

## Completer (Alumni) Survey

**CAEP Standard/Component:** 1.1, 1.5, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 5.5, & technology cross-cutting theme

**InTASC Standards:** 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10

**ETSU Clemmer College Framework:** 1-8

### **Administration and Purpose**

The completer survey is an EPP-created survey which measures alumni perceptions of their knowledge, skills, dispositions, related to their overall teacher preparation while attending ETSU. The survey's components and statements are tagged and aligned to CAEP, InTASC, and reflect the EPP's conceptual framework and beliefs. The survey content also parallels the end of program, mentor teacher, and principal survey.

- a. Points of Administration-** The completer survey is administered online once each year through email distribution. All alumni who graduated within the last 3 years are solicited to participate in the study based on contact information from Alumni Relations as well as Program Information.
- b. Purpose of Assessment & Use in Candidate Monitoring or Decisions on Progression-** The data are shared with program faculty and Advisory Boards at data meetings, LEA meetings, and retreats. The data results from the survey are used to assess the quality of the advanced programs and the way programs have prepared candidates for their roles as professionals. The survey is not designed to be an evaluation of the completer's present level of performance, only a measure of their perception of their preparation after gaining experience. The EPP uses the results to improve the quality of the programs and the operational effectiveness of advanced programs within the EPP.
- c. Instructions Provided to Respondents to Surveys-** The completer survey was developed and piloted in the fall of 2020. Completers/alumni are provided with a link to the completer survey that is distributed from program coordinators for advanced programs. Completers are asked to be honest, as their responses are a valuable part of the quality assurance process. Directions given to completers are tailored to each Advanced Program. An example of the Reading Specialist Survey directions is below.

*Dear ETSU Alumni,*

*Clemmer College believes in preparing Reading Specialists that not only have the content knowledge and pedagogy skills to facilitate learning in a classroom, but are also active agents in improving and influencing lives in their communities. Reading teacher preparation is a dynamic process that involves input from a*

*diverse support team (e.g., faculty, supervisors, mentor teachers, and principals), it is essential to closely monitor the aspects of our programs that our graduates feel we excel in, and those areas that we as a College need to improve upon. Therefore, we are reaching out to you today to request your feedback on the impact your Masters in Reading at ETSU had on your current instruction.*

*We are requesting that you take the time to complete our brief survey of your perception of the quality of your program while at ETSU. The survey will provide you with statements related to instructional practice and professional dispositions and ask you to respond based on the impact the program had on your teaching today.*

*Quality preparation at the Clemmer College is only as good as the feedback we receive from our local community partners. We hold your input to the highest regard, and we will use your feedback to guide change across our program.*

*If you have any questions about the survey, please contact Dr. Karin Keith at keithkj@etsu.edu or 423-439-7598.*

*Thank you kindly for your time and support,  
Clemmer College Administrative Team*

Completers are asked to rate each indicator as follows:

**Strongly agree** = you feel you are able to perform the behavior all the time

**Agree** = you feel you are able to perform the behavior most of the time

**Disagree** = you feel you are able to perform the behavior some of the time

**Strongly Disagree** = you feel you are rarely able to perform the behavior

- d. Criteria for Success-** A Likert was selected based on seeking to understand about the opinions/perceptions of participants related with single ‘latent’ variable (i.e, teaching behaviors). “Here during analysis, the scores of all items of the questionnaire are combined (sum) to generate a composite score.” (Joshi, et al., 2015)

The Advanced CAEP team developed a scoring criterion in conjunction with program specific advisory boards. Field pretests in Fall 2020 with indicate that programs need to revisit each item to make it more actionable (Groves et al., 2011). Field pretests are a validity procedure that are small scale rehearsals, that are used to “evaluate the survey instrument as well as the data collection and respondent selection procedures” (Groves et al., 2011, p. 265). The field pre-tests were completed by selected LEA partners prior to their participation in the on-campus advisory board meeting.

