

**Unit Employer Survey: Report (Draft)**

**Section I. Survey Information**

The current data are based on a follow-up, year two administration of the Unit Employer Survey, with a second surrounding school district, conducted in February of 2019. The school district surveyed employs a considerable number of our completers relative to other, surrounding districts. Responses for the current survey were obtained from a total of 8 principals from 8 different schools in the school district representing ## employees/completers of Salisbury University education programs.

**Section II. Employer Survey Items**

To assess employers’ perceptions of our completers’ performance, a 10-item measure was administered. As with the previous administration in 2018, the items were co-developed, endorsed, and refined 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 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 (α=0.93).

*Table 1*. Employer Survey Items – Descriptive Information

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Employer Survey Item | 2018 | | | 2019 | | |
| *M* | *Mdn* | *SD* | *M* | *Mdn* | *SD* |
| 1. Understands the diverse needs of students  (InTASC 2; CAEP 1.1, 4.3/A.4.1) | 3.38 | 4.00 | 0.79 | 4.38 | 4.50 | 0.74 |
| 2. Plans for the diverse needs of students  (InTASC 7; CAEP 1.1, 4.3/A.4.1) | 3.50 | 4.00 | 0.79 | 4.38 | 4.50 | 0.74 |
| 3. Knows the required content  (InTASC 4; CAEP 1.1, 4.3/A.4.1) | 3.75 | 4.00 | 0.38 | 4.88 | 5.00 | 0.35 |
| 4. Teaches required content  (InTASC 5; CAEP 1.1, 4.3/A.4.1) | 3.88 | 4.00 | 0.38 | 4.88 | 5.00 | 0.35 |
| 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 | 4.88 | 5.00 | 0.35 |
| 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 | 4.88 | 5.00 | 0.35 |
| 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 | 4.25 | 5.00 | 1.39 |
| 8. Demonstrates professionalism  (InTASC 9; MCEE; CAEP 1.1, 4.3/A.4.1) | 3.88 | 4.00 | 0.38 | 4.75 | 5.00 | 0.46 |
| 9. Uses technology in ways that improve student learning  (ISTE; CAEP 1.5, 4.3/A.4.1) | 3.88 | 4.00 | 0.38 | 4.63 | 5.00 | 0.74 |

Descriptive information for each of the first nine items is presented in Table 1. As can be seen in Table 1, all mean values for the items exceeded 3.50 and all median values exceeded 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 again indicated positive impact of our completers on student learning and growth. For example, one supervisor/principal wrote: “Educators have [been] engaging strategies that impact student growth.”. Another representative response was: “This educator had a significant and direct impact on students’ ability to master the Algebra 1 assessment.”.

**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 by year of assessment.

Table 2. Employer Overall Satisfaction – Descriptive Information

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Overall Rating | 2018 | | | 2019 | | |
| *M* | *Mdn* | *SD* | *M* | *Mdn* | *SD* |
| Employer Satisfaction  (CAEP 4.3/4.1) | 4.63 | 5.00 | 0.49 | 4.75 | 5.00 | 0.46 |

Based on the findings, supervisors/principals indicated overall satisfaction with the performance of SU completers, and these ratings were consistent across the two school sites and time-frames.

**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 for both school sites and time-frames.

Table 3. Employer Overall Rating – Descriptive Information

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Overall Rating | 2018 | | | 2019 | | |
| *M* | *Mdn* | *SD* | *M* | *Mdn* | *SD* |
| Employer Rating(s) of Preparation Quality  (CAEP 4.3/4.1) | 4.25 | 5.00 | 0.79 | 4.63 | 5.00 | 0.744 |

Based on the findings, supervisors/principals indicated consistent, strong ratings of the quality of SU completers. Further, scores on the overall satisfaction item were positively and significantly correlated with scores on the overall rating of completer quality, *r*s=0.79, *p* < .05, providing evidence of convergence across employers’ ratings of our completers’ performance (AERA, APA, NCME, 2014).2

**Conclusions and Next Steps Based on the Employer Survey Results**

The results of the Unit Employer Survey continue to 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. These positive appraisals exist across school sites and time-frames of assessment.

2. Employers indicated overall satisfaction with and strong ratings of the quality of the preparation of our completers. These satisfaction ratings again persist across school sites.

3. As with the alumni survey, the unit needs to continue 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.
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**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.

2Based on the nature of the data analyzed, the Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient was computed and is reported.