The North Carolina
Recent Graduate Survey Report
2012-13

North Carolina A&T State University

Education Policy Initiative at Carolina

May 2014

Contents

Introduction

This report presents two assessments of the degree to which teacher preparation programs at North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University (NCA&T) equip their graduates to meet the challenges that they encounter during their first year of teaching in North Carolina public schools. One assessment, the North Carolina Recent Graduate Survey[1], is by the programs' graduates themselves. The second assessment, teacher evaluation ratings based on North Carolina Professional Teaching Standards 1-5, is by the principals of the schools where first year teachers taught. Both assessments are based on the graduates' experience as first year teachers in NC public schools during the 2012-13 school year.

These two types of assessments are intended to complement other results from an ongoing program of Teacher Quality Research commissioned by the UNC General Administration and conducted by the Education Policy Initiative at Carolina (EPIC), which is based in the Department of Public Policy at UNC-Chapel Hill. The fundamental purpose of the present report is consistent with the central purpose of our whole program of teacher quality research: to provide UNC teacher preparation programs with solid, research-based evidence to guide ongoing program improvement. The graduates' own and their principals' assessments of first year teachers' preparedness to handle the challenges of serving as teacher of record provide evidence on the relative strengths and weaknesses of first year teachers, and allow for comparisons between UNC-prepared and other first year teachers who taught in North Carolina public schools during the 2012-13 school year.

As background for the survey and teacher evaluation results we present later in this report, we first offer a brief account of the origins and evolution of the present study.

In 2011-12, the UNC Deans' Council commissioned the EPIC to survey recent graduates of their teacher preparation programs to learn how well the programs had prepared the graduates to meet the challenges they had encountered as first year teachers in NC public schools. To complement these survey responses, the UNC Deans' Council also asked us to include (1) survey items about support for continued learning provided by NC public schools (school context) and (2) assessments of graduates' performance by their school principal (teacher evaluation ratings). In spring 2012, we administered the first iteration of the Recent Graduate Survey and provided each UNC teacher preparation program a campus-specific report. In spring 2013 we administered the second iteration of the Recent Graduate Survey and provide those results in the present report. The survey is structured tightly around the five standards established by the NC Professional Teaching Standards Commission that frame the protocol mandated for use in the North Carolina Educator Evaluation System:

- Teachers demonstrate leadership
- Teachers establish a respectful environment for a diverse population of students
- Teachers know the content they teach
- Teachers facilitate learning for their students
- Teachers reflect on their practice

---

[1] The survey sent to first year teachers in the spring of 2011-12 and 2012-13, and referred to as the Recent Graduate Survey throughout this report, was distributed as The New Teacher Preparation Survey – see appendix for a copy of the survey instrument.

For this 2012-13 report we have made three important changes. First, instead of simply providing average (mean) survey results for North Carolina Professional Teaching Standards 1-5, we now include a detailed analysis of each survey item for Standards 1-5. This means that UNC teacher preparation programs can know how their graduates were rated on a particular standard, overall, as well as on specific indicators of that standard. The goal of these fine-grained results is to further aid teacher preparation program improvement. Second, for the 2011-12 Recent Graduate Survey reports, we only attributed a survey respondent to NCA&T if she was a traditionally prepared undergraduate of NCA&T; however, the current report attributes a survey respondent to NCA&T if she was traditionally prepared at NCA&T at either the undergraduate or graduate degree level. This allows us to provide a more comprehensive assessment of teacher preparation program performance. Finally, in the 2011-12 Recent Graduate Survey report, we indicated statistically significant mean differences (for survey responses, teacher evaluation ratings, or measures of school context) at a p-value below 0.05. Given the small sample size of survey respondents and the purpose of this work—to provide teacher preparation programs with evidence to guide improvement—we now mark statistically significant mean differences at p-values below 0.10 and 0.05. We hope this allows teacher preparation programs to better discern areas of strength or in need of improvement.

