

Student Teacher Exit Survey

Alignment

Alignment to State Standards. The Student Teacher Exit Survey was developed using items from the State of Missouri first year teacher survey (which is administered by the state department of education). Items are explicitly aligned to Missouri Teacher Standards (MTS); which is the ongoing performance evaluation tool for Missouri educators.

Evidence Overview

Description and Use of Assessment as Part of the Quality Assurance System. The Student Teaching Exit Survey assesses all candidates' perceptions related to their preparation at program completion. The survey consists of 38 closed-questions that mirror those used on the First Year Teacher Survey administered by the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (i.e., I was prepared to modify instruction for English language learners.) The items are divided into groups corresponding to each of the Missouri Teacher Standards, and an additional question about the use of technology is included as is a question that elicits an overall rating of the overall quality of the professional education program. The questions' required responses are constructed in a 5-point Likert-type scale of agreement 5- Strongly Agree, 4 – Agree, 3 - Neutral, 2 – Disagree, and 1 – Strongly Disagree. The scale for the question pertaining to the quality of the teacher preparation is: 5 - Very Good, 4 – Good, 3 – Fair, 2 – Poor, and 1 - Very Poor.

Quantitative and qualitative results are disaggregated by program and discussed among various stakeholder groups (faculty, advisory boards, and others) annually as a part of the continuous quality improvement.

Evidence and Analysis

Directions Delivered to Candidates. Directions provide the details of the assessment as described in the paragraph above and include that the UCM Teacher Education Program will use candidates' responses to help improve the EPP.

Evaluation Instrument. The items included on the survey are provided in the data table below.

Presentation of Data**Student Teacher Exit Survey**

- Scale:
 - 1 - Strongly Disagree
 - 2 - Disagree
 - 3 - Neutral
 - 4 - Agree
 - 5 - Strongly Agree

		Fall 2020 N=30	Spring 2021 N=163	Fall 2021 N=56	Spring 2022 N=174
Standard 1 Content Knowledge	I was prepared to incorporate interdisciplinary instruction.	4.33	4.20	4.05	4.15
	I was prepared in my content area.	4.57	4.53	4.41	4.39
	I was prepared to engage students in my content area.	4.57	4.58	4.45	4.54
	I was prepared to make my content meaningful to my students.	4.63	4.60	4.41	4.45
Standard 2 Learning, Growth, and Development	I was prepared to design lessons that include differentiated instruction.	4.63	4.44	4.23	4.39
	I was prepared to implement instruction based on a student's IEP.	4.20	3.90	3.70	3.73
	I was prepared to modify instruction for English language learners.	3.93	3.64	3.38	3.52
	I was prepared to modify instruction for gifted learners.	4.07	3.90	3.39	3.68
	I was prepared to create lesson plans to engage all learners.	4.63	4.47	4.36	4.34
Standard 3 Curriculum Implementation	I was prepared to deliver lessons based on curriculum standards.	4.43	4.56	4.54	4.52
	I was prepared to deliver lessons for diverse learners.	4.40	4.26	4.29	4.29
Standard 4 Critical Thinking	I was prepared to implement a variety of instructional strategies.	4.60	4.52	4.48	4.43
	I was prepared to engage students in critical thinking.	4.53	4.45	4.34	4.27
	I was prepared to model critical thinking and problem solving.	4.60	4.48	4.45	4.34
Technology	I was prepared to use technology to enhance student learning.	4.70	4.39	4.50	4.33
Standard 5 Positive Classroom Environment	I was prepared to create a classroom environment that encourages student engagement.	4.67	4.59	4.55	4.48
	I was prepared to use a variety of classroom management strategies.	4.60	4.46	4.45	4.28
	I was prepared to manage a variety of discipline issues.	3.93	3.87	3.73	3.67

	I was prepared to motivate my students to learn..	4.47	4.53	4.30	4.33
	I was prepared to keep my students on task.	4.78	4.33	4.27	4.16
	I was prepared to foster positive student relationships.	4.80	4.75	4.75	4.68
	I was prepared to facilitate smooth transitions for my students.	4.47	4.39	4.38	4.27
Standard 6 Effective Communication	I was prepared to use effective communication strategies to foster learning.	4.47	4.56	4.5	4.40
	I was prepared to effectively communicate with parents.	3.87	3.71	3.71	3.60
	I was prepared to effectively communicate with all staff.	4.50	4.34	4.41	4.22
	I was prepared to promote respect for diverse cultures, genders, and intellectual/physical abilities.	4.63	4.59	4.48	4.45
	I was prepared to use technology as a communication tool.	4.60	4.45	4.43	4.37
	I was prepared to enhance students' skills in using technology as a communication tool.	4.53	4.40	4.27	4.25
Standard 7 Student Assessment and Data Analysis	I was prepared to use assessments to evaluate learning.	4.67	4.51	4.52	4.43
	I was prepared to develop assessments to evaluate learning.	4.53	4.42	4.39	4.30
	I was prepared to analyze assessment data to improve instruction.	4.53	4.42	4.38	4.22
	I was prepared to help students set learning goals based on assessment results.	4.50	4.23	4.25	4.13
	I was prepared to work with colleagues to set learning goals using assessment results.	4.57	4.36	4.36	4.12
Standard 8 Professionalism	I was prepared to analyze data to reflect on areas for professional growth.	4.47	4.42	4.45	4.26
	I was prepared to reflect on my practices for professional growth.	4.53	4.58	4.52	4.49
Standard 9 Professional Collaboration	I was prepared to collaborate with colleagues to support students' learning.	4.67	4.50	4.46	4.36
	I was prepared to collaborate with parents to support student learning.	4.13	3.80	3.80	3.77
	I was prepared to participate in professional organizations.	4.0	4.02	4.41	3.92

Which best reflects your perspective about the overall quality of the professional education program you completed?						
	Very poor 1	Poor 2	Fair 3	Good 4	Very Good 5	Mean
Fall 2020 - 30 student teachers responded	0%	3%	0%	27%	70%	4.63
Spring 2021 - 163 student teachers responded	0%	0%	3.7%	34.4%	61.9%	4.58
Fall 2021 - 56 student teachers responded	1.8%	0%	1.8%	46.4%	50.0%	4.43
Spring 2022 - 174 student teachers responded	0%	1%	9.1%	43.2%	46.8%	4.35