The following document presents data and findings associated with Quinnipiac University School of Education (SOE) Employer and Milestones Surveys for both MAT and EDL.

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. Those open-ended prompt responses that have been coded at this time are shared below.

A representative sample of completer employers responded to the survey (Table 4.3.a.1). The proportion of respondents in urban districts (28%) 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 (see Table 4.3.a.2.). Overall, Employers rated 75% of completers as *Proficient* or *Exemplary* across all 4 domains, apart from 2 items where the proportion fell to 65%. Going forward, we will share these findings, including needs for SEL, classroom management, and assessment practices support, into our continuous improvement cycle.

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 MAT completers' Milestones or from our EDL Completers' Employers during the 2020-2021 academic year. We are currently engaged in collecting data for the 2021-2022 academic year and look forward to updating this document by Fall 2022.

Milestones Survey – MAT

The Completer Milestones survey was designed using CAEP guidelines for employment milestones including promotion and retention. We asked completers from 2014-2018 graduating cohorts to provide information on employment and career milestones achieved (Table 4.3.c.1.a). Survey respondents (n = 103; 28.9% response rate) are approximately representative of MAT completers and represent a variety of district settings. Some 59% 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 5% of respondents indicated they left teaching, far less than 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 (75.7%), additional certification (67.0%), providing professional development (43.7%; many on technology), and attending (45.6%) or presenting at (7.8%) conferences, completers' dedication to the profession and ongoing development in enhancing their practice is evident.

Employer Survey - EDL

To assess satisfaction of EDL employers, an Employer Survey was sent to EDL candidates' direct supervisors. The survey was partially aligned to the latest Educational Leadership Constituent Council

¹ https://portal.ct.gov/-/media/SDE/Talent Office/ctequityplan.pdf?la=en

² 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.

(ELCC) Standards and four domains of the Connecticut Leader Evaluation and Support (CLES) Rubric: Instructional Leadership, Talent Management, Organizational Systems and Culture & Climate. Respondents were asked to rate completers abilities as Below Standard (1), Developing (2), Proficient/Effective (3), or Exemplary/Highly Effective (4) for each item. The percent of completers within a cohort who were rated at a given level for a given item, are presented in turn.

Going forward we plan to review items within this survey to create a survey that is aligned with National Educational Leadership Preparation (NELP) Standards. 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. Overall, we find that employers are satisfied with EDL candidates' preparation and we have identified targets areas where the SOE can work to provide additional support during preparation.

Trends and External Benchmarks

In the absence of publicly available state data, and 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 and rated 80% of EDL completers as *Proficient* or *Exemplary* across all 4 domains of the EDL survey. These trends were quite stable year-to-year regardless of cohort.

Additionally, within the MAT Milestones Survey, some 59% 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 5% 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.

Measure 3: Data Table Guide

Employer Survey - MAT

Background Information on Employer Respondents (Table 4.3.a.1)p. 3
Alpha Reliability of Employer Survey (Table 4.3.2.1)p. 3
Ratings on Items Related to Learner and Learning (Table 4.3.a.3)p. 4
Percent of Employer Ratings in Each Performance Level on Items Related to the Learner and Learning (Table 4.3.a.4)p. 5
Ratings on Items Related to Content Knowledge (Table 4.3.a.5)p. 6
Percent of Employer Ratings in Each Performance Level on Items Related to Content Knowledge (Table 4.3.a.6)p. (

³ https://portal.ct.gov/-/media/SDE/Talent Office/ctequityplan.pdf?la=en

⁴ 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.

	Ratings on Items Related to Instructional Practice (Table 4.3.a.7)p. 7
	Percent of Employer Ratings in Each Performance Level on Items Related to Instructional Practice (Table 4.3.a.8)p. 8
	Ratings on Items Related to Professional Responsibilities (Table 4.3.a.9)p. 9
	Percent of Employer Ratings in Each Performance Level on Items Related to Instructional Practice (Table 4.3.a.10)p. 10
	Patterns of Responses to Prompt 1 (Table 4.3.a.11)p. 11
	Patterns of Responses to Prompt 2 (Table 4.3.a.12)p. 12
Milest	Demographics of Milestones Survey Respondents (Table 4.3.c.1.a)p. 13 Reasons provided for leaving district of initial hire (Table 4.3.c.1.b)p. 13 Milestones Achieved by Quinnipiac SOE Completers (Table 4.3.c.2)p. 14
Emplo	yer Survey - EDL
	Domain I: Instructional Leadership (Table BQ)