In the following sections we first provide greater detail on the survey of recent graduates and on the instrument that principals use to evaluate teachers. Next, we provide response rate information for each UNC institution, for all UNC institutions combined, and for all other (non-UNC) sources. After the survey response rates, we present survey and teacher evaluation results comparing graduates of NCA&T with those of all other UNC institutions combined and all non-UNC sources (e.g. teachers from North Carolina private colleges and universities, out-of-state, and alternative entry programs). Please note, in this report we present teacher evaluation results for the sample of first year teachers who *also* responded to the Recent Graduate Survey. Future work by the EPIC will examine teacher evaluation ratings for the full population of early-career teachers.

Instruments and Methods

As previously indicated, we structured the Recent Graduate Survey around the standards developed by the NC Professional Teaching Standards Commission and adopted by the State Board of Education. The five standards are stated broadly, but the Commission's report presenting the standards elaborates on each with a set of more specific statements and supporting discussion. For example, for the standard Teachers Demonstrate Leadership, the Commission's report and supporting discussion breaks the general concern for leadership down into five specific areas:

- Teachers lead in their classrooms
- Teachers demonstrate leadership in their school
- Teachers lead the teaching profession
- Teachers advocate for schools and students
- Teachers demonstrate high ethical standards

The construction of the items in the Recent Graduate Survey was guided by the NC Professional Teaching Standards Commission's elaborating statements and discussion, but because survey

items must be concise and easily understood at a glance, the statements we offered summarized in a nutshell the statements and discussion in the Commission report. Each statement took the form of an assertion: "My teacher preparation program prepared me well to …." To respond to the statements, the Recent Graduate Survey offered first year teachers a five-point scale: strongly disagree, disagree, neither agree nor disagree, agree, or strongly agree. (A copy of the full survey, including the full branching structure designed to guide respondents, may be found in the Appendix.) To summarize the first year teachers' assessments of the degree to which their program prepared them to meet each standard (item), we treated the 5-point scale (disagree strongly to agree strongly) as a five-value interval scale and calculated the mean response on each standard (item) for respondents from each institution, for all other UNC-prepared first year teachers combined, and for all non-UNC first year teachers.

The NC Teacher Evaluation Process (http://www.ncpublicschools.org/docs/effectiveness-model/ncees/instruments/teach-eval-manual.pdf) is complex and prescribed in considerable detail with rubrics and subscales, but in essence, during the 2012-13 school year, it called upon principals to use observations, various kinds of artifacts (e.g., lesson plans, formative assessments), and other evidence to rate teachers on the five standards discussed above. The rating scale for Standards 1-5 included five levels:

- *Not Demonstrated*: Teacher did not demonstrate competence on or adequate growth toward achieving standard(s) of performance.
- *Developing*: Teacher demonstrated adequate growth toward achieving standards(s) during the period of performance, but did not demonstrate competence on standard(s) of performance.
- *Proficient*: Teacher demonstrated basic competence on standard(s) of performance.
- *Accomplished*: Teacher exceeded basic competence on standard(s) of performance most of the time.
- *Distinguished*: Teacher consistently and significantly exceeded basic competence on standard(s) of performance.

To summarize principals' evaluation ratings of teachers, we used a procedure similar to that used for the survey responses – treating the five levels of evaluation ratings as points on an interval scale running from 1 to 5 – and for all survey respondents we calculated the mean for first year teachers from each institution, for all other UNC-prepared first year teachers combined, and for all non-UNC first year teachers combined. We should stress, however, that one should not treat the first year teachers' own ratings of their preparation and their principals' rating of their performance as directly comparable. The first year teachers' responses indicated how strongly they agreed or disagreed with the statements concerning how well their programs prepared them to meet a particular standard, while the principals rated them on a quite different five point scale (from "not demonstrated" to "distinguished"). For example, a response of 3 on the survey ("Neither agree nor disagree") that the teacher preparation program prepared them well to meet a certain standard clearly does not equate to a principal rating of Proficient, also scored as a three for purposes of summarizing the responses. In general, however, we might expect the first year teachers' responses on the survey to correlate reasonably well with their principals' ratings – a point which we comment on below.

