The following document presents data and findings associated with Quinnipiac University School of Education (SOE) Employer and Milestones Surveys for both MAT (Initial) and EDL (Advanced) as well as Stakeholder Involvement, as evidenced through Advisory Board Meeting Minutes. *Due to challenges associated with school closures and distance learning during the COVID-19 Pandemic, it was not possible to collect data on our MAT completers' milestones at the end of the 2020-2021 academic year. We are pleased to report that we successfully collected these data for the 2021-2022 academic year and which are included in this 2021-2022 Annual Report.* 

#### **Employer Survey - MAT**

The MAT Employer Surveys is aligned to the **10 InTasc Standards** (considered to be the knowledge, skills, and dispositions expected of effective teachers) organized and presented by the four categories: Learner and Learning, Content Knowledge, Instructional Practice, Professional Responsibility. Employers were asked to report completers' ability as Below Standard (1), Developing (2), Proficient (3), or Exemplary (4) for each item. Cohort mean scores for each item, as well as the percent of completers within a cohort who were rated at a given level for a given item, are presented in turn. The surveys also include three open-ended prompts which have been coded and are shared below.

A representative sample of completer Employers responded to the survey (Table 2.1-2.8). The proportion of respondents in urban districts (29.6%) is similar to that of completers working in urban districts (36.7%) from 2017-2019. Analyses suggest good reliability on the overall scale as well as on each of the subscales (Table 2.2) Overall, Employers rated 70% of completers as *Proficient* or *Exemplary* across all 4 domains, apart from 1 item where the proportion fell to 68%. In 2021-2022 data, classroom management was no longer identified as an area where Employers identified completers would benefit from additional support. Instead, Employers highlighted that completers would benefit from development of skills around managing challenging interactions with parents, providing SEL support to students in trauma/high needs contexts, and ensuring completers are cognizant of their own SEL needs as they engage in teaching and learning in post-COVID 19 environments.

#### **Milestones Survey – MAT**

The Completer Milestones survey was designed using CAEP guidelines for employment milestones including promotion and retention. We asked completers from 2014-2019 graduating cohorts to provide information on employment and career milestones achieved (Table 2.9-2.11). Survey respondents (n = 166; 38.6% response rate) are approximately representative of MAT completers and represent a variety of district settings. Some 56% of respondents indicated they remain employed in the district as initial hire, consistent with the statewide 4-year teacher retention rate of 58.9% (mobility rate  $41.1\%^1$ ). Less than 9% of respondents indicated they left teaching, half the national 5-year teacher attrition rate  $(17\%)^2$ . Overall, we are pleased with the milestones our completers achieved during their first 5 years as teachers of record. Whether through leadership roles (73.5%), additional certification (69.3%), providing professional development (41.5%; many on technology or SEL), and attending (36.7%) or presenting at (28.3%) conferences, completers' dedication to the profession and ongoing development in enhancing their practice is evident.

#### **Employer Survey - EDL**

We are very pleased to share that in Fall 2022, the EPP hired a Director for our Educational Leadership program which has been without an official program director since Summer 2020 due to

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> <u>https://portal.ct.gov/-/media/SDE/Talent\_Office/ctequityplan.pdf?la=en</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Gray, L., and Taie, S. (2015). Public School Teacher Attrition and Mobility in the First Five Years: Results From the First Through Fifth Waves of the 2007–08 Beginning Teacher Longitudinal Study (NCES 2015-337). U.S. DOE Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch.

*Quinnipiac University SOE Measure 2. Satisfaction of Employers and Stakeholder Involvement* budget cuts. The EPP looks forward to working with the new director in support of our EDL candidates as well as around Assessment, Instruments, Surveys, and Continuous Improvement efforts. One remaining area of need in our EDL program is the development of an Employer survey. In Fall 2022, the EPP began collaborating with the new EDL program director around the development of such an instrument. At this time, we have reviewed a variety of instruments which were available online as shared by other EPPs. We are now developing our own EDL Employer survey, aligned with CAEP and NELP standards, that we plan to pilot in Fall 2023. We look forward to sharing progress and reporting data associated with this instrument in the 2022-23 Annual Report. Additionally, we will standardize timing of survey data collection, and conduct response rate, and reliability and validity analyses, as needed, on this survey to ensure it is a robust measure of employers' perceptions of EDL completer performance.