Employer Survey - MAT

Table 4.3.a.1. Background Information on Employer Respondents

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

Table 4.3.a.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

Table 4.3.a.3. Employer Ratings on Items Related to Learner and Learning

The teacher understand how learners grow and develop.	Employers of 2017 Completers (n = 12) Mean (SD) 3.25	Employers of 2018 Completers (n = 18) Mean (SD)	Employers of 2019 Completers (n = 15) Mean (SD)	Employers of 2020 Completers (n=10) Mean (SD)
2. The teacher recognizes that patterns of learning and development vary individually and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional and physical areas.	(.75)	(.64)	(.63)	(0.63)
	3.33	3.11	3.47	3.30
	(.65)	(.68)	(.52)	(0.67)
3. The teacher designs and implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences for learners.	3.33	3.06	3.20	3.30
	(.78)	(.64)	(.56)	(0.67)
4. The teacher uses the understanding of individual differences to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards	3.25	3.17	3.33	3.40
	(.87)	(.71)	(.62)	(0.84)
5. The teacher uses understanding of diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards	3.00	3.17	3.29	3.30
	(1.13)	(.62)	(.61)	(0.67)
6. The teacher works with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning.	3.33	3.33	3.53	3.10
	(.89)	(.59)	(.64)	(0.99)
7. The teacher works with others to create environments that encourage positive social interaction.	3.58	3.33	3.53	3.10
	(.52)	(.59)	(.64)	(0.99)
8. The teacher works with others to create environments that encourage active engagement in learning.	3.25	3.39	3.60	3.40
	(.62)	(.61)	(.63)	(0.70)
9. The teacher works with others to create environments that encourage self-motivation.	3.17	3.17	3.21	3.20
	(.72)	(.62)	(.80)	(0.79)
Overall mean rating across learner and learning Items	3.27	3.21	3.35	3.26
	(.69)	(.53)	(.56)	(0.76)

Table 4.3.a.4 Percent of Employer Ratings in Each Performance Level on Items Related to the Learner and Learning

	Cohort Year	N	Below Standard (1)	Developing (2)	Proficient (3)	Exemplary (4)
1. The teacher understands how	2017	12	0	16.7	41.7	41.7
learners grow and develop.	2018	18	0	16.7	61.1	22.2
realitions give in all and verep.	2019	15	0	6.7	46.7	46.7
	2020	10	0	10.0	60.0	30.0
	Total	55	0.0	12.8	52.7	34.6
2. The teacher recognizes that	2017	12	0	8.3	50.0	41.7
patterns of learning and development	2018	18	0	16.7	55.6	27.8
vary individually and across the	2019	15	0	0	53.3	46.7
cognitive, linguistic, social,	2020	10	0	10.0	50.0	40.0
emotional and physical areas.	Total	55	0.0	9.1	52.7	38.2
3. The teacher designs and	2017	12	0	16.7	33.3	50.0
implements developmentally	2018	18	0	16.7	61.1	22.2
appropriate and challenging learning	2019	15	0	6.7	66.7	26.7
experiences for learners.	2020	10	0	10.0	50.0	40.0
1	Total	55	0.0	12.8	54.5	32.7
4. The teacher uses the	2017	12	0	25.0	25.0	50.0
understanding of individual	2018	18	0	16.7	50.0	33.3
differences to ensure inclusive	2019	15	0	6.7	53.3	40.0
learning environments that enable	2020	10	0	20.0	20.0	60.0
each learner to meet high standards	Total	55	0.0	16.4	40.0	43.6
5. The teacher uses understanding of	2017	12	8.3	33.3	8.3	50.0
diverse cultures and communities to	2018	18	0	11.1	61.1	27.8
ensure inclusive learning	2019	14	0	7.1	57.1	35.7
environments that enable each	2020	10	0	10.0	50.0	40.0
learner to meet high standards	Total	54	1.8	14.8	46.3	37.0
6. The teacher works with others to	2017	12	8.3	0	41.7	50.0
create environments that support	2018	18	0	5.6	55.6	38.9
individual and collaborative	2019	15	0	6.7	33.3	60.0
learning.	2020	10	10.0	10.0	40.0	40.0
	Total	55	3.6	5.5	43.6	47.3
7. The teacher works with others to	2017	12	0	0	41.7	58.3
create environments that encourage	2018	18	0	5.6	55.6	38.9
positive social interaction.	2019	15	0	6.7	33.3	60.0
	2020	10	10.0	10.0	40.0	40.0
	Total	55	1.8	5.5	43.6	49.1
8. The teacher works with others to	2017	12	0	8.3	58.3	33.3
create environments that encourage	2018	18	0	5.6	50.0	44.4
active engagement in learning.	2019	15	0	6.7	26.7	66.7
	2020	10	0	10.0	40.0	50.0
	Total	55	0.0	7.3	43.6	49.1
9. The teacher works with others to	2017	12	0	16.7	50	33.3
create environments that encourage	2018	18	0	11.1	61.1	27.8
self-motivation.	2019	14	0	21.4	35.7	42.9
	2020	10	0	20.0	40.0	40.0
	Total	54	0.0	16.7	48.1	35.2