In addition to the recent graduates' ratings of how well their teacher preparation programs prepared them to teach and the evaluation ratings of their performance, the UNC deans also

asked us to inquire about the first year teachers' assessments of the context within which they were teaching. Did their schools provide environments that supported good teaching and further learning about how to teach? In this regard, we asked new teachers how strongly they disagreed or agreed with a series of statements about opportunities for collaboration with their peers, opportunities for professional development, school leadership, and parental involvement in their school. To summarize the school context data, we calculated means for each of the context measures—peer collaboration, professional development, school leadership, and parental involvement—and present results for first year teachers from each UNC institution, for all other UNC-prepared first year teachers combined, and for all non-UNC first year teachers combined.

Subsequent sections of this report present four types of data – response rates, survey responses, teacher evaluation ratings, and school context – in tabular formats, together with interpretive commentary.

Response Rates

For the 2012-13 Recent Graduate Survey, we employed a two-stage process to identify first year teachers in NC public schools. First, using September 2012 pay data from the NC Department of Public Instruction (NCDPI), we identified all teachers with either zero years of experience or a missing experience value.[2] Second, with the assistance of Dan Holloman, the President of Personnel Administrators of North Carolina (PANC), 62 of the 115 NC school districts verified our first year teacher lists by either adding beginning teachers hired after September or removing individuals who were no longer teaching in the district.

With this two-stage process, we emailed the Recent Graduate Survey to 6,799 teachers in April 2013. Of those teachers, 518 respondents indicated that they were not first year teachers (and did not complete the survey). Using the 2012-13 full-year salary data from the NCDPI, we identified an additional 657 non-respondents who were not first year teachers. Finally, we excluded the survey responses of 92 individuals who were first year teachers but had graduated from a UNC institution prior to 2009-10. After these restrictions, Table 1 shows that there were 5,532 eligible respondents and 2,101 respondents—an overall response rate of 37.98 percent. For the UNC system there were 2,184 eligible respondents and 741 respondents—a system response rate of 33.93 percent. Finally, first year teachers' response rates varied substantially from institution to institution within the UNC system, from a low of 23.81 percent to a high of 56.52 percent. The rate for NCA&T was 23.81 percent, below the average response rate for the UNC system.

---

[2] Approximately 2.6% of the teachers in the September pay data are missing an experience value. Because some of these teachers may be first year teachers, we included them in our initial sample specification. Later, we used a survey item and the 2012-13 full-year salary file to identify first year teachers.

Table 1: Response Rates for 2012-13 Recent Graduate Survey

Category	Respondents	Eligible Respondents	Response Rate
UNC Overall	741	2184	33.93%
ASU	122	367	33.24%
ECU	141	362	38.95%
ECSU	13	23	56.52%
FSU	17	39	43.59%
NCA&T	10	42	23.81%
NCCU	10	35	28.57%
NCSU	61	214	28.50%
UNCA	12	32	37.50%
UNCC	83	217	38.25%
UNCCH	26	91	28.57%
UNCG	99	290	34.14%
UNCP	26	83	31.33%
UNCW	48	182	26.37%
WCU	57	173	32.95%
WSSU	16	34	47.06%
All Non-UNC	1360	3348	40.62%
Overall	2101	5532	37.98%

Recent Graduate Survey and Teacher Ratings for NCA&T

Table 2 displays the results for NCA&T for both the survey of recent graduates and teachers' ratings on the North Carolina Educator Evaluation System. As Table 2 indicates, the NCA&T graduates' average (mean) responses concerning how well NCA&T programs prepared them for the challenges of teaching were significantly higher on Standard 1 (leadership), Standard 3 (content knowledge), Standard 4 (facilitating learning) and Standard 5 (reflecting on practice) than those of first year teachers from all other UNC programs and all non-UNC sources. The NCA&T graduates' responses addressing the items of Standard 2 (classroom environment) were not statistically different from those of first year teachers from all other UNC programs and all non-UNC sources.

