Frequencies by Graduation Year and Program

Undergraduate Responses:

The 2021 alumni survey was sent to 455 undergraduate program completers. Based on the responses received from 2018 - 2020 graduates, there is a 23% undergraduate (initial programs) response rate. Including the 2014 – 2017 graduates, the response rate is 25%.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2014 - 2017 (completed graduate program within the last three years)** | **2018 (n = 140)** | **2019 (n = 149)** | **2020 (n = 176)** | **Total (n = 455)** |
| **Total (n = 455)** | **8** | **26 (19%)** | **37 (25%)** | **42 (24%)** | **113 (25%)** |
| **Adolescence Education (n = 167)** | 1 | 15 | 15 | 17 | 48 (29%) |
| English (n = 38) | 1 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 13 (34%) |
| Foreign Language) (n = 16) | 0 | 1 (Spanish) | 1 (French) | 3 (French and Spanish) | 5 (31%) |
| Mathematics (n = 41) | 0 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 12 (29%) |
| Science (n = 20) | 0 | 2 (Biology & Chemistry) | 2 (Physics) | 2 (Biology & Earth Sciences) | 6 (30%) |
| Social Studies (n = 52) | 0 | 4 (Political Science & History) | 5 (History) | 4 (History) | 13 (25%) |
| **Childhood with Special Education (n = 176)** | 5 | 6 | 16 | 13 | 40 (23%) |
| **Early Childhood / Childhood Education (n = 112)** | 2 | 5 | 6 | 12 | 25 (22%) |

Graduate Responses:

The 2021 alumni survey was sent to 124 graduate program completers. Based on the responses received from 2018-2020 graduates, there is a 25% graduate (advanced programs) response rate. Including graduate teacher candidates currently enrolled in the program, the response rate is 37%.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2018 (n = 40)** | **2019 (n = 44)** | **2020 (n = 40)** | **Currently enrolled (completed undergraduate program within the last three years)** | **Total (n = 124)** |
| **Total (n = 124)** | **8 (20%)** | **9 (20%)** | **13 (33%)** | **15** | **45 (36%)** |
| **Adolescence Education (n = 6)** | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 (67%) |
| English (n = 2) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 (100%) |
| Foreign Language (n = 2)  | 0 | 0 | 1 (French) | 0 | 1 (50%) |
| Social Studies (n = 2) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 (50%) |
| **Literacy (n = 118)** | 6 | 9 | 12 | 14 | 41 (33%) |

Results by Graduation Year

**What next steps have you completed following graduation from SUNY Geneseo?**

**Undergraduate:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2014 - 2017 (n = 8)** | **2018 (n = 26)** | **2019 (n = 37)** | **2020 (n = 42)** | **Total (n = 113)** |
| **Attained teaching certification**  | 7 (88%) | 25 (96%) | 29 (78%) | 35 (83%) | **96 (85%)** |
| **Currently employed related to field of study**  | 8 (100%) | 23 (88%) | 33 (89%) | 34 (81%) | **98 (87%)** |
| **Currently employed but not related to field of study**  | 0 (0%) | 1 (4%) | 2 (5%) | 1 (2%) | **4 (4%)** |
| **Currently not employed**  | 0 (0%) | 1 (4%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (7%) | **4 (4%)** |
| **Continuing education since graduating in the field of education**  | 0 (0%) | 16 (62%) | 23 (62%) | 40 (95%) | **79 (70%)** |
| **Continuing education since graduating outside the field of education**  | 0 (0%) | 2 (8%) | 4 (11%) | 1 (2%) | **7 (6%)** |

Overall, across all graduating years, about 86% of graduates have attained teaching certification and are currently employed related to their field of study. This is an increase of 6% from the 2018 alumni survey that included alumni from 2015-2017.

Overall, 4% of graduates are employed not related to field of study. This is a decrease of 6% from the 2018 alumni survey that included alumni from 2015-2017. Three of these four graduates left comments; one positive and two mixed. The graduate who left the positive comment specifically mentioned their new role at CNN and said the following, “I loved the School of Ed! I am working at CNN now. It is still an educational context— I have brought up using different learning styles to help with learning the website, marketing to audiences that prefer auditory vs. visual vs. kinesthetic learning of data. My education degree definitely helped prepare me with transferrable skills even though I have decided not to pursue a typical classroom teaching role.”

Overall, 4% of graduates are currently not employed, with 3 of these alumni having graduated most recently in 2020 and all 4 alumni pursuing education in their field of education. This is an increase of 2% from the 2018 alumni survey that included alumni from 2015-2017.

