. Worked collaboratively with families								
Overall n = 32	3.53	0.51	Overall n= 27	3.30	0.465	Overall n= 24	3.29	.61
Elementary n = 20	3.50	0.51	Elementary n = 20	3.30	0.47	Elementary n = 20	3.35	.57
Secondary n = 12	3.58	0.51	Secondary n = 7	3.28	0.49	Secondary n = 4	3.00	.70
15. Exhibited professional dress and behavior								
Overall n = 32	3.65	0.54	Overall n= 27	3.37	0.69	Overall n= 24	3.58	.57
Elementary n = 20	3.70	0.47	Elementary n = 20	3.35	0.67	Elementary n = 20	3.65	.48
Secondary n = 12	3.58	0.66	Secondary n = 7	3.43	0.79	Secondary n = 4	3.25	.83

Total survey responders and response rate

2016	2017	2018
32/61=52.4%	27/57=47%	24/72=33%

Open response comments that appear more than once:

Program Strengths – The CNU teacher excelled in. . .

Content knowledge

Rapport with Student

Classroom management

Willingness to learn and grow

Willingness to collaborate

Professionalism

Effective use of instructional technology

Program Weaknesses – The CNU teacher struggled with...

Communication with family/parents

Classroom management

Working with SPED and TAG students