Table 2: Recent Graduate Survey and Teacher Evaluation Results

Teacher Groups	Recent Graduate Survey Results					Teacher Evaluation Results				
	Standard One	Standard Two	Standard Three	Standard Four	Standard Five	Standard One	Standard Two	Standard Three	Standard Four	Standard Five
NCA&T	4.250 (0.565)	4.580 (0.545)	4.620 (0.457)	4.580 (0.476)	4.595 (0.386)	2.900 (0.316)	3.100 (0.316)	3.000 (0.000)	3.000 (0.000)	3.000 (0.000)
All Other UNC	**3.801*** (0.736)	4.337 (0.640)	**4.337†** (0.629)	**4.249†** (0.639)	**4.198*** (0.638)	**3.093†** (0.519)	3.167 (0.562)	**3.059*** (0.533)	**3.073*** (0.537)	**3.066*** (0.523)
All Non-UNC	**3.788*** (0.755)	4.399 (0.608)	**4.341†** (0.625)	**4.268†** (0.648)	**4.239*** (0.614)	3.035 (0.521)	3.099 (0.573)	2.992 (0.511)	2.996 (0.556)	**3.046*** (**0.530**)

*Note: This table presents mean recent graduate survey responses and evaluation ratings on the five North Carolina Professional Teaching Standards. The standard deviation is included in parentheses. †Indicates statistically significant differences (compared to NCA&T) at the 0.10 level. *Indicates statistically significant differences (compared to NCA&T) at the 0.05 level.*

Turning to the evaluation results, the average (mean) evaluation ratings for NCA&T graduates on Standard 1 (leadership), Standard 3 (content knowledge) and Standard 4 (facilitating learning) were significantly lower than those for all other UNC teacher preparation graduates combined. Furthermore, the average (mean) evaluation ratings for NCA&T graduates on Standard 5 (reflecting on practice) were significantly lower than those for all other UNC teacher preparation graduates combined and all non-UNC sources. NCA&T graduates' ratings were similar to those for first year teachers from all other UNC programs for Standard 2 and similar to those for all non-UNC sources for the remaining four standards.

A new feature of this year's report is a detailed analysis of each item in the Professional Preparation section of the 2012-13 Recent Graduate Survey. As can be seen in Tables 3 through 7, each item in the survey was crafted to address one of the five North Carolina Educator Evaluation Standards. Below each of these tables is an explanation of any statistically significant results.

Table 3: Standard 1 (Teachers Demonstrate Leadership)

Standard 1: Leadership	NCA&T	All Other UNC	All Non-UNC
Lead in my classroom by establishing a safe and orderly environment for my students	4.800 (0.424)	**4.362*** (0.822)	**4.374*** (0.804)
Play an active leadership role in my school (e.g., participate in the school improvement team and lead professional development)	4.300 (0.675)	**3.637*** (0.980)	**3.590*** (1.015)
Play an active role in the profession (e.g., present at professional meetings and serve on regional or statewide advisory committees)	3.800 (1.229)	3.529 (1.030)	3.437 (1.083)
Advocate for policies and practices to improve education for students	4.100 (0.738)	3.705 (0.948)	3.752 (0.937)

*Note: This table presents mean recent graduate survey responses for Standard 1 survey items. The standard deviation is included in parentheses. †Indicates statistically significant differences (compared to NCA&T) at the 0.10 level. *Indicates statistically significant differences (compared to NCA&T) at the 0.05 level.*

As can be seen in Table 3, the NCA&T graduates' average (mean) responses concerning whether their preparation program prepared them well to lead in their classroom by establishing a safe and orderly environment for their students were significantly higher than those of all other UNC prepared teachers and all non-UNC institutions' graduates. Furthermore, the NCA&T graduates' average (mean) responses concerning whether their preparation program prepared them well to play an active leadership role in their school were significantly higher than those of all other UNC and all non-UNC prepared teachers. For the remaining Standard 1 items, there were not statistically significant differences between the responses of NCA&T graduates and those of all other UNC prepared teachers or all non-UNC prepared teachers.

Table 4: Standard 2 (Teachers Establish a Respectful Environment)

Standard 2: Classroom Environment	NCA&T	All Other UNC	All Non-UNC
Develop lessons that counteract stereotypes and incorporate histories and contributions of all cultures	4.700 (0.483)	**4.145*** (0.821)	**4.200*** (0.800)
Establish a rapport with my students	4.500 (0.707)	4.513 (0.691)	4.574 (0.678)
Treat my students as individuals by appreciating differences and valuing contributions	4.700 (0.483)	4.560 (0.683)	4.619 (0.650)
Develop teaching strategies for my students with learning disabilities	4.500 (0.707)	4.111 (0.938)	4.194 (0.868)
Collaborate with colleagues, administrators, and families to understand and support student learning	4.500 (0.707)	4.356 (0.810)	4.409 (0.742)

Note: This table presents mean recent graduate survey responses for Standard 2 survey items. The standard deviation is included in parentheses. [†]Indicates statistically significant differences (compared to NCA&T) at the 0.10 level. *Indicates statistically significant differences (compared to NCA&T) at the 0.05 level.