Overall, 70% of graduates are continuing education in the field of education. This is an increase of 13% from the 2018 alumni survey that included alumni from 2015-2017. An increasing trend is also observed over time from this survey for continuing education in the field of education likely due to more recent undergraduates continuing directly into a graduate program and those that have graduated a few years ago have likely already completed a graduate program.

Finally, 7 graduates (6%) indicated that they are continuing education outside the field of education across all graduating years. This is an increase of 3% (4 more graduates) from the 2018 alumni survey that included alumni from 2015-2017. Five of these seven graduates left comments; two positive, two negative, and one mixed.

**Graduate:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2018 (n = 8)** | **2019 (n = 9)** | **2020 (n = 13)** | **Currently enrolled (n = 15)** | **Overall (n = 45)** |
| **Attained teaching certification**  | 6 (75%) | 9 (100%) | 10 (77%) | 12 (80%) | **37 (82%)** |
| **Currently employed related to field of study**  | 8 (100%) | 9 (100%) | 13 (100%) | 11 (73%) | **41 (91%)** |
| **Currently employed but not related to field of study**  | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | **0 (0%)** |
| **Currently not employed**  | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (20%) | **3 (7%)** |
| **Continuing education since graduating in the field of education**  | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 11 (73%) | **11 (24%)** |
| **Continuing education since graduating outside the field of education**  | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | **0 (0%)** |

Overall, across all graduating years, 82% of graduates have attained teaching certification and 91% are currently employed related to their field of study (100% of all alumni who have graduated are employed in the field of study). Three students currently enrolled in the graduate program are not employed but all those who have graduated are employed and all of them within their field of study.

There are no graduate alumni employed outside their field of study or continuing education since graduating outside the field of education. This is a 3% decrease from the 2018 alumni survey which included 2015-2017 graduates.

There is an increase in those employed in the field of study for graduates as compared to undergraduates (4%) and a decrease in those employed outside the field of study (4%). An expected large decrease is observed in those continuing education since graduating in the field of education for graduates as compared to undergraduates (43%).

**If employed in your field of study, please indicate your salary:**

**Undergraduate:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2014 - 2017 (n = 8)** | **2018 (n = 23)** | **2019 (n = 32)** | **2020 (n = 34)** | **Total (n = 97)** |
| Less than $30,000  | 1 (13%) | 2 (9%) | 3 (9%) | 16 (47%) | **22 (23%)** |
| $30,001 - $35,000  | 0 (0%) | 1 (4%) | 2 (6%) | 2 (6%) | **5 (5%)** |
| $35,001 - $40,000  | 0 (0%) | 2 (9%) | 5 (16%) | 2 (6%) | **9 (9%)** |
| $40,001 - $45,000  | 2 (25%) | 7 (30%) | 11 (34%) | 6 (18%) | **26 (27%)** |
| $45,001 - $50,000  | 2 (25%) | 3 (13%) | 2 (6%) | 1 (3%) | **8 (8%)** |
| $50,001 - $55,000  | 1 (13%) | 2 (9%) | 2 (6%) | 1 (3%) | **6 (6%)** |
| $55,001 - $60,000  | 1 (13%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (3%) | 1 (3%) | **3 (3%)** |
| More than $60,000  | 1 (13%) | 6 (26%) | 4 (13%) | 0 (0%) | **11 (11%)** |
| Prefer not to answer  | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (6%) | 5 (15%) | **7 (7%)** |

Overall, across all graduating years, more than half (64%) of those employed in their field of study are making $45,000 or less. The average salary for our alumni from the last three years is $40,001 - $45,000. Looking at trends, making less than $30,000 decreases the further out an alumnus has graduated showing an increase from lower salaries to higher salaries over time. As expected, almost half (47%) of those who are employed and have graduated in 2020 make less than $30,000. Many of the respondents who selected less than $30,000 identified as substitute teachers, teacher assistants, or teach internationally (only 1 out of 22 identified as a full time teacher) also revealing that our alumni move into full time roles the longer they are in the field. Making between $45,001 - $60,000 increases the further out an alumnus has graduated showing again an increase from lower salaries to higher salaries.

