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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Teachers College Exit Survey is designed to solicit graduating students' feedback on what they value most in their educational experience and how well the College and individual programs meet their expectations. In 2011, we received 415 completed surveys out of the 1,934 sent to all master's graduates ( $22 \%$ response rate). In 2010, we received 499 completed surveys out of the 1,712 sent to all master's graduates (29\% response rate).

The survey questionnaire includes 65 statements about academic programs and courses, instruction, academic advising, learning environment, resources, student support services, and statements measuring overall satisfaction. Survey participants are asked to rate each statement from not important (1) to very important (6) on an importance scale, and from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (6) on an agreement scale. Eight open-ended questions provide respondents an opportunity to comment or elaborate on each of the subdomains and on their educational experience at Teachers College in general.

## Student Priorities

All but four statements were rated as important by the majority of respondents with the mean ratings of above 5.0 on a six-point scale. The four statements that were rated lowest in importance refer to regular assessment of students' progress by programs (mean 4.9), opportunities to develop research skills (mean 4.8), and instructors' and students' use of technology and media (mean 4.4). The statements rated highest in importance (mean ratings above 5.5 in 2011) are shown in the table below.

| Statements | \% Very Important <br> (6) |  | Mean |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2010 | 2011 | 2010 | 2011 |
| My academic program was excellent. | 83 | 82 | 5.8 | 5.8 |
| Quality of instruction in most classes was excellent. | 81 | 82 | 5.8 | 5.8 |
| My program was an intellectually stimulating place. | 73 | 82 | 5.7 | 5.7 |
| Faculty were scholarly and professionally competent. | 77 | 77 | 5.7 | 5.7 |
| My program was free of discrimination. | 75 | 76 | 5.6 | 5.7 |
| Course content was relevant to my life or career goals. | 67 | 73 | 5.6 | 5.6 |
| Adequate financial aid was available for most students. | 76 | 72 | 5.6 | 5.6 |
| Instructors used effective teaching strategies. | 65 | 70 | 5.5 | 5.6 |
| My advisor was knowledgeable about program requirements. | 66 | 69 | 5.5 | 5.6 |
| Faculty treated all students fairly. | 65 | 68 | 5.6 | 5.5 |
| My advisor was available when needed. | 63 | 65 | 5.5 | 5.5 |
| My program provided good academic advising. | 66 | 65 | 5.5 | 5.5 |
| The College/program had adequate resources to support learning. | 63 | 64 | 5.5 | 5.5 |
| My program provided accurate information about program requirements. | 64 | 63 | 5.5 | 5.5 |
| Communication between faculty and students in my program was good. | 62 | 62 | 5.5 | 5.5 |
| Faculty respected student opinions or ideas that differed from their own. | 58 | 61 | 5.4 | 5.5 |

## Strengths and Challenges

A performance gap was calculated by subtracting the agreement mean from the importance mean. The larger the performance gap, the further away the College and programs were in meeting students' expectations; the smaller the gap, the closer the College or programs were in meeting students' expectations. Challenges were defined as statements with importance means of 5.0 and above, and with performance gaps of 1.0 or larger; strengths were defined as statements with importance means of 5.0 , and with a performance gaps of 0.5 or smaller. The table below shows the strengths and challenges as identified for the 2011 respondents; the 2010 data are provided for comparison. The strengths and challenges identified in the 2011 data are presented graphically on page 4.

| Strengths | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Gap } \\ & 2010 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Gap } \\ 2011 \end{gathered}$ | Importance Mean | Agreement Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I had adequate opportunities for reflection and critical thinking. | 0.3 | 0.3 | 5.4 | 5.1 |
| My program had clear requirements. | 0.4 | 0.4 | 5.3 | 4.9 |
| Fellow students demonstrated high academic abilities. | 0.5 | 0.5 | 5.3 | 4.7 |
| My program provided a solid theoretical foundation in my discipline. | 0.4 | 0.4 | 5.2 | 4.8 |
| Students reflected a diversity of backgrounds and experiences. | 0.3 | 0.4 | 5.2 | 4.9 |
| Challenges | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Gap } \\ & 2010 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Gap } \\ & 2011 \end{aligned}$ | Importance Mean | Agreement Mean |
| My academic program was excellent. | 1.3 | 1.3 | 5.8 | 4.5 |
| Quality of instruction in most classes was excellent. | 1.2 | 1.3 | 5.8 | 4.5 |
| Adequate financial aid was available for most students. | 2.1 | 2.2 | 5.6 | 3.4 |
| Course content was relevant to my life or career goals. | 0.8 | 1.0 | 5.6 | 4.6 |
| My program provided good academic advising. | 1.7 | 1.5 | 5.5 | 4.0 |
| Instructors used effective teaching strategies. | 1.1 | 1.2 | 5.5 | 4.4 |
| My advisor was available when needed. | 1.1 | 1.0 | 5.5 | 4.6 |
| My program provided a good variety of courses. | 1.2 | 1.2 | 5.4 | 4.2 |
| My advisor supported me in pursuing my life and career goals. | 1.4 | 1.2 | 5.4 | 4.2 |
| My program provided a well-integrated set of courses. | 1.0 | 1.1 | 5.4 | 4.3 |
| My program was responsive to student feedback. | 1.1 | 1.1 | 5.4 | 4.3 |
| The frequency of interactions with my advisor was adequate. | 1.3 | 1.1 | 5.3 | 4.2 |
| I had flexibility to choose courses based on my life or career goals. | 1.1 | 1.2 | 5.2 | 4.0 |
| Classroom facilities were adequate. | 1.1 | 1.2 | 5.2 | 4.0 |

## Overall Satisfaction

About three quarters ( $70 \%-78 \%$ ) of respondents were satisfied with their experiences at TC, reported that their program met their expectations, that if they could start over they would attend TC or their program, and would recommend their program to others (ratings of 4-6). A majority of respondents (87\%) were satisfied with their learning while in the program. On the other hand, only $60 \%$ felt that tuition was a worthwhile investment. Mean values of questions measuring satisfaction were between 3.8 and 4.9 on a six-point scale.


| Strengths <br> Importance-Agreement Gap <0.5, 2011 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} 5.4 \\ 8 \\ 8.1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5.3 \\ 8 \\ 4.9 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 5.2 \\ 8.9 \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ |
| I had adequate opportunities for reflection and critical thinking. | My program had clear requirements. | Fellow students demonstrated high academic abilities. | My program provided a solid theoretical foundation in my discipline. | Students reflected a diversity of backgrounds and experiences. |

## Challenges

Importance-Agreement Gap >1.0, 2011


4.0


| My academic | Quality of instruction Adequate financial | Course content was | My program | Instructors used | My advisor was |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| program was | in most classes was aid was available for relevant to my life or | provided good | effective teaching | available when |  |
| excellent. | excellent. | most students. | career goals. | academic advising. | strategies. |

## - importance oagreement

Challenges
Importance-Agreement Gap >1.0, 2011


| My program provided a good variety of courses. | My advisor supported me in pursuing my life and career goals. | My program provided a wellintegrated set of courses. | My program was responsive to student feedback. | The frequency of interactions with my advisor was adequate. | I had flexibility to choose courses based on my life or career goals. | Classroom facilities were adequate. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | -importance Oagreement |  |  |  |  |

## INTRODUCTION

The Teachers College Exit Survey is designed to solicit graduating students' feedback on what they value most in their educational experience and how well the College and individual programs meet student expectations.

Several changes have been made to the Exit Survey instrument since the May 2009 administration. Separate survey instruments were created for master's and doctoral graduates. Both instruments are organized by subdomains in which structured-response items are followed by an open-ended item. The majority of changes are found in the Instruction and Advising sub-domains to reflect different needs of master's and doctoral students. Another change is the use of six-point response scales instead of four-point scales to increase the variability of responses.

The May 2010 and 2011 Exit Surveys (Appendix D) include 65 statements about academic programs and courses, instruction, academic advising, learning environment, resources, student support services, and statements measuring overall satisfaction. The survey was administered to students who either graduated or applied for graduation in the academic years of 2009-2010 and 2010-2011. Survey participants were asked to rate each statement from not important (1) to very important (6) on an importance scale, and from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (6) on an agreement scale. Eight open-ended questions provided respondents an opportunity to comment or elaborate on their perceptions of program strengths and weaknesses, and on their educational experience at Teachers College in general.

In 2011, surveys were administered to 1934 master's graduates and 253 doctoral graduates. Completed surveys were received from 415 master's graduates and 79 doctoral graduates, giving response rates of 22 and 31 percent, respectively. In 2010, surveys were administered to 1712 master's graduates and 263 doctoral graduates. Completed surveys were received from 499 master's graduates and 124 doctoral graduates, giving response rates of 29 and 47 percent, respectively. The response rates for individual programs and departments are shown in Appendix C. The respondents' characteristics are shown in Appendix B.

The sections of the report that follow are organized around the six subdomains (academic programs and courses, instruction, academic advising, learning environment, resources, student support services) and statements measuring overall satisfaction. Each subdomain section includes two charts. The bar chart shows percent of respondents which rated each statement as very important (rating 6) in 2010 and in 2011. The bars go from the statements with the highest number of very important ratings to the lowest. The high-low chart shows the performance gap calculated by subtracting the agreement mean from the importance mean. A larger performance gap indicates that the College and programs do not meet students' expectations; a smaller gap indicates that the College or programs do a relatively good job of meeting expectations. There are only two statements, both in the Instruction subdomain, which have a negative gap, i.e., the programs either exceeded respondents' expectations or these particular characteristics were over-emphasized by the programs. The complete set of data is provided in Appendix A.

