

**Kansas Educator Alumni and Employer Survey
Spring/Summer 2016 Survey Administration
Kansas State University**

Background

This report provides a summary of the spring/summer 2016 survey administration of the Kansas Educator Alumni and Employer Survey with comparison to the spring 2013, 2014, and spring 2015 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 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, 2014 and August 31, 2015, and were teaching in the state of Kansas during the 2015 - 2016 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 2015 - 2016 school year. These data did not capture individuals that were licensed, or teaching in other states.

Current 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. This information is only available once all districts have reported their personnel data. Due to delayed reporting in the past, OEIE consulted with KSDE and were able to obtain contact information by April 14, 2016. This is a full month earlier than in previous years. See table below for summary of KSDE data release dates.

Year	Data Released from KSDE
2016	April 14
2015	May 15
2014	May 29
2013	May 17

While still not the optimal time for Alumni and Employers to be completing surveys, the initial email was sent before the end of April which may have reached some Alumni and Employers prior to the end of the school year.

An issue with the KSDE data from previous years was the large number of Alumni and Employers without email addresses. For Alumni, most with missing emails were employed by USD 259. USD 259 provided the same email address for multiple Alumni. OEIE obtained missing email addresses by looking at school websites to obtain the actual email address or using naming conventions (such as lastname@school.edu) that were noted on the school websites. In 2016, 17% of Alumni direct email addresses were not provided. In 2016, 15% of Employer direct emails were not provided; however, building email addresses for these Principals were included in the KSDE data. OEIE used the building email for those Employers who did not have a direct email address provided in the KSDE data. This process resulted in each Alumni and Employer having an email address. When surveys were administered, very few bounce backs occurred (Alumni = 2% in 2015 and 2016 as compared to 6% in 2014; Employers = 1% in 2016 and 2% in both 2015 and 2014). In principle, 98% of Alumni and 99% of Employers should have received the survey request. However, many school districts may have firewalls that block delivery without sending bounce back messages.

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 2016 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 distributed to Alumni “work” email addresses provided by KSDE on April 25, 2016. The following week, the Deans of Education from Fort Hays State University (FHSU), Kansas State University (KSU), the University of Kansas (KU), and Wichita State University (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.

In the 2015 survey administration, Dr. Scott Myers, Director of Teacher Licensure and Accreditation Kansas State Department of Education, sent a pre-notice directly to each Alumni encouraging him/her to complete the survey. Due to email server issues that occurred at KSDE in the 2015 distribution, Dr. Myers was not able to continue this practice. In the 2016 survey administration, Dr. Myers 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 3, May 11, May 19, May 27, June 3, and June 10, 2016.

At the close of the survey in June, it was observed that many institutions had response rates around 20%. OEIE contacted the Deans of these institutions to request personal email accounts of students; with the strategy that Alumni may respond to requests sent to their personal email account. FHSU was

not able to share the Alumni personal email addresses with OEIE; however, their Alumni Association sent a message to the personal email addresses of their Alumni encouraging them to check their school email accounts, to find and complete the survey. Personal email addresses were obtained from KSU, KU, and WSU. The survey was relaunched to those students on July 11 with reminders on July 15, July 21, July 27, and July 29. This effort only resulted in 23 additional responses. The use of personal email addresses did not appear to improve the Alumni response rate.

Most of the Alumni in 2016 (72%) who start the survey complete the survey (71% in 2015). Therefore, the major challenge appears to be getting the Alumni to open the email and start the survey.

As shown in Table 1, FHSU and KSU had their highest response rates over the four year period. Three of the other institutions improved their response rate from 2015 but still have response rates lower than the earlier survey distributions. One institution had a lower response rate in 2016 than in 2015 and 2013. This may be due to the large number of the institution's graduates who are hired by USD 259. It is possible many of these Alumni are not receiving the survey.

The use of pre-notice about the survey from Deans, posting on the KSDE Administrative listserv requesting administrators encourage completing, launching the survey earlier than in the past years, and use of personal email addresses did not improve response rates. If improved Alumni response rates are a goal, new strategies should be explored.

Only completed surveys were used in the analysis. It should be noted that 49% of the Alumni completing the survey represent two institutions: 25% KSU and 24% FHSU. The remaining 51% of Alumni completing the survey represent the other four participating institutions. A similar pattern appeared in 2015; however, the two institutions with the largest participation were KSU (26%) and WSU (23%).

Employer Survey

The survey was distributed to Employers of FHSU, KSU, KU, Washburn, and WSU Alumni on April 25, 2016. The following week, 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 3, May 11, May 19, May 27, June 3, and June 10, 2016.

As found with the Alumni survey, the response rate was low. OEIE relaunched the survey to Employers on July 13, 2016. Reminders were distributed on July 20, July 28, August 3, and August 9. This effort yielded 57 completed surveys of the total 249 responses. This represents 23% of the responses. It may be helpful in future survey administrations to provide both the end of school year and later in the summer options allowing Employers two different times to respond.

Similarly to Alumni, those Employers who start the survey in 2016 (84%) complete the survey (81% in 2015). The challenge continues to be how to get Employers, as Alumni, to open and respond to the survey. Other types of notifications and direct communication from the institutions may promote increased response rates.

2016 had the highest response rate combined for six of the institutions resulting in a 1% increase from 37% in 2015 to 38% 2016 and a 9% increase from 29% in 2013 to 38% in 2016 (Table 2). In 2016, three institutions (KSU, Washburn, and WSU) yielded their highest response rates for the 2013 – 2016 period. Two institutions reported response rates similar to previous years. One institution's response rate in 2016 dropped from 2015, but remained very similar to the 2014 and 2013 rates.

Only completed surveys were used in the analysis. As with the Alumni survey, Employers of Alumni from two institutions (KSU = 26%; FHSU = 24%); represent 50% of the Employers completing the survey. The remaining 50% of Employers completing the survey represent the other four institutions. A similar pattern appeared in 2015 with the same institutions representing 48% of Employer responses.

Table 1: Alumni Potential Survey Recipients and Response Rates

Institution	Alumni Names Identified by KSDE Only	Names with No Email Addresses*	Surveys Distributed to Known Email Addresses**	Survey Bounce backs	Total Potential Alumni Survey Recipients	Number of Completed Surveys***	2016 Response Rate (%)	2015 Response Rate (%)	2014 Response Rate (%)	2013 Response Rate (%)
Emporia State University	158	11	147	7	140	36	26%	25%	26%	39%
Fort Hays State University	144	8	144	1	143	53	37%	22%	16%	25%
Kansas State University	160	5	160	4	156	56	36%	30%	22%	32%
Pittsburg State University	Did not participate in 2016							29%	28%	36%
University of Kansas	88	2	88	1	87	24	28%	24%	19%	30%
Washburn University	62	1	62	3	59	14	24%	20%	38%	32%
Wichita State University	167	103	167	2	165	42	25%	30%	14%	30%
Total	779	130	768	18	750	225	30%	26%	20%	32%

* USD 259 provided the same email address for all Alumni hired in the district.

**Email addresses were created based on email naming conventions from the website or email accounts from the school/district. Emporia State University did not find missing email addresses.

***A total of 226 Alumni completed the survey. One Alumni selected “Attended privately-funded university outside the State of Kansas.”

Table 2: Employer Potential Survey Recipients and Response Rates

Institution	Employer Names Identified by KSDE Only	Names with No Email Addresses	Surveys Distributed to Known Email Addresses*	Survey Bounce backs	Total Potential Employer Survey Recipients	Number of Completed Surveys	2016 Response Rate (%)	2015 Response Rate (%)	2014 Response Rate (%)	2013 Response Rate (%)
Emporia State University	158	25	133	2	131	33	25%	22%	33%	27%
Fort Hays State University	132	14	132	1	132	61	46%	49%	44%	43%
Kansas State University	151	18	151	3	149	65	44%	41%	36%	26%
Pittsburg State University	Did not participate in 2016							42%	26%	34%
University of Kansas	79	25	79	1	78	20	26%	32%	24%	26%
Washburn University	56	10	56	0	56	28	50%	33%	24%	26%
Wichita State University	117	12	117	0	117	42	36%	33%	25%	27%
Total	693	104	668	7	663	249	38%	37%	31%	29%

*Building emails were used for those Principals who did not have a direct email address provided for Fort Hays State University, Kansas State University, the University of Kansas, Washburn University, and Wichita State University. Emporia State University did not find missing email addresses.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1

Kansas Educator Alumni
Survey Data

Summary of Ratings¹				
Statewide Results				
Kansas Educator Alumni Survey - Spring 2013 - 2016				
	Kansas Public Universities			
	2013 (n=162)	2014 (n=145)	2015 (n=400)	2016 (n=226)
	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)
Foundation Composite				
Mean	4.25 ²	4.14	4.15 ³	4.09 ⁴
(SD)	(0.52)	(0.53)	(0.58)	(0.55)
Planning Composite				
Mean	4.30	4.25	4.28 ⁵	4.26
(SD)	(0.62)	(0.65)	(0.64)	(0.56)
Instruction Composite				
Mean	4.25 ⁶	4.11	4.21 ⁵	4.17 ⁷
(SD)	(0.60)	(0.65)	(0.63)	(0.56)
Assessment Composite				
Mean	4.11 ⁸	4.03	4.03 ⁹	4.02
(SD)	(0.68)	(0.72)	(0.73)	(0.70)
Technology Composite				
Mean	4.09 ²	3.90	3.94 ⁵	4.02 ⁷
(SD)	(0.88)	(0.84)	(0.92)	(0.78)
Diversity Composite				
Mean	4.30	4.23	4.22 ⁹	4.19
(SD)	(0.59)	(0.66)	(0.69)	(0.66)
Motivate and Engage Composite				
Mean	4.12 ⁶	4.03	4.04	4.00 ¹⁰
(SD)	(0.67)	(0.67)	(0.69)	(0.71)
Ethics Composite				
Mean	4.40 ²	4.32	4.24	4.21
(SD)	(0.51)	(0.62)	(0.63)	(0.64)
Reflect Composite				
Mean	4.50 ⁸	4.41	4.42	4.31 ⁷
(SD)	(0.54)	(0.59)	(0.60)	(0.65)

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

²n=160

³n=396

⁴n=223

⁵n=399

⁶n=159

⁷n=225

⁸n=161

⁹n=398

¹⁰n=224

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.