#### **Advisory Board Meeting Minutes**

EPP clinical partners include our Program Directors and faculty, our Curriculum and Assessment Review Committee (CARC), and the Advisory Board. The board, established in 2012, includes teachers and administrators from P-12 urban and suburban settings, recent completers, EPP faculty and administrators. The Board meets between three and four times per academic year to discuss and resolve issues such as candidate recruitment, admission, preparation, and outcomes. Such discussions often lead to changes in policy or procedures and, in this way, through the Advisory Board, the EPP's clinical partners share responsibility for improvement of candidate preparation and clinical experiences, including procedures, policies, assessments, and placements.

Our strong relationships with clinical partners foster shared responsibility for completer outcomes. From 2017 to 2022, more than 20% of MAT completers were hired within the 17 local districts with which we partner. Because of this, our clinical partners have a vested interest in supporting candidate preparation and improving completer outcomes. In turn, these robust community connections keep us in touch with the needs of the clinical partners and professionals in the field, which informs our approach to candidate preparation. Partners also participate in our career preparation workshops, resume/cover letter sessions, and mock interviews sessions, are run by clinical partners, including recent completers, all of whom work in local P-12 schools. The role of the Advisory Board, and topics discussed, is more fully evidenced in the Advisory Board Meeting Minute included below.

#### **Trends and External Benchmarks**

In the absence of publicly available state data, and due to the differences in metrics used to assess teaching effectiveness by regional SOEs, we are unable to make direct comparisons in employer satisfaction between our SOE and other regional SOEs. We can report that the surveys exceed the 20% CAEP minimum required response rates and overall employers rated 70% of MAT completers as *Proficient* or *Exemplary* across all 4 InTasc domains in the MAT Employer Survey. These trends were quite stable year-to-year regardless of cohort. Additionally, within the MAT Milestones Survey, some 56% of respondents indicated they remain employed in the district as initial hire, consistent with the statewide 4-year teacher retention rate of 58.9% (mobility rate  $41.1\%^3$ ). Finally, less than 8% of respondents indicated they left teaching, far less than national 5-year teacher attrition rate  $(17\%)^4$ , an important benchmark to highlight which suggests a high level both employer and completer satisfaction.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> <u>https://portal.ct.gov/-/media/SDE/Talent\_Office/ctequityplan.pdf?la=en</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Gray, L., and Taie, S. (2015). Public School Teacher Attrition and Mobility in the First Five Years: Results From the First Through Fifth Waves of the 2007–08 Beginning Teacher Longitudinal Study (NCES 2015-337). U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved May 22 2020 from http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch.

### Measure 2: Data Table Guide

Employer Survey - MAT
Table 2.1 Background Information on Employer Respondents
Table 2.2 Alpha Reliability of Employer Surveyp. 4
Table 2.3 Employer Ratings by Performance Level: Learner and Learningp. 5
Tale 2.4 Employer Ratings by Performance Level: Content Knowledgep. 6
Table 2.5 Employer Ratings by Performance Level: Instructional Practicep. 7
Table 2.6 Employer Ratings by Performance Level: Instructional Practicep. 8
Table 2.7 Patterns of Responses to Prompt 1p. 9
Table 2.8 Patterns of Responses to Prompt 2p. 10
Milestone Survey - MAT
Table 2.9 Demographics of Milestones Survey Respondents
Table 2.10 Reasons provided for leaving district of initial hirep. 11
Table 2.11 Milestones Achieved by MAT Completersp. 12
Employer Survey - EDL
Employer Survey Development Statementp. 13
Stakeholder Involvement
Advisory Board Meeting Agenda May 24, 2022p. 14
Advisory Board Meeting Agenda Jan 25, 2022 n. 15

Advisory Board Meeting Agenda May 24, 2022	
Advisory Board Meeting Agenda Jan 25, 2022	p. 15
Advisory Board Meeting Agenda Oct 05, 2021	•
Advisory Board Meeting Agenda May 13, 2021	p. 18

	Employers of				
	2017	2018	2019	2020	2022
	Completers	Completers	Completers	Completers	Completers
	(n = 14)	(n = 18)	(n = 15)	(n=10)	(n=7)
Response Rate	20.3	34.6%	28.3%	15.4%	11.7%
Role in School					
Principal	93%	100%	93%	90%	85.7%
Assistant Principal	7%	0%	7%	10%	14.3%
Type of School					
Elementary	71%	50%	67%	40%	85.7
Secondary	29%	50%	33%	20%	14.3%
Middle	-	-	-	20%	0%
K-8	-	-	-	20%	0%
Urbanicity					
Urban	14%	39%	27%	30%	42.9%
Suburban	79%	56%	66%	60%	57.1%
Rural	7%	6%	7%	10%	0%

