A.4.1.1.ADD Employer Satisfaction

Description

The two cycles of data represented below come from two different program evaluations of the building leadership program. The evaluations were conducted by a group of program candidates as part of TLL643 Program Development and Evaluation in 2015 and 2020. Using Kirkpatrick's model for evaluation, the class looked at the program through the lens of Kirkpatrick's four levels: Reaction, Learning, Application, and Outcomes.

Employer satisfaction fell under the "Application" heading as employers for program completers were contacted and asked to complete the IDOE RISE Principal rubric, which evaluated the principal on their levels of effectiveness on key skills. While the rubric was designed to gauge effectiveness, it also, by extension, serves as an indication of employer satisfaction with the skills of the principal. An employer would be unlikely to rate a principal as Highly Effective if they were unsatisfied with the principal's preparation in that area.

In cycle 1, only one employer fully completed the rubric, and in cycle 2, none of the employers who were contacted completed the rubric. The employers were contacted via email initially and then sent two reminders a week apart. This may be due to the timing of the program evaluation, which was during at time in the spring semester when many districts are focused on standardized testing preparation and also around spring break.

RISE Indicator	Cycle 1 n = 1	Cycle 2 n = 0
Human Capital Management		
1.1.1 Hiring and retention	4	*
1.1.2 Evaluation of teachers	4	*
1.1.3 Professional Development	4	*
1.1.4 Leadership and Talent Development	4	*
1.1.5 Delegation	4	*
1.1.6 Strategic Assignment	4	*
1.1.7 Addressing teachers who are in need of improvement or ineffective	4	*
Instructional Leadership		
1.2.1 Mission and Vision	4	*
1.2.2 Classroom Observations	4	*
1.2.3 Teacher Collaboration	3	*
Leading Indicators of Student Learning		
1.3.1 Planning and Developing Student Learning Objectives	3	*
1.3.2 Rigorous Student Learning Objectives	4	*
1.3.3 Instructional Time	3	*
Personal Behavior		
2.1.1 Professionalism	4	*
2.1.2 Time Management	4	*
2.1.3 Using Feedback to Improve Student Performance	4	*
2.1.4 Initiative and Persistence	4	*
Building Relationships		
2.2.1 Culture of Urgency	3	*
2.2.2 Communication	3	*
2.2.3 Forging Consensus for Change and Improvement	3	*
Culture of Achievement		
2.3.1 High expectations	3	*
2.3.2 Academic Rigor	3	*
2.3.3 Data Usage in Teams	4	*

Analysis

- Overall, the effectiveness ratings of the completer were very good.
- Recognizing the small "n," opportunities for growth exist within 8 areas
- RISE standard 2.2, Building Relationships, had the lowest average score (3)
- RISE standard 1.1, Human Capital Management, had the highest average score (4)

Interpretation

With a single data point it is difficult to draw many conclusions regarding candidates in the ADV program, which in this case is the Master of Arts in Educational Leadership. Data does exist for candidates in the Building Level Leadership program from these two cycles; however, under CAEP definitions, those candidates in that program are not considered as part of an ADV program. Therefore, that data is not included. What the single data point does seem to indicate is the opportunity to work with candidates on their relationship building skills, although this completer was still rated as effective. This data would also suggest that the completer was prepared to handle the hiring and retention elements of the principal position.

Action

Programmatically, action wasn't taken related to curriculum or specific program changes; however, the response rates did indicate the need for a new method of gathering employer satisfaction data. The EPP, using the IDOE Teacher and Employer satisfaction surveys as a model, aligned the RISE rubric with a more abridged survey tool that is presently being reviewed by the IDOE for possible use by all EPPs. The new surveys (one for employers - A.4.1.ADD and one for completers – A.4.2.ADD) are more streamlined, use terminology and a format that mirrors the state teacher surveys, and aligns with the indicators from the RISE rubric but use a satisfaction with preparation scale. So while the previous employer satisfaction data doesn't provide specific curricular direction, it has helped direct the efforts of a more effective process.