**Graduate:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2018 (n = 8)** | **2019 (n = 8)** | **2020 (n = 13)** | **Currently enrolled (n = 11)** | **Overall (n = 40)** |
| Less than $30,000  | 2 (25%) | 1 (13%) | 0 (0%) | 7 (64%) | **10 (25%)** |
| $30,001 - $35,000  | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (15%) | 0 (0%) | **2 (5%)** |
| $35,001 - $40,000  | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (8%) | 1 (9%) | **2 (5%)** |
| $40,001 - $45,000  | 0 (0%) | 4 (50%) | 3 (23%) | 2 (18%) | **9 (23%)** |
| $45,001 - $50,000  | 2 (25%) | 2 (25%) | 4 (31%) | 0 (0%) | **8 (20%)** |
| $50,001 - $55,000  | 1 (13%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (15%) | 1 (9%) | **4 (10%)** |
| $55,001 - $60,000  | 1 (13%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (8%) | 0 (0%) | **2 (5%)** |
| More than $60,000  | 2 (25%) | 1 (13%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | **3 (8%)** |
| Prefer not to answer  | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (8%) | 0 (0%) | **1 (3%)** |

Overall, across all graduating years, about half (53%) of those employed in their field of study are making from $40,001 - $55,000. Looking at trends, making more than $55,000 increases the further out an alumnus has graduated showing an increase from lower salaries to higher salaries. Many of the respondents who selected less than $30,000 are currently enrolled in the graduate program and identified as substitute teachers, graduate assistants, or teaching internationally (only 1 out of 10 identified as a full time teacher) also revealing that alumni move into full time roles the longer they are in the field. Comparing undergraduate and graduate salaries, graduate salaries tend to be higher by about $10,000 which is not unexpected as more education tends to yield higher salaries.

**If employed in a school, please check the population(s) served**

**Undergraduate:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2014 - 2017 (n = 8)** | **2018 (n = 23)** | **2019 (n = 32)** | **2020 (n = 34)** | **Total (n = 97)** |
| Rural  | 4 (50%) | 3 (13%) | 8 (25%) | 5 (15%) | **20 (21%)** |
| Suburban  | 3 (38%) | 14 (61%) | 14 (48%) | 26 (76%) | **57 (59%)** |
| Urban  | 1 (13%) | 6 (26%) | 8 (25%) | 1 (3%) | **16 (16%)** |

Suburban populations are served by more alumni the more recently they graduated thus high needs schools (rural and urban) are served less by alumni who more recently graduated. Comparing to the 2018 alumni survey, rural and urban populations overall are served less by 7% and 16% of alumni respectively and suburban populations are served by more than 6% of alumni.

**Graduate:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2018 (n = 8)** | **2019 (n = 8)** | **2020 (n = 13)** | **Currently enrolled (n = 11)** | **Overall (n = 40)** |
| Rural  | 2 (25%) | 4 (50%) | 4 (31%) | 3 (27%) | **13 (33%)** |
| Suburban  | 4 (50%) | 4 (50%) | 9 (69%) | 6 (55%) | **23 (58%)** |
| Urban  | 2 (25%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (8%) | 1 (9%) | **4 (10%)** |

Overall, across all graduating years, suburban populations are served 50% or more of the time. Overall, across all graduating years, high needs schools (rural and urban) are served by 43% of alumni (33% for rural and 10% for urban). Overall, rural schools are served more than three times urban schools, and suburban schools are served about double that of rural schools. Comparing to the 2018 alumni survey, rural and urban populations overall are served less by 21% and 12% of alumni respectively and suburban populations are served by more than 9% of alumni. Comparing to undergraduate alumni, the rural service rate increases by 12%, the suburban and urban rates don’t change significantly.

**The degree to which I believe I was prepared at SUNY Geneseo to do the following:**

**Mean (Standard Deviation)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **3 - Completely** | **2 - Mostly** | **1 - Somewhat** | **0 - Not at all** |