As can be seen in Table 4, the NCA&T graduates' average (mean) responses concerning whether their program prepared them well to develop lessons that counteract stereotypes and incorporate histories and contributions of all cultures were significantly higher than those of all other UNC prepared teachers and all non-UNC institutions' graduates. While this item has a statistically significant result, it does not affect the statistical significance of Standard 2 overall, as can be seen in Table 2. For the remaining Standard 2 items, there were not statistically significant differences between the responses of NCA&T graduates and those of all other UNC prepared teachers or all non-UNC prepared teachers.

Table 5: Standard 3 (Teachers Know the Content They Teach)

Standard 3: Content Knowledge	NCA&T	All Other UNC	All Non-UNC
Align my teaching with the North Carolina Standard Course of Study and/or Common Core Standards	4.800 (0.422)	**4.498**[†] (0.720)	**4.415*** (0.808)
Understand the core concepts of my subject and/or grade level	4.700 (0.483)	**4.382**[†] (0.773)	**4.405**[†] (0.735)
Plan interdisciplinary lessons	4.400 (0.699)	4.103 (0.852)	4.100 (0.866)
Plan relevant and meaningful lessons	4.600 (0.699)	4.390 (0.708)	4.408 (0.708)
Incorporate life skills into my teaching (e.g., responsibility and leadership)	4.600 (0.516)	4.313 (0.798)	4.377 (0.775)

Note: This table presents mean recent graduate survey responses for Standard 3 survey items. The standard deviation is included in parentheses. [†]Indicates statistically significant differences (compared to NCA&T) at the 0.10 level. *Indicates statistically significant differences (compared to NCA&T) at the 0.05 level.

As can be seen in Table 5, the NCA&T graduates' average (mean) responses concerning whether their preparation program prepared them well to align their teaching with the North Carolina Standard Course of Study and/or Common Core Standards were significantly higher than those of all other UNC prepared teachers and all non-UNC institutions' graduates. Furthermore, the NCA&T graduates' average (mean) responses concerning whether their preparation program prepared them well to understand the core concepts of their subject and/or grade level were significantly higher than those of all other UNC and all non-UNC prepared teachers. For the remaining Standard 3 items, there were not statistically significant differences between the responses of NCA&T graduates and those of all other UNC prepared teachers or all non-UNC prepared teachers.

Table 6: Standard 4 (Teachers Facilitate Learning for their Students)

Standard 4: Facilitating Learning	NCA&T	All Other UNC	All Non-UNC
Incorporate 21st Century content into my teaching (e.g., global awareness and financial literacy)	4.600 (0.516)	**4.205*** (0.785)	**4.195*** (0.860)
Understand the learning and development processes appropriate for my students	4.500 (0.527)	4.244 (0.723)	4.254 (0.738)
Help students work in teams to develop leadership qualities	4.500 (0.527)	4.256 (0.769)	4.254 (0.781)
Use technology in the classroom	4.700 (0.483)	**4.330*** (0.783)	**4.383**[†] (0.793)
Use technology to promote student inquiry and engagement	4.600 (0.699)	4.208 (0.843)	4.256 (0.854)

Note: This table presents mean recent graduate survey responses for Standard 4 survey items. The standard deviation is included in parentheses. [†]Indicates statistically significant differences (compared to NCA&T) at the 0.10 level. *Indicates statistically significant differences (compared to NCA&T at the 0.05 level).

As can be seen in Table 6, the NCA&T graduates' average (mean) responses concerning whether their preparation program prepared them well to incorporate 21st Century content into their teaching were significantly higher than those of all other UNC prepared teachers and all non-UNC institutions' graduates. Furthermore, the NCA&T graduates' average (mean) responses concerning whether their preparation program prepared them well to use technology in the classroom were significantly higher than those of all other UNC and all non-UNC prepared teachers. For the remaining Standard 4 items, there were not statistically significant differences between the responses of NCA&T graduates and those of all other UNC prepared teachers or all non-UNC prepared teachers.