Data from the designed completer Likert-scale were categorized as ordinal, bipolar, data (DeVellis, 2016). Based on survey development literature (Croasmun & Ostrom, 2011; DeVellis, 2016; Groves et al.,

2011) and CAEP committee's expectations of scores based on a normal curve, the following criteria for success was defined:

Criteria for Analyzing ETSU Completer Survey Data (On a 4-point scale):

1. Program Target Score = 2.8-3.4 (70-85% of average total possible points)
2. Program Strength = Above 3.4 (> 85% of average total possible points)
3. Program Area of Need = Under 2.8 (< 70% of total possible points)

Croasmun, J. T., & Ostrom, L. (2011). Using Likert-Type Scales in the Social Sciences. *Journal of Adult Education*, 40(1), 19-22.

DeVellis, R. F. (2016). *Scale development: Theory and applications* (Vol. 26). Sage publications.

Groves, R. M., Fowler Jr, F. J., Couper, M. P., Lepkowski, J. M., Singer, E., & Tourangeau, R. (2011). *Survey methodology* (Vol. 561). John Wiley & Sons.

Joshi, et al. (2015). Likert scale: Explored and explained. *Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology*, 396-403.

Tennessee Department of Education. (2019). *Teacher Education Acceleration Model- TEAM*.  
<https://team-tn.org/teacher-evaluation/>

Tennessee Department of Education. (2020). *Tennessee Educator Survey*.  
<http://educatorsurvey.tnk12.gov/>

- e. **Evaluation Categories Aligned to CAEP, InTASC, National/Professional & State Standards-** The survey's components and statements (i.e., latent variables) are tagged and aligned specifically to CAEP, InTASC, reflect the EPP's conceptual framework and beliefs as well as align to Professional Standards for each program. The survey content was co-developed with LEA partners based on the language from the 10 InTASC standards. The survey content and assessment items also parallel the employer survey.

**Content of Assessment**

- a. **Indicators Assess Explicitly Identified Aspects of CAEP, InTASC, National/Professional & State Standards-** Statements and components of the completer survey are explicitly identified and aligned to the language in the 10 InTASC standard progression levels. In addition to the direct InTASC standard alignment this, EPP created instrument aligns with the following CAEP standards 1.1, 1.5, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 5.5, & technology cross-cutting theme, and all of the attributes of the Clemmer College Conceptual

Framework. As of July 2018, CAEP and the Tennessee Department of Education entered a formal agreement where Tennessee EPP programs will have to align to the CAEP standards at the state level. “The CAEP Board of Directors (CAEP Board or Board) and the SBE have adopted standards (CAEP Standards or Standards) that serve as the basis for all EPP accreditation and state approval reviews undertaken by CAEP. The CAEP Standards reflect the voice of the education field on what makes a quality educator” (CAEP, 2018). As a result, the alignment to the CAEP and InTASC standards represents fulfillment of the EPP requirements at the state level.

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation- CAEP (2018). *Tennessee Department of Education and the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation Partnership Agreement.*

<http://caepnet.org/working-together/~media/Files/caep/state-partners/tn-partnership-agreement-unsigned.pdf?la=en>

- b. Indicators reflect the degree of difficulty or level of effort described in the standards-** The survey provides statements related to instructional practices and professional dispositions and asks them to respond based on the impact it has had on their present-day instructional practices. For each of the teaching behaviors provided, completers are asked their level of agreement to the associated prompt. In addition, a 4-point agree/disagree scale was used for completers to evaluate each of the presented indicators. Agree/disagree scales are often used in research due to the uniform response format, and the survey response options only needed to be presented on the scale once, thus reducing time and streamlining the survey administration process (Saris, et al., 2010). Survey development research also states that agree/disagree scales must have participants respond to each individual item based on item specificity, or one specific teaching behavior for each item, and avoids question prompts that address global behaviors (DeVellis, 2016; Saris, et al., 2010).