# **Employer Survey - MAT**

### Table 2.2. Alpha Reliability of Employer Survey Subscale and Overall Scale (2017-2019 data)

	Number of Items	Cronbach's Alpha Reliability
The Learner and Learning Items	9	.95
Content Knowledge Items	5	.91
Instructional Practice Items	9	.96
Professional Responsibility Items	8	.93
All Items	31	.98

	Cohort Year	N	Below Standard	Developing (2)	Proficient (3)	Exemplary (4)
1. The teacher understands how	2018	18	<u>(1)</u> 0	16.7	61.1	22.2
	2018	18	0	6.7	46.7	46.7
learners grow and develop.	2019	10	0	10	60	<u> </u>
	2020	7	0	14.3	85.7	0
	Total	50	0.0	12.0	60.0	28.0
2. The teacher recognizes that	2018	18	0.0	12.0	55.6	28.0
2. The teacher recognizes that patterns of learning and development	2018	15	0	0	53.3	46.7
vary individually and across the	2019	10	0	10	50	40.7
cognitive, linguistic, social,	2020	7	0	14.3	85.7	<u> </u>
emotional and physical areas.	Total	50	0.0	14.5	58.0	32.0
	2018	18	0.0	16.7	61.1	22.2
3. The teacher designs and implements developmentally	2018	15	0	6.7	66.7	22.2
appropriate and challenging learning	2019	10	0	10	50	40
experiences for learners.	2020	7	0	28.8	71.4	<u> </u>
experiences for learners.	Total	50	0.0	14.1	62.0	24.0
4. The teacher uses the	2018	18	0.0	14.1	50	33.3
understanding of individual	2018	15	0	6.7	53.3	40
differences to ensure inclusive	2019	10	0	20	20	60
learning environments that enable	2020	7	0	28.8	57.1	14.3
each learner to meet high standards	Total	50	0.0	16.1	46.0	38.0
5. The teacher uses understanding of	2018	18	0.0	11.1	61.1	27.8
diverse cultures and communities to	2010	14	0	7.1	57.1	35.7
ensure inclusive learning	2017	10	0	10	50	40
environments that enable each	2020	7	0	14.3	71.4	14.3
learner to meet high standards	Total	49	0.0	10.2	59.2	30.6
6. The teacher works with others to	2018	18	0	5.6	55.6	38.9
create environments that support	2019	15	0	6.7	33.3	60
individual and collaborative	2020	10	10	10	40	40
learning.	2022	7	0	28.6	42.9	28.6
6	Total	50	2.0	10.0	44.0	44.0
7. The teacher works with others to	2018	18	0	5.6	55.6	38.9
create environments that encourage	2019	15	0	6.7	33.3	60
positive social interaction.	2020	10	10	10	40	40
1	2022	7	0	14.3	71.4	14.3
	Total	50	2.0	8.0	48.0	42.0
8. The teacher works with others to	2018	18	0	5.6	50	44.4
create environments that encourage	2019	15	0	6.7	26.7	66.7
active engagement in learning.	2020	10	0	10	40	50
	2022	7	0	14.3	85.7	0
	Total	50	0.0	8.0	46.0	46.0
9. The teacher works with others to	2018	18	0	11.1	61.1	27.8
create environments that encourage	2019	14	0	21.4	35.7	42.9
self-motivation.	2020	10	0	20	40	40
	2022	7	0	14.3	85.7	0
	Total	49	0.0	16.3	53.1	30.6

Table 2.3 Percent of Employer	Ratings by Performance Level: Items Relat	ed to Learner and Learning

