# Kansas Educator Alumni and Employer Survey
## Spring/Summer 2017 Survey Administration
## Kansas State University

### Background

This report provides a summary of the spring/summer 2017 survey administration of the Kansas Educator Alumni and Employer Survey with comparison to the spring 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2016 survey administration where appropriate.

### Survey Administration for Regent Institutions

The Office of Educational Innovation and Evaluation (OEIE) contacted the seven regent institutions to secure commitment for participation in the statewide Alumni and Employer survey. Five institutions provided permission for OEIE to survey their Alumni and Employers as part of this initiative. Emporia State University (ESU) conducted their own survey administration (using the same survey instrument as used by OEIE) and provided OEIE their data that was included in the statewide results. Pittsburg State University (PSU) also administered their own surveys noting they obtained higher response rates when sending the survey directly. PSU edited some of the survey items; therefore, their responses could not be included in the 2016 and 2017 statewide results.

OEIE contacted the Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) to obtain contact information of individuals with an education degree from one of the seven regent institutions, who received a first-time teaching license from KSDE between June 1, 2015 and August 31, 2016, and were teaching in the state of Kansas during the 2016 - 2017 school year (referred to as Alumni). Also included in the data were the names and email addresses of Principals (referred to as Employers) who employed the Alumni during the 2016 - 2017 school year. These data did not capture individuals that were licensed, or teaching in other states.

Each year KSDE informs OEIE when the contact information for Alumni and Employers are available. This information is only available once all districts have reported their personnel data; that typically occurs in April or May. See table for summary of KSDE data release dates.

| Year | Data Released from KSDE |
|------|------------------------|
| 2017 | May 2 |
| 2016 | April 14 |
| 2015 | May 15 |
| 2014 | May 29 |
| 2013 | May 17 |

While not the optimal time for Alumni and Employers to be completing surveys, the initial survey request email was sent before the end of the end of the school year.

In previous years, KSDE provided OEIE the data directly. In 2017, the five institutions were required to obtained their own data from the KSDE IHE Portal and forwarded on to OEIE for survey distribution. KSDE

data sharing protocols make it difficult for the agency to share contact information, e.g., KSDE can provide "district" or "work" email, but not personal contacts. An issue with the KSDE data from previous years was the large number of Alumni and Employers without email addresses. All Alumni and Employers had contact information. One recurring issue regarding email address is that USD 259 provides the same email address for all Alumni hired by the district. USD 259 employs many Wichita State University (WSU) Alumni. WSU obtained the personal email addresses of those Alumni and included those email addresses in the data submitted to OEIE.

When surveys were administered, very few bounce backs occurred (Alumni = 4; Employers = 3). In principle, over 99% of Alumni and Employers should have received the survey request. However, many school districts may have firewalls that block delivery without sending bounce back messages. Also, at the time of survey distribution the nation was experiencing a "scareware" event that may have made recipients wary to respond.

Please refer to Table 1 for the numbers of Alumni email addresses obtained, number of surveys emailed to Alumni, and survey response rates for each institution and overall. Similar information is provided in Table 2 for the Employer survey distribution.

A summary of the spring/summer 2017 survey administration for both the **Alumni** and **Employer** survey follow. The summaries are based on the five institutions for which OEIE distributed the surveys and data provided by ESU where applicable. PSU administered the survey on their own; therefore, survey administration data were not available to include PSU in the discussion that follows.

**Alumni Survey**

All surveys were initially distributed to Alumni "work" email addresses during the May 7 – 8, 2017 period. Deans of Education from Fort Hays State University (FHSU), Kansas State University (KSU), the University of Kansas (KU), and WSU sent an email to each Alumni student encouraging him/her to respond to the survey. These messages were sent to the KSDE provided email address.

To facilitate response rate, Dr. Scott Myers from KSDE posted a notice on the KSDE Administrators listserv asking Principals and Superintendents to encourage their first year educators to look for and complete the survey.

Reminders were provided for these Alumni on May 16, May 22, May 25, June 1, June 9, and June 14, 2017.

At the close of the survey in June, it was observed that many institutions had their lowest response rates since the survey inception. In an effort to increase the response rate, the survey was relaunched on July 24 to those students who had not previously responded. Reminders were provided on August 2, August 9, and August 11. This effort resulted in 39 additional responses; representing 16% of total responses.

Most of the Alumni in 2016 (72%) who started the survey completed the survey (71% in 2015). However, in 2017, only 66% of Alumni opening the survey link completed the survey. The major challenges appear to be interesting the Alumni to open the email to start the survey and for Alumni to complete the survey.

All institutions had Alumni response rates at or above 26% with an overall response rate across institutions of 29%. WSU had its highest response rate for the five-year period. This may be a result of inserting the personal email addresses for their Alumni hired by USD 259. FHSU and KSU response rates were much lower than 2016 response rates but were still higher than in some previous years. The remaining institutions' 2017 response rate remained about the same as in 2016.

Over the five-year period, the use of pre-notices about the survey from Deans, posting on the KSDE Administrative listserv requesting administrators encourage completion, launching the survey in April rather than May, and use of personal email addresses did not improve response rates. If improved Alumni response rates are a goal, new strategies should to be explored.

Only completed surveys were used in the analysis. The OEIE distributed surveys require a response to each item. The ESU data, while complete surveys, do not require a response to each item; therefore, some item totals vary. It should be noted that 49% of the Alumni completing the survey represent two institutions: 27% KSU and 22% WSU. The remaining 51% of Alumni completing the survey represent the other four participating institutions. A similar pattern appeared in 2016 with KSU (25%) and FHSU (24%) comprising 49% of the responses and in 2015 with the largest participation from KSU (26%) and WSU (23%).

**Employer Survey**

The survey was distributed to Employers of FHSU, KSU, KU, Washburn, and WSU Alumni during the May 7 - 8, 2017 period. Dr. Scott Myers from KSDE posted a notice on the KSDE Administration listserv encouraging Principals and Superintendents to complete their survey as well as encourage their first-year teachers to complete the Alumni survey.

Reminders were provided on May 16, May 24, June 1, June 9, June 14, and June 16, 2017.

As found with the Alumni survey, the response rate was low. OEIE relaunched the survey to Employers on July 24, 2017. Reminders were distributed on August 1, August 9 and August 11. This effort yielded 38 completed surveys representing 13% of total responses.

Unlike 2017 Alumni, those Employers who started the survey in 2017 (87%) completed the survey (81% in 2015; 84% in 2016). The challenge continues to be how to get Employers to open and respond to the survey. Other types of notifications and direct communication from the institutions may promote increased response rates.

2017 had the highest response rate combined for six of the institutions (40%). All institutions reported response at or above 28%. In 2017, two institutions (KSU, WSU) yielded their highest response rates for the 2013 – 2017 period. Other institutions reported response rates similar to previous years.

Only completed surveys were used in the analysis. The OEIE distributed surveys require a response to each item. The ESU data, while complete surveys, do not require a response to each item; therefore, some item totals vary. As with the Alumni survey, Employers of Alumni from two institutions (KSU = 29%; FHSU

= 22%); represent 51% of the Employers completing the survey. The remaining 49% of Employers completing the survey represent the other four institutions. A similar pattern appeared in 2016 and 2015.

**Table 1: Alumni Potential Survey Recipients and Response Rates**

| Institution | Surveys Distributed to Known Email Addresses | Survey Bounce-backs | Total Potential Alumni Survey Recipients | Number of Completed Surveys | 2017 Response Rate (%) | 2016 Response Rate (%) | 2015 Response Rate (%) | 2014 Response Rate (%) | 2013 Response Rate (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emporia State University | 154 | 0 | 154 | 43 | 28% | 26% | 25% | 26% | 39% |
| Fort Hays State University | 141 | 1 | 140 | 37 | 26% | 37% | 22% | 16% | 25% |
| Kansas State University | 222 | 1 | 221 | 63 | 29% | 36% | 30% | 22% | 32% |
| Pittsburg State University | Did not participate | | | | | | 29% | 28% | 36% |
| University of Kansas | 105 | 1 | 104 | 27 | 26% | 28% | 24% | 19% | 30% |
| Washburn University | 62 | 0 | 62 | 16 | 26% | 24% | 20% | 38% | 32% |
| Wichita State University | 142 | 1 | 141 | 52 | 37% | 25% | 30% | 14% | 30% |
| **Total** | **826** | **4** | **822** | **238** | **29%** | **30%** | **26%** | **20%** | **32%** |

**Table 2: Employer Potential Survey Recipients and Response Rates**

| Institution | Surveys Distributed to Known Email Addresses | Survey Bounce-back | Total Potential Survey Recipients | Number of Surveys Completed | 2017 Response Rate (%) | 2016 Response Rate (%) | 2015 Response Rate (%) | 2014 Response Rate (%) | 2013 Response Rate (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emporia State University | 146 | 0 | 146 | 44 | 30% | 25% | 22% | 33% | 27% |
| Fort Hays State University | 133 | 1 | 132 | 64 | 48% | 46% | 49% | 44% | 43% |
| Kansas State University | 182 | 1 | 181 | 84 | 46% | 44% | 41% | 36% | 26% |
| Pittsburg State University | Did not participate | | | | | | 42% | 26% | 34% |
| University of Kansas | 102 | 1 | 101 | 28 | 28% | 26% | 32% | 24% | 26% |
| Washburn University | 55 | 0 | 55 | 26 | 47% | 50% | 33% | 24% | 26% |
| Wichita State University | 105 | 0 | 105 | 40 | 38% | 36% | 33% | 25% | 27% |
| **Total** | **723** | **3** | **720** | **286** | **40%** | **38%** | **37%** | **31%** | **29%** |

# APPENDICES

# APPENDIX 1

Kansas Educator Alumni
Survey Data

| | Kansas Public Universities | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Summary of Ratings[1]**<br>**Statewide Results**<br>**Kansas Educator Alumni Survey - Spring 2013 - 2017** | | | | | |
| **Category** | **2013**<br>**(n=162)** | **2014**<br>**(n=145)** | **2015**<br>**(n=400)** | **2016**<br>**(n=226)** | **2017**<br>**(n=238)** |
| | **Mean**<br>**(SD)** | **Mean**<br>**(SD)** | **Mean**<br>**(SD)** | **Mean**<br>**(SD)** | **Mean**<br>**(SD)** |
| **Foundation Composite** | 4.25[2]<br>(0.52) | 4.14<br>(0.53) | 4.15[5]<br>(0.58) | 4.09[8]<br>(0.55) | 4.19[11]<br>(0.55) |
| **Planning Composite** | 4.30<br>(0.62) | 4.25<br>(0.65) | 4.28[6]<br>(0.64) | 4.26<br>(0.56) | 4.31[11]<br>(0.64) |
| **Instruction Composite** | 4.25[3]<br>(0.60) | 4.11<br>(0.65) | 4.21[6]<br>(0.63) | 4.17[9]<br>(0.56) | 4.15[12]<br>(0.65) |
| **Assessment Composite** | 4.11[4]<br>(0.68) | 4.03<br>(0.72) | 4.03[7]<br>(0.73) | 4.02<br>(0.70) | 4.01<br>(0.78) |
| **Technology Composite** | 4.09[2]<br>(0.88) | 3.90<br>(0.84) | 3.94[6]<br>(0.92) | 4.02[9]<br>(0.78) | 4.06<br>(0.90) |
| **Diversity Composite** | 4.30<br>(0.59) | 4.23<br>(0.66) | 4.22[7]<br>(0.69) | 4.19<br>(0.66) | 4.23[11]<br>(0.90) |
| **Motivate and Engage Composite** | 4.12[3]<br>(0.67) | 4.03<br>(0.67) | 4.04<br>(0.69) | 4.00[10]<br>(0.71) | 3.98[11]<br>(0.72) |
| **Ethics Composite** | 4.40[2]<br>(0.51) | 4.32<br>(0.62) | 4.24<br>(0.63) | 4.21<br>(0.64) | 4.29[13]<br>(0.63) |
| **Reflect Composite** | 4.50[4]<br>(0.54) | 4.41<br>(0.59) | 4.42<br>(0.60) | 4.31[9]<br>(0.65) | 4.36[11]<br>(0.64) |

**[1]**=Ratings Key: 5= Strongly Agree; 4 = Agree; 3 = Neither Agree Nor Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 1 = Strongly Disagree
[2]n=160
[3]n=159
[4]n=161
[5]n=396
[6]n=399
[7]n=398
[8]n=223
[9]n=225
[10]n=224
[11]n=237
[12]n=235
[13]n=236

Composite Value Scores were created for each case (an individual response) and not the mean of means. Composite Value Scores were calculated by summing all items within a given category. For instance, the Foundations Composite value was created by summing the six individual items within the category. *Note*, in instances of missing data (e.g., not all questions were answered), a Composite Value was not obtained for that individual case. Additionally, when all items were not answered by a respondent, the n-value for an individual item or Composite Value Score may differ from the total number responding, indicated in the table note. Mean and standard deviation values were calculated for the Composite Value Score within each year.

| Summary of Cronbach's alpha Statewide Results Kansas Educator Alumni Survey - Spring 2013 - 2017 | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Category | Number of items | Kansas Public Universities | | | | |
| | | 2013 (n=162) | 2014 (n=145) | 2015 (n=400) | 2016 (n=226) | 2017 (n=238) |
| Foundations | 6 | .80 | .79 | .81 | .79 | .83 |
| Planning | 5 | .84 | .87 | .89 | .86 | .88 |
| Instruction | 5 | .83 | .86 | .85 | .83 | .85 |
| Assessment | 5 | .88 | .89 | .89 | .87 | .91 |
| Technology | 5 | .94 | .94 | .95 | .95 | .96 |
| Diversity | 6 | .87 | .90 | .91 | .90 | .90 |
| Motivation and Engagement | 6 | .84 | .85 | .85 | .87 | .86 |
| Professionalism and Ethical Behavior | 5 | .77 | .84 | .85 | .88 | .87 |
| Reflective Practice | 4 | .67 | .72 | .73 | .75 | .82 |

**Foundations of Teaching**

| | Summary of Ratings[1] Foundations of Teaching Kansas Educator Alumni Survey - Spring 2013 - 2017 | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Kansas State University | | | | | Kansas Public Universities | | | | |
| | 2013 (n=43) | 2014 (n=35) | 2015 (n=102) | 2016 (n=56) | 2017 (n=63) | 2013 (n=162) | 2014 (n=145) | 2015 (n=400) | 2016 (n=226) | 2017 (n=238) |
| | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) |
| **Foundation 1.** I was prepared to understand the foundations (historical, philosophical, social, and cultural) of my professional field. | 4.36[2] (0.62) | 4.17 (0.66) | 4.26 (0.73) | 4.16 (0.71) | 4.17 (0.71) | 4.35[3] (0.63) | 4.19 (0.60) | 4.28[4] (0.67) | 4.23 (0.56) | 4.20 (0.69) |
| **Foundation 2.** I was prepared to understand how students learn and develop. | 4.31[2] (0.52) | 4.11 (0.68) | 4.25 (0.75) | 4.21 (0.62) | 4.35 (0.60) | 4.39[3] (0.56) | 4.23 (0.62) | 4.28 (0.70) | 4.23 (0.66) | 4.34 (0.63) |
| **Foundation 3.** I was prepared to understand how to provide a variety of opportunities that support student learning and development. | 4.29[2] (0.71) | 4.00 (0.84) | 4.10 (0.84) | 4.04 (0.83) | 4.29 (0.66) | 4.39[3] (0.65) | 4.18 (0.75) | 4.20 (0.78) | 4.09[5] (0.80) | 4.29 (0.74) |

| | Kansas State University | | | | | Kansas Public Universities | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Summary of Ratings[1]** **Foundations of Teaching** **Kansas Educator Alumni Survey - Spring 2013 - 2017** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **2013 (n=43)** | **2014 (n=35)** | **2015 (n=102)** | **2016 (n=56)** | **2017 (n=63)** | **2013 (n=162)** | **2014 (n=145)** | **2015 (n=400)** | **2016 (n=226)** | **2017 (n=238)** |
| | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** |
| **Foundation 4.** I was prepared to understand and use knowledge of school, family, cultural, and community factors that influence the quality of education for all students. | 4.19[2] (0.80) | 4.29 (0.57) | 4.15 (0.78) | 4.11 (0.82) | 4.10 (0.78) | 4.22[3] (0.81) | 4.15 (0.76) | 4.11[6] (0.85) | 4.12 (0.77) | 4.14 (0.76) |
| **Foundation 5.** I was prepared to know the content of my professional field. | 4.38[2] (0.66) | 4.17 (1.01) | 4.21 (0.98) | 4.18 (0.92) | 4.33 (0.78) | 4.47[3] (0.65) | 4.32 (0.81) | 4.40[4] (0.78) | 4.29[7] (0.81) | 4.39 (0.71) |
| **Foundation 6.** I was prepared to understand the state and federal laws that directly impact schools. | 3.62[2] (1.03) | 3.51 (1.09) | 3.47 (1.11) | 3.54 (1.04) | 3.62 (1.02) | 3.69[8] (1.01) | 3.75 (0.99) | 3.66 (1.07) | 3.54 (1.04) | 3.78[11] (0.95) |
| **Foundation Composite (Cronbach Alpha: 0.80, 0.83)** | 4.19[2] (0.52) | 4.04 (0.64) | 4.07 (0.64) | 4.04 (0.61) | 4.14 (0.55) | 4.25[8] (0.52) | 4.14 (0.53) | 4.15[9] (0.58) | 4.09[10] (0.55) | 4.19[11] (0.55) |

[1]=Ratings Key: 5= Strongly Agree; 4 = Agree; 3 = Neither Agree Nor Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 1 = Strongly Disagree

Composite mean values are based on the responses to all items within the category, not the mean of means.