The completer survey is broken down in two major sections:

1. Demographic information and employment status (n = 5)
2. Perception and evaluation of overall preparation as a teacher based on InTASC Standards (n = 33).

Saris, W., Revilla, M. A., Krosnick, J. A., & Shaeffer, E. M. (2010). Comparing questions with agree/disagree response options to questions with construct-specific response options. *Survey Research Methods*. 2010; 4 (1): 61-79.

- c. Indicators unambiguously describe the proficiencies to be evaluated-** Prompts/indicators (i.e., latent variables) describe the proficiencies to be evaluated, have a single subject and are stated in terms of behaviors or practices directly derived from the InTASC standards. In addition, each of the indicators were specifically designed so that scoring is anchored in the behaviors related to professional best practices. The Advanced CAEP committee, with feedback from LEA partners, reviewed and edited survey items to remove double-barreled and ambiguous wording (DeVellis, 2016).
- d. Indicators require higher levels of intellectual behaviors-** Each survey item (indicator) on the completer survey was written to address performance behaviors of the InTASC standards. Each of the InTASC standards were developed to maintain the specific delineation between knowledge, dispositions, and performances related to teaching behaviors (CCSSO, 2013). For example, InTASC standard #2, which addresses understanding diverse learner needs, has indicators related to performance, essential knowledge, and dispositions. The CCSSO (2013) has specifically noted that the *performance* indicator has been “put first, as the aspect can be observed and assessed in teaching practice” (p. 6), as compared to that of *knowledge* and *dispositions*.

Each of the survey items (indicators) use specific language from the InTASC standards in association with teacher performance behaviors. The completer survey was developed to meet the highest possible level of Bloom’s taxonomy (Krahtwol, 2002) of cognition. Below is the representation that all survey items fell within the upper level of Bloom’s taxonomy. (*Note: the level of Bloom’s goes in descending order, with 6 being the highest cognitive application, and 1 being the lowest*)

Survey Items on Bloom’s Level 6 (Creating) and Level 5 (Evaluating) (n = 6)

1. Assess student performance and can make informed instructional decisions to meet learners’ developmental needs (cognitive, social, emotional, and physical).
2. Adapt instruction to address students’ individual strengths, interests, and needs to advance individual student learning in different ways.
3. Design instruction to build on learners’ prior knowledge and experiences.
4. Develop a learning environment that promotes self-directed and collaborative interactions and experiences.

5. Recognize learning misconceptions in a discipline, and then is able to create learning experiences that build accurate conceptual understanding.
6. Understand how to connect concepts and use differing perspectives to engage learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving related to his/her discipline.
7. Plan for instruction based on formative and summative assessment data, prior learning knowledge, and learner interest.

Survey Items on Bloom's Level 4 (Analyze) and Level 3 (Applying) (n = 9)

1. Use verbal and nonverbal communication with individuals from diverse cultural backgrounds and differing perspectives in the learning environment.
2. Possess a deep knowledge of content standards and learning progressions in the discipline s/he teaches.
3. Understand AND use multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor student progress, and to guide decision making.
4. Engage learners in using a range of learning and technology tools to access, interpret, and evaluate information.
5. Use a variety of instructional strategies to support and expand learners' communication through speaking, listening, writing, and other modes.
6. Understand the expectations of the profession including code of ethics, professional standards of practice, and relevant policy and law.
7. Seek opportunities to draw upon current educational theory, policy, and research as sources of analysis and reflection to improve practice.
8. Collaborate with learners, families, and other school personnel to establish mutual expectations and ongoing communication to support learner development and achievement.
9. Take responsibility for contributing to and advancing the profession.

Survey Items on Bloom's Level 2 (Understanding) and Level 1 (Remembering) (n = 0)

1. None

Council of Chief State School Officers [CCSSO] (2013, April). *Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards and Learning Progressions for Teachers 1.0: A resource for ongoing teacher development*. Washington, DC: Author.

