

## Missouri's First Year Educator Survey

### University of Central Missouri Report

**Survey:**

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

**Beginning school year:**

2021 ▼

**Ending school year:**

2021 ▼

[Show Report](#)

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
<b>Standard 1 - Content Knowledge</b>						4.22	0.60
1. The teacher was prepared to incorporate interdisciplinary instruction.	1%	2%	7%	67%	23%	4.10	0.66
2. The teacher was prepared in his or her content area	1%	1%	1%	59%	38%	4.32	0.64
3. The teacher was was prepared to engage students in his or her content area.	1%	1%	6%	63%	30%	4.21	0.63
4. The teacher was prepared to make content meaningful to students.	1%	1%	6%	57%	35%	4.24	0.69
<b>Standard 2 - Learning, Growth, and Development</b>						3.93	0.69
5. The teacher was prepared to design lessons that include differentiated instruction.	1%	3%	13%	58%	26%	4.05	0.75
6. The teacher was prepared to implement instruction based on a student's IEP.	1%	3%	17%	56%	24%	4	0.76
7. The teacher was prepared to modify instruction for English language learners.	2%	3%	35%	42%	18%	3.71	0.86
8. The teacher was prepared to modify instruction for gifted learners.	1%	3%	32%	46%	18%	3.77	0.81

9. The teacher was prepared to create lesson plans to engage all learners.	1%	1%	12%	58%	28%	4.12	0.69
<b>Standard 3 - Curriculum Implementation</b>						4.07	0.63
10. The teacher was prepared to deliver lessons based on curriculum standards.	1%	1%	6%	65%	27%	4.17	0.63
11. The teacher was prepared to deliver lessons for diverse learners.	1%	3%	15%	61%	20%	3.96	0.74
<b>Standard 4 - Critical Thinking</b>						4.04	0.71
12. The teacher was prepared to implement a variety of instructional strategies.	1%	3%	9%	62%	26%	4.10	0.72
13. The teacher was prepared to engage students in critical thinking.	1%	4%	14%	57%	24%	3.99	0.78
14. The teacher was prepared to model critical thinking and problem solving.	1%	3%	14%	56%	26%	4.03	0.77
<b>Standard - N/A</b>							
15. The teacher was prepared to use technology to enhance student learning.	1%	1%	8%	60%	30%	4.18	0.66
<b>Standard 5 - Positive Classroom Environment</b>						4.09	0.67
16. The teacher was prepared to create a classroom environment that encourages student engagement.	1%	3%	10%	57%	29%	4.12	0.74
17. The teacher was prepared to use a variety of classroom management strategies.	1%	8%	12%	54%	25%	3.92	0.90
18. The teacher was prepared to manage a variety of discipline issues.	1%	10%	13%	53%	23%	3.87	0.90
19. The teacher was prepared to motivate his or her students to learn.	1%	3%	5%	62%	29%	4.16	0.70
20. The teacher was prepared to keep his or her students on task.	1%	3%	10%	59%	26%	4.07	0.75
21. The teacher was prepared to foster positive student relationships.	1%	1%	3%	52%	43%	4.36	0.65
22. The teacher was prepared to facilitate smooth transitions for his or her students.	1%	3%	7%	61%	28%	4.13	0.71

<b>Standard 6 - Effective Communication</b>						4.18	0.59
23. The teacher was prepared to use effective communication strategies to foster learning.	1%	1%	6%	63%	29%	4.18	0.66
24. The teacher was prepared to effectively communicate with parents.	1%	3%	8%	63%	24%	4.07	0.74
25. The teacher was prepared to effectively communicate with all staff.	1%	2%	7%	61%	29%	4.15	0.69
26. The teacher was prepared to promote respect for diverse cultures, genders, and intellectual / physical abilities.	1%	2%	6%	60%	31%	4.19	0.69
27. The teacher was prepared to use technology as a communication tool.	1%	1%	2%	61%	35%	4.30	0.61
28. The teacher was prepared to enhance students' skills in using technology as a communication tool.	1%	1%	5%	63%	29%	4.19	0.65
<b>Standard 7 - Student Assessment and Data Analysis</b>						3.98	0.63
29. The teacher was prepared to use assessments to evaluate learning.	1%	1%	8%	65%	25%	4.14	0.64
30. The teacher was prepared to develop assessments to evaluate learning.	1%	3%	14%	65%	17%	3.95	0.70
31. The teacher was prepared to analyze assessment data to improve instruction.	1%	2%	20%	58%	20%	3.94	0.73
32. The teacher was prepared to help students set learning goals based on assessment results.	1%	3%	22%	56%	18%	3.89	0.75
33. The teacher was prepared to work with colleagues to set learning goals using assessment results.	1%	1%	18%	58%	22%	4	0.72
<b>Standard 8 - Professionalism</b>						4.05	0.62
34. The teacher was prepared to analyze data to reflect on areas for professional growth.	1%	2%	19%	59%	19%	3.94	0.72
35. The teacher was prepared to reflect on his or her practices for professional growth.	1%	1%	7%	65%	27%	4.16	0.63
<b>Standard 9 - Professional Collaboration</b>						4.13	0.59
36. The teacher was prepared to collaborate with colleagues to	1%	1%	4%	65%	29%	4.20	0.64

support student learning.

37. The teacher was prepared to collaborate with parents to support student learning.	1%	1%	8%	67%	23%	4.12	0.62
---	----	----	----	-----	-----	------	------

38. The teacher was prepared to participate in professional organizations.	1%	1%	14%	62%	23%	4.06	0.67
--	----	----	-----	-----	-----	------	------

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.	1%	1%	9%	56%	34%	4.22	0.69

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?	1%	7%	54%	37%	3.29	0.63

Question / Standard	No (1)	Yes (2)
39c. Was the teacher currently teaching in the subject area in which he/she was certified?	14%	86%

Question / Standard	Ineffective (1)	Minimally Effective (2)	Effective (3)	Highly Effective (4)	Mean	StdDev
39d. Based upon the performance based evaluation of this first year teacher, how would you rate his/her ability to achieve the expected level of student growth?	1%	7%	61%	31%	3.22	0.60

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

