



October 15, 2007

Teachers College Columbia University

Class 2007 Exit Survey

AUTHORED BY: OFFICE OF ACCREDITATION AND ASSESSMENT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS 1

SURVEY ADMINISTRATION AND INSTRUMENT 2

1. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE RESPONDENTS..... 3

2. QUANTITATIVE FINDINGS 7

3. QUALITATIVE FINDINGS OF OPEN-ENDED RESPONSES 18

3.1. Faculty..... 18

3.2. Courses and Curriculum 19

3.3. Instruction..... 21

3.4. Program Organization 22

3.5. Community and Diversity..... 24

3.6. College Support and Services 25

3.7. Resources 27

3.8. Internship..... 28

3.9. Technology 29

3.10. Politics 30

3.11. General Evaluation..... 31

SUMMARY OF QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE FINDINGS..... 34

APPENDIX A: SURVEY INSTRUMENT 37

APPENDIX B: RESPONSE RATE BY DEPARTMENT/PROGRAM..... 41

SURVEY ADMINISTRATION AND INSTRUMENT

In May 2007, the Office of Accreditation and Assessment sent out the *May 2007 Exit Survey* to 1,756 graduates¹ who had filed for degrees to be awarded in October 2006, February 2007, or May 2007. An e-mail with a link to the survey website was sent to the list of graduates and graduating students provided by the Registrar's Office; mail surveys were sent out a few days later. A follow-up post card and an e-mail message were sent a week later to increase the number of responses. A second postcard was sent two weeks after. We received 523 completed surveys—342 web surveys, and 181 mail surveys. The rate of return was 30% (see Appendix B for response rates by department/ program).

Several changes were made to the previous survey instrument: (a) the instructions were modified and shortened; (b) two open-ended questions (items 68 and 69) were added; (c) items 72 and 73 had minor wording changes; (d) a fifth option was added to the question about degree received (item 70); and (e) the question about ethnic/racial background (item 77) was modified based on "guidelines for new race/ethnicity requirements" from the federal government.

The final questionnaire had 10 subscales, and was comprised of 64 statements, each with two four-point Likert scales, four open-ended questions, and 10 demographic/background information questions. The four open-ended questions (items 66-69) asked respondents to identify two specific strengths and weaknesses of their programs of study, make general comments about their experience at Teachers College, and provide comments and suggestions about the survey. Of the 523 respondents who completed the exit survey, 447 provided answers to at least 1 out of the 4 open-ended questions.

¹ Valid addresses only, undeliverable mailings not included

1. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE RESPONDENTS

Department	Number of Respondents			Percent of Total		
	May-05	May-06	May-07	May-05	May-06	May-07
Arts & Humanities	58	51	87	22.5	15.6	17.4
Biobehavioral Sciences	7	18	14	2.7	5.5	2.8
Counseling & Clinical Psychology	19	37	56	7.4	11.3	11.2
Curriculum & Teaching	28	31	49	10.9	9.5	9.8
Health & Behavior Studies	33	39	62	12.8	11.9	12.4
Human Development	13	14	25	5	4.3	5.0
International & Transcultural Studies	15	33	45	5.8	10.1	9.0
Mathematics, Science & Technology	21	30	43	8.1	9.2	8.6
Organization & Leadership	64	74	115	24.8	22.6	23.0
Interdisciplinary	-	-	3	-	-	0.6
Total number of respondents	258	327	499	100%	100%	100%
Missing	7	20	24			
Total	265	347	523			
Program	Number of Respondents			Percent of Total		
	May-05	May-06	May-07	May-05	May-06	May-07
Administration in Special Education	-	1	2	-	0.3	0.4
Adult Learning and Leadership	-	5	2	-	1.6	0.4
AEGIS	-	1	3	-	0.3	0.6
Anthropology and Education	-	2	4	-	0.6	0.8
Applied Anthropology	-	-	1	-	-	0.2
Applied Behavior Analysis	-	3	4	-	1.0	0.8
Applied Linguistics	-	5	9	-	1.6	1.8
Applied Physiology	-	5	1	-	1.6	0.2
Applied Physiology and Nutrition	-	1	6	-	0.3	1.2
Art and Art Education	-	5	10	-	1.6	2.0
Arts Administration	-	6	5	-	1.9	1.0
Bilingual/Bicultural Education	-	4	12	-	1.3	2.4
Clinical Psychology	-	5	7	-	1.6	1.4
Cognitive Studies in Education	-	2	6	-	0.6	1.2
Communication and Education	-	4	5	-	1.3	1.0
Comparative and International Education	-	2	4	-	0.6	0.8
Computing in Education	-	4	1	-	1.3	0.2
Counseling Psychology	-	22	30	-	7.1	6.1
Curriculum and Teaching	-	10	14	-	3.2	2.9
Deaf and Hard of Hearing	-	3	4	-	1.0	0.8
Developmental Psychology	-	6	9	-	1.9	1.8
Disability Studies in Education	-	-	2	-	-	0.4
Early Childhood	-	4	7	-	1.3	1.4
Early Childhood Special Education	-	3	2	-	1.0	0.4
Education Leadership	-	21	50	-	6.8	10.2
Economics and Education	-	6	-	-	1.9	-
Elementary Education/Inclusive Elementary	-	6	18	-	1.9	3.7
Gifted Education	-	2	2	-	0.6	0.4
Health Education	-	12	13	-	3.9	2.6

Higher and Postsecondary Education	-	7	20	-	2.3	4.1
Instructional Practice in Special Education	-	-	1	-	-	0.2
Instructional Technology and Media	-	4	8	-	1.3	1.6
Interdisciplinary Studies in Education	-	-	2	-	-	0.4
International Educational Development	-	16	22	-	5.1	4.5
Kinesiology	-	-	2	-	-	0.4
Learning Disabilities	-	4	2	-	1.3	0.4
Literacy Specialist	-	-	2	-	-	0.4
Mathematics Education	-	12	19	-	3.9	3.9
Measurement and Evaluation	-	1	4	-	0.3	0.8
Mental Retardation/Autism	-	3	2	-	1.0	0.4
Motor Learning	-	1	1	-	0.3	0.2
Music and Music Education	-	8	17	-	2.6	3.5
Nurse Executive	-	7	1	-	2.3	0.2
Nursing Education	-	1	-	-	0.3	-
Nutrition Education	-	5	6	-	1.6	1.2
Organizational Psychology	-	30	39	-	9.6	7.9
Philosophy and Education	-	-	2	-	-	0.4
Physical Education	-	3	1	-	1.0	0.2
Politics and Education	-	1	1	-	0.3	0.2
Psychology in Education	-	6	17	-	1.9	3.5
Reading Specialist	-	6	10	-	1.9	2.0
School Psychology	-	3	12	-	1.0	2.4
Science Education	-	5	9	-	1.6	1.8
Social Studies	-	8	11	-	2.6	2.2
Sociology and Education	-	5	6	-	1.6	1.2
Speech and Language Pathology	-	6	5	-	1.9	1.0
Teaching of ASL	-	1	3	-	0.3	0.6
Teaching of English	-	11	18	-	3.5	3.7
Teaching Physics	-	-	1	-	-	0.2
TESOL	-	7	13	-	2.3	2.6
Neuroscience and Education	-	-	1	-	-	0.2
Total number of respondents	-	311	491	-	100%	100%
Missing	-	36	32			
Total	-	347	523			
Type of Program	Number of Respondents			Percent of Total		
	May-05	May-06	May-07	May-05	May-06	May 07
Teacher education ²	120	142	194	45.8	45.5	39.5
Non-teacher education	142	170	297	54.2	54.5	60.5
Total number of respondents	262	312	491	100%	100%	100%
Missing	3	35	32			
Total	265	347	523			
Degree	Number of Respondents			Percent of Total		
	May-05	May-06	May-07	May-05	May-06	May-07

² All masters and doctoral students from teacher education programs under the NCATE-review umbrella were coded as teacher education. These did not include students in education leadership, school counseling, and school psychology.

Master of Arts or Science	192	207	356	73.3	62.7	71.2
Master of Education	54	46	96	20.6	13.9	19.2
Doctor of Education	14	54	27	5.3	16.4	5.4
Doctor of Philosophy	2	23	21	0.8	7	4.2
Total number of respondents	262	330	500	100%	100%	100%
Missing	3	17	23			
Total	265	347	523			
Gender	Number of Respondents			Percent of Total		
	May-05	May-06	May-07	May-05	May-06	May-07
Female	204	265	405	77.9	80.8	81.3
Male	58	63	93	22.1	19.2	18.7
Total number of respondents	262	328	498	100%	100%	100%
Missing	3	19	25			
Total	265	347	523			
Age	Number of Respondents			Percent of Total		
	May-05	May-06	May-07	May-05	May-06	May-07
20-25	58	84	125	22.6	25.5	25.1
26-30	91	102	199	35.4	31	40.0
31-35	54	68	93	21	20.7	18.7
36 and above	54	75	81	21	22.8	16.3
Total number of respondents	257	329	498	100%	100%	100%
Missing	8	18	25			
Total	265	347	523			
Citizenship	Number of Respondents			Percent of Total		
	May-05	May-06	May-07	May-05	May-06	May-07
U.S. citizen	222	302	443	84.7	91.8	90.0
not U.S. citizen	40	27	49	15.3	8.2	10.0
Total number of respondents	262	329	492	100%	100%	100%
Missing	3	18	31			
Total	265	347	523			
Race/Ethnicity	Number of Respondents			Percent of Total		
	May-05	May-06	May-07	May-05	May-06	May-07
African American	13	20	36	5	6.2	7.2
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1	0	6	0.4	0	1.2
Asian	46	45	76	17.6	14	15.3
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	-	-	3	-	-	0.6
White (of European, Middle Eastern, or North African origins)	172	160	303	65.6	49.7	61.0
Latino or Hispanic American	8	21	37	3.1	6.5	7.4
Other	22	33	11	8.4	10.2	2.2
Prefer not to respond	n/a	43	41	n/a	13.4	8.2
Total number of respondents	262	322	497	100%	100%	100%
Missing	3	25	26			
Total	265	347	523			
Financial Sources	Number of Respondents			Percent of Total		
	May-05	May-06	May-07	May-05	May-06	May-07
Employment (May 2006: full-time, part-time, or none)	211	266	493	80.2	81.3	94.3
Loans	157	186	278	64.3	56.4	55.3
Grants	37	115	199	15.2	34.8	39.5
Scholarships/Fellowships	83			34		

Research Assistantships	14	34	42	5.7	10.3	8.3
Teaching Assistantships	22			9		
Savings	77	129	198	31.6	39.1	39.4
Spouse/Partner	-	48	68	-	14.5	13.5
Family/Friends	-	113	164	-	34.2	32.5
Other	38	71	73	15.6	21.5	14.5
General Career Plans	Number of Respondents			Percent of Total		
	May-05	May-06	May-07	May-05	May-06	May-07
To continue graduate study	41	32	-	15.6	9.8	-
To teach or work in a two- or four-year college	20	66	-	7.6	20.1	-
To work in a preK-12 school setting	111	117	-	42.4	35.7	-
To work in a non-school, non-university setting	-	75	-	-	22.9	-
Other	90	38	-	34.4	11.6	-
Total number of respondents	262	328	-	100%	100%	-
Missing	3	19	-			-
Total	265	347	-			-

2. QUANTITATIVE FINDINGS

Relative importance of individual Likert-type items to students. Respondents were asked to rate each item on the agreement scale (from strongly disagree to strongly agree) and on the importance scale (from scarcely important to very important).³ The difference between the agreement and importance ratings for each item shows how well the College or program is meeting student expectations for that particular item. The difference is calculated by subtracting the importance rating mean from the agreement rating mean. A negative difference indicates that the College or program is not meeting student expectations. A positive difference indicates that the College or program is exceeding student expectations. A difference close to zero indicates that student expectations are close to being fully met.

An analysis of the differences shows that the College or program has either closely met or exceeded student expectations in the following areas (from the most positive of (+0.3) to (-0.2)):

- Class activities/assignments encouraged teamwork and collaboration (+0.3)
- My program faculty used technology in their courses (+0.1)
- Students of diverse backgrounds and different experiences were encouraged to participate in class (0)
- Class activities/assignments allowed me to practice my research skills (-0.1)
- My program faculty used a variety of assessment methods (e.g., exams, papers, projects) to evaluate my performance (-0.1)
- Students supported each other to meet the academic demands of my program (-0.1)
- My program was free of discrimination with regard to gender, race, creed, national origin, age, disability status, sexual orientation, and marital status (-0.1)
- Class activities/assignments encouraged reflection and critical thinking (-0.2)
- My fellow students demonstrated high academic abilities (-0.2)
- The student body reflected a diversity of background and experience, including members of minority groups and persons with disabilities (-0.2)
- My program helped me to develop the ability to accept people with different values and beliefs (-0.2)

The following items have the largest negative differences indicating that these areas are most below student expectations. The differences range from the most negative of (-1.7) to (-0.8).