[2]n=42
[3]n=161
[4]n=398
[5]n=225
[6]n=399
[7]n=224
[8]n=160
[9]n=396
[10]n=223
[11]n=237

**Preparation for Planning**

| | Summary of Ratings [1] Preparation for Planning Kansas Educator Alumni Survey - Spring 2013 – 2017 | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Kansas State University | | | | | Kansas Public Universities | | | | |
| | 2013 (n=43) | 2014 (n=35) | 2015 (n=102) | 2016 (n=56) | 2017 (n=63) | 2013 (n=162) | 2014 (n=145) | 2015 (n=400) | 2016 (n=226) | 2017 (n=238) |
| | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) |
| **Planning 1.** I was prepared to plan integrated and coherent instruction to meet the learning needs of all students. | 4.30 (0.74) | 4.11 (0.68) | 4.15 (0.80) | 4.16 (0.78) | 4.27 (0.79) | 4.28 (0.72) | 4.19 (0.80) | 4.16[2] (0.79) | 4.20 (0.69) | 4.21[3] 0.87 |
| **Planning 2.** I was prepared to develop lesson plans that align with district, state standards and/or national standards. | 4.51 (0.59) | 4.31 (0.72) | 4.44 (0.67) | 4.27 (0.75) | 4.37 (0.87) | 4.38 (0.81) | 4.28 (0.83) | 4.38 (0.76) | 4.38 (0.64) | 4.43[3] 0.78 |
| **Planning 3.** I was prepared to collaborate with other professionals to improve the overall learning of all students. | 4.47 (0.59) | 4.34 (0.64) | 4.41 (0.72) | 4.23 (0.76) | 4.41 (0.69) | 4.31 (0.82) | 4.31 (0.80) | 4.33 (0.81) | 4.26 (0.78) | 4.35[3] 0.79 |

| | Kansas State University | | | | | Kansas Public Universities | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Summary of Ratings [1]** **Preparation for Planning** **Kansas Educator Alumni Survey - Spring 2013 – 2017** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2013 (n=43) | 2014 (n=35) | 2015 (n=102) | 2016 (n=56) | 2017 (n=63) | 2013 (n=162) | 2014 (n=145) | 2015 (n=400) | 2016 (n=226) | 2017 (n=238) |
| | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) |
| **Planning 4.** I was prepared to implement lesson plans that build on the students' existing knowledge and skills. | 4.37 (0.79) | 4.23 (0.81) | 4.34 (0.86) | 4.20 (0.80) | 4.37 (0.63) | 4.34 (0.76) | 4.30 (0.73) | 4.30 (0.76) | 4.27 (0.64) | 4.33[3] 0.70 |
| **Planning 5.** I was prepared to create lesson plans that promote critical thinking with the students. | 4.23 (0.90) | 4.09 (0.85) | 4.26 (0.84) | 4.11 (0.85) | 4.27 (0.75) | 4.21 (0.85) | 4.14 (0.83) | 4.23[2] (0.81) | 4.19 (0.73) | 4.24[3] 0.78 |
| **Planning Composite (Cronbach Alpha: 0.87 0.88)** | 4.38 (0.54) | 4.22 (0.57) | 4.32 (0.61) | 4.19 (0.66) | 4.34 (0.61) | 4.30 (0.62) | 4.25 (0.65) | 4.28[2] (0.64) | 4.26 (0.56) | 4.31[3] 0.64 |

[1]=Ratings Key: 5= Strongly Agree; 4 = Agree; 3 = Neither Agree Nor Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 1 = Strongly Disagree
Composite mean values are based on the responses to all items within the category, not the mean of means.
[2]n=399
[3]n=237

**Preparation to Provide Appropriate Instruction**

| | Kansas State University | | | | | Kansas Public Universities | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Summary of Ratings** [1] **Preparation to Provide Appropriate Instruction** **Kansas Educator Alumni Survey - Spring 2013 - 2017** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **2013 (n=43)** | **2014 (n=35)** | **2015 (n=102)** | **2016 (n=56)** | **2017 (n=63)** | **2013 (n=162)** | **2014 (n=145)** | **2015 (n=400)** | **2016 (n=226)** | **2017 (n=238)** |
| | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** |
| **Instruction 1**. I was prepared to use effective communication techniques in order to develop a positive learning environment. | 4.34[2] (0.57) | 4.06 (0.68) | 4.31 (0.73) | 4.30 (0.63) | 4.33 (0.65) | 4.36[3] (0.68) | 4.20 (0.79) | 4.35[4] (0.69) | 4.33 (0.60) | 4.34 (0.65) |
| **Instruction 2.** I was prepared to effectively use questioning skills to promote higher level thinking skills. | 4.22[2] (0.65) | 3.97 (0.92) | 4.25 (0.75) | 4.13 (0.83) | 4.13 (0.92) | 4.19[3] (0.76) | 4.03 (0.86) | 4.20 (0.79) | 4.14[5] (0.78) | 4.08[7] (0.92) |
| **Instruction 3.** I was prepared to employ teaching skills that reflect current theory, research, and practice. | 4.20[2] (0.81) | 3.91 (0.78) | 4.14 (0.77) | 4.20 (0.72) | 4.22 (0.66) | 4.19[3] (0.77) | 4.06 (0.81) | 4.18 (0.78) | 4.15 (0.68) | 4.13[7] (0.82) |
| **Instruction 4.** I was prepared to provide student-centered instruction that is characterized by clarity, variety, and flexibility. | 4.32[2] (0.76) | 4.17 (0.62) | 4.31 (0.76) | 4.16 (0.80) | 4.16 (0.90) | 4.26[3] (0.81) | 4.17 (0.75) | 4.21 (0.79) | 4.18[5] (0.71) | 4.17[7] (0.80) |

| | Kansas State University | | | | | Kansas Public Universities | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Summary of Ratings** [1]<br>**Preparation to Provide Appropriate Instruction**<br>**Kansas Educator Alumni Survey - Spring 2013 - 2017** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **2013**<br>**(n=43)** | **2014**<br>**(n=35)** | **2015**<br>**(n=102)** | **2016**<br>**(n=56)** | **2017**<br>**(n=63)** | **2013**<br>**(n=162)** | **2014**<br>**(n=145)** | **2015**<br>**(n=400)** | **2016**<br>**(n=226)** | **2017**<br>**(n=238)** |
| | **Mean<br>(SD)** | **Mean<br>(SD)** | **Mean<br>(SD)** | **Mean<br>(SD)** | **Mean<br>(SD)** | **Mean<br>(SD)** | **Mean<br>(SD)** | **Mean<br>(SD)** | **Mean<br>(SD)** | **Mean<br>(SD)** |
| **Instruction 5.** I was prepared to integrate multiple content areas into interdisciplinary units of study. | 4.22[2]<br>(0.82) | 4.00<br>(0.69) | 4.09<br>(0.98) | 4.04<br>(0.91) | 4.10<br>(1.00) | 4.26[6]<br>(0.84) | 4.09<br>(0.82) | 4.11<br>(0.91) | 4.08<br>(0.85) | 4.08<br>(0.91) |
| **Instruction Composite (Cronbach Alpha: 0.83, 0.85)** | 4.26[2]<br>(0.54) | 4.02<br>(0.58) | 4.22<br>(0.66) | 4.16<br>(0.65) | 4.19<br>(0.64) | 4.25[6]<br>(0.60) | 4.11<br>(0.65) | 4.21[4]<br>(0.63) | 4.17[5]<br>(0.56) | 4.15[8]<br>(0.65) |

[1]=Ratings Key: 5= Strongly Agree; 4 = Agree; 3 = Neither Agree Nor Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 1 = Strongly Disagree
Composite mean values are based on the responses to all items within the category, not the mean of means.
[2]n=41
[3]n=160
[4]n=399
[5]n=225
[6]n=159
[7]n=237
[8]n=235

**Preparation to Incorporate Assessment**

| | Summary of Ratings [1] Preparation to Incorporate Assessment Kansas Educator Alumni Survey - Spring 2013 - 2017 | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Kansas State University** | | | | | **Kansas Public Universities** | | | | |
| | **2013 (n=43)** | **2014 (n=35)** | **2015 (n=102)** | **2016 (n=56)** | **2017 (n=63)** | **2013 (n=162)** | **2014 (n=145)** | **2015 (n=400)** | **2016 (n=226)** | **2017 (n=238)** |
| | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** |
| **Assessment 1**. I was prepared to use data for instructional decision making. | 4.02[2] (0.92) | 3.66 (1.03) | 3.84 (1.03) | 3.71 (1.06) | 3.86 (0.95) | 4.00[3] (0.88) | 3.88 (0.98) | 3.92[4] (0.97) | 3.90 (0.92) | 3.86 (1.03) |
| **Assessment 2.** I was prepared to engage in assessment activities to identify areas for student improvement. | 4.19 (0.85) | 3.91 (0.82) | 4.04 (0.86) | 4.00 (0.97) | 3.97 (0.86) | 4.16 (0.76) | 4.01 (0.84) | 4.09[4] (0.78) | 4.01 (0.83) | 3.96 (0.94) |
| **Assessment 3.** I was prepared to use a variety of assessment tools. | 4.16 (0.92) | 4.09 (0.78) | 4.04 (1.04) | 3.93 (1.01) | 4.13 (0.89) | 4.13 (0.92) | 4.05 (0.87) | 4.02[4] (0.91) | 4.03 (0.85) | 4.06 (0.90) |
| **Assessment 4.** I was prepared to provide feedback to students, which allows them to improve their learning. | 3.98 (0.86) | 4.06 (0.68) | 4.09 (0.86) | 4.00 (0.97) | 4.25 (0.80) | 4.11 (0.81) | 4.15 (0.75) | 4.08 (0.84) | 4.12 (0.75) | 4.11 (0.83) |

| | Kansas State University | | | | | Kansas Public Universities | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Summary of Ratings [1]** **Preparation to Incorporate Assessment** **Kansas Educator Alumni Survey - Spring 2013 - 2017** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **2013** **(n=43)** | **2014** **(n=35)** | **2015** **(n=102)** | **2016** **(n=56)** | **2017** **(n=63)** | **2013** **(n=162)** | **2014** **(n=145)** | **2015** **(n=400)** | **2016** **(n=226)** | **2017** **(n=238)** |
| | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** |
| **Assessment 5**. I was prepared to employ appropriate assessment techniques in order to measure the learning of all students. | 4.12 (0.88) | 4.03 (0.71) | 4.00 (1.00) | 3.93 (0.99) | 4.13 (0.83) | 4.15 (0.75) | 4.06 (0.83) | 4.03 (0.86) | 4.05 (0.84) | 4.05 (0.83) |
| **Assessment Composite (Cronbach Alpha: 0.88, 0.91)** | 4.09[2] (0.73) | 3.95 (0.68) | 4.00 (0.81) | 3.91 (0.92) | 4.07 (0.72) | 4.11[3] (0.68) | 4.03 (0.72) | 4.03[5] (0.73) | 4.02 (0.70) | 4.01 (0.78) |

[1]=Ratings Key: 5= Strongly Agree; 4 = Agree; 3 = Neither Agree Nor Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 1 = Strongly Disagree
Composite mean values are based on the responses to all items within the category, not the mean of means.
[2]n=42
[3]n=161
[4]n=399
[5]n=398

**Preparation to Incorporate Technology**

| | Summary of Ratings [1] Preparation to Incorporate Technology Kansas Educator Alumni Survey - Spring 2013 – 2017 | | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | Kansas State University | | | | | Kansas Public Universities | | | | |
| | 2013 (n=43) | 2014 (n=35) | 2015 (n=102) | 2016 (n=56) | 2017 (n=63) | 2013 (n=162) | 2014 (n=145) | 2015 (n=400) | 2016 (n=226) | 2017 (n=238) |
| | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) |
| **Technology 1**. I was prepared to make use of appropriate technology in the classroom. | 4.14[2] (1.12) | 3.60 (1.03) | 3.94 (1.11) | 4.02 (0.77) | 4.19 (0.90) | 4.12[3] (1.01) | 3.92 (0.92) | 3.96 (1.03) | 4.06[4] (0.85) | 4.07 (0.99) |
| **Technology 2.** I was prepared to use a variety of media resources to present information. | 4.19[2] (0.92) | 3.74 (1.01) | 3.94 (1.00) | 3.91 (0.88) | 4.22 (0.85) | 4.08[5] (0.94) | 3.88 (0.97) | 3.95[6] (0.96) | 4.04 (0.84) | 4.05 (0.95) |
| **Technology 3.** I was prepared to use technology effectively to enhance student learning. | 4.14[2] (1.05) | 3.80 (0.96) | 3.89 (1.09) | 3.84 (0.89) | 4.11 (1.00) | 4.04[3] (0.98) | 3.92 (0.92) | 3.91 (1.03) | 4.03 (0.82) | 4.03 (1.03) |
| **Technology 4.** I was prepared to provide opportunities for my students to utilize technology. | 4.00[2] (1.08) | 3.71 (0.93) | 3.81 (1.06) | 3.75 (1.07) | 4.14 (0.91) | 3.98[3] (1.05) | 3.83 (0.97) | 3.86[6] (1.06) | 3.96[4] (0.95) | 4.03 (0.99) |

| | Summary of Ratings [1] Preparation to Incorporate Technology Kansas Educator Alumni Survey - Spring 2013 – 2017 | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Kansas State University | | | | | Kansas Public Universities | | | | |
| | 2013 (n=43) | 2014 (n=35) | 2015 (n=102) | 2016 (n=56) | 2017 (n=63) | 2013 (n=162) | 2014 (n=145) | 2015 (n=400) | 2016 (n=226) | 2017 (n=238) |
| | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) |
| **Technology 5.** I was prepared to use technology to enhance my overall professional work. | 4.31[2] (0.84) | 3.83 (0.92) | 4.08 (0.98) | 3.93 (0.89) | 4.24 (0.89) | 4.20[3] (0.90) | 3.98 (0.88) | 4.04 (0.98) | 4.05 (0.84) | 4.11 (0.96) |
| **Technology Composite (Cronbach Alpha: 0.95, 0.96)** | 4.16[2] (0.93) | 3.74 (0.90) | 3.93 (0.96) | 3.89 (0.83) | 4.18 (0.83) | 4.09[5] (0.88) | 3.90 (0.84) | 3.94[6] (0.92) | 4.02[4] (0.78) | 4.06 (0.90) |