**Undergraduate:**

|  | **2018** **(n = 26)** | **2019** **(n = 37)** | **2020** **(n = 42)** | **Overall for 2021 Alumni Survey (n = 105)** | **ANOVA (2018 – 2020 alumni)**  | **2018 Alumni Survey (n =101); 2015 – 2017 alumni** | **T-Test (2018 and 2021 alumni survey responses)**  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Demonstrate an understanding of students' strengths and different learning styles (InTASC 1) | 2.35 | 2.46 | 2.57 | 2.48 (0.695) | 0.427Increase observed  | 2.37 (0.745) | 0.274No significant difference  |
| 2. Integrate multiple perspectives to the discussion of content, including attention to learners’ cultural norms (InTASC 2) | 2.27 | 2.03 | 2.33 | 2.21 (0.743) | 0.169No trend observed | 2.10 (0.831) | 0.317No significant difference |
| 3. Integrate multiple perspectives to the discussion of the content, including attention to learners’ personal, family, and community experiences (InTASC 2) | 2.19 | 2.22 | 2.40 | 2.29 (0.720) | 0.397Increase observed  | 2.12 (0.886) | 0.132No significant difference  |
| 4. Display cultural sensitivity and respect cultural differences (InTASC 2) | 2.20 | 2.08 | 2.24 | 2.17 (0.769) | 0.655No trend observed | 2.30 (0.742) | 0.219No significant difference |
| 5. Create an active learning environment where students develop collaborative and independent inquiry skills (InTASC 3) | 2.50 | 2.51 | 2.60 | 2.54 (0.605) | 0.770Slight increase observed  | 2.41 (0.790) | 0.185No significant difference  |
| 6. Create an active learning environment where all students are able to be successful learners (InTASC 3) | 2.38 | 2.54 | 2.55 | 2.50 (0.606) | 0.511Slight increase observed  | 2.45 (0.781) | 0.607No significant difference  |
| 7. Foster respectful communication within the learning community (InTASC 3) | 2.42 | 2.41 | 2.60 | 2.49 (0.735) | 0.462Increase observed  | 2.61 (0.663) | 0.221No significant difference  |
| 8. Understand major concepts and processes of inquiry to the discipline you teach (InTASC 4) | 2.19 | 2.38 | 2.50 | 2.38 (0.685) | 0.199Increase observed  | 2.28 (0.885) | 0.364No significant difference  |
| 9. Foster creative and critical thinking related to global issues (InTASC 5) | 1.92 | 1.83 | 2.24 | 2.02 (0.892) | 0.111Increase observed | 2.01 (0.831) | 0.934No significant difference |
| 10. Foster creative and critical thinking related to issues in the local community (InTASC 5) | 1.84 | 2.03 | 2.17 | 2.04 (0.812) | 0.282Increase observed  | 2.05 (0.876) | 0.932No significant difference  |
| 11. Implement a variety of strategies for communicating feedback to learners (InTASC 6) | 2.04 | 2.41 | 2.55 | 2.37 (0.788) | 0.031\* Significant increase  | 2.41 (0.737) | 0.707No significant difference  |
| 12. Base instructional decisions on documentation of student learning (InTASC 6)  | 1.88 | 2.32 | 2.60 | 2.32 (0.860) | 0.003\* Significant increase  | 2.44 (0.780) | 0.296No significant difference  |
| 13. Use data from multiple assessments to revise practices that meet learner needs (InTASC 6) | 2.08 | 2.22 | 2.40 | 2.26 (0.809) | 0.251 Increase observed  | 2.41 (0.815) | 0.186No significant difference  |
| 14. Use district, state, and national learning standards for planning and instruction (InTASC 7) | 2.38 | 2.73 | 2.74 | 2.65 (0.554) | 0.019\* Significant increase  | 2.60 (0.601) | 0.535No significant difference  |
| 15. Demonstrate an understanding of the role of educational research in the classroom (InTASC 7)  | 2.27 | 2.08 | 2.33 | 2.23 (0.800) | 0.363 No trend observed | 2.22 (0.832) | 0.930No significant difference |
| 16. Apply educational research in classroom teaching (InTASC 7) | 2.19 | 2.00 | 2.26 | 2.15 (0.818) | 0.353 No trend observed | 2.08 (0.924) | 0.565No significant difference |
| 17. Be effective in oral communication (InTASC 8)  | 2.44 | 2.46 | 2.57 | 2.50 (0.654) | 0.657Increase observed | 2.53 (0.742) | 0.758No significant difference |
| 18. Be effective in written communication (InTASC 8) | 2.28 | 2.30 | 2.46 | 2.36 (0.790) | 0.556Increase observed  | 2.57 (0.698) | 0.045\*Significant decrease  |
| 19. Use technology to enhance instruction and to promote active learning (InTASC 8) | 2.31 | 2.42 | 2.57 | 2.45 (0.749) | 0.351Increase observed | 2.26 (0.879) | 0.096No significant difference |
| 20. Pursue continuing professional growth (InTASC 9) | 2.27 | 2.24 | 2.48 | 2.34 (0.782) | 0.362Increase observed  | 2.41 (0.751) | 0.513No significant difference  |
| 21. Demonstrate an understanding of professional and ethical standards of the profession (InTASC 9) | 2.60 | 2.68 | 2.69 | 2.66 (0.514) | 0.775 Slight increase observed  | 2.59 (0.724) | 0.423No significant difference  |
| 22. Foster positive relationships with colleagues to support students' learning and well-being (InTASC 10) | 2.48 | 2.24 | 2.48 | 2.39 (0.769) | 0.333No trend observed | 2.52 (0.769) | 0.227No significant difference |
| 23. Foster positive relationships with parents to support students' learning and well-being (InTASC 10) | 2.12 | 2.00 | 2.07 | 2.06 (0.890) | 0.868No trend observed | 2.40 (0.884) | 0.006\*Significant decrease |
| 24. Foster positive relationships with community organizations to support students' learning and well-being (InTASC 10) | 2.08 | 1.97 | 2.10 | 2.05 (0.918) | 0.826No trend observed | 2.32 (0.894) | 0.034\*Significant decrease |