- Adequate financial aid was available for students in my program (-1.7)
- My program provided good academic advisement (-1.0)
- Student support services and staff were helpful (e.g., Registrar's Office, Financial Aid Office, Student Accounts Office, Office of Doctoral Studies) (-1.0)
- My program monitored my progress towards my degree (-0.9)
- Classroom facilities were adequate (-0.9)
- A good variety of courses was offered by my program (-0.8)
- Courses were offered frequently enough that I was able to complete my degree requirements as planned (-0.8)
- I had the flexibility to choose courses based on my academic interests (-0.8)
- My program was receptive to student input regarding curriculum or program improvement (-0.8)
- Program and degree requirements were clearly explained to me (-0.8)

Likert-type statements with the highest numbers of agreements or disagreements. Table 2.1 below shows the top 20 statements with the highest combined "agree" and "strongly agree" ratings. Column 1 shows the percentage of students who either agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. Column 2 shows the difference between the importance of the item to students, and student agreement with the item based on their experience.

Table 2.1: *Statements with the Highest Percent of Agreements*

³ Noel-Levitz, Inc. (2005). National Student Satisfaction and Priorities Report. Available online at: www.noellevitz.com

Question/Statement	Percent of Agreements	Difference
My program was free of discrimination with regard to gender, race, creed, national origin, age, disability status, sexual orientation, and marital status.	91%	-0.1
My program faculty were scholarly and professionally competent.	90%	-0.4
My program faculty were open to discuss different scholarly points of view.	90%	-0.4
Class activities/assignments encouraged reflection and critical thinking.	89%	-0.2
My program faculty treated students with respect.	89%	-0.3
Students of diverse backgrounds and different experiences were encouraged to participate in class.	88%	0
My internship experience contributed to my academic development.	87%	-0.3
Class activities/assignments encouraged teamwork and collaboration.	86%	0.3
My program faculty were fair and unbiased in assessing/grading student work.	86%	-0.4
My internship/field placement site was conducive to my learning and professional development.	86%	-0.4
My program faculty treated all students fairly.	85%	-0.5
My program was an intellectually stimulating place.	84%	-0.5
Students supported each other to meet the academic demands of my program.	84%	-0.1
Course content provided me with a solid theoretical background in my discipline.	83%	-0.3
My program helped me to develop the ability to accept people with different values and beliefs.	83%	-0.2
My fellow students demonstrated high academic abilities.	81%	-0.2
My program faculty used appropriate class activities and assignments to help me learn.	80%	-0.5
My program had clear requirements.	80%	-0.4
I got to apply what I learned in my courses to real-life situations during my internship.	80%	-0.5
I got to practice a variety of professional skills during my internship.	80%	-0.4

Table 2.2 shows 15 statements with the highest combined “disagree” and “strongly disagree” ratings, that is, these are the areas which the most number of students felt were lacking. Column 1 shows the percentage of students who either disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. Column 2 shows the difference between the importance of the item to students, and student agreement with the item based on their experience.

Table 2.2 *Statements with the Highest Percent of Disagreements*

Question/Statement	Percent of Dis-agreements	Difference
Adequate financial aid was available for students in my program.	65%	-1.7
Classroom facilities were adequate.	51%	-0.9
My program monitored my progress towards my degree.	50%	-0.9
My program provided opportunities to use technology that could be applied in a professional context.	46%	-0.5
I had the flexibility to choose courses based on my academic interests.	44%	-0.8
My program regularly assessed my professional knowledge and skills.	43%	-0.7
Student support services and staff were helpful (e.g., Registrar’s Office, Financial Aid Office, Student Accounts Office, Office of Doctoral Studies).	42%	-1
My program faculty used technology in their courses.	40%	0.1
My program provided good academic advisement.	40%	-1
I had opportunities to use relevant technologies during internship.	40%	-0.5
My program was receptive to student input regarding curriculum or program improvement.	39%	-0.8
Required courses were not repetitive.	38%	-0.7
Faculty in my program reflected a diversity of background and experience, including members of minority groups and persons with disabilities.	37%	-0.5
A good variety of courses was offered by my program.	37%	-0.8
Program and degree requirements were clearly explained to me.	36%	-0.8

Table 2.3: Quantitative Subscale and Item Summary

Subscale and Items	Agreement Scale							Importance Scale							Gap Analysis	
	Disagree strongly			Agree strongly	Mean 1	Don't know/NA	N	Scarcely important			Very important	Mean 2	Don't know/NA	N	Gap (Mean 1 - Mean 2)	sig.
	1	2	3	4				1	2	3	4					
Course Offerings (mean=3.0, Cronbach's alpha=0.75, N=467)																
1) A good variety of courses was offered by my program.	36 7.2%	149 29.7%	216 43.0%	101 20.1%	2.8	21	502	10 2.0%	20 4.0%	111 22.1%	361 71.9%	3.6	21	502	-0.8	0.00*
2) Courses were offered frequently enough that I was able to complete my degree requirements as planned.	43 8.8%	92 18.7%	183 37.3%	173 35.2%	3.0	32	491	7 1.4%	13 2.4%	72 14.6%	401 81.3%	3.8	30	493	-0.8	0.00
3) I had the flexibility to choose courses based on my academic interests.	51 10.6%	160 33.4%	173 36.1%	95 19.8%	2.7	44	479	12 2.5%	30 6.2%	149 30.7%	295 60.7%	3.5	37	486	-0.8	0.00
4) Course content provided me with a solid theoretical background in my discipline.	16 3.1%	69 13.4%	194 37.7%	235 45.7%	3.3	9	514	7 1.4%	29 5.7%	123 26.0%	339 66.9%	3.6	16	507	-0.3	0.00
5) Course content was applicable to my anticipated work in the field.	21 4.1%	91 17.8%	210 41.2%	188 36.9%	3.1	13	510	2 0.4%	11 2.2%	86 17.0%	407 80.4%	3.8	17	506	-0.7	0.00
6) Required courses were academically rigorous.	32 6.3%	74 14.5%	214 41.8%	192 37.5%	3.1	11	512	9 1.8%	47 9.3%	200 39.6%	249 49.3%	3.4	18	505	-0.3	0.00
Instruction (mean=3.1, Cronbach's alpha=0.89, N=480)																
	1	2	3	4				1	2	3	4					
7) My program faculty had teaching styles that responded to my learning style and goals.	33 6.5%	94 18.4%	235 46.0%	149 29.2%	3.0	12	511	6 1.2%	33 6.5%	165 32.4%	305 59.9%	3.5	14	509	-0.5	0.00
8) My program faculty used appropriate class activities and assignments to help me learn.	20 3.9%	83 16.3%	243 47.6%	164 32.2%	3.1	13	510	4 0.8%	23 4.5%	164 32.3%	317 62.4%	3.6	15	508	-0.5	0.00

9) My program faculty used hands-on activities in their classes.	45 9.0%	106 21.2%	200 39.9%	150 29.9%	2.9	22	501	22 4.4%	86 17.2%	173 34.5%	220 43.9%	3.2	22	501	-0.3	0.00
10) Class activities/assignments encouraged reflection and critical thinking.	10 2.0%	47 9.2%	189 36.9%	266 52%	3.4	11	512	7 1.4%	22 4.3%	138 27.2%	340 67.1%	3.6	16	507	-0.2	0.00
11) Class activities/assignments encouraged teamwork and collaboration.	17 3.3%	56 10.9%	190 37.1%	249 48.6%	3.3	11	512	44 8.7%	82 16.2%	194 38.3%	187 36.9%	3	16	507	0.3	0.00
12) Class activities/assignments allowed me to practice my research skills.	28 5.5%	114 22.4%	185 36.3%	183 35.9%	3.0	13	510	30 6.0%	89 17.7%	165 32.9%	218 43.4%	3.1	21	502	-0.1	0.01
13) My program faculty gave me helpful feedback on assignments.	33 6.5%	109 21.3 %	208 40.7%	161 31.5%	3.0	12	511	5 1.0%	13 2.6%	119 23.5%	370 73.0%	3.7	16	507	-0.7	0.00
14) My program faculty gave me timely feedback on assignments.	28 5.5%	82 16.0%	216 42.2%	186 36.3%	3.1	11	512	9 1.8%	32 6.3%	174 34.4%	291 57.5%	3.5	17	506	-0.4	0.00
15) My program faculty used a variety of assessment methods (e.g., exams, papers, projects) to evaluate my performance.	24 4.7%	83 16.2%	201 39.3%	204 39.8%	3.1	11	512	16 3.2%	69 13.7%	192 38.2%	226 44.9%	3.2	20	503	-0.1	0.01
16) My program faculty were fair and unbiased in assessing/grading student work.	18 3.6%	53 10.5%	170 33.8%	262 52.1%	3.3	20	503	5 1.0%	18 3.6%	106 21.0%	375 74.4%	3.7	19	504	-0.4	0.00
17) My program faculty were scholarly and professionally competent.	15 2.9%	39 7.6%	160 31.2%	299 58.3%	3.4	10	513	6 1.2%	9 1.8%	71 14.0%	421 83.0%	3.8	16	507	-0.4	0.00
18) My program faculty used technology in their courses.	31 6.1%	171 33.7%	199 39.2%	107 21.1%	2.8	15	508	59 11.8 %	143 28.6%	180 36.0%	118 23.6%	2.7	23	500	0.1	0.47
Faculty Dispositions Towards Students (mean=3.1, Cronbach's alpha=0.89, N=487)	Disagree strongly			Agree strongly	Mean 1	Don't know/ NA	N	Scarcely important			Very important	Mean 2	Don't know/ NA	N	Gap (Mean 1- Mean 2)	sig.
	1	2	3	4				1	2	3	4					
19) There was good communication between faculty and students regarding student needs, concerns, and suggestions.	51 10.1%	120 23.7%	186 36.7%	150 29.6%	2.9	16	507	3 0.6%	14 2.8%	153 30.5%	331 66.1%	3.6	22	501	-0.7	0.00
20) My program faculty were accessible to students outside the classroom.	34 6.7%	97 19.1%	194 38.3%	182 35.9%	3.0	16	507	6 1.2%	27 5.4%	154 30.6%	317 62.9%	3.6	19	504	-0.6	0.00

21) My program faculty cared about professional welfare and development of students.	47 9.3%	79 15.6%	179 35.4%	201 39.7%	3.1	17	506	4 0.8%	16 3.2%	126 25.0%	358 71.0%	3.7	14	504	-0.6	0.00
22) My program faculty treated students with respect.	19 3.7%	38 7.4%	145 28.4%	309 60.5%	3.5	12	511	4 0.8%	6 1.2%	86 17.0%	410 81.0%	3.8	17	506	-0.3	0.00
23) My program faculty treated all students fairly.	25 5.0%	50 10.0%	167 33.3%	259 51.7%	3.3	22	501	4 0.8%	11 2.2%	91 18.0%	399 79.0%	3.8	18	505	-0.5	0.00
Learning Community (mean=3.0, Cronbach's alpha=0.83, N=438)	Disagree strongly			Agree strongly	Mean 1	Don't know/ NA	N	Scarcely important			Very important	Mean 2	Don't know/ NA	N	Gap (Mean 1 - Mean 2)	sig.
	1	2	3	4				1	2	3	4					
24) My program faculty were open to discuss different scholarly points of view.	32 6.4%	63 12.5%	175 43.8%	233 46.3%	3.2	20	503	7 1.4%	10 2.0%	148 29.5%	337 67.1%	3.6	21	502	-0.4	0.00
25) My program was an intellectually stimulating place.	26 5.1%	57 11.2%	164 32.1%	264 51.7%	3.3	12	511	4 0.8%	3 0.6%	83 16.4%	417 82.2%	3.8	16	507	-0.5	0.00
26) My program was receptive to student input regarding curriculum or program improvement.	68 14.5%	115 24.5%	167 35.5%	120 25.5%	2.7	53	470	9 1.8%	36 7.3%	168 34.1%	279 56.7%	3.5	31	492	-0.8	0.00
27) My program encouraged collaboration with faculty and/or other students.	47 9.4%	99 19.7%	176 35.1%	180 35.9%	3.0	21	502	17 3.4%	59 11.8%	197 39.6%	225 45.2%	3.3	25	498	-0.3	0.00
28) Students supported each other to meet the academic demands of my program.	20 4.0%	60 11.9%	188 37.2%	237 46.9%	3.3	18	505	11 2.2%	55 11.0%	177 35.5%	255 51.2%	3.4	25	498	-0.1	0.04
29) There was a sense of community in my program.	56 11.0%	91 17.8%	169 33.1%	194 38.0%	3.0	13	510	14 2.8%	47 9.3%	161 31.9%	282 56.0%	3.4	19	504	-0.4	0.00
30) My fellow students demonstrated high academic abilities.	20 3.9%	76 15.0%	199 39.2%	213 41.9%	3.2	15	508	13 2.6%	34 6.8%	174 34.8%	279 55.8%	3.4	23	500	-0.2	0.00
31) My program provided opportunities to use technology that could be applied in a professional context.	64 13.1%	160 32.7%	156 31.8%	110 22.4%	2.6	33	490	29 5.9%	85 17.3%	197 40.1%	180 36.7%	3.1	32	491	-0.5	0.00

