Longitudinal Study of Key Questions
from Mentor Teacher Survey
2019-2025

The Mentor Teacher Survey is designed to collect data from mentor teachers who worked with a recent Ball State University Student Teacher regarding the preparation program and the readiness of the student teacher on day one in the classroom experience. The survey is administered in both the fall and spring after student teaching is completed. One report featuring aggregate data from both surveys is completed at the end of the spring semester for the academic year.

A new mentor teacher survey was developed in the summer of 2019. All members of the Professional Education Committee (PEC) and select faculty from the EPP were asked to provide feedback on the survey before administration.

The survey is administered through Qualtrics to all mentor teachers using their school email address, as provided to the Office of Teacher Education-Clinical Practice. Teachers receive the following email:

*The purpose of this survey is to collect data on your perceptions of Ball State University's effectiveness in preparing candidates to be classroom-ready on day one of their student teaching placement. Your responses should be based on your experience with the **most recent** Ball State University student teacher you supervised. All the data collected from this survey will be used to make improvements to our educator preparation program. The data will also be shared with the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) as BSU prepares for the CAEP Unit Self-Study and CAEP Onsite Visit. All information provided in this survey is completely confidential. Please respond to each item with complete candor. The survey will take approximately 20 minutes to complete. Your assistance is greatly appreciated. The survey will close on **[DATE]**.*

Mentor teachers are sent three reminders through Qualtrics.

The purpose of this document is to provide a longitudinal study of key questions related to our teacher preparation program from the Mentor Teacher Survey. This data is shared on an annual basis with the Professional Education Committee (PEC). There are additional questions in the Mentor Teacher Survey (including open-ended questions, questions about demographics, and questions about services provided by our EPP). That may be reviewed upon request.

Year	Number of Surveys Distributed	Number of Surveys Received	Response Rate
2019-2020[1]	319	293	91.8%
2020-2021	467	351	75.2%
2021-2022	532	335	63%
2022-2023	465	351	75.5%
2023-2024			
2024-2025			

For the InTASC categories, the maximum value is 11 (Strongly Agree) while the minimum value is 8 (Strongly Disagree). These values were used to calculate the Mean.

InTASC Category	Years	'N'	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Mean
My student teacher had a strong knowledge of the content I teach (InTASC 4, 7, 8)	2019-2020	286	92 (32.2%)	160 (55.9%)	27 (9.4%)	7 (2.5%)	10.18
	2020-2021	341	125 (36.7%)	171 (50.2%)	39 (11.4%)	6 (1.8%)	10.22
	2021-2022	319	111 (34.8%)	154 (48.3%)	39 (12.2%)	15 (4.7%)	10.13
	2022-2023	336	125 (37.2%)	165 (49.1%)	39 (11.6%)	7 (2.1%)	10.21
	2023-2024						
	2024-2025						

InTASC Category	Years	'N'	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Mean
My student teacher had the knowledge to utilize student assessment data to inform instruction (InTASC 6, 7)	2019-2020	286	57 (19.9%)	187 (65.4%)	34 (65.4%)	8 (11.9%)	10.02
	2020-2021	341	77 (22.6%)	205 (60.1%)	53 (15.5%)	6 (1.8%)	10.04
	2021-2022	319	72 (22.6%)	188 (58.9%)	43 (13.5%)	16 (16%)	9.99
	2022-2023	336	92 (27.4%)	185 (55.1%)	50 (14.9%)	9 (2.7%)	10.07
	2023-2024						

---

[1] In the spring semester of the 2019-2020 academic year, student teaching was shortened due to COVID-19. This may have had an impact on some of the responses for all questions during this administration of the survey.

	2024-2025						

InTASC Category	Years	'N'	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Mean
My student teacher had a good understanding of how to use pre-test data to structure differentiated instruction utilizing techniques to reach all students (InTASC 1, 2, 6, 7, 8)	2019-2020	286	59 (20.6%)	165 (57.7%)	56 (19.6%)	6 (2.1%)	9.97
	2020-2021	341	76 (22.3%)	200 (58.7%)	60 (17.6%)	5 (1.5%)	10.02
	2021-2022	319	64 (20.1%)	189 (59.3%)	51 (16%)	15 (4.7%)	9.95
	2022-2023	336	79 (23.5%)	178 (53%)	70 (20.8%)	9 (2.7%)	9.97
	2023-2024						
	2024-2025						