\*p < 0.05 statistically significant difference

For all items, all mean averages are at 2.0 (mostly rating) or above except for item #12 (Base instructional decisions on documentation of student learning) for 2018 undergraduate completers with a score of 1.88.

High rated items (2.45 and higher) are mainly tagged to the Domains of the Learner (InTASC 1 & 3) and Learning and Instructional Practice (InTASC 7 & 8):

1. Demonstrate an understanding of students' strengths and different learning styles (InTASC 1)

5. Create an active learning environment where students develop collaborative and independent inquiry skills (InTASC 3)

6. Create an active learning environment where all students are able to be successful learners (InTASC 3)

7. Foster respectful communication within the learning community (InTASC 3)

14. Use district, state, and national learning standards for planning and instruction (InTASC 7)

17. Be effective in oral communication (InTASC 8)

19. Use technology to enhance instruction and to promote active learning (InTASC 8)

21. Demonstrate an understanding of professional and ethical standards of the profession (InTASC 9)

Low rated items (2.06 and lower) are tagged to InTASC Standards 5 (Application of Content) and 10 (Leadership and Collaborations); all of these items are related to fostering thinking and/or relationships surrounding parents, community, and global issues:

9. Foster creative and critical thinking related to global issues (InTASC 5)

10. Foster creative and critical thinking related to issues in the local community (InTASC 5)

23. Foster positive relationships with parents to support students' learning and well-being (InTASC 10)

24. Foster positive relationships with community organizations to support students' learning and well-being (InTASC 10)

Comments directly related to these items are as follows:

* “There are a significant number of refugee families in the district, while we did cover ELL support I can see areas in my own teaching that could improve upon mods/accoms for ELL students that were not covered in SUNY Geneseo programs.”
* “More practice about calling parents and describing student who need more support (how would a parent react/what should you say) and more curriculum planning.”
* “The classes in the School of Education rarely, if ever, discussed/taught Culturally Responsive teaching along with Trauma Informed teaching. As a teacher, I am currently determining the most developmentally way to teach topics such as Juneteenth to Kindergarteners when there is no curriculum. I believe that by teaching teachers about more cultures, holidays, and traditions that you will create teachers who are more confident in creating an inclusive classroom and global citizens.”
* “I think ensuring that current professors are still involves in public schools and up to date with educational practices is important to help prepare students for the current education world.”
* “More emphasis on the roles of inter professional collaboration would also be very valuable for teacher candidates (how to work with speech language pathologists, occupational therapists, physical therapists, etc.)”
* “Collaboration/communication with paraprofessionals and related services staff (school counselors, speech/language pathologists, physical/occupational therapists”
* “I think I could have been better prepared for the duties of a consultant teacher specifically and the communication that goes on between me and gen ed teachers, school psychs/counselors, SLPs, therapists, families, etc. I would have also liked more training on how to respond to/work with students with social/emotional/behavioral needs (positive behavioral interventions, incentives, effective parent communication).”
* “Needs to be more of an emphasis on anti-racist education. Race was seldom mentioned during my four years at Geneseo”
* “Being prepared for all learners and along with strategy-based learning techniques, providing more instruction on how to teach content concepts to students”
* “Experience in an urban school environment. I did the out of area student teaching placement in Buffalo but was placed both times in suburban schools. I would have liked to get more urban school experiences in general. I found that most of my experiences as well with field visits were to suburban and rural schools - very rarely did I get a genuine urban school experience.”
* “Geneseo only talks about job prospects related to Rochester and Geneseo. Broaden your horizon, your students could use the guidance.”
* “I would have benefited from more education classes and English classes that were focused around HOW to teach English. I was required to take so many English classes where I read books I would never use in a middle school or high school classroom. There should be more education/ English classes focused around books we would actually teach our students one day.”
* “I did not receive urban or rural placements- only suburban and I was wildly unprepared for a short-term sub position in the Tonawanda City School District as well as my long-term sub job in the Batavia City Schools.”
* “A big part of teaching is parent and home communication… it was never discussed in any of my classes.”
* “More strategy instructions along with actual context from content in Undergrad programs would be beneficial. I learned most of my strategies that I utilize in my classroom in my Literacy/Grad program, but if I didn't get my graduate degree immediately, I believe I would have been at a significant disadvantage when interviewing/teaching.”
* “Too much focus on history and non-relevant topics. Have more classes on practical applications and running a classroom on your own”
* “I also felt unprepared to facilitate home-school communication with families. During student teaching, we had adolescent seminars we had to go to- maybe focusing one of those on home communication best practices would be helpful. This also could have been a helpful unit in block 3 classes”
* “The importance of family communication, parent partnership and student relationships.”
* “How to make parent/caregiver phone calls”
* “I understand that there are some ways in which coursework will never teach you as well as actually being in the classroom, but I often felt that my coursework did not prepare me for the realities of teaching. There were many times when I felt that my education professors had been outside of the classroom for so long, making their theory important, but incredibly difficult to put in practice when classrooms often have unexpected distractions and circumstances. Similarly, I felt that I learned some innovative and creative lesson planning skills, but my coursework never seemed to be put into a larger context of school objectives or how my classroom might figure into a team setting.”
* “I am glad to hear that SUNY Geneseo SOE has since implemented specific ways to introduce antiracist teaching into the classroom because I also felt like that was briefly mentioned, but never fully explored. I hope that this, and the reasons we see educational inequity, is more fully covered in a history of education class because that knowledge is essential for teaching all students.”
* “Geneseo could improve upon diversity and equity in the classroom, parent and familial communication and student relationships.”
* “Preparation for the community building, recognition of multicultural perspectives, and parental relationship fostering was almost non-existent. I also believe that Geneseo itself could improve in respecting and admiring multicultural perspectives - as in, modeling what they are searching for from their SOE graduates rather than JUST having them attend PDs on the practice.”