	Cohort Year	N	Below Standard	Developing (2)	Proficient (3)	Exemplary (4)
			(1)			
10. The teacher understands the	2018	18	0	16.7	72.2	11.1
central concept, tools of inquiry	2019	15	0	6.7	53.3	40
and the structures of the	2020	10	0	10	60	30
discipline(s) he or she teaches.	2022	7	0	14.3	85.7	0
L (/	Total	50	0.0	12.0	66.0	22.0
11. The teacher creates learning	2018	18	0	22.2	61.1	16.7
experiences that make aspects of	2019	15	6.7	0	53.3	40
the discipline accessible and	2020	10	0	30	50	20
meaningful for learners to assure	2022	7	0	28.6	71.4	0
mastery of the content.	Total	50	2.0	18.0	58.0	22.0
12. The teacher uses differing	2018	18	0	16.7	66.7	16.7
perspectives to engage learners in	2019	15	0	6.7	60	33.3
critical thinking.	2020	10	0	20	60	20
2	2022	7	0	42.9	57.1	0
	Total	50	0.0	18.0	62.0	20.0
13. The teacher engages learners in	2018	18	5.6	16.7	66.7	11.1
collaborative problem solving	2019	15	0	6.7	66.7	26.7
related to authentic local and	2020	10	10	20	50	20
global issues.	2022	7	0	42.9	57.1	0
	Total	50	4.0	18.0	62.0	16.0
14. The teacher understands how to	2018	18	5.6	16.7	66.7	11.1
connect concepts within the	2019	15	0	6.7	60	33.3
content area and with other	2020	10	0	40	40	20
discipline areas.	2022	7	0	42.9	57.1	0
L.	Total	50	2.0	22.0	58.0	18.0

Table 2.4 Percent of Employer Ratings in Each Performance Level on Items Related to Content Knowledge

Table 2.5 Percent of Employer Ratings in Each Performance Level on Items Related to Instructional Practice

	Cohort Year	N	Below Standard (1)	Developing (2)	Proficient (3)	Exemplary (4)
15. The teacher understands and uses	2018	18	0	27.8	50	22.2
multiple methods of assessment to	2019	14	0	14.3	42.9	42.9
engage learners in their own growth.	2020	10	0	20	50	30
	2022	7	0	28.6	57.1	14.3
	Total	49	0.0	22.5	49.0	28.6
16. The teacher understands and uses	2018	18	0	27.8	44.4	27.8
multiple methods of assessment to	2019	14	0	14.3	50	35.7
monitor learner progress.	2020	10	0	40	40	20
	2022	7	0	28.6	57.1	14.3
	Total	49	0.0	26.5	46.9	26.5
17. The teacher understands and uses	2018	18	0	27.8	55.6	16.7
multiple methods of assessment to	2019	14	7.1	7.1	42.9	42.9
guide his/her decision making.	2020	10	0	50	30	20
	2022	7	0	28.6	57.1	14.3
	Total	49	2.0	26.5	47.0	24.5
18. The teacher understands and uses	2018	18	11.1	16.7	66.7	5.6
multiple methods of assessment to	2019	15	6.7	20	40	33.3
guide the learners' decision making.	2020	10	0	50	30	20
	2022	7	0	28.6	57.1	14.3
	Total	50	6.0	26.0	50.0	18.0
19. The teacher plans instruction that	2018	18	0	22.2	50	27.8
supports every student in meeting	2019	15	0	13.3	46.7	40
rigorous learning goals.	2020	10	0	20	50	30
	2022	7	0	42.9	57.1	0
	Total	50	0.0	22.0	50.0	28.0
20. The teacher plans instruction that	2018	18	0	22.2	61.1	16.7
draws upon knowledge of content	2019	15	0	20	53.3	26.7
areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary	2020	10	0	30	50	20
skills and pedagogy.	2022	7	0	42.9	57.1	0
	Total	50	0.0	26.0	56.0	18.0
21. The teacher plans instruction that	2018	18	0	16.7	72.2	11.1
draws upon the knowledge of	2019	15	0	6.7	60	33.3
learners and the context of the	2020	10	0	30	40	30
community.	2022	7	0	14.3	85.7	0
	Total	50	0.0	16.0	64.0	20.0
22. The teacher understands and uses	2018	18	5.6	27.8	50	16.7
a variety of instructional strategies to	2019	15	0	6.7	60	33.3
encourage learners to develop deep	2020	10	0	20	30	50
understanding of content areas and	2022	7	0	28.6	71.4	0
their connections.	Total	50	2.0	20.0	52.0	26.0
23. The teacher encourages learners	2018	18	5.6	16.7	50	27.8
to build skills and apply knowledge	2019	15	0	13.3	40	46.7
in meaningful and authentic ways.	2020	10	0	20	40	40
	2022	7	0	14.3	85.7	0
	Total	50	2.0	16.0	50.0	32.0

