



CAEP Annual Report Impact Measure 2

Satisfaction of Employers and Stakeholder Involvement

Satisfaction of Employers - Initial

Initial level satisfaction of Employers (R4.2) is demonstrated through the Kansas Educator Employer Survey. The survey is developed, validated, and administered through the Office of Educational Innovation and Evaluation (OEIE) at Kansas State University. The Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) collects the contact information of the individuals with an education degree from one of the seven regent institutions who received a first-time teaching license from KSDE between June 1, 2020 and August 31, 2021, and were teaching in the state of Kansas during the 2021 - 2022 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 2021 - 2022 school year.

The statewide Employer response rate for 2022 was 23% and the FHSU Employer response rate for 2022 was 39%. The second section of the survey includes the following two Likert-type questions and two open-ended questions related to employer satisfaction:

1. Compared with first-year educators who have completed programs from other institutions, how would you rate candidates from FHSU in terms of preparation? [3= Better Prepared; 2= As well prepared; 1= Not as well prepared; 0= No comparison available]
2. How likely are you to recommend early career educators, who graduated from FHSU be retained? Assuming the teacher wants to return to your school next year, how likely would you rehire the teacher(s)? [1= Very Unlikely; 2= Somewhat Unlikely; 3= Somewhat Likely; 4= Very Likely]
3. Please share what you think is the strongest aspect of the educator preparation program.
4. Please share how you think we might improve the educator preparation program.

The following table provides the FHSU employer responses and comments for the 2022 survey:

Question	3 = Better Prepared		2 = As well Prepared		1 = Not as well Prepared		0 = Comparison Unavailable	
	Total	Percent	Total	Percent	Total	Percent	Total	Percent
Compared with first-year educators who have completed programs from other institutions, how would you rate candidates from FHSU in terms of preparation? (n = 45)	6	13.3%	34	75.6%	2	4.4%	3	6.7%
Question	4 = Very Likely		3 = Somewhat Likely		2 = Somewhat Unlikely		1 = Very Unlikely	
	Total	Percent	Total	Percent	Total	Percent	Total	Percent
How likely are you to recommend early career educators, who graduated from FHSU be retained? Assuming the teacher wants to return to your school next year, how likely would you rehire the teacher(s)? (n = 45)	36	80.0%	9	20.0%	0	0%	0	0%

Employer Comments

<i>Please share what you think is the strongest aspect of the educator preparation program.</i>
Very well prepared for lesson planning.
Knowledge of content standards and how to design lessons.
The work as a para is very valuable. Having them be a para gives them valuable practice and helps them see effective practices in motion.
Shelby was well prepared for her teaching position. She took on the head volleyball coaching position this year as well and did a great job but I think she realized it stretched her pretty thin. She continues to do a great job and has great rapport with her students and the other team members in our building.
Content and relationships with students
Understands the content and executes it well.
Mr. X works well with students of all ages.
Knowledge of teaching content, basic responsibilities, and handling oneself professionally.
I think the students that are coming to student teach are well prepared and have a passion for education.
The students are prepared to come into the classroom and be successful.
Promoting reflective practices and continued growth as educators
Content knowledge
They plan well for each lesson and use a wide variety of styles to teach each student.
In the para-to-pathway program, teacher candidates have the opportunity to be fully engaged in our building philosophy.
Standards integration
Content area knowledge
I've always felt any education major who has come into our building to complete there student teaching has come in with a strong sense of knowledge of the content they are placed.
Professional networking with others certified staff.
I really like that students are getting out into the classrooms before they do students teaching to see if this is the field they truly want to be in.
I've been impressed with the relationship-building skills of FHSU graduates. They understand the need to "reach" before you "teach." As an admin, I can help a teacher develop instructional skills, but teaching the importance of relationships is difficult if the teacher does not possess those abilities or have a desire to become better.
A lot of the teachers that have gone through this program have been able to do a lot of online so it fits their current work/personal schedule while taking classes.
The overall program is quality, and the educators are well-rounded.
I believe the strongest aspect of the educator preparation program is the students knowledge of different curriculum & the usage of textbooks.
New teachers seem to come out of the program with a strong understanding of their content, pedagogy and a desire to teach.

<i>Please share how you think we might improve the educator preparation program.</i>
I think there is more application needed. Instead of learning theory of things, actually allowing them to teach Guided Reading groups, design guided reading stations, plan lessons with gradual release in mind, go in classrooms with significant behaviors. Theory does not translate well when in an actual classroom.
More preparation with assessment.

More instructional strategies. Our educator gets "stuck" when their first instructional strategy isn't successful.
Continue to bridge the paraprofessional work to the teacher work so they are able to work and still get an education.
Communication could have been a little better when she was planning her kindergarten visitation day since it included another teacher in the building and the other teacher had to change her plans to fit X's. I'm confident she will do better in the future.
Handling disagreements or opposing views of other staff members. How to handle conflict with colleagues
User-friendly lesson plans. Our educator knows how to create in-depth, multi-page lesson plans for a single 45 min lesson, but she lacks in her ability to create and plan out user-friendly quick-glance lesson plans that are vital in a classroom. I'd appreciate colleges educating students on both the lesson plans that include the pedagogy as well as lesson plans that are a basic map of skills to be established each week.
Mr. X often changes his mind regarding what he wants to teach. This creates a change each year in staffing.
Teachers have to learn how to design their lessons and questions to promote higher order thinking, to make students do the cognitive lifting, and include real-world connections and application. They need to teach differently than they were taught, and they don't know what that looks like.
I would like to see them do some of their own things. I understand that they will do somethings that the cooperating teacher does in their classroom, and I think sometimes the student teacher just follows along. Like to see them do their own thing on some lessons.
How to handle themselves when they do not agree with a decision made by another teacher or administration. Teach the components of 'reading foundations' to educators, especially those of elementary candidates to teaching. How to respond to critiques and reflection questions without defensive posture or "I'm quitting" attitudes.
Continue preparing teachers on how to handle themselves professionally and answer questions or discussions that will include issues from the social media world
Technology usage in assessing student knowledge
There are times when it would be beneficial for some of the teacher candidates in this program to have experience in different schools.
Engagement strategies beyond technology.
Understanding the science of reading. BSEL understanding and Classroom management
More experiences in teaching and leading classroom
We ran into a situation at the end of this school year where the student teacher did not act in an ethical manner when addressing her concerns with our administration. I do not feel her actions came as a result from her education from FHSU. FHSU is not to blame. The unfortunate thing that I perhaps learned and reflected on from this situation, is that perhaps higher levels of education may have to start implementing conversations to our young education majors the proper channels of communication and understanding the proper levels of authority when in an education setting. Education and the Public School system is not a place for text messaging Board members. If there are other administrators out there that are okay with the idea of teachers text messaging their concerns beyond the chain of command then I will be quiet. I am one that feels strongly in the practice of communicating one on one. Being a team member in finding solutions and not complaining about fairness.
All classes for undergraduate classes in education should be in person. There needs to be that interaction with others. Get your students to become subs, promote that in your classes. What better way to get the true feeling of what a class is going to be like as well as make a few extra dollars while going to school. Maybe the people teaching the education classes are out of touch with the way students lives have changed from when they may have been in the classroom. They should go into the buildings once in a while to see what their students will soon be dealing with, and it might give them a different perspective on how to instruct at the college level.

I think it would be very beneficial for more advisors, professors, etc. to come out and supervise the teachers a little bit. No one from FHSU actually really does anything or provides any feedback to the students once they begin their student teaching. They make the principals and mentor teachers do everything and its just one more thing for those people to do.

Satisfaction of Employers - Advanced

The EPP utilized focus group interviews to measure employer satisfaction. The EPP program coordinators requested employer information from the completers. Employers were sent an email invitation to participate in the focus group. The Employer Satisfaction Focus Groups were conducted in Fall 2022 and Spring 2023. A third cycle of data collection is scheduled for Fall 2023. The focus group meetings were held virtually using Zoom. Using an interview guide, the employers were grouped into small groups and asked a series of questions regarding their level of satisfaction with the completers' preparation. The focus group questions included areas aligned with the RA1.1 knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions (RA4.1.1 Employer Satisfaction).

At least two faculty members, not teaching in the program, facilitated each group. Each facilitator documented notes throughout the interview and then following the interview, the facilitators corroborated notes and identified themes from the focus group. The feedback from the focus groups was provided to the program coordinators and the CAEP Standard 4 committee. The Fall 2022 and Spring 2023 qualitative data analysis revealed that generally FHSU graduates felt prepared in each of the categories. A third cycle of data will be collected in Fall 2023.

The Fall 2022 and Spring 2023 qualitative analysis revealed employers are satisfied to highly satisfied with FHSU completers. Employers noted completers excelled in the category of professionalism and were highly satisfied with the programs completed by FHSU completers. The opportunity for completers to have additional practical experiences was consistently noted as an opportunity to improve the program.

Table of Analysis by Category

Disaggregated by Program Grouping

Category	Library Media Specialist	ESOL, Gifted, Reading Specialist	School Counseling, School Psychology	Special Education
Content Knowledge	Indicated completers had strong content knowledge.	Expressed satisfaction with FHSU completers and felt they had high-quality content knowledge. Suggested more instruction on SPED law as it relates to gifted education.	Expressed satisfaction with completers knowledge.	Expressed satisfaction with completers theoretical as well as practical knowledge.
Professionalism	Noted completers had a high level of professionalism.	All noted completers excel in this area.	Satisfied with the understanding of law and policy. Indicated a need to understand their role as a school leader more deeply.	Satisfied with completers' professionalism.
Program Satisfaction	Expressed a high level of satisfaction with the FHSU programs. It was noted that completers were open to learning.	Expressed satisfaction with the programs and indicated completers were very strong in their area and in their ability to take on leadership roles.	Expressed satisfaction and noted completers are not afraid to jump, learn and ask questions.	Very satisfied with the FHSU program and noted appreciation for the attention paid to individuals and timely topics.

Preparation Improvements	Additional opportunities for fieldwork throughout the program and additional one-on-one time with instructors were suggested. While employers noted completers were well prepared to integrate technology, it was suggested that digital literacy should be emphasized.	Suggested continuing the flexible options for graduate students.	Suggested additional practical experiences at all levels to expand school-based knowledge and to continue to build understanding of current trends.	Suggested the need for preparing completers with general pedagogy and class management in addition to the current program as well as understanding the mindset needed to survive.
--------------------------	---	--	---	---

Stakeholder Involvement

The inclusion and input of various stakeholders in the program evaluation and improvement is a priority for the EPP. Each CAEP Standards committee seeks to incorporate stakeholders outside of the EPP to participate in the committee work. The EPP also hosts and attends various meetings throughout the year to collaborate with stakeholders and partners across the various programs and at both the initial and advanced levels. Below are meetings conducted in 2022 with stakeholder involvement.

Date	Committee/Meeting	Purpose	Members/Participants
Monthly	CAEP Committees 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, Diversity, and Steering	Oversee standard requirements, develop, review, and revise assessments, review collected data and recommend changes for continuous improvement.	Primarily Internal with one or two external partner stakeholders on each committee
Monthly	Council on Preparation of Teachers and School Personnel	Review and revise EPP policy	Internal stakeholders – representation across EPP
02/15/2022	Partner Administrator Meeting	Administrator discussion on licensure, FHSU programs, district needs, and update from State School Board representative	EPP Administrator Faculty Area superintendents and principals District #5 State School Board Representative
06/15/2022	Summer Partner Meeting	Discussion with regional school district partners including superintendents, principals, and counselors.	EPP Administrators and Faculty School district representatives
10/27/2021	Future Educator Day and Partner Meeting	Partner schools bring possible future educators for workshop with KS Teacher of the Year Team. EPP Admin/Faculty meets with district representatives to discuss local needs and possible solutions.	EPP Administrators and Faculty KS Teacher of the Year Team Prospective high school students District #5 State School Board Representative
11/07/2022	Data Retreat	EPP and Partner meeting to review assessment data and make recommendations for continuous improvement	EPP Administrators and Faculty PK-12 Representatives

2022-2023 CAEP COMMITTEE MEMBERS

CAEP STEERING COMMITTEE	STANDARD 1 Initial (Content & Pedagogical Knowledge)		STANDARD 2 Initial (Clinical Partnerships & Pract.)
Kenny Rigler, Chair	Kenny Rigler, Co-Chair	Elizabeth Langley, Foreign Lang.	Scott Gregory, Co-Chair
Judy Brummer	Janet Stramel Co-Chair	Scott Gregory, Secondary	Chris Jochum, Co-Chair
Paul Adams	Chris Jochum, Secondary/Elem	Sharon Wilson, English	Anayansi Ramirez
Chris Jochum	Judy Brummer	Matthew Clay, Science	Kerry Schuckman
Sherry Crow	Keith Dreiling, Math	Laura Andrews, Music	Sue Boldra
Scott Gregory	Bill Weber, Math	Brian Hutchinson, Art	Gary Andersen
Janet Stramel	Eddie Olmstead, Chemistry	Jason Ney, HHP	Valerie Zelenka
Jerrie Brooks	Masa Watanabe, Chemistry	Jennifer Bechard, HHP	Renee Cason
Elodie Jones	Matt Gallart, Biology	Laney Roths, ECU	Jessie Watson
Betsy Crawford	Eric Deyo, Physics	Gary Andersen, T2T	Judy Brummer
Carrie Tholstrup	Todd Moore, Earth and Space	Valerie Zelenka, MSE	Kenny Rigler
Kim Chappell	Scott Jones, Business	Jerrie Brooks, LAL SPED	
	Paul Nienkamp, History		
	Jeremy Ryan, Agriculture		
	Susan Dumler, Tech & Eng. Ed.		
STANDARDS 1 & 2 Advanced (Content & Clinical)	STANDARD 3 Initial & Advanced (Cand. Qlty., Recruit. & Select.)	STANDARD 4 Initial & Advanced (Program Impact)	STANDARD 5 Initial & Advanced (Qlty. Assur. & Cont. Improv.)
Jerrie Brooks, Co-Chair, SPED	Elodie Jones, Co-Chair	Janet Stramel, Co-Chair	Kenny Rigler, Chair
Carrie Tholstrup, Co-Chair, Read	Betsy Crawford, Co-Chair	Kim Chappell, Co-Chair	Judy Brummer
Sherry Crow, Library	Andi Beckman	Linda Feldstein	Paul Adams
Robert Moody, Leadership	Kerry Schuckman	Heather Musil	Jeff Sadler
Sarah Lancaster, School Coun.	Laney Roths	Amy Schaffer	Jerrie Brooks
Lora Hoffman, School Coun.	Yaprak Dalat Ward	Robert Moody	Sohyun Yang
Linda Mayer, ESOL	Suzanne Becking	Brooke Moore	Matthew Posey
Amy Drinnon, School Psych.	Kevin Splichal	Kenny Rigler	Andy Cutright
Stephanie Muth, Driver Education	Megan Maska	Judy Brummer	
Sohyun Yang, Gifted	Derek Edwards		
Kenny Rigler	Amanda Frank		
Judy Brummer	Kristin Hernandez		
	Imelda Koenke		
	Kenny Rigler		
	Judy Brummer		
DIVERSITY Initial & Advanced			
Betsy Crawford, Co-Chair			
Sherry Crow, Co-Chair			
Sarah Broman Miller			
Linda Feldstein			
Matthew Clay			
Carrie Tholstrup			
Yaprak Dalat Ward			
Sohyun Yang			
Elodie Jones			
Teresa Clouch			
Kristin Hernandez			
Kenny Rigler			