Table 4.3.a.5. Employer Ratings on Items Related to Content Knowledge

	Employers	Employers	Employers	Employers
	of 2017	of 2018	of 2019	of 2020
	Completers	Completers	Completers	Completers
	(n = 12)	(n = 18)	(n = 15)	(n=10)
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)
10. The teacher understands the central concept, tools of	3.00	2.94	3.33	3.20
inquiry and the structures of the discipline(s) he or she	(.78)	(.54)	(.62)	(0.63)
teaches.				
11. The teacher creates learning experiences that make	3.09	2.94	3.27	2.90
aspects of the discipline accessible and meaningful for	(1.04)	(.64)	(.80)	(0.74)
learners to assure mastery of the content.				
12. The teacher uses differing perspectives to engage	3.00	3.00	3.27	2.80
learners in critical thinking.	(1.10)	(.59)	(.59)	(0.92)
13. The teacher engages learners in collaborative problem	3.09	2.83	3.20	2.80
solving related to authentic local and global issues.	(.70)	(.71)	(.56)	(0.79)
14. The teacher understands how to connect concepts	3.00	2.83	3.27	3.00
within the content area and with other discipline areas.	(.89)	(.71)	(.59)	(0.67)
Overall mean rating across content knowledge items	3.04	2.89	3.25	2.94
	(.85)	(.59)	(.57)	(0.75)

Table 4.3.a.6 Percent of Employer Ratings in Each Performance Level on Items Related to Content Knowledge

	Cohort Year	N	Below Standard	Developing (2)	Proficient (3)	Exemplary (4)
	1 Cui		(1)	(2)	(3)	(1)
10. The teacher understands the	2017	11	0	27.3	45.5	27.3
central concept, tools of inquiry	2018	18	0	16.7	72.2	11.1
and the structures of the	2019	15	0	6.7	53.3	40.0
discipline(s) he or she teaches.	2020	10	0	10.0	60.0	30.0
	Total	54	0.0	14.8	59.3	25.9
11. The teacher creates learning	2017	11	9.1	18.2	27.3	45.5
experiences that make aspects of	2018	18	0	22.2	61.1	16.7
the discipline accessible and	2019	15	6.7	0	53.3	40.0
meaningful for learners to assure	2020	10	0	30.0	50.0	20.0
mastery of the content.	Total	54	3.7	16.7	50.0	29.7
12. The teacher uses differing	2017	11	9.1	27.3	18.2	45.5
perspectives to engage learners in	2018	18	0	16.7	66.7	16.7
critical thinking.	2019	15	0	6.7	60.0	33.3
	2020	10	0	20.0	60.0	20.0
	Total	54	1.9	16.7	53.7	27.8
13. The teacher engages learners in	2017	11	0	18.2	54.5	27.3
collaborative problem solving	2018	18	5.6	16.7	66.7	11.1
related to authentic local and	2019	15	0	6.7	66.7	26.7
global issues.	2020	10	10.0	20.0	50.0	20.0
	Total	54	3.7	14.8	61.1	20.4
14. The teacher understands how to	2017	11	0	36.4	27.3	36.4
connect concepts within the	2018	18	5.6	16.7	66.7	11.1
content area and with other	2019	15	0	6.7	60.0	33.3
discipline areas.	2020	10	0	40.0	40.0	20.0
	Total	54	1.9	22.3	51.9	24.1

Table 4.3.a.7. Employer Ratings on Items Related to Instructional Practice

	Employers	Employers	Employers	Employers
	of 2017	of 2018	of 2019	of 2020
	Completers	Completers	Completers	Completers
	(n = 12)	(n = 18)	(n = 15)	(n=10)
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)
15. The teacher understands and uses multiple methods	2.82	2.94	3.29	3.10
of assessment to engage learners in their own growth.	(.75)	(.73)	(.73)	(0.74)
16. The teacher understands and uses multiple methods	2.91	3.00	3.21	2.80
of assessment to monitor learner progress.	(.94)	(.77)	(.70)	(0.79)
17. The teacher understands and uses multiple methods	3.17	2.89	3.21	2.70
of assessment to guide his/her decision making.	(1.03)	(.68)	(.89)	(0.82)
18. The teacher understands and uses multiple methods	2.83	2.67	3.00	2.80
of assessment to guide the learners' decision making.	(.94)	(.77)	(.93)	(0.82)
19. The teacher plans instruction that supports every	3.17	3.06	3.27	3.10
student in meeting rigorous learning goals.	(.84)	(.73)	(.70)	(0.74)
20. The teacher plans instruction that draws upon	3.00	2.94	3.00	2.90
knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-	(.95)	(.64)	(.70)	(0.74)
disciplinary skills and pedagogy.				
21. The teacher plans instruction that draws upon the	3.17	2.94	3.27	3.00
knowledge of learners and the context of the	(.84)	(.54)	(.59)	(0.82)
community.				
22. The teacher understands and uses a variety of	3.17	2.78	3.27	3.30
instructional strategies to encourage learners to	(.94)	(.81)	(.59)	(0.82)
develop deep understanding of content areas and their				
connections.				
23. The teacher encourages learners to build skills and	3.17	3.00	3.33	3.20
apply knowledge in meaningful and authentic ways.	(.94)	(.84)	(.72)	(0.79)
Overall mean rating across instructional practice items	2.98	2.91	3.23	2.98
1-400000	(.81)	(.60)	(.68)	(0.78)