Comparing to the 2018 alumni survey, ratings are not significantly different for most items but 3 items are statistically significantly different with 2021 alumni ratings being lower than that from the 2018 alumni survey:

18. Be effective in written communication (InTASC 8) > Ratings decreased overall by 0.2 points

23. Foster positive relationships with parents to support students' learning and well-being (InTASC 10) > Ratings decreased overall by 0.3 points

24. Foster positive relationships with community organizations to support students' learning and well-being (InTASC 10) > Ratings decreased overall by 0.3 points

Over the three most recent years, undergraduates have tended to rate these items more highly the more recently they graduated with three items having significantly different ratings over time:

11. Implement a variety of strategies for communicating feedback to learners (InTASC 6) > Ratings increased by 0.5 points

13. Use data from multiple assessments to revise practices that meet learner needs (InTASC 6) > Ratings increased by 0.7 points

14. Use district, state, and national learning standards for planning and instruction (InTASC 7) > Ratings increased by 0.4 points

**Mean (Standard Deviation)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **3 - Completely** | **2 - Mostly** | **1 - Somewhat** | **0 - Not at all** |

**Graduate:**

|  | **2018** **(n = 8)** | **2019** **(n = 9)** | **2020** **(n = 13)** | **Overall for 2021 Alumni Survey (n = 30)** | **ANOVA (2018 – 2020 alumni)**  | **2018 Alumni Survey (n =40); 2015 – 2017 alumni** | **T-Test (2018 and 2021 alumni survey responses)**  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Demonstrate an understanding of students' strengths and different learning styles (InTASC 1) | 2.63 | 2.70 | 2.36 | 2.53 (0.718) | 0.484Decrease observed  | 2.65 (0.580) | 0.435No significant difference  |
| 2. Integrate multiple perspectives to the discussion of content, including attention to learners’ cultural norms (InTASC 2) | 2.38 | 2.30 | 2.29 | 2.31 (0.738) | 0.964Slight decrease observed | 2.28 (0.751) | 0.866No significant difference |
| 3. Integrate multiple perspectives to the discussion of the content, including attention to learners’ personal, family, and community experiences (InTASC 2) | 2.63 | 2.30 | 2.29 | 2.38 (0.707) | 0.528Decrease observed  | 2.28 (0.905) | 0.610No significant difference  |
| 4. Display cultural sensitivity and respect cultural differences (InTASC 2) | 2.38 | 2.33 | 2.50 | 2.42 (0.672) | 0.835Slight increase observed | 2.40 (0.672) | 0.900No significant difference |
| 5. Create an active learning environment where students develop collaborative and independent inquiry skills (InTASC 3) | 2.50 | 2.50 | 2.36 | 2.44 (0.716) | 0.863Slight decrease observed  | 2.65 (0.533) | 0.158No significant difference  |
| 6. Create an active learning environment where all students are able to be successful learners (InTASC 3) | 2.63 | 2.80 | 2.57 | 2.66 (0.701) | 0.738No trend observed  | 2.68 (0.616) | 0.898No significant difference  |
| 7. Foster respectful communication within the learning community (InTASC 3) | 2.75 | 2.80 | 2.43 | 2.62 (0.751) | 0.437Decrease observed  | 2.70 (0.564) | 0.607No significant difference  |