Table 2.6 Percent of Employer Ratings in Each Performance Level on Items Related to Professional Responsibility

	Cohort Year	N	Below Standard (1)	Developing (2)	Proficient (3)	Exemplary (4)
24. The teacher engages in ongoing	2018	17	0	5.9	64.7	29.4
professional learning and uses that	2019	14	0	7.1	42.9	50
learning to continually evaluate and	2020	10	10	0	50	40
adjust his/her practice.	2022	7	0	28.6	57.1	14.3
	Total	48	2.1	8.3	54.2	35.4
25. The teacher seeks opportunities	2018	18	0	11.1	44.4	44.4
to engage in professional growth to	2019	15	0	6.7	26.7	66.7
improve teaching and learning.	2020	10	10	0	50	40
	2022	7	0	28.6	42.9	28.6
	Total	50	2.0	10.0	40.0	48.0
26. The teacher examines his/her	2018	18	0	11.1	72.2	16.7
practice and adjusts that practice to	2019	15	6.7	0	33.3	60
meet the needs of each learner.	2020	10	10	0	40	50
	2022	7	0	28.6	42.9	28.6
	Total	50	4.0	8.0	50.0	38.0
27. The teacher collaborates with	2018	18	0	11.1	50	38.9
learners, families, colleagues, other	2019	15	0	6.7	40	53.3
school professionals and community	2020	10	10	0	50	40
members to improve instructional	2022	7	0	28.6	57.1	14.3
practice.	Total	50	2.0	10.0	48.0	40.0
28. The teacher is reflective and	2018	17	0	11.8	58.8	29.4
evaluates the effects of his/her	2019	15	6.7	0	46.7	46.7
choices and actions on others	2020	10	10	0	50	40
(learners, families, other	2022	7	0	14.3	71.4	14.3
professionals, and the community).	Total	49	4.1	6.1	55.1	34.7
29. The teacher collaborates with	2018	18	0	5.6	61.1	33.3
learners, families, colleagues, other	2019	15	6.7	0	53.3	40
school professionals and community	2020	10	10	0	50	40
members to advance the teaching	2022	7	0	28.6	57.1	14.3
profession.	Total	50	4.0	6.0	56.0	34.0
30. The teacher seeks appropriate	2018	18	0	27.8	55.6	16.7
leadership roles in the school and	2019	15	6.7	20	46.7	26.7
community.	2020	10	0	30	30	40
-	2022	7	0	42.9	42.9	14.3
	Total	50	2.0	28.0	46.0	24.0
31. The teacher demonstrates	2018	17	0	11.8	35.3	52.9
leadership by modeling ethical	2019	15	0	6.7	40	53.3
behavior.	2020	10	10	10	40	40
	2022	7	0	14.3	57.1	28.6
	Total	49	2.0	10.2	40.8	46.9

Comment about positive aspect of completers'	Percent of	Percent of	Percent of	Percent of
preparedness	Responses	Responses	Responses	Responses
	of	of	of	of
	Principals	Principals	Principals	Principals
	of 2018	of 2019	of 2020	of 2022
	Completers	Completers	Completers	Completers
	(n = 16)	(n = 15)	(n = 10)	(n = 7)
Planning effective lesson plans	6.3%	0%	10%	14.3%
Differentiation	6.3%	6.7%	30%	0%
Assessment	25%	0%	20%	0%
Content	6.3%	6.7%	10%	0%
Implementing engaging and effective instruction	12.5%	20%	10%	0%
Interacting successfully with parents	6.3%	6.7%	0%	0%
Connecting with students	0%	6.7%	10%	28.6%
Reflecting on and working to improve their own practice	6.3%	20%	0%	0%
Open to/seeks feedback	0%	6.7%	10%	14.3%
Carefully developing curriculum	6.3%	6.7%	0%	0%
Collaboration with colleagues	12.5%	13.3%	20%	42.9%
Effective implementation of Responsive classroom	12.5%		10%	0%
Interviewing well	0%	0%	0%	0%
Professionalism	0%	6.7%	10%	28.6%
Commitment to/passion for teaching.	6.3%	20%	20%	14.3%
Effective Social Emotional Skills	n/a	n/a	n/a	14.3%
Sets High Expectations	n/a	n/a	n/a	14.3%
Well Prepared for Teaching	n/a	n/a	n/a	42.9%

