

# Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

- [Home](#)
- [Resources](#)
- [Contact](#)
- [Missouri Report](#)
- [Institutional Report](#)
- [Logout](#)

## Missouri's First Year Educator Survey

### University of Missouri-Kansas City Report

Survey:

Teacher      Teacher's Principal  
Principal      Principal's Supervisor  
Counselor      Counselor's Supervisor

Beginning school year:

2018

Ending school year:

2018

Include Open-Ended Questions

\* Rows are displayed if there is a minimum of 15 respondents. However, actual counts are not displayed.

Question / Standard	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Mean	StdDev
Standard 1 - Content Knowledge						4.16	0.68
1. The teacher was prepared to incorporate interdisciplinary instruction.	0%	6%	0%	75%	19%	4.06	0.66
2. The teacher was prepared in his or her content area	0%	0%	6%	56%	38%	4.31	0.58
3. The teacher was was prepared to engage students in his or her content area.	0%	6%	6%	56%	31%	4.13	0.78
4. The teacher was prepared to make content meaningful to students.	0%	6%	13%	44%	38%	4.13	0.86
Standard 2 - Learning, Growth, and Development						3.93	0.79
5. The teacher was prepared to design lessons that include differentiated instruction.	0%	13%	13%	56%	19%	3.81	0.88
6. The teacher was prepared to implement instruction based on a student's IEP.	0%	6%	19%	50%	25%	3.94	0.83
7. The teacher was prepared to modify instruction for English language learners.	0%	6%	13%	56%	25%	4	0.79

8. The teacher was prepared to modify instruction for gifted learners.	0%	6%	31%	38%	25%	3.81	0.88
9. The teacher was prepared to create lesson plans to engage all learners.	0%	13%	6%	44%	38%	4.06	0.97
Standard 3 - Curriculum Implementation						4.06	0.85
10. The teacher was prepared to deliver lessons based on curriculum standards.	0%	13%	6%	44%	38%	4.06	0.97
11. The teacher was prepared to deliver lessons for diverse learners.	0%	6%	13%	50%	31%	4.06	0.83
Standard 4 - Critical Thinking						3.98	0.80
12. The teacher was prepared to implement a variety of instructional strategies.	0%	6%	13%	56%	25%	4	0.79
13. The teacher was prepared to engage students in critical thinking.	0%	6%	19%	50%	25%	3.94	0.83
14. The teacher was prepared to model critical thinking and problem solving.	0%	6%	19%	44%	31%	4	0.87
Standard - N/A							
15. The teacher was prepared to use technology to enhance student learning.	0%	6%	13%	44%	38%	4.13	0.86
Standard 5 - Positive Classroom Environment						4.00	0.79
16. The teacher was prepared to create a classroom environment that encourages student engagement.	0%	13%	6%	50%	31%	4	0.94
17. The teacher was prepared to use a variety of classroom management strategies.	0%	13%	6%	56%	25%	3.94	0.90
18. The teacher was prepared to manage a variety of discipline issues.	0%	13%	6%	63%	19%	3.88	0.86
19. The teacher was prepared to motivate his or her students to learn.	0%	6%	6%	63%	25%	4.06	0.75
20. The teacher was prepared to keep his or her students on task.	0%	13%	6%	56%	25%	3.94	0.90
21. The teacher was prepared to foster positive student relationships.	0%	6%	0%	63%	31%	4.19	0.73
22. The teacher was prepared to facilitate smooth transitions for his or her students.	0%	6%	13%	56%	25%	4	0.79
Standard 6 - Effective Communication						4.11	0.66
23. The teacher was prepared to use effective communication strategies to foster learning.	0%	6%	6%	63%	25%	4.06	0.75
24. The teacher was prepared to effectively communicate with parents.	0%	0%	13%	63%	25%	4.13	0.60
25. The teacher was prepared to effectively communicate with all staff.	0%	6%	13%	50%	31%	4.06	0.83
26. The teacher was prepared to promote respect for diverse cultures, genders, and intellectual / physical abilities.	0%	0%	13%	56%	31%	4.19	0.63
27. The teacher was prepared to use technology as a communication tool.	0%	6%	0%	69%	25%	4.13	0.70
28. The teacher was prepared to enhance students' skills in using technology as a communication tool.	0%	6%	6%	56%	31%	4.13	0.78

Standard 7 - Student Assessment and Data Analysis						3.95	0.83
29. The teacher was prepared to use assessments to evaluate learning.	0%	13%	6%	56%	25%	3.94	0.90
30. The teacher was prepared to develop assessments to evaluate learning.	0%	13%	6%	56%	25%	3.94	0.90
31. The teacher was prepared to analyze assessment data to improve instruction.	0%	13%	6%	56%	25%	3.94	0.90
32. The teacher was prepared to help students set learning goals based on assessment results.	0%	13%	0%	69%	19%	3.94	0.83
33. The teacher was prepared to work with colleagues to set learning goals using assessment results.	0%	6%	13%	56%	25%	4	0.79
Standard 8 - Professionalism						4.00	0.71
34. The teacher was prepared to analyze data to reflect on areas for professional growth.	0%	6%	13%	56%	25%	4	0.79
35. The teacher was prepared to reflect on his or her practices for professional growth.	0%	0%	25%	50%	25%	4	0.71
Standard 9 - Professional Collaboration						4.15	0.61
36. The teacher was prepared to collaborate with colleagues to support student learning.	0%	0%	6%	56%	38%	4.31	0.58
37. The teacher was prepared to collaborate with parents to support student learning.	0%	6%	6%	63%	25%	4.06	0.75
38. The teacher was prepared to participate in professional organizations.	0%	0%	19%	56%	25%	4.06	0.66

Question / Standard	Very Poor (1)	Poor (2)	Fair (3)	Good (4)	Very Good (5)	Mean	StdDev
---------------------	---------------	----------	----------	----------	---------------	------	--------

39. Please click on the response that best reflects your perspective about the overall quality of the professional education program your teacher completed.	0%	6%	25%	31%	38%	4	0.94
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----	----	-----	-----	-----	---	------

Question / Standard	Ineffective (1)	Minimally Effective (2)	Effective (3)	Highly Effective (4)	Mean	StdDev
---------------------	-----------------	-------------------------	---------------	----------------------	------	--------

39b. Based upon the performance based evaluation of this first year teacher, how would you rate his/her impact upon students?	0%	19%	56%	25%	3.06	0.66
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----	-----	-----	-----	------	------



If you have any problems, questions, or comments about this website, please direct your concerns to:

OSEDA Tech Support  
 Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis  
 University of Missouri - Columbia  
[muextosedats@umsystem.edu](mailto:muextosedats@umsystem.edu) (573) 882-7396