Foundations of Teaching

Summary of Ratings ¹								
Foundations of Teaching								
Kansas Educator Alumni Survey - Spring 2013 - 2016								
	Kansas State University				Kansas Public Universities			
	2013 (n=43)	2014 (n=35)	2015 (n=102)	2016 (n=56)	2013 (n=162)	2014 (n=145)	2015 (n=400)	2016 (n=226)
	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)	4.35 ³ (0.63)	4.19 (0.60)	4.28 ⁴ (0.67)	4.23 (0.56)
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)	4.39 ³ (0.56)	4.23 (0.62)	4.28 (0.70)	4.23 (0.66)
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)	4.39 ³ (0.65)	4.18 (0.75)	4.20 (0.78)	4.09 ⁵ (0.80)
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)	4.22 ³ (0.81)	4.15 (0.76)	4.11 ⁶ (0.85)	4.12 (0.77)
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)	4.47 ³ (0.65)	4.32 (0.81)	4.40 ⁴ (0.78)	4.29 ⁷ (0.81)

Summary of Ratings ¹								
Foundations of Teaching								
Kansas Educator Alumni Survey - Spring 2013 - 2016								
	Kansas State University				Kansas Public Universities			
	2013 (n=43)	2014 (n=35)	2015 (n=102)	2016 (n=56)	2013 (n=162)	2014 (n=145)	2015 (n=400)	2016 (n=226)
	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)
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)	3.69 ⁸ (1.01)	3.75 (0.99)	3.66 (1.07)	3.54 (1.04)
Foundation Composite Mean (SD)	4.19 ² (0.52)	4.04 (0.64)	4.07 (0.64)	4.04 (0.61)	4.25 ⁸ (0.52)	4.14 (0.53)	4.15 ⁹ (0.58)	4.09 ¹⁰ (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.

²n=42

³n=161

⁴n=398

⁵n=225

⁶n=399

⁷n=224

⁸n=160

⁹n=396

¹⁰n=223

Preparation for Planning

Summary of Ratings ¹								
Preparation for Planning								
Kansas Educator Alumni Survey - Spring 2013 – 2016								
	Kansas State University				Kansas Public Universities			
	2013 (n=43)	2014 (n=35)	2015 (n=102)	2016 (n=56)	2013 (n=162)	2014 (n=145)	2015 (n=400)	2016 (n=226)
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(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)	4.28 (0.72)	4.19 (0.80)	4.16 ² (0.79)	4.20 (0.69)
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)	4.38 (0.81)	4.28 (0.83)	4.38 (0.76)	4.38 (0.64)
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)	4.31 (0.82)	4.31 (0.80)	4.33 (0.81)	4.26 (0.78)
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)	4.34 (0.76)	4.30 (0.73)	4.30 (0.76)	4.27 (0.64)
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)	4.21 (0.85)	4.14 (0.83)	4.23 ² (0.81)	4.19 (0.73)

Summary of Ratings ¹								
Preparation for Planning								
Kansas Educator Alumni Survey - Spring 2013 – 2016								
	Kansas State University				Kansas Public Universities			
	2013 (n=43)	2014 (n=35)	2015 (n=102)	2016 (n=56)	2013 (n=162)	2014 (n=145)	2015 (n=400)	2016 (n=226)
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)
Planning Composite Mean (SD)	4.38 (0.54)	4.22 (0.57)	4.32 (0.61)	4.19 (0.66)	4.30 (0.62)	4.25 (0.65)	4.28 ² (0.64)	4.26 (0.56)

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.

²n=399

Preparation to Provide Appropriate Instruction

Summary of Ratings ¹								
Preparation to Provide Appropriate Instruction								
Kansas Educator Alumni Survey - Spring 2013 - 2016								
	Kansas State University				Kansas Public Universities			
	2013 (n=43)	2014 (n=35)	2015 (n=102)	2016 (n=56)	2013 (n=162)	2014 (n=145)	2015 (n=400)	2016 (n=226)
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(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)	4.36 ³ (0.68)	4.20 (0.79)	4.35 ⁴ (0.69)	4.33 (0.60)
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)	4.19 ³ (0.76)	4.03 (0.86)	4.20 (0.79)	4.14 ⁵ (0.78)
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)	4.19 ³ (0.77)	4.06 (0.81)	4.18 (0.78)	4.15 (0.68)
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)	4.26 ³ (0.81)	4.17 (0.75)	4.21 (0.79)	4.18 ⁵ (0.71)
Instruction 5. I was prepared to integrate multiple content areas into interdisciplinary units of study.	4.22 ² (0.82)	4.00 (0.69)	4.09 (0.98)	4.04 (0.91)	4.26 ⁶ (0.84)	4.09 (0.82)	4.11 (0.91)	4.08 (0.85)

Summary of Ratings ¹								
Preparation to Provide Appropriate Instruction								
Kansas Educator Alumni Survey - Spring 2013 - 2016								
	Kansas State University				Kansas Public Universities			
	2013 (n=43)	2014 (n=35)	2015 (n=102)	2016 (n=56)	2013 (n=162)	2014 (n=145)	2015 (n=400)	2016 (n=226)
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)
Instruction Composite Mean (SD)	4.26 ² (0.54)	4.02 (0.58)	4.22 (0.66)	4.16 (0.65)	4.25 ⁶ (0.60)	4.11 (0.65)	4.21 ⁴ (0.63)	4.17 ⁵ (0.56)

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.

²n=41

³n=160

⁴n=399

⁵n=225

⁶n=159

Preparation to Incorporate Assessment

Summary of Ratings ¹								
Preparation to Incorporate Assessment								
Kansas Educator Alumni Survey - Spring 2013 - 2016								
	Kansas State University				Kansas Public Universities			
	2013 (n=43)	2014 (n=35)	2015 (n=102)	2016 (n=56)	2013 (n=162)	2014 (n=145)	2015 (n=400)	2016 (n=226)
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(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)	4.00 ³ (0.88)	3.88 (0.98)	3.92 ⁴ (0.97)	3.90 (0.92)
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)	4.16 (0.76)	4.01 (0.84)	4.09 ⁴ (0.78)	4.01 (0.83)
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 (0.92)	4.05 (0.87)	4.02 ⁴ (0.91)	4.03 (0.85)
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)	4.11 (0.81)	4.15 (0.75)	4.08 (0.84)	4.12 (0.75)
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)	4.15 (0.75)	4.06 (0.83)	4.03 (0.86)	4.05 (0.84)

Summary of Ratings ¹								
Preparation to Incorporate Assessment								
Kansas Educator Alumni Survey - Spring 2013 - 2016								
	Kansas State University				Kansas Public Universities			
	2013 (n=43)	2014 (n=35)	2015 (n=102)	2016 (n=56)	2013 (n=162)	2014 (n=145)	2015 (n=400)	2016 (n=226)
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)
Assessment Composite Mean (SD)	4.09 ² (0.73)	3.95 (0.68)	4.00 (0.81)	3.91 (0.92)	4.11 ³ (0.68)	4.03 (0.72)	4.03 ⁵ (0.73)	4.02 (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.

²n=42

³n=161

⁴n=399

⁵n=398

Preparation to Incorporate Technology

Summary of Ratings ¹								
Preparation to Incorporate Technology								
Kansas Educator Alumni Survey - Spring 2013 – 2016								
	Kansas State University				Kansas Public Universities			
	2013 (n=43)	2014 (n=35)	2015 (n=102)	2016 (n=56)	2013 (n=162)	2014 (n=145)	2015 (n=400)	2016 (n=226)
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(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)	4.12 ³ (1.01)	3.92 (0.92)	3.96 (1.03)	4.06 ⁴ (0.85)
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)	4.08 ⁵ (0.94)	3.88 (0.97)	3.95 ⁶ (0.96)	4.04 (0.84)
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)	4.04 ³ (0.98)	3.92 (0.92)	3.91 (1.03)	4.03 (0.82)
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)	3.98 ³ (1.05)	3.83 (0.97)	3.86 ⁶ (1.06)	3.96 ⁴ (0.95)
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)	4.20 ³ (0.90)	3.98 (0.88)	4.04 (0.98)	4.05 (0.84)
Technology Composite Mean (SD)	4.16 ² (0.93)	3.74 (0.90)	3.93 (0.96)	3.89 (0.83)	4.09 ⁵ (0.88)	3.90 (0.84)	3.94 ⁶ (0.92)	4.02 ⁴ (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.