Selected comments, suggestions, and criticisms about each subdomain complete each section. These comments are provided as illustration or clarification of the quantitative data presented in the charts. The complete set of comments by program is available upon program request.

## ACADEMIC PROGRAMS AND COURSES




## Selected Comments, Suggestions and Criticisms about Program Curriculum and Courses

* Program $X$ is outstanding. There is a clear philosophical purpose, which forms an undercurrent to all coursework. This was significant in terms of helping me to formulate my own theoretical understanding of educational principles. My experience at Teachers College exceeded my expectations.
* Most of my program work was dictated in terms of required classes with few electives. That said, my classes were appropriate and excellent. My program was outstanding, rigorous, well-planned, and overseen.
* I experienced difficulties in registration (of courses) more than half of the time. Courses were filled up very quickly, with a number of students dropping out later on. ... Before registration, there hardly was any syllabus to provide sufficient information before making decision to enroll. Some courses provided only 2-3 lines of information and they were far from being helpful. There was no syllabus information about courses, number of students in the class, or what courses would be open in what semester. This made it extremely difficult to plan anything much in advance and it has to be semester by semester.
* As a part-time student, I was upset that there were required classes that were only offered during the middle of the day. It was difficult to figure out a way to complete all of my required classes while working full time. The academic rigor of the classes varied, but many of them were not all that challenging. Much of the information learned in my classes was information that is fairly self-evident to anyone who works in the field.
* ... Within our core courses, the courses became very repetitive and on the verge of boring. For three semesters, we had to take basically the same two classes; and after some time, it seemed as if we were not learning much. I think for the two classes that I am thinking of, we could have been also pushed more and had different assignments, rather than the same thing over and over again for three semesters.
* Not a big selection of classes from semester to semester. That said, everyone had to basically take the same classes, and they were large and crowded, oftentimes without enough chairs or desks. I found this to be completely unacceptable after paying so much money and going to a reputable program. I also felt some of the classes could have been less introspective and more research-focused.
* I took a class ... that was completely based on theory and disconnected from the reality of teaching in a classroom. ... I took another class ... and this was also a class that was out of touch with what we face in the classroom. These two classes could have been the two most important classes I took at Teachers College as far as my future career as a teacher was concerned, but instead I left both classes feeling like I had wasted my money and unprepared for what I may have to face as a first-year teacher.
* My program had excellent courses taught by extremely insightful and experienced professionals. However, my program required me to take courses outside of my department $\ldots$ and this is where much of my disappointment with Teachers College lies. I had a few courses which were a complete waste of my time, usually because the professor did not add at all to the readings or my critical thinking about a topic.
* There did not seem to be any connection from course to course, and there was repetitive content. More thought should go into sequencing and taking concepts that were laid out in one course and applying them in subsequent courses. I got a cursory knowledge of many theories, but none in-depth where I can easily explain it now from memory. Compared to other programs around the country, I think ours is very weak, and I feel under-prepared for interviews.


## INSTRUCTION

## Instruction

Percent of Respondents Rating Statements as Very Important (6)
81\% 82\%


## Instruction

4.8

Importance-Agreement Gap, 2011


3.6

Quality of instruction in most classes was excellent.

| Instructors used | I had adequate | Instructors | Instructors used |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| effective | opportunities for | provided timely | appropriate |
| teaching | reflection and | feedback about | methods to |
| strategies. | critical thinking. student progress. | assess student |  | performance.


course.

I had adequate I had adequate I had adequate I had adequate Instructors used opportunities to opportunities to opportunities for opportunities to information develop skills to develop research teamork and learn new media technmation develop skills to develop research teamwork and learn new media technology and children and/or skills. collaboration. and technology. media in the adults.

## Selected Comments, Suggestions and Criticisms about Instruction

* In-class instruction was of high-quality, but professors were usually unavailable for out-ofclass consultations (i.e., office hours). I was disappointed that I did not have the time or opportunity to make strong relationships with my professors. I believe this was due to the HUGE class sizes-- from 50 to 100 students in the majority of my classes, and the professors' outside research interests that prevented the professors from spending enough quality time mentoring students.
* Professors were well-prepared and informed about the various topics discussed in class. They also encouraged vigorous class discussions to add more depth to the courses and various topics.
* While many professors seemed to revamp their curriculum often, it was clear that some of the senior professors used the same notes/slides year after year and did not seem to add new and exciting information. In addition, it was very frustrating when they did not know how to use the technology devices. I think it should be a required one-day, even one-hour, course that they learn how to use the technology, which was simple enough for even the technologically-impaired (me) to figure out. It wasted a lot of class time!
* In my program, there were a lot of adjunct professors who were very difficult to get in touch with, and who were often not prepared for class. From my experience, teaching courses was low on the priority list for many professors, adjunct or tenured. It was shocking how poor the instruction was in many of the classes across disciplines. Given Teachers College's reputation, I was highly disappointed in the quality of instruction.
* I learned no skills. None. Even my research practicum was a joke, made up almost entirely of reading papers from The New York Times. I kid you not, unfortunately.
* Some classes were better than others. All department courses in my program were taught by doctoral students. I strongly feel I should have had professors teaching courses, considering how much I paid in tuition. My core course was pretty useless; I would have liked to have learned more practical information in that course. A workshop on technology (e.g., SMART Boards, etc.) would have been very useful. More instruction on methods for teaching diverse learners would have been helpful.
* My research practica-if those are considered classes-were excellent. The courses themselves were not particularly rigorous; some were downright bad. The worst professors were the ones who read from PowerPoint slides. I do not have time to attend classes where I am being read to.
* A bright side was that many instructors, but not all, used the latest teaching methods to help us learn. This allowed the course content to be digested easily. Teamwork was great and employed in just about all of the classes. Technology was used heavily only in a few classes. Some of the instructors were less interested or had a difficult time with using technology. Almost all classes allowed significant time for the reflective process.
* The quality of instruction was relatively high, but I felt that it could have been better. Class size was far too large, which made good instruction somewhat difficult. Professors touted the importance of getting to know each student, but some did not even know my name, despite my class participation and active role in program activities.
* Feedback was a problem. We got very little feedback, and what we did get was many times late. A few professors gave none at all. Also, we received little feedback on our final project, which took us the bulk of the summer to complete.


## ACADEMIC ADVISING

## Academic Advising

Percent of Respondents Rating Statements as Very Imprortant (6)



## Selected Comments, Suggestions and Criticisms about Academic Advising

* The newer program plan was easier to read. I liked that my advisor allowed me to substitute courses for requirements since I did not want to be a consultant. My advisor was very good to work with and treated me fairly.
* I had hoped my advisor would become a mentor, which did not happen. The few times that I emailed or went to talk to her, it seemed like just an informational session rather than her actually helping me pursue my goals.... I definitely did NOT have (a mentorship) experience at Teachers College, which is probably one of the more disappointing attributes about the program. I also felt like I should not have to constantly seek her out. If she was interested at all in her students' progress, monthly or semester emails would have been nice, or suggestions to come talk. It seemed to be a one-way street with no real effort coming from her end.
* In addition to the comments above about my advisor, I would like to add that he was always available; I am not talking about just weekends. When I had a problem with one of my courses, he emailed me from Rome during his vacation to answer my questions. Even when I visited Teachers College prior to graduation, he was kind enough to take an hour of his time to give me a tour of the school.
* I wanted an advisor that would serve as a mentor. It was quite unclear how to go about choosing an advisor with no formal designation of an advisor. You could easily go through the entire program without an advisor and have no one notice. It is also very difficult for part-time students to maintain contact with advisors.
* Having office hours for Master's students outside of business hours once a week would be a huge improvement. I often could not attend my professors' office hours because of work.
* My advisor was around to approve my class choices, but only when I reached out. There was never an attempt to contact me or offer additional assistance. I would come in and say, "I'd like to take these 3 classes," and he would say, "Great." When I tried to ask about options for electives, he was not very helpful. I got more advice from other students in the program.
* My advisor was never available and never once contacted me. When I sought her out to get advising on classes, she did not know the requirements for my cohort. I ended up having to take an additional two credits, which cost money. I was very dissatisfied. The excuse that was always given for her was that she was very busy with her research.
* Advisement is disappointing. One of the most frustrating aspects is that students often do not know about many things that are available (e.g., certain courses that may be helpful, certifications, etc.). The information is there, but unless we stumble upon it through random conversation with a friend, etc., we will never hear about it. Advisors do not know us well enough to know how to suggest personally relevant and helpful information. There is no central place to find all of the information in a way that is helpful or not overwhelming.
* My advisor was amazing, very supportive, and reliable. She was available to me when needed, and supported me in continuing the program through many tough times in my personal and family life. She was available to me to support me in continuing through the program and not giving up.


## LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

## Learning Environment

Percent of Respondents Rating Statements as Very Important (6)


| $8$ |  | $8$ | Im $4.6$ | Learning En portance-Agree $4.7$ | vironment ment Gap, 20 <br> 4.8 | 1 | 5.4 <br> 4.3 | $8$ | $8$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| My program was an intellectually stimulating place. | Faculty were scholarly and professionally competent. | My program provided an effective learning environment for it students. | Communication between faculty and students in $m y$ program was good | Faculty respected student opinions or ideas that differed from their own. <br> - importance | Faculty were usually available after class and/or during office hours <br> oagreement | Faculty cared about students as individuals. | My program was responsive to student feedback. | Fellow students demonstrated high academic abilities | was a sense munity in my gram. |

## Selected Comments, Suggestions and Criticisms about Learning Environment

* Program X was very good about taking student surveys and reflections, and making changes where needed. Although the program's courses may not have been all perfect, the director and professors were sincerely interested in students' opinions and selfreflections.
* I always fill out the surveys, faculty evaluations, and questionnaires being sent my way. I never saw a change, or not even sure if anyone read them. This is why I put 'don't know' on 'My program was responsive to student feedback.' I do not know. Was it? Did anyone care that the smallest class I took had more than 40 people? Does anyone care I got ONLY the title page of my paper marked B+, and was expected to see this assignment as 'a learning experience'? If giving me my whole paper was not an option, using one adjective would be the best next thing. I am not picky, I would settle for 'good,' 'mediocre,' or 'horrific.' Anything will do, really.
* In all honesty, I think it could have been harder. I would like even more of a challenge. Also, there are some people in this program that should absolutely not be here. I worked very hard in school and thought I would be surrounded by the best minds in the field. There were several students who did not seem academically disciplined or intelligent enough to be in this program. It diminishes the prestige for the rest of us.
* The community that was created within the program came more from the students in each cohort than from the faculty encouragement. My faculty tried to take in student input by having town hall meetings, but I am not sure we really saw any results from the input.
* Our department has created a learning environment that students were afraid to speak up if they did not agree with the faculty members. We were made to write reflection papers, and were penalized if we did not demonstrate the same kind of thinking our faculty members wanted us to. It became such a joke that I started making up what I wrote in these reflection papers in order to please them and let them hear what they wanted to hear. There is no academic freedom or freedom of thinking in this department; you MUST agree with the faculty members, or you just will not ever graduate.
* Despite the lack of organization I experienced at Teachers College (TC) in many aspects from the Student Housing to the Registrar's Office, to the website, I really found TC to be a wonderfully stimulating place. I loved going to classes and learning about a new aspect of teaching. It was wonderful to be in classes with stimulating students and professors. It was also great to be a student again. I also felt that the faculty treated each other and the students very well.
* The faculty at Teachers College (TC) is what sets it apart from other universities. Topnotch instructors were the reason why my time at TC was so enjoyable.
* The competency of students was disappointing. I often felt a lack of motivation from my peers. The caliber of students does not seem 'Ivy League' or 'Tier 1.' This was the most disappointing aspect of the program.
* I thought my program was very responsive to students' needs, for the most part; that was very nice to see. When something was not working, or students had different needs than what was set on the curriculum, most professors were ready to shift things around and tailor to our needs.



## Selected Comments, Suggestions and Criticisms about Diversity

* I was quite comfortable with the teaching styles and the diversity in my program. I believe that my program did an excellent job of creating a diverse cohort, and the faculty did an excellent job of being fair and responding to student inquiries.
* Class biases are so embedded in all the things we do, I think it's hard for people to see how marginalized students from low-income backgrounds are, and were turned off from continuing.
* My overall BIGGEST complaint was there is discrimination in this program. If you are a guy, the advisor loves you. If you will suck up, the advisor will love you. If you are going to mind your own business, not gossip, not kiss-butt, work your tail off, you will be ignored and forgotten. If you were not a favorite or a 'suck up,' you did not get what you deserved. I did what I was told, I worked very hard, I did not talk back to professors or talk behind their backs. Honestly, I am an ideal student, but since I did not suck up/brown nose/whatever and I would not complain or cry to the professor, I honestly got shafted and ignored. I do not ever want to be someone who cries to get what they want, and it is upsetting that graduate students do this. I am proud of how I handled these situations and my work ethic; I just wish I did not get shafted along the way.
* There is also a preference given to African-American students, whereas other minority groups were ignored or minimized.
* There were not many males in the program; and at times I felt like they were treated differently (i.e., more favorably).
* I can point to many examples of favoritism exhibited by our program director. Students favored by the director often received access to classes, distribution of scholarship points, and information about career opportunities before, or in place of, other students.
* Teachers College tries to foster a learning environment. There are times, however, that I question the priorities. For example, it seems sometimes that diversity is a higher priority than education. I believe that diversity is important, but it is useless unless it is in service of what we are in school to accomplish.
* I did not feel comfortable around student peers. As a minority and an older student, I felt out of place. Many students that I worked with made me feel isolated. Only when I was in a group where students were of diverse backgrounds did I thrive academically.


## RESOURCES

## Resources

Percent of Respondents Rating Statements as Very Important (6)


|  | Importa <br> 5.3 <br> 4.7 | Resources ce-Agreement Gap <br> 5.3 <br> 4.8 | 2011 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adequate financial aid was The College/ program had available for most adequate resources to students. support learning. | Program staff was caring and helpful. | Gottesman Libraries resouces and services were adequate. <br> mportance oagreem | Classroom facilities were adequate. | Specialized facilities (labs, Information technology and studios, etc.) and media resources were equipment were adequate. adequate. |

## Selected Comments, Suggestions and Criticisms about Resources

* Almost every classroom I had class in at TC was inadequate in some way. Many of them were physically falling apart-there were holes in the walls or leaks from the ceiling. Very often, there would not be enough chairs in the room to accommodate the number of students enrolled so the rooms were cramped and people had to get chairs from other rooms. I was really disappointed by the physical space.
* The classrooms were filthy and falling apart. Ceiling tiles were stained and/or missing. There was grim and gum on the floor of many classes. The computers/technology in the classroom rarely worked. I had classes where students had to sit on a folding chair in the corner due to a lack of space. The school costs way too much to provide such embarrassing facilities. The professors often commented on how inadequate the facilities were.
* The school did not have the software we needed to use in the computer labs, so we had to go to computer labs on the main campus or at SIPA. Classrooms were abysmal--cold in the winter, sweltering in the summer. The chairs were often falling apart and the technology was outdated or non-existent. The desks in some rooms are so small; you have to bring in clipboards to take tests.
* I feel like the computer lab could use some upgrading. I know that people work tirelessly to keep it maintained. However, I often found myself having to switch terminals several times before finding one that would meet my needs. Sometimes, computers would not log-in. Other times, certain computers would not allow me to open documents that professors had posted on Classweb. Although most of the staff in the computer lab was helpful and pleasant, I did encounter one person who was consistently rude and unhelpful.
* Not all of the classrooms were up to date, but I believe that this is beginning to change. There was only one classroom that had current education technology, but most others had adequate (i.e., digital projectors and speakers) technology. The Gottesman Library was great. It was a wonderful place to work.
* The libraries were helpful in providing a physical space for study and collaboration. Issues with printing were extremely frustrating at Gottesman Library. I tried to get much printing done at Butler, as the Gottesman printers consumed a great deal of money without producing any physical result on numerous occasions.
* Perhaps create more studying space for students, as it was often full in the library. We should also not have to pay for printing, and should be on the Columbia printing system.
* The lack of financial aid for graduate students, both master's and doctoral students, at Teachers College (TC) was astounding. Some of the courses were certainly not worth the cost of thousands of dollars per credit! While I was fortunate to have some professors who were really wonderful and supportive, there were several professors who provided little help, refused to answer questions, and dismissed their students because they did not have the time or interest in helping them learn; this is both unacceptable and should not happen at a school like Columbia, and particularly for the amount of money you are asking students to pay. Furthermore, if TC is going to charge that much, at least provide proper classrooms, real desks and chairs, and appropriate heating/cooling in each room.
* Many students qualify for student work study, but there are not many opportunities available for this sort of aid. There is also a great delay in receiving any refund money from the loans that most students depend on for rent, bills, and food expenses.


## STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES



## Selected Comments, Suggestions and Criticisms about Student Support Services

* Overall, I found the staff helpful. However, the general set-up of the offices was disjointed, inefficient, and uncoordinated. The physical location of the offices throughout different areas of the school added to the problems above. There were always a multitude of needless forms that did not make sense. People in various offices have no idea of how processes work in other offices. Teachers College can, and should, do better. To get anything done required multiple trips to different offices on different days, and it just did not make for a cohesive experience.
* My only complaint is that the systems set up by these services make it very difficult for students like me who have full time jobs and attend Teachers College at night. I was almost never there when offices were open, yet I was often required to get a paper from one office to fill out and sign (or have someone else sign) and return it to an office. Again, there has to be a better way. Between fax machines and scanners and computers, surely it could be simplified, especially for those of us who can't stop in during the day.
* I have never had more difficulty getting basic administrative tasks completed than I had in my tenure at Teachers College. I am not sure why this is the case, as my undergraduate institution was much larger and I did not have any of these issues. I have to say I have constantly been surprised by the inability to complete basic tasks such as, clearing holds that were placed on my record by mistake, submitting immunization forms, and checking on degree requirements or graduation paperwork.
* Career Services was so helpful in finding a position! They did an amazing job setting up and advertising information sessions and recruiting events.
* I found that the Career Services office, while well-intentioned, was not equipped to help students in my particular field. It seems that the office is geared toward helping students
in Education or Organizational Psychology fields, but neglects to investigate opportunities for students in other programs at Teachers College.
* I would have found it helpful if Career Services had more support for teachers applying to jobs internationally (i.e., more connections and resources). This year has been a particularly difficult year for recent graduates to find employment, and I think that Career Services needed to help us come up with innovative ways to stand out, as well as find alternatives.
* Career Services is an awesome resource and I think many of us were too busy to really take advantage of all they have to offer, but I am glad I did because everyone there was very helpful. However, Student Accounts needs to get their act together on billing-it was never clear or obvious when bills were due, and I am really not a huge fan of electronic bills. I know they save resources, but their implementation needs to be improved so that all the information arrives in an email, not as a reminder to go log into some convoluted, non-Teachers College site to find out what to pay.
* The staff in Student Accounts are very friendly; however, the time that it takes to issue a refund check after my loan posts seems unnecessarily long. Is there a way to issue the check within one week? It has typically taken 2-4 weeks.
* The Registrar's Office has improved over time here. In my initial dealings with them, I found the staff to be particularly rude and abrasive, which made no sense to me. The staff in the Financial Aid Office is significantly more friendly and supportive. Career Services is a bit mixed, but I appreciate the services they provide. Overall, similar to the faculty here, I think some, if not most, of the staff are quite supportive, understanding, and responsive to student inquiries; however, some are not. It is a shame when I send emails to staff requiring assistance and do not receive a reply, or when I am treated rudely at an office. However, the majority of my interactions here have been very pleasant.
* Registrar's Office was sometimes helpful, but they always had a bad attitude. There was terrible customer service with the exception of a few. Admissions Office was extremely helpful, particularly when I was deciding which program to apply for.
* Some people in the Financial Aid Office were extremely helpful, but others were unhelpful and did not give complete information. One time, I was actually given wrong information that caused me to have trouble with a bill. People in the Office of the Registrar are not always friendly, but I have always had my questions answered and been able to get the information I need. I do not think it is too much to ask for people who are first contacts in any office to be a little bit friendly.
* I was continuously unhappy with the staff at the Financial Aid Office, where I was ALWAYS put on hold for more than 10-15 minutes when I called, and where staff at the front desk were rude and not knowledgeable about my questions on several occasions. Additionally, while some staff at the Office of the Registrar were pleasant and helpful, the focal point for letters related to student enrollment status was inefficient, rude, and unhelpful; she seems opposed to doing anything in a timely or efficient manner.
* I used the 'Mothers Room' to pump before class. It would be nice if the room was bigger and cleaner, but I loved having that to use; so helpful.


## OVERALL SATISFACTION



## Selected Comments, Suggestions and Criticisms about Overall Satisfaction

* I think Teachers College at large is a really amazing place. I was, however, less satisfied with my program than I had hoped. As a student on a fellowship, I had tuition provided for, so I am still grateful for the experience. However, I think that Program $X$ needs to overhaul the way that they prepare teachers. It seems that many of us are coming out of the program unprepared to teach (the subject matter) in urban New York City. It seems like we are being prepared much in the same way that TC was preparing prospective (subject matter) teachers 50 years ago, which seems tragic, given the cutting edge involvement so many other programs at TC are touting.
* Overall, I had a good experience at Teachers College; it made perfect sense for me since I wanted to stay in New York, and I was given good professional opportunities. My program faculty are extremely caring. I appreciate the work that they put into my program and the attention that I was given.
* If my master's program could have offered us more guidance, options, events, and opportunities in research, internships, etc., it would have been far better. I found myself wondering where this degree is taking me. Since I graduated, I have been struggling to defend the worth of my courses to employers.
* The cost is outrageous. Considering what I could have paid for other degrees to end up with the same job, I do not think the school spends enough time on its students' career opportunities. Not only did I have to take out loans for school, but also to live in NYC. Coming from a very lower class area with little money, I worry if I made a successful investment in my future. TC is way too expensive. I even have to pay to print at the library which I have never done at any other school! Overall, I enjoyed my professors and knowledge gained, but I would not do it again, nor recommend it to ANYONE else.
* I really did love and appreciate my experience and time at Teachers College. I do have some serious complaints and disappointments. HOWEVER, I paid for a very good education and got a degree from a top-notch school that has been helping me grab many job opportunities. TC does make my resume much better and I did pay for the name brand school. Maybe I could have gotten a similar education somewhere else, I am not sure.
* My program was worth investing in, but I am not sure any program is worth $\$ 1100$ a credit. If I could start over, I am really not sure I would choose Teachers College (TC) again. I love the program and the content is exceptional and that is worth it; but the size of each cohort, the overall cost, the disorganization of my program, and the overall mediocrity with which I feel so much of TC is run, I am not sure it would balance out in my favor to attend again. It is very hard to get people in many offices to respond back to phone calls and emails, and I feel this is unacceptable. The content of my program is why I came, and it exceeded my expectations, so for that, I am grateful. For all other aspects of TC, I am not sure I would recommend it to others.
* While I did not feel that Teachers College provided an excellent education, I would probably return for the experience of living in New York City and being a part of Columbia. I was able to participate in a lot of unique programs and experiences that were offered through TC or Columbia. That being said, I think the teaching was horrible in too many instances, and I would recommend the school to people with a lot of caveats.
* I feel that I learned from the program and grew as a professional, but would not attribute that solely to the faculty. I would attribute that to my fieldwork experiences and the peers I met within the program. I feel that the experience could have been better if the faculty were more attentive and acted as if they cared about teaching and developing new professionals. Instead of concentrating my energies on studying and growing in my field, I feel like I had to constantly play a game just to make sure that I would graduate. I feel the thing that I really paid for with my tuition was the Columbia name on my diploma. For anyone interested in a master's program with attentive and supportive faculty members, I would not recommend attending (my) program at Teachers College.
* I had a wonderful experience at Teachers College. I am very satisfied with my decision to complete my graduate education in the chosen program. I have built strong connections with the students and faculty. Tuition could be lower.
* I am on the fence regarding my experience at Teachers College. Right now, I don't know whether I would make the same decision to attend. Perhaps the Teachers College name has helped me in my job search, but I still feel the college is a fairly poor value. It is very expensive, and I feel that the institution is living solely on its reputation from the past instead of the academic programs it offers today. Overall, I am quite disappointed.

APPENDIX A: MEANS AND FREQUENCIES TABLES
Academic Program and Courses

| Statement | Year | Agreement (Percentage) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Importance (Percentage) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Gap Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | (1) Strongly Disagree $\qquad$ (6) Strongly Agree |  |  |  |  |  | Mean | n | (1) Not Important............(6) Very Important |  |  |  |  |  | Mean | n |  |
|  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |  |  |  |
| 1) My academic program was excellent. | 2010 | 4 | 6 | 10 | 22 | 31 | 28 | 4.5 | 494 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 83 | 5.8 | 413 | 1.3 |
|  | 2011 | 3 | 8 | 11 | 18 | 31 | 28 | 4.5 | 408 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 14 | 82 | 5.8 | 352 | 1.3 |
| 2) My program had a clear philosophy or focus. | 2010 | 3 | 6 | 12 | 19 | 24 | 36 | 4.7 | 496 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 13 | 27 | 54 | 5.3 | 412 | 0.6 |
|  | 2011 | 3 | 6 | 14 | 19 | 30 | 29 | 4.5 | 406 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 14 | 28 | 52 | 5.3 | 350 | 0.8 |
| 3) My program had clear requirements. | 2010 | 1 | 4 | 8 | 20 | 27 | 40 | 4.9 | 493 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 12 | 24 | 56 | 5.3 | 409 | 0.4 |
|  | 2011 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 21 | 29 | 39 | 4.9 | 407 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 15 | 26 | 55 | 5.3 | 351 | 0.4 |
| 4) My program provided a well-integrated set of courses. | 2010 | 3 | 8 | 13 | 28 | 26 | 22 | 4.3 | 493 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 13 | 31 | 54 | 5.3 | 407 | 1.0 |
|  | 2011 | 5 | 6 | 13 | 27 | 28 | 21 | 4.3 | 403 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 29 | 57 | 5.4 | 348 | 1.1 |
| 5) My program provided a good variety of courses. | 2010 | 4 | 8 | 18 | 25 | 24 | 21 | 4.2 | 493 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 28 | 59 | 5.4 | 408 | 1.2 |
|  | 2011 | 4 | 7 | 19 | 28 | 22 | 19 | 4.2 | 402 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 13 | 28 | 57 | 5.4 | 349 | 1.2 |
| 6) I was able to register for courses I needed with few conflicts. | 2010 | 4 | 5 | 10 | 14 | 25 | 42 | 4.8 | 481 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 12 | 26 | 58 | 5.4 | 401 | 0.6 |
|  | 2011 | 4 | 5 | 8 | 16 | 26 | 41 | 4.8 | 402 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 11 | 29 | 58 | 5.4 | 345 | 0.6 |
| 7) I had flexibility to choose courses based on my life or career goals. | 2010 | 7 | 10 | 15 | 21 | 25 | 21 | 4.1 | 475 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 14 | 27 | 53 | 5.2 | 394 | 1.1 |
|  | 2011 | 7 | 8 | 18 | 27 | 21 | 19 | 4.0 | 395 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 17 | 25 | 53 | 5.2 | 339 | 1.2 |
| 8) My program provided a solid theoretical foundation in my discipline. | 2010 | 2 | 5 | 9 | 18 | 30 | 37 | 4.8 | 490 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 15 | 27 | 50 | 5.2 | 411 | 0.4 |
|  | 2011 | 4 | 2 | 10 | 18 | 29 | 37 | 4.8 | 404 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 15 | 22 | 55 | 5.2 | 349 | 0.4 |
| 9) Course content was relevant to my life or career goals | 2010 | 2 | 4 | 10 | 20 | 29 | 35 | 4.8 | 491 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 25 | 67 | 5.6 | 406 | 0.8 |
|  | 2011 | 3 | 4 | 12 | 18 | 31 | 32 | 4.6 | 404 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 18 | 73 | 5.6 | 350 | 1.0 |
| 10) Most courses were academically rigorous. | 2010 | 4 | 5 | 9 | 19 | 32 | 31 | 4.6 | 490 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 16 | 30 | 48 | 5.2 | 407 | 0.6 |
|  | 2011 | 5 | 7 | 12 | 20 | 27 | 30 | 4.5 | 404 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 14 | 29 | 51 | 5.2 | 351 | 0.7 |