Table 4.3.a.8 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	2017	11	9.1	9.1	72.7	9.1
multiple methods of assessment to	2018	18	0	27.8	50.0	22.2
engage learners in their own growth.	2019	14	0	14.3	42.9	42.9
	2020	10	0	20.0	50.0	30.0
	Total	53	1.9	18.9	52.8	26.4
16. The teacher understands and uses	2017	11	9.1	18.2	45.5	27.3
multiple methods of assessment to	2018	18	0	27.8	44.4	27.8
monitor learner progress.	2019	14	0	14.3	50.0	35.7
	2020	10	0	40.0	40.0	20.0
	Total	53	1.9	24.5	45.3	28.3
17. The teacher understands and uses	2017	12	8.3	16.7	25.0	50.0
multiple methods of assessment to	2018	18	0	27.8	55.6	16.7
guide his/her decision making.	2019	14	7.1	7.1	42.9	42.9
	2020	10	0	50.0	30.0	20.0
	Total	54	3.7	24.1	40.8	31.5
18. The teacher understands and uses	2017	12	8.3	25.0	41.7	25.0
multiple methods of assessment to	2018	18	11.1	16.7	66.7	5.6
guide the learners' decision making.	2019	15	6.7	20.0	40.0	33.3
	2020	10	0	50.0	30.0	20.0
	Total	55	7.3	25.5	47.3	20.0
19. The teacher plans instruction that	2017	12	0	25	33.3	41.7
supports every student in meeting	2018	18	0	22.2	50.0	27.8
rigorous learning goals.	2019	15	0	13.3	46.7	40.0
	2020	10	0	20.0	50.0	30.0
	Total	55	0.0	20.0	45.5	34.6
20. The teacher plans instruction that	2017	12	8.3	16.7	41.7	33.3
draws upon knowledge of content	2018	18	0	22.2	61.1	16.7
areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary	2019	15	0	20.0	53.3	26.7
skills and pedagogy.	2020	10	0	30.0	50.0	20.0
	Total	55	1.8	21.8	52.7	23.6
21. The teacher plans instruction that	2017	12	0	25.0	33.3	41.7
draws upon the knowledge of	2018	18	0	16.7	72.2	11.1
learners and the context of the	2019	15	0	6.7	60.0	33.3
community.	2020	10	0	30.0	40.0	30.0
	Total	55	0.0	18.2	54.5	27.3
22. The teacher understands and uses	2017	12	8.3	8.3	41.7	41.7
a variety of instructional strategies to	2018	18	5.6	27.8	50.0	16.7
encourage learners to develop deep	2019	15	0	6.7	60.0	33.3
understanding of content areas and	2020	10	0	20.0	30.0	50.0
their connections.	Total	55	3.6	16.4	47.3	32.7
23. The teacher encourages learners	2017	12	8.3	8.3	41.7	41.7
to build skills and apply knowledge	2018	18	5.6	16.7	50.0	27.8
in meaningful and authentic ways.	2019	15	0	13.3	40.0	46.7
	2020	10	0	20.0	40.0	40.0
	Total	55	3.6	14.5	43.6	38.2

Table 4.3.a.9. Employer Ratings on Items Related to Professional Responsibility

	Employers	Employers	Employers	Employers
	of 2017	of 2018	of 2019	of 2020
	Completers	Completers	Completers	Completers
	(n = 12)	(n = 18)	(n = 15)	(n = 10)
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)
24. The teacher engages in ongoing professional	3.25	3.24	3.43	3.20
learning and uses that learning to continually evaluate	(.62)	(.56)	(.65)	(0.92)
and adjust his/her practice.				
25. The teacher seeks opportunities to engage in	3.33	3.33	3.60	3.20
professional growth to improve teaching and learning.	(.65)	(.69)	(.63)	(0.92)
26. The teacher examines his/her practice and adjusts	3.17	3.06	3.47	3.30
that practice to meet the needs of each learner.	(1.03)	(.54)	(.83)	(0.95)
27. The teacher collaborates with learners, families,	3.42	3.28	3.47	3.20
colleagues, other school professionals and community	(.67)	(.67)	(.64)	(0.92)
members to improve instructional practice.	, í	, ,		
28. The teacher is reflective and evaluates the effects	3.42	3.18	3.33	3.20
of his/her choices and actions on others (learners,	(.79)	(.64)	(.82)	(0.92)
families, other professionals, and the community).	,	,	,	,
29. The teacher collaborates with learners, families,	3.17	3.28	3.27	3.20
colleagues, other school professionals and community	(.84)	(.58)	(.80)	(0.92)
members to advance the teaching profession.	()	()	,	,
30. The teacher seeks appropriate leadership roles in	2.83	2.89	2.93	3.10
the school and community.	(1.19)	(.68)	(.88)	(0.88)
31. The teacher demonstrates leadership by modeling	3.64	3.41	3.47	3.10
ethical behavior.	(.67)	(.71)	(.64)	(0.99)
Overall mean rating across professional responsibility	3.34	3.19	3.37	3.19
items	(.69)	(.52)	(.69)	(0.93)

Table 4.3.a.10. Percent of Employer Ratings in Each Performance Level on Items Related to Professional Responsibility