²n=42

³n=161

⁴n=225

⁵n=160

⁶n=399

Preparation for Diversity

Summary of Ratings ¹								
Preparation for Diversity								
Kansas Educator Alumni Survey - Spring 2013 - 2016								
	Kansas State University				Kansas Public Universities			
	2013 (n=43)	2014 (n=35)	2015 (n=102)	2016 (n=56)	2013 (n=162)	2014 (n=145)	2015 (n=400)	2016 (n=226)
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(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)	4.49 (0.71)	4.43 (0.69)	4.37 (0.74)	4.36 (0.76)
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)	4.38 (0.76)	4.26 (0.80)	4.28 (0.84)	4.22 (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)	4.14 (0.88)	4.16 (0.87)	4.08 (0.97)	4.13 (0.80)
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)	4.30 (0.71)	4.21 (0.84)	4.22 ² (0.81)	4.17 (0.80)
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)	4.20 (0.80)	4.14 (0.86)	4.17 ² (0.85)	4.08 (0.87)
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)	4.27 (0.71)	4.20 (0.75)	4.20 (0.82)	4.19 (0.77)

Summary of Ratings ¹								
Preparation for Diversity								
Kansas Educator Alumni Survey - Spring 2013 - 2016								
	Kansas State University				Kansas Public Universities			
	2013 (n=43)	2014 (n=35)	2015 (n=102)	2016 (n=56)	2013 (n=162)	2014 (n=145)	2015 (n=400)	2016 (n=226)
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)
Diversity Composite Mean (SD)	4.30 (0.61)	4.18 (0.57)	4.22 (0.66)	4.05 (0.78)	4.30 (0.59)	4.23 (0.66)	4.22 ³ (0.69)	4.19 (0.66)

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.

²n=399

³n=398

Preparation to Motivate and Engage Students

Summary of Ratings ¹								
Preparation to Motivate and Engage Students								
Kansas Educator Alumni Survey - Spring 2013 - 2016								
	Kansas State University				Kansas Public Universities			
	2013 (n=43)	2014 (n=35)	2015 (n=102)	2016 (n=56)	2013 (n=162)	2014 (n=145)	2015 (n=400)	2016 (n=226)
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(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)	3.78 ³ (1.17)	3.69 (1.14)	3.71 (1.11)	3.56 (1.16)
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)	3.99 ⁴ (1.02)	3.95 (0.89)	3.88 (0.97)	3.85 (0.94)
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)	3.86 ⁴ (1.02)	3.62 (1.07)	3.68 (1.08)	3.74 ⁵ (1.04)
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)	4.23 ³ (0.78)	4.06 (0.85)	4.18 (0.80)	4.17 ⁵ (0.82)
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)	4.46 ⁴ (0.64)	4.48 (0.59)	4.42 (0.67)	4.38 (0.69)

Summary of Ratings ¹								
Preparation to Motivate and Engage Students								
Kansas Educator Alumni Survey - Spring 2013 - 2016								
	Kansas State University				Kansas Public Universities			
	2013 (n=43)	2014 (n=35)	2015 (n=102)	2016 (n=56)	2013 (n=162)	2014 (n=145)	2015 (n=400)	2016 (n=226)
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(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)	4.45 ⁴ (0.65)	4.39 (0.66)	4.35 (0.77)	4.27 (0.71)
Motivate & Engage Composite Mean (SD)	4.01 ⁶ (0.63)	3.97 (0.59)	4.01 (0.67)	3.95 (0.79)	4.12 ⁷ (0.67)	4.03 (0.67)	4.04 (0.69)	4.00 ⁸ (0.71)

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.

²n=42

³n=160

⁴n=161

⁵n=225

⁶n=41

⁷n=159

⁸n=224

Preparation for Professional Ethics

Summary of Ratings ¹								
Preparation for Professional Ethics								
Kansas Educator Alumni Survey - Spring 2013 - 2016								
	Kansas State University				Kansas Public Universities			
	2013 (n=43)	2014 (n=35)	2015 (n=102)	2016 (n=56)	2013 (n=162)	2014 (n=145)	2015 (n=400)	2016 (n=226)
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(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)	4.00 (0.98)	3.92 (1.02)	3.75 (1.06)	3.77 (1.00)
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)	4.40 (0.64)	4.34 (0.77)	4.24 (0.78)	4.20 (0.77)
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)	4.48 ² (0.60)	4.43 (0.64)	4.39 (0.68)	4.31 (0.70)
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)	4.67 ² (0.48)	4.57 (0.59)	4.54 (0.60)	4.47 (0.60)
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)	4.40 (0.73)	4.32 (0.86)	4.28 (0.80)	4.27 (0.76)

Summary of Ratings ¹								
Preparation for Professional Ethics								
Kansas Educator Alumni Survey - Spring 2013 - 2016								
	Kansas State University				Kansas Public Universities			
	2013 (n=43)	2014 (n=35)	2015 (n=102)	2016 (n=56)	2013 (n=162)	2014 (n=145)	2015 (n=400)	2016 (n=226)
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)
Ethics Composite Mean (SD)	4.33 (0.47)	4.38 (0.61)	4.17 (0.64)	4.14 (0.65)	4.40 ³ (0.51)	4.32 (0.62)	4.24 (0.63)	4.21 (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.

²n=161

³n=160

Reflective Practice

Summary of Ratings ¹								
Reflective Practice								
Kansas Educator Alumni Survey - Spring 2013 – 2016								
	Kansas State University				Kansas Public Universities			
	2013 (n=43)	2014 (n=35)	2015 (n=102)	2016 (n=56)	2013 (n=162)	2014 (n=145)	2015 (n=400)	2016 (n=226)
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(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)	4.61 (0.56)	4.54 (0.62)	4.57 (0.59)	4.42 ² (0.65)
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)	4.37 ³ (0.74)	4.34 (0.74)	4.29 (0.80)	4.18 (0.85)
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)	4.52 (0.64)	4.37 (0.73)	4.42 (0.68)	4.34 (0.71)
Reflect Composite Mean (SD)	4.60 (0.48)	4.36 (0.53)	4.40 (0.65)	4.18 (0.74)	4.50 ³ (0.54)	4.41 (0.59)	4.42 (0.60)	4.31 ² (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.

²n=225

³n=161

**Kansas Educator Alumni Survey
Spring 2016 Survey Administration**

Demographic Data Kansas Educator Alumni Survey - Spring 2016 Endorsement				
Endorsement Type	Kansas State University		Kansas Public Universities	
	<i>n</i>	Percent*	<i>n</i>	Percent*
Early Childhood Deaf or Hard-of-Hearing	--	--	--	--
Early Childhood Unified	1	1.8%	18	8.0%
Early Childhood School Psychologist	--	--	--	--
Early Childhood Visually Impaired	--	--	--	--
K-6 Adaptive	4	7.1%	15	6.6%
K-6 Elementary	28	50.0%	109	48.2%
K-6 English for Speakers of Other Languages	6	10.7%	27	11.9%
K-6 Functional	1	1.8%	3	1.3%
K-6 Gifted	--	--	1	0.4%
G5-8 Adaptive	1	1.8%	3	1.3%
G5-8 English Language Arts	2	3.6%	6	2.7%
G5-8 English for Speakers of Other Languages	--	--	--	--
G5-8 Functional	--	--	2	0.9%
G5-8 Gifted	--	--	1	0.4%
G5-8 History Comprehensive	--	--	3	1.3%
G5-8 Mathematics	1	1.8%	7	3.1%
G5-8 Science	1	1.8%	4	1.8%
G6-12 Adaptive	1	1.8%	4	1.8%
G6-12 Agriculture	2	3.6%	2	0.9%
G6-12 Biology	4	7.1%	7	3.1%
G6-12 Business	1	1.8%	5	2.2%
G6-12 Chemistry	4	7.1%	9	4.0%
G6-12 Communication Technology	1	1.8%	1	0.4%
G 6-12 Earth and Space Science	1	1.8%	3	1.3%
G6-12 English Language Arts	2	3.6%	12	5.3%
G6-12 English for Speakers of Other Languages	--	--	3	1.3%
G6-12 Family & Consumer Science	1	1.8%	2	0.9%
G6-12 Functional	--	--	1	0.4%
G6-12 Gifted	--	--	--	--
G6-12 History and Government	--	--	8	3.5%
G6-12 Journalism	--	--	--	--
G6-12 Mathematics	2	3.6%	8	3.5%
G6-12 Physics	1	1.8%	5	2.2%
G6-12 Power, Energy, Transportation Technology	--	--	--	--
G6-12 Production Technology	--	--	--	--
G6-12 Psychology	1	1.8%	1	0.4%
G6-12 Speech/Theatre	1	1.8%	1	0.4%
G6-12 Technology Education	2	3.6%	7	3.1%