[1]=Ratings Key: 5= Strongly Agree; 4 = Agree; 3 = Neither Agree Nor Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 1 = Strongly Disagree
Composite mean values are based on the responses to all items within the category, not the mean of means.
[2]n=42
[3]n=161
[4]n=225
[5]n=160
[6]n=399

**Preparation for Diversity**

| | Summary of Ratings [1] Preparation for Diversity Kansas Educator Alumni Survey - Spring 2013 - 2017 | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Kansas State University | | | | | Kansas Public Universities | | | | |
| | 2013 (n=43) | 2014 (n=35) | 2015 (n=102) | 2016 (n=56) | 2017 (n=63) | 2013 (n=162) | 2014 (n=145) | 2015 (n=400) | 2016 (n=226) | 2017 (n=238) |
| | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) |
| **Diversity 1**. I was prepared to establish a classroom environment of respect and rapport that provides a culture for learning. | 4.49 (0.67) | 4.37 (0.60) | 4.41 (0.69) | 4.34 (0.79) | 4.37 (0.87) | 4.49 (0.71) | 4.43 (0.69) | 4.37 (0.74) | 4.36 (0.76) | 4.38 (0.75) |
| **Diversity 2.** I was prepared to effectively work with individuals from diverse backgrounds. | 4.40 (0.76) | 4.20 (0.63) | 4.33 (0.72) | 4.00 (0.93) | 4.29 (0.81) | 4.38 (0.76) | 4.26 (0.80) | 4.28 (0.84) | 4.22 (0.82) | 4.24 (0.82) |
| **Diversity 3**. I was prepared to understand the larger political, social, and economic context of education. | 4.14 (0.89) | 4.14 (0.69) | 4.11 (0.92) | 3.96 (0.91) | 4.06 (1.01) | 4.14 (0.88) | 4.16 (0.87) | 4.08 (0.97) | 4.13 (0.80) | 4.11[4] (0.91) |

| | Summary of Ratings [1] Preparation for Diversity Kansas Educator Alumni Survey - Spring 2013 - 2017 | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Kansas State University | | | | | Kansas Public Universities | | | | |
| | 2013 (n=43) | 2014 (n=35) | 2015 (n=102) | 2016 (n=56) | 2017 (n=63) | 2013 (n=162) | 2014 (n=145) | 2015 (n=400) | 2016 (n=226) | 2017 (n=238) |
| | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) |
| **Diversity 4.** I was prepared to implement instruction that accommodates diverse learning styles. | 4.42 (0.59) | 4.06 (0.84) | 4.16 (0.83) | 4.02 (0.86) | 4.19 (0.78) | 4.30 (0.71) | 4.21 (0.84) | 4.22[2] (0.81) | 4.17 (0.80) | 4.24 (0.78) |
| **Diversity 5**. I was prepared to encourage students to see, question, and interpret ideas from diverse perspectives. | 4.09 (0.97) | 4.14 (0.77) | 4.11 (0.91) | 4.00 (0.97) | 4.19 (0.91) | 4.20 (0.80) | 4.14 (0.86) | 4.17[2] (0.85) | 4.08 (0.87) | 4.18 (0.83) |
| **Diversity 6.** I was prepared to implement non-biased techniques for meeting the needs of diverse learners. | 4.28 (0.80) | 4.14 (0.73) | 4.20 (0.78) | 4.00 (0.95) | 4.22 (0.83) | 4.27 (0.71) | 4.20 (0.75) | 4.20 (0.82) | 4.19 (0.77) | 4.23 (0.76) |
| **Diversity Composite (Cronbach Alpha: 0.91, 0.90)** | 4.30 (0.61) | 4.18 (0.57) | 4.22 (0.66) | 4.05 (0.78) | 4.22 (0.73) | 4.30 (0.59) | 4.23 (0.66) | 4.22[3] (0.69) | 4.19 (0.66) | 4.23[4] (0.90) |

[1]=Ratings Key: 5= Strongly Agree; 4 = Agree; 3 = Neither Agree Nor Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 1 = Strongly Disagree
Composite mean values are based on the responses to all items within the category, not the mean of means.
[2]n=399
[3]n=398
[4]n=237

**Preparation to Motivate and Engage Students**

| | Summary of Ratings [1] Preparation to Motivate and Engage Students Kansas Educator Alumni Survey - Spring 2013 - 2017 | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Kansas State University | | | | | Kansas Public Universities | | | | |
| | 2013 (n=43) | 2014 (n=35) | 2015 (n=102) | 2016 (n=56) | 2017 (n=63) | 2013 (n=162) | 2014 (n=145) | 2015 (n=400) | 2016 (n=226) | 2017 (n=238) |
| | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) |
| **Motivate & Engage 1.** I was prepared to manage student behavior in the classroom. | 3.60[2] (1.15) | 3.51 (1.12) | 3.60 (1.15) | 3.43 (1.28) | 3.33 (1.22) | 3.78[3] (1.17) | 3.69 (1.14) | 3.71 (1.11) | 3.56 (1.16) | 3.53[9] (1.17) |
| **Motivate & Engage 2.** I was prepared to use a variety of motivational strategies to facilitate learning for all students. | 3.84 (1.09) | 3.83 (0.86) | 3.79 (1.02) | 3.73 (1.10) | 3.76 (0.91) | 3.99[4] (1.02) | 3.95 (0.89) | 3.88 (0.97) | 3.85 (0.94) | 3.80 (0.98) |
| **Motivate & Engage 3.** I was prepared to communicate with family and community members to make them partners in the educational process. | 3.81 (0.96) | 3.46 (1.04) | 3.54 (1.11) | 3.75 (1.07) | 3.57 (1.10) | 3.86[4] (1.02) | 3.62 (1.07) | 3.68 (1.08) | 3.74[5] (1.04) | 3.58 (1.08) |

| | Summary of Ratings [1] Preparation to Motivate and Engage Students Kansas Educator Alumni Survey - Spring 2013 - 2017 | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Kansas State University | | | | | Kansas Public Universities | | | | |
| | 2013 (n=43) | 2014 (n=35) | 2015 (n=102) | 2016 (n=56) | 2017 (n=63) | 2013 (n=162) | 2014 (n=145) | 2015 (n=400) | 2016 (n=226) | 2017 (n=238) |
| | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) |
| **Motivate & Engage 4.** I was prepared to collaborate with educational personnel to support student learning. | 4.19[2] (0.71) | 4.11 (0.68) | 4.26 (0.61) | 4.16 (0.80) | 4.14 (0.86) | 4.23[3] (0.78) | 4.06 (0.85) | 4.18 (0.80) | 4.17[5] (0.82) | 4.13 (0.87) |
| **Motivate & Engage 5.** I was prepared to establish a caring relationship with students developed through engagement and high expectations for all learners. | 4.37 (0.62) | 4.54 (0.51) | 4.44 (0.62) | 4.38 (0.62) | 4.35 (0.79) | 4.46[4] (0.64) | 4.48 (0.59) | 4.42 (0.67) | 4.38 (0.69) | 4.47 (0.67) |

| | Summary of Ratings [1] Preparation to Motivate and Engage Students Kansas Educator Alumni Survey - Spring 2013 - 2017 | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Kansas State University | | | | | Kansas Public Universities | | | | |
| | 2013 (n=43) | 2014 (n=35) | 2015 (n=102) | 2016 (n=56) | 2017 (n=63) | 2013 (n=162) | 2014 (n=145) | 2015 (n=400) | 2016 (n=226) | 2017 (n=238) |
| | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) |
| **Motivate & Engage 6.** I was prepared to create an environment that encourages positive social interaction among students. | 4.35 (0.72) | 4.37 (0.49) | 4.40 (0.79) | 4.23 (0.79) | 4.29 (0.81) | 4.45[4] (0.65) | 4.39 (0.66) | 4.35 (0.77) | 4.27 (0.71) | 4.36 (0.75) |
| **Motivate & Engage Composite (Cronbach Alpha: 0.88, 0.86)** | 4.01[6] (0.63) | 3.97 (0.59) | 4.01 (0.67) | 3.95 (0.79) | 3.91 (0.76) | 4.12[7] (0.67) | 4.03 (0.67) | 4.04 (0.69) | 4.00[8] (0.71) | 3.98[9] (0.72) |

[1]=Ratings Key: 5= Strongly Agree; 4 = Agree; 3 = Neither Agree Nor Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 1 = Strongly Disagree
Composite mean values are based on the responses to all items within the category, not the mean of means.
[2]n=42
[3]n=160
[4]n=161
[5]n=225
[6]n=41
[7]n=159
[8]n=224
[9]n=237

**Preparation for Professional Ethics**

| | Summary of Ratings [1] Preparation for Professional Ethics Kansas Educator Alumni Survey - Spring 2013 - 2017 | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Kansas State University | | | | | Kansas Public Universities | | | | |
| | 2013 (n=43) | 2014 (n=35) | 2015 (n=102) | 2016 (n=56) | 2017 (n=63) | 2013 (n=162) | 2014 (n=145) | 2015 (n=400) | 2016 (n=226) | 2017 (n=238) |
| | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) |
| **Ethics 1.** I was prepared to understand the legal practices in education. | 3.91 (0.92) | 3.97 (1.10) | 3.53 (1.10) | 3.68 (1.06) | 3.78 (1.04) | 4.00 (0.98) | 3.92 (1.02) | 3.75 (1.06) | 3.77 (1.00) | 3.91 (0.95) |
| **Ethics 2.** I was prepared to understand the ethical practices in education. | 4.42 (0.54) | 4.29 (0.89) | 4.19 (0.82) | 4.16 (0.80) | 4.33 (0.74) | 4.40 (0.64) | 4.34 (0.77) | 4.24 (0.78) | 4.20 (0.77) | 4.30[4] (0.74) |
| **Ethics 3.** I was prepared to meet the ethical standards of my profession. | 4.47 (0.55) | 4.43 (0.74) | 4.35 (0.75) | 4.25 (0.67) | 4.41 (0.73) | 4.48[2] (0.60) | 4.43 (0.64) | 4.39 (0.68) | 4.31 (0.70) | 4.41[4] (0.67) |
| **Ethics 4.** I was prepared to understand how to behave in ways that reflect integrity, responsibility, and honesty. | 4.58 (0.50) | 4.66 (0.48) | 4.51 (0.63) | 4.43 (0.63) | 4.49 (0.69) | 4.67[2] (0.48) | 4.57 (0.59) | 4.54 (0.60) | 4.47 (0.60) | 4.54 (0.62) |

| | Summary of Ratings [1] Preparation for Professional Ethics Kansas Educator Alumni Survey - Spring 2013 - 2017 | | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | Kansas State University | | | | | Kansas Public Universities | | | | |
| | 2013 (n=43) | 2014 (n=35) | 2015 (n=102) | 2016 (n=56) | 2017 (n=63) | 2013 (n=162) | 2014 (n=145) | 2015 (n=400) | 2016 (n=226) | 2017 (n=238) |
| | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) |
| **Ethics 5.** I was prepared to establish collegial relationships with all stakeholders (school personnel, parents, community, etc.) to support student learning. | 4.26 (0.76) | 4.52 (0.56) | 4.28 (0.79) | 4.20 (0.75) | 4.19 (0.84) | 4.40 (0.73) | 4.32 (0.86) | 4.28 (0.80) | 4.27 (0.76) | 4.27 (0.83) |
| **Ethics Composite (Cronbach Alpha: 0.91, 0.87)** | 4.33 (0.47) | 4.38 (0.61) | 4.17 (0.64) | 4.14 (0.65) | 4.24 (0.70) | 4.40[3] (0.51) | 4.32 (0.62) | 4.24 (0.63) | 4.21 (0.64) | 4.29[5] (0.63) |

[1]=Ratings Key: 5= Strongly Agree; 4 = Agree; 3 = Neither Agree Nor Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 1 = Strongly Disagree
Composite mean values are based on the responses to all items within the category, not the mean of means.
[2]n=161
[3]n=160
[4]n=237
[5]n=236

**Reflective Practice**

| | Summary of Ratings [1] Reflective Practice Kansas Educator Alumni Survey - Spring 2013 – 2017 | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Kansas State University | | | | | Kansas Public Universities | | | | |
| | 2013 (n=43) | 2014 (n=35) | 2015 (n=102) | 2016 (n=56) | 2017 (n=63) | 2013 (n=162) | 2014 (n=145) | 2015 (n=400) | 2016 (n=226) | 2017 (n=238) |
| | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) |
| **Reflect 1.** I was prepared to employ self-reflection to improve my teaching practice. | 4.70 (0.46) | 4.43 (0.65) | 4.56 (0.61) | 4.24 (0.77) | 4.46 (0.67) | 4.61 (0.56) | 4.54 (0.62) | 4.57 (0.59) | 4.42[2] (0.65) | 4.49 (0.61) |
| **Reflect 2.** I was prepared to locate resources available to help me improve my professional practice. | 4.49 (0.63) | 4.29 (0.75) | 4.25 (0.84) | 4.11 (0.89) | 4.17 (0.93) | 4.37[3] (0.74) | 4.34 (0.74) | 4.29 (0.80) | 4.18 (0.85) | 4.23[4] (0.87) |
| **Reflect 3.** I was prepared to use multiple resources such as professional literature, mentoring, and interaction with colleagues to aid my growth as an educator. | 4.63 (0.49) | 4.37 (0.65) | 4.38 (0.75) | 4.18 (0.86) | 4.35 (0.79) | 4.52 (0.64) | 4.37 (0.73) | 4.42 (0.68) | 4.34 (0.71) | 4.38 (0.72) |

| Reflect Composite (Cronbach Alpha: 0.78, 0.82) | 4.60 (0.48) | 4.36 (0.53) | 4.40 (0.65) | 4.18 (0.74) | 4.33 (0.67) | 4.50[3] (0.54) | 4.41 (0.59) | 4.42 (0.60) | 4.31[2] (0.65) | 4.36[4] (0.64) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

[1]=Ratings Key: 5= Strongly Agree; 4 = Agree; 3 = Neither Agree Nor Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 1 = Strongly Disagree
Composite mean values are based on the responses to all items within the category, not the mean of means.
[2]n=225
[3]n=161
[4]n=237

## Kansas Educator Alumni Survey
## Spring 2017 Survey Administration

| Demographic Data<br>Kansas Educator Alumni Survey - Spring 2017<br>Endorsement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Kansas State University | | Kansas Public Universities | |
| **Endorsement Type** | *n* | **Percent*** | *n* | **Percent*** |
| Early Childhood Deaf or Hard-of-Hearing | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Early Childhood Unified | 1 | 1.6 | 10 | 4.2 |
| Early Childhood School Psychologist | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Early Childhood Visually Impaired | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| K-6 Adaptive | 3 | 4.8 | 6 | 2.5 |
| K-6 Elementary | 24 | 38.1 | 87 | 36.6 |
| K-6 English for Speakers of Other Languages | 3 | 4.8 | 12 | 5.0 |
| K-6 Functional | -- | -- | 2 | 0.8 |
| K-6 Gifted | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| G5-8 Adaptive | -- | -- | 2 | 0.8 |
| G5-8 English Language Arts | -- | -- | 3 | 1.3 |
| G5-8 English for Speakers of Other Languages | 1 | 1.6 | 2 | 0.8 |
| G5-8 Functional | 3 | 4.8 | 4 | 1.7 |
| G5-8 Gifted | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| G5-8 History Comprehensive | 1 | 1.6 | 2 | 0.8 |
| G5-8 Mathematics | 1 | 1.6 | 12 | 5.0 |
| G5-8 Science | 2 | 3.2 | 4 | 1.7 |
| G6-12 Adaptive | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| G6-12 Agriculture | 3 | 4.8 | 3 | 1.3 |
| G6-12 Biology | 4 | 6.3 | 7 | 2.9 |
| G6-12 Business | 1 | 1.6 | 1 | 0.4 |
| G6-12 Chemistry | 1 | 1.6 | 5 | 2.1 |
| G6-12 Communication Technology | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| G 6-12 Earth and Space Science | 3 | 4.8 | 4 | 1.7 |
| G6-12 English Language Arts | 6 | 9.5 | 21 | 8.8 |
| G6-12 English for Speakers of Other Languages | -- | -- | 1 | 0.4 |
| G6-12 Family & Consumer Science | 3 | 4.8 | 3 | 1.3 |
| G6-12 Functional | 1 | 1.6 | 2 | 0.8 |
| G6-12 Gifted | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| G6-12 History and Government | 2 | 3.2 | 7 | 2.9 |
| G6-12 Journalism | 2 | 3.2 | 4 | 1.7 |
| G6-12 Mathematics | 4 | 6.3 | 13 | 5.5 |
| G6-12 Physics | 1 | 1.6 | 4 | 1.7 |
| G6-12 Power, Energy, Transportation Technology | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| G6-12 Production Technology | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| G6-12 Psychology | -- | -- | 1 | 0.4 |
| G6-12 Speech/Theatre | -- | -- | 1 | 0.4 |
| G6-12 Technology Education | -- | -- | -- | -- |

| Demographic Data<br>Kansas Educator Alumni Survey - Spring 2017<br>Endorsement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Kansas State University | | Kansas Public Universities | |
| Endorsement Type | *n* | Percent* | *n* | Percent* |
| PreK-12 Adaptive | -- | -- | 2 | 0.8 |
| PreK-12 Art | 2 | 3.2 | 2 | 0.8 |
| PreK-12 Building Leadership | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| PreK-12 Deaf or Hard-of-Hearing | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| PreK-12  District Leadership | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| PreK-12 English for Speakers of Other Languages | 1 | 1.6 | 2 | 0.8 |
| PreK-12 Foreign Language | 1 | 1.6 | 1 | 0.4 |
| PreK-12 Functional | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| PreK-12 Gifted | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| PreK-12 Health | -- | -- | 1 | 0.4 |
| PreK-12 Instrumental Music | 3 | 4.8 | 6 | 2.5 |
| PreK-12 Library Media Specialist | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| PreK-12 Music | 4 | 6.3 | 9 | 3.8 |
| PreK-12 Physical Education | -- | -- | 4 | 1.7 |
| PreK-12  Program Leadership | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| PreK-12  Reading Specialist | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| PreK-12  School Counselor | 1 | 1.6 | 1 | 0.4 |
| PreK-12 School Psychologist | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| PreK-12 Teacher Leader | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| PreK-12 Visually Impaired | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| PreK-12 Vocal Music | 3 | 4.8 | 5 | 2.1 |
| Total | 63 | 100.0 | 238 | 100.0 |

*Respondents were not required to respond to each question. Therefore, percent value displayed is based upon the total number of individuals that responded to a specific question.

| Demographic Data<br>Kansas Educator Alumni Survey - Spring 2017<br>Please indicate the type of license you currently hold. | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Kansas State University | | Kansas Public Universities | |
| License Type | n | Percent* | n | Percent* |
| Initial License | 49 | 77.8 | 131 | 67.2 |
| One year non-renewable License | 1 | 1.6 | 1 | 0.5 |
| Professional License | 10 | 15.9 | 58 | 29.7 |
| Provisional License | 3 | 4.8 | 5 | 2.6 |
| Restricted License | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| **Total** | **63** | **100.0** | **195** | **100.0** |

\* Respondents were not required to respond to each question. Therefore, percent value displayed is based upon the total number of individuals that responded to a specific question.

| Demographic Data<br>Kansas Educator Alumni Survey - Spring 2017<br>In what year did you graduate from your educator preparation program? | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Kansas State University | | Kansas Public Universities | |
| Date | n | Percent* | n | Percent* |
| Prior to 2015 | 4 | 6.3 | 11 | 5.6 |
| 2015 | 37 | 58.7 | 83 | 42.6 |
| 2016 | 21 | 33.3 | 99 | 50.8 |
| 2017 | 1 | 1.6 | 2 | 1.0 |
| **Total** | **63** | **100.0** | 195 | 100.0 |

\*Respondents were not required to respond to each question. Therefore, percent value displayed is based upon the total number of individuals that responded to a specific question.

| Demographic Data<br>Kansas Educator Alumni Survey - Spring 2017<br>For how many years have you been teaching at your current school? | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Kansas State University | | Kansas Public Universities | |
| Number of Years | n | Percent* | n | Percent* |
| Less than 1 year | 24 | 38.1 | 65 | 33.3 |
| 1 to 2 years | 39 | 61.9 | 124 | 63.6 |
| More than 2 years | -- | -- | 6 | 3.1 |
| **Total** | **63** | **100.0** | **195** | **100.0** |

\*Respondents were not required to respond to each question. Therefore, percent value displayed is based upon the total number of individuals that responded to a specific question.

**Emporia State University data did not include responses to demographic survey items. Therefore, the total number of responses is 195 rather than 238**

| Demographic Data Kansas Educator Alumni Survey - Spring 2017 In what grade level do you currently spend the majority of your teaching time? | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Kansas State University | | Kansas Public Universities | |
| **Grade Level** | *n* | **Percent*** | *n* | **Percent*** |
| Pre-K | 1 | 1.6 | 3 | 1.5 |
| Kindergarten | 5 | 7.9 | 21 | 10.8 |
| 1st Grade | 7 | 11.1 | 14 | 7.2 |
| 2nd Grade | 3 | 4.8 | 12 | 6.2 |
| 3rd Grade | 2 | 3.2 | 11 | 5.6 |
| 4th Grade | 7 | 11.1 | 26 | 13.3 |
| 5th Grade | 5 | 7.9 | 13 | 6.7 |
| 6th Grade | 4 | 6.3 | 14 | 7.2 |
| 7th Grade | 3 | 4.8 | 15 | 7.7 |
| 8th Grade | 3 | 4.8 | 15 | 7.7 |
| 9th Grade | 9 | 14.3 | 21 | 10.8 |
| 10th Grade | 5 | 7.9 | 8 | 4.1 |
| 11th Grade | 8 | 12.7 | 19 | 9.7 |
| 12th Grade | 1 | 1.6 | 3 | 1.5 |
| **Total** | **63** | **100.0** | **195** | **100.0** |

*Respondents were not required to respond to each question. Therefore, percent value displayed is based upon the total number of individuals that responded to a specific question.

| Demographic Data Kansas Educator Alumni Survey - Spring 2017 What is your highest degree that you most recently obtained? | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Kansas State University | | Kansas Public Universities | |
| **Degree** | *n* | **Percent*** | *n* | **Percent*** |
| Bachelor's Degree | 59 | 93.7 | 185 | 94.9 |
| Master's Degree | 4 | 6.3 | 10 | 5.1 |
| Doctoral Degree | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| **Total** | **63** | **100.0** | **195** | **100.0** |

*Respondents were not required to respond to each question. Therefore, percent value displayed is based upon the total number of individuals that responded to a specific question.

| Demographic Data<br>Kansas Educator Alumni Survey - Spring 2017<br>From what institution did you obtain your educator preparation degree? | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Kansas State University | | Kansas Public Universities | |
| Institution | *n* | Percent* | *n* | Percent* |
| Emporia State University | -- | -- | 43 | 18.1 |
| Fort Hays State University | -- | -- | 37 | 15.5 |
| Kansas State University | 63 | 100.0% | 63 | 26.5 |
| Pittsburg State University | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| University of Kansas | -- | -- | 27 | 11.3 |
| Washburn University | -- | -- | 16 | 6.7 |
| Wichita State University | -- | -- | 52 | 21.8 |
| Other privately-funded university outside of the state of Kansas | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| **Total** | **63** | **100.0** | **238** | **100.0** |

*Respondents were not required to respond to each question. Therefore, percent value displayed is based upon the total number of individuals that responded to a specific question.

| Demographic Data<br>Kansas Educator Alumni Survey - Spring 2017<br>Respondent Gender | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Kansas State University | | Kansas Public Universities | |
| Gender | *n* | Percent* | *n* | Percent* |
| Female | 51 | 81.0 | 158 | 81.0 |
| Male | 12 | 19.0 | 37 | 19.0 |
| Prefer not to respond | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| **Total** | **63** | **100.0** | **195** | **100.0** |

*Respondents were not required to respond to each question. Therefore, percent value displayed is based upon the total number of individuals that responded to a specific question.

| Demographic Data<br>Kansas Educator Alumni Survey - Spring 2017<br>Respondent Ethnicity | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Kansas State University | | Kansas Public Universities | |
| Ethnicity | *n* | Percent* | *n* | Percent* |
| Hispanic or Latino | 1 | 1.6 | 4 | 2.1 |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 60 | 95.2 | 184 | 94.4 |
| Prefer not to respond | 2 | 3.2 | 7 | 3.6 |
| **Total** | **63** | **100.0** | **195** | **100.0** |

*Respondents were not required to respond to each question. Therefore, percent value displayed is based upon the total number of individuals that responded to a specific question.

| Demographic Data<br>Kansas Educator Alumni Survey - Spring 2017<br>Respondent Race | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Kansas State University | | Kansas Public Universities | |
| Race | n | Percent* | n | Percent* |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | -- | -- | 2 | 1.0 |
| Asian | -- | -- | 1 | 0.5 |
| Black or African American | 1 | 1.6 | 2 | 1.0 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| White | 60 | 95.2 | 182 | 93.3 |
| Multi-Racial | 1 | 1.6 | 5 | 2.6 |
| Prefer not to respond | 1 | 1.6 | 3 | 1.5 |
| **Total** | **63** | **100.0** | **195** | **100.0** |

*Respondents were not required to respond to each question. Therefore, percent value displayed is based upon the total number of individuals that responded to a specific question.

**What do you consider as the greatest strength of your educator preparation program?**
Kansas State University responses (*n*=56):
- Creating effective lesson plans that meet the needs of all students.
- Curriculum and instruction
- Diverse real world experiences.
- Having passionate professors makes it easy for you to gain that passion as well. Learning about how the communities you live and work in have endless amounts of resources has helped me in a district that is low income.
- Having the opportunity to student teach under a strong teacher
- How professional and successful I believed the program was. My professors were always prepared and they enjoyed their job, which made me enjoy coming to class. I believe it is because of K-State's college of education program that I had such a successful first year teaching.
- I believe that the best preparation for teaching is to be thrown into the deep end without a life jacket. My preparation program was sure to expose us to classrooms early on, and they were sure to expose us to all grade levels. Because of those experiences, many knew early on if teaching was truly for them, or if the grade level they were interested in was a right fit for their teaching style. My program was also very deliberate about the populations that we worked with, so that we can experience a wide range of students from all walks of life.
- I felt very prepared to teach my content. I also feel as though my program did an excellent job of teaching professionalism both amongst colleagues and students.
- I know the laws and standards.
- I student taught in Fall 2015, and that was absolutely the greatest strength. I student taught at [School Name] and was pushed very strongly because of [Professor] and [Professor]. They prepared me wholly for all I could handle in my first year, and I loved the split placement because I gained an entirely new perspective, as well as confidence for teaching any grade level. The student teaching portfolio truly prepped me for interviews, and even for my first year of teaching because I am confident I my ability to stretch my lessons, behavior management strategies, and self-reflection.
- I think one of the greatest strengths of the educator preparation program was learning how to create engaging and age-appropriate lesson plans. Although my school does not require us to turn in lesson plans, I still create them out of habit and I know that is because I was taught the importance of having them. It has helped tremendously when I have had a sub in my classroom.
- I think the greatest strength of my education preparation program was the presentation and suggestion of strategies to utilize in the classroom.
- I would consider the opportunities that I had to be in a school prior to teaching was a great strength of my educator preparation program. I got a wide range of experiences from being on a military base, to a smaller school, to being in both a middle school and high school.
- I would say the greatest strength was/is (since I am also a current graduate student) the amazing professors who truly strive to get to know the students they teach. Thus, the K-State professors inspire and show their students how we should also strive to get to know our own students. I felt comfortable going to my professors and asking them questions, seeking helping, or simply going to ask for their advice. They were very knowledgeable and up-to-date on the newest educational research. The professors in the K-State College of Education expect a lot out of their students, however, it pays off. I realized once I had a job that writing lesson plans was much easier. If K-State had not required such in-depth writing, it may have hurt me if I did not have that practice and prior experience.

**What do you consider as the greatest strength of your educator preparation program?**
Kansas State University responses (*n*=56):

- In family and consumer sciences education, [Professor] taught us extensively how to build 21st century processing skills directly into our lessons to enhance critical thinking skills in our students. This is an area that my principal has been very impressed with this year. It is a large focus on the state level, so I feel like I am very well prepared to be doing this in my classroom.
- Incorporating all content areas together to help understand how to incorporate multiple contents areas into a classroom or lesson.
- It allows us to experience multiple types of learning. We are able to have specialized classes for each core content area that give us ways to prepare lessons and integrate them together.
- It is very inclusive and teaches to appreciate every unique student and student need. I think the teachers that come from our program are much more empathetic towards student situations than people from other programs. My program also had an amazing faculty that were enthusiastic about teaching and provided many amazing opportunities to become involved.
- [Professor]. She is just wonderful and I learned wonders from her.
- Lesson Planning and using the standards. As much as we did it, when I got out into the classroom, I was so familiar with lesson planning! It is second nature to me.
- Many resources, colleagues to collaborate with.
- Making guided lessons and units of instruction that use higher level questioning and align with state and common core standards.
- Multiple opportunities to interact with students in the classrooms
- My education preparation program was very rich in providing opportunities to learn the basics. We learned a variety of different methods to gather information, and search for resources in an ever-changing world.
- My educator program emphasized depth of knowledge to a high degree. This is where I believe the greatest strength lies.
- My greatest strength from the educator preparation program was learning how to write, and implement lessons that met state standards.
- One of K-State's education program is that they make sure future teachers understand the standards they will be working with. They also make sure the future teachers get practice so they know how to design coherent lessons that are standards-based and student-centered.
- Opportunities for shadowing other teachers. Throughout my experience in school, I was able to visit and observe many different teachers, which gave me better understanding of teaching methods, classroom management strategies, etc.
- Organization
- Overall, I felt prepared to teach. I was not stressed or worried for my first year. I think my strength was my knowledge and skills I had ready to bring to the classroom.
- Practice with a lot of teaching strategies
- Prepared to write engaging lesson plans without curriculum
- Providing feedback in multiple ways throughout teaching and learning
- Some of the specific professors who were extremely invested in their work.
- The broad, all-encompassing knowledge and skill set provided with an inside-out approach
- The clinical instructor program that accompanies student teaching. I was lucky enough to have been given a clinical instructor that was always accessible. I know that some of my peers didn't have the same accessibility and it greatly impacted their experience in a negative way.
- The content classes of Block C and K-2 reading in Block B.
- The experience in multiple cooperating classrooms.

**What do you consider as the greatest strength of your educator preparation program?**
Kansas State University responses (*n*=56):

- The faculty.
- The field experiences in many different classrooms was incredibly beneficial. I graduated with experience in four different classrooms and that was valuable.
- The greatest strength of Kansas State Universities educator preparation program was the personnel at Kansas State University. The professors truly prepared me as a counselor to deliver comprehensive school counseling curriculum.
- The greatest strength of my program was providing experience within schools. By participating in a classroom, I was able to observe multiple teachers and their behavior. I was able to observe admin and other support systems to assist students.
- The greatest strength of the preparation program was how much field experience I got. I got to see a variety of schools and classrooms, and how each operates differently. Seeing that much was very helpful.
- The greatest strength was allowing us to learn by doing. Our student teaching experiences were a great opportunity to learn about a real life classroom and career as an educator.
- The greatest strength was lesson planning preparation.
- The greatest strength was the incredible staff, especially those that were willing to stray from the lesson to answer real-world questions when we entered our blocks and when we were student teaching.
- The high volume of experiential learning and practice teaching as well as volunteer opportunities.
- The in the classroom 40 hour observations during Methods taught me more than anything else. To be able to shadow a teacher who is effective in instruction and to learn more about content, techniques, and specifically communication with students was invaluable. It was SO important to understand fully what works and what does not work. I always felt through my education and graduate program that we should focus on what works effectively and model that for our student teachers. Student teachers need to establish confidence and experience. More help in this area would provide them with a stronger foundation. Defaulting on practices that are tried and true is much better than giving student teachers less boundaries on which to work with. I understand their needs to be flexibility in allowing teachers to exercise their own styles, ideas; etc., but more often than not I observed student teachers struggling with efficient ways of planning, and effective communication.
- The lesson planning sections. I know how to create a very strong lesson plan.
- The professors -- they all truly cared and were passionate about their teachings.
- The program gave us a great deal of time and support in the field allowing us to become comfortable in the classroom setting and working with students and other teachers and students going through the program.
- The quality of my field experiences. All of the teachers whose rooms I spent time in during my various field experiences and student teacher were very knowledgeable about their fields, their classrooms, and the profession of teaching as a whole.
- The small class sizes.
- The time spent around students and in the schools.
- We are given several field experiences.
- We are introduced to a lot of things. We only get a surface introduction.

**If you could make one improvement to your educator preparation program, what would it be?**
Kansas State University responses (*n*=57):
- Actually prepare students for real teaching.
- Although I was able to visit other classrooms, I feel I would have benefitted from additional learning of behavior management/classroom management strategies.
- Assessment
- Behavior management practice. We need more of it. Also, how to deal with tragedies (suicide, death, school shootings, etc.)
- BEHAVIOR MANAGMENT
- Better class over using technology in the classroom.
- Block B was very weak, and I did not retain very many skills from this block (I took Block B in Fall 2014). It was tough to utilize the science portion because it was very specific to the Foss curriculum, and I barely taught during my practicum. Additionally, I am not confident to teach reading in the K-2 grade levels. However, I did pass all of my classes in this block with As, and I wish I had been able to learn the concepts in these classes more deeply. This needs revamping to become more similar to Block C (the Block C of Spring 2015).
- Choose a specific technology and study it to the best of the student's ability.
- Classroom management is by far the greatest challenge for a first year teacher, this class should have been a MUCH bigger emphasis at K-State. It should have gone into more detail and given challenging scenarios for its students to come up with interventions and behavioral practices for future students. There should be a much bigger emphasis on "teacher language" when managing students effectively and how that should all tie into classroom rules and expectations.
- Classroom management is the key to a successful classroom. One small class does not cut it. Even though experience is the best teacher, we need more instruction! Maybe having us create a plan and implementing that for student teaching. Reflecting on what went wrong and what we can try for our first year.
- Continuing to have the music education faculty grading and observing the music education students and not the college of education.
- Do more practice with parent communication and how to modify tests for differentiation.
- Eliminate the fluff and do more actual hands on teaching. I felt like experience is what I lacked.
- Having a clinical instructor that is present, accountable, and closely monitored/monitoring. It is really frustrating to hear of a student teaching peer who is doing significantly less work than what is required and still receiving the same degree that I worked hard for. That is on the clinical instructors and how closely they work with student teachers and what they let them "get away" with doing/not doing.
- Having more time in the actual elementary classroom. Behavior management is so important and was only one class. It did not prepare me for the actual problems in a classroom. More time in an actual classroom is the best thing.
- I am English...do not have me take 100 classes on all of the literature in the world. Teach ME how to teach IT!
- I think it would have to be an increased emphasis on some of the laws and regulations that are coming down the pike and are currently relevant.
- I think there needs to be a better connection between content focus and general education program. I felt like there was a disconnect between my education courses and my content courses. Some areas of my teaching were not covered by either groups. I think the expectation

**If you could make one improvement to your educator preparation program, what would it be?**
Kansas State University responses (*n*=57):

> was that the other courses were covering this. It would be beneficial to have an advisor from both areas to help bridge this gap.

- I wish that we would have more preparation in classroom community building skills or behavior management.
- I would have enjoyed more time spent on dealing with students as they cope with trauma or grief. Many circumstances have appeared in my first year of teaching where students are dealing with trauma and coping with events that have arisen in our district ad school. I feel like I was not prepared to cope with the loss of a student to suicide or other student losses, and struggled to help my students cope as the adult that they needed.
- I would implement more classes on differentiating instruction and teaching students with dyslexia, an issue becoming more prevalent each year. 20% of kids are getting diagnosed with this learning disability and teachers need to be well prepared and equipped with the knowledge and resources to help those kids learn to read and excel in all subjects. This is the main reason I chose to get my Reading Specialist endorsement- I want to learn how to help those struggling readers and help them succeed.
- I would like more training on teaching low socio-economic students and family. At the school I am currently at there are extreme behaviors that I have come in contact with and strongly feel that I was not exposed to anything like this previously. I was no prepared for what to do and feel like it really affected how my first year went.
- I would provide more opportunities to develop a complete classroom plan. Often time, we discussed how different things would make our classroom grow and be productive for students, but rarely did we get to make an action plan for our future classroom. It was not until I started teaching that I felt I had a solid grasp of a classroom structure.
- I would spend more time with hands one learning.  You just learn more from experience. Student teaching is what really prepared me.  Not the portfolio but the actually fact of controlling a classroom by myself for two sold weeks.
- Make classroom management a focus of one of the field experiences. Classroom management is the most important set of skills a teacher has. If a teacher cannot control the class, it does not matter how good your lessons are; the kids will not learn.
- More classroom management practices and tools
- More on classroom management
- More realistic expectations for collaborating with other educators.
- More time in the classroom before student teaching
- More training on specific accommodations/modifications for children with special needs.
- N/A, overall it was a tremendous preparation program.
- Not spend as much time teaching the content. As a professional, I did not feel that I needed to learn math skills of elementary students, I feel that it should be expected that I know those, and if I do not then I would need to take those classes.
- One class targeted to teaching diverse learners is not enough. I know it is mentioned in other classes, but I was hired in an urban district and I felt very underprepared for the realities I faced. The education program felt geared toward suburban schools, which have no shortage of teachers. We desperately need teachers in urban schools and the program does not do the best job of preparing teachers for that setting.

**If you could make one improvement to your educator preparation program, what would it be?**
Kansas State University responses (*n*=57):

- One improvement I would suggest would be a better overview of school and district events given in the course of the year (i.e. fundraisers, monthly assemblies, etc.) and the expectations of the teacher/student responsibility for those events.
- One improvement of the educator preparation program is in the enhancement of research opportunities in the area of counseling diverse, oppressed, and under privileged populations.
- One improvement would be learning more techniques to differentiate instruction. For example, strategies to easily implement into the classroom for students performing above grade level or below grade level.
- One improvement would be to extend the experience within schools a bit longer. Every semester should have designated time within a school for observations and interactions.
- One improvement would be to provide more background and information on the large variety of behaviors that can be present in a classroom.
- One thing I felt totally unprepared for, was the small details. Like what do you really need for your classroom. What should you expect when signing a contract? What the differences are between KPERS, different insurance options, etc. The benefits portion was very overwhelming, because not once was this discussed while at K-State, so when it came time to make decisions, I was clueless.
- Parent communication.
- Preparation for scheduling students with pull out and inclusion minutes, along with scheduling para schedules.
- Provide us with more information on legal practices. It does not come up often in school systems. However, it is a good thing to understand when/if it does occur in one's career.
- Quality authentic assessment, that integrates high-level thinking in mathematics, would be beneficial.
- Reduce the cost of tuition. As an employed educator, I still just get by paycheck to paycheck and am now paying back student loans.
- Spend more time in the classroom with practicing teachers
- Spend more time in the field of special education. Like, a LOT more time.
- Staying consistent with management, especially at the end of the year!
- Strategies for motivating students who have bigger problems outside of the school than homework and tests.
- The class about students with special needs to be updated and improved. I felt extremely unprepared to work with IEP students and providers.
- There was very little instruction on how to best serve special needs students. I only took one course that covered the laws associated with special needs students but I was never taught strategies or practice to instruct and assess special education students. This is an area that I feel I was extremely unprepared for.
- There was not much focus on how to deal with troubled behavior. We were always warned about what not to do, but it never seemed we really were taught how to handle certain situations. When is enough, enough? When do we let the administrators step in versus handling it ourselves? I have had a really challenging class this year and although my administration and team is wonderful, I think if I had been exposed or prepared for this type of behavior throughout my time at KSU, I would have been much better at it tan I am now.
- To talk more about behaviors and strategies to deal with them, outside of SPED classes. Use role-play or skits to practice.

**If you could make one improvement to your educator preparation program, what would it be?**
Kansas State University responses (*n*=57):

- Today is the age of technology and during my technology for teacher class I felt I learned nothing. Yes showing me apps is good but integrating them into a classroom is much different than me just looking at it in a college class setting. I was not taught how to integrate that into our classrooms as a teacher.
- Today's philosophy is to educate those individuals with a spectrum of limitations in the traditional classroom. This includes the behavioral spectrum and FLS students. I firmly believe that our educational training is not preparing our teachers for the rigors of teaching the wide spectrum of needs. We are transitioning into a therapeutic environment with what has been communicated this year. I feel ill-prepared to effectively facilitate the gamut of needs that are imposed under my responsibility without further training in special needs.
- Use of technology, especially in small districts. All of the districts in the area around where I attended college are well funded and have loads of technology, much of which is not available in smaller districts. So learning how to integrate technology when there is not much of it would be helpful.
- We had a class over using technology in the classroom, and while I learned a lot about some programs I can use, it was geared towards having iPads in the classroom. This has not been the case of the school I have been in, and I have found that I needed more training on using basic technology in my classroom like a projector, using excel etc.
- We were made aware of many requirements, such as the standards, but it was never taught or explained to us how to effectively use them. We need more time in a real classroom in our actual content. I almost think that the internship should last an entire school year instead of a semester. I grew and learned more in my semester student teaching than I did in the rest of my schooling. My cooperating teacher had to explain a lot of things that were not covered by my schooling during my student teaching.

**Please share any additional comments or recommendations you might wish to make concerning your educator preparation program.**

Kansas State University responses (*n*=18):

- For a lot of the neither agree nor disagree responses, I responded in that way because I had been a para in a school district for 4 years and got a lot of experience working in schools and with children from that technical perspective.
- I believe that the student teaching portfolio needs to have a section in one of the components that focuses on classroom management. Classroom management was by far the hardest part of my first year.
- I definitely felt that I should have been introduced to the concept of unit planning before I got into curriculum instruction classes. There was so much to learn at once that it felt rushed and incomplete.
- I feel like I was completely Unprepared for teaching once I actually started. We did not learn how to write real lesson plans at all, just the long, scripted versions you NEVER use or write as a real teacher. We did not learn how to teach guided reading, we did not learn how to use stations in math/reading. The technology class was an absolute joke. We learned how to create a blog and that was it. Nothing about document cameras, Smartboards, interactive lessons, etc. We did not learn anything about how to actually manage a classroom, and we especially did not learn how to teach and manage behavior in a diverse school. After two AWFUL years of teaching, I have left teaching entirely because I was so utterly unprepared and had no idea what I was doing. I can name four others that graduated with me that have also left teaching for the same reasons. I feel like I wasted thousands of dollars on a degree I will never use again.
- I feel that I am fully prepared for teaching secondary science due to my program. If I ever have questions, my program has taught me where to go to find resources.
- I liked that we covered a variety of topics and skills, especially in reading and math. We looked at the underlying skills (word decoding, number sense) behind the broader demonstrated skills (reading a passage, solving a word problem).
- I really just want to repeat that I sincerely hope that the program will consider working with urban or even rural districts. I would have loved the opportunity to student teach in an urban district but I felt as though that was never an option. I was not prepared to teach in a classroom with more than five separate languages, various reading levels, and drastically different home lives. I cannot stress the importance of learning to teach in truly diverse classrooms.
- If [Professor] is still there, tell her she was the best at pushing us to achieve our greatest potential. And, as I stated earlier, spend more time on special education. Specifically IEPs. Give us examples of what an IEP or a 504 looks like so we could have some form of an idea over what we will be experiencing as teachers. I was completely lost when I saw my first IEP -- I had no idea what I was looking at!
- K-State is known for their wonderful teacher education program.
- My program prepared me very well for the classroom! The experiences provided were valuable to my learning when preparing as an educator and helped me to grow into the educator I am in the classroom today.
- My school does guided reading. I had no idea how to teach guided reading and how to prep for stations. I recommend teaching students about that and give them more ideas.
- n/a
- N/A
- Please require more assessment design and implementation because I find it very difficult to assess my students in all subjects except for math.  The rest of the disciplines are tough for me

**Please share any additional comments or recommendations you might wish to make concerning your educator preparation program.**

Kansas State University responses (*n*=18):

> to create an authentic assessment that gives me the information  want to know.   Secondly, I want to know more about the history of education in our nation during the Foundations of Education course.  I believe it can help me, as a teacher, when I reflect on practices and know why we do certain things the way we do them.   Lastly, teach the students about a technology piece called Showbie, Google Classroom, and Notability.  These are vital in my currently paperless classroom, and I am in shock that I did not learn about these while I was in college.

- Spend much more time on behavior management, techniques, strategies, etc.
- Stress and high workloads can cripple new educators. Having a self-wellness class would be a good idea; we must take care of ourselves before we are able to do our jobs effectively. Otherwise, burnout will happen.
- Thank you all for offering and sharing your knowledge with me to help me become the best educator I can be. You all are heroes!
- There needs to be ESOL and SPED classes that everyone takes. It is such a high demand now that even if you do not choose an emphasis in one, there should be at least one overarching class for each (like 723).

*Responses are verbatim; spelling and grammatical errors were corrected.

# APPENDIX 2

Kansas Educator Employer Data

| Summary of Ratings[1] Statewide Results Kansas Educator Employer Survey - Spring 2013 - 2017 | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Category** | **2013 (n=218)** | **2014 (n=254)** | **2015 (n=383)** | **2016 (n=249)** | **2017 (n=286)** |
| | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** |
| **Foundation Composite** | 3.97[2] (0.53) | 4.02 (0.55) | 3.91 (0.70) | 3.94[9] (0.57) | 4.05[11] (0.62) |
| **Planning Composite** | 4.07[3] (0.66) | 4.14 (0.67) | 4.03[6] (0.77) | 4.05[9] (0.66) | 4.16[12] (0.77) |
| **Instruction Composite** | 3.86[4] (0.75) | 3.94 (0.73) | 3.85 (0.77) | 3.84 (0.73) | 3.94[11] (0.78) |
| **Assessment Composite** | 3.87[3] (0.60) | 3.95 (0.64) | 3.89[6] (0.73) | 3.89[10] (0.64) | 3.99[11] (0.68) |
| **Technology Composite** | 4.24[5] (0.61) | 4.25 (0.68) | 4.14[7] (0.76) | 4.11[9] (0.60) | 4.20 (0.70) |
| **Diversity Composite** | 3.90[4] (0.68) | 3.97 (0.69) | 3.97[8] (0.73) | 3.98[9] (0.59) | 4.08 (0.70) |
| **Motivate and Engage Composite** | 4.03[3] (0.70) | 4.11 (0.77) | 4.03 (0.82) | 4.01[10] (0.75) | 4.11[12] (0.80) |
| **Ethics Composite** | 4.32[4] (0.57) | 4.40 (0.63) | 4.28[7] (0.75) | 4.27[9] (0.65) | 4.38[11] (0.73) |
| **Reflect Composite** | 4.04 (0.59) | 4.06 (0.67) | 4.02[6] (0.77) | 3.99[10] (0.63) | 4.13[12] (0.68) |

[1]=Ratings Key: 5= Strongly Agree; 4 = Agree; 3 = Neither Agree Nor Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 1 = Strongly Disagree
[2]n=213
[3]n=215
[4]n=217
[5]n=216
[6]n=381
[7]n=382
[8]n=379
[9]n=247
[10]n=248
[11]n=284
[12]n=285

Composite Value Scores were created for each case (an individual response) and not the mean of means. Composite Value Scores were calculated by summing all items within a given category. For instance, the Foundations Composite value was created by summing the six individual items within the category. *Note*, in instances of missing data (e.g., not all questions were answered), a Composite Value was not obtained for that individual case. Additionally, when all items were not answered by a respondent, the n-value for an individual item or Composite Value Score may differ from the total

number responding, indicated in the table note. Mean and standard deviation values were calculated for the Composite Value Score within each year.

| Summary of Cronbach's alpha Statewide Results Kansas Educator Employer Survey - Spring 2013 - 2017 | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Category** | **Number of items** | **Kansas Public Universities** | | | | |
| | | **2013 (n=218)** | **2014 (n=254)** | **2015 (n=383)** | **2016 (n=249)** | **2017 (n=286)** |
| Foundations | 6 | .87 | .89 | .91 | .91 | .91 |
| Planning | 5 | .91 | .92 | .92 | .93 | .94 |
| Instruction | 5 | .91 | .91 | .89 | .91 | .92 |
| Assessment | 5 | .89 | .91 | .92 | .92 | .93 |
| Technology | 5 | .93 | .94 | .95 | .93 | .95 |
| Diversity | 6 | .90 | .92 | .92 | .91 | .93 |
| Motivation and Engagement | 6 | .92 | .94 | .94 | .93 | .94 |
| Professionalism and Ethical Behavior | 5 | .93 | .94 | .95 | .95 | .96 |
| Reflective Practice | 4 | .89 | .91 | .92 | .91 | .92 |

**Foundations of Teaching**

| | Summary of Ratings[1] Foundations of Teaching Kansas Educator Employer Survey - Spring 2013 - 2017 | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Kansas State University** | | | | | **Kansas Public Universities** | | | | |
| | **2013 (n=37)** | **2014 (n=59)** | **2015 (n=84)** | **2016 (n=65)** | **2017 (n=84)** | **2013 (n=218)** | **2014 (n=254)** | **2015 (n=383)** | **2016 (n=249)** | **2017 (n=286)** |
| | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** |
| **Foundation 1.** The educators have a clear and compelling vision of learning. | 4.19 (0.46) | 4.20 (0.48) | 4.13 (0.62) | 4.09 (0.63) | 4.32 (0.54) | 4.15 (0.59) | 4.14 (0.61) | 4.04 (0.83) | 4.04 (0.68) | 4.20 (0.70) |
| **Foundation 2.** The educators understand theories of human development. | 3.73 (0.65) | 4.00 (0.53) | 3.89 (0.64) | 4.02 (0.62) | 4.01 (0.67) | 3.91[2] (0.66) | 3.97 (0.55) | 3.83 (0.81) | 3.94 (0.65) | 4.03[8] (0.71) |
| **Foundation 3.** The educators understand the foundations (historical, philosophical, social, and cultural) of the professional field. | 3.68 (0.67) | 3.97 (0.49) | 3.88 (0.67) | 3.95 (0.51) | 4.05 (0.64) | 3.89 (0.63) | 3.95 (0.61) | 3.81 (0.82) | 3.90 (0.61) | 4.01[8] (0.72) |
| **Foundation 4.** The educators use knowledge of school, family, cultural, and community factors that influence the quality of education for all students. | 3.92 (0.86) | 4.00 (0.79) | 4.06 (0.68) | 4.05 (0.76) | 4.04 (0.75) | 4.03 (0.76) | 4.05 (0.83) | 3.96 (0.88) | 4.02 (0.79) | 4.06 (0.81) |

| | Kansas State University | | | | | Kansas Public Universities | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Summary of Ratings[1]** **Foundations of Teaching** **Kansas Educator Employer Survey - Spring 2013 - 2017** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **2013 (n=37)** | **2014 (n=59)** | **2015 (n=84)** | **2016 (n=65)** | **2017 (n=84)** | **2013 (n=218)** | **2014 (n=254)** | **2015 (n=383)** | **2016 (n=249)** | **2017 (n=286)** |
| | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** |
| **Foundation 5.** The educators demonstrate a strong knowledge of the subject(s) taught. | 4.19 (0.57) | 4.31 (0.70) | 4.36 (0.69) | 4.18 (0.63) | 4.31 (0.69) | 4.27[2] (0.67) | 4.33 (0.76) | 4.19 (0.90) | 4.16 (0.70) | 4.31 (0.76) |
| **Foundation 6.** The educators integrate concepts from professional studies into their own teaching environment. | 4.16 (0.73) | 4.14 (0.66) | 4.11 (0.62) | 4.09 (0.72) | 4.14 (0.62) | 4.06[2] (0.73) | 4.11 (0.74) | 4.01 (0.86) | 3.99[3] (0.76) | 4.11 (0.79) |
| **Foundation 7.** The educators are well-versed in state and federal laws that directly impact schools. | 3.22[4] (0.80) | 3.56 (0.82) | 3.52 (0.83) | 3.49 (0.81) | 3.49 (0.87) | 3.44[5] (0.87) | 3.63 (0.83) | 3.53 (0.93) | 3.54 (0.80) | 3.66 (0.87) |
| **Foundation Composite (Cronbach's alpha: 0.86, 0.91)** | 3.88[4] (0.49) | 4.02 (0.45) | 3.99 (0.54) | 3.98 (0.52) | 4.05 (0.51) | 3.97[6] (0.53) | 4.02 (0.55) | 3.91 (0.70) | 3.94[3] (0.57) | 4.05[7] (0.62) |

[1]=Ratings Key: 5= Strongly Agree; 4 = Agree; 3 = Neither Agree Nor Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 1 = Strongly Disagree
Composite mean values are based on the responses to all items within the category, not the mean of means.
[2]n=217
[3]n=247
[4]n=36
[5]n=216
[6]n=213
[7]n=284
[8]n=285

**Preparation for Planning**

| | Summary of Ratings[1] Preparation for Planning Kansas Educator Employer Survey - Spring 2013 - 2017 | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Kansas State University** | | | | | **Kansas Public Universities** | | | | |
| | **2013 (n=37)** | **2014 (n=59)** | **2015 (n=84)** | **2016 (n=65)** | **2017 (n=84)** | **2013 (n=218)** | **2014 (n=254)** | **2015 (n=383)** | **2016 (n=249)** | **2017 (n=286)** |
| | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** |
| **Planning 1.** The educators select clear lesson activities that build towards student learning objectives. | 4.30 (0.70) | 4.20 (0.52) | 4.19 (0.78) | 4.23 (0.58) | 4.37 (0.56) | 4.20 (0.68) | 4.21 (0.72) | 4.10 (0.88) | 4.11 (0.72) | 4.24 (0.82) |
| **Planning 2.** The educators ensure that objectives and activities are aligned with district, state and/or national standards. | 4.30 (0.70) | 4.32 (0.54) | 4.27 (0.66) | 4.17 (0.67) | 4.32 (0.52) | 4.22[2] (0.71) | 4.21 (0.71) | 4.12[3] (0.86) | 4.16 (0.71) | 4.23 (0.75) |
| **Planning 3.** The educators collaborate with colleagues when planning instruction. | 4.30 (0.70) | 4.37 (0.69) | 4.31 (0.79) | 4.08 (0.82) | 4.44 (0.68) | 4.23 (0.71) | 4.27 (0.79) | 4.19 (0.90) | 4.15[4] (0.78) | 4.33 (0.85) |
| **Planning 4.** The educators plan thorough, well-organized lessons. | 4.16 (0.73) | 4.41 (0.59) | 4.07 (0.85) | 4.14 (0.68) | 4.24 (0.79) | 4.06 (0.82) | 4.21 (0.84) | 4.02 (0.98) | 4.08[4] (0.75) | 4.16 (0.93) |
| **Planning 5.** The educators use his or her understanding of student development for lesson planning. | 3.84 (0.93) | 4.07 (0.76) | 3.98 (0.82) | 3.88 (0.80) | 4.07 (0.77) | 3.92 (0.89) | 3.99 (0.85) | 3.94 (0.91) | 3.93 (0.82) | 4.03 (0.90) |

| | Kansas State University | | | | | Kansas Public Universities | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Summary of Ratings[1]** **Preparation for Planning** **Kansas Educator Employer Survey - Spring 2013 - 2017** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **2013 (n=37)** | **2014 (n=59)** | **2015 (n=84)** | **2016 (n=65)** | **2017 (n=84)** | **2013 (n=218)** | **2014 (n=254)** | **2015 (n=383)** | **2016 (n=249)** | **2017 (n=286)** |
| | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** |
| **Planning 6.** The educators create lesson plans that promote critical thinking with the students. | 3.86 (0.98) | 4.05 (0.75) | 3.94 (0.90) | 3.98 (0.76) | 4.05 (0.79) | 3.81[5] (0.94) | 3.94 (0.88) | 3.78[3] (0.97) | 3.94 (0.82) | 3.98[9] (0.94) |
| **Planning Composite (Cronbach's alpha: 0.91, 0.94)** | 4.13 (0.66) | 4.24 (0.49) | 4.13 (0.68) | 4.08 (0.59) | 4.25 (0.57) | 4.07[6] (0.66) | 4.14 (0.67) | 4.03[7] (0.77) | 4.05[8] (0.66) | 4.16[9] (0.77) |

[1]=Ratings Key: 5= Strongly Agree; 4 = Agree; 3 = Neither Agree Nor Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 1 = Strongly Disagree
Composite mean values are based on the responses to all items within the category, not the mean of means.
[2]n=217
[3]n=382
[4]n=248
[5]n=216
[6]n=215
[7]n=381
[8]n=247
[9]n=285

**Preparation to Provide Appropriate Instruction**

| | Kansas State University | | | | | Kansas Public Universities | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Summary of Ratings[1]** Preparation to Provide Appropriate Instruction Kansas Educator Employer Survey - Spring 2013 - 2017 | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **2013 (n=37)** | **2014 (n=59)** | **2015 (n=84)** | **2016 (n=65)** | **2017 (n=84)** | **2013 (n=218)** | **2014 (n=254)** | **2015 (n=383)** | **2016 (n=249)** | **2017 (n=286)** |
| | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** |
| **Instruction 1**. The educators use a variety of teaching strategies to enhance student learning. | 4.05 (0.88) | 4.17 (0.77) | 4.19 (0.74) | 4.06 (0.79) | 4.23 (0.65) | 4.02 (0.84) | 4.09 (0.85) | 4.02 (0.88) | 4.01 (0.82) | 4.14 (0.82) |
| **Instruction 2.** The educators include differentiated instructional activities for all learners. | 3.78 (0.98) | 3.86 (0.92) | 3.94 (0.88) | 3.78 (0.80) | 3.90 (0.99) | 3.69 (1.01) | 3.81 (0.94) | 3.77 (0.99) | 3.75 (0.91) | 3.81 (1.00) |
| **Instruction 3.** The educators use a variety of resources to present information. | 4.08 (0.83) | 4.25 (0.71) | 4.23 (0.73) | 4.11 (0.69) | 4.14 (0.76) | 4.06[2] (0.77) | 4.19 (0.74) | 4.01 (0.89) | 4.01 (0.77) | 4.07 (0.86) |
| **Instruction 4.** The educators use effective questioning skills and facilitates classroom discussion. | 3.84 (1.01) | 3.92 (0.65) | 3.92 (0.78) | 3.83 (0.80) | 4.01 (0.77) | 3.81 (0.91) | 3.88 (0.84) | 3.80 (0.91) | 3.80 (0.83) | 3.89 (0.93) |
| **Instruction 5**. The educators integrate multiple content areas into interdisciplinary units of study. | 3.65 (0.92) | 3.59 (0.91) | 3.79 (0.85) | 3.62 (0.88) | 3.75 (0.88) | 3.68 (0.88) | 3.71 (0.92) | 3.67 (0.91) | 3.66 (0.87) | 3.74[3] (0.93) |

| | Kansas State University | | | | | Kansas Public Universities | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Summary of Ratings[1]**<br>**Preparation to Provide Appropriate Instruction**<br>**Kansas Educator Employer Survey - Spring 2013 - 2017** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **2013**<br>**(n=37)** | **2014**<br>**(n=59)** | **2015**<br>**(n=84)** | **2016**<br>**(n=65)** | **2017**<br>**(n=84)** | **2013**<br>**(n=218)** | **2014**<br>**(n=254)** | **2015**<br>**(n=383)** | **2016**<br>**(n=249)** | **2017**<br>**(n=286)** |
| | **Mean<br>(SD)** | **Mean<br>(SD)** | **Mean<br>(SD)** | **Mean<br>(SD)** | **Mean<br>(SD)** | **Mean<br>(SD)** | **Mean<br>(SD)** | **Mean<br>(SD)** | **Mean<br>(SD)** | **Mean<br>(SD)** |
| **Instruction Composite (Cronbach's alpha: 0.87, 0.92)** | 3.88<br>(0.81) | 3.96<br>(0.66) | 4.01<br>(0.66) | 3.88<br>(0.65) | 4.01<br>(0.67) | 3.86[2]<br>(0.75) | 3.94<br>(0.73) | 3.85<br>(0.77) | 3.84<br>(0.73) | 3.94[3]<br>(0.78) |

[1]=Ratings Key: 5= Strongly Agree; 4 = Agree; 3 = Neither Agree Nor Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 1 = Strongly Disagree
Composite mean values are based on the responses to all items within the category, not the mean of means.
[2]n=217
[3]n=284

**Preparation to Incorporate Assessment**

| | Kansas State University | | | | | Kansas Public Universities | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Summary of Ratings[1]** <br> **Preparation to Incorporate Assessment** <br> **Kansas Educator Employer Survey - Spring 2013 - 2017** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **2013 (n=37)** | **2014 (n=59)** | **2015 (n=84)** | **2016 (n=65)** | **2017 (n=84)** | **2013 (n=218)** | **2014 (n=254)** | **2015 (n=383)** | **2016 (n=249)** | **2017 (n=286)** |
| | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** |
| **Assessment 1.** The educators evaluate student knowledge and performance by using multiple methods of assessment. | 3.94[2] (0.71) | 3.90 (0.71) | 3.94 (0.78) | 3.85 (0.73) | 4.00 (0.81) | 3.90[3] (0.79) | 3.94 (0.75) | 3.80 (0.90) | 3.88 (0.78) | 3.99 (0.83) |
| **Assessment 2.** The educators utilize assessment outcomes to develop instruction that meets the needs of all students. | 3.78 (0.85) | 3.80 (0.83) | 3.92 (0.84) | 3.72 (0.86) | 3.87 (0.77) | 3.76 (0.85) | 3.78 (0.85) | 3.80[4] (0.91) | 3.78 (0.85) | 3.88 (0.82) |
| **Assessment 3.** The educators adhere to ethical and unbiased assessment practices. | 4.08[2] (0.60) | 4.25 (0.54) | 4.27 (0.68) | 4.17 (0.70) | 4.29 (0.67) | 4.16[3] (0.60) | 4.26 (0.70) | 4.20 (0.80) | 4.18[5] (0.68) | 4.26[8] (0.71) |
| **Assessment 4.** The educators make assessment criteria clear to students. | 3.78 (0.71) | 3.95 (0.65) | 4.04 (0.67) | 3.78 (0.76) | 4.05 (0.64) | 3.87 (0.74) | 3.94 (0.78) | 3.88 (0.86) | 3.84 (0.71) | 3.95 (0.79) |
| **Assessment 5.** The educators accurately interpret assessment results. | 3.73 (0.69) | 3.92 (0.73) | 4.01 (0.75) | 3.83 (0.72) | 3.92 (0.72) | 3.84 (0.71) | 3.93 (0.75) | 3.84 (0.86) | 3.86 (0.72) | 3.97 (0.75) |

| | Kansas State University | | | | | Kansas Public Universities | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Summary of Ratings[1]** **Preparation to Incorporate Assessment** **Kansas Educator Employer Survey - Spring 2013 - 2017** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **2013 (n=37)** | **2014 (n=59)** | **2015 (n=84)** | **2016 (n=65)** | **2017 (n=84)** | **2013 (n=218)** | **2014 (n=254)** | **2015 (n=383)** | **2016 (n=249)** | **2017 (n=286)** |
| | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** |
| **Assessment 5**. The educators use best practice research and data when making decisions. | 3.73 (0.84) | 3.83 (0.79) | 3.89 (0.81) | 3.80 (0.79) | 3.87 (0.72) | 3.71[3] (0.81) | 3.86 (0.79) | 3.77 (0.90) | 3.80 (0.79) | 3.85 (0.84) |
| **Assessment Composite (Cronbach's alpha: 0.89, 0.93)** | 3.81[6] (0.57) | 3.94 (0.56) | 4.01 (0.64) | 3.86 (0.61) | 4.00 (0.58) | 3.87[7] (0.60) | 3.95 (0.64) | 3.89[4] (0.73) | 3.89[5] (0.64) | 3.99[8] (0.68) |

[1]=Ratings Key: 5= Strongly Agree; 4 = Agree; 3 = Neither Agree Nor Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 1 = Strongly Disagree

Composite mean values are based on the responses to all items within the category, not the mean of means.

[2]n=36
[3]n=217
[4]n=381
[5]n=248
[6]n=35
[7]n=215
[8]n=284

**Preparation to Incorporate Technology**

| | Kansas State University | | | | | Kansas Public Universities | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2013 (n=37) | 2014 (n=59) | 2015 (n=84) | 2016 (n=65) | 2017 (n=84) | 2013 (n=218) | 2014 (n=254) | 2015 (n=383) | 2016 (n=249) | 2017 (n=286) |
| | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) |
| **Technology 1**. The educators make use of appropriate technology in the classroom teaching environment. | 4.41 (0.60) | 4.39 (0.59) | 4.45 (0.63) | 4.09 (0.80) | 4.29 (0.69) | 4.28[2] (0.70) | 4.32 (0.75) | 4.21 (0.84) | 4.20 (0.68) | 4.24 (0.76) |
| **Technology 2.** The educators incorporate technology into communication activities. | 4.30 (0.52) | 4.41 (0.59) | 4.38 (0.66) | 4.06 (0.75) | 4.21 (0.73) | 4.26[2] (0.67) | 4.26 (0.78) | 4.12[3] (0.85) | 4.13 (0.68) | 4.20 (0.78) |
| **Technology 3.** The educators continually adapt to changes in technology. | 4.35 (0.59) | 4.31 (0.73) | 4.32 (0.75) | 4.00 (0.79) | 4.20 (0.69) | 4.22[2] (0.72) | 4.24 (0.77) | 4.11 (0.86) | 4.09[4] (0.70) | 4.17 (0.77) |
| **Technology 4.** The educators integrate technology into the professional practice. | 4.31[5] (0.58) | 4.37 (0.69) | 4.42 (0.59) | 4.05 (0.74) | 4.24 (0.71) | 4.23[6] (0.70) | 4.29 (0.76) | 4.18 (0.80) | 4.14[4] (0.65) | 4.24 (0.74) |
| **Technology 5**. The educators use technology appropriately for assessment purposes. | 4.19 (0.52) | 4.22 (0.65) | 4.29 (0.69) | 3.95 (0.80) | 4.17 (0.69) | 4.19[2] (0.66) | 4.16 (0.76) | 4.07[3] (0.85) | 4.04 (0.67) | 4.16 (0.78) |

Summary of Ratings[1]
Preparation to Incorporate Technology
Kansas Educator Employer Survey - Spring 2013 - 2017

| | Kansas State University | | | | | Kansas Public Universities | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Summary of Ratings[1]** **Preparation to Incorporate Technology** **Kansas Educator Employer Survey - Spring 2013 - 2017** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **2013 (n=37)** | **2014 (n=59)** | **2015 (n=84)** | **2016 (n=65)** | **2017 (n=84)** | **2013 (n=218)** | **2014 (n=254)** | **2015 (n=383)** | **2016 (n=249)** | **2017 (n=286)** |
| | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** |
| **Technology Composite (Cronbach's alpha: 0.94, 0.95)** | 4.32[5] (0.45) | 4.34 (0.56) | 4.37 (0.58) | 4.03 (0.70) | 4.22 (0.63) | 4.24[6] (0.61) | 4.25 (0.68) | 4.14[3] (0.76) | 4.11[7] (0.60) | 4.20 (0.70) |

[1]=Ratings Key: 5= Strongly Agree; 4 = Agree; 3 = Neither Agree Nor Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 1 = Strongly Disagree

Composite mean values are based on the responses to all items within the category, not the mean of means.

[2]n=217

[3]n=382

[4]n=248

[5]n=36

[6]n=216

[7]n=247

**Preparation for Diversity**

| | Kansas State University | | | | | Kansas Public Universities | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Summary of Ratings[1]** **Preparation for Diversity** **Kansas Educator Employer Survey - Spring 2013 - 2017** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **2013 (n=37)** | **2014 (n=59)** | **2015 (n=84)** | **2016 (n=65)** | **2017 (n=84)** | **2013 (n=218)** | **2014 (n=254)** | **2015 (n=383)** | **2016 (n=249)** | **2017 (n=286)** |
| | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** |
| **Diversity 1**. The educators create a learning community that is sensitive to the multiple experiences of diverse learners. | 4.00 (0.85) | 4.02 (0.71) | 4.18 (0.75) | 4.02 (0.70) | 4.15 (0.63) | 3.98[2] (0.80) | 4.04 (0.80) | 4.03 (0.85) | 4.00 (0.73) | 4.09 (0.77) |
| **Diversity 2.** The educators respect cultural differences by providing equitable learning opportunities for all students. | 4.00 (0.82) | 4.07 (0.67) | 4.20 (0.67) | 4.00 (0.71) | 4.23 (0.65) | 4.06 (0.73) | 4.07 (0.75) | 4.08 (0.82) | 4.06 (0.66) | 4.19 (0.72) |
| **Diversity 3**. The educators implement non-biased techniques for meeting needs of diverse learners. | 3.95 (0.81) | 4.03 (0.69) | 4.17 (0.73) | 4.06 (0.61) | 4.21 (0.58) | 4.02 (0.71) | 4.09 (0.75) | 4.01 (0.85) | 4.06[3] (0.64) | 4.16 (0.74) |
| **Diversity 4.** The educators adapt lessons to meet the diverse needs of all students. | 3.78 (0.89) | 3.88 (0.87) | 3.96 (0.81) | 3.86 (0.81) | 4.02 (0.76) | 3.74 (0.90) | 3.86 (0.86) | 3.84 (0.94) | 3.89 (0.77) | 4.00 (0.83 |

| | Kansas State University | | | | | Kansas Public Universities | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Summary of Ratings[1]** **Preparation for Diversity** **Kansas Educator Employer Survey - Spring 2013 - 2017** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **2013 (n=37)** | **2014 (n=59)** | **2015 (n=84)** | **2016 (n=65)** | **2017 (n=84)** | **2013 (n=218)** | **2014 (n=254)** | **2015 (n=383)** | **2016 (n=249)** | **2017 (n=286)** |
| | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** |
| **Diversity 5**. The educators respond appropriately to larger political, social, economic, and cultural issues through global awareness. | 3.59 (0.90) | 3.90 (0.74) | 3.85 (0.86) | 3.85 (0.81) | 4.01 (0.75) | 3.70 (0.87) | 3.80 (0.80) | 3.84[4] (0.84) | 3.85 (0.72) | 3.94 (0.83) |
| **Diversity Composite (Cronbach's alpha: 0.90, 0.93)** | 3.86 (0.72) | 3.98 (0.63) | 4.07 (0.67) | 3.96 (0.59) | 4.13 (0.57) | 3.90[2] (0.68) | 3.97 (0.69) | 3.97[4] (0.73) | 3.98[3] (0.59) | 4.08 (0.70) |

[1]=Ratings Key: 5= Strongly Agree; 4 = Agree; 3 = Neither Agree Nor Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 1 = Strongly Disagree
Composite mean values are based on the responses to all items within the category, not the mean of means.
[2]n=217
[3]n=247
[4]n=379

**Preparation to Motivate and Engage Students**

| | Kansas State University | | | | | Kansas Public Universities | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Summary of Ratings[1]** Preparation to Motivate and Engage Students Kansas Educator Employer Survey - Spring 2013 - 2017 | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **2013 (n=37)** | **2014 (n=59)** | **2015 (n=84)** | **2016 (n=65)** | **2017 (n=84)** | **2013 (n=218)** | **2014 (n=254)** | **2015 (n=383)** | **2016 (n=249)** | **2017 (n=286)** |
| | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** |
| **Motivate & Engage 1.** The educators establish collaborative, productive relationships with all stakeholders (e.g., families, school personnel, and community members) to support student learning. | 3.92 (0.83) | 4.12 (0.74) | 4.12 (0.84) | 3.83 (0.91) | 4.00 (0.78) | 3.94[2] (0.86) | 4.05 (0.90) | 3.96 (0.97) | 3.96[3] (0.83) | 4.02 (0.94) |
| **Motivate & Engage 2.** The educators establish a caring relationship with students developed through engagement and high expectations for all learners. | 4.24 (0.72) | 4.31 (0.84) | 4.30 (0.77) | 4.14 (0.90) | 4.21 (0.71) | 4.22[2] (0.72) | 4.25 (0.84) | 4.19 (0.90) | 4.16 (0.79) | 4.26 (0.84) |
| **Motivate & Engage 3.** The educators set clear standards of conduct. | 4.08 (0.72) | 4.10 (0.84) | 4.14 (0.84) | 3.98 (0.86) | 4.05 (0.82) | 3.98[2] (0.89) | 4.07 (0.91) | 3.96 (0.97) | 3.95 (0.93) | 4.05 (0.92) |

| | Kansas State University | | | | | Kansas Public Universities | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **2013 (n=37)** | **2014 (n=59)** | **2015 (n=84)** | **2016 (n=65)** | **2017 (n=84)** | **2013 (n=218)** | **2014 (n=254)** | **2015 (n=383)** | **2016 (n=249)** | **2017 (n=286)** |
| | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** |
| **Motivate & Engage 4.** The educators address student behavior in an appropriate, positive, and constructive manner. | 4.08 (0.76) | 4.05 (0.90) | 4.14 (0.78) | 3.83 (0.98) | 3.99 (0.91) | 3.97[2] (0.90) | 4.06 (0.93) | 3.99 (0.92) | 3.95 (0.92) | 4.07 (0.95) |
| **Motivate & Engage 5.** The educators promote an orderly, safe classroom environment conducive to learning. | 4.16 (0.80) | 4.31 (0.73) | 4.23 (0.84) | 4.05 (0.84) | 4.17 (0.77) | 4.14[4] (0.80) | 4.21 (0.82) | 4.12 (0.91) | 4.07 (0.88) | 4.19[5] (0.84) |
| **Motivate & Engage 6.** The educators prioritize tasks and manages time efficiently for effective student learning. | 4.03 (0.73) | 4.17 (0.75) | 4.02 (0.86) | 3.97 (0.79) | 4.08 (0.88) | 3.95[2] (0.82) | 4.04 (0.84) | 3.95 (0.95) | 3.97 (0.82) | 4.07 (0.91) |
| **Motivate & Engage Composite (Cronbach's alpha: 0.92, 0.94)** | 4.09 (0.61) | 4.18 (0.68) | 4.16 (0.69) | 3.97 (0.75) | 4.08 (0.69) | 4.03[4] (0.70) | 4.11 (0.77) | 4.03 (0.82) | 4.01[3] (0.75) | 4.11[5] (0.80) |

**Summary of Ratings[1]**
**Preparation to Motivate and Engage Students**
**Kansas Educator Employer Survey - Spring 2013 - 2017**

[1]=Ratings Key: 5= Strongly Agree; 4 = Agree; 3 = Neither Agree Nor Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 1 = Strongly Disagree
Composite mean values are based on the responses to all items within the category, not the mean of means.
[2]n=217
[3]n=248
[4]n=215
[5]n=285

**Preparation for Professional Ethics**

| | Summary of Ratings[1] Preparation for Professional Ethics Kansas Educator Employer Survey - Spring 2013 - 2017 | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Kansas State University | | | | | Kansas Public Universities | | | | |
| | 2013 (n=37) | 2014 (n=59) | 2015 (n=84) | 2016 (n=65) | 2017 (n=84) | 2013 (n=218) | 2014 (n=254) | 2015 (n=383) | 2016 (n=249) | 2017 (n=286) |
| | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) |
| **Ethics 1.** The educators behave in an ethical manner when interacting with others. | 4.32 (0.63) | 4.56 (0.60) | 4.38 (0.66) | 4.32 (0.73) | 4.43 (0.78) | 4.36 (0.60) | 4.43 (0.67) | 4.33 (0.79) | 4.31[2] (0.68) | 4.41 (0.80) |
| **Ethics 2.** The educators behave in a caring manner when interacting with others. | 4.32 (0.63) | 4.58 (0.62) | 4.37 (0.74) | 4.43 (0.59) | 4.43 (0.65) | 4.39[3] (0.60) | 4.44 (0.68) | 4.32[4] (0.82) | 4.35 (0.64) | 4.40 (0.76) |
| **Ethics 3.** The educators understand how to question authority in a respectful and constructive manner. | 4.19 (0.70) | 4.39 (0.70) | 4.14 (0.76) | 4.14 (0.92) | 4.35 (0.70) | 4.25 (0.70) | 4.32 (0.74) | 4.19[4] (0.88) | 4.18[2] (0.80) | 4.34 (0.80) |
| **Ethics 4.** The educators display commitment to professionalism and ethical standards. | 4.19 (0.62) | 4.58 (0.53) | 4.24 (0.79) | 4.23 (0.79) | 4.42 (0.72) | 4.28 (0.68) | 4.39 (0.72) | 4.23 (0.86) | 4.24 (0.75) | 4.38[7] (0.81) |
| **Ethics 5.** The educators meet the ethical standards of the profession. | 4.35 (0.59) | 4.54 (0.62) | 4.30 (0.74) | 4.31 (0.71) | 4.42 (0.76) | 4.34 (0.62) | 4.44 (0.71) | 4.32 (0.79) | 4.29 (0.69) | 4.39[7] (0.80) |

| | Summary of Ratings[1] Preparation for Professional Ethics Kansas Educator Employer Survey - Spring 2013 - 2017 | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Kansas State University | | | | | Kansas Public Universities | | | | |
| | 2013 (n=37) | 2014 (n=59) | 2015 (n=84) | 2016 (n=65) | 2017 (n=84) | 2013 (n=218) | 2014 (n=254) | 2015 (n=383) | 2016 (n=249) | 2017 (n=286) |
| | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) |
| Ethics Composite (Cronbach's alpha: 0.95, 0.96) | 4.28 (0.55) | 4.53 (0.53) | 4.29 (0.67) | 4.29 (0.67) | 4.41 (0.66) | 4.32[3] (0.57) | 4.40 (0.63) | 4.28[4] (0.75) | 4.27[5] (0.65) | 4.38[6] (0.73) |

[1]=Ratings Key: 5= Strongly Agree; 4 = Agree; 3 = Neither Agree Nor Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 1 = Strongly Disagree

Composite mean values are based on the responses to all items within the category, not the mean of means.