	Cohort Year	N	Below Standard	Developing (2)	Proficient (3)	Exemplary (4)
24 Th 4 1	2017	10	(1)	0.2	50.2	22.2
24. The teacher engages in ongoing	2017	12	0	8.3	58.3	33.3
professional learning and uses that	2018	17	0	5.9	64.7	29.4
learning to continually evaluate and adjust his/her practice.	2019	14	0	7.1	42.9	50.0
adjust his/her practice.	2020	10	10.0	0	50.0	40.0
25 771	Total	53	1.9	5.6	54.7	37.7
25. The teacher seeks opportunities	2017	12	0	8.3	50.0	41.7
to engage in professional growth to	2018	18	0	11.1	44.4	44.4
improve teaching and learning.	2019	15	0	6.7	26.7	66.7
	2020	10	10.0	0	50.0	40.0
	Total	55	1.8	7.3	41.8	49.1
26. The teacher examines his/her	2017	12	8.3	16.7	25.0	50.0
practice and adjusts that practice to	2018	18	0	11.1	72.2	16.7
meet the needs of each learner.	2019	15	6.7	0	33.3	60.0
	2020	10	10.0	0	40.0	50.0
	Total	55	5.5	7.3	45.4	41.8
27. The teacher collaborates with	2017	12	0	8.3	41.7	50.0
learners, families, colleagues, other	2018	18	0	11.1	50.0	38.9
school professionals and community	2019	15	0	6.7	40.0	53.3
members to improve instructional	2020	10	10.0	0	50.0	40.0
practice.	Total	55	1.8	7.3	45.5	45.4
28. The teacher is reflective and	2017	12	0	16.7	25.0	58.3
evaluates the effects of his/her	2018	17	0	11.8	58.8	29.4
choices and actions on others	2019	15	6.7	0	46.7	46.7
(learners, families, other	2020	10	10.0	0	50.0	40.0
professionals, and the community).	Total	54	3.7	7.4	46.3	42.6
29. The teacher collaborates with	2017	12	0	25.0	33.4	41.7
learners, families, colleagues, other	2018	18	0	5.6	61.1	33.3
school professionals and community	2019	15	6.7	0	53.3	40.0
members to advance the teaching	2020	10	10.0	0	50.0	40.0
profession.	Total	55	3.6	7.3	50.9	38.2
30. The teacher seeks appropriate	2017	12	0	25.0	33.3	33.3
leadership roles in the school and	2018	18	0	27.8	55.6	16.7
community.	2019	15	6.7	20.0	46.7	26.7
	2020	10	0	30.0	30.0	40.0
	Total	55	1.8	25.5	43.7	27.3
31. The teacher demonstrates	2017	11	0	9.1	18.2	72.7
leadership by modeling ethical	2018	17	0	11.8	35.3	52.9
behavior.	2019	15	0	6.7	40.0	53.3
	2020	10	10.0	10.0	40.0	40.0
	Total	53	1.9	9.5	34.0	54.7

10

Table 4.3.a.11. Patterns of Responses to Prompt 1 From Employers of 2017-2020 Completers

Comment about positive aspect of	Percent of	Percent of	Percent of	Percent of
completers' preparedness	Responses of	Responses of	Responses of	Responses of
	Principals of	Principals of	Principals of	Principals of
	2017	2018	2019	<mark>2020</mark>
	Completers	Completers	Completers	Completers
	(n = 9)	(n = 16)	(n = 15)	(n = 10)
Planning effective lesson plans	11.1%	6.3%	0%	10%
Differentiation	11.1%	6.3%	6.7%	30%
Assessment	0%	25%	0%	20%
Content	0%	6.3%	6.7%	10%
Implementing engaging and effective	11.1%	12.5%	20%	10%
instruction				
Interacting successfully with parents	11.1%	6.3%	6.7%	0%
Connecting with children	11.1%	0%	6.7%	10%
Reflecting on and working to improve	11.1%	6.3%	20%	0%
their own practice				
Open to/seeks feedback	11.1%	0%	6.7%	10%
Carefully developing curriculum	11.1%	6.3%	6.7%	0%
Collaboration with colleagues	11.1%	12.5%	13.3%	20%
Effective implementation of Responsive	0%	12.5%		10%
classroom				
Interviewing well	11.1%	0%	0%	0%
Professionalism	0%	0%	6.7%	10%
Commitment to/passion for teaching.	0%	6.3%	20%	20%

Table 4.3.a.12. Patterns of Responses to Prompt 2 From Principals of 2017, 2018, and 2019 Completers