Demographic Data Kansas Educator Alumni Survey - Spring 2016 Endorsement				
Endorsement Type	Kansas State University		Kansas Public Universities	
	<i>n</i>	Percent*	<i>n</i>	Percent*
PreK-12 Adaptive	--	--	4	1.8%
PreK-12 Art	1	1.8%	1	0.4%
PreK-12 Building Leadership	--	--	--	--
PreK-12 Deaf or Hard-of-Hearing	--	--	--	--
PreK-12 District Leadership	--	--	--	--
PreK-12 English for Speakers of Other Languages	--	--	2	0.9%
PreK-12 Foreign Language	--	--	2	0.9%
PreK-12 Functional	--	--	--	--
PreK-12 Gifted	--	--	--	--
PreK-12 Health	--	--	1	0.4%
PreK-12 Instrumental Music	4	7.1%	8	3.5%
PreK-12 Library Media Specialist	--	--	--	--
PreK-12 Music	5	8.9%	9	4.0%
PreK-12 Physical Education	--	--	5	2.2%
PreK-12 Program Leadership	--	--	--	--
PreK-12 Reading Specialist	--	--	--	--
PreK-12 School Counselor	--	--	--	--
PreK-12 School Psychologist	--	--	--	--
PreK-12 Teacher Leader	--	--	--	--
PreK-12 Visually Impaired	--	--	--	--
PreK-12 Vocal Music	4	7.1%	8	3.5%
Total	56	100.0%	226	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 2016 Please indicate the type of license you currently hold.				
License Type	Kansas State University		Kansas Public Universities	
	<i>n</i>	Percent*	<i>n</i>	Percent*
Initial License	44	78.6%	174	79.5%
One year non-renewable License	--	--	2	0.9%
Professional License	6	10.7%	32	14.6%
Provisional License	6	10.7%	10	4.6%
Restricted License	--	--	1	0.5%
Total	56	100.0%	219	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 2016 In what year did you graduate from your educator preparation program?				
Date	Kansas State University		Kansas Public Universities	
	<i>n</i>	Percent*	<i>n</i>	Percent*
Prior to 2011	1	1.8%	1	0.5%
2011	1	1.8%	3	1.6%
2012	--	--	3	1.6%
2013	1	1.8%	7	3.7%
2014	23	41.1%	66	34.7%
2015	28	50.0%	104	54.7%
2016	2	3.6%	6	3.2%
Total	56	100.0%	190	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 2016 For how many years have you been teaching at your current school?				
Number of Years	Kansas State University		Kansas Public Universities	
	<i>n</i>	Percent*	<i>n</i>	Percent*
Less than 1 year	32	57.1%	109	49.1%
1 to 2 years	23	41.1%	107	48.2%
More than 2 years	1	1.8%	6	2.7%
Total	56	100.0%	222	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 2016				
In what grade level do you currently spend the majority of your teaching time?				
Grade Level	Kansas State University		Kansas Public Universities	
	<i>n</i>	Percent*	<i>n</i>	Percent*
Pre-K	2	3.6%	10	4.55
Kindergarten	5	8.9%	13	5.9%
1 st Grade	9	16.1%	20	9.0%
2 nd Grade	5	8.9%	22	9.9%
3 rd Grade	2	3.6%	20	9.0%
4 th Grade	5	8.9%	22	9.9%
5 th Grade	3	5.4%	21	9.5%
6 th Grade	6	10.7%	18	8.1%
7 th Grade	2	3.6%	13	5.9%
8 th Grade	4	7.1%	11	5.0%
9 th Grade	5	8.9%	25	11.3%
10 th Grade	4	7.1%	9	4.1%
11 th Grade	3	5.4%	11	5.0%
12 th Grade	1	1.8%	7	3.2%
Total	56	100.0%	222	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 2016				
What is your highest degree that you most recently obtained?				
Degree	Kansas State University		Kansas Public Universities	
	<i>n</i>	Percent*	<i>n</i>	Percent*
Bachelor's Degree	53	94.6%	202	91.0%
Master's Degree	3	5.4%	18	8.1%
Doctoral Degree	--	--	2	0.9%
Total	55	100.0%	222	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 2016 From what institution did you obtain your educator preparation degree?				
Institution	Kansas State University		Kansas Public Universities	
	<i>n</i>	Percent*	<i>n</i>	Percent*
Emporia State University	--	--	36	15.9%
Fort Hays State University	--	--	53	23.5%
Kansas State University	56	100.0%	56	24.8%
Pittsburg State University	--	--	--	--
University of Kansas	--	--	24	10.6%
Washburn University	--	--	14	6.2%
Wichita State University	--	--	42	18.6%
Other privately-funded university outside of the state of Kansas	--	--	1	0.4%
Total	55	100.0%	226	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 2016 Respondent Gender				
Gender	Kansas State University		Kansas Public Universities	
	<i>n</i>	Percent*	<i>n</i>	Percent*
Female	48	85.7%	183	82.8%
Male	8	14.3%	36	16.3%
Prefer not to respond	--	--	2	0.9%
Total	56	100.0%	221	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 2016 Respondent Ethnicity				
Ethnicity	Kansas State University		Kansas Public Universities	
	<i>n</i>	Percent*	<i>n</i>	Percent*
Hispanic or Latino	2	3.6%	9	4.1%
Not Hispanic or Latino	53	94.6%	206	93.2%
Prefer not to respond	1	1.8%	6	2.7%
Total	56	100.0%	221	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 2016 Respondent Race				
Race	Kansas State University		Kansas Public Universities	
	<i>n</i>	Percent*	<i>n</i>	Percent*
American Indian or Alaska Native	1	1.8%	2	0.9%
Black or African American	1	1.8%	2	0.9%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	--	--	1	0.5%
White	51	91.1%	205	92.3%
Multi-Racial	2	3.6%	5	2.3%
Prefer not to respond	1	1.8%	7	3.2%
Total	56	100.0%	222	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=49):

- As a music educator, I felt INCREDIBLY prepared in my content area. We were beaten up and had to do everything, but K-State prepares music teachers WAY better than any other Kansas school. It's embarrassing how large the gap is between music educators from K-State vs. other schools that aren't KU.
- Block c and student teaching gave me hands on experience and teacher feedback. Thinking on my feet applying what was taught prepared me best.
- Collaborating with fellow teachers
- Creating positive relationships with my students
- Gaining experience by being in various elementary classrooms throughout the program
- Helping us align our lesson objectives to the standards
- I believe that all aspects from my education program were great. I learned from all of them. It made me feel prepared and confident about getting a job in an area that was not my area of concentration.
- I believe the greatest strength of my educator preparation program was teaching us about self-reflection. I constantly was self-reflecting each and every day over lessons I taught, how I handled things in the classroom, and how I interacted with my fellow educators. Self-reflection is crucial for growing as an educator and even more importantly, as a person. This self-reflection creates more motivation to become the best teacher possible for my students.
- I enjoyed having a good amount of time in the actual classroom. That was a strength.
- I feel like I was really ready in the reading aspect of things to a point. We hit reading in two different blocks but really I don't feel like I was prepared for anything.
- I felt that a couple of my professors were very experienced and exceptional teachers. They gave us excellent examples of what they actually did in their classroom to give us ideas of what we could do. They didn't necessarily use a textbook but instead used their own experiences and researched based strategies.
- I really enjoyed the practicum placements and being able to work in the classroom regularly before student teacher and having my own classroom. I also found it helpful that these practicums take place during class so you don't have to find extra time on our own to go to the classroom.
- I think learning the teaching content and the aspect of professionalism are the greatest strengths of the preparation program.
- I think my educator preparation program did a good job of explaining that much of what we learn during the first year of teaching will truly come from the first year experience. There is only so much that we can prepare for when it comes to education. I came into my first year knowing that I would learn a lot, and that helped me cope with many of the struggles of my first year.
- I think my greatest strength is establishing a relationship with not only my students but my colleagues as well. I am very confident and comfortable with everyone that I work with and it makes the working environment a positive one.
- I was able to learn from former teachers in my particular content area and they helped us learn from their experiences in the classroom.
- I would consider Lab Techniques in the Science classroom the greatest strength in my educator preparation program. This is because the professor gave us time to teach and reteach lessons to our peers, giving us constant feedback, and continued visits in the classroom even after graduation in order to continue education.

What do you consider as the greatest strength of your educator preparation program?

Kansas State University responses ($n=49$):

- Informing us on the foundation of education and providing a large amount of time in the classroom
- Instrument techniques preparation
- Integration into the classroom, we had several placements which gave us experience in MS and HS settings.
- It taught me to work collaboratively with colleagues.
- Learning different ways to incorporate informal and formal assessments.
- Learning how to effectively plan a unit.
- Learning how to write an effective lesson plan that was aligned with grade appropriate standards and objectives.
- Lesson planning. This was a great help.
- My educator preparations program was rigorous and we spent a lot of time in actual classrooms learning and interacting with students and master teachers. These involvement opportunities gave us hands-on experiences with content, classroom management, working with colleagues and paraprofessionals, and lesson planning/time management. Through observations, we also received valuable feedback (teaching strengths and improvements). My professor for Block 2 classes had very high expectations and prepared us well in the fields of lesson planning, making science an inquiry based subject, laboratory management/design, self-reflection, and high-level questioning. Through my classes at Kansas State University, I also felt that I gained a good background in Educational Psychology and teaching practices.
- None, the program didn't teach me a whole lot about real life teaching.
- Observations in local schools
- One on one time with my advisor
- Preparation in the specific teaching field and professionalism in the workplace.
- Preparing us for effective lesson planning and building our knowledge of our content area.
- Preparing us to be ethical teachers who care about our students.
- Specific teaching subject/Content knowledge
- Student teaching
- Student teaching in both elementary and secondary settings.
- The amount of time we spent in the classroom throughout blocks.
- The best experiences were the real classroom experiences, student teaching and the two required math classes taken with Jenny Johnson. The first one was when she was still in the math department and then she switched over to the Ed dept. I took the two classes in back to back semesters with her and it was fantastic.
- The educator preparation program prepared me for my teaching career in many different ways. Every aspect of teaching was taught in one of my classes.
- The emphasis on technology being used by educators to plan and prepare instruction as well as on student use of technology in the classroom.
- The greatest strength of my educator preparation program was the opportunities that were provided for us to be in the classroom and being able to reflect with our observers.
- The greatest strength of the educator preparation program was preparing students for lesson planning with the use of data.
- The hands on involvement and being in schools as part as my classes.
- The number of contact hours with students in various roles, i.e. observations, practicum and student teaching, has given me experience in the classroom which allowed me to practice

What do you consider as the greatest strength of your educator preparation program?

Kansas State University responses ($n=49$):

applying content I have learned in courses prior to graduation.