Program Organization (mean=2.9, Cronbach's alpha=0.86, N=469)	Disagree strongly			Agree strongly	Mean 1	Don't know/ NA	N	Scarcely important			Very important	Mean 2	Don't know/ NA	N	Gap (Mean 1 - Mean 2)	sig.
	1	2	3	4				1	2	3	4					
32) My program had a clear philosophy.	43 8.6%	96 19.2%	174 34.7%	188 37.5%	3.0	22	501	15 3.0%	49 9.8%	176 35.3%	258 51.8%	3.6	25	498	-0.6	0.00
33) My program had clear requirements.	34 6.7%	67 13.2%	165 32.4%	243 47.7%	3.2	14	509	6 1.2%	25 5.0%	140 27.8%	333 66.1%	3.6	19	504	-0.4	0.00
34) Program requirements were relevant to my anticipated work in the field.	22 4.4%	99 19.6%	194 38.5%	189 37.5%	3.1	19	504	3 0.6%	18 3.6%	114 22.8%	364 72.9%	3.7	24	499	-0.6	0.00
35) My program provided a well-integrated set of courses.	33 6.5%	117 23.0%	217 42.6%	142 27.9%	2.9	14	509	7 1.4%	19 3.8%	149 29.7%	327 65.1%	3.6	21	502	-0.7	0.00
36) Required courses were not repetitive.	79 15.6%	115 22.7%	158 31.2%	154 30.4%	2.8	17	506	6 1.2%	22 4.4%	174 34.7%	300 59.8%	3.5	21	502	-0.7	0.00
37) My program monitored my progress towards my degree.	117 23.5%	130 26.1%	127 25.5%	124 24.9%	2.5	25	498	14 2.8%	51 10.3%	154 31.1%	276 55.8%	3.4	28	495	-0.9	0.00
38) My program regularly assessed my professional knowledge and skills.	73 14.6%	140 28.0%	189 37.8%	98 19.6%	2.6	23	500	12 2.4%	65 13.1%	194 39.0%	226 45.5%	3.3	26	497	-0.7	0.00
Academic Advisement (mean=3.0, Cronbach's alpha=0.91, N=477)	Disagree strongly			Agree strongly	Mean 1	Don't know/ NA	N	Scarcely important			Very important	Mean 2	Don't know/ NA	N	Gap (Mean 1 - Mean 2)	sig.
	1	2	3	4				1	2	3	4					
39) I received accurate information about program and degree requirements.	68 13.3%	82 16.1%	169 33.1%	191 37.5%	3.0	13	510	4 0.8%	8 1.6%	103 20.4%	389 77.2%	3.7	19	504	-0.7	0.00
40) Program and degree requirements were clearly explained to me.	72 14.4%	111 21.7%	149 29.2%	179 35.0%	2.9	12	511	8 1.6%	10 2.0%	105 20.9%	380 75.5%	3.7	20	503	-0.8	0.00
41) I knew what I had to do to meet program and degree requirements.	35 6.9%	79 15.5%	157 30.8%	239 46.9%	3.2	13	510	3 0.6%	9 1.8%	85 16.9%	407 80.8%	3.8	19	504	-0.6	0.00

42) My program provided good academic advisement.	101 20.2%	100 20.0%	168 33.5%	132 26.3%	2.7	22	501	7 1.4%	16 3.2%	103 20.8%	370 74.6%	3.7	27	496	-1	0.00
43) My academic advisor was knowledgeable about program requirements.	57 11.6%	69 14.1%	133 27.1%	232 47.3%	3.1	32	491	6 1.2%	12 2.4%	91 18.5%	284 77.9%	3.7	30	493	-0.6	0.00
44) My academic advisor was approachable.	56 11.4%	47 9.5%	127 25.8%	263 53.3%	3.2	30	493	6 1.2%	12 2.4%	65 13.2%	411 83.2%	3.8	29	494	-0.6	0.00
45) My academic advisor helped me to complete my program as planned.	80 16.4%	66 13.5%	131 26.8%	212 43.4%	3.0	34	489	9 1.8%	21 4.3%	91 18.4%	373 75.5%	3.7	29	494	-0.7	0.00
Diversity (mean=3.3, Cronbach's alpha=0.80, N=429)	Disagree strongly			Agree strongly	Mean 1	Don't know/ NA	N	Scarcely important			Very important	Mean 2	Don't know/ NA	N	Gap (Mean 1- Mean 2)	sig.
	1	2	3	4				1	2	3	4					
46) Faculty in my program reflected a diversity of background and experience, including members of minority groups and persons with disabilities.	81 16.3%	104 20.9%	139 27.9%	174 34.9%	2.8	25	498	30 6.0%	68 13.7%	141 28.4%	258 51.9%	3.3	26	497	-0.5	0.00
47) The student body reflected a diversity of background and experience, including members of minority groups and persons with disabilities.	39 7.7%	91 18.0%	163 32.2%	213 42.1%	3.1	17	506	24 4.8%	59 11.8%	152 30.3%	266 53.1%	3.3	22	501	-0.2	0.00
48) My program was free of discrimination with regard to gender, race, creed, national origin, age, disability status, sexual orientation, and marital status.	15 3.0%	29 5.5%	108 21.9%	342 69.2%	3.6	29	494	9 1.8%	11 2.2%	79 15.7%	403 80.3%	3.7	21	502	-0.1	0.00
49) Students of diverse backgrounds and different experiences were encouraged to participate in class.	15 3.0%	43 8.7%	133 26.9%	304 61.4%	3.5	28	495	12 2.4%	29 5.8%	132 26.5%	325 65.3%	3.5	25	498	0	0.04
50) My program helped me to develop the ability to accept people with different values and beliefs.	29 6.1%	52 10.9%	157 33.1%	237 49.9%	3.3	48	475	17 3.6%	37 7.7%	115 24.1%	309 64.6%	3.5	45	478	-0.2	0.00
51) My program prepared me to work with diverse children and/or adults.	33 6.8%	91 18.8%	142 29.3%	219 45.2%	3.1	38	485	14 2.9%	33 6.9%	119 23.9%	319 66.3%	3.5	42	481	-0.4	0.00

Resources (mean=2.7, Cronbach's alpha=0.80, N=327)	Disagree strongly			Agree strongly	Mean 1	Don't know/ NA	N	Scarcely important			Very important	Mean 2	Don't know/ NA	N	Gap (Mean 1-Mean 2)	sig.
	1	2	3	4				1	2	3	4					
52) Gottesman Libraries resources and services were adequate.	26 5.3%	75 15.4%	177 36.4%	208 42.8%	3.2	37	486	10 2.0%	31 6.3%	133 27.0%	318 64.6%	3.5	31	492	-0.3	0.00
53) Specialized facilities and equipment were adequate (e.g. laboratories or studios; equipment needed for teaching and/or creative work in my field).	44 10.9%	73 18.1%	150 37.2%	136 33.7%	3.0	120	403	10 2.3%	43 10.1%	143 33.6%	230 54.0%	3.4	97	426	-0.4	0.00
54) Classroom facilities were adequate.	110 21.6%	148 29.1%	173 34.0%	78 15.3%	2.4	14	509	12 2.4%	54 10.7%	209 41.4%	230 45.5%	3.3	18	505	-0.9	0.00
55) Student support services and staff were helpful (e.g., Registrar's Office, Financial Aid Office, Student Accounts Office, Office of Doctoral Studies).	86 17.2%	123 24.6%	182 36.3%	110 22.0%	2.6	22	501	8 1.6%	20 4.0%	148 29.7%	322 64.7%	3.6	25	498	-1	0.00
56) Adequate financial aid was available for students in my program.	187 45.0%	83 20.0%	74 17.8%	72 17.3%	2.1	107	416	9 2.1%	4 0.9%	69 13.6%	362 83.4%	3.8	89	434	-1.7	0.00
57) Technological resources were adequate.	44 9.0%	98 20.0%	232 47.3%	117 23.8%	2.9	32	491	12 2.5%	54 11.2%	206 42.7%	211 43.7%	3.3	40	483	-0.4	0.00
Internship/Field Experiences (mean=3.2, Cronbach's alpha=0.86, N=245)	Disagree strongly			Agree strongly	Mean 1	Don't know/ NA	N	Scarcely important			Very important	Mean 2	Don't know/ NA	N	Gap (Mean 1-Mean 2)	sig.
	1	2	3	4				1	2	3	4					
59) My internship experience contributed to my academic development.	16 5.5%	23 7.9%	64 22.1%	187 64.5%	3.5	233	290	5 1.7%	8 2.8%	30 10.5%	244 85.0%	3.8	23 6	287	-0.3	0.00
60) I got to apply what I learned in my courses to real-life situations during my internship.	15 5.2%	43 14.9%	77 26.7%	153 53.1%	3.3	235	288	3 1.0%	8 2.8%	36 12.5%	240 83.6%	3.8	23 6	287	-0.5	0.00
61) I got to practice a variety of professional skills during my internship.	12 4.2%	44 15.4%	60 21.0%	170 59.4%	3.4	237	286	3 1.1%	9 3.2%	35 12.3%	238 83.5%	3.8	23 8	285	-0.4	0.00

62) My supervisor(s) guided me during my internship.	43 15.2%	43 15.2%	80 28.4%	116 41.1%	3.0	241	282	7 2.5%	11 3.9%	52 18.4%	213 75.3%	3.7	24 0	283	-0.7	0.00
63) My supervisor(s) regularly evaluated my performance during internship.	44 15.7%	50 17.9%	69 24.6%	117 41.8%	3.0	243	280	10 3.5%	18 6.4%	61 21.6%	193 68.4%	3.5	24 1	282	-0.5	0.00
64) My internship/field placement site was conducive to my learning and professional development.	14 4.9%	26 9.2%	79 27.9%	164 58.0%	3.4	240	283	5 1.8%	9 3.2%	25 8.8%	245 86.3%	3.8	23 9	284	-0.4	0.00
65) I had opportunities to use relevant technologies during internship.	45 17.6%	58 22.7%	74 29.0%	78 30.6%	2.7	268	255	17 6.6%	38 14.8%	78 30.5%	123 48.0%	3.2	26 7	256	-0.5	0.00
Technology (mean=2.8, Cronbach's alpha=0.73, N=246)	Disagree strongly			Agree strongly	Mean 1	Don't know/ NA	N	Scarcely important			Very important	Mean 2	Don't know/ NA	N	Gap (Mean 1- Mean 2)	sig.
	1	2	3	4				1	2	3	4					
18) My program faculty used technology in their courses.	31 6.1%	171 33.7%	199 39.2%	107 21.1%	2.8	15	508	59 11.8%	143 28.6%	180 36.0%	118 23.6%	2.7	23	500	0.1	0.47
31) My program provided opportunities to use technology that could be applied in a professional context.	64 13.1%	160 32.7%	156 31.8%	110 22.4%	2.6	33	490	29 5.9%	85 17.3%	197 40.1%	180 36.7%	3.1	32	491	-0.5	0.00
57) Technological resources were adequate.	44 9.0%	98 20.0%	232 47.3%	117 23.8%	2.9	32	491	12 2.5%	54 11.2%	206 42.7%	211 43.7%	3.3	40	483	-0.4	0.00
65) I had opportunities to use relevant technologies during internship.	45 17.6%	58 22.7%	74 29.0%	78 30.6%	2.7	268	255	17 6.6%	38 14.8%	78 30.5%	123 48.0%	3.2	26 7	256	-0.5	0.00

*Note: Values in bold indicate that the difference is significant.

Ten Subscales. The exit survey had 10 subscales. The item scores on the agreement rating scale of each subscale were added and averaged to obtain a composite score. *Instruction, Diversity, and Internship* have the highest composite scores. *Resources, Technology, and Program Organization* have the lowest scores. This indicates that, on average, students were most satisfied with *Instruction, Diversity, and Internship* and least satisfied with *Resources, Technology, and Program Organization*.

All subscales have Cronbach's alpha values of 0.73 or greater, indicating that the items 'hang together' acceptably for all the subscales. Table 2.4 below shows the descriptive statistics for each of the subscales.

Table 2.4: *Composite Scores for Ten Subscales*

Subscales	May 2006	May 2007		
	mean	mean	Alpha	N
Course Offerings	3.0	3.0	0.75	467
Instruction	3.2	3.1	0.89	480
Faculty Dispositions Towards Students	3.1	3.1	0.89	487
Learning Community	3.0	3.0	0.83	438
Program Organization	2.9	2.9	0.86	469
Academic Advisement	3.0	3.0	0.91	477
Diversity	3.2	3.3	0.80	429
Resources	2.6	2.7	0.80	327
Internship/Field Experiences	3.3	3.2	0.86	245
Technology	2.8	2.8	0.73	246

Composite Scores and Student Characteristics. The preliminary analysis comparing means for different subgroups (ANOVA) of respondents revealed several significant relationships:

- Male graduates tended to evaluate *Academic Advisement* more positively than did female graduates (Table 2.5a).

Table 2.5a: *Gender and Academic Advisement*

Gender	Academic Advisement	
	mean	N
Female	2.9	379
Male	3.2	83

- White graduates tended to evaluate *Diversity, Course Offerings, Instruction, Faculty Dispositions, and Learning Community* more positively than did Non White graduates (Table 2.5b).

Table 2.5b: *Ethnicity and Five Subscales*

Ethnicity	Diversity		Course Offerings		Instruction		Faculty Dispositions		Learning Community	
	mean	N	mean	N	Mean	N	mean	N	mean	N
non European-American	3.1	157	2.9	178	3.0	178	3.0	182	2.9	167
European-American	3.3	261	3.0	272	3.2	286	3.3	289	3.1	255

- Older graduates, 31 years of age and above, tended to evaluate *Course Offerings, Instruction, Faculty Dispositions, Learning Community, Program Organization and Academic Advisement* more positively than did younger graduates, 20-30 years old. Younger graduates, 20-25 years old, and older graduates, 36 years of age and above, tended to give *Technology* a more positive evaluation than did the graduates aged 26-30 years old (Table 2.5c).

Table 2.5c: *Age and Seven Subscales*

Age Group	Course Offerings		Instruction		Faculty Dispositions		Learning Community		Program Organization		Academic Advisement		Technology	
	mean	N	mean	N	mean	N	mean	N	mean	N	mean	N	mean	N
20-25	2.9	120	3.1	120	3.1	119	3.0	111	2.8	117	2.9	121	3.0	80
26-30	2.9	184	3.1	187	3.1	189	3.0	166	2.8	182	2.9	185	2.7	89
31-35	3.1	84	3.2	84	3.3	87	3.1	76	3.0	80	3.2	83	2.6	40
36 and above	3.2	64	3.2	75	3.3	77	3.2	71	3.2	74	3.2	73	2.8	32

- Graduates from teacher education⁴ programs tended to give more positive evaluations to *Resources* than graduates from non-teacher education programs did ($F = 5.60, p = 0.019 < 0.05$) (Table 2.5d).

Table 2.5d: *Composite Scores for Teacher Education and Non Teacher Education Respondents*

Programs	Resources	
	mean	N
Teacher Education	2.8	121
Non-Teacher Education	2.6	193

⁴ All masters and doctoral students from teacher education programs under the NCATE-review umbrella were coded as teacher education. These did not include students in education leadership, school counseling, and school psychology.

3. QUALITATIVE FINDINGS OF OPEN-ENDED RESPONSES

The analysis of the open-ended responses was guided by the coding scheme developed two years ago for the May 2005 Exit Survey study. The names of some subcategories have been modified to provide an accurate, up-to-date description of the current data (e.g., subcategory “Faculty disposition towards students” was renamed “Faculty-student relationship”).

This section of the report is organized in the following sequence: faculty, courses and curriculum, instruction, program organization, community and diversity, student support services, resources, internship, technology, politics, and general evaluation. Only subcategories, which have 25 (5% of 523 respondents) or more comments are included in this report. The subcategories for each main category are reported in a descending order of the number of comments they received. A higher number may indicate the relative importance of certain subcategories, given that graduates were asked to identify only two strengths and two weaknesses.

3.1. Faculty

The *Faculty* category comprises of comments related to faculty, instructors, professors, and teachers, except for those about faculty retention and tenure. It has four subcategories, listed in descending order of the number of comments received:

- *Faculty-student relationship*—comments about faculty’s relationship with, or disposition towards, students (113 comments; 22% of respondents).
- *Faculty general*—comments about faculty in a non-descript way (92 comments; 18% of respondents).
- *Faculty expertise*—comments about faculty knowledge, expertise, and scholarship (86 comments; 16% of respondents).

Faculty-student relationship received 113 comments (22% of respondents); 59 strength and 54 weakness comments; *Faculty general* had 92 comments (18% of respondents); 63 strength and 29 weakness comments; *Faculty expertise* had 86 comments (16% of respondents); 79 strength and 7 weakness comments.

Relationship with faculty was extremely important to students, as evidenced by the number of comments (113 or 22% of survey respondents) related to *Faculty-student relationship*, which had the highest number of comments in the *Faculty* category. Students appreciated faculty for being caring, accessible, understanding, supportive, and approachable; for faculty’s “personal involvement in the program;” for being “very involved/concerned with students not only on an academic level, but on a personal level as well.” Students admired and respected faculty for their scholarship, exceptional knowledge, and “amazing talents;” for bringing “their expertise, dedication, and most of all enthusiasm to their students;” for being “scholarly and professionally competent;” or for being “masters in their field.”

Students were disappointed when faculty were “unapproachable and condescending,” “intimidating” and “not very responsive to students;” when faculty “did not seem to care much about (students’) progress and development in the field;” or when faculty were “unqualified” and “inexcusably awful—disorganized, incompetent, never returned papers.”

Example of Strengths

I found that my professors were interested in me as a person and took great strides in helping me reach my educational and personal goals.

Faculty was very involved/concerned with students not only on an academic level, but on a personal level as well.

The faculty cares and gives you all it took to be successful.

Most of the professors are extremely dedicated and connect well with the students. They are able to foster a creative yet rigorous learning environment.

Some of the professors are always there during office hours and additional non teaching hours.

Professors ... had time to talk to me and cared about my experience.

The professors were approachable and helpful.

Examples of Weaknesses

I loved TC, but felt that the faculty and staff did not care much about students (with the exception of a few individuals).

I did not enjoy my experience b/c I didn't have a mentor or staff support within my program. I was expecting to develop closer relationships with my professors.

My experience at TC was rather unfavorable, particularly due to the uncaring personalities of a specific few people in my department who did not give me the support I needed as a student. I would not recommend this program to anyone.

The faculty is often seen as unapproachable and condescending about questions students may have outside of the classroom.

The faculty was not very approachable; they did not seem to care that much about our progress and development in the field. This notion was not true of every faculty member; however, it did reflect the overall sentiment of many of the masters students who graduated with me.

Some professors seemed more interested in their own personal development and what they know, instead of teaching and mentoring students.

3.2. Courses and Curriculum

The *Courses and Curriculum* category comprises of six subcategories, listed in descending order of the number of comments received:

- *Practical value*—refers to relevance and applicability of courses or curriculum to future work; includes comments about a balance between theory and practice (116 comments; 22% of respondents).
- *Academic value*—refers to depth, breadth, appropriateness, and currency of course content (115 comments; 22% of respondents).
- *Variety and availability of courses*—Variety and availability of courses to meet the needs of students to graduate in time (81 comments; 15% of respondents).
- *Academic rigor*—comments about academic rigor, standards, or expectations (43 comments; 8% of respondents).
- *Courses general*—comments about courses in a general way (39 comments; 7% of respondents).
- *Flexibility to pursue academic interests*— comments about program flexibility enabling students to choose courses of their interest, to plan their program of study, or to maintain full-time jobs (29 comments; 6% of respondents).

Practical value received 47 strength, and 69 weakness comments; *Academic value* received 50 strength and 65 weakness comments; *Variety and availability of courses* received 20 strength and 61 weakness comments; *Academic rigor* received 17 strength and 26 weakness comments; *Courses general* received 22 strength and 17 weakness comments; *Flexibility to pursue academic interests* received 24 strength and 5 weakness comments.

Practical value, Academic value, Academic rigor. These three characteristics of courses received more weakness than strength comments. Students appreciated courses which provided them with a strong theoretical foundation of the subject matter; courses which covered a broad range of content and topics, and dealt with in depth; courses which covered current research; courses which were “well woven together and the essential concepts and questions were clearly identified and agreed upon.” Equally important, students coveted courses which merged theory, application, and practice; courses which “prepared graduates for (the) professional world;” and courses which provided “hands-on and practical learning experiences.” Students wanted courses that were “rigorous” and challenged them intellectually.

Conversely, students were disappointed when courses had “too much abstract theory,” and were “research focused (and) disconnected with real world practices;” when course materials were “old,” “outdated and irrelevant,” when courses were so “repetitive” that “every required course had 50% overlap

of materials,” and students felt they were taking “the same class over and over again;” when courses were “too easy,” and had such a “serious lack of academic rigor” that students did not feel “adequately prepared for additional graduate study.” Many students cited as weakness the repetitiveness of courses in the textbooks used, the assignments given, and in the reading materials. Even students who “love philosophical/ethereal thinking and discussions” felt “a great need for a more practical focus (and) less theory.”

Variety and availability of courses. There were three times more weakness comments about variety and availability of courses than strengths. Most of the strength comments related to the variety and “diversity” of courses rather than their availability. However, students who had full-time day jobs appreciated classes being held in the evening hours. Weakness comments included not only that the variety of course offerings was “very limited,” “weak and uninteresting,” and course schedules unsuitable, but also the duration of class sessions. Some students felt 2-hour weekly classes were too short and suggested increasing them to 3-hour classes each week. Infrequent course offerings, especially of the core courses, posed problems for students. Master students, who planned to complete their program within a year, found it difficult to do so when required courses were offered once every two years. Part-time students were especially affected by classes being offered too early in the day, and not frequently enough. When course selection and schedule within programs are limited, students suggested that they be allowed to take more electives within, as well as, outside their programs. Tied to this was a suggestion that programs collaborate in such a way that obstacles of cross-registration of courses be removed.

Flexibility to Pursue Academic Interests. Comments in this subcategory were overwhelmingly positive. Respondents appreciated the ability to shape their course of study to meet academic and research needs through electives within and outside their program, to study in the summer and online, or to complete the program while working full-time.

Examples of Strengths

Curriculum is strong on theory and uses primary sources.

Flexibility and variety of the courses offered. Also the content was diverse, yet applicable to my work as a teacher.

The coursework was very challenging, which made good grades seem like a real achievement.

Philosophy of education is fascinating, presented in ways easily applicable to the real classroom.

The program tries to combine theory with practice.

Flexibility in allowing master students to take classes in other departments to ensure students take full advantage of school offerings.

Examples of Weaknesses

I wish that some of the courses were offered more frequently so that I didn't have to extend my time at TC past the 5 semesters that my program of study requires. Or even the ability to go off sequence in my program.

It was not as I expected. It was much easier and I did not have to put much work into my grades.

Too theoretical and research focused. Disconnected with real world practices. Outdated and irrelevant.

Theories were often extremely "progressive"—this is great for the purpose of deepening my knowledge, but it's often disconnected from the daily practical experiences in my career as a teacher.

A lot of "collaborative" projects didn't work as such. My long commute made it difficult to come to New York to work on a project. A lot of projects/papers felt like "busy work." I am an in-service teacher and I would have liked to use more of what I was learning in my classroom.

The level of the study is a mere repetition of some undergraduate classes—even worse, since it's not even thoughtfully designed.

I was exposed to interesting new ideas, but do not see quite where to go with those ideas practically.

Student should be given more lee-way regarding individual academic endeavors and the varied types of scholarship regarding therein. Sometimes I felt intellectually stifled at TC.

3.3. Instruction

The *Instruction* category comprises of comments related to how faculty organize and conduct their teaching. It has two subcategories which received more than 25 comments each. They are:

- *Teaching skills*—comments about faculty as teachers or refers to faculty teaching in general; it also includes comments about pedagogical methods or styles (52 comments; 10% of respondents).
- *Feedback and assessment*—comments about the quality and timeliness of feedback and quality of assessment practices (27 comments; 5% of respondents).

Teaching skills received 19 strength, and 33 weakness comments. Students appreciated professors who facilitated “thought provoking” dialogue that challenged students’ assumptions and thinking; professors who used a “student-centered teaching” style; professors who were “able to foster a creative yet rigorous learning environment;” professors who “taught in the way they hope (students) will teach.” Conversely, students were disappointed when professors “do not teach as they instruct (students) to teach,” such as employing “differentiated instruction and student-centered classrooms;” when professors “sadly (had) no teaching skills” and did not “inspire, encourage, or provide exciting new information;” when professors stuck to one teaching style and “did not try to teach the material through a variety of modalities,” such as “constantly (having students) work in groups and did absolutely no lecturing, modeling or demonstrating.” A student opined that the “teaching of many courses at TC is mediocre but flies under the radar because lenient grading promotes student forgiveness and because the course evaluation forms are poorly constructed.”

Feedback and assessment received 1 strength, and 26 weakness comments. Students reported not receiving timely and meaningful feedback. Some faculty “never returned papers.” Some doctoral candidates were delayed from graduating because their advisors “never returned (their) materials in a timely fashion,” and provided “very little guidance and feedback on (their) dissertation study.” When feedback was given, it sometimes took “months” after the assignment was turned in. Regarding assessments, students felt that “some of the grading seemed very subjective and unfair.” Methods of assessment were not varied, not always valid.

Examples of Strengths

Good teachers—professors who taught in the way they hope we'll teach.

Superior instructors with the highest caliber of teaching skills than any other department or institution. All class discussions were facilitated at an outstanding level.

Most of the professors are extremely dedicated and connect well with the students. They are able to foster a creative yet rigorous learning environment.

Some of my professors were fantastic. It wasn't just what they taught; it was the way they taught. They truly put into practice the art of teaching TC style.

I appreciated the emphasis on papers and other means of evaluation vs. use of exams. This was practical and useful.

Examples of Weaknesses

Some teachers seem to have absolutely no teaching experience.

Poor overall quality of teaching—I was disappointed—instructors did not inspire or encourage/provide exciting new information in my opinion.

Although I respect her highly, my program director is not a good teacher. She is an excellent researcher and has a wealth of knowledge and experience, but she is not adequate instructing in the classroom. She should only be a guest lecturer and should not have a class(es).

Poorly trained professors! Some believe since if one is a good researcher then one must be a better educator and that is not true.

While teaching styles were different from one professor to the next, each professor stuck to that teaching style and did not try to teach the material through a variety of modalities. One professor constantly had us work in groups and did absolutely no lecturing, modeling or demonstrating. Another professor always asked us to talk about the readings in small groups and then present our reflections to the class. A different professor constantly had us discussing the readings.

It is disheartening not to get feedback for class work, let alone NEVER seeing your assignments again once handed in. Professors also too conveniently turn the lessons over to students for individual research and presentations without putting any effort in grounding the class in their so called expertise. If we can research and teach each other, why do we come to TC with its exorbitant tuition rates? Most students agree amongst ourselves we pay for the name, not for the education, which is seriously lacking.

My supervisor did not give me feedback until the end of the semester. Therefore, I was not able to improve on my classroom methods throughout my semester, but had to wait until the next—or until I am/will be in my own classroom—this is the antithesis of what we are taught at TC.

Some of the grading seemed very subjective and unfair.

3.4. Program Organization

The *Program Organization* category comprises of comments related to students' perceptions of their program. It has four subcategories which received more than 25 comments each. They are:

- *Design and requirements*—comments about overall program structure, including cohort design, sequence of courses, and program requirements (201 comments; 38% of respondents).
- *Instructor-student ratio*—comments about faculty workload and assignments, faculty-student ratio, class size, retention and tenure policies. (36 comments; 7% of respondents).
- *Philosophy and focus*—comments about program philosophy, focus, or emphasis (69 comments; 13% of respondents).
- *Consistency or hypocrisy*—comments about the connection between the stated philosophy/commitments and actual practice; and includes misinformation on the web or college documents, such as the catalog (27 comments; 5% of respondents).

Design and requirements received 66 strength and 135 weakness comments. Students appreciated well-organized courses and programs; flexible curriculum and requirements; scheduling that allowed them to take classes while working full-time; the cohort system which provided a support system for students; an inter-disciplinary program; the flexibility to take classes outside their program; their program incorporating the advantages of being in the city into their studies; having clear expectations for degree requirements.

Students were disappointed when degree requirements were not communicated clearly to them on the web-site or in program materials; when the programs were unstructured and disorganized; when they had to switch advisors two or more times; when there was not a consistent and reliable source with whom they could air concerns; when program requirements changed but there was little support for students in the former program to adjust; when programs were discontinued and many students were "inconvenienced;" when programs were "poorly run;" when they were not informed of changes and developments taking place within their programs. Students felt that courses and curriculum should be "more standardized from year to year," and that information about requirements should be communicated to students early in the term or year.

Philosophy and focus received 46 strength and 23 weakness comments. Students appreciated when their program had a clear focus, philosophy of education, and identity; when the program focused on diversity, experiential learning, collaboration, self-reflection, research, multiculturalism, social justice and taking the initiative; when the program took a progressive view towards education. Conversely, students were disappointed when the program was poorly defined, lacked focus, and had "no sense of overall mission;" when faculty were "militant in their ideology and as a result turned (students) off and made (them) feel incompetent and angry;" when there was an over-emphasis on either a qualitative or quantitative research approach; when there was "too much multi-cultural" emphasis; when the program

was “narrow minded” and “other points of views (different) from the professors’ are not encouraged or even tolerated.”

Instructor-student ratio received 5 strength and 31 weakness comments. Students appreciated small classes. Large classes made it “difficult to develop relationship and rapport with faculty and students.” Large classes adversely affected the type of assignments students were given, as well as the type of feedback they received. Some observed that programs accepted “too many students” and yet did not have “enough qualified and experienced faculty to handle the students,” which led students to “literally fight to get into classes with experienced professors.”

Consistency or hypocrisy received 1 strength and 26 weakness comments. There were two types of inconsistency that were extracted from students’ comments. The first is with regards to faculty not modeling the kind of teaching they instructed their students about. The other has to do with inaccurate or misleading information published in the catalog or posted on the web, for example, information about courses being listed as program degree requirements but not offered by the program; or of programs marketing themselves as “programs for researchers, practitioners, and policy makers equally” when in reality, the faculty “highly prioritize the training of researchers at the detriment of educational practitioners.” Students noted that there were courses which were not what they were described to be, especially the new ones.

Examples of Strengths

I am in a cohort program, and my cohort was one of the greatest parts of my experience. We became a fantastic team. We helped each other study, and took classes together. It was great.

I also appreciated the progressive view toward education.

The small size of each cohort also facilitates community and collaboration among students.

Examples of Weaknesses

Oversubscribed classes—the program accepts too many students and do not have enough qualified and experienced faculty to handle the students. Classes go up to more than 40 in size, and this is impossible to promote effective class discussion. Students literally have to fight to get into classes with experienced professors.

Current faculty highly prioritize the training of researchers at the detriment of educational practitioners. Yet, the program markets itself as a program for researchers, practitioners, and policy makers equally. While the inclusion of research was important to me, my classmates and I were devalued due to our career interests.

False advertising of courses—courses that have not been taught and will not be offered are included in the catalogue. This is very disappointing and an utter disgrace for TC to advertise falsely the courses that they do not offer.

Many texts were great; however, faculty was sometimes lax. It's important for professors to grade papers on time and provide adequate opportunities for students to show knowledge. When faculty is teaching future teachers they need to model good teaching themselves!

TC is a school of education—but it does not practice what it preaches in the classroom. Professors who have only done research should be required to take a teaching course before they teach!

Despite their philosophy, diverse opinions were not welcomed. When students expressed concerns about teaching that were not in line with the very theoretical approaches emphasized in the class, the professors seemed irritated and were quick to challenge that view rather than allowing an open and comfortable forum for discussing it.

Not enough courses offered per semester related to the department and concentration and course offerings were not given early enough, especially for the first semester. When I first arrived at TC, I was very overwhelmed and when it was time to register, I did not find any courses offered in my concentration and the others that I were interested in taking were all full because they had limited capacity. Poorly prepared for new students.

I think that the department in general and specifically my program was poorly run.

3.5. Community and Diversity

The *Community and Diversity* category has three subcategories which received more than 25 comments each:

- *Sense of community*—comments about relationships among students, between students and faculty that build camaraderie, collegiality, and collaboration (104 comments; 20% of respondents).
- *Student qualities*—comments about the academic, professional, and personal qualities of students (64 comments; 12% of respondents).
- *Diversity of students*—refers to representation of students of multiple ethnic and/or cultural backgrounds (34 comments; 7% of respondents).

Sense of community received 50 strength and 54 weakness comments. The cohort system was credited by many students of fostering “strong personal and professional bonds,” and was “one of the greatest strengths of (their) programs.” Being in a cohort program was “one of the greatest parts of (their) experience.” They took classes together, helped and supported each other in their studies. Programs that stressed “the importance of learning” tended to create a “less competitive, more meaningful environment.” Students who either had the opportunity to collaborate with faculty, or experienced faculty who helped them achieve their goals, tended also to feel more connected to the TC community. Several students, disappointed with their programs of study, pointed out that meeting “a great group of peers” and developing “life-long friendships” made their experience at TC enjoyable.

On the other hand, it was particularly difficult for part-time, commuting, older, “more experienced” students to enjoy a sense of community at TC. These students felt “isolated” and “very removed” from TC. One student remarked that he/she felt “like a lost number,” no matter how many times he/she tried to build a connection with faculty and other students. Some students attributed the absence of a sense of community to the fact that there was a “very large” number of students in their department, and suggested creating a common meeting ground or area to help foster a sense of community at TC.

Student qualities received 48 strength and 16 weakness comments. Three times as many students described their peers as “wonderfully intelligent, passionate,” “amazingly bright, curious and concerned with subject matter,” “committed,” “motivated,” and having “significant experience in the field.” On the other hand, students in the other camp felt that admission was not selective enough. They observed that many of their classmates were “not of high intellectual caliber;” that they were “woefully unprepared for graduate school and clearly lacked strong academic backgrounds;” that they were “inexperienced, immature, and lacking in critical thinking ability.” Classmates who had no work experience were not able to bring an “insight into the classroom which hinders learning.”

Diversity of students received 21 strength and 13 weakness comments. Students appreciated having peers who were from a “variety of backgrounds, educational levels, and experience” and who could enrich the student experience at TC. Students felt that the high cost of education at TC, accompanied by the paucity of financial aid, was a possible explanation for the lack of diversity of students.

Examples of Strengths

I have made several life-long friendships with individuals who were not in my program and with those that were.

I enjoyed my experience at TC because of friends but the program was different from what I expected academically and socially.

Wonderful community! TC has all the human qualities Columbia in general lacks.

Stresses the importance of learning, which creates a less competitive, more meaningful environment.

The small size of each cohort also facilitates community and collaboration among students.

The students were amazingly bright, curious and concerned with the subject matter.

The students—variety of backgrounds, educational levels, and experience can offer a rich experience.

Examples of Weaknesses

I just feel like a lost number. There is no sense of community, no connection with faculty or other students, despite my attempts to try. This is unfortunate. I know others share my thoughts on this, whether they bother to fill this survey out or not.

The environment was more competitive than collaborative among my peers which was encouraged by my department to some degree...

There were way too many students in my program which makes it very difficult to develop connections w/ professors! In my opinion, graduate programs should be small; professors should know something about who you are (at the very least, they should know your name) which was rarely the case in my enormous ... program. Sometimes we barely fit in a classroom and students were sitting on the floor! That is definitely not fair, especially with all the money we pay to be TC students! I think we deserved better!

Please continue to work on building the student community. Evening living on campus, I found it very difficult to get to know people.

It was very isolating, TC lacked the spirit and social networking opportunities that other schools at Columbia had like the Business School and even at SIPA.

Although TC is a great learning environment, students should be encouraged to network with each other. Many students are cold, distant and too competitive with the TC environment.

Abysmal intellectual quality of student body. I don't understand how so many low-caliber students were accepted into an Ivy League program. I'd recommend more rigorous admission standards for sure.

Lower fees and the amount of money per credit we have to pay! Education is already very expensive, and TC students are usually those who come from affluent backgrounds. This is unfair and unacceptable.

3.6. College Support and Services

The *College Support and Services* has three subcategories which received more than 25 comments each:

- *Advisement and guidance*—comments about the availability and quality of advising as provided by faculty, program, or College (95 comments; 18% of respondents).
- *Administrative offices*—comments about the availability and quality of administrative student services provided by TC offices, e.g., Registrar's, ODS, Financial Aid (67 comments; 13% of respondents).
- *Career and employment*—comments about the availability and quality of career counseling and job/employment search assistance (31 comments; 6% of respondents).

Advisement and guidance received 9 strength and 86 weakness comments. Students appreciated receiving “terrific” advising from faculty that “helped (them) to develop intellectually in a way that would not have happened without faculty advising.” Students appreciated the support of faculty “to complete their degree on time and (being) their mentors.” However, many more students reported not having anyone to advise or guide them at TC. Students reported feeling “forced to figure out on (their) own” the many questions they had. When students did receive advisement, the information was inaccurate, unclear, unhelpful, or inadequate. Different advisors would inform students about different requirements within the same program. Some Masters students reported that they were assigned doctoral students, who “were not well prepared to advise,” as advisors. Advisors were impersonal and unresponsive in the way they interacted with students. Students also received incompetent guidance from staff outside their programs. Students recognized that faculty were often overwhelmed by the number of advisees they had. Poor advisement and guidance caused many students to postpone graduation by a term to several years, incurring extra costs to stay at TC longer than they had planned to and budgeted for as well as stress and frustration.

Administrative offices received 6 strength and 61 weakness comments. Students appreciated administrative offices remaining open after 5pm. Special mention was made of a number of personnel who were “exceptionally helpful and truly cared about students” (Gary Ardan, and Rocky Schwarz in Duplicating, and program secretaries in some programs). But the vast majority of students who commented about their experiences with the administration and bureaucracy of TC did not have positive things to say. Many students described their encounters with most administrative office personnel as “abominable,” “unpleasant,” “rude,” “atrocious,” “absolutely deplorable,” and “terrible in every sense.” Administrative staff was often “unhelpful,” “unmotivated,” “condescending,” “unresponsive,” and “dismissive.” Even students who had an “overall positive experience at TC” reported that the experience was “overshadowed” by the bureaucracy and “awful interactions” with various administrative offices. Some students suggested training staff in positive customer service practices.

Career and employment received 3 strength and 28 weakness comments. A few students appreciated obtaining help in finding employment, and for the recruiting opportunities which led to good job placements. Most students, however, reported not having enough help with career and job search support. A student reported that “no one was willing to help guide (his/her) friends or (him/her) in finding an internship for (their) masters’ project.” His/her advisor, when asked, did not recommend taking advantage of the career center. This particular graduate commented that although he/she had graduated seven months ago, he/she was still unemployed.

Examples of Strengths

The faculty advising is terrific and has helped me develop intellectually in a way that would not have happened without faculty advising.

The support of the faculty for students to complete their degree on time and be mentors.

Certain people were exceptionally helpful and truly cared about students—Gary Ardan, Rocky Schwarz in Duplicating, program secretaries in the Counseling and Clinical Program.

Examples of Weaknesses

ABSOLUTELY ZERO assistance and resources in the post-graduation job search.

My advisor had relationships with hundreds of school principals yet refused to help me when it was time to look for a job!

EVERY semester for three years I had a problem with my loan. I had to jump through hoops to get the money owed to me. Due to this, my rent has been late at least two times per year and I have amassed finance charges in credit cards that would otherwise have been paid off on time.

I think that TC needs some major renovation and re-branding. Additionally, many of the offices at TC are not helpful, uninformed, dismissive, and unpleasant to communicate with.

Student services (financial aid, student accounts, registrar's office) are absolutely deplorable. There is no way that a top notch school should have this level of ridiculous lack of coordination and absurd procedures that waste student's money, time, and mental energy. The online registration and student account system needs to be trashed and overhauled. Every semester was infuriating, and I know I'm not in the least bit alone in believing this. What is more frustrating is that it seems that the different student services departments have no clue how the students feel about the level of incompetence. They do not offer student support; they just create ludicrous challenges for students.

I seriously recommend TC administer another kind of survey on registrar people (plus transcription office people). They are sooo unmotivated; at least the impression they're making is that they are so trying to NOT do what they are paid for. ... I have a lot more to say about their service but there's 2000 word limit so I should stop here. But please do have another survey about registrar's office service.

My overall experience at TC was good; however, I would have liked to see more involvement from my academic advisor in that specific role. I had very little guidance throughout my masters program and would have liked to have had his professional guidance in my classes and internship.

I would have liked somebody to clearly explain what the requirements for my degree were and helped me plan a timeline to follow.

Advising was really, really poor and scattered. Advisors are stretched way too thin, communication is poor between them, and it's embarrassingly obvious. No one seems to be able to make a decision, or to know what certain requirements are, and you are sent on a wild goose chase from one place to the next. TC is too expensive and our time is too precious for this. Please, please get it together!

My academic advisor was difficult to contact/see for an appointment. Thus, it took quite some time to determine my exact requirements for degree fulfillment since I had transferred credits from another institution.

No coordinated advisement system—I didn't even know September was time to apply for jobs for the following year until I was here for 3 years!

Not one faculty member informed the students in our program about the national certification exam that we could/should complete. Also, no one was willing to help guide my friends or myself in finding an internship for our masters' project. When I asked my advisor if I should take advantage of the career center he did not recommend it. I received my degree from TC 7 months ago and I am still unemployed.

I got mixed messages on elective requirements, which cost me considerable money as I had to add an additional 2 credits at the end of my program.

One fundamental thing that is lacking is TC students really need wise people—as advisors, as professors, etc.—who are experts in their field, can have an opinion and impart honest, sage advice, and this rarely happens. I don't want someone to hold my hand and help me with every single decision. I just want someone who is available, who cares and knows me, and is knowledgeable when I need it.

Had a horrible time w/my original academic adviser, who had very little information on what requirements were & was not very keen to follow up on any questions or dilemmas I had, had a much better time once I changed advisers, but just wish only those professors who are genuinely interested in advising students were allowed to do so.

I loved my learning experience at TC but I am disappointed that no one cares to direct you when you are leaving the school. TC has an incredible reputation, but I think the next time around, I would rather save my money, and go to a school that can help prepare me to find a job.

3.7. Resources

The *Resources* category has two subcategories which received more than 25 comments each:

- *Financial aid*—comments about availability of financial aid to students and cost of studies at TC (77 comments; 15% of respondents)
- *Facilities and space*—comments about overall quality and availability of space including classrooms and specialized facilities (46 comments; 9% of respondents)

Financial aid received 2 strength and 75 weakness comments. The inadequacy of financial aid led some students to question their decision to enroll at TC if they could start over. Many had accumulated enormous debts to complete their education at TC. Students who would be entering “low-paying” fields felt that it was TC’s responsibility to work on financial aid issues so that society could have “smart people” in the “helping” professions.

Facilities and space received 3 strength and 43 weakness comments. Students felt the condition of classrooms did not reflect the prestige of the institution. Many comments were related to the physical facilities being in great need of repair. Students reported of classrooms reeking of an “unbearable smell” from water damage which caused them to be sick on the first night of classes. Others were cramped in classrooms too small for the large number of students registered; some students had to sit on the floor. Students observed that the comfort and cleanliness of many classrooms were so poor that it adversely affected their “concentration/learning levels.”

Examples of Strengths

I greatly appreciate the contribution TC made to my FLAS fellowship.

Scholarship money was appreciated first 2 summers.

Great resources (technology, classrooms ...).

The school was always so clean, the security guards were funny and helpful, the facilities were amazing and the buildings were quite conducive for learning.

Examples of Weaknesses

I am still terribly burdened by the fact that there is such limited funding. I am now 29, and over \$100,000 in debt—purely due to this LONG program. It is unbelievable that the No.1 Education institution in the entire country has nothing to offer the students.

More scholarships would create a more interesting and actually diverse student body. I have never been around so many over privileged under experienced and not thoughtful white women in my life. This seriously hurts the profession. Yet, the professors respond to this by acting defensively and alienating these women.

It is a struggle every semester to figure out how to pay for tuition.

Some of the facilities and some of the classes really made me question the cost of tuition, especially since the majority of people attending TC are educators. At roughly \$2900 per class, and over forty students in many of the classes, financial equity and justice is not extended to the TC student body.

Too expensive. Predatory loans offered through Financial Aids (CITI ASSIST).

Overpriced tuition. Not sure I would have done this knowing what I know now.

I'm not sure students should have to take on such high levels of debt to become teachers.

Not enough financial aid—I am a U.S. citizen who works overseas. Previous salary was \$4000. I had to take \$60K to cover costs.

TC is not affordable to many students.

Very little financial aid including no teaching assistantships which makes it difficult to now apply for academic jobs. Of my cohort, less than half got their Ph.D.s, others dropped out for lack of support and direction.

I found classrooms run down and did not reflect the prestige of the institution.

The physical appearance/comfort/cleanliness/temperature of many classrooms should be improved and renovated! Some classrooms were unbearable (i.e., bad acoustics, no technology, dusty/garbage on floor, uncomfortable seats/tables, etc.). This is not beneficial for students' concentration/learning levels.

The classroom facilities are HORRIBLE!!! They are not ergonomic and do not reflect accommodations conducive for dynamic learning. Get new chairs, tables, fix the heat/cooling system. The school should look like Columbia Business School, not an 1860's schoolhouse.

In terms of facilities, leadership should stand back and look at the school. Walk down hallways and see how the school looks to outsiders. I understand that there are financial constraints, but there is a level of trashiness that is allowed that could be fixed. There should not be handwritten notes taped to the walls, in the bathrooms, etc. There should be a consistent image (a better image) that creates pride in the school.

The labs that we had access to were worse than most of the labs in public schools that we worked with. It was hard to figure out where our tuition dollars went since they clearly didn't go to facilities.

3.8. Internship

The *Internship* category has no subcategories and encompasses all comments related to internship, student teaching, practica, and field experiences. It received 89 comments (17% of respondents)—50 strengths and 39 weaknesses. Students appreciated the internship for being an

“intense learning experience.” It provided students “numerous opportunities to put theory into practice.” To many, it provided “the best training and feedback.”

Weaknesses about internship included the changing of internship requirements every year, the absence of internship opportunities, the lack of supervision for students who took internship out of state, and students having to find their own internship.

Examples of Strengths

The most worthwhile part was student teaching.

The internship was serious! I was able to spend solid time watching, learning, and doing principalship. There are several things I have experienced that many of my aspiring admin friends have not!

Practicum and field work experiences as well as supervision was exceptional. It was a great learning experience and very applicable to job.

The practicum allowed for creativity on the students part as well as professional skills development.

The strong relationship between what I did in the classroom and what I learned during my course work as well as the many opportunities to receive feedback through direct observation by my professors during my internship.

Examples of Weaknesses

No internship program/training for the "real world."

I had two supervisors that provided very little support and feedback. To provide more specific information on how to succeed in our practicum because the midterm grades were not always accurately based on our academic performance.

No required internship, and there's no guidance but the list of places where to get one if I want an internship--but the list is not very helpful since it's what everybody knows (e.g., get an internship at craigslist.org).

3.9. Technology

The *Technology* category has no subcategories and encompasses all comments related to technology. It received 25 comments (5% of respondents)—1 strength, and 24 weaknesses. Many students who commented on technology felt it was inadequate and needed to be updated. One student remarked that technological devices were available, but no one could explain them to students. Use of technology was also lacking in the instruction of classes. Students would like current software used by professionals in the field to be made available in the computer labs.

Examples of Strengths

Technological devices are available for students. But no one can explain them.

Examples of Weaknesses

My experience at TC could have been better if there had been better technology in every class (i.e., availability of Power Point).

While I received a good education here at TC, I was very disappointed with my experience at TC as an educational institution. The facilities, classrooms, and technology are inadequate.

Lack of technology in the classroom; lack of technology in instruction.

It was disappointing that the program had no coursework involving or using learning technology. In fact, faculty did not use technology to communicate or accept assignments.

There needs to be better integration of current technology in the field, especially software used by professionals should be made available in the computer labs (HM & Macy).

The program also teaches relatively little (with the exception of one math course) about how to use technology: Note that competing programs to TC's, like NYU's program, specifically teach

future teachers how to use programs like Geometer's Sketchpad, etc. that are changing the landscape of math teaching.

3.10. Politics

The *Politics* category comprises of two loosely-related subcategories which received 25 or more comments each:

- *Inter-program and school collaboration*—comments about collaboration and communication between programs and departments at TC, and between TC and other schools at Columbia and inter/nationally (31 comments; 6% of respondents)
- *TC/Columbia reputation*—comments related to the prestige or reputation of TC or Columbia University; it also includes comments about TC education not being up to par with its reputation (25 comments; 5% of respondents)

Inter-program and school collaboration received 5 strength and 26 weakness comments. Students appreciated having access to courses outside their programs, both within and outside TC in the greater Columbia University campus system. Students were disappointed when there was miscommunication and lack of clarity about degree requirements between schools. Lack of collaboration between schools and departments created many obstacles for students wishing to take courses outside their programs. Students emphasized that if their program required them to take a class outside their home department, then they should not be “closed out” by the other department.

TC/Columbia reputation received 11 strength and 13 weakness comments. Students acknowledged that the name and reputation of the college, and its affiliation to Columbia University, was a strength to help them find jobs. On the other hand, a number of students felt that TC “needs to be integrated into the Columbia community instead of just using its name.” There were also students who were disappointed and reported that it was an “utter disgrace for TC to advertise falsely the courses that they do not offer.” Students reported having “mixed feelings” about paying for the Columbia University degree but not obtaining a quality education. Although students agreed it had an “impressive name” and “an “impressive array of course offerings,” many were “extremely unimpressed” with the education they received and felt no more qualified now than when they entered TC because academic rigor was “severely lacking.” One student concluded that there was a lot to be desired about a TC education; if it were not for its name association to Columbia, “TC could just be another community college.”

Examples of Strengths

Flexibility to take up courses with other departments and plan my schedule.

Access to courses at Columbia proper, SIPA, Public Health.