Table 4.3.a.12. Patterns of Responses to Prompt 2 From Principals of 2017, 2018, and 2019 Completers									
	Percent of	Percent of	Percent of	Percent of					
	Responses of	Responses of	Responses of	Responses					
	Principals of	Principals of	Principals of	of Principals					
	2017 Completers	2018	2019	of 2020					
	(n = 9)	Completers	Completers	Completers					
		(n = 16)	(n = 15)	(n = 10)					
Behavior/classroom management	22.2%	12.5%	13.3%	20%					
Interacting with challenging parents	11.1%	6.3%	6.6%	0%					
Trauma informed practice/knowledge	0%	25%	0%	0%					
of challenging student backgrounds									
How to address high needs/sped	0%	12.5%	6.6%	0%					
students with classroom management,									
instructional supports, and									
socioemotional learning									
Content knowledge	22%	0%	0%	0%					
Balance of structure and freedom	0%	12.5%	0%	0%					
Confidence	0%	12.5%	0%	0%					
Performance-based assessments to	0%	6.3%	6.6%	10%					
drive ongoing instruction and guided									
groups									
Cultural competency	11.1%	6.3%	0%	0%					
Anxiety around/avoidance of feedback	0%	6.3%	6.6%	10%					
from administrators/department leaders									
and collaboration with colleagues									
Time management	0%	6.3%	6.6%	10%					
Instructional practice	0%	6.3%	0%	0%					
Organization	0%	6.3%	0%	0%					
Data analysis and usage	11.1%	0%	0%	0%					
Need for basic school before more	0%	0%	6.6%	0%					
complex skills									
More instruction on teaching reading	0%	0%	6.6%	0%					
skills									
Professional development	0%	0%	6.6%	0%					
Being an effective team member	11.1%	0%	0%	0%					

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 are currently engaged in collecting data for the 2021-2022 academic year and look forward to updating this document by Fall 2022.

Table 4.3.c.1.a Demographics of Milestones Survey Respondents

Demographic	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	Average
Characteristic	(n = 33)	(n = 37)	(n = 14)	(n = 15)	(n = 4)	Across
						Years
Program at Quinnipiac						
5-Year Elementary	54.5%	43.2%	50%	26.7%	75%	46.6%
5-Year Secondary	30.3%	35.1%	35.7%	20%	25%	31.1%
5-Semester Elementary	9.1%	13.5%	7.1%	33.3%	0%	13.6%
5-Semester Secondary	6.1%	8.1%	7.1%	20%	0%	8.1%
School District Type						
Rural	15.2%	8.1%	7.1%	0%	0%	8.7%
Suburban	39.4%	48.6%	50%	53.3%	75%	47.6%
Urban	42.4%	35.1%	42.9%	33.3%	25%	37.9%
Not Provided	3%	8.1%	0%	13.3%	0%	5.8%
Employed in Title I or High	-Needs School	ol				
Yes	51.5%	32.4%	35.7%	60%	50%	40.8%
No	48.5%	62.2%	57.1%	40%	50%	56.3%
Don't Know	0%	5.4%	7.1%	0%	0%	2.9%
Employed in Same District	as Initial Hire				_	
Yes	63.6%	54.1%	71.4%	53.3%	50%	59.2%
No	36.4%	45.9%	28.6%	46.7%	50%	40.8%

4.3.c.1.b Reasons provided for leaving district of initial hire

If not employed in same district of initial hire, reasons for leaving $(n = 41)$	
Moved $(n = 10)$	24.4%
Budget cuts/low enrollment $(n = 6)$	14.6%
Moved from public to private/charter schools or opposite $(n = 5)$	12.2%
Moved to a permanent/full-time position $(n = 5)$	12.2%
Miscellaneous $(n = 4)$	9.8%
Dissatisfaction with district $(n = 3)$	7.3%
No longer teaching $(n = 2)$	4.9%
Went into special education $(n = 2)$	4.9%
Higher salary $(n = 2)$	4.9%
Changed to have a shorter commute $(n = 2)$	4.9%

Table 4.3.c.2. Career Milestones Achieved by Quinnipiac SOE Completers

Milestone	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	Average
	(n = 33)	(n = 37)	(n = 14)	(n = 15)	(n = 4)	2014-18
Certification Beyond Initial	75.8%	75.7%	64.3%	40%	25%	67.0%
Certification						
Completed Administrative	9.1%	2.7%	7.1%	0%	0%	4.9%
Director Coursework						
Assumed Leadership Roles in	87.9%	73%	85.7%	53.3%	50%	75.7%
School/District						
Presented at Conference(s)	12.1%	8.1%	0%	6.7%	0%	7.8%
Provided Professional	54.5%	40.5%	35.7%	40%	25%	43.7%
Development						
Earned Honors Related to	21.2%	5.4%	0%	0%	25%	9.7%
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 = 103)	
Yes $(n = 47)$	45.6%
No $(n = 43)$	41.7%
No response/NA $(n = 13)$	12.6%
Provided professional development within school or district (n = 103)	12.070
Yes $(n = 45)$	43.7%
No (n = 58)	56.3%
Topic if provided professional development within school or district (n =	20.370
45)	
Technology (n = 17)	37.8%
Literacy	271070
Math	
Restorative practice	
Earned honors/awards related to teaching (n = 103)	
Yes (n = 9)	8.7%
No $(n = 94)$	91.3%
Nature of honors/awards, if earned $(n = 9)$	
Teacher/Rookie of the year in school (n = 4)	44.4%
Excellence in teaching in school $(n = 2)$	22.2%
Teacher of the month $(n = 1)$	11.1%
Grant recipient (n = 1)	11.1%
Perfect attendance $(n = 1)$	11.1%

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 from our EDL completers' Enployers during the 2020-2021 academic year. We are currently engaged in collecting data for the 2021-2022 academic year and look forward to updating this document by Fall 2022.

