**2b. Satisfaction of Employers/Graduates**

**The College of Education conducted a survey for Master of Education in Educational Leadership (MEDEL) and master’s in special education (MSPED) to have a real reflection on our graduates and our courses.**

# A. Advanced programs

**1. Master of Education in Educational Leadership (MEDEL) employer/ graduate**

Table 1: Master of Education in Educational Leadership (MEDEL) employer/ graduate satisfaction survey results

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Survey Item** | **Evaluator** | |
| **Graduate**  **Mean** | **Employer Mean** |
| 1. | Maintaining high standards for content knowledge in discipline areas. | 3.50 | 3.75 |
| 2. | The belief that all students can learn and have the ability to be successful in their academic endeavors. | 3.50 | 4.00 |
| 3. | Demonstrating respect for diversity. | 3.75 | 4.00 |
| 4. | Recognizing the importance of using diverse educational resources, including technology. | 4.00 | 3.50 |
| 5. | Engaging in critical reflection of theory and professional practice. | 3.75 | 3.75 |
| 6. | Using critical thinking to solve problems. | 4.00 | 3.75 |
| 7. | Demonstrating professional conduct that models ethical behavior and integrity. | 3.75 | 3.75 |
| 8. | Initiating and leading others in achieving goals, vision, and mission. | 3.50 | 4.00 |
|  | **Average** | 3.72 | 3.81 |

As shown in Table 1, the results for the Master of Education in Educational Leadership (MEDEL) program demonstrate a balanced evaluation from both graduates and employers. Here's an analysis of the survey findings:

* Overall, the program receives positive evaluations from both graduates and employers, with a mean score of 3.72 from graduates and 3.81 from employers. This indicates a general satisfaction with the program's quality and its impact on the job market.
* When looking at the individual survey items, there's some variation in scores between graduates and employers:
  + For item 1 (Maintaining high standards for content knowledge in discipline areas), there's a close alignment between graduate and employer scores, with employers rating it slightly higher (3.75 compared to 3.50).
  + For item 2 (The belief that all students can learn and have the ability to be successful), there's a more noticeable difference, with employers rating it significantly higher (4.00 compared to 3.50).
  + Item 3 (Demonstrating respect for diversity) shows a relatively balanced view, with graduate and employer scores closely aligned (3.75 and 4.00, respectively).
  + Item 4 (Recognizing the importance of using diverse educational resources) is one of the areas where graduates rate is higher than employers (4.00 compared to 3.50).
  + Other items, like critical reflection, professional conduct, and leadership, show balanced ratings with slight differences between graduate and employer scores.

These findings provide a general view of the effectiveness of the MEDEL program and its alignment with market expectations. The slight discrepancies between graduate and employer evaluations suggest areas for potential improvement to further enhance the satisfaction of all stakeholders.

To improve the satisfaction of all stakeholders in the Master of Education in Educational Leadership (MEDEL) program, you can focus on the following areas:

1. **Enhance Communication Between Graduates and Employers**:
   * Create platforms or events that bring together graduates and employers to discuss expectations and needs. This can help understand what employers are looking for and how graduates can improve their skills.
2. **Develop Internship Programs**:
   * Provide internship opportunities or collaborative projects with educational institutions and companies. This gives graduates direct practical experience and helps them understand market requirements.
3. **Update the Curriculum Based on Market Needs**:
   * Regularly review the curriculum to ensure it reflects the latest trends and needs in educational leadership. Consider incorporating new resources such as technology and modern teaching methods.
4. **Encourage Participation in Volunteer and Community Activities**:
   * Encourage students to engage in volunteer and community activities, which helps them develop leadership, communication, and diversity interaction skills.
5. **Provide Mentoring Programs**:
   * Establish mentoring programs where new students and graduates can interact with experienced professionals. This can foster a sense of belonging and help graduates navigate their careers more effectively.
6. **Strengthen Critical Thinking and Problem-Solving Skills**:
   * Offer workshops and training sessions focused on developing critical thinking and problem-solving skills, as these are highly sought after by employers.
7. **Regularly Measure Graduate Satisfaction**:
   * Conduct periodic surveys to evaluate the graduate experience and satisfaction with the program. This feedback can be used to make continuous improvements.
8. **Master’s in special education (MSPED) employer/ graduate satisfaction survey results**

Table 2: Master’s in special education (MSPED) employer/ graduate satisfaction survey results **section 1**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section 1:** | | **Evaluator** | |
| **Graduate**  **Mean** | **Employer Mean** |
| 1. | Maintaining challenging expectations for individuals with disabilities to develop the highest possible learning outcomes and quality of life potential in ways that respect their dignity, cult... | 4.00 | 4.00 |
| 2. | Maintaining a high level of professional competence and integrity and exercising professional judgment to benefit individuals with disabilities and their families. | 3.50 | 4.00 |
| 3. | Promoting meaningful and inclusive participation of individuals with disabilities in their schools and communities. | 4.00 | 4.00 |
| 4. | Practicing collegially with others who are providing services to individuals with disabilities. | 4.00 | 4.00 |
| 5. | Developing relationships with families based on mutual respect and actively involving families and individuals with disabilities in educational decision making. | 3.50 | 4.00 |
| 6. | Using evidence, instructional data, research and professional knowledge to inform practice. | 4.00 | 4.00 |
| 7. | Protecting and supporting the physical and psychological safety of individuals with disabilities. | 4.00 | 3.00 |
| 8. | Neither engaging in nor tolerating any practice that harms individuals with disabilities. | 4.00 | 4.00 |
| 9. | Practicing within the professional ethics and standards of the profession; upholding laws, regulations, and policies that influence professional practice; and advocating im... | 4.00 | 3.00 |
| 10. | Advocating for professional conditions and resources that will improve learning outcomes of individuals with disabilities. | 3.50 | 3.00 |
| 11. | Participating in the growth and dissemination of professional knowledge and skills. | 4.00 | 4.00 |
| 12. | Reflecting on, evaluating, and improving their professional practice as an ongoing process | 3.00 | 4.00 |
|  | **Average** | 3.79 | 3.75 |

As shown in Table 2, the results for the master’s in special education (MSPED) program demonstrate a balanced evaluation from both graduates and employers. Here's an analysis of the survey findings:

* The graduates' average scores range between 3 and 4, while the employers' scores range between 3 and 4. This indicates a general understanding between graduates and employers regarding the program's aspects, with some minor differences.
* **Overall Agreement in Certain Aspects**:
  + Both graduates and employers scored equally (4.00) in several areas such as high learning expectations, community inclusion, collaborative work, use of evidence and data, protection, and safety of individuals with disabilities, and participation in professional growth. These results suggest a strong agreement on the value of these aspects in the master's program.
* **Notable Differences**:
  + There's a significant difference in "maintaining a high level of professional competence and integrity" where graduates give a lower score (3.50) compared to employers (4.00).
  + Another difference is in "protecting and supporting the physical and psychological safety of individuals with disabilities" where graduates rate this higher than employers.
  + A notable lower rating from graduates is in "reflecting, evaluating, and improving professional practice" (3.00) compared to employers (4.00).
* **Overall Conclusion**: Despite some variations in specific areas, the general average ratings show a good level of alignment between graduates and employers regarding the program's quality.

Table 3: Master’s in special education (MSPED) employer/graduate satisfaction survey results **section 2**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section 2:** | | **Evaluator** | |
| **Graduate**  **Mean** | **Employer Mean** |
| 1 | Integrate important aspects of education in Qatar into their educational efforts. | 4.00 | 4.00 |
| 2 | Produce growth in student learning and a positive environment for students. | 4.00 | 4.00 |
| 3 | Use technology to improve students’ learning. | 3.50 | 3.00 |
| 4 | Collaborate effectively with educators, parents, and students. | 4.00 | 3.00 |
| 5 | Develop and implement solutions to address the needs of the organization. | 3.50 | 4.00 |
| 6 | Use research and scholarship in educational efforts. | 3.00 | 4.00 |
| 7 | Reflect on, evaluate, and improve efforts. | 5.00 | 4.00 |
| 8 | Contribute to positive change in the organization. | 4.00 | 4.00 |
|  | **Average** | 3.88 | 3.75 |

Table 3 above displays the results of a satisfaction survey conducted among employers and graduates of a master’s in special education (MSPED) program. It shows the average scores from both graduates and employers across eight different evaluation criteria.

* The overall average rating from graduates was 3.88, slightly higher than the employers' average of 3.75. This might suggest that graduates feel more confident in their skills compared to employers' perspectives.
* In some areas, such as "Integrate important aspects of education in Qatar into their educational efforts" and "Produce growth in student learning and a positive environment for students," the satisfaction levels were equal, with both graduates and employers scoring 4.00 on average.
* There are noticeable differences in some areas between the graduates' and employers' evaluations. For example:
  + For "Use technology to improve students’ learning," graduates rated it at 3.50, while employers gave it a 3.00.
  + In "Collaborate effectively with educators, parents, and students," graduates rated it at 4.00, while employers scored it at 3.00.
  + However, for "Use research and scholarship in educational efforts," employers rated it at 4.00, compared to 3.00 from the graduates.
* The criterion "Reflect on, evaluate, and improve efforts" received the highest average score from both graduates (5.00) and employers (4.00). This might indicate the graduates' strong ability to critically reflect and continuously improve their work.

Overall, the table shows discrepancies in the evaluation of different skills between graduates and employers.

# B. Initial programs:

Employer/graduates satisfaction with initial program completers’ performance was measured through a survey.

The survey includes 36 items inviting participants to evaluate the program completers’ teaching skills and qualification using the following four-point Likert-type scale:

1. = “Not prepared at all, and the teacher appeared to be competent in this aspect”
2. = “Reasonably prepared, and the teacher demonstrated most of the requested competencies in this aspect”
3. = “Well prepared, and the teacher demonstrated high level of competencies in this aspect”
4. = “Excellent, and the teachers demonstrated excellence in this aspect”

Data for this survey was collected through the Social & Economic Survey Research Institute at Qatar University. Fifty-seven employers responded to the survey.

# Findings and Discussion Quantitative data

The results of the survey on graduate /employers’ satisfaction are presented in Table 5.

1. **Undergraduate**

Table 4. Respondents by Evaluator, and Level

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | **Frequency** | **%** |
| **Evaluator** | **Employer** | 125 | 81.7 |
| **Graduate** | 28 | 18.3 |
| **Total** | **153** | **100.0** |
| **Level** | **BPRIM** | 92 | 60.1 |
| **BSEC** | 61 | 39.9 |
| **Total** | **153** | **100.0** |

The table provides information about respondents based on two categories: "Evaluator" and "Level".

1. **Evaluator**:
   * The majority of respondents were evaluated by "Employers," accounting for 81.7% of the total respondents.
   * The rest, a significantly smaller proportion (18.3%), were evaluated by "Graduates."
   * This distribution suggests that most responses were from employers, possibly indicating their level of influence or involvement in the study or research.
2. **Level**:
   * Regarding the level, the primary level (BPRIM) represents a majority of the respondents, accounting for 60.1%.
   * The secondary level (BSEC) makes up 39.9%.
   * This distribution could indicate the primary focus of the study or give insights into the nature of the research, suggesting that it leans more towards the primary level.

Table 5. Bachelor Primary and Bachelor Secondary Survey Results

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not prepared at all** | **Reasonably prepared** | **Well prepared** | **Excellent** | **Mean** |
| Ensures that all students learn at a high level and achieve success | 4.6% | 15.0% | 31.4% | 49.0% | 3.25 |
| Supports students with special learning needs to learn in different ways | 9.8% | 26.8% | 26.8% | 36.6% | 2.90 |
| Recognizes that subject matter must be meaningful for all students | 3.9% | 15.7% | 30.1% | 50.3% | 3.27 |
| Creates supportive learning environments in which students’ ideas, beliefs and opinions are shared and valued | 5.2% | 19.0% | 24.2% | 51.6% | 3.22 |
| Has enthusiasm about teaching/subject area | 5.9% | 15.0% | 22.9% | 56.2% | 3.29 |
| Shows respect for individual and cultural differences | 2.6% | 5.2% | 26.1% | 66.0% | 3.56 |
| Provides care and support for students | 3.3% | 12.4% | 24.8% | 59.5% | 3.41 |
| Reflects critically on professional practice | 3.9% | 27.5% | 25.5% | 43.1% | 3.08 |
| Develops research-proven teaching strategies | 7.2% | 32.7% | 24.8% | 35.3% | 2.88 |
| Uses student data to plan and review learning experiences | 5.2% | 19.6% | 33.3% | 41.8% | 3.12 |
| Engages in reflective practices | 5.2% | 27.5% | 28.8% | 38.6% | 3.01 |
| Pursues opportunities to grow professionally and participate in life-long learning | 5.9% | 13.7% | 28.8% | 51.6% | 3.26 |
| Engages in personal and professional development | 4.6% | 17.0% | 30.1% | 48.4% | 3.22 |
| Uses effective language in communicative situations and various social functions | 5.2% | 14.4% | 27.5% | 52.9% | 3.28 |
| Collaborates with colleagues to give and receive help | 2.6% | 9.2% | 21.6% | 66.7% | 3.52 |
| Provides a positive climate in the classroom and participates in maintaining such a climate in the school as a whole | 3.9% | 14.4% | 22.9% | 58.8% | 3.37 |
| Meets personal work-related goals and priorities | 4.6% | 13.1% | 28.8% | 53.6% | 3.31 |
| Contributes towards professional teams | 3.3% | 7.2% | 27.5% | 62.1% | 3.48 |
| Builds relationships with families and the broader community to enhance student learning | 3.3% | 15.0% | 26.8% | 54.9% | 3.33 |
| Meets ethical accountability and professional requirements | 3.9% | 6.5% | 24.8% | 64.7% | 3.50 |
| Lessons based on monitoring, assessment, and student feedback from previous lessons are developed | 2.6% | 19.0% | 33.3% | 45.1% | 3.21 |
| Teaching strategies appropriate for Curriculum Standards are used | 3.9% | 13.7% | 35.3% | 47.1% | 3.25 |
| A range of materials and resources are utilized to engage students | 5.9% | 17.0% | 29.4% | 47.7% | 3.19 |
| A variety of skills and resources are used to evaluate and modify lessons | 5.2% | 20.3% | 30.7% | 43.8% | 3.13 |
| Varied individual and group learning strategies are used | 4.6% | 17.6% | 30.7% | 47.1% | 3.20 |
| Print, multimedia, online, and electronic teaching resources are used | 2.6% | 13.7% | 35.3% | 48.4% | 3.29 |
| Language, literacy, and numeracy development are identified and monitored | 3.3% | 22.9% | 31.4% | 42.5% | 3.13 |
| Students’ learning is assessed and reported using methods in line with school policies | 3.9% | 14.4% | 33.3% | 48.4% | 3.26 |
| Clear, accurate and concise feedback on the outcomes of assessment is provided to students | 3.9% | 17.0% | 34.6% | 44.4% | 3.20 |
| Assessments are reviewed for continued appropriateness | 3.9% | 15.0% | 34.0% | 47.1% | 3.24 |
| Technology-rich lessons are designed to take students beyond the school environment to investigate problems and propose possible solutions | 3.9% | 23.5% | 31.4% | 41.2% | 3.10 |
| Students are involved in examining the nature of work and leisure, work/career options in Qatar, and in global markets | 7.8% | 28.8% | 29.4% | 34.0% | 2.90 |
| Students are supported in taking intellectual risks, testing ideas, and using initiative | 5.9% | 26.8% | 28.8% | 38.6% | 3.00 |
| ICT is used to access and manage information on student learning. | 3.3% | 19.0% | 32.0% | 45.8% | 3.20 |
| Learning goals in Curriculum Standards and school-based curricula are identified | 2.6% | 13.7% | 34.6% | 49.0% | 3.30 |
| Critical and creative thinking, decision making, and problem skills are promoted | 5.9% | 24.8% | 27.5% | 41.8% | 3.05 |
| Students are encouraged to interact respectfully with others including those with diverse backgrounds | 3.9% | 9.8% | 32.0% | 54.2% | 3.37 |
| Interaction and communication are conducted in an open, inclusive, equitable and ethical way | 4.6% | 8.5% | 34.6% | 52.3% | 3.35 |
| Focuses across subject areas on topics, problems, and issues relevant to local, national, and global communities | 4.6% | 15.7% | 36.6% | 43.1% | 3.18 |
| Learning environment that fosters students’ positive attitudes and learning experiences is created. | 3.3% | 15.0% | 32.7% | 49.0% | 3.27 |

Table 5 provides an overview of evaluations related to various aspects of educational performance. Here's a brief commentary on each aspect:

* **Students achieving success**: About half of the students consider this aspect to be excellent, indicating that many teachers ensure students' success.
* **Support for students with special learning needs**: Here, a percentage of students (36.6%) consider support excellent, but 9.8% believe it's not prepared at all. This suggests a need to increase awareness about supporting students with special needs.
* **Subject matter relevance to students**: A large percentage (50.3%) find the subjects meaningful, indicating a focus on students.
* **Supportive learning environments**: A high proportion (51.6%) see the environment as supportive, indicating a focus on involving students in discussions and valuing their opinions.
* **Enthusiasm for teaching**: More than half of the students (56.2%) consider enthusiasm high, indicating passion from the teachers.
* **Respect for individual and cultural differences**: A very high percentage (66.0%) see significant respect for differences, reflecting an inclusive environment.
* **Care and support for students**: About 60% of students consider this aspect excellent, indicating a strong focus on student care.
* **Developing research-based teaching strategies**: This percentage is relatively low, suggesting there is room to improve the use of research and evidence in developing teaching strategies.

These results indicate that there are strengths and weaknesses. Areas that require further improvement are mainly related to supporting students with special learning needs and utilizing research-based teaching strategies, while the strong points include respect for cultural differences, teachers' enthusiasm, and support for students in a supportive environment.

Table 6. Comparison by Evaluator, and Level

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **t** | **df** | **Sig.** | **Effect size** |
| **Evaluator** | -3.868 | 63.073 | <.001 | -0.60 |
| **Level** | .607 | 151 | .54 | 0.10 |

For the first comparison between evaluators, indicates that employees have, on average, lower scores than graduates. The highly significant p-value (<0.001) suggests that this difference is unlikely due to random chance alone. Additionally, the effect size of -0.60 indicates a moderate effect.

For the second comparison between levels, there is no significant difference between the BSEC and BPRIM, as indicated by the p-value (0.54 > 0.05).

1. **Diploma**

Table 7. Diploma Survey Results

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Well prepared** | **Excellent** | **Mean** |
| Ensures that all students learn at a high level and achieve success | 0% | 100.0% | 4.00 |
| Supports students with special learning needs to learn in different ways | 20.0% | 80.0% | 3.80 |
| Recognizes that subject matter must be meaningful for all students | 0% | 100.0% | 4.00 |
| Creates supportive learning environments in which students’ ideas, beliefs and opinions are shared and valued | 0% | 100.0% | 4.00 |
| Has enthusiasm about teaching/subject area | 20.0% | 80.0% | 3.80 |
| Shows respect for individual and cultural differences | 0% | 100.0% | 4.00 |
| Provides care and support for students | 0% | 100.0% | 4.00 |
| Reflects critically on professional practice | 20.0% | 80.0% | 3.80 |
| Develops research-proven teaching strategies | 0% | 100.0% | 4.00 |
| Uses student data to plan and review learning experiences | 20.0% | 80.0% | 3.80 |
| Engages in reflective practices | 20.0% | 80.0% | 3.80 |
| Pursues opportunities to grow professionally and participate in life-long learning | 0% | 100.0% | 4.00 |
| Engages in personal and professional development | 0% | 100.0% | 4.00 |
| Uses effective language in communicative situations and various social functions | 0% | 100.0% | 4.00 |
| Collaborates with colleagues to give and receive help | 0% | 100.0% | 4.00 |
| Provides a positive climate in the classroom and participates in maintaining such a climate in the school as a whole | 0% | 100.0% | 4.00 |
| Meets personal work-related goals and priorities | 0% | 100.0% | 4.00 |
| Contributes towards professional teams | 0% | 100.0% | 4.00 |
| Builds relationships with families and the broader community to enhance student learning | 20.0% | 80.0% | 3.80 |
| Meets ethical accountability and professional requirements | 0% | 100.0% | 4.00 |
| Lessons based on monitoring, assessment, and student feedback from previous lessons are developed | 0% | 100.0% | 4.00 |
| Teaching strategies appropriate for Curriculum Standards are used | 0% | 100.0% | 4.00 |
| A range of materials and resources are utilized to engage students | 0% | 100.0% | 4.00 |
| A variety of skills and resources are used to evaluate and modify lessons | 20.0% | 80.0% | 3.80 |
| Varied individual and group learning strategies are used | 0% | 100.0% | 4.00 |
| Print, multimedia, online, and electronic teaching resources are used | 0% | 100.0% | 4.00 |
| Language, literacy, and numeracy development are identified and monitored | 20.0% | 80.0% | 3.80 |
| Students’ learning is assessed and reported using methods in line with school policies | 0% | 100.0% | 4.00 |
| Clear, accurate and concise feedback on the outcomes of assessment is provided to students | 20.0% | 80.0% | 3.80 |
| Assessments are reviewed for continued appropriateness | 20.0% | 80.0% | 3.80 |
| Technology-rich lessons are designed to take students beyond the school environment to investigate problems and propose possible solutions | 0% | 100.0% | 4.00 |
| Students are involved in examining the nature of work and leisure, work/career options in Qatar, and in global markets | 40.0% | 60.0% | 3.60 |
| Students are supported in taking intellectual risks, testing ideas, and using initiative | 0% | 100.0% | 4.00 |
| ICT is used to access and manage information on student learning. | 20.0% | 80.0% | 3.80 |
| Learning goals in Curriculum Standards and school-based curricula are identified | 0% | 100.0% | 4.00 |
| Critical and creative thinking, decision making, and problem skills are promoted | 0% | 100.0% | 4.00 |
| Students are encouraged to interact respectfully with others including those with diverse backgrounds | 0% | 100.0% | 4.00 |
| Interaction and communication are conducted in an open, inclusive, equitable and ethical way | 20.0% | 80.0% | 3.80 |
| Focuses across subject areas on topics, problems, and issues relevant to local, national, and global communities | 0% | 100.0% | 4.00 |
| Learning environment that fosters students’ positive attitudes and learning experiences is created. | 20.0% | 80.0% | 3.80 |

Based on table 7, the survey results indicate a positive evaluation of many key aspects related to teaching quality and student support. Here are some observations:

* All categories with a 100% "Excellent" rating reflect a strong commitment from teachers to meet high teaching standards. These categories include providing a supportive learning environment, respecting diversity, developing research-based teaching strategies, effective language use, collaborating with colleagues, and contributing to a positive classroom climate.
* Categories with lower percentages of "Excellent" ratings may indicate areas for performance improvement. For example, supporting students with special needs at 80% may suggest a need for more resources or training. Additionally, the use of technology to manage information and evaluate lessons at 80% might require a stronger focus on modern technologies.
* The areas related to communication with families and the broader community were rated at 80% "Excellent," indicating room for enhancing community relations and strengthening partnerships to support student learning.
* Categories that encourage critical and creative thinking received a 100% "Excellent" rating, which is a positive sign of fostering an educational environment that supports students' personal and professional growth.

In summary, the table shows a positive balance across various teaching aspects, with some areas that could be targeted for quality improvement and educational outcomes.

1. **Overall**

Table 8. Respondents by Evaluator, program, and Level

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | **Frequency** | **%** |
| **Evaluator** | **Employer** | 130 | 82.3 |
| **Graduate** | 28 | 17.7 |
| **Total** | **158** | **100.0** |
| **Program** | **UG** | 153 | 96.8 |
| **Diploma** | 5 | 3.2 |
| **Total** | **158** | **100.0** |
| **Level** | **BPRIM** | 92 | 58.2 |
| **BSEC** | 61 | 38.6 |
| **Diploma** | 5 | 3.2 |
| **Total** | **158** | **100.0** |

Table 8 shows the distribution of respondents based on three criteria: evaluator, program, and academic level.

**Evaluator**

* Out of 158 respondents, 82.3% are employers (130 individuals), while 17.7% are graduates (28 individuals). This indicates that the majority of evaluators in this study are employers.

**Program**

* The most common program is the undergraduate (UG) program, comprising 96.8% of the total sample (153 individuals), while the diploma program represents only 3.2% (5 individuals). This shows a significant focus on undergraduate programs in the sample.

**Academic Level**

* In terms of academic levels, the primary level (BPRIM) constitutes 58.2% of respondents (92 individuals), the secondary level (BSEC) accounts for 38.6% (61 individuals), and the diploma level is only 3.2% (5 individuals). This indicates that most respondents are from primary and secondary levels.

**Overall,** the table shows that the vast majority of evaluators are employers, and undergraduate programs are the most represented in this study. Regarding academic levels, the largest proportion of respondents is from the primary and secondary levels.

Table 9. Overall Survey Results

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not prepared at all** | **Reasonably prepared** | **Well prepared** | **Excellent** | **Mean** |
| Ensures that all students learn at a high level and achieve success | 4.4% | 14.6% | 30.4% | 50.6% | 3.27 |
| Supports students with special learning needs to learn in different ways | 9.5% | 25.9% | 26.6% | 38.0% | 2.93 |
| Recognizes that subject matter must be meaningful for all students | 3.8% | 15.2% | 29.1% | 51.9% | 3.29 |
| Creates supportive learning environments in which students’ ideas, beliefs and opinions are shared and valued | 5.1% | 18.4% | 23.4% | 53.2% | 3.25 |
| Has enthusiasm about teaching/subject area | 5.7% | 14.6% | 22.8% | 57.0% | 3.31 |
| Shows respect for individual and cultural differences | 2.5% | 5.1% | 25.3% | 67.1% | 3.57 |
| Provides care and support for students | 3.2% | 12.0% | 24.1% | 60.8% | 3.42 |
| Reflects critically on professional practice | 3.8% | 26.6% | 25.3% | 44.3% | 3.10 |
| Develops research-proven teaching strategies | 7.0% | 31.6% | 24.1% | 37.3% | 2.92 |
| Uses student data to plan and review learning experiences | 5.1% | 19.0% | 32.9% | 43.0% | 3.14 |
| Engages in reflective practices | 5.1% | 26.6% | 28.5% | 39.9% | 3.03 |
| Pursues opportunities to grow professionally and participate in life-long learning | 5.7% | 13.3% | 27.8% | 53.2% | 3.28 |
| Engages in personal and professional development | 4.4% | 16.5% | 29.1% | 50.0% | 3.25 |
| Uses effective language in communicative situations and various social functions | 5.1% | 13.9% | 26.6% | 54.4% | 3.30 |
| Collaborates with colleagues to give and receive help | 2.5% | 8.9% | 20.9% | 67.7% | 3.54 |
| Provides a positive climate in the classroom and participates in maintaining such a climate in the school as a whole | 3.8% | 13.9% | 22.2% | 60.1% | 3.39 |
| Meets personal work-related goals and priorities | 4.4% | 12.7% | 27.8% | 55.1% | 3.34 |
| Contributes towards professional teams | 3.2% | 7.0% | 26.6% | 63.3% | 3.50 |
| Builds relationships with families and the broader community to enhance student learning | 3.2% | 14.6% | 26.6% | 55.7% | 3.35 |
| Meets ethical accountability and professional requirements | 3.8% | 6.3% | 24.1% | 65.8% | 3.52 |
| Lessons based on monitoring, assessment, and student feedback from previous lessons are developed | 2.5% | 18.4% | 32.3% | 46.8% | 3.23 |
| Teaching strategies appropriate for Curriculum Standards are used | 3.8% | 13.3% | 34.2% | 48.7% | 3.28 |
| A range of materials and resources are utilized to engage students | 5.7% | 16.5% | 28.5% | 49.4% | 3.22 |
| A variety of skills and resources are used to evaluate and modify lessons | 5.1% | 19.6% | 30.4% | 44.9% | 3.15 |
| Varied individual and group learning strategies are used | 4.4% | 17.1% | 29.7% | 48.7% | 3.23 |
| Print, multimedia, online, and electronic teaching resources are used | 2.5% | 13.3% | 34.2% | 50.0% | 3.32 |
| Language, literacy, and numeracy development are identified and monitored | 3.2% | 22.2% | 31.0% | 43.7% | 3.15 |
| Students’ learning is assessed and reported using methods in line with school policies | 3.8% | 13.9% | 32.3% | 50.0% | 3.28 |
| Clear, accurate and concise feedback on the outcomes of assessment is provided to students | 3.8% | 16.5% | 34.2% | 45.6% | 3.22 |
| Assessments are reviewed for continued appropriateness | 3.8% | 14.6% | 33.5% | 48.1% | 3.26 |
| Technology-rich lessons are designed to take students beyond the school environment to investigate problems and propose possible solutions | 3.8% | 22.8% | 30.4% | 43.0% | 3.13 |
| Students are involved in examining the nature of work and leisure, work/career options in Qatar, and in global markets | 7.6% | 27.8% | 29.7% | 34.8% | 2.92 |
| Students are supported in taking intellectual risks, testing ideas, and using initiative | 5.7% | 25.9% | 27.8% | 40.5% | 3.03 |
| ICT  is used to access and manage information on student learning. | 3.2% | 18.4% | 31.6% | 46.8% | 3.22 |
| Learning goals in Curriculum Standards and school-based curricula are identified | 2.5% | 13.3% | 33.5% | 50.6% | 3.32 |
| Critical and creative thinking, decision making, and problem skills are promoted | 5.7% | 24.1% | 26.6% | 43.7% | 3.08 |
| Students are encouraged to interact respectfully with others including those with diverse backgrounds | 3.8% | 9.5% | 31.0% | 55.7% | 3.39 |
| Interaction and communication are conducted in an open, inclusive, equitable and ethical way | 4.4% | 8.2% | 34.2% | 53.2% | 3.36 |
| Focuses across subject areas on topics, problems, and issues relevant to local, national, and global communities | 4.4% | 15.2% | 35.4% | 44.9% | 3.21 |
| Learning environment that fosters students’ positive attitudes and learning experiences is created. | 3.2% | 14.6% | 32.3% | 50.0% | 3.29 |

Table 9 above presents the overall survey results for various educational and learning environment parameters. It shows the distribution of performance scores across four categories: "Not prepared at all," "Reasonably prepared," "Well prepared," and "Excellent." Here are some observations regarding the table:

1. **Areas with the highest "Excellent" scores**:
   * "Shows respect for individual and cultural differences" (67.1%), "Collaborates with colleagues to give and receive help" (67.7%), and "Meets ethical accountability and professional requirements" (65.8%) have the highest percentages in the "Excellent" category.
2. **Areas with higher "Reasonably prepared" or "Not prepared at all" scores**:
   * "Supports students with special learning needs to learn in different ways" (25.9% Reasonably prepared, 9.5% Not prepared at all), and "Develops research-proven teaching strategies" (31.6% Reasonably prepared, 7.0% Not prepared at all) have higher scores in the "Not prepared at all" and "Reasonably prepared" categories.
3. **Areas with the highest average scores**:
   * In terms of average scores, "Shows respect for individual and cultural differences" and "Collaborates with colleagues to give and receive help" have an average above 3.5, indicating strong performance in these areas.
4. **Areas with the lowest average scores**:
   * The areas with the lowest average scores include "Supports students with special learning needs to learn in different ways" (2.93) and "Develops research-proven teaching strategies" (2.92), suggesting room for improvement in these aspects.
5. **Distribution of "Excellent" across the areas**:
   * Most areas have "Excellent" percentages ranging between 40% and 60%, indicating a strong appreciation for high-performing standards.

Overall, there are clear areas of excellence, while some domains, particularly those related to supporting students with special needs and developing innovative teaching strategies, require further attention and improvement.

Table 10. Comparison by Evaluator, program, and Level

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Categories** | **Mean** | **t** | **df** | **Sig.** | **Effect size** |
| **Evaluator** | Employer | 3.17 | -2.70 | 156 | 0.01 | -0.56 |
| Graduate | 3.59 |
| **Level** | BPRIM | 3.25 | 0.61 | 151 | 0.54 | 0.10 |
| BSEC | 3.18 |
| **Program** | UG | 3.22 | -9.09 | 28.24 | <0.001 | -0.93 |
| Diploma | 3.92 |

Table 10 compares three different categories (evaluator, level, and program) based on metrics like the mean, t-value, degrees of freedom, statistical significance, and effect size.

* **Evaluator:** There is a statistically significant difference between the "Employer" and "Graduate" evaluations (p = 0.01), with a lower mean for "Employer" (3.17) compared to "Graduate" (3.59). The effect size (-0.56) indicates a moderate effect.
* **Level:** There is no statistically significant difference between "BPRIM" and "BSEC" (p = 0.54).
* **Program:** There is a significant difference between "UG" and "Diploma" (p < 0.001), with a higher mean for "Diploma" (3.92). The effect size (-0.93) indicates a strong effect.
* Further research is recommended to understand the reasons behind the significant differences between "Employer" and "Graduate", and between "UG" and "Diploma".