InTASC Category	Years	'N'	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Mean
My student teacher had a good understanding of how to assess students' prior knowledge and how to adjust instruction based on their prior knowledge (InTASC 2, 6, 7)	2019-2020	286	68 (23.8%)	172 (60.1%)	38 (13.3%)	8 (13.3%)	10.05
	2020-2021	341	92 (27%)	190 (55.7%)	52 (15.3%)	7 (2.1%)	10.08
	2021-2022	319	74 (23.2%)	183 (57.4%)	53 (16.6%)	9 (2.8%)	10.01
	2022-2023	336	78 (23.2%)	188 (56%)	63 (18.8%)	7 (2.1%)	10.00
	2023-2024						
	2024-2025						

InTASC Category	Years	'N'	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Mean

InTASC Category	Years	'N'	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Mean
My student teacher used multiple methods of assessment that support, verify, and document learning (InTASC 6)	2019-2020	286	73 (25.5%)	155 (54.2%)	53 (18.5%)	5 (1.8%)	10.03
	2020-2021	341	92 (27%)	181 (53.1%)	59 (17.3%)	9 (2.6%)	10.04
	2021-2022	319	82 (25.7%)	165 (51.7%)	58 (18.2%)	14 (4.4%)	9.99
	2022-2023	336	88 (26.2%)	175 (52.1%)	66 (19.6%)	7 (2.1%)	10.02
	2023-2024						
	2024-2025						

InTASC Category	Years	'N'	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Mean
My student teacher utilized methods of self-reflection for instructional preparation (InTASC 6)	2019-2020	286	125 (43.7%)	130 (45.5%)	24 (8.4%)	7 (2.5%)	10.30
	2020-2021	341	143 (41.9%)	159 (46.6%)	37 (10.9%)	4 (1.2%)	10.30
	2021-2022	319	131 (41.1%)	150 (47%)	28 (8.8%)	10 (3.1%)	10.26
	2022-2023	336	135 (40.2%)	159 (47.3%)	30 (8.9%)	12 (3.6%)	10.24
	2023-2024						
	2024-2025						

InTASC Category	Years	'N'	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Mean
My student teacher developed positive relationships with school colleagues (InTASC 10)	2019-2020	286	157 (54.9%)	110 (38.7%)	13 (4.6%)	6 (2.1%)	10.46
	2020-2021	341	207 (60.7%)	113 (33.1%)	17 (5%)	4 (1.2%)	10.53
	2021-2022	319	174 (54.6%)	121 (37.9%)	18 (5.6%)	6 (1.9%)	10.45
	2022-2023	336	186 (55.4%)	123 (36.6%)	19 (5.7%)	8 (2.4%)	10.45
	2023-2024						
	2024-2025						

InTASC Category	Years	'N'	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Mean
My student teacher developed positive relationships with learners and their families and the larger community (InTASC 10)	2019-2020	286	114 (39.9%)	126 (44.1%)	39 (13.6%)	7 (2.5%)	10.21
	2020-2021	341	158 (46.3%)	153 (44.9%)	25 (7.3%)	5 (1.8%)	10.36
	2021-2022	319	134 (42%)	151 (47.3%)	26 (8.2%)	8 (2.5%)	10.29
	2022-2023	336	140 (41.7%)	164 (48.8%)	25 (7.4%)	7 (2.1%)	10.30
	2023-2024						
	2024-2025						

InTASC Category	Years	'N'	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Mean
My student teacher had a strong understanding of student rights (InTASC 9, 10)	2019-2020	286	115 (40.2%)	151 (52.8%)	17 (5.9%)	3 (1.1%)	10.32
	2020-2021	341	140 (41.1%)	174 (51%)	24 (7%)	3 (0.9%)	10.32
	2021-2022	319	133 (41.7%)	166 (52%)	15 (4.7%)	5 (1.6%)	10.34
	2022-2023	336	131 (39%)	175 (52.1%)	26 (7.7%)	4 (1.2%)	10.29
	2023-2024						
	2024-2025						