[2]n=248

[3]n=217

[4]n=382

[5]n=247

[6]n=284

[7]n=285

| | Kansas State University | | | | | Kansas Public Universities | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **2013**<br>**(n=37)** | **2014**<br>**(n=59)** | **2015**<br>**(n=84)** | **2016**<br>**(n=65)** | **2017**<br>**(n=84)** | **2013**<br>**(n=218)** | **2014**<br>**(n=254)** | **2015**<br>**(n=383)** | **2016**<br>**(n=249)** | **2017**<br>**(n=286)** |
| | **Mean**<br>**(SD)** | **Mean**<br>**(SD)** | **Mean**<br>**(SD)** | **Mean**<br>**(SD)** | **Mean**<br>**(SD)** | **Mean**<br>**(SD)** | **Mean**<br>**(SD)** | **Mean**<br>**(SD)** | **Mean**<br>**(SD)** | **Mean**<br>**(SD)** |
| **Reflect 1.** The educators use feedback to modify leadership practices. | 3.95<br>(0.74) | 4.03<br>(0.59) | 4.07<br>(0.82) | 3.91<br>(0.70) | 4.19<br>(0.59) | 4.00<br>(0.73) | 4.00<br>(0.78) | 3.99<br>(0.89) | 3.93<br>(0.77) | 4.09<br>(0.80) |
| **Reflect 2.** The educators provide feedback that allows students to reflect on their learning. | 3.89<br>(0.61) | 3.93<br>(0.69) | 3.96<br>(0.83) | 3.80<br>(0.77) | 4.05<br>(0.71) | 3.90<br>(0.73) | 3.91<br>(0.77) | 3.87<br>(0.89) | 3.89<br>(0.74) | 3.99<br>(0.80) |
| **Reflect 3.** The educators use reflections to adjust instruction. | 3.86<br>(0.79) | 4.03<br>(0.83) | 4.11<br>(0.81) | 3.89<br>(0.77) | 4.15<br>(0.69) | 3.97<br>(0.76) | 3.99<br>(0.87) | 3.99<br>(0.90) | 3.92<br>(0.78) | 4.05<br>(0.84) |
| **Reflect 4.** The educators engage in professional learning opportunities. | 4.30<br>(0.57) | 4.37<br>(0.61) | 4.26<br>(0.58) | 4.23<br>(0.66) | 4.44<br>(0.57) | 4.30<br>(0.64) | 4.33<br>(0.72) | 4.21<br>(0.80) | 4.22<br>(0.64) | 4.35<br>(0.70) |
| **Reflect 5.** The educators show evidence of reflection in professional practice (e.g., planning, delivering, and evaluating instruction). | 4.11<br>(0.66) | 4.19<br>(0.78) | 4.10<br>(0.83) | 3.98<br>(0.78) | 4.31<br>(0.56) | 4.03<br>(0.71) | 4.07<br>(0.78) | 4.04[2]<br>(0.92) | 4.00[3]<br>(0.74) | 4.17[4]<br>(0.76) |

**Summary of Ratings[1]**
**Reflective Practice**
**Kansas Educator Employer Survey - Spring 2013 - 2017**

| | Kansas State University | | | | | Kansas Public Universities | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Summary of Ratings[1]**<br>**Reflective Practice**<br>**Kansas Educator Employer Survey - Spring 2013 - 2017** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **2013**<br>**(n=37)** | **2014**<br>**(n=59)** | **2015**<br>**(n=84)** | **2016**<br>**(n=65)** | **2017**<br>**(n=84)** | **2013**<br>**(n=218)** | **2014**<br>**(n=254)** | **2015**<br>**(n=383)** | **2016**<br>**(n=249)** | **2017**<br>**(n=286)** |
| | **Mean**<br>**(SD)** | **Mean**<br>**(SD)** | **Mean**<br>**(SD)** | **Mean**<br>**(SD)** | **Mean**<br>**(SD)** | **Mean**<br>**(SD)** | **Mean**<br>**(SD)** | **Mean**<br>**(SD)** | **Mean**<br>**(SD)** | **Mean**<br>**(SD)** |
| **Reflect Composite (Cronbach's alpha: 0.88, 0.92)** | 4.02<br>(0.55) | 4.11<br>(0.56) | 4.10<br>(0.69) | 3.96<br>(0.61) | 4.23<br>(0.51) | 4.04<br>(0.59) | 4.06<br>(0.67) | 4.02[2]<br>(0.77) | 3.99[3]<br>(0.63) | 4.13[4]<br>(0.68) |

[1]=Ratings Key: 5= Strongly Agree; 4 = Agree; 3 = Neither Agree Nor Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 1 = Strongly Disagree
Composite mean values are based on the responses to all items within the category, not the mean of means.
[2]n=381
[3]n=248
[4]n=285

| | Summary of Ratings<br>Statewide Results<br>Kansas Educator Employer Survey - Spring 2013 - 2017 | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Compared with first-year educators who have completed advanced programs from other institutions, how would you rate candidates from this institution in terms of preparation? | | | | | | | |
| | Kansas State University | | | | Kansas Public Universities | | | |
| | Better Prepared | As Well Prepared | Not As Well Prepared | No Comparison Available | Better Prepared | As Well Prepared | Not As Well Prepared | No Comparison Available |
| Year | *n* | | | | *n* | | | |
| | Frequencies (%) | | | | Frequencies (%) | | | |
| 2017 | 25<br>29.8% | 49<br>58.3% | 8<br>9.5% | 2<br>2.4% | 91<br>31.8% | 154<br>53.8% | 34<br>11.9% | 7<br>2.4% |
| 2016 | 21<br>32.3% | 39<br>60.0% | 4<br>6.2% | 1<br>1.5% | 59<br>27.3% | 135<br>62.5% | 16<br>7.4% | 6<br>2.8% |
| 2015 | 29<br>34.5% | 49<br>58.3% | 4<br>4.8% | 2<br>2.4% | 89<br>24.1% | 228<br>61.8% | 27<br>7.3% | 6<br>1.6% |
| 2014 | 22<br>37.3% | 32<br>54.2% | 2<br>3.4% | 3<br>5.1% | 84<br>33.1% | 137<br>53.9% | 23<br>9.1% | 10<br>3.9% |
| 2013 | 10<br>27.8% | 24<br>66.7% | 2<br>5.6% | -- | 61<br>28.1% | 129<br>59.4% | 18<br>8.3% | 9<br>4.1% |

| | Kansas State University | | | | Kansas Public Universities | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Summary of Ratings** | | | | | | | |
| | **Statewide Results** | | | | | | | |
| | **Kansas Educator Employer Survey - Spring 2013 - 2017** | | | | | | | |
| | **How likely are you to recommend early career educators who graduate from …** | | | | | | | |
| | **Kansas State University** | | | | **Kansas Public Universities** | | | |
| | **Very Likely** | **Some-what Likely** | **Some-what Unlikely** | **Very Unlikely** | **Very Likely** | **Some-what Likely** | **Some-what Unlikely** | **Very Unlikely** |
| **Year** | *n* | | | | *n* | | | |
| | **Frequencies (%)** | | | | **Frequencies (%)** | | | |
| 2017 | 67 79.8% | 15 17.9% | 0 0.0% | 2 2.4% | 230 80.4% | 39 13.6% | 9 3.1% | 8 2.8% |

**Please share what you think is the strongest aspect of the educator preparation program.:**
Kansas State University responses (*n*=54):

- Ability to design lessons and facilitate learning. Understanding of standards and how to interpret them into lessons. Understanding that assessment is a necessary component of learning.
- Building relationships with all students. Meeting them where the students are at when they walk in your door. Effective structure and classroom management.
- Content Knowledge Comprehension of quality and effective instructional strategies.
- Excellent lesson plans, classroom management
- [Teacher] is a first year teacher at Maize South Middle School. She is one of the strongest staff members in my building, and only a first year teacher. [Teacher] is well prepared for lessons. She is organized in her planning, and knowledgeable in the content. [Teacher] is very collaborative, and works well with students, parents, and staff. She is confident in her abilities, but always willing to accept feedback and learn. [Another teacher] is also a first year teacher at Maize South Middle School. [Other teacher] has jumped right into education, and in addition to teaching, she is also our Yearbook Sponsor. [Other teacher] has worked hard to overcome classroom management struggles in her first year of education. She is very open to communication, and willing to try ideas to improve her classroom instruction and management.
- [Teacher] is committed to the profession and has a good grasp of the principles of good teaching--good management, planning, lesson delivery. He is a very willing learner.
- High understanding of pedagogy and understanding of lesson planning.
- I appreciate that the few KSU grads I have hired have been people who care for students. It is evident they want to teach for the right reasons.
- I believe Kansas State University is doing an excellent job with respect to preparing preservice teacher in best practices in elementary math instruction.
- I believe that the program allows future teachers to begin to see the rigor required of educators today.  The program exposes future educators to diverse programs and classrooms.
- I believe the grads come out with a strong content background.
- I believe the program offers our teachers multiple in school experiences. They are prepared in how to plan lessons and build relationships. They are aware of all realms of teaching but to actually have time to incorporate all they know takes time. Differentiation and truly using data/feedback takes time but all understand the need for it. Collaborative skills appear to be strong and technology is much easier for them to integrate into the curriculum.
- I feel classroom management is key to a successful teacher. From there knowing how to differentiate with some students as they are at all different ability levels.
- I feel teachers are prepared to use technology.
- I feel the teachers are prepared to learn, they are comfortable with technology and are open to learning all they can to help their students achieve.
- It is apparent that students enter teaching with a lot of classroom observations and experiences.
- It is consistently apparent that Kansas State pre-service teachers have been trained to implement research-based, current procedures for educating students.
- Knowledge of materials.
- KSU education students really come into the education field from KSU very well prepared! They have many strong areas but I would say the best is the classroom management area and the knowledge of curriculum.
- KSU graduates come prepared and ready for the education world.

**Please share what you think is the strongest aspect of the educator preparation program.:**
Kansas State University responses (*n*=54):

- KSU's clinical partnerships with school districts; The impact of having them "live" in the school for their block and student teaching time;
- [Teacher's] lesson planning and use of a multitude of various activities made her room very interactive and interesting.
- Lesson planning.
- [Teacher] was excellent with her teaching strategies and relationships with students.
- [Teacher] maintains professional relationships with all stakeholders, is positive, and supportive of the school mission.
- [Teacher] content knowledge and skill with technology integration are her greatest strengths.
- NA
- New hires from K-State have a somewhat strong background in lesson planning and design. Reflection is also a strength.
- Our teachers are well versed in current educational practices, like Marzano's CTW or Kagan structures. Whether it is embedded in the teacher program or just because our newest teachers are tech savvy, they are comfortable adapting lessons to a tech environment and teaching applications to students.
- Positive outlook and interactions with students. His enthusiasm for his content.
- Prepared well to enter into the classroom.
- Professionalism and Technology.
- Reflective practices.
- [Teacher] demonstrates professionalism in all aspects of her job. She truly understands the importance of developing positive relationships with students and does this on a daily basis. She is one of the strongest first year teachers I have seen.
- She is a rock star in every way!
- Strong content background. Strong love of children.
- Teacher Instruction Practices.
- Teachers are well prepared to take on the academic standards with their students.
- Teaching about cultural diversity and relevance.
- Technology and useful applications to use in the technology area. Creative and up to date lesson ideas.
- The ability to diversity and individualize instruction; making lessons fun and engaging for students.
- The instructor has made strong relationships with students. The instructor has incorporated many instructional strategies in the classroom, and is not afraid to try new things.
- The partnership with local school district is the strongest aspect of the program.
- The preparation of lessons and understanding their content to teach it effectively to all students.
- The strongest aspect of the education program that I have observed is the relational capacity that teachers have with the students.
- The students seem to be well versed in curriculum. How to build a unified curriculum and what it takes to have a viable curriculum.
- The teacher was well prepared in many instructional areas and was willing to learn appropriate strategies to better assist her students.
- Tiered instruction/ Differentiation.

**Please share what you think is the strongest aspect of the educator preparation program.:**
Kansas State University responses (*n*=54):
- To work as a team.
- Use of standards
- Very well prepared music teacher. She understands the differences needed for kindergarten and sixth.
- We do not have a young teacher at this time that graduated with an education degree.
- We have had numerous opportunities in recent years to hire graduates of the Human Ecology (FACS education) department of Kansas State University. We have found each of our recent hires to be very well prepared to be a leader in the classroom and in our school.
- Well rounded background.

**Please share how you think we might improve the educator preparation program.:**
Kansas State University responses (*n*=48):
- Actually, the survey is a bit premature since the candidate has not yet had his first day with students. He is a very promising candidate who student-taught in my building, but I have not yet had an opportunity to observe him when he is fully on his own. I might be able to answer this question better about midway through this school year. The question about how likely I am to rehire him does not have an option for undecided, but whether or not I rehire will depend on his performance. Of course, I hired him with the intention of keeping him forever and am working hard to make sure that happens, but I don't know yet.
- An understanding of urban instruction. A better understanding of various cultures and dealing with students of poverty and how to meet their needs.
- Being a role model with cell phone usage/social media usage within a learning environment setting. When to use it and when to be actively engaged with colleagues and peers.
- Classroom management.
- Classroom management - areas that focus on what to do in tough situations or how to handle tough students.  How to collect data, what to collect, and how to decipher assessment for future benefit.
- Classroom management and implementation of different instructional strategies.
- Classroom management continues to be the weakest area by far.
- Classroom management has been a huge struggle for new hires from K-State.
- College students need to have a greater opportunity to experience life in the classroom as often as possible, while also experiencing the most recent research related to educational best practice.
- Continue to focus on classroom management, understanding the needs of adolescent students, and relationship building.
- Continue to fully teach growth mindset along with executive functioning skills and the importance of the development of social/emotional skills in the learning process.
- Cooperative learning activities.
- Differentiation is a key piece of instruction that could be improved.
- Do more situational/role playing with classroom management.
- Emphasize the importance of utilizing visuals for learning - such as physical environment (anchor charts).
- Focus on standards when developing lessons.
- Focus time and energy on the following components: Relationship Building Structure Organization Pre-corrective teaching strategies.

**Please share how you think we might improve the educator preparation program.:**
Kansas State University responses (*n*=48):
- How to differentiate instruction and ensure the educators are knowledgeable about how children learn to read.
- I am extremely pleased with my new teacher. She is an excellent addition to our school family.
- I believe there is still work to do to improve the understanding of the process and science of teaching reading for elementary teachers.
- I do think students need to actually study some of the current theories and methods of classroom management, not just develop (copy) what they have seen in a cooperating teacher. Secondly, I do think they need the same approach to assessment of student products.
- I would like to see the teacher better prepared in classroom management skills.
- I would suggest giving more practical tips on classroom management. This is especially true for students who have experienced trauma or have severe behavior issues.
- If more time could be spent on developing procedures and routines for the classroom it would help with classroom management.
- Improve work with assessment including appropriate uses of assessment for formative instruction and common assessment.
- Include LETRs training in the prep courses for teachers.
- It's hard to have a holistic viewpoint for this survey - I would say it is important for your team to reflect on your practices by going out into the schools to see for yourself; I would also wonder what data you have to determine how long your graduates TAY in the profession.
- Learning can be fun while being rigorous. Seems like the goal was "fun" rather than high expectations in a rigorous setting.
- [Teacher] did not handle the ethical standards of a Catholic school well nor with the hierarchy when it was discussed.
- More exposure to differentiated instruction (what it is, how to do it, etc.). More exposure to responding to interventions. More exposure to common formative assessments and how to truly use data to drive instructional practices.
- More stress on developing relationships with students and families, the importance of continuous and open communication among all stakeholders, and classroom discipline models, such as PBIS and Safe and Civil Schools.
- More work on formalized assessment disaggregation and interpretation would be helpful.
- NA.
- NA.
- No weak areas that I see.
- None at this time.
- Nothing.
- Preparation for special needs students in their classroom. Tools to utilize for behavioral challenges in the classroom. Analyzing data for understanding of instructional changes. Work ethic.
- Professionalism at all times.
- Questioning Teachers need to be aware of stronger methods of assessment and how to accommodate students with special needs as well as general education students in need of Tier 2 Interventions.
- Remind teachers that they must plan learning activities until the very last day.  Watching Hollywood movies for the last week of school is unacceptable.

**Please share how you think we might improve the educator preparation program.:**
Kansas State University responses (*n*=48):
- So many variables such as the students themselves. I have had teachers come through your program, the same year and teach the same curriculum. Due to their personalities, interests, etc., they show strengths in some areas and weaknesses in others that ae different from one another.
- Some beginning teachers fail to follow through with discipline. They want to be friends with the students have the students like them. Respect will come if the educators set the limitations, but follow through and keep order in the classroom so all students can learn.
- Stressing the importance of classroom management and the use of parent communication would be good.
- Students need to be taught how to deal with adversity. How to handle tough student behaviors and tough parent behaviors. How to properly deal with negative social media attacks.
- Teachers need to be exposed much more deeply to how students learn to read and how to address students who have not mastered literacy skills. Teachers also need to be prepared to manage behaviors in a restorative rather than punitive manner.
- With our diverse population, it is a great benefit to us to have student teachers who are bilingual.
- Work with interns on their communication skills.

*Responses are verbatim; spelling and grammatical errors were corrected.