Instruction

| Statement | Year | Agreement (Percentage) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Importance (Percentage) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Gap <br> Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | (1) Strongly Disagree .(6) Strongly Agree |  |  |  |  |  | Mean | n | (1) Not Important............(6) Very Important |  |  |  |  |  | Mean | n |  |
|  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |  |  |  |
| 12) Quality of instruction in most classes was excellent. | 2010 | 2 | 5 | 11 | 25 | 28 | 28 | 4.6 | 492 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 16 | 81 | 5.8 | 405 | 1.2 |
|  | 2011 | 3 | 6 | 10 | 23 | 33 | 26 | 4.5 | 403 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 82 | 5.8 | 344 | 1.3 |
| 13) Instructors used effective teaching strategies. | 2010 | 1 | 6 | 14 | 31 | 28 | 20 | 4.4 | 489 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 25 | 65 | 5.5 | 404 | 1.1 |
|  | 2011 | 3 | 6 | 12 | 25 | 33 | 21 | 4.4 | 403 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 22 | 70 | 5.6 | 342 | 1.2 |
| 14) Instructors considered student differences as they taught a course. | 2010 | 2 | 7 | 16 | 26 | 25 | 23 | 4.3 | 484 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 15 | 29 | 45 | 5.0 | 396 | 0.7 |
|  | 2011 | 5 | 6 | 17 | 24 | 27 | 20 | 4.2 | 389 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 17 | 24 | 47 | 5.1 | 340 | 0.8 |
| 15) Instructors used information technology and media in the classroom. | 2010 | 2 | 6 | 18 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 4.4 | 489 | 4 | 6 | 17 | 19 | 27 | 27 | 4.4 | 403 | 0 |
|  | 2011 | 2 | 7 | 14 | 25 | 32 | 20 | 4.4 | 402 | 4 | 6 | 16 | 27 | 19 | 28 | 4.3 | 343 | 0 |
| 16) Instructors provided timely feedback about student progress. | 2010 | 2 | 7 | 14 | 23 | 31 | 23 | 4.4 | 490 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 16 | 30 | 49 | 5.2 | 404 | 0.8 |
|  | 2011 | 2 | 6 | 13 | 27 | 30 | 21 | 4.4 | 401 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 15 | 31 | 50 | 5.3 | 343 | 0.8 |
| 17) Instructors used appropriate methods to assess student performance. | 2010 | 1 | 2 | 11 | 25 | 33 | 28 | 4.7 | 483 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 13 | 32 | 51 | 5.3 | 401 | 0.6 |
|  | 2011 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 22 | 40 | 25 | 4.7 | 400 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 16 | 29 | 52 | 5.3 | 341 | 0.6 |
| 18) I had adequate opportunities to develop research skills. | 2010 | 7 | 9 | 13 | 20 | 26 | 25 | 4.2 | 480 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 18 | 23 | 45 | 4.9 | 396 | 0.7 |
|  | 2011 | 6 | 9 | 17 | 19 | 27 | 23 | 4.2 | 395 | 4 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 24 | 43 | 4.8 | 337 | 0.7 |
| 19) I had adequate opportunities for reflection and critical thinking. | 2010 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 15 | 26 | 48 | 5.0 | 487 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 12 | 24 | 59 | 5.3 | 401 | 0.3 |
|  | 2011 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 14 | 27 | 48 | 5.1 | 400 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 11 | 28 | 57 | 5.4 | 343 | 0.3 |
| 20) I had adequate opportunities for teamwork and collaboration. | 2010 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 14 | 30 | 46 | 5.1 | 486 | 2 | 5 | 12 | 21 | 26 | 34 | 4.7 | 403 | -0.4 |
|  | 2011 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 14 | 30 | 47 | 5.1 | 400 | 3 | 5 | 11 | 21 | 25 | 35 | 4.7 | 341 | -0.5 |
| 21) I had adequate opportunities to learn new media and technology. | 2010 | 10 | 16 | 18 | 26 | 17 | 14 | 3.7 | 480 | 4 | 5 | 15 | 21 | 22 | 33 | 4.5 | 397 | 0.9 |
|  | 2011 | 9 | 17 | 21 | 24 | 19 | 11 | 3.6 | 398 | 3 | 7 | 14 | 26 | 22 | 28 | 4.4 | 338 | 0.8 |
| 22) I had adequate opportunities to develop skills to work with diverse children and/or adults. | 2010 | 7 | 8 | 14 | 21 | 22 | 28 | 4.3 | 468 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 13 | 26 | 50 | 5.1 | 384 | 0.8 |
|  | 2011 | 7 | 8 | 11 | 24 | 26 | 24 | 4.3 | 374 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 12 | 24 | 51 | 5.0 | 322 | 0.8 |

Academic Advising

| Statement | Year | Agreement (Percentage) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Importance (Percentage) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Gap Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1=Strongly Disagree...6=Strongly Agree |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1=Not Important...6=Very Important |  |  |  |  |  | Mean | n |  |
|  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Mean | n | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |  |  |  |
| 24) My program provided good academic advising. | 2010 | 15 | 13 | 14 | 17 | 21 | 21 | 3.8 | 475 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 21 | 66 | 5.5 | 387 | 1.7 |
|  | 2011 | 13 | 10 | 13 | 18 | 21 | 24 | 4.0 | 396 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 23 | 65 | 5.5 | 337 | 1.5 |
| 25) My program provided accurate information about program requirements. | 2010 | 4 | 7 | 13 | 16 | 26 | 34 | 4.6 | 479 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 25 | 64 | 5.5 | 384 | 1.0 |
|  | 2011 | 4 | 5 | 11 | 19 | 24 | 36 | 4.6 | 398 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 26 | 63 | 5.5 | 335 | 0.9 |
| 26) My program regularly assessed my academic performance. | 2010 | 10 | 10 | 14 | 18 | 24 | 24 | 4.1 | 465 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 20 | 26 | 43 | 4.9 | 377 | 0.9 |
|  | 2011 | 10 | 7 | 13 | 23 | 27 | 21 | 4.1 | 382 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 20 | 28 | 41 | 4.9 | 323 | 0.8 |
| 27) I knew who to contact for questions about programs and services. | 2010 | 7 | 6 | 11 | 17 | 26 | 33 | 4.5 | 479 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 9 | 26 | 59 | 5.4 | 391 | 0.9 |
|  | 2011 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 16 | 23 | 38 | 4.5 | 401 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 23 | 61 | 5.4 | 341 | 0.8 |
| 28) My advisor was available when needed. | 2010 | 10 | 8 | 11 | 15 | 22 | 35 | 4.3 | 467 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 25 | 63 | 5.5 | 383 | 1.1 |
|  | 2011 | 9 | 6 | 9 | 14 | 20 | 42 | 4.6 | 393 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 24 | 65 | 5.5 | 337 | 1 |
| 29) The frequency of interactions with my advisor was adequate. | 2010 | 15 | 11 | 9 | 17 | 17 | 30 | 4.0 | 469 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 16 | 27 | 54 | 5.3 | 380 | 1.3 |
|  | 2011 | 13 | 5 | 12 | 17 | 18 | 34 | 4.2 | 391 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 12 | 28 | 56 | 5.3 | 334 | 1.1 |
| 30) My advisor was knowledgeable about program requirements. | 2010 | 5 | 6 | 8 | 13 | 24 | 45 | 4.8 | 460 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 23 | 66 | 5.5 | 380 | 0.7 |
|  | 2011 | 7 | 4 | 8 | 10 | 21 | 50 | 4.8 | 388 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 21 | 69 | 5.6 | 338 | 0.7 |
| 31) My program/ advisor kept me informed about my academic progress. | 2010 | 20 | 14 | 11 | 17 | 16 | 22 | 3.6 | 455 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 16 | 25 | 48 | 5.0 | 374 | 1.4 |
|  | 2011 | 18 | 10 | 10 | 19 | 19 | 23 | 3.8 | 382 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 17 | 27 | 45 | 5.0 | 332 | 1.2 |
| 32) My advisor supported me in completing my program in a timely manner. | 2010 | 12 | 9 | 9 | 14 | 17 | 40 | 4.3 | 456 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 23 | 61 | 5.4 | 374 | 1.1 |
|  | 2011 | 12 | 6 | 7 | 14 | 16 | 44 | 4.5 | 387 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 13 | 19 | 63 | 5.4 | 335 | 0.9 |
| 33) My advisor supported me in pursuing my life or career goals. | 2010 | 16 | 11 | 8 | 13 | 17 | 35 | 4.1 | 453 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 24 | 64 | 5.5 | 371 | 1.4 |
|  | 2011 | 14 | 9 | 9 | 15 | 17 | 37 | 4.2 | 380 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 10 | 20 | 64 | 5.4 | 331 | 1.2 |

Learning Environment

| Statement | Year | Agreement (Percentage) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Importance (Percentage) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Gap <br> Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1=Strongly Disagree...6=Strongly Agree |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1=Not Important...6=Very Important |  |  |  |  |  | Mean | n |  |
|  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Mean | n | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |  |  |  |
| 35) My program provided an effective learning environment for its students. | 2010 | 2 | 3 | 10 | 24 | 30 | 31 | 4.7 | 480 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 27 | 62 | 5.5 | 390 | 0.8 |
|  | 2011 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 22 | 70 | 4.7 | 333 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 16 | 28 | 41 | 4.8 | 400 | 1.0 |
| 36) My program was an intellectually stimulating place. | 2010 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 16 | 26 | 44 | 4.9 | 480 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 21 | 73 | 5.7 | 390 | 0.8 |
|  | 2011 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 16 | 28 | 41 | 4.8 | 400 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 17 | 79 | 5.7 | 334 | 0.9 |
| 37) Faculty were scholarly and professionally competent. | 2010 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 16 | 30 | 45 | 5.1 | 479 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 19 | 77 | 5.7 | 390 | 0.7 |
|  | 2011 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 13 | 34 | 41 | 5.0 | 395 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 19 | 77 | 5.7 | 331 | 0.8 |
| 38) Faculty were usually available after class and/or during office hours. | 2010 | 3 | 3 | 7 | 19 | 29 | 39 | 4.8 | 469 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 11 | 26 | 57 | 5.3 | 385 | 0.5 |
|  | 2011 | 3 | 2 | 10 | 19 | 34 | 32 | 4.8 | 389 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 13 | 28 | 57 | 5.4 | 329 | 0.6 |
| 39) Communication between faculty and students in my program was good. | 2010 | 6 | 5 | 10 | 18 | 28 | 33 | 4.6 | 479 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 27 | 62 | 5.5 | 391 | 0.9 |
|  | 2011 | 5 | 4 | 11 | 18 | 31 | 31 | 4.6 | 396 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 26 | 62 | 5.5 | 333 | 0.9 |
| 40) Faculty respected student opinions or ideas that differed from their own. | 2010 | 3 | 4 | 11 | 18 | 30 | 33 | 4.7 | 476 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 29 | 58 | 5.4 | 391 | 0.7 |
|  | 2011 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 16 | 36 | 32 | 4.7 | 394 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 29 | 61 | 5.5 | 330 | 0.8 |
| 41) Faculty cared about students as individuals. | 2010 | 4 | 6 | 10 | 18 | 30 | 32 | 4.6 | 476 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 12 | 27 | 58 | 5.4 | 393 | 0.8 |
|  | 2011 | 5 | 5 | 12 | 17 | 28 | 34 | 4.6 | 394 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 27 | 60 | 5.4 | 330 | 0.8 |
| 42) Faculty treated all students fairly. | 2010 | 3 | 4 | 8 | 16 | 32 | 38 | 4.8 | 477 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 26 | 65 | 5.6 | 393 | 0.7 |
|  | 2011 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 15 | 34 | 36 | 4.8 | 389 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 22 | 68 | 5.5 | 330 | 0.8 |
| 43) My program was responsive to student feedback. | 2010 | 8 | 8 | 13 | 18 | 27 | 27 | 4.3 | 440 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 14 | 28 | 56 | 5.4 | 376 | 1.1 |
|  | 2011 | 6 | 8 | 13 | 19 | 30 | 23 | 4.3 | 356 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 29 | 57 | 5.4 | 315 | 1.1 |
| 44) There was a sense of community in my program. | 2010 | 8 | 8 | 11 | 16 | 23 | 34 | 4.4 | 475 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 29 | 55 | 5.3 | 390 | 0.9 |
|  | 2011 | 8 | 8 | 10 | 21 | 22 | 32 | 4.4 | 395 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 11 | 29 | 53 | 5.2 | 333 | 0.9 |
| 45) Fellow students demonstrated high academic abilities. | 2010 | 4 | 3 | 7 | 18 | 31 | 36 | 4.8 | 477 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 30 | 56 | 5.3 | 393 | 0.5 |
|  | 2011 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 21 | 34 | 31 | 4.7 | 395 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 12 | 30 | 52 | 5.3 | 330 | 0.5 |
| 46) Faculty reflected a diversity of backgrounds and experiences. | 2010 | 4 | 6 | 9 | 19 | 27 | 35 | 4.6 | 474 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 12 | 28 | 56 | 5.3 | 390 | 0.7 |
|  | 2011 | 4 | 5 | 9 | 25 | 29 | 28 | 4.6 | 390 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 12 | 25 | 55 | 5.3 | 329 | 0.7 |
| 47) Students reflected a diversity of backgrounds and experiences. | 2010 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 14 | 30 | 45 | 5 | 476 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 12 | 27 | 56 | 5.3 | 392 | 0.3 |
|  | 2011 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 17 | 32 | 38 | 4.9 | 397 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 15 | 26 | 53 | 5.2 | 331 | 0.4 |
| 48) My program was free of discrimination. | 2010 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 9 | 25 | 56 | 5.2 | 448 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 18 | 75 | 5.6 | 385 | 0.5 |
|  | 2011 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 13 | 27 | 50 | 5.1 | 368 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 17 | 76 | 5.7 | 321 | 0.6 |

Resources

| Statement | Year | Agreement (Percentage) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Importance (Percentage) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Gap <br> Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1=Strongly Disagree...6=Strongly Agree |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1=Not Important...6=Very Important |  |  |  |  |  | Mean | n |  |
|  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Mean | n | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |  |  |  |
| 50) The College/ program had adequate resources to support learning. | 2010 | 2 | 4 | 10 | 21 | 31 | 33 | 4.7 | 480 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 24 | 63 | 5.5 | 391 | 0.7 |
|  | 2011 | 4 | 4 | 9 | 21 | 30 | 32 | 4.7 | 383 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 24 | 64 | 5.5 | 318 | 0.8 |
| 51) Program staff was caring and helpful. | 2010 | 2 | 5 | 11 | 19 | 28 | 36 | 4.7 | 476 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 32 | 56 | 5.4 | 392 | 0.7 |
|  | 2011 | 2 | 4 | 11 | 20 | 28 | 35 | 4.7 | 392 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 11 | 29 | 56 | 5.3 | 321 | 0.6 |
| 52) Gottesman Libraries resources and services were adequate. | 2010 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 20 | 33 | 34 | 4.8 | 463 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 29 | 58 | 5.4 | 383 | 0.6 |
|  | 2011 | 2 | 5 | 8 | 18 | 32 | 35 | 4.8 | 381 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 26 | 58 | 5.3 | 313 | 0.6 |
| 53) Classroom facilities were adequate. | 2010 | 7 | 9 | 16 | 21 | 27 | 20 | 4.1 | 481 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 17 | 33 | 45 | 5.2 | 392 | 1.1 |
|  | 2011 | 10 | 9 | 16 | 23 | 25 | 18 | 4.0 | 397 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 15 | 36 | 44 | 5.2 | 324 | 1.2 |
| 54) Specialized facilities (labs, studios, etc.) and equipment were adequate. | 2010 | 3 | 7 | 12 | 24 | 31 | 24 | 4.4 | 380 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 13 | 34 | 48 | 5.2 | 322 | 0.8 |
|  | 2011 | 4 | 10 | 12 | 24 | 29 | 21 | 4.3 | 298 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 16 | 30 | 47 | 5.1 | 260 | 0.9 |
| 55) Information technology and media resources were adequate. | 2010 | 3 | 5 | 10 | 23 | 36 | 24 | 4.6 | 459 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 16 | 34 | 45 | 5.2 | 380 | 0.6 |
|  | 2011 | 2 | 8 | 13 | 25 | 29 | 23 | 4.4 | 368 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 19 | 32 | 43 | 5.1 | 308 | 0.7 |
| 56) Adequate financial aid was available for most students. | 2010 | 25 | 12 | 12 | 13 | 19 | 20 | 3.5 | 377 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 16 | 76 | 5.6 | 330 | 2.1 |
|  | 2011 | 24 | 13 | 13 | 16 | 15 | 18 | 3.4 | 323 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 17 | 72 | 5.6 | 281 | 2.2 |

APPENDIX B: CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS

|  | n |  | percent |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2010 | 2011 | 2010 | 2011 |
| Department |  |  |  |  |
| Arts \& Humanities | 94 | 89 | 19\% | 22\% |
| Biobehavioral Sciences | 26 | 21 | 5\% | 5\% |
| Counseling \& Clinical Psychology | 63 | 27 | 13\% | 7\% |
| Curriculum \& Teaching | 45 | 50 | 9\% | 12\% |
| Health \& Behavior Studies | 39 | 40 | 8\% | 10\% |
| Human Development | 28 | 28 | 6\% | 7\% |
| International \& Transcultural Studies | 51 | 33 | 10\% | 8\% |
| Mathematics, Science \& Technology | 48 | 31 | 10\% | 8\% |
| Organization \& Leadership | 105 | 94 | 21\% | 23\% |
| Number of respondents with known department | 499 | 413 | 100\% | 100\% |
| Number of respondents with unknown department | 0 | 1 |  |  |
| Total number of respondents | 499 | 414 |  |  |
| Type of Program |  |  |  |  |
| Teacher education ${ }^{1}$ | 224 | 185 | 45\% | 45\% |
| Non-teacher education | 275 | 229 | 55\% | 55\% |
| Total number of respondents | 499 | 414 | 100\% | 100\% |
| Missing | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Total | 499 | 414 |  |  |
| Degree |  |  |  |  |
| Master of Arts | 392 | 318 | 79\% | 77\% |
| Master of Science | 28 | 23 | 6\% | 6\% |
| Master of Education | 79 | 68 | 16\% | 16\% |
| Master of Philosophy |  | 5 |  | 1\% |
| Total number of respondents | 499 | 414 | 100\% | 100\% |
| Missing | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Total | 499 | 414 |  |  |
| Gender |  |  |  |  |
| Female | 408 | 331 | 82\% | 80\% |
| Male | 91 | 83 | 18\% | 20\% |
| Total number of respondents | 499 | 414 | 100\% | 100\% |
| Missing | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Total | 499 | 414 |  |  |
| Age |  |  |  |  |
| 20-25 | 70 | 107 | 14\% | 26\% |
| 26-30 | 227 | 162 | 46\% | 39\% |
| 31-35 | 100 | 73 | 20\% | 18\% |
| 36 and above | 93 | 69 | 19\% | 17\% |
| Total number of respondents | 490 | 411 | 100\% | 100\% |
| Missing | 9 | 3 |  |  |