InTASC Category	Years	'N'	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Mean
My student teacher used instructional strategies to promote the idea that students can learn and grow at a high	2019-2020	286	89 (31.1%)	163 (57%)	29 (10.1%)	5 (1.8%)	10.17
	2020-2021	341	124 (36.4%)	185 (54.3%)	29 (8.5%)	3 (0.9%)	10.26
	2021-2022	319	115 (36.1%)	160 (50.2%)	38 (11.9%)	6 (1.9%)	10.20
	2022-2023	336	106 (31.6%)	187 (55.7%)	39 (11.6%)	4 (1.2%)	10.18
	2023-2024						

level (InTASC 1, 2, 3, 7, 8)	2024-2025						

InTASC Category	Years	'N'	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Mean
My student teacher understood the needs of diverse learners and used teaching approaches designed to respect all learners (InTASC 2, 3, 8)	2019-2020	286	94 (32.8%)	151 (52.8%)	36 (12.6%)	5 (1.8%)	10.17
	2020-2021	341	126 (37%)	181 (53.1%)	30 (8.8%)	4 (1.2%)	10.26
	2021-2022	319	116 (36.4%)	160 (50.2%)	32 (10%)	11 (3.5%)	10.19
	2022-2023	336	119 (35.4%)	175 (52.1%)	36 (10.7%)	6 (1.8%)	10.21
	2023-2024						
	2024-2025						

InTASC Category	Years	'N'	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Mean
My student teacher had the necessary skills to work with students with exceptional needs (InTASC 1, 2)	2019-2020	286	83 (29%)	145 (50.7%)	49 (17.1%)	9 (3.2%)	10.06
	2020-2021	341	94 (27.6%)	190 (55.7%)	48 (14.1%)	9 (2.6%)	10.08
	2021-2022	319	87 (22.3%)	170 (53.3%)	49 (15.4%)	13 (4.1%)	10.04
	2022-2023	336	90 (26.8%)	183 (54.5%)	56 (16.7%)	7 (2.1%)	10.06
	2023-2024						
	2024-2025						

InTASC Category	Years	'N'	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Mean
My student teacher was prepared to meet the needs of high ability	2019-2020	286	66 (23.1%)	164 (57.3%)	47 (16.4%)	9 (3.2%)	10.07
	2020-2021	341	92 (27%)	187 (54.8%)	55 (16.1%)	7 (2.1%)	10.07
	2021-2022	319	85 (26.7%)	160 (50.2%)	60 (18.8%)	14 (4.4%)	9.99

	2022-2023	336	86 (25.6%)	189 (56.3%)	51 (15.2%)	10 (3%)	10.04
students in my classroom (InTASC 1, 2)	2023-2024						
	2024-2025						

InTASC Category	Years	'N'	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Mean
My student teacher had the necessary skills to work with students who have linguistic differences (InTASC 1, 2)	2019-2020	286	44 (15.4%)	170 (59.4%)	62 (21.7%)	10 (3.5%)	9.87
	2020-2021	341	63 (18.5%)	210 (61.6%)	61 (17.9%)	7 (2.1%)	9.96
	2021-2022	319	65 (20.4%)	175 (54.9%)	66 (20.7%)	13 (4.1%)	9.92
	2022-2023	336	64 (19.1%)	203 (60.4%)	64 (19.1%)	5 (1.5%)	9.97
	2023-2024						
	2024-2025						

InTASC Category	Years	'N'	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Mean
My student teacher promoted both creative and critical thinking in students (InTASC 5, 8)	2019-2020	286	83 (29%)	165 (57.7%)	33 (11.5%)	5 (1.8%)	10.14
	2020-2021	341	122 (35.8%)	176 (51.2%)	38 (11.1%)	5 (1.5%)	10.22
	2021-2022	319	103 (32.3%)	172 (53.9%)	37 (11.6%)	7 (2.2%)	10.16
	2022-2023	336	96 (28.6%)	184 (54.8%)	48 (14.3%)	8 (2.4%)	10.10
	2023-2024						
	2024-2025						

InTASC Category	Years	'N'	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Mean
My student teacher used and interpreted	2019-2020	286	98 (34.3%)	157 (34.3%)	25 (8.7%)	6 (2.1%)	10.21
	2020-2021	341	117 (34.3%)	183 (53.7%)	38 (11.1%)	3 (0.9%)	10.21

	2021-2022	319	106 (33.2%)	173 (54.2%)	34 (10.7%)	6 (1.9%)	10.19
both verbal and non-verbal clues to assess understanding (InTASC 1, 2, 4, 7, 8)	2022-2023	336	107 (31.9%)	184 (54.8%)	37 (11%)	8 (2.4%)	10.16
	2023-2024						
	2024-2025						

InTASC Category	Years	'N'	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Mean
My student teacher promoted the use of technology to actively engage learners (InTASC 1, 2, 4)	2019-2020	286	94 (32.9%)	155 (54.2%)	32 (11.2%)	5 (1.8%)	10.18
	2020-2021	341	158 (46.3%)	155 (45.5%)	26 (7.3%)	2 (0.6%)	10.38
	2021-2022	319	121 (37.9%)	159 (49.8%)	31 (9.7%)	8 (2.5%)	10.23
	2022-2023	336	119 (35.4%)	181 (53.9%)	31 (9.2%)	5 (1.5%)	10.23
	2023-2024						
	2024-2025						

InTASC Category	Years	'N'	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Mean
My student teacher implemented a classroom management system that promoted a positive and safe learning environment (InTASC 3)	2019-2020	286	79 (27.6%)	160 (55.9%)	33 (11.5%)	14 (4.9%)	10.06
	2020-2021	341	110 (32.3%)	183 (53.7%)	41 (12%)	7 (2.1%)	10.16
	2021-2022	319	100 (31.4%)	162 (50.8%)	41 (12.9%)	16 (5%)	10.08
	2022-2023	336	92 (27.4%)	189 (56.3%)	43 (12.8%)	12 (3.6%)	10.07
	2023-2024						
	2024-2025						

InTASC Category	Years	'N'	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Mean
My student teacher	2019-2020	286	139 (48.6%)	120 (42%)	22 (7.7%)	5 (1.8%)	10.37

	2020-2021	341	195 (57.2%)	118 (35.6%)	26 (7.6%)	2 (0.6%)	10.48
displayed enthusiasm for my content area and actively engaged students in the content that I teach (InTASC 4, 5, 10)	**2021-2022**	319	160 (50.2%)	129 (40.4%)	23 (7.2%)	7 (2.2%)	10.39
	2022-2023	336	162 (48.2%)	138 (41.1%)	30 (8.9%)	6 (1.8%)	10.36
	2023-2024						
	2024-2025						

InTASC Category	Years	'N'	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Mean
My student teacher created developmentally appropriate instruction that accounted for the strengths, interests, and needs of students (InTASC 1, 2, 7, 8)	**2019-2020**	286	97 (33.9%)	159 (55.6%)	25 (8.8%)	5 (1.8%)	10.22
	2020-2021	341	130 (38.1%)	180 (52.8%)	27 (7.9%)	4 (1.2%)	10.28
	2021-2022	319	115 (36.1%)	167 (52.4%)	28 (8.8%)	9 (2.8%)	10.22
	2022-2023	336	123 (36.6%)	177 (52.7%)	27 (8%)	9 (2.7%)	10.23
	2023-2024						
	2024-2025						

InTASC Category	Years	'N'	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Mean
My student teacher planned a sequence of learning experiences and included short and long term goals (InTASC 1, 7)	**2019-2020**	286	92 (32.2%)	155 (54.2%)	29 (10.1%)	10 (3.5%)	10.15
	2020-2021	341	108 (31.7%)	183 (53.7%)	45 (13.2%)	5 (1.5%)	10.16
	2021-2022	319	94 (29.5%)	171 (53.6%)	46 (14.4%)	8 (2.5%)	10.10
	2022-2023	336	108 (32.1%)	180 (53.6%)	39 (11.6%)	9 (2.7%)	10.15
	2023-2024						
	2024-2025						

InTASC Category	Years	'N'	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Mean
My student teacher planned lessons that are aligned with school corporation goals and student learning competencies (InTASC 1, 7, 9)	2019-2020	286	122 (52.7%)	141 (49.3%)	17 (5.9%)	6 (2.1%)	10.33
	2020-2021	341	158 (46.3%)	169 (49.6%)	12 (3.5%)	2 (0.6%)	10.42
	2021-2022	319	128 (40.1%)	170 (53.3%)	18 (5.6%)	3 (0.9%)	10.33
	2022-2023	336	138 (41.1%)	179 (53.3%)	15 (4.5%)	4 (1.2%)	10.34
	2023-2024						
	2024-2025						