- The support from the faculty and staff at KSU.
- The time spent in the schools, gaining firsthand experience.
- The use of collaboration.
- Tying learning to standards Exposure to and practice of varied ways of teaching for a variety of students
- Utilizing technology within instruction and assessment.
- Wide range of information, but nothing can truly prepare you for being alone in a classroom. College gave as much "textbook" knowledge as they could. I think really, all was covered, but until you are in it alone and learning your specific district want and needs as well, you don't really know what it will be like.

If you could make one improvement to your educator preparation program, what would it be?

Kansas State University responses ($n=49$):

- A few classes seemed almost pointless to the profession, towards the end of the semester I was still unclear with the outcomes of the course.
- All the variety of needs of the different students are impossible to learn. Classroom management is the biggest problem, planning time, developing curriculum needs has been horrible!
- As a Special Education teacher in an interrelated classroom, one of my struggles is general education teachers not wanting to deal with students that are labeled. They don't think that students with disabilities are their students too. They think they are the Special Education teacher's only. I would suggest that in the education programs they discuss this with all the teachers. If they have a student with a label it's their students also and their job to help them be successful learners. And if that requires them to made accommodations and modifications that they do them and not let the student fail or leave everything for the SPED teacher to do for them.
- Being able to find quality placements for Block 1 Field Experience that is in my content and closer to Manhattan.
- Better placement and background on cooperative teachers. I felt like I was a free substitute while student teaching.
- Better prepare us for a classroom, not just strategies. We never learn about classroom management.
- Classroom management. I was not prepared for classroom management at all. We had one class one day a week for not even an hour and no chance to implement it into a classroom.
- Dealing with the emotional needs of students. I feel that we need more training in this area.
- Focus on the "politics" that occur within a school district and how to handle less than ideal administration.
- Have accurate teachings into what classrooms do on a daily basis and be realistic. I teach in KC and they are years ahead of what KSU taught us, they do things I had never been taught and was expected to know. It would be nice if the school was on the forefront of the teaching world instead of the small town teaching world.

If you could make one improvement to your educator preparation program, what would it be?

Kansas State University responses ($n=49$):

- I believe the education preparation program has already taken leaps and bounds in being able to help future teachers be prepared for using technology in the classroom. I think it would be very beneficial for a technology class in which you get to practice using a smart board and also learning about other useful apps. The technology class at Kansas State usually happens when you are a younger student. To make it more relevant and relatable for students, it would be ideal to have that class as a junior rather than a sophomore, or even in the semester before student teaching.
- I came in with no knowledge of the curriculum [redacted] uses. It would have been nice to sit down a fellow first grade teacher at the beginning of summer and have them walk through the curriculum with me. I would have felt much more prepared for the beginning of the school year.
- I did not feel confident or comfortable with the technology aspect of the program.
- I felt very prepared to enter the teaching field upon graduation.
- I think that it would be more beneficial to be in more classrooms more often to just observe different classroom management techniques.
- I think that music education should have different classes for some subjects, especially the literacy class.
- I wished I would have had more training in classroom management and severe behavior issues.
- I would add more courses on classroom management, including management of support staff (paraprofessionals). In my preparation program, there weren't any courses related to leadership in education.
- I would have changed to make our classroom experiences and our time learning tie together better. I wish we would have also practiced more before going into a real classroom.
- I would have liked to have been given opportunities to observe my colleagues to get more classroom management ideas and instructional ideas for my own classroom.
- I would have liked to learn more about IEP's and how to help those students in our classroom. We had one class about that I would have liked to have taken more than one class over it because I knew next to nothing about it.
- I would like to see more classes on behavior management.
- I would suggest a reconsideration of the curriculum taught in Educational Technology. I didn't really need to know how to create a Pinterest board (a large part of my grade in the class) or make an online bulletin board. What I DID need to know was how to work a Promethean board/Elmo/Projector, how to troubleshoot computer problems, how to work effectively with Google Docs/Google Classroom, etc. The class has potential to be incredibly helpful, but I honestly felt that what I learned was shallow and unhelpful.
- I would teach more lessons in class in front of peers to practice when something goes wrong in a lesson.
- If I could make one improvement it would be to the technology in the classroom course. The course entailed me creating a website that ended up more as a blog, and taught me nothing about overheads, document cameras, connecting computers to televisions, or anything useful in the classroom.
- It's hard to teach behavior management but that needed to be taught different or something. Also just teach about how to renew your license or basic stuff like that.
- Learn more about real world accommodations for students that need extra help. Practicing making them for everything you create.
- Learn more ways to incorporate technology to the students.

If you could make one improvement to your educator preparation program, what would it be?

Kansas State University responses (n=49):

- Literacy instruction just didn't click for me. I didn't see a connection from k-2 to 3-6. It was very disjointed. There should be more focused classes on specific reading instruction. The courses now are much, much too general. Classroom management and assessment should be 3 hour courses. Making them one hour courses is pointless and ends up being busywork.
- More field experience in the schools BEFORE student teaching.
- More focus on classroom management and teaching students with diverse backgrounds
- More focus on preparing for concerts and all that entails (I'm a music teacher)
- More in depth pedagogy
- More preparation for dealing with classroom behavior and different scenarios. I.e. inappropriate language, defiance, unmotivated students, drama etc.
- More real contact with students. I think it should be more of an emphasis prior to being in the college of ed.
- More relevant content specific instruction
- More time actually teaching and planning lessons for real students.
- More time with Elementary Music Methods. I only had one class that prepared me for my elementary career while the others were focused on secondary music.
- Music majors need more general education classes. We never really learned about professionalism (general), the laws and things each grade learns in the general classroom. We could better collaborate with general classroom teachers if we have a general outline of what each grade learns.
- N/A
- Nothing!
- One improvement could be helping future educators with student behavior- especially strategies of encouraging them to accept others, work well with others, and different motivations to get their very best work.
- One improvement that could be made to the educator preparation program would be discussing the state of education in Kansas and the reality and gravity of the situation that schools are facing (lack of funds, no tenure, you don't need an education degree to be hired, etc.) It's very serious and the topic was never discussed.
- One improvement would be to have conversations about the hard part of teaching. Teaching isn't the hard part; the hard part is dealing with behavior managements, meeting the needs of all of the children, and dealing with busy schedules.
- Relating content to students personal life
- Special Education should do an entire semester of student teaching for their practicum, not just 9 weeks.
- Teaching us how to better handle relationships with parents and colleagues.
- The district I taught in this year used a lot of curriculum guides. I wish I would have had more training in how to effectively use and plan with a curriculum guides. Especially when there needs to be more material added to the lesson.
- The only area I wish I had more experience with before student teaching was guided reading. During classes I know we discussed running records and the different levels of reading but I'm not sure if we ever fully discuss what a guided reading group is or looks like.

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

Kansas State University responses (n=19):

- Another area that I would add to the education program is writing Individualized Education Plans. I learned how to write goals but I think there should be a practice program for education students to practice writing an entire plan. One thing I don't understand is that Early Childhood is considered age birth to age 8 yrs and there are two different certifications. My degree is Unified, which is birth to Kindergarten. I would like to see Early Childhood Unified cover birth to age 8yrs.
- During my educator preparation program I was well supported and encouraged in my pursuit to become a future educator. However after I graduated and became an alumnus I was disrespected and slandered, calling my character into question. These allegations were later proved to be false; however there was never any reconciliation from the individuals in the K-State education department. In short the conduct of these individuals in the educator preparation program was highly unprofessional and disheartening for a new teacher such as myself.
- I do have one suggestion. I didn't appreciate how my request to be within the [redacted] school district was set aside and I was placed out at [redacted]. I ended up having to take student teaching twice. Looking back it has given me a greater desire to be an amazing teacher, but I still have hard feelings about that. As seniors in college, I think we as people know our strengths and weaknesses enough that we should be able to know where we will be successful at. I didn't have a ton of experience out at [redacted], and I was placed out there my last semester. I knew that being in a school out in [redacted] would not be the best scenario for me, yet I was placed out there anyways. I know that it is hard to be able to place everyone where they prefer, but I think the more likely you can match a student to their desired placement, the higher the probability that they will get more out of there student teaching experience. In addition to placements, I was placed in a classroom in which there had been a student teacher in the fall. I think that as a program, placing a student teacher in a classroom in which there has previously been a student teacher that school year is not the best recipe for success for the cooperating teacher, the student teacher, or the students.
- I feel like I was prepared for a school that has hardly any problems. I have had trouble planning lessons using curriculum when in reality we use curriculum but through school we hardly looked at curriculum. I was not prepared for classroom management, especially high behavior students. We never got a chance to implement stuff and see how to do it in a classroom setting. I feel like student teaching needs to be two semesters so that they get the chance to see the beginning of the year and the end of the year. The school I'm at has high behaviors and I was not prepared at all what so ever and due to that I am non-renewed my first year and have to find a new job. Students from low socio economic status and poverty, I wasn't prepared to deal with and nor did I learn how to handle it. I don't feel like I was prepared for anything. There needs to be more classes on classroom management, math, writing, reading and use curriculum that is current and can help us when we get into the classroom.
- I feel very prepared to enter the teaching profession after attending K-State.
- I felt like my program did a poor job of preparing teachers for the field.
- I felt very unprepared to me up with ways to cover all of the standards and ensure that they were being hit as well as devise a method to determine a long-term scope and sequence for the year.

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

Kansas State University responses ($n=19$):

- I further recommend that training be conducted in DIBELS. Mainly how to conduct them for the different grade levels.
- I think overall the education program needs some serious re-doing. Education in Kansas has changed so much within the past few years and recent graduates, including myself, felt ill-prepared for the actual classroom and how to apply what we learned. OR information that was learned didn't apply to the classroom, at all. EX: art, music, woodshop, etc. classes didn't get effective assessment skills. This is due to the different nature if the classroom, where there aren't/shouldn't be pen and paper exams.
- I would like to see a short course on things we might need to buy for our classroom before the school starts, ideas on what to use our classroom money on, questions that we should ask people at our buildings. For example, were do we find supplies like markers, sticky notes, or note cards; when we send out envelopes do we have to lick them close or will someone else do it. This would have been a short course/chat I would of liked to have. I'm a first generation graduate and I no family members as teachers, so little things like these I didn't know about.
- K-State is great. I feel I am a good teacher because of K-State and the opportunities it provided. The early field experiences and in-school practice was probably the most influential parts of my education because I got to work with hundreds of different ids in different content areas before I student taught.
- More classroom experience is needed and less on lesson plans.
- More classroom time!
- More on classroom management and behaviors. I am a special ed teacher and I feel as if I was not prepared for what I got!
- More talk about the funding of education would be neat in my opinion.
- N/A
- Student teaching for music educators should last a year. One semester at the secondary level and one semester at the elementary level. Only spending 4-5 weeks at each school was not nearly enough time.
- The educator program really prepared me for teaching!
- The special education program should have classes available as an undergraduate about Functional Life Skills classroom/students.

*Responses are confidential; spelling and grammatical errors were corrected. Names and personal identifiers were removed to protect the confidentiality of the subjects and respondents.

APPENDIX 2

Kansas Educator Employer
Data

Summary of Ratings¹				
Statewide Results				
Kansas Educator Employer Survey - Spring 2013 - 2016				
	2013 (n=218)	2014 (n=254)	2015 (n=383)	2016 (n=249)
	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)
Foundation Composite Mean (SD)	3.97 ² (0.53)	4.02 (0.55)	3.91 (0.70)	3.94 ³ (0.57)
Planning Composite Mean (SD)	4.07 ⁴ (0.66)	4.14 (0.67)	4.03 ⁵ (0.77)	4.05 ³ (0.66)
Instruction Composite Mean (SD)	3.86 ⁶ (0.75)	3.94 (0.73)	3.85 (0.77)	3.84 (0.73)
Assessment Composite Mean (SD)	3.87 ⁴ (0.60)	3.95 (0.64)	3.89 ⁵ (0.73)	3.89 ⁷ (0.64)
Technology Composite Mean (SD)	4.24 ⁸ (0.61)	4.25 (0.68)	4.14 ⁹ (0.76)	4.11 ³ (0.60)
Diversity Composite Mean (SD)	3.90 ⁶ (0.68)	3.97 (0.69)	3.97 ¹⁰ (0.73)	3.98 ³ (0.59)
Motivate and Engage Composite Mean (SD)	4.03 ⁴ (0.70)	4.11 (0.77)	4.03 (0.82)	4.01 ⁷ (0.75)
Ethics Composite Mean (SD)	4.32 ⁶ (0.57)	4.40 (0.63)	4.28 ⁹ (0.75)	4.27 ³ (0.65)
Reflect Composite Mean (SD)	4.04 (0.59)	4.06 (0.67)	4.02 ⁵ (0.77)	3.99 ⁷ (0.63)

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

²n=213

³n=247

⁴n=215

⁵n=381

⁶n=217

⁷n=248

⁸n=216

⁹n=382

¹⁰n=379

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.

Foundations of Teaching

Summary of Ratings ¹								
Foundations of Teaching								
Kansas Educator Employer Survey - Spring 2013 - 2016								
	Kansas State University				Kansas Public Universities			
	2013 (n=37)	2014 (n=59)	2015 (n=84)	2016 (n=65)	2013 (n=218)	2014 (n=254)	2015 (n=383)	2016 (n=249)
	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)	4.15 (0.59)	4.14 (0.61)	4.04 (0.83)	4.04 (0.68)
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)	3.91 ² (0.66)	3.97 (0.55)	3.83 (0.81)	3.94 (0.65)
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)	3.89 (0.63)	3.95 (0.61)	3.81 (0.82)	3.90 (0.61)
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)	4.03 (0.76)	4.05 (0.83)	3.96 (0.88)	4.02 (0.79)
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)	4.27 ² (0.67)	4.33 (0.76)	4.19 (0.90)	4.16 (0.70)
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)	4.06 ² (0.73)	4.11 (0.74)	4.01 (0.86)	3.99 ³ (0.76)

Summary of Ratings ¹								
Foundations of Teaching								
Kansas Educator Employer Survey - Spring 2013 - 2016								
	Kansas State University				Kansas Public Universities			
	2013 (n=37)	2014 (n=59)	2015 (n=84)	2016 (n=65)	2013 (n=218)	2014 (n=254)	2015 (n=383)	2016 (n=249)
	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)
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)	3.44 ⁵ (0.87)	3.63 (0.83)	3.53 (0.93)	3.54 (0.80)
Foundation Composite Mean (SD)	3.88 ⁴ (0.49)	4.02 (0.45)	3.99 (0.54)	3.98 (0.52)	3.97 ⁶ (0.53)	4.02 (0.55)	3.91 (0.70)	3.94 ³ (0.57)

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.

²n=217

³n=247

⁴n=36

⁵n=216

⁶n=213

Preparation for Planning

Summary of Ratings ¹								
Preparation for Planning								
Kansas Educator Employer Survey - Spring 2013 - 2016								
	Kansas State University				Kansas Public Universities			
	2013 (n=37)	2014 (n=59)	2015 (n=84)	2016 (n=65)	2013 (n=218)	2014 (n=254)	2015 (n=383)	2016 (n=249)
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(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)	4.20 (0.68)	4.21 (0.72)	4.10 (0.88)	4.11 (0.72)
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)	4.22 ² (0.71)	4.21 (0.71)	4.12 ³ (0.86)	4.16 (0.71)
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)	4.23 (0.71)	4.27 (0.79)	4.19 (0.90)	4.15 ⁴ (0.78)
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)	4.06 (0.82)	4.21 (0.84)	4.02 (0.98)	4.08 ⁴ (0.75)
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)	3.92 (0.89)	3.99 (0.85)	3.94 (0.91)	3.93 (0.82)
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)	3.81 ⁵ (0.94)	3.94 (0.88)	3.78 ³ (0.97)	3.94 (0.82)

Summary of Ratings ¹								
Preparation for Planning								
Kansas Educator Employer Survey - Spring 2013 - 2016								
	Kansas State University				Kansas Public Universities			
	2013 (n=37)	2014 (n=59)	2015 (n=84)	2016 (n=65)	2013 (n=218)	2014 (n=254)	2015 (n=383)	2016 (n=249)
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)
Planning Composite Mean (SD)	4.13 (0.66)	4.24 (0.49)	4.13 (0.68)	4.08 (0.59)	4.07 ⁶ (0.66)	4.14 (0.67)	4.03 ⁷ (0.77)	4.05 ⁸ (0.66)

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.

²n=217

³n=382

⁴n=248

⁵n=216

⁶n=215

⁷n=381

⁸n=247

Preparation to Provide Appropriate Instruction

Summary of Ratings ¹								
Preparation to Provide Appropriate Instruction								
Kansas Educator Employer Survey - Spring 2013 - 2016								
	Kansas State University				Kansas Public Universities			
	2013 (n=37)	2014 (n=59)	2015 (n=84)	2016 (n=65)	2013 (n=218)	2014 (n=254)	2015 (n=383)	2016 (n=249)
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(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)	4.02 (0.84)	4.09 (0.85)	4.02 (0.88)	4.01 (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)	3.69 (1.01)	3.81 (0.94)	3.77 (0.99)	3.75 (0.91)
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)	4.06 ² (0.77)	4.19 (0.74)	4.01 (0.89)	4.01 (0.77)
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)	3.81 (0.91)	3.88 (0.84)	3.80 (0.91)	3.80 (0.83)
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)	3.68 (0.88)	3.71 (0.92)	3.67 (0.91)	3.66 (0.87)
Instruction Composite Mean (SD)	3.88 (0.81)	3.96 (0.66)	4.01 (0.66)	3.88 (0.65)	3.86 ² (0.75)	3.94 (0.73)	3.85 (0.77)	3.84 (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.

²n=217

Preparation to Incorporate Assessment

Summary of Ratings ¹								
Preparation to Incorporate Assessment								
Kansas Educator Employer Survey - Spring 2013 - 2016								
	Kansas State University				Kansas Public Universities			
	2013 (n=37)	2014 (n=59)	2015 (n=84)	2016 (n=65)	2013 (n=218)	2014 (n=254)	2015 (n=383)	2016 (n=249)
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(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)	3.90 ³ (0.79)	3.94 (0.75)	3.80 (0.90)	3.88 (0.78)
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)	3.76 (0.85)	3.78 (0.85)	3.80 ⁴ (0.91)	3.78 (0.85)
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)	4.16 ³ (0.60)	4.26 (0.70)	4.20 (0.80)	4.18 ⁵ (0.68)
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)	3.87 (0.74)	3.94 (0.78)	3.88 (0.86)	3.84 (0.71)
Assessment 5. The educators accurately interpret assessment results.	3.73 (0.69)	3.92 (0.73)	4.01 (0.75)	3.83 (0.72)	3.84 (0.71)	3.93 (0.75)	3.84 (0.86)	3.86 (0.72)
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)	3.71 ³ (0.81)	3.86 (0.79)	3.77 (0.90)	3.80 (0.79)

Summary of Ratings ¹								
Preparation to Incorporate Assessment								
Kansas Educator Employer Survey - Spring 2013 - 2016								
	Kansas State University				Kansas Public Universities			
	2013 (n=37)	2014 (n=59)	2015 (n=84)	2016 (n=65)	2013 (n=218)	2014 (n=254)	2015 (n=383)	2016 (n=249)
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)
Assessment Composite Mean (SD)	3.81 ⁶ (0.57)	3.94 (0.56)	4.01 (0.64)	3.86 (0.61)	3.87 ⁷ (0.60)	3.95 (0.64)	3.89 ⁴ (0.73)	3.89 ⁵ (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.

²n=36

³n=217

⁴n=381

⁵n=248

⁶n=35

⁷n=215

Preparation to Incorporate Technology

Summary of Ratings ¹								
Preparation to Incorporate Technology								
Kansas Educator Employer Survey - Spring 2013 - 2016								
	Kansas State University				Kansas Public Universities			
	2013 (n=37)	2014 (n=59)	2015 (n=84)	2016 (n=65)	2013 (n=218)	2014 (n=254)	2015 (n=383)	2016 (n=249)
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(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)	4.28 ² (0.70)	4.32 (0.75)	4.21 (0.84)	4.20 (0.68)
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)	4.26 ² (0.67)	4.26 (0.78)	4.12 ³ (0.85)	4.13 (0.68)
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)	4.22 ² (0.72)	4.24 (0.77)	4.11 (0.86)	4.09 ⁴ (0.70)
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)	4.23 ⁶ (0.70)	4.29 (0.76)	4.18 (0.80)	4.14 ⁴ (0.65)
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)	4.19 ² (0.66)	4.16 (0.76)	4.07 ³ (0.85)	4.04 (0.67)

Summary of Ratings ¹								
Preparation to Incorporate Technology								
Kansas Educator Employer Survey - Spring 2013 - 2016								
	Kansas State University				Kansas Public Universities			
	2013 (n=37)	2014 (n=59)	2015 (n=84)	2016 (n=65)	2013 (n=218)	2014 (n=254)	2015 (n=383)	2016 (n=249)
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)
Technology Composite Mean (SD)	4.32 ⁵ (0.45)	4.34 (0.56)	4.37 (0.58)	4.03 (0.70)	4.24 ⁶ (0.61)	4.25 (0.68)	4.14 ³ (0.76)	4.11 ⁷ (0.60)

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.

²n=217

³n=382

⁴n=248

⁵n=36

⁶n=216

⁷n=247

Preparation for Diversity

Summary of Ratings ¹								
Preparation for Diversity								
Kansas Educator Employer Survey - Spring 2013 - 2016								
	Kansas State University				Kansas Public Universities			
	2013 (n=37)	2014 (n=59)	2015 (n=84)	2016 (n=65)	2013 (n=218)	2014 (n=254)	2015 (n=383)	2016 (n=249)
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(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)	3.98 ² (0.80)	4.04 (0.80)	4.03 (0.85)	4.00 (0.73)
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)	4.06 (0.73)	4.07 (0.75)	4.08 (0.82)	4.06 (0.66)
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)	4.02 (0.71)	4.09 (0.75)	4.01 (0.85)	4.06 ³ (0.64)
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)	3.74 (0.90)	3.86 (0.86)	3.84 (0.94)	3.89 (0.77)
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)	3.70 (0.87)	3.80 (0.80)	3.84 ⁴ (0.84)	3.85 (0.72)

Summary of Ratings ¹								
Preparation for Diversity								
Kansas Educator Employer Survey - Spring 2013 - 2016								
	Kansas State University				Kansas Public Universities			
	2013 (n=37)	2014 (n=59)	2015 (n=84)	2016 (n=65)	2013 (n=218)	2014 (n=254)	2015 (n=383)	2016 (n=249)
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)
Diversity Composite Mean (SD)	3.86 (0.72)	3.98 (0.63)	4.07 (0.67)	3.96 (0.59)	3.90 ² (0.68)	3.97 (0.69)	3.97 ⁴ (0.73)	3.98 ³ (0.59)

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.

²n=217

³n=247

⁴n=379

Preparation to Motivate and Engage Students

Summary of Ratings ¹								
Preparation to Motivate and Engage Students								
Kansas Educator Employer Survey - Spring 2013 - 2016								
	Kansas State University				Kansas Public Universities			
	2013 (n=37)	2014 (n=59)	2015 (n=84)	2016 (n=65)	2013 (n=218)	2014 (n=254)	2015 (n=383)	2016 (n=249)
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(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)	3.94 ² (0.86)	4.05 (0.90)	3.96 (0.97)	3.96 ³ (0.83)
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)	4.22 ² (0.72)	4.25 (0.84)	4.19 (0.90)	4.16 (0.79)
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)	3.98 ² (0.89)	4.07 (0.91)	3.96 (0.97)	3.95 (0.93)
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)	3.97 ² (0.90)	4.06 (0.93)	3.99 (0.92)	3.95 (0.92)

Summary of Ratings ¹								
Preparation to Motivate and Engage Students								
Kansas Educator Employer Survey - Spring 2013 - 2016								
	Kansas State University				Kansas Public Universities			
	2013 (n=37)	2014 (n=59)	2015 (n=84)	2016 (n=65)	2013 (n=218)	2014 (n=254)	2015 (n=383)	2016 (n=249)
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)
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)	4.14 ⁴ (0.80)	4.21 (0.82)	4.12 (0.91)	4.07 (0.88)
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)	3.95 ² (0.82)	4.04 (0.84)	3.95 (0.95)	3.97 (0.82)
Motivate & Engage Composite Mean (SD)	4.09 (0.61)	4.18 (0.68)	4.16 (0.69)	3.97 (0.75)	4.03 ⁴ (0.70)	4.11 (0.77)	4.03 (0.82)	4.01 ³ (0.75)

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.

²n=217

³n=248

⁴n=215

Preparation for Professional Ethics

Summary of Ratings ¹								
Preparation for Professional Ethics								
Kansas Educator Employer Survey - Spring 2013 - 2016								
	Kansas State University				Kansas Public Universities			
	2013 (n=37)	2014 (n=59)	2015 (n=84)	2016 (n=65)	2013 (n=218)	2014 (n=254)	2015 (n=383)	2016 (n=249)
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(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)	4.36 (0.60)	4.43 (0.67)	4.33 (0.79)	4.31 ² (0.68)
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)	4.39 ³ (0.60)	4.44 (0.68)	4.32 ⁴ (0.82)	4.35 (0.64)
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)	4.25 (0.70)	4.32 (0.74)	4.19 ⁴ (0.88)	4.18 ² (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)	4.28 (0.68)	4.39 (0.72)	4.23 (0.86)	4.24 (0.75)
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)	4.34 (0.62)	4.44 (0.71)	4.32 (0.79)	4.29 (0.69)
Ethics Composite Mean (SD)	4.28 (0.55)	4.53 (0.53)	4.29 (0.67)	4.29 (0.67)	4.32 ³ (0.57)	4.40 (0.63)	4.28 ⁴ (0.75)	4.27 ⁵ (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.

²n=248

³n=217

⁴n=382

⁵n=247

Reflective Practice

Summary of Ratings¹

Reflective Practice

Kansas Educator Employer Survey - Spring 2013 - 2016

	Kansas State University				Kansas Public Universities			
	2013 (n=37)	2014 (n=59)	2015 (n=84)	2016 (n=65)	2013 (n=218)	2014 (n=254)	2015 (n=383)	2016 (n=249)
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)
Reflect 1. The educators use feedback to modify leadership practices.	3.95 (0.74)	4.03 (0.59)	4.07 (0.82)	3.91 (0.70)	4.00 (0.73)	4.00 (0.78)	3.99 (0.89)	3.93 (0.77)
Reflect 2. The educators provide feedback that allows students to reflect on their learning.	3.89 (0.61)	3.93 (0.69)	3.96 (0.83)	3.80 (0.77)	3.90 (0.73)	3.91 (0.77)	3.87 (0.89)	3.89 (0.74)
Reflect 3. The educators use reflections to adjust instruction.	3.86 (0.79)	4.03 (0.83)	4.11 (0.81)	3.89 (0.77)	3.97 (0.76)	3.99 (0.87)	3.99 (0.90)	3.92 (0.78)
Reflect 4. The educators engage in professional learning opportunities.	4.30 (0.57)	4.37 (0.61)	4.26 (0.58)	4.23 (0.66)	4.30 (0.64)	4.33 (0.72)	4.21 (0.80)	4.22 (0.64)
Reflect 5. The educators show evidence of reflection in professional practice (e.g., planning, delivering, and evaluating instruction).	4.11 (0.66)	4.19 (0.78)	4.10 (0.83)	3.98 (0.78)	4.03 (0.71)	4.07 (0.78)	4.04 ² (0.92)	4.00 ³ (0.74)
Reflect Composite Mean (SD)	4.02 (0.55)	4.11 (0.56)	4.10 (0.69)	3.96 (0.61)	4.04 (0.59)	4.06 (0.67)	4.02 ² (0.77)	3.99 ³ (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.