| 8. Understand major concepts and processes of inquiry to the discipline you teach (InTASC 4) | 2.62 | 2.40 | 2.29 | 2.41 (0.756) | 0.614Decrease observed  | 2.53 (0.599) | 0.455No significant difference  |
| 9. Foster creative and critical thinking related to global issues (InTASC 5) | 2.25 | 2.20 | 2.00 | 2.13 (0.793) | 0.740Decrease observed | 2.05 (0.749) | 0.662No significant difference |
| 10. Foster creative and critical thinking related to issues in the local community (InTASC 5) | 2.38 | 2.11 | 2.00 | 2.13 (0.885) | 0.647Decrease observed  | 2.15 (0.834) | 0.992No significant difference  |
| 11. Implement a variety of strategies for communicating feedback to learners (InTASC 6) | 2.50 | 2.60 | 2.14 | 2.37 (0.871) | 0.414 Decrease observed | 2.53 (0.640) | 0.372No significant difference  |
| 12. Base instructional decisions on documentation of student learning (InTASC 6)  | 2.50 | 2.50 | 2.00 | 2.28 (0.991) | 0.380 Decrease observed | 2.50 (0.877) | 0.322No significant difference  |
| 13. Use data from multiple assessments to revise practices that meet learner needs (InTASC 6) | 2.38 | 2.60 | 2.36 | 2.44 (0.801) | 0.753 No trend observed  | 2.63 (0.628) | 0.263No significant difference  |
| 14. Use district, state, and national learning standards for planning and instruction (InTASC 7) | 2.38 | 2.90 | 2.50 | 2.59 (0.798) | 0.332 No trend observed | 2.65 (0.580) | 0.713No significant difference  |
| 15. Demonstrate an understanding of the role of educational research in the classroom (InTASC 7)  | 2.25 | 2.30 | 2.21 | 2.25 (0.880) | 0.974 No trend observed | 2.40 (0.810) | 0.455No significant difference |
| 16. Apply educational research in classroom teaching (InTASC 7) | 2.38 | 2.40 | 2.07 | 2.25 (0.842) | 0.586 Decrease observed | 2.33 (0.859) | 0.693No significant difference |
| 17. Be effective in oral communication (InTASC 8)  | 2.63 | 2.80 | 2.43 | 2.59 (0.560) | 0.281No trend observed | 2.68 (0.526) | 0.486No significant difference |
| 18. Be effective in written communication (InTASC 8) | 2.75 | 2.70 | 2.29 | 2.53 (0.718) | 0.236Decrease observed | 2.75 (0.439) | 0.114No significant difference |
| 19. Use technology to enhance instruction and to promote active learning (InTASC 8) | 1.63 | 2.50 | 2.21 | 2.16 (0.808) | 0.064Increase observed | 2.33 (0.730) | 0.352No significant difference |
| 20. Pursue continuing professional growth (InTASC 9) | 2.00 | 2.70 | 1.93 | 2.19 (0.896) | 0.088Increase in 2019 but decrease in 2020  | 2.55 (0.552) | 0.040\*Significant decrease  |
| 21. Demonstrate an understanding of professional and ethical standards of the profession (InTASC 9) | 2.63 | 2.80 | 2.43 | 2.59 (0.756) | 0.505 No trend observed  | 2.68 (0.694) | 0.601No significant difference  |
| 22. Foster positive relationships with colleagues to support students' learning and well-being (InTASC 10) | 2.75 | 2.80 | 2.50 | 2.66 (0.701) | 0.548Decrease observed | 2.60 (0.769) | 0.733No significant difference |
| 23. Foster positive relationships with parents to support students' learning and well-being (InTASC 10) | 2.25 | 2.60 | 2.00 | 2.25 (0.880) | 0.265No trend observed | 2.30 (0.939) | 0.818No significant difference |
| 24. Foster positive relationships with community organizations to support students' learning and well-being (InTASC 10) | 2.00 | 2.20 | 2.07 | 2.09 (0.928) | 0.902No trend observed | 2.38 (0.868) | 0.176No significant difference |