InTASC Category	Years	'N'	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Mean
My student teacher planned lessons that are aligned with Indiana P-12 college and career ready academic standards (InTASC 1, 4,7, 9)	2019-2020	286	115 (40.2%)	145 (50.7%)	21 (7.3%)	5 (1.8%)	10.29
	2020-2021	341	136 (39.9%)	190 (55.7%)	13 (3.8%)	2 (0.6%)	10.35
	2021-2022	319	125 (39.2%)	167 (52.4%)	23 (7.2%)	4 (1.3%)	10.29
	2022-2023	336	130 (38.7%)	187 (55.7%)	15 (4.8%)	3 (0.9%)	10.32
	2023-2024						
	2024-2025						

Based on your work with the most current student teacher from Ball State University, please check the statement that most accurately reflects your view of Ball State University's preparation program.					
Year	'N'	BSU did an extremely poor job of preparing candidate for first day in classroom.	BSU did an adequate job of preparing candidate for first day in classroom.	BSU did a good job of preparing candidate for first day in classroom.	BSU did a superb job of preparing candidate for first day in classroom.

2019-2020	293	8 (2.7%)	38 (13%)	146 (49.8%)	101 (34.5%)
2020-2021	341	20 (5.7%)	57 (16.2%)	175 (49.9%)	99 (28.2%)
2021-2022	335	16 (4.8%)	68 (20.3%)	155 (46.3%)	96 (28.7%)
2022-2023	350	15 (4.3%)	77 (22%)	160 (45.7%)	98 (28%)
2023-2024					
2024-2025					

At the end of the student teaching placement, how well prepared is this student teacher to successfully lead their own classroom.					
Year	'N'	The student teacher is ill prepared to lead classroom.	The student teacher is minimally prepared to lead classroom.	The student teacher is well prepared to lead classroom.	The student teacher is exceptionally well prepared to lead classroom.
2019-2020	286	5 (1.8%)	37 (12.9%)	138 (48.3%)	106 (37.1%)
2020-2021	341	8 (2.4%)	36 (10.6%)	155 (45.5%)	142 (41.6%)
2021-2022	318	12 (3.8%)	37 (11.6%)	153 (48.1%)	116 (36.5%)
2022-2023	336	133 (39.6%)	153 (45.5%)	36 (10.7%)	14 (4.2%)
2023-2024					
2024-2025					

Based on my experiences with the most recent student teacher that I mentored from Ball State University, my observation is that BSU provided a candidate who upheld the expectations of the profession.					
Year	'N'	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
2019-2020	286	144 (50.4%)	112 (39.2%)	20 (7%)	10 (3.5%)
2020-2021	341	174 (51%)	133 (39%)	27 (7.9%)	7 (2.1%)
2021-2022	318	157 (49.4%)	130 (40.9%)	19 (6%)	12 (3.8%)
2022-2023	336	163 (48.5%)	138 (41.1%)	25 (7.4%)	10 (3%)
2023-2024					
2024-2025					

Based on my experience with my most recent Ball State University student teacher, I would enthusiastically accept another BSU student teacher.					
Year	'N'	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
2019-2020	286	162 (56.8%)	101 (35.4%)	16 (5.6%)	6 (2.1%)
2020-2021	341	175 (51.3%)	135 (39.6%)	26 (7.6%)	5 (1.5%)

Year	'N'	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
2021-2022	318	162 (50.9%)	125 (39.3%)	23 (7.2%)	8 (2.5%)
2022-2023	336	153 (45.5%)	140 (41.7%)	36 (10.7%)	7 (2.1%)
2023-2024					
2024-2025					

I would recommend Ball State University to any individual interested in pursuing a teacher preparation program.					
Year	'N'	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
2019-2020	285	149 (52.3%)	115 (40.4%)	16 (5.6%)	5 (1.8%)
2020-2021	341	158 (46.3%)	153 (44.9%)	26 (7.6%)	4 (1.2%)
2021-2022	318	134 (42.1%)	163 (51.3%)	17 (5.4%)	4 (1.3%)
2022-2023	336	132 (39.3%)	175 (52.1%)	26 (7.7%)	3 (0.9%)
2023-2024					
2024-2025					

Updated: May 24, 2023