²n=381

³n=248

Summary of Ratings Statewide Results Kansas Educator Employer Survey - Spring 2013 - 2016								
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	<i>n</i>				<i>n</i>			
	Frequencies (%)				Frequencies (%)			
2016	21 32.3%	39 60.0%	4 6.2%	1 1.5%	59 27.3%	135 62.5%	16 7.4%	6 2.8%
2015	29 34.5%	49 58.3%	4 4.8%	2 2.4%	89 24.1%	228 61.8%	27 7.3%	6 1.6%
2014	22 37.3%	32 54.2%	2 3.4%	3 5.1%	84 33.1%	137 53.9%	23 9.1%	10 3.9%
2013	10 27.8%	24 66.7%	2 5.6%	--	61 28.1%	129 59.4%	18 8.3%	9 4.1%

Please share what you think is the strongest aspect of the educator preparation program:

Kansas State University responses (n=38):

- Classroom Management. Diversity. Engagement.
- Confidence and command in the classroom.
- Content area knowledge.
- Content Background.
- Content in field. Use of technology.
- Content knowledge and instructional practices
- Content preparation seems to be adequate. Students also can discuss and seem to be able to work with technology. Students seem to be educated about cultural diversity more so than learning diversity.
- Educators come out of the educational program with a sense of what teaching requires. They often have a strong desire to be successful with students. They are good at developing relationships. They are willing learners and recognize the need to help students be successful. They are sensitive to diverse needs and experiences. They want to perform well and are willing to learn.
- Ethics and professionalism has been great to see from our KSU grads. Their relationships with colleagues, students, and parents have been positive and professional. That, coupled with sincere reflection of best practice and how to improve their instruction, has really been impressive to see.
- Great way of getting students to make sure that they are being very respectful and empathetic to kids. Understanding where kids come from and what they bring (or don't bring) to the table. Some basic parts of Ruby Payne that my teachers really understand. Really appreciate that aspect.
- I believe educational experience/real life learning is the strongest aspect.
- I believe that the knowledge and the use of technology in the classroom is a strong point. The students know the foundations of what makes a good lesson.
- I don't know how the program affected my teacher. I believe her best qualities came from how she was raised.
- I have had the pleasure of working with several K-State graduates early in their career. They were all extremely prepared to teach the standards and curriculum area they specialized.
- I like the understanding of the growth mindset, meaning that our new teachers to the profession understand that they have areas to grow in for the teaching profession.
- I will just say this is the strongest group of first year teachers I have had in quite some time. They all have great potential to be tremendous at their chosen craft.
- Knowledge of instructional best practices, leadership initiative, being part of a community of adult learners.
- Knowledge of music content.
- Not sure at this point.
- Objective, standard-driven instruction.
- One of the strongest components is the focus on the Kansas College and Career Readiness Standards and ensuring that preservice teachers understand how to access these and align them with instruction.
- Professional attitude.
- [Redacted] was well prepared in looking to the 21st century learner and envisioning a student who is prepared not just in content area, but in social/emotional standards.

Please share what you think is the strongest aspect of the educator preparation program:

Kansas State University responses (n=38):

- [Redacted] has been a very strong first year teacher in our building. She is professional, hardworking, provides differentiated instruction, utilizes technology in her classroom, and 89% of her students met their growth targets in both reading and math. That is not an easy accomplishment and one [redacted] is most proud of. Most of the teachers in our building are K-State students and I would put them up against the best teachers in the state!
- Strong instructional skills.
- Students are current on relevant pedagogy and know what today's youth appreciate in the delivery of instruction.
- Teachers from K-State are strong in understanding the state standards and how to design lessons to achieve those. They are resourceful and know how to acquire open source resources for planning. Teachers from K-State have nice, positive relationships with the students, but have high expectations for behavior.
- Teachers have knowledge of the profession. I sense excitement on their faces.
- Teachers understand the value of relationship building and dedication to effective planning.
- Teachers who have been prepared through this program are able to make instructional decisions that are student-focused. They exhibit professionalism while creating welcoming learning environments for their students.
- Teaching students about diversity they were to experience in their classroom.
- The Block system that allows for more student contact.
- The numerous opportunities to get into the schools before the student teaching semester.
- The student teachers we have from KSU have been well prepared in the field they will be teaching. Strong understanding of the content, child development, etc.
- The teachers have a clear and strong understanding of their subject areas.
- The two teachers we have hired this year have been very prepared for the classroom. They are terrific teachers as well as terrific people!
- Very strong in curriculum and strategies.
- Very well rounded teaching program.

Please share how you think we might improve the educator preparation program:

Kansas State University responses (n=35):

- [Redacted] School District uses iPad with 1:1 Implementation. Although your graduates know how to use technology for themselves, having students be 1:1 and integration of curriculum based instruction was very different. She did a great job collaborating and researching how to do this, but was unaware when she came.
- Classroom Management and strategies for tough kids.
- Classroom management ideas.
- Classroom management instruction, modifying and accommodating for special needs.
- Classroom Management--dealing with students who have trauma in their background. Other strategies to help students besides punishment that center around the importance of the relationship with the children.
- Continue preparing for extreme behaviorally and academically challenged students.
- Continue to work on technology in the classroom and how these tools can enhance student growth in all subject areas.
- Do you have anyway of checking Maturity level? Sorry I think this is just a one in a thousand incident.

Please share how you think we might improve the educator preparation program:

Kansas State University responses (n=35):

- Ed program could include more information on how to differentiate to meet individual needs.
- Emphasis on learning a variety of effective teaching strategies is important. They only seem to know Kagan (cooperative learning), but nothing about the Marzano's Nine or Anita Archer's strategies. They also do not understand the elements of effective lesson design (Hunter). The work required on portfolio's and lesson plans during student teaching is entirely too much. It is not realistic that they will do such thorough lesson plans on every single lesson when they become "real" teachers. I had rather you focus on teaching them the different teaching strategies that have the most effect size. There is too much redundant work during their student teaching.
- Helping students grasp flexibility and adapting while in an active teaching environment.
- I am not sure how much you are having teacher candidates examine their summative data following an assessment, but the more you can do of that the better. The quicker they can get in the habit of looking at their data to identify trends (up or down) and areas of growth for specific skills, standards, and benchmarks, the better off they will be.
- I believe there needs to be a great amount of work on preparing students for reading instruction. This seems to be a weakness of KSU graduates each year. Math pedagogical practices are quite strong from KSU graduates.
- In my opinion, all teacher ed. programs do not focus enough attention on classroom management techniques, how to differentiate instruction, use of collaboration among students, etc.
- Increase technology integration courses. My K-State "newer" teachers say that the technology emphasis and training is not strong in the elementary education program. For music it doesn't appear to be strong either. This new teacher has a smartboard and one-to-one iPad--not really ever used meaningfully.
- It's difficult to teach morals. Human interactions. Using "sick" days. How we treat each other professionally and personally. Huge task, its society. The television tells them they "deserve it" because they are special. This is not an issue with my current teacher, but I am seeing it in the younger generation. Food for Thought.
- Keep doing what you are doing. The teachers we have hired from K-State are phenomenal!
- Keep up the great work. I can't think of a way that you can improve at this point. K-State graduates are well prepared.
- K-State has done a great job with the teacher ed. program. Tough to say as I am a big Jayhawk fan, but I cannot fault the Ed program. All the teachers I have seen have been great. Keep up the good work.
- Many new teachers are reluctant to communicate with parents consistently. Not sure if this is something that can be addressed or not. We continue to visit about communication with all staff.
- More actual interaction with students. More work on classroom management skills.
- More data based problem solving is needed I would be happy to teach a few lessons to the KSU students to help solve this problem.
- More emphasis on classroom management would be helpful to all students. This means not in theory, but how to establish boundaries and limits with students, how to establish a routine of consistent response to students' actions. Students need to know about systematic ways to approach a very diverse group of students. [Redacted] has struggled with PLC collaboration as well. She has withheld from the other teachers saying what she had as not good enough since

Please share how you think we might improve the educator preparation program:

Kansas State University responses ($n=35$):

she is so new. First year teachers seem to struggle with the constancy of the demands and the "quick turnaround" in having things done and ready to go. Differentiation is also a very difficult concept to grasp.

- More focus on the importance of behavioral data collection and the Special Education evaluation and identification processes.
- Much more work needs to be done to prepare KSU graduates to do guided reading, running records, and be abreast of Fountas and Pinnell. I've been extremely disappointed with the response in this area.
- Not ready for the social aspect as a teacher, struggled with professional relationships, struggled with student relationships, much of the struggles came from personal issues and not schooling.
- Remind students of the importance of learning from veteran staff and to always show professionalism in dress.
- Special Education scaffolding. Social/emotional behavior techniques.
- Students may need more practical experience in managing difficult students, possibly through PBIS and Win-Win Discipline.
- Students need specific instruction in grading practices, classroom management, and instructional strategies as related to content area.
- Teaching effective instructional practices for mathematics - i.e. Van de Walle's book, Teaching Student-Centered Mathematics.
- The candidates should have a better vision of the amount of work required to be a strong, effective instructor.
- The universities prepare the students the best they can. Much of the knowledge graduates have on teaching, learning, and discipline cannot be developed until the student has their own classroom. This is not a reflection of the university it is just a reality.
- THEY MUST HAVE more DIRECT experiences in the classroom. Their junior and senior years should be 50% in a classroom with the other 50% in classes learning REAL pedagogy in CRITICAL areas--math (problem-solving) and reading/writing (ELA). They do NOT come with an understanding of teaching an average reader to read. They come with no strategies for the challenging readers. WE MUST do BETTER. THEY MUST HAVE an understanding of student behavior and PBIS strategies. Finally they need to be able to PROGRESS MONITOR reading, math, writing and behavior.
- Understanding assessment. Accepting constructive criticism. Use data to drive instruction.

*Responses are confidential; spelling and grammatical errors were corrected. Names and personal identifiers were removed to protect the confidentiality of the subjects and respondents.