Access to courses in other TC programs.

Ivy league reputation.

The name "Teachers College" was a strength. That is what I paid for.

My affiliation with the school helped me to get a new job in the area.

The affiliation with Columbia University.

Examples of Weaknesses

There's no communication between the departments. For example, my program requires a course in (another) education, but (the other program) don't always offer courses we can take. Some people almost got stuck and that's the school's fault.

TC is a bit disorganized. Processes and procedures need to be more streamlined. Better communication between departments and service offices.

TC overall had many good qualities/programs but access to those programs was limited and difficult. I wish that organization had been better to save some stress on the students.

I would have liked a stronger connection to Columbia University. It would have been nice to be able to utilize their resources.

My experience was overwhelmingly positive and personally and academically enriching. I did, however, note and feel our isolation from the broader University and wondered what that was a reflection of.

(TC) could benefit from a more fluid relationship with CU so that career changers could enroll in the necessary content courses to support the graduate content work.

I have mixed feelings. I guess I paid for the Columbia University degree instead of the experience. It would have been nice to have had a quality experience, though. But I guess you can't have it all.

TC has an incredible reputation, but I think the next time around, I would rather save my money, and go to a school that can help prepare me to find a job.

TC needs to be more integrated into the Columbia community instead of just using its name.

3.11. General Evaluation

The *General Evaluation* category comprises of two subcategories which received 25 or more comments each:

- Overall satisfaction—comments about students' overall evaluation of their program of study and/or educational experiences at TC (159 comments; 30% of 523 respondents).
- Overall preparation—comments about the overall quality of academic or professional preparation; student's expression or sense of being well-prepared (53 comments; 10% of 523 respondents).

Overall satisfaction received a total of 159 comments (30% of 523 respondents); 111 strength, 32 weakness, and 19 “mixed feelings” comments. The majority of students were satisfied with their experience at TC. Noteworthy is how extreme students’ overall evaluation of their experience at TC was in some cases. While some enjoyed their experience so much that they did not want to leave, others regretted the time and money they spent at TC. While some felt they had grown both academically and as a “human being,” others were “utterly devastated.” A great number of students qualified their positive evaluation by pointing out that the cost of education was exceedingly high, and they wished more financial aid was available.

Student perception of how well TC had prepared them for the professional world was similarly extreme. Overall preparation received 55 comments (11% of 523 respondents); 34 strength, 19 weakness, and 2 ambivalent comments. While some students felt they learned a lot, others felt their programs did not prepare them for “entry-level masters positions in research or practice.” There were yet others whose classmates were “turned off” from the teaching profession as a result of their experience at TC.

Examples of Strengths

This was a thoroughly incredible experience for me and I will be grateful for the opportunity for the rest of my life. My peers and my teachers taught me in remarkable ways.

It was an invaluable experience. I have made several life-long friendships with individuals who were not in my program and with those that were.

It has been a learning experience not only in the academic field, but also as a human being.

It was wonderful! I'm actually glad that I am working towards a second masters degree because I don't want to leave yet.

It was incredibly stimulating and life impacting—I did not want it to end.

I enjoyed my experience at TC because of friends but the program was different from what I expected academically and socially.

I really enjoyed all my courses and my experience at TC. All of my professors were great. Attending TC was a worthwhile experience I would recommend to others.

My experience was overwhelmingly positive and personally and academically enriching. I did, however, note and feel our isolation from the broader University and wondered what that was a reflection of. Also, other programs are overshadowed by a huge focus on the teaching programs

at TC. TC is a rich academic environment offering much more than programs for teachers. I wish this was reflected more visibly. (That being said, I do realize that teaching programs are extremely important!)

I believe I acquired a very well-rounded education from TC which will help me in the future teaching or give advice teaching techniques to friends and family who teach similar or related subjects/courses.

My experience at TC was very beneficial to me. Not only in regards to obtaining my degree but also in the exposure to the academic areas of which I am concerned. The program and professors gave me many insights, which I am still applying in my professional career.

In all I have been absolutely thrilled during my matriculation at TC. I have learned so very, very, very much and the time/money has been well spent.

Examples of Weaknesses

It was incredibly frustrating to pay that much money and get so little out of the experience.

I regret choosing to attend Teacher's College. I don't believe that the (name of) program accurately advertised their principles to students. The program is very research based and does not directly lead to a general classroom degree as I and many others were led to believe.

I was utterly devastated by my experience in (name of program), and have heard professionals within and outside the Teachers College community echo my bitter sentiments of strong theory and passion resulting not in the formation of 'outstanding' teachers, but teachers that merely meet standards. Anything above or below such 'standards,' (in other words, "exceptional teachers"), was met with smiling hostility and subtle discrimination that most certainly revealed the insecurities, weaknesses, and disorder of the direction of the program, as it also encouraged learners not to 'stand out' in ANY way, be it in a positive or negative. I believed TC was a place to learn and grow, and to receive guidance and support in these reflective endeavors in order to foster exceptional educators. This belief is gone from me now in regards to my program—not TC in general; they are looking for standard teachers, rather than for teachers who are exceptional in any way.

Everything else! Horrible program, and I REGRET the time and money I spent at TC. 1. No academic advisors; 2. No one who knew program requirements; 3. Switched program mid-way through—What am I supposed to do? 4. Courses that were a WASTE of time. 5. Mean program director.

For the most part I did not enjoy my time on campus—no intellectual community. Felt like a commuter school. Don't feel my program prepared me for the academic job market. If I had to do it again, I would choose a different graduate school and not be \$40,000 in debt today.

Very disappointing—expected more rigor in content delivery, and work. But mostly, just got overloaded with reading materials and not enough critical thinking and discussion. Doesn't feel I learned any new skills—just information that I can read on Wikipedia.

I feel like I spent a lot of money and that I haven't gotten the education I thought I would get with my 40 thousand dollars (that's not even counting the opportunity cost of 2 years without a job). I was disappointed by my program's lack of organization and practicality within courses. The program emphasized a lot of practical experiences, but did not try to MODEL how to teach, handle classroom behavior, prepare for parent-teacher conferences ...

Overall, I would not recommend this program to others interested in education. I enjoyed the learning aspect, however dealing w/ TC staff and my department was often difficult—especially for someone working a full-time and going to school.

Disappointed in community college feel of TC. Minus the "we're #1 accolade," it's a place that takes money however it can get it and spends it GOD knows how.

I did not enjoy my experience at TC and would not recommend it for other teachers/friends. I'm sure many of my classmates feel the same way, but don't want to bother with (the) survey.

The (name of) program was beyond terrible. How it is the No. 1 program in the country is baffling! Wide sweeping changes need to be made, starting from the top. I have told all I know to NEVER go to TC.

Impressive name, impressive array of course offerings. Teacher preparation is a joke—I feel no more qualified now than when I entered. Academic rigor is severely lacking: There is a "TC Education" way that is fuzzy, stifling, and exclusive.

In general the quality of TC classes was poor. I enjoyed my electives at Social Work, SIPA and Columbia proper much more. For the money, I expected rigorous training and to exit the program with a level of knowledge and qualification (which) I just don't have.

I think that TC has a great reputation because they accept outstanding students and these dedicated students choose TC. However, I do not think that the (name of) program, offers students anything and in fact, turned off a number of students to the teaching profession.

Mixed

It taught me a lot, yet I would not do another graduate program there (at TC).

It was fine, not great, not terrible. Too expensive for an OK experience. I learned a lot, but I could have read all the assigned readings and never attended class, and learned just as much. The way in which most, not all, classes in my program were taught left little to be gained by being in attendance.

Good experience. I learned a lot, but felt little connection or feedback from faculty.

Overall, it was a good experience, but my program was run so poorly I wouldn't recommend it to others. I received my diploma late because my advisor forgot to turn in my paperwork, and I've spent FIVE MONTHS trying to get a letter of eligibility from the certification office so I can get a professional license in another state.

I have had a positive experience at TC—however improvement can be made with the non-teaching staff who are usually rude, uniformed, and generally act like you are bothering them. Train staff in positive customer service practices.

It was very intense, and I enjoyed it overall. However, now I am burdened by tremendous debt (for one year of study!), which will take years to pay off. It's depressing.

I had an overall positive experience at TC, but there were a lot of red tapes and problems in the department and in TC administration. Almost every year you can expect something going wrong, e.g., financial aid not processed even though I submitted months ago, delay in getting my diploma.

I loved my learning experience at TC but I am disappointed that no one cares to direct you when you are leaving the school. TC has an incredible reputation, but I think the next time around, I would rather save my money, and go to a school that can help prepare me to find a job.

SUMMARY OF QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE FINDINGS

The May 2007 Exit Survey received completed questionnaires from 523 graduating students (30% response rate). Of the total number of respondents, 447 provided responses to at least one of the four open-ended questions. The following are *some of the highlights* inferred from students' quantitative and qualitative responses.

Areas of Strengths

The three top strengths which garnered over 90% of agreement from respondents were: the scholarly and professional competence of TC faculty, faculty's openness to discuss different scholarly points of view, and a free-of-discrimination environment.

Over 80% of respondents positively evaluated the quality of instruction in their programs. They agreed that faculty used appropriate class activities and assignments, which helped students learn, facilitated reflection and critical thinking, and encouraged teamwork and collaboration. Faculty treated all students fairly and with respect, and used unbiased methods of evaluating student performance.

Courses, which provided a solid theoretical background, were also a strength of academic programs. Internship was a major strength in those programs that required internship, practicum, or student teaching. Over 80% of respondents agreed that the internship experience contributed to their academic development, that the internship site was conducive to their learning and professional development, that they got to apply what they learned in their courses to real-life situations, and that they got to practice a variety of professional skills during the internship.

Over 80% of respondents found TC and their academic programs to be an intellectually stimulating place where fellow students demonstrated high academic abilities and support for each other. Students from diverse backgrounds and with different experiences were encouraged to participate in class.

Areas for Improvement

Financial aid and classroom facilities topped the list of areas in need of improvement—they were found inadequate by 65% and 51% of respondents, respectively.

Over 40% of students reported that their programs did not monitor their progress toward the degree and did not regularly assess their professional knowledge and skills. These findings may be linked to poor academic advising and confusing program and degree requirements. Respondents also felt that their programs were not responsive to student input regarding curriculum and program improvement.

More than 37% of respondents believed that course offerings were limited, that required courses were often repetitive, and that students did not have enough flexibility to choose courses based on their academic interests.

Three out of four statements related to technology were identified as areas for improvement. Over 40% of respondents did not have adequate opportunities to learn about relevant technologies in their classes or to use technology during their internships. Faculty did not use technology in their courses (note that this third point was relatively not important to students).

Last but not least, 42% of respondents did not find student support services and staff responsive to their needs.

Program Philosophy and Organization

More than 70% of respondents agreed that their academic programs had clear philosophies. Comments related to program philosophy were twice more likely to be strengths than weaknesses. Students appreciated their programs having a clear focus, philosophy of education, and identity. They saw emphases on diversity, experiential learning, collaboration, self-reflection, research, multiculturalism and social justice as program strengths.

Most respondents found program requirements clear (80%) and relevant to the anticipated work in the field (76%).

On the other hand, almost a third of respondents felt their programs did not provide a well-integrated set of courses, and almost 40% found the required courses repetitive. Many students

perceived their programs to be unstructured, disorganized, and “poorly-run.” Respondents felt program courses and curriculum should be “more standardized from year to year,” and that information about requirements should be available early in the semester.

Only half of the respondents agreed that their programs monitored their progress toward the completion of their degrees; and 57% agreed that the programs regularly assessed student professional knowledge and skills.

Curriculum and Course Offerings

More than three-fourths of the respondents agreed that TC courses provided them with a solid theoretical background in their chosen disciplines. Almost 80% agreed that courses were academically rigorous and that course content was applicable to the anticipated work in the field. Students appreciated courses that challenged them intellectually, merged theory and practice, and “prepared graduates for the professional world.”

Fewer respondents were satisfied with the variety of course offerings (63%) and the flexibility to choose courses they were interested in (56%). Comments related to course variety and availability were three times more likely to be among program weaknesses than strengths. According to these comments the variety of course offerings was “very limited,” and course schedules were difficult to work with. Masters students who planned to complete their programs within a year, found it difficult to do so when required courses were offered once every two years. When course selection and schedule were limited, students suggested that they be allowed to take more electives within as well as outside their programs.

Program Faculty and Instruction

Almost 90% of respondents agreed that program faculty were scholarly and professionally competent. In the open-ended comments, students admired faculty for their scholarship, exceptional knowledge, and for bringing “their expertise, dedication, and most of all, enthusiasm to their students.” Faculty were accessible to students outside the classroom (74%) and cared about the professional welfare and development of students (75%). Respondents appreciated faculty for being caring, understanding, supportive, and “very involved with students not only on an academic level, but on a personal level as well.”

About 75% of respondents found faculty’s teaching styles to have met student learning needs. Faculty used appropriate class activities and assignments to help students learn (80%). Class activities and assignments encouraged reflection and critical thinking (89%), teamwork and collaboration (86%), and allowed for the practice of research skills (72%). Faculty gave students helpful (72%) and timely (79%) feedback on assignments, used a variety of assessments (79%), and were fair and unbiased (86%) in evaluating student performance. On the other hand, a number of students identified specific weaknesses in program instruction. They were disappointed when faculty “do not teach as they instruct students to teach,” do not employ “differentiated instruction and student-centered classrooms,” and “do not inspire, encourage, or provide exciting new information.”

Community and Diversity

Almost 84% of respondents found their programs to be an intellectually stimulating place. Program faculty were open to discuss different scholarly points of view (90%) and fellow students demonstrated high academic abilities (81%) and support for each other (84%). Fewer respondents (71%) felt that there was a sense of community in their programs, or that programs encouraged collaboration between faculty and students. Only 61% felt that their programs were receptive to student input regarding curriculum or program improvements.

About 90% of respondents agreed their programs were free of discrimination and that students of diverse backgrounds were encouraged to participate in class. The status of student diversity was perceived more positively than that of faculty diversity (74% vs. 63%). White students, which constituted 61% of all respondents, tended to evaluate *Diversity, Course Offerings, Instruction, Faculty, and Learning Community* more positively than their non-White peers.

Respondents reported that their programs helped them to develop an ability to accept people with different values and beliefs (83%), and had prepared them to work with diverse children or adults (75%).

Academic Advising

Academic advising remains an area of concern for many TC students. Only 60% of respondents agreed that their programs provided good academic advisement. Of the 95 open-ended comments related to advisement and guidance, 86 were “weaknesses”. Many students reported not having anyone to advise or guide them. They felt “forced to figure out on their own” the many questions they had. When students did receive advisement, the information was often inaccurate, unclear, unhelpful, or inadequate. Between 64% and 71% of respondents agreed that they received clear and accurate information about program and degree requirements.

The evaluations of academic advisors were slightly more positive. Approximately three-fourths of respondents found their advisors to be approachable (79%) and knowledgeable about program requirements (74%). About 70% agreed that advisors helped them to complete their studies as planned. However, several comments referred to advisors being impersonal and unresponsive to student needs. Respondents also noted that faculty was overwhelmed by the many advisees they had.

Technology

While about 71% of respondents reported TC technological resources to be adequate, both quantitative findings and open-ended comments suggested that the use of technological resources in teaching and learning was inadequate.

Sixty percent of respondents agreed that faculty used technology in their courses. Half of the respondents agreed that programs provided opportunities to use technology in a professional context. About 60% of respondents reported having opportunities to use relevant technologies during internship. Students would like current applications used by professionals in the field to be made available in the computer labs and to be taught in program courses.

APPENDIX A: SURVEY INSTRUMENT

TEACHERS COLLEGE MAY 2007 EXIT SURVEY

On the left **Agreement** scale, tell us the extent to which you agree with the statement in light of your experience as a student at Teachers College. On the right **Importance** scale, tell us how important the aspect was to you.

Agreement scale						Importance to me				
Don't know / NA	Disagree strongly			Agree strongly		Don't know / NA	Scarcely important			Very important
DK NA	1	2	3	4	1) A good variety of courses was offered by my program.	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	2) Courses were offered frequently enough that I was able to complete my degree requirements as planned.	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	3) I had the flexibility to choose courses based on my academic interests.	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	4) Course content provided me with a solid theoretical background in my discipline.	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	5) Course content was applicable to my anticipated work in the field.	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	6) Required courses were academically rigorous.	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	7) My program faculty had teaching styles that responded to my learning style and goals.	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	8) My program faculty used appropriate class activities and assignments to help me learn.	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	9) My program faculty used hands-on activities in their classes.	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	10) Class activities/assignments encouraged reflection and critical thinking.	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	11) Class activities/assignments encouraged teamwork and collaboration.	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	12) Class activities/assignments allowed me to practice my research skills.	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	13) My program faculty gave me helpful feedback on assignments.	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	14) My program faculty gave me timely feedback on assignments.	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	15) My program faculty used a variety of assessment methods (e.g., exams, papers, projects) to evaluate my performance.	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	16) My program faculty were fair and unbiased in assessing/grading student work.	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	17) My program faculty were scholarly and professionally competent.	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	18) My program faculty used technology in their courses.	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	19) There was good communication between faculty and students regarding student needs, concerns, and suggestions.	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	20) My program faculty were accessible to students outside the classroom.	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	21) My program faculty cared about professional welfare and development of students.	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	22) My program faculty treated students with respect.	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	23) My program faculty treated all students fairly.	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	24) My program faculty were open to discuss different scholarly points of view.	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	25) My program was an intellectually stimulating place.	DK NA	1	2	3	4

Agreement scale						Importance to me				
DK NA	1	2	3	4	26) My program was receptive to student input regarding curriculum or program improvement.	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	27) My program encouraged collaboration with faculty and/or other students.	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	28) Students supported each other to meet the academic demands of my program.	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	29) There was a sense of community in my program.	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	30) My fellow students demonstrated high academic abilities.	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	31) My program provided opportunities to use technology that could be applied in a professional context.	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	32) My program had a clear philosophy.	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	33) My program had clear requirements.	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	34) Program requirements were relevant to my anticipated work in the field.	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	35) My program provided a well-integrated set of courses.	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	36) Required courses were not repetitive.	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	37) My program monitored my progress towards my degree.	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	38) My program regularly assessed my professional knowledge and skills.	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	39) I received accurate information about program and degree requirements.	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	40) Program and degree requirements were clearly explained to me.	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	41) I knew what I had to do to meet program and degree requirements.	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	42) My program provided good academic advisement.	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	43) My academic advisor was knowledgeable about program requirements.	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	44) My academic advisor was approachable.	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	45) My academic advisor helped me to complete my program as planned.	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	46) Faculty in my program reflected a diversity of background and experience, including members of minority groups and persons with disabilities.	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	47) The student body reflected a diversity of background and experience, including members of minority groups and persons with disabilities.	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	48) My program was free of discrimination with regard to gender, race, creed, national origin, age, disability status, sexual orientation, and marital status.	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	49) Students of diverse backgrounds and different experiences were encouraged to participate in class.	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	50) My program helped me to develop the ability to accept people with different values and beliefs.	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	51) My program prepared me to work with diverse children and/or adults.	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	52) Gottesman Libraries resources and services were adequate.	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	53) Specialized facilities and equipment were adequate (e.g. laboratories or studios; equipment needed for teaching and/or creative work in my field).	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	54) Classroom facilities were adequate.	DK NA	1	2	3	4

Agreement scale						Importance to me				
DK NA	1	2	3	4	55) Student support services and staff were helpful (e.g., Registrar's Office, Financial Aid Office, Student Accounts Office, Office of Doctoral Studies).	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	56) Adequate financial aid was available for students in my program.	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	57) Technological resources were adequate.	DK NA	1	2	3	4

58) Please indicate with a check if your program required you to complete an internship, practicum or student teaching?

YES → Please respond to items 59 through 65.

NO → Skip to question 66.

Agreement scale						Importance to me				
Don't know/ NA	Disagree strongly			Agree strongly		Don't know/ NA	Scarcely important			Very important
DK NA	1	2	3	4	59) My internship experience contributed to my academic development.	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	60) I got to apply what I learned in my courses to real-life situations during my internship.	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	61) I got to practice a variety of professional skills during my internship.	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	62) My supervisor(s) guided me during my internship.	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	63) My supervisor(s) regularly evaluated my performance during internship.	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	64) My internship/field placement site was conducive to my learning and professional development.	DK NA	1	2	3	4
DK NA	1	2	3	4	65) I had opportunities to use relevant technologies during internship.	DK NA	1	2	3	4

For questions 66-69, feel free to use whatever space is available on the form to complete your responses.

66. What do you see as 2 specific *strengths* of your program of study?

67. What do you see as 2 specific *weaknesses* of your program of study?

68. What general comments would you like to make regarding your student experience at TC?

69. What do you think of the survey? Are the aspects mentioned important to you? Is there something you would like us to consider including in the next survey? Are the statements worded clearly? Please share your thoughts with us.

Background Information

70. Which degree did you *most recently* complete?

1). MA 2). MS 3). EdM 4). PhD 5). EdD

71. What was the first semester at TC when you started the program you have most recently completed?

1) Fall _____ (year) 2) Spring _____ (year) 3) Summer _____ (year)

72. Which department did you graduate, or are graduating from?

73. Which program did you graduate, or are graduating from?

74. What is your gender? 1) Female 2) Male

APPENDIX B: RESPONSE RATE BY DEPARTMENT/PROGRAM

Note: The total number of respondents by the department may be different from the total number of respondents from all programs within the department because some respondents identified the department but not the program they graduated from.

Department/Program	Graduates ⁵	Respondents	Response Rate
ARTS AND HUMANITIES	375	87	23%
Applied Linguistics	16	9	56%
Art and Art Education	38	10	26%
Arts Administration	20	5	25%
Dance and Dance Education	2	0	0%
History and Education	2	0	0%
Music and Music Education	82	17	21%
Philosophy and Education	10	2	20%
Religion and Education	1	0	0%
Teaching of English	95	18	19%
Teaching of Social Studies	62	11	18%
Teaching of Spanish	1	0	0%
TESOL	46	13	28%
BIOBEHAVIORAL STUDIES	66	14	21%
Applied Physiology	9	1	11%
Kinesiology	0	2	0
Motor Learning	1	1	100%
Neuroscience and Education	6	1	17%
Physical Education	9	1	11%
Speech & Language Pathology	41	5	12%
COUNSELING AND CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY	204	56	27%
Clinical Psychology	24	7	29%
Counseling Psychology	110	30	27%
Psychology in Education	70	17	24%
CURRICULUM AND TEACHING	182	50	27%
Curriculum and Teaching	49	14	29%
dis/Abilities Studies in Education	2	2	100%
Early Childhood Education	14	7	50%
Early Childhood/Special Education	26	2	8%
Inclusive Elementary (Dual)	10	4	40%
Elementary/Childhood Education (Preservice)	42	14	33%
Giftedness	8	2	25%
Learning Disabilities	14	2	14%
Literacy Specialist	17	2	12%
HEALTH AND BEHAVIOR STUDIES	217	60	28%
Admin of Special Education Programs	2	2	100%
Reading Specialist	44	10	23%
School Psychology	35	12	34%
Applied Behavior Analysis	22	4	18%
Behavioral Disorders	1	0	0%
Blind & Visual Impairment	1	0	0%
Guidance & Rehabilitation	1	0	0%

⁵ As per mailing list provided by the Registrar's Office

Health Education	32	13	41%
Hearing Impairment	19	4	21%
Instructional Practice in Special Education	2	1	50%
Mental Retardation	15	2	13%
Nursing Education Professorial Role	1	1	100%
Applied Physiology & Nutrition	8	6	75%
Nutrition Education	21	6	29%
Physical Disabilities	1	0	0%
Research in Special Education	1	0	0%
Supervision in Special Education	4	0	0%
Teaching ASL as a Foreign Language	7	3	43%
HUMAN DEVELOPMENT	70	25	36%
Applied Statistics	3	0	0%
Cognitive Studies in Education	11	6	55%
Measurement and Evaluation	8	4	50%
Developmental Psychology	28	9	32%
Sociology and Education	20	6	30%
INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES	6	1	17%
Interdisciplinary Studies in Education	6	2	33%
INTERNATIONAL AND TRANSCULTURAL	128	46	36%
Anthropology and Education	10	4	40%
Applied Anthropology (w/GSAS)	3	1	33%
Bilingual/Bicultural Education	24	12	50%
Comparative & Intl Education	13	4	31%
Economics and Education	8	0	0%
International Educational Development	70	22	31%
MATHEMATICS, SCIENCE, & TECHNOLOGY	172	43	25%
Communication and Education	12	5	42%
Computing in Education	20	1	5%
Instructional Technology & Media	32	8	25%
Mathematics Education	71	19	27%
Science Education	10	9	90%
Supervision in Science Education	2	0	0%
Teaching Biology: 7-12	14	0	0%
Teaching Chemistry: 7-12	6	0	0%
Teaching Earth Science:7-12	2	0	0%
Teaching Physics:7-12	3	1	33%
ORGANIZATION AND LEADERSHIP	337	117	35%
Adult & Continuing Education	2	0	0%
Adult Ed Guided Intensive Study	6	3	50%
Adult Learning & Leadership	4	2	50%
Education Leadership	139	50	36%
Higher & Postsecondary Education	53	20	38%
Inquiry in Education Admin Practice	2	0	0%
Organizational Psychology	118	39	33%
Politics and Education	13	1	8%