Table 7: Standard 5 (Teachers Reflect on their Practice)

Standard 5: Reflecting on Practice	NCA&T	All Other UNC	All Non-UNC
Use a variety of methods to assess student learning	4.700 (0.483)	**4.265*** (0.733)	**4.276*** (0.722)
Use a variety of instructional strategies to foster student learning	4.700 (0.483)	**4.290*** (0.699)	**4.343*** (0.686)
Use student assessment and other data to guide decisions about my teaching	4.667 (0.500)	**4.225*** (0.797)	**4.260*** (0.767)
Adapt my teaching practices based on research	4.200 (0.632)	4.018 (0.808)	4.063 (0.819)
Seek resources to support my professional development (e.g. professional literature and workshops).	4.700 (0.483)	**4.192*** (0.817)	**4.251*** (0.762)

Note: This table presents mean recent graduate survey responses for Standard 5 survey items. The standard deviation is included in parentheses. †Indicates statistically significant differences (compared to NCA&T) at the 0.10 level. *Indicates statistically significant differences (compared to NCA&T) at the 0.05 level.

As can be seen in Table 7, the NCA&T graduates' average (mean) responses concerning whether their preparation program prepared them well to (1) use a variety of methods to assess student learning; (2) use a variety of instructional strategies to foster student learning; (3) use student assessment and other data to guide decisions about their teaching; and (4) seek resources to support professional development were significantly higher than those of all other UNC prepared teachers and all non-UNC institutions' graduates. For the remaining Standard 5 item, there were not statistically significant differences between the responses of NCA&T graduates and those of all other UNC prepared teachers or all non-UNC prepared teachers.

Before closing this section, we should note one surprising and substantively important finding concerning these assessments of first year teachers' preparedness: the correlations between teachers' evaluation ratings and their own ratings of how well their programs had prepared them were positive but strikingly low. By design, all correlation coefficients range between -1 and +1, with a negative 1 indicating that across all respondents, the highest possible values on one variable always go with the lowest possible values on the other, and a *positive 1* indicating that the highest possible value on one variable always go with the highest possible value on the other. As Table 8 reflects, all correlations for both UNC and non-UNC respondents fell below 0.2, conventionally viewed as a low positive correlation. In other words, new teachers' ratings of how well their programs had prepared them did not match or correspond to their evaluation ratings.

Table 8: Correlations Between Survey Responses and Principals' Ratings

	Standard 1	Standard 2	Standard 3	Standard 4	Standard 5
All Responses	0.129	0.068	0.065	0.091	0.061
All UNC Responses	0.091	0.077	0.084	0.103	0.069
All Non-UNC Responses	0.149	0.068	0.054	0.086	0.057

School Context

As indicated earlier, in addition to surveying first year teachers about their teacher preparation programs, we also asked them to respond to a series of items about four dimensions of the contexts in which they were teaching: peer collaboration, professional development, school leadership, and parental involvement. As Table 9 shows, on average, NCA&T graduates rated their schools higher than all other UNC prepared teachers and non-UNC prepared teachers on peer collaboration, professional development, and school leadership. In general, all new teachers rated their schools reasonably favorably on three of the four constructs (from just below 4 to better than 4.5 on a 5 point scale), but tended to rate them lower on parental involvement.

Table 9: Recent Graduate Survey School Context

	Peer Collaboration	Professional Development	School Leadership	Parental Involvement
NCA&T	4.560 (0.497)	4.450 (0.497)	4.900 (0.175)	2.867 (1.068)
All Other UNC	**3.960*** (0.767)	**3.889*** (0.710)	**4.487*** (0.613)	3.033 (1.040)
All Non-UNC	**3.945*** (0.806)	**3.895*** (0.716)	**4.481*** (0.608)	2.958 (1.028)

Note: This table presents mean recent graduate survey responses for Standard 5 survey items. The standard deviation is included in parentheses. [†]Indicates statistically significant differences (compared to NCA&T) at the 0.10 level. *Indicates statistically significant differences (compared to NCA&T) at the 0.05 level.