Employer Survey – EDL

Table BQ. EDL Candidates' Employer Survey Domain I: Instructional Leadership

To what extent is the graduate able to:	Cohort Year	N	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient or Effective	Exemplary or Highly Effective
	2017	7	0.0	0.0	57.1	42.9
use a variety of instructional practices based	2018	10	0.0	0.0	10.0	90.0
upon principles of effective teaching?	Total	17	0.0	0.0	29.4	70.6
	2017	7	0.0	0.0	71.4	28.6
provide an instructional program that is	2018	10	0.0	0.0	60.0	40.0
responsive to the needs of diverse students?	Total	17	0.0	0.0	64.7	35.3
	2017	7	0.0	14.3	28.6	57.1
use technology to enhance the teaching and	2018	10	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
learning process?	Total	17	0.0	5.9	11.8	82.4
	2017	7	0.0	0.0	28.6	71.4
manage and engage students in meaningful	2018	10	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
learning activities?	Total	17	0.0	0.0	11.8	88.2
assess student learning and plan instruction	2017	7	0.0	0.0	71.4	28.6
based on students' strengths and	2018	10	0.0	0.0	20.0	80.0
weaknesses?	Total	17	0.0	0.0	41.2	58.8
involve students in self-assessment of their	2017	7	0.0	14.3	57.1	28.6
	2018	10	0.0	0.0	40.0	60.0
own progress?	Total	17	0.0	5.9	47.1	47.1
	2017	7	0.0	0.0	71.4	28.6
develop performance-based assessments?	2018	10	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
. 792	Total	17	0.0	0.0	29.4	70.6
facilitate the learning of students with annuich	2017	7	0.0	0.0	71.4	28.6
facilitate the learning of students with special needs?	2018	10	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
needsr	Total	17	0.0	0.0	58.8	41.2
facilitate the learning of CUI (Facility	2017	7	0.0	14.3	57.1	28.6
facilitate the learning of ELL (English	2018	10	10.0	0.0	50.0	40.0
Language Learners)?	Total	17	5.9	5.9	52.9	35.3
work with and communicate with	2017	7	0.0	14.3	28.6	57.1
	2018	10	0.0	0.0	10.0	90.0
parents/guardians/caregivers?	Total	17	0.0	5.9	17.6	76.5
use data to assess and improve at udant	2017	7	0.0	0.0	42.9	57.1
use data to assess and improve student	2018	10	0.0	0.0	30.0	70.0
learning?	Total	17	0.0	5.9	17.6	76.5

15

Table BR. EDL Candidates' Employer Survey Domain II: Talent Manager

100 (100)	Cohort			Once or	Three or	Five or Six	Seven or
	Year	N	Never	Twice a	Four Times a	Times a	More Times
To what extent is the graduate:	Teal			Year	Year	Year	a Year
able to observe other teachers in your school or other	2017	6	0.0	0.0	33.3	33.3	33.3
schools?	2018	8	12.5	0.0	37.5	12.5	37.5
	Total	14	7.1	0.0	35.7	21.4	35.7
engaging in some form of action research, individually or	2017	6	0.0	16.7	50.0	16.7	16.7
in collaboration with other teachers or leaders in your	2018	8	0.0	12.5	50.0	25.0	12.5
school, or in collaboration with staff in other schools?	Total	14	0.0	14.3	50.0	21.4	14.3
able to collaborate with teachers or leaders on issues of	2017	6	0.0	0.0	16.7	33.3	50.0
curriculum and /or instruction?	2018	8	0.0	0.0	12.5	12.5	75.0
curriculum and /or instructions	Total	14	0.0	0.0	14.3	21.4	64.3
participating in professional development opportunities,	2017	6	0.0	0.0	33.3	33.3	33.3
both those required by your school/district as well as	2018	8	0.0	0.0	25.0	37.5	37.5
those the graduate sought out to attend voluntarily?	Total	14	0.0	0.0	28.6	35.7	35.7

Table BS. EDL Candidates' Employer Survey Domain III: Organizational Systems

Table B3. EDE Candidates Employer Survey Domain III: Organizational Systems								
	Cohort		Below		Proficient	Exemplary		
	Year	N	Standard	Developing	or	or Highly		
To what level is the graduate is able to:					Effective	Effective		
work collaboratively with others to develop, articulate,	2017	6	0.0	16.7	0.0	83.3		
implement and steward a shared vision of learning for your	2018	8	0.0	0.0	25.0	75.0		
school?	Total	14	0.0	7.1	14.3	78.6		
collect and analyze data to identity school goals, assess	2017	6	0.0	0.0	66.7	33.3		
organizational effectiveness, and implement plans to achieve	2018	8	0.0	0.0	25.0	75.0		
school goals?	Total	14	0.0	0.0	42.9	57.1		
	2017	6	0.0	0.0	66.7	33.3		
promote continual and sustainable school improvement?	2018	8	0.0	0.0	37.5	62.5		
	Total	14	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0		
	2017	6	0.0	16.7	66.7	16.7		
evaluate school progress and revise school plans supported by	2018	8	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0		
stakeholders?	Total	14	0.0	7.1	57.1	35.7		
sustain a school culture and instructional program conducive to	2017	6	0.0	0.0	83.3	16.7		
student learning through collaboration, trust, and a personalized	2018	8	0.0	0.0	25.0	75.0		
learning environment with high expectations for all students?	Total	14	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0		
	2017	6	0.0	0.0	66.7	33.3		
create and evaluate a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent	2018	8	0.0	0.0	37.5	62.5		
curricular and instructional school program?	Total	14	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0		
The second control of	2017	6	0.0	33.3	50.0	16.7		
develop and supervise the instructional and leadership capacity	2018	8	0.0	0.0	62.5	37.5		
of school staff?	Total	14	0.0	14.3	57.1	28.6		
	2017	6	0.0	0.0	66.7	33.3		
promote the most effective and appropriate technologies to	2018	8	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0		
support teaching and learning in a school environment?	Total	14	0.0	0.0	28.6	71.4		
	2017	6	0.0	50.0	33.3	16.7		
monitor and evaluate school management and operational	2018	8	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0		
systems?	Total	14	0.0	21.4	42.9	35.7		
	2017	6	16.7	33.3	33.3	16.7		
efficiently use human, fiscal, and technological resources to manage	2018	8	0.0	0.0	37.5	62.5		
school operations?	Total	14	7.1	14.3	35.7	42.9		
	TOTAL	14	7.1	14.3	33.7	42.3		

Table BT. EDL Candidates' Employer Survey Domain IV: Culture and Climate

To what extent is the graduate able to:	Cohort Year	N	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient or Effective	Exemplary or Highly Effective
	2017	5	0	20.0	60.0	20.0
develop school capacity for distributed leadership?	2018	8	0	0.0	37.5	62.5
ALACTIC P. M. S.	Total	13	0	7.7	46.2	46.2
	2017	5	0	0.0	60.0	40.0
ensure teacher and organizational time focusing on supporting high quality core instruction and student learning?		8	0	0.0	12.5	87.5
		13	0	0.0	30.8	69.2
collaborate with faculty and community members by collecting	2017	5	0	0.0	80.0	20.0
and analyzing information pertinent to the improvement of the	2018	8	0	0.0	25.0	75.0
school's educational environment?	Total	13	0	0.0	46.2	53.8
mobilize community resources by promoting an understanding,	2017	5	0	0.0	80.0	20.0
appreciation, and use of diverse cultural, social, and intellectual	2018	8	0	0.0	25.0	75.0
resources within the school community?	Total	13	0	0.0	46.2	53.8
respond to community interests and needs by building and	2017	5	0	0.0	80.0	20.0
sustaining positive school relationships with families and	2018	8	0	0.0	25.0	75.0
caregivers?	Total	13	0	0.0	46.2	53.8
respond to community interests and needs by building and	2017	5	0	0.0	80.0	20.0
sustaining productive school relationships with community partners?	2018	8	0	0.0	37.5	62.5
	Total	13	0	0.0	53.8	46.2
	2017	5	0	0.0	80.0	20.0
act with integrity and fairness to ensure a school system of accountability for every student's academic and social success?	2018	8	0	0.0	12.5	87.5
	Total	13	0	0.0	38.5	61.5
model principles of self-awareness, reflective practice,	2017	2	0	0.0	50.0	50.0
transparency, and ethical behavior as related to your role	2018	4	0	0.0	0.0	100.0
within the school/district?	Total	6	0	0.0	16.7	83.3
The state of the s	2017	5	0	0.0	60.0	40.0
safeguard the value and beliefs of democracy, equity, and	2018	8	0	0.0	0.0	100.0
diversity within the school?	Total	13	0	0.0	23.1	76.9
	2017	5	0	0.0	60.0	40.0
evaluate the potential moral and legal consequences of	2018	8	0	0.0	50.0	50.0
decision making in the school?	Total	13	0	0.0	53.8	46.2
	2017	5	0	0.0	60.0	40.0
promote social justice within the school to ensure that	2018	8	0	0.0	12.5	87.5
ndividual student needs inform all aspects of schooling?	Total	13	0	0.0	30.8	69.2
11 PRP 0 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1	2017	5	0	0.0	60.0	40.0
advocate for school students, families and caregivers?	2018	8	0	0.0	0.0	100.0
	Total	13	0	0.0	23.1	76.9
officers level district states and extremely desired.	2017	5	0	20.0	40.0	40.0
nfluence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting	2018	8	0	0.0	50.0	50.0
student learning in a school environment?	Total	13	0	7.7	46.2	46.2
	2017	5	0	20.0	60.0	20.0
anticipate and assess emerging trends and initiatives in order to	2018	8	0	0.0	62.5	37.5
dapt school-based leadership strategies?	Total	13	0	7.7	61.5	30.8