[^0]|  | n |  | percent |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2010 | 2011 | 2010 | 2011 |
| Total | 499 | 414 |  |  |
| Citizenship |  |  |  |  |
| U.S. citizen | 430 | 358 | 87\% | 86\% |
| Non-U.S. citizen | 63 | 56 | 13\% | 14\% |
| Total number of respondents | 493 | 414 | 100\% | 100\% |
| Missing | 6 | 0 |  |  |
| Total | 499 | 414 |  |  |
| Race/Ethnicity |  |  |  |  |
| African American/ Black | 43 | 32 | 9\% | 8\% |
| American Indian or Alaskan Native | 1 |  | 0\% |  |
| Asian | 2 | 7 | 0\% | 2\% |
| Asian/ Pacific Islander | 48 | 49 | 10\% | 12\% |
| White (of European, Middle Easter, or North African origins) | 264 | 197 | 53\% | 48\% |
| Latino or Hispanic American | 28 | 31 | 6\% | 8\% |
| Other | 4 | 2 | 1\% | 1\% |
| Foreign | 35 | 33 | 7\% | 8\% |
| None | 25 | 14 | 5\% | 3\% |
| Not indicated | 34 | 35 | 7\% | 9\% |
| Unknown | 2 | 1 | 0\% | 0\% |
| Two or more races | 12 | 13 | 2\% | 3\% |
| Total number of respondents | 498 | 414 | 100\% | 100\% |
| Missing | 1 | 0 |  |  |
| Total | 499 | 414 |  |  |

## APPENDIX C: RESPONSE RATE BY DEPARTMENT AND PROGRAM

Note: The number of respondents by department may not equal the sum of the number of respondents of its affiliated programs because some respondents indicated their department but not their program of study.

|  | 2010 |  |  | 2011 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Departments and Programs | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline n \\ \text { Graduate } \\ s \end{array}$ | n Respond ents | Respons e Rate | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline n \\ \text { Graduate } \\ \mathbf{s} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | n Respond ents | Respons e Rate |
| ARTS AND HUMANITIES | 346 | 94 | 27\% | 443 | 89 | 20\% |
| Applied Linguistics | 12 | 7 | 58\% | 26 | 8 | 31\% |
| Art and Art Education | 50 | 16 | 32\% | 37 | 13 | 35\% |
| Arts Administration | 30 | 12 | 40\% | 39 | 10 | 26\% |
| Dance and Dance Education | 1 | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |
| History and Education | 13 | 0 | 0\% | 25 | 0 | 0\% |
| Music and Music Education | 57 | 16 | 28\% | 54 | 7 | 13\% |
| Philosophy and Education | 6 | 0 | 0\% | 15 | 0 | 0\% |
| Religion and Education | 1 | 0 | 0\% |  |  |  |
| Teaching of English | 85 | 16 | 19\% | 150 | 24 | 16\% |
| Teaching of Social Studies | 54 | 11 | 20\% | 49 | 14 | 29\% |
| TESOL | 38 | 14 | 37\% | 39 | 5 | 13\% |
| TESOL-Japan | 13 | 0 | 0\% | 32 | 6 | 19\% |
| BIOBEHAVIORAL STUDIES | 88 | 26 | 30\% | 97 | 21 | 22\% |
| Applied Physiology | 10 | 4 | 40\% | 13 | 4 | 31\% |
| Curriculum and Teaching in Physical Education | 2 | 1 | 50\% | 4 | 0 | 0\% |
| Kinesiology |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 100\% |
| Motor Learning | 7 | 4 | 57\% | 8 | 3 | 38\% |
| Neuroscience and Education | 10 | 4 | 40\% | 19 | 3 | 16\% |
| Physical Education | 6 | 3 | 50\% |  |  |  |
| Speech and Language Pathology | 53 | 11 | 21\% | 47 | 8 | 17\% |
| COUNSELING AND CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY | 220 | 63 | 29\% | 240 | 50 | 21\% |
| Clinical Psychology | 11 | 1 | 9\% | 13 | 1 | 8\% |
| Counseling Psychology |  |  |  | 3 | 0 | 0\% |
| Psychological Counseling | 93 | 26 | 28\% | 107 | 22 | 21\% |
| Psychology in Education | 116 | 36 | 31\% | 117 | 27 | 23\% |
| CURRICULUM AND TEACHING | 179 | 45 | 25\% | 179 | 27 | 15\% |
| Curriculum and Teaching | 11 | 3 | 27\% | 4 | 0 | 0\% |
| Curriculum and Teaching Elementary Education | 20 | 4 | 20\% | 15 | 1 | 6\% |
| Curriculum and Teaching Secondary Education | 9 | 3 | 33\% | 7 | 1 | 14\% |
| Early Childhood Education | 11 | 2 | 18\% | 13 | 2 | 15\% |
| Early Childhood Education/ Special Education | 21 | 6 | 29\% | 25 | 7 | 28\% |
| Elementary Inclusive Education | 54 | 12 | 22\% | 64 | 6 | 9\% |
| Gifted Education | 8 | 4 | 50\% | 2 | 1 | 50\% |
| Literacy Specialist | 45 | 11 | 24\% | 49 | 9 | 18\% |
| HEALTH AND BEHAVIOR STUDIES | 145 | 39 | 27\% | 184 | 40 | 22\% |
| Applied Behavior Analysis | 17 | 4 | 24\% | 17 | 2 | 12\% |
| Applied Physiology and Nutrition Education | 12 | 6 | 50\% | 17 | 4 | 24\% |


|  | 2010 |  |  | 2011 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Departments and Programs | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { n } \\ \text { Graduate } \\ \mathrm{s} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | n Respond ents | Respons e Rate | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline n \\ \text { Graduate } \\ \mathbf{s} \end{array}$ | n Respond ents | Respons e Rate |
| Behavioral Nutrition |  |  |  | 1 | 0 | 0\% |
| Blindness \& Visual Impairment | 3 | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 0 | 0\% |
| Community Nutrition Education | 1 | 0 | 0\% |  |  |  |
| Deaf \& Hard of Hearing | 10 | 1 | 10\% | 18 | 3 | 17\% |
| Guidance \& Rehabilitation | 1 | 1 | 100\% | 1 | 1 | 100\% |
| Health Education | 13 | 7 | 54\% | 23 | 9 | 39\% |
| Instructional Practice in Special Education | 1 | 0 | 0\% |  |  |  |
| Intellectual Disabilities/ Autism | 14 | 2 | 14\% | 18 | 3 | 17\% |
| Nursing Education | 1 | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |
| Nutrition Education | 10 | 4 | 40\% | 14 | 3 | 21\% |
| Nutrition and Public Health | 4 | 0 | 0\% | 7 | 1 | 14\% |
| Physical Disabilities |  |  |  | 1 | 0 | 0\% |
| Reading Specialist | 27 | 5 | 19\% | 20 | 6 | 30\% |
| School Psychology | 23 | 6 | 26\% | 29 | 7 | 24\% |
| Severe or Multiple Disabilities | 5 | 2 | 40\% | 4 | 0 | 0\% |
| Teaching ASL as a Foreign Language | 4 | 0 | 0\% | 8 | 0 | 0\% |
| HUMAN DEVELOPMENT | 84 | 28 | 33\% | 111 | 28 | 25\% |
| Applied Statistics | 1 | 0 | 0\% | 7 | 0 | 0\% |
| Cognitive Studies in Education | 17 | 4 | 24\% | 14 | 5 | 36\% |
| Developmental Psychology |  |  |  | 2 | 0 | 0\% |
| Educational Psychology | 2 | 0 | 0\% | 4 | 0 | 0\% |
| Measurement and Evaluation |  |  |  | 5 | 2 | 40\% |
| Psychology-Developmental | 44 | 14 | 32\% | 52 | 13 | 25\% |
| Sociology and Education | 20 | 10 | 50\% | 29 | 8 | 28\% |
| INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES | - | - |  | 2 | 1 | 50\% |
| Interdisciplinary Studies Education |  |  |  | 2 | 1 | 50\% |
| INTERNATIONAL AND TRANSCULTURAL | 130 | 51 | 39\% | 150 | 33 | 22\% |
| Anthropology and Education | 15 | 7 | 47\% | 10 | 1 | 10\% |
| Bilingual/Bicultural Education | 19 | 5 | 26\% | 25 | 5 | 20\% |
| Comparative \& International Education | 8 | 3 | 38\% | 9 | 2 | 22\% |
| Economics and Education | 9 | 4 | 44\% | 21 | 5 | 24\% |
| International Educational Development | 79 | 32 | 41\% | 85 | 20 | 24\% |
| MATHEMATICS, SCIENCE, \& TECHNOLOGY | 171 | 48 | 28\% | 140 | 31 | 22\% |
| Communication | 14 | 6 | 43\% | 9 | 2 | 22\% |
| Computing in Education | 18 | 6 | 33\% | 14 | 5 | 36\% |
| Instructional Technology and Media | 30 | 12 | 40\% | 27 | 4 | 15\% |
| Mathematics Education | 74 | 17 | 23\% | 64 | 11 | 17\% |
| Science Education | 24 | 6 | 25\% | 24 | 8 | 33\% |
| Science and Dental Education |  |  |  | 1 | 0 | 0\% |
| Supervision in Science Education | 7 | 1 | 14\% |  |  |  |
| Teacher Education in Science | 3 | 0 | 0\% |  |  |  |
| Technology Specialist | 1 | 0 | 0\% | 7 | 0 | 0\% |
| ORGANIZATION AND LEADERSHIP | 349 | 105 | 30\% | 387 | 94 | 24\% |


|  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ |  |  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Departments and Programs | $\mathbf{n}$ <br> Graduate <br> $\mathbf{s}$ | n <br> Respond <br> ents | Respons <br> e Rate | $\mathbf{n}$ <br> Graduate <br> $\mathbf{s}$ | $\mathbf{n}$ <br> Respond <br> ents | Respons <br> e Rate |
| Adult \& Continuing Education |  |  |  | 19 | 4 | $21 \%$ |
| Adult Learning and Leadership | 10 | 2 | $20 \%$ | 19 | 4 | $21 \%$ |
| Education Leadership Studies | 12 | 4 | $33 \%$ | 23 | 5 | $22 \%$ |
| Leadership, Policy and Politics | 8 | 2 | $25 \%$ | 7 | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Higher \& Postsecondary Education | 35 | 13 | $37 \%$ | 68 | 31 | $46 \%$ |
| Nurse Executive | 29 | 16 | $55 \%$ |  |  |  |
| Politics and Education | 17 | 8 | $47 \%$ | 15 | 5 | $33 \%$ |
| Private School Leadership | 35 | 7 | $20 \%$ | 66 | 13 | $20 \%$ |
| Psychology-Organizational | 120 | 33 | $28 \%$ | 107 | 25 | $23 \%$ |
| Public School and District Leadership | 83 | 20 | $24 \%$ | 79 | 11 | $14 \%$ |
| Social-Organizational Psychology |  |  |  | 3 | 0 | $0 \%$ |

APPENDIX D: EXIT SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

## Survey ID:

## TEACHERS COLLEGE EXIT SURVEY Masters Students 2009-2010

Dear Participant: Please carefully read each statement on the left and, using the two scales on the right, indicate, first, the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements in light of your student experiences at Teachers College, and, second, how important each of these statements is in your educational experience.

|  | Academic Program and Courses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | My academic program was excellent. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | DK |
| 2 | My program had a clear philosophy or focus. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | DK |
| 3 | My program had clear requirements. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | DK |
| 4 | My program provided a well-integrated set of courses. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | DK |
| 5 | My program provided a good variety of courses. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | DK |
| 6 | I was able to register for courses I needed with few conflicts. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DK } \\ & \text { NA } \end{aligned}$ |
| 7 | I had flexibility to choose courses based on my life or career goals. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DK } \\ & \text { NA } \end{aligned}$ |
| 8 | My program provided a solid theoretical foundation in my discipline. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DK } \\ & \text { NA } \end{aligned}$ |
| 9 | Course content was relevant to my life or career goals. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DK } \\ & \text { NA } \end{aligned}$ |
| 10 | Most courses were academically rigorous. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DK } \\ & \text { NA } \end{aligned}$ |

11) Additional comments about your program curriculum or courses (please use the extra sheet in the back if necessary):
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

|  | Instruction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12 | Quality of instruction in most classes was excellent. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | DK |
| 13 | Instructors used effective teaching strategies. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | DK |
| 14 | Instructors considered student differences as they taught a course. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | DK |
| 15 | Instructors used information technology and media in the classroom. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DK } \\ & \text { NA } \end{aligned}$ |
| 16 | Instructors provided timely feedback about student progress. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DK } \\ & \text { NA } \end{aligned}$ |
| 17 | Instructors used appropriate methods to assess student performance. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DK } \\ & \text { NA } \end{aligned}$ |
| 18 | I had adequate opportunities to develop research skills. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | DK |
| 19 | I had adequate opportunities for reflection and critical thinking. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DK } \\ & \text { NA } \end{aligned}$ |
| 20 | I had adequate opportunities for teamwork and collaboration. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DK } \\ & \text { NA } \end{aligned}$ |
| 21 | I had adequate opportunities to learn new media and technology. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | DK |
| 22 | I had adequate opportunities to develop skills to work with diverse children and/or adults. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | DK |

23) Additional comments about quality of instruction in your program (please use the extra sheet in the back if necessary):
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

## Survey ID:

|  | Academic Advising |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 24 | My program provided good academic advising. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | DK <br> NA |
| 25 | My program provided accurate information about program requirements. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DK } \\ & \text { NA } \end{aligned}$ |
| 26 | My program regularly assessed my academic performance. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DK } \\ & \text { NA } \end{aligned}$ |
| 27 | I knew who to contact for questions about programs and services. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DK } \\ & \text { NA } \end{aligned}$ |
| 28 | My advisor was available when needed. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DK } \\ & \text { NA } \end{aligned}$ |
| 29 | The frequency of interactions with my advisor was adequate. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DK } \\ & \text { NA } \end{aligned}$ |
| 30 | My advisor was knowledgeable about program requirements. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DK } \\ & \text { NA } \end{aligned}$ |
| 31 | My program/advisor kept me informed about my academic progress. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DK } \\ & \text { NA } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| 32 | My advisor supported me in completing my program in a timely manner. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DK } \\ & \text { NA } \end{aligned}$ |
| 33 | My advisor supported me in pursuing my life or career goals. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DK } \\ & \text { NA } \end{aligned}$ |

34) Additional comments about advisement in your program (please use the extra sheet in the back if necessary):
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

|  | Learning Environment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 35 | My program provided an effective learning environment for its students. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | DK <br> NA |
| 36 | My program was an intellectually stimulating place. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DK } \\ & \text { NA } \end{aligned}$ |
| 37 | Faculty were scholarly and professionally competent. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DK } \\ & \text { NA } \end{aligned}$ |
| 38 | Faculty were usually available after class and/or during office hours. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | DK NA |
| 39 | Communication between faculty and students in my program was good. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DK } \\ & \text { NA } \end{aligned}$ |
| 40 | Faculty respected student opinions or ideas that differed from their own. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DK } \\ & \text { NA } \end{aligned}$ |
| 41 | Faculty cared about students as individuals. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DK } \\ & \text { NA } \end{aligned}$ |
| 42 | Faculty treated all students fairly. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DK } \\ & \text { NA } \end{aligned}$ |
| 43 | My program was responsive to student feedback. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DK } \\ & \text { NA } \end{aligned}$ |
| 44 | There was a sense of community in my program. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DK } \\ & \text { NA } \end{aligned}$ |
| 45 | Fellow students demonstrated high academic abilities. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DK } \\ & \text { NA } \end{aligned}$ |
| 46 | Faculty reflected a diversity of backgrounds and experiences. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DK } \\ & \text { NA } \end{aligned}$ |
| 47 | Students reflected a diversity of backgrounds and experiences. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DK } \\ & \text { NA } \end{aligned}$ |
| 48 | My program was free of discrimination. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DK } \\ & \text { NA } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |

49) Additional comments about the learning environment in your program (please use the extra sheet in the back if necessary):

## Survey ID:

|  | Resources |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 50 | The College/program had adequate resources to support learning. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | DK |
| 51 | Program staff was caring and helpful. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DK } \\ & \text { NA } \end{aligned}$ |
| 52 | Gottesman Libraries resources and services were adequate. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DK } \\ & \text { NA } \end{aligned}$ |
| 53 | Classroom facilities were adequate. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DK } \\ & \text { NA } \end{aligned}$ |
| 54 | Specialized facilities (labs, studios, etc.) and equipment were adequate. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DK } \\ & \text { NA } \end{aligned}$ |
| 55 | Information technology and media resources were adequate. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DK } \\ & \text { NA } \end{aligned}$ |
| 56 | Adequate financial aid was available for most students. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DK } \\ & \text { NA } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |

57) Additional comments about college or program resources (please use the extra sheet in the back if necessary):
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

|  | In your experience as a student, how helpful were the following student support services? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 58 | Office of the Registrar | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | D |
| 59 | Financial Aid Office | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | D |
| 60 | Student Accounts | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | D |
| 61 | Career Services | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | D |
| 62 | Other (please specify): | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | D |
| 63 | Other (please specify): | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | D |

64) Additional comments about student support services (please use the extra sheet in the back if necessary):

| 65 | Overall, how did your program meet your expectations? | Much worse than I expected 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 Much better than I expected | DK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 66 | How much do you feel you learned in your program? | Not much 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 A lot | DK |
| 67 | Overall, how satisfied are you with your experience? | Very dissatisfied 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 Very satisfied | DK |
| 68 | Tuition paid was a worthwhile investment. | Strongly disagree 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 Strongly agree | DK |
| 69 | If you could start over, would you attend TC? | Definitely not 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 Definitely yes | DK |
| 70 | If you could start over, would you choose your program at TC? | Definitely not 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 Definitely yes | DK |
| 71 | Would you recommend your program at TC to others? | Definitely not 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 Definitely yes | DK |

72) Additional comments about your student experience at TC (please use the extra sheet in the back if necessary):
73) Comments or suggestions about this questionnaire (please use the extra sheet in the back if necessary):

[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ All master's 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.

