

## COMPLETER PERCEPTIONS

### CAEP Standards: 4.4, 5.4

This artifact documents completer perceptions gathered through surveys and focus group session.

In compliance with the Kentucky Council of Post-Secondary Education requirements, national accreditation requirements, and best practices, the provider works with various constituents to survey program completers. In 2008, the MSU Assessment Office began contacting alumni to garner completers' perceptions of the quality of their programs. In fall 2014, a university ad hoc committee of MSU Assessment Staff plus university faculty and staff reviewed and revised the completer survey to better align with CPE requirements. The provider's Director of Assessment served on that committee.

Survey items include dates, location, and nature of current employment; salary range; employment relationship to initial degree; quality of program preparation for current position; employer; and graduate school plans. MSU survey data are disaggregated by program and shared with the provider upon request. The provider used a variation of the MSU completer survey template to conduct completer surveys each semester beginning spring 2014. Survey items addressed degree earned and major field of study; graduation semester/year; employment location, relevance to degree, and type; and graduate school plans. The MSU registrar provided completers' names. The provider emailed survey links to completers.

Because of the difficulty of obtaining current completer contact information, the survey response rate has been historically low (ranging from 1 to 5). Furthermore, survey items mostly target employment and continued education, not preparedness. Therefore, these data are not an accurate representation of all completers' perceptions of their program preparedness.

To gain additional information from graduates who completed the program within the past few years, the provider created and implemented a completer survey November 2015. Instead of the MSU-provided survey items, the survey focused upon these topics: initial area of certification; year of graduation from initial program; current employment; teaching assignment; preparation to work with students, parents, colleagues, supervisors effectively; relevance and effectiveness of preparation for current job responsibilities; collaborative efforts with MSU faculty; and ways respondents or schools measure student-learning growth. The survey was completed by program completers who have been or are currently enrolled in a graduate educator preparation program at MSU. Forty-six completers elected to participate in the survey, all of which have undergraduate education degrees from Murray State University. The *November 2015 Completers Survey Table* documents the respondents' ratings.

**November 2015 Completers Survey Table**

<b>Question</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>
My initial teacher certification program prepared me to...				
work with my students effectively	4.3%	4.3%	56.5%	34.8%
work with parents effectively	6.5%	32.6%	43.5%	17.4%
work with colleagues effectively	2.2%	6.5%	54.3%	37%
work with supervisors effectively	2.2%	8.7%	58.7%	30.4%
effectively apply professional knowledge to my work	0%	2.2%	60.9%	37%
effectively apply professional skills to my work	0%	6.5%	56.5%	37%
effectively apply professional dispositions to my work	0%	6.5%	52.5%	41.3%
The preparation that I received from the program was relevant to the responsibilities that I confront on the job.	2.2%	8.9%	64.4%	24.4%
The preparation that I received from the program was effective in preparing me for the responsibilities that I confront on the job.	4.4%	13.3%	60%	22.2%

To gain additional insight into completers' satisfaction with their preparedness, faculty interviewed graduate students in EDU 600 *Introduction to Teacher Leader*. Questions were developed by Dr. Jacqueline Hansen (Director of Assessment), Dr. Meagan Musselman (Coordinator of the Teacher Leader Program), Dr. Dusty Reed (Assistant Professor), and Dr. Yuejin Xu (Associate Professor). Questions were vetted with the CAEP Leadership Team before the session commenced. Results appear below.

## **Focus Group Minutes with Completers**

A focus group of 17 completers from Murray State University's teacher preparation program was conducted on February 2016. The questions and results are listed below.

Did your initial certification program prepare you to work with students effectively?

SED 300 was especially helpful in providing specific strategies to work with students with disabilities. It would be helpful to have even more coursework around assisting students with disabilities. Several completers reported not being prepared for classroom management. They mentioned that with the increase in practicum hours, they thought students would have more opportunities to work with managing student behavior and were more prepared as first year teachers.

Did your initial certification program prepare you to work with parents effectively?

Completers reported needing more help in this area. They specifically mentioned needing strategies of how to diffuse irate parents.

Did your initial certification program prepare you to work with colleagues effectively?

The team and group projects in several courses were good preparation for working with colleagues. Discussions and activities involving PLCs mimicked PLC participation in the schools.

Did your initial certification program prepare you to work with supervisors effectively?

The requirements from courses in the teacher preparation program required more detail on lesson plans and assessments than administrators require. Completers felt very prepared to work with their supervisors effectively.

Did your initial certification program prepare you to effectively apply professional knowledge and dispositions to your work?

Some of the recent completers that had to complete the 200 hours of practicum reported this was very beneficial and provided them a lot of exposure to classroom issues. One completer reported that her extended practicum led to her student teaching placement in the same school, which led to a job offer within the district.

Was the preparation you received from the program relevant and effective to the responsibilities that you confront on the job?

The lesson plan and unit plans used throughout the program were aligned with what was expected during KTIP. It was reported that Infinite Campus training is needed at the undergraduate level. There is a lot of “on the job training” that has to occur for new teachers in regards to Infinite Campus. Co-teaching training was reported to be beneficial, but most of the teachers reported not having the opportunity to collaborate with another teacher and therefore did not get to use the co-teaching strategies.