Conclusion

The fundamental purpose of the present report is to help NCA&T improve the quality of its teacher preparation program by providing data on its recent graduates' (1) perceptions of program performance and (2) NCPTS evaluation ratings. Specifically, we hope that NCA&T will use findings from this report, in conjunction with data from other sources (e.g. teacher value-added, program exit surveys), to identify program strengths and areas for improvement and institute evidence-based program reforms.

Overall, NCA&T graduates rated their preparation quality significantly higher than all other UNC and non-UNC sources on Standards 1, 3, 4, and 5. Looking within standards, NCA&T

graduates scored significantly higher on two Standard 1 items, one Standard 2 item, two Standard 3 items, two Standard 4 items, and four Standard 5 items. Turning to evaluation results, school principals rated NCA&T graduates significantly lower than all other UNC graduates on Standards 1, 3, 4, and 5 and significantly lower than all non-UNC sources on Standard 5. Finally, NCA&T graduates reported working in schools with higher levels of peer collaboration, professional development, and school leadership. For all these results, we caution that response rates to the 2012-13 Recent Graduate Survey were below 40 percent for many UNC institutions and the non-UNC category (see Table 1). Therefore, in future survey iterations, we will partner with the NC Department of Public Instruction to try and increase survey response.

Perhaps the most striking result from this study was our finding that first year teachers' responses to survey items about the degree to which their programs prepared them to take responsibility for a classroom of students did not correlate well with their principals' ratings of their performance. As we noted earlier, the two ratings use different scales, and a given numerical response to a survey item cannot be directly compared with the same numerical evaluation rating by a principal. Nonetheless, one might have expected that when new teachers agreed or agreed strongly with the statement that their preparation program prepared them well to meet a certain standard, the first year teacher's principal would tend to rate that teacher's performance more highly than she would rate a new teacher who did not agree that her preparation was good. Correlations in Table 8 indicate that this was the case to only a very slight degree. As potential explanations for this result, we note that there was little variation in principals' evaluation ratings of teachers and that teachers tended to rate their preparation programs highly. This may be because (1) the survey items do not allow for meaningful distinctions and/or (2) first year teachers are not good judges of how well their teacher education programs prepared them to teach. To address these concerns, we have partnered with an advisory committee comprised of NCDPI, UNCGA, and UNC campus representatives to design a new Recent Graduate Survey that we will administer in the 2013-14 academic year.

Teacher Preparation Survey 2012-13

The Teacher Preparation Survey Purpose

This survey is being conducted on behalf of teacher education programs across North Carolina by a team of researchers from Education Policy Initiative at Carolina in partnership with the University of North Carolina. The survey focuses on the views of first year teachers concerning their professional preparation and experiences as novice teachers. The purpose of this study is to gain a better understanding of how well-prepared teachers feel to meet their professional responsibilities during their first year on the job.   Your participation will help us formulate evidenced-based recommendations to improve the quality of both alternative entry and traditional teacher preparation programs across the state. We hope that you will take advantage of this opportunity to communicate your experience and views to those who create policies regarding teacher preparation in North Carolina.   Format The survey contains two sections. The first section focuses on professional preparation and the second focuses on your experiences at your current school. Estimated time of completion is 20 minutes. If you cannot complete the survey in one sitting, you will be able to return to a partially completed survey without having to start from the beginning by using the link provided in the e-mail. Privacy: All of the information provided in this survey will be reported only in summary form. Individual responses will not be shared. Thank you in advance for you time!

Please select the category that best describes your most recent preparation.   *UNC system schools are Appalachian State, East Carolina, Elizabeth City State, Fayetteville State, North Carolina A&T, North Carolina Central, North Carolina State, UNC-Asheville, UNC-Chapel Hill, UNC-Charlotte, UNC-Greensboro, UNC-Pembroke, UNC-Wilmington, Western Carolina, and Winston-Salem State.

○ UNC system college or university   *(listed above) (1)
○ Private college or university in North Carolina (2)
○ College or university outside of North Carolina (3)
○ Teach for America (4)
○ Alternative/Lateral Entry (5)

Section I: The following section focuses on your professional preparation.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
Lead in my classroom by establishing a safe and orderly environment for my students (1)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Play an active leadership role in my school (e.g., participate in the school improvement team and lead professional development) (2)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Play an active role in the profession (e.g., present at professional meetings and serve on regional or statewide advisory committees) (3)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Advocate for policies and practices to improve education for students (4)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
Develop lessons that counteract stereotypes and incorporate histories and contributions of all cultures (1)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Establish a rapport with my students (2)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Treat my students as individuals by appreciating differences and valuing contributions (3)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Develop teaching strategies for my students with learning disabilities (4)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Collaborate with colleagues, administrators, and families to understand and support student learning (5)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
Align my teaching with the North Carolina Standard Course of Study and/or Common Core Standards (1)	○	○	○	○	○
Understand the core concepts of my subject and/or grade level (2)	○	○	○	○	○
Plan interdisciplinary lessons (3)	○	○	○	○	○
Plan relevant and meaningful lessons (4)	○	○	○	○	○
Incorporate life skills into my teaching (e.g., responsibility and leadership) (5)	○	○	○	○	○

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
Incorporate 21st Century content into my teaching (e.g., global awareness and financial literacy) (1)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Understand the learning and development processes appropriate for my students (2)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Help students work in teams to develop leadership qualities (3)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Use technology in the classroom (4)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Use technology to promote student inquiry and engagement (5)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
Use a variety of methods to assess student learning (1)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Use a variety of instructional strategies to foster student learning (2)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Use student assessment and other data to guide decisions about my teaching (3)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Adapt my teaching practices based on research (4)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Seek resources to support my professional development (e.g., professional literature and workshops) (5)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

Click to write the question text:

Section II: The following section focuses on your experiences at your current school.

Select a response that best reflects your level of agreement.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
One or more members of my school leadership team (e.g., principal, AP, or curriculum coordinator) has observed my classroom instruction (1)	○	○	○	○	○
One or more members of my school leadership team has evaluated my classroom instruction (2)	○	○	○	○	○
One or more members of the school leadership team has given me useful feedback (3)	○	○	○	○	○

Select a response that best reflects your level of agreement.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
I receive ongoing guidance and/or feedback from another teacher and/or instructional specialist (1)	○	○	○	○	○
I am given flexibility in implementing curriculum in my classroom (2)	○	○	○	○	○

Select a response that best reflects your level of agreement.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
At my school, teachers collaborate on lesson content and/or instructional practices (1)	○	○	○	○	○
At my school, teachers observe one another teaching (2)	○	○	○	○	○
At my school, teachers provide useful feedback to one another (4)	○	○	○	○	○
At my school, teachers feel collectively responsible for student learning (3)	○	○	○	○	○

Select a response that best reflects your level of agreement.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
Most parents or guardians of my students attend parent-teacher conferences (1)	○	○	○	○	○
I feel supported by most of my students' parents or guardians (2)	○	○	○	○	○
At my school, most parents or guardians play an active role in the school (e.g., volunteer, attend PTA meetings) (3)	○	○	○	○	○

Select a response that best reflects your level of agreement.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
If I try really hard, I can get through to even the most difficult student (1)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I am good at helping all the students in my classes make significant improvement (2)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I am certain that I am making a difference in the lives of my students (3)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I can deal with almost any learning problem (4)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I can motivate students who have low interest in school work (5)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I can get students to believe they can do well in school work (6)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

If you had the opportunity to start over in a new career, I would still choose to become a teacher

- ❍ Strongly Disagree (1)
- ❍ Disagree (2)
- ❍ Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)
- ❍ Agree (4)
- ❍ Strongly Agree (5)

I am satisfied with my job as a teacher

○ Strongly Disagree (1)
○ Disagree (2)
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)
○ Agree (4)
○ Strongly Agree (5)

Since entering the teaching profession, have you participated in professional development?

○ Yes (1)
○ No (2)

If No Is Selected, Then Skip To End of Survey

I have participated in professional development that improved my...

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
Instructional skills (1)	○	○	○	○	○
Rapport with students (2)	○	○	○	○	○
Knowledge of my subject and/or grade (3)	○	○	○	○	○
Understanding of curricular standards (4)	○	○	○	○	○