Krathwohl, D. R. (2002). A revision of Bloom's taxonomy: An overview. *Theory into Practice*, 41(4), 212-218.

- e. **Indicators require consequential attributes of candidate proficiencies-** Because all survey items are a direct derivative of the language in the InTASC standards, the completer survey meets, and potentially exceeds, the minimal sufficient level. The minimal sufficient level to meet this CAEP sub-standard is that at least 80% indicators require observers to judge consequential attributes of candidate proficiencies in InTASC standards, and 95% is deemed above expectation.

### Survey Content

- a. **Questions aligned to EPPs mission, CAEP, InTASC, National/Professional & State Standards-** The survey has 32 items which directly align to required teaching behaviors from the InTASC standards. The section relating to overall preparation as a teacher provides completers with one InTASC teacher behavior and asks them to select one of four response options on a Likert scale: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Agree, and Strongly Agree. In addition, the survey asks for comments in the form of suggestions and strengths of the education program. In addition to the direct InTASC standard alignment, this EPP created instrument aligns with the following CAEP standards 1.1, 1.5, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 5.5, & technology cross-cutting theme, and all of the attributes of the Clemmer College Conceptual Framework.
- b. **Items have single subject and are unambiguous-** To the highest degree possible, the CAEP committee, with help from LEA partners, avoided double-barreled, complex, and ambiguous survey items. Complex indicators (verb indicators) were written based on LEA and EPP collaboration and instrument development. Based on the recommendation of the collaboration group, the more complex indicator, or indicators have two action verbs (e.g., understands and uses), represent a more advanced proficiency, and direct language was kept from the InTASC standards.
- c. **Leading questions are avoided-** All survey items were stated positively, and completers are asked to SA, A, D, or SD to each survey item (indicator), therefore leading questions were avoided and do not lead completers towards a specific response.

- d. **Items state in terms of behaviors and practices-** Prompts/indicators describe the proficiencies to be evaluated, have a single subject and are stated in terms of behaviors or practices directly derived from the InTASC standards. In addition, each of the indicators were specifically designed so that scoring is anchored in the teaching behaviors related to teaching professional best practices.

### Survey Data Quality

- a. **Choices are qualitatively defined using specific criteria aligned with key attributes-** Likert scales that have an agree/disagree scale are widely used in education and social sciences (DeVellis, 2016). An agree, disagree scale is a range of answer options that go from strongly agree to strongly disagree. It allows respondents to answer more precisely and it provides more nuanced survey responses to analyze. Since each survey item is directly related to teacher behaviors from the InTASC standards, research has shown that this item specificity is much less prone to response bias towards default agreement (DeVellis, 2016; Groves et al., 2011; Saris, et al., 2010). Each of following features of agree/disagree Likert scales was implemented for the completer survey items (indicators):
1. All survey items started with a positively worded declarative statement.
  2. All survey items had an ordered continuum of response options that are directly associated with each declarative statement.
  3. Survey response options were balanced between positive and negative response choices, with no neutral choice.
  4. All survey response options were qualitatively labeled (e.g., strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree).
  5. Quantitative values were assigned to each of the qualitative labels (4- strongly agree, 3- agree, 2- disagree, 1- strongly disagree) (DeVellis, 2016; Groves et al., 2011; Saris, et al., 2010).
- b. **Feedback provided to EPP is actionable-** Feedback from this instrument is triangulated with the employer survey to provide increased credibility of the results. All survey instruments use the same prompts (declarative statement) so data can be analyzed from multiple perspectives by the EPP.
- c. **EPP provides evidence that questions are piloted prior to use-** The Advanced CAEP leadership developed a scoring criterion in conjunction based on two focus groups and field pretests with LEA partners, both of which took place in the Fall, 2020 (Groves et al., 2011). The field pre-tests were

completed by selected LEA partners prior to their participation in the on-campus advisory board meetings. In addition, all members of the Advanced CAEP team piloted and provided feedback on the complete survey prior to use.