### *Quinnipiac University SOE Measure 2. Satisfaction of Employers and Stakeholder Involvement* Table 2.7. Patterns of Responses to Prompt 1 From Employers of 2018-2020, 2022 Completers

	Percent of	Percent of	Percent of	Percent of
	Responses	Responses	Responses	Responses
	of	of	of	of
	Principals	Principals	Principals	Principals
	of 2018	of 2019	of 2020	of 2020
	Completers	Completers	Completers	Completer
	(n = 16)	(n = 15)	(n = 10)	(n = 7)
Behavior/classroom management	12.5%	13.3%	20%	0%
Interacting with challenging parents	6.3%	6.6%	0%	14.3%
Trauma informed practice/knowledge of challenging student backgrounds	25%	0%	0%	0%
How to address high needs/sped students with classroom	12.5%	6.6%	0%	14.3%
management, instructional supports, and socioemotional learning	12.570	0.070	070	14.370
Content knowledge	0%	0%	0%	0%
Balance of structure and freedom	12.5%	0%	0%	0%
Confidence	12.5%	0%	0%	14.3%
Performance-based assessments to drive ongoing instruction and guided groups	6.3%	6.6%	10%	14.3%
Cultural competency	6.3%	0%	0%	0%
Anxiety around/avoidance of feedback from administrators/department leaders and collaboration with	6.3%	6.6%	10%	0%
colleagues				
Time management	6.3%	6.6%	10%	0%
Instructional practice	6.3%	0%	0%	14.3%
Organization	6.3%	0%	0%	0%
Data analysis and usage	0%	0%	0%	14.3%
Need for basic school before more complex skills	0%	6.6%	0%	0%
More instruction on teaching reading skills	0%	6.6%	0%	0%
Professional development	0%	6.6%	0%	14.3%
Being an effective team member	0%	0%	0%	14.3%
Maintaining personal well-being in face of wide range of school issues (SEL, mental health, safety)	n/a	n/a	n/a	28.6%

# *Quinnipiac University SOE Measure 2. Satisfaction of Employers and Stakeholder Involvement* Table 2.8. Patterns of Responses to Prompt 2 From Principals of 2017, 2018, and 2019 Completers

#### **Milestones Survey - MAT**

Due to challenges associated with school closures and distance learning during the COVID-19 Pandemic, despite our best efforts it was not possible to collect updated data on our Milestones during the 2020-2021 academic year. We did, however, successfully collect data for the 2021-2022 academic year (presented below).

Demographic	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Average
Characteristic	(n = 33)	(n = 37)	(n = 14)	(n =42)	(n = 25)	(n=15)	Across
							Years
Program Ar	ea at Quinn	ipiac					
4+1 Elementary	54.5%	43.2%	50%	28.6%	60.0%	53.3%	45.8%
4+1 Secondary	30.3%	35.1%	35.7%	26.2%	24.0%	13.3%	28.3%
GradMAT Elementary	9.1%	13.5%	7.1%	26.2%	8.0%	13.3%	14.5%
GradMAT Secondary	6.1%	8.1%	7.1%	19.0%	8.0%	20.0%	11.4%
School Dist	rict Type						
Rural	15.2%	8.1%	7.1%	7.1%	12.0%	6.7%	9.6%
Suburban	39.4%	48.6%	50%	47.6%	52.0%	53.3%	47.5%
Urban	42.4%	35.1%	42.9%	33.3%	28.0%	26.7%	34.9%
Not Provided	3%	8.1%	0%	11.9%	8.0%	20.0%	8.4%
Employed in	n Title I or	High-Needs	s School				
Yes	51.5%	32.4%	35.7%	47.6%	28.0%	26.7%	39.2%
No	48.5%	62.2%	57.1%	50.0%	68.0%	73.3%	57.8%
Don't Know	0%	5.4%	7.1%	2.4%	4.0%	0.0%	3.0%
Employed in	n Same Dis	trict as Initi	al Hire				
Yes	63.6%	54.1%	71.4%	47.6%	56.0%	53.3%	56.0%
No	36.4%	45.9%	28.6%	52.4%	44.0%	46.7%	44.0%

Table 2.9 Demographics of Milestones Survey Respondents\*

Table 2.10 Reasons provided for leaving district of initial hire

If not employed in same district of initial hire, reasons for leaving $(n = 70)$	
Moved $(n = 19)$	27.1%
Budget cuts/low enrollment $(n = 8)$	11.4%
Moved from public to private/charter schools or opposite $(n = 6)$	8.6%
Moved to a permanent/full-time position $(n = 8)$	11.4%
Miscellaneous $(n = 4)$	5.7%
Dissatisfaction with district $(n = 10)$	14.3%
No longer teaching $(n = 6)$	8.6%
Went into special education $(n = 2)$	2.9%
Higher salary $(n = 2)$	2.9%
Changed to have a shorter commute $(n = 5)$	7.1%

*Quinnipiac University SOE Measure 2. Satisfaction of Employers and Stakeholder Involvement* Table 2.11. Career Milestones Achieved by Quinnipiac SOE Completers

Milestone	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Average
	(n = 33)	(n = 37)	(n = 14)	(n =42)	(n = 25)	(n=15)	2014-18
Certification Beyond	75.8%	75.7%	64.3%	61.9%	76.0%	53.3%	69.3%
Initial Certification							
Completed Administrative	9.1%	2.7%	7.1%	11.9%	12.0%	6.7%	8.4%
Director Coursework							
Assumed Leadership	87.9%	73%	85.7%	66.7%	64.0%	66.7%	73.5%
Roles in School/District							
Presented at Conference(s)	12.1%	8.1%	0%	14.3%	4.0%	0.0%	28.3%
D	54 50/	40.50/	25 70/	40.50/	22.00/	40.00/	41 50/
Provided Professional	54.5%	40.5%	35.7%	40.5%	32.0%	40.0%	41.5%
Development			<b>22</b> (	4 6 - 0 (		< <b>-</b> 0 /	
Earned Honors Related to	21.2%	5.4%	0%	16.7%	16.0%	6.7%	12.6%
Teaching							

If taken on leadership roles, nature of the role $(n = 78)$		
Committee membership $(n = 49)$	63%	
Team leader		
Cooperating/mentor teacher		
Lead student organization/activity/club		
Instructional coach		

If presented at conference, type of conference $(n = 8)$	
Local (n = 2)	25%
State $(n = 5)$	62.5%
Regional/National (n =1)	12.5%

Attended local, regional, or national conference $(n = 166)$	
	26.70/
Yes (n = 61)	36.7%
No $(n = 92)$	55.4%
No response/NA ( $n = 13$ )	7.8%
Provided professional development within school or district ( $n = 166$ )	
Yes (n = 69)	41.6%
No $(n = 97)$	58.4%
Professional development topic provided within school or district ( $n = 68$ )	
Technology $(n = 25)$	36.8%
Literacy or Math	
Restorative practice	
SEL	
Classroom Management	
Earned honors/awards related to teaching $(n = 166)$	
Yes $(n = 23)$	13.9%
No $(n = 143)$	86.1%
Nature of honors/awards, if earned $(n = 19)$	
Teacher/Rookie of the year in school $(n = 5)$	26.3%
Excellence in teaching in school $(n = 7)$	36.8%
Teacher of the month $(n = 3)$	15.8%
Grant recipient $(n = 1)$	5.3%
Perfect attendance $(n = 1)$	5.3%

### **Employer Survey – EDL**

As noted above, we are currently engaged in developing an EDL Employer Survey in collaboration with the newly hired EDL Program Director and look forward to piloting the survey in Fall 2023. We anticipate having preliminary data available to share in the 2022-2023 Annual Report.

# ADVISORY BOARD MEETING AGENDA SEPTEMBER 28, 2022, 5 PM

- 1) Hamlet Hernandez, Interim Educational Leadership Program Director
- 2) Peter Gamwell event: October 26, 2022: "Thinker, Learner, Dreamer Doer: Innovative Pedagogies for Cultivation Every Student's Potential"
  - a) 5:00 to 6:00 Reception in Education Suite
  - b) 6:00 to 7:00 Introduction: Hamlet Hernandez; Peter Gamwell talk in Medical School Auditorium
- 3) Alumni Council
  - a) Newsletter
  - b) SOE Bobcat Social
  - c) Mentor Bank
  - d) Baby Bobcats
  - e) Alumni Highlights
- 4) Data Updates
  - a) CAEP 8 Annual Measures shift to 4 Annual Measures
  - b) CARC Report
  - c) Results from Milestones Survey and EDL & MAT Exit Surveys.
- 5) New SPED Programs Leading to Initial Certification
  - a) 4+1 (Elementary & Secondary)
  - b) GradMAT (Elementary & Secondary
- 6) REC
- 7) Educators Rising: Next Event: November 16, 2022

# **ADVISORY MEETING AGENDA: MAY 24, 2022**

# 4:30-5:30/6:00

- 1) Welcome and thanks for joining us! (Beth)
- 2) SOE Strategic Goal #1: To develop distinctive and distinguished new degree and certificate programs aligned with the mission of Quinnipiac University and the School of Education, while strengthening and improving current programs through data-driven analysis. (QU Goal #1)
  - a. SPED Initial Certification June 1 (Judy/Anne)
  - b. IDN 4+1 (Ruth/Anne)
  - c. Residency Educator Certificate (Anne)
  - d. CARC (Anna)
  - e. Recommendations/Feedback?
- 3) SOE Strategic Goal #2: To prepare School of Education graduates for success and distinction in the dynamic and ever-changing 21st century workplace. (QU Goal #1)
  - a. Alumni Council Update (Beth) connects to Goal 4
  - b. MAT Update (Christina)
  - c. MAT Mock Interviews (Beth)
  - d. EDL Career Seminars (Beth)
  - e. Recommendations/Feedback?
- 4) SOE Strategic Goal #3: To expand the visibility and outreach of the School of

Education within the Quinnipiac University community as well in the local,

regional, national and global communities. (QU Goal #3 & 4)

- a. Ed Rising April 27<sup>th</sup> (Anne)
- b. QUADS (Anna)
- c. Community Outreach Coordinator (Ed Rising, Community Colleges) (Judy P)
- d. Recommendations/Feedback?
- 5) SOE Strategic Goal #4: To build and continuously strengthen strategic partnerships with units and organizations within and beyond the Quinnipiac University community. (QU Goal # 3 & 4)

- a. Recommendations/Feedback Requested (Anne)
- 6) SOE Strategic Goal #5: To increase and diversify graduate enrollment and to diversify faculty and staff within the School of Education. (QU Goal #2)
  - a. EDL Updates: Admissions Numbers & Demographics (Beth)
  - b. Numbers in Other Programs (Anna)
  - c. Recommendations/Feedback Requested
- 7) SOE Strategic Goal #6: To continue to enhance the culture and climate of the School of Education based on the values of inclusion and compassion, putting students first, and promoting social justice as crucial to our culture and our mission. (QU Goals # 2, 3 & 4)
  - a. Recommendations/Feedback Requested (Anne)

# **ADVISORY MEETING AGENDA: JANUARY 25, 2022**

# 4:30-5:30/6:00



- 1) Welcome and thanks for joining us! (Beth)
- 2) Milestones Survey: Advisory Board Feedback (Anna & Beth)
- 3) Elementary Survey: Changes made to elementary (Anna & Beth)
  - a) Original
  - b) Jenna's revisions
  - c) Final revisions
- 4) Alumni Council: New (Beth)
  - a) First Meeting: February 7
- 5) EDL Program Updates (Anne)
- 6) Community Outreach Position: New (Anne & Judy)
  - a) Ed Rising
  - b) Residency
  - c) Community College
  - d) High School Liaison
- 7) MAT Update (Christina)
- 8) IDN 4 + 1 Program (New) (Anne)
- 9) MAT/BIO/Science outreach (Anne)

### ADVISORY BOARD MEETING AGENDA

### OCTOBER 5, 2021

#### 4:30 ZOOM MEETING

- 1) Introductions: New Members (Hamlet Hernandez, Monica Morales, Jenna Malkin)
- CAEP: Accreditation Council Review: October 23, 2021 (We respond to clarifying questions from the CAEP Panel.) (Beth)
- 3) Educational Leadership Update (Anne)
- 4) CARC (Curriculum Assessment & Review Committee) Meetings (Beth)
  - a. Tech Module CARC Meeting (Christina & Anna)
  - b. Research Rubric CARC Meeting (Beth & Anna)
  - c. Curriculum Unit Rubric CARC Meeting (Christina & Anna)
- 5) Student Learning Outcomes Survey for alumni from years 2016-2020 (Beth)
- 6) New Initiatives (Anne)
  - a) Cross endorsement in bilingual education
  - b) Degree based program in Social & Emotional Learning
  - c) Doctorate in SEL & Equity