For all items, all mean averages are at 2.0 (mostly rating) or above except for the following:

 19. Use technology to enhance instruction and to promote active learning (InTASC 8) > 2018 score is 1.63, scores increased for 2019 and 2020

 20. Pursue continuing professional growth (InTASC 9) > 2020 score is 1.93, score was much higher in 2019

Comments surrounding these items are as follows:

* “The classes and professors were extremely knowledgeable and helpful, however, I did not learn how to use important educational programs nearly every school uses (Google classroom, EBackpack, etc). That should be a part of the curriculum as we are now in an online learning model.”
* “Updated technology (not teaching me about technology from the 1970s...)”
* “Digital literacy/technology”
* “Using Technology in the classroom”
* “The French courses are mostly irrelevant to the middle-high school level of teaching. The philosophical educational courses required have no relevance in the real classroom. We need guidance in dealing with a changing world, with parents, with curriculum development at the middle-high school level, with lesson planning, with classroom management. Practical skills are necessary to be able to teach. I know that the state requires a Master’s degree but it should still be professional development that is practical. For French- what resources to use from authentic speakers, what textbooks to use, how to develop curriculum without a textbook, unit planning, Comprehensible Input, where to find age appropriate readings and how to teach reading”
* “More emphasis on the roles of inter professional collaboration would also be very valuable for teacher candidates (how to work with speech language pathologists, occupational therapists, physical therapists, etc.)”

High rated items (2.45 and higher) are mainly tagged to InTASC Standards 3 (Learning Environments) and 8 (Instructional Strategies)

1. Demonstrate an understanding of students' strengths and different learning styles (InTASC 1)

6. Create an active learning environment where all students are able to be successful learners (InTASC 3)

7. Foster respectful communication within the learning community (InTASC 3)

14. Use district, state, and national learning standards for planning and instruction (InTASC 7)

17. Be effective in oral communication (InTASC 8)

18. Be effective in written communication (InTASC 8)

21. Demonstrate an understanding of professional and ethical standards of the profession (InTASC 9)

22. Foster positive relationships with colleagues to support students' learning and well-being (InTASC 10)

Low rated items (2.19 and lower) are tagged to InTASC Standard 5 (Application of Content) and the Professional Responsibility Domain (InTASC 9 & 10)

9. Foster creative and critical thinking related to global issues (InTASC 5)

10. Foster creative and critical thinking related to issues in the local community (InTASC 5)

19. Use technology to enhance instruction and to promote active learning (InTASC 8)

20. Pursue continuing professional growth (InTASC 9)

24. Foster positive relationships with community organizations to support students' learning and well-being (InTASC 10)

Comparing to the 2018 alumni survey, ratings are not significantly different for all but 1 item, #20 (Pursue continuing professional growth) > Ratings decreased by 0.4 points

Over the three most recent years, there are no statistically significant differences over time, however, graduates have tended to rate these items lower the more recently they graduated (observed for 13 of 24 items).

Comparing ratings from undergraduate and graduate, ratings tend to decrease for graduates while they tend to increase for undergraduate students over time. Standards 3 and 8 are both rated higher while Standards 5 and 10 are both rated lower for undergraduates and graduates.

Results by Program

**What next steps have you completed following graduation from SUNY Geneseo?**

**Undergraduate:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Adol. Eng. (n = 13)** | **Adol. FL (n = 5)** | **Adol. Math (n = 11)** | **Adol. Sci. (n = 6)** | **Adol. SS (n = 13)** | **Childhood with Special Education (n = 40)** | **Early Childhood / Childhood Education (n = 25)** | **Total (n = 113)** |
| **Attained teaching certification**  | 10 (77%) | 4 (80%) | 9 (82%) | 4 (67%) | 12 (92%) | 35 (88%) | 22 (88%) | **96 (85%)** |
| **Currently employed related to field of study**  | 11 (85%) | 4 (80%) | 8 (73%) | 5 (83%) | 13 (100%) | 34 (85%) | 23 (92%) | **98 (87%)** |
| **Currently employed but not related to field of study**  | 1 (8%) | 1 (20%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (17%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (3%) | 0 (0%) | **4 (4%)** |
| **Currently not employed**  | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (9%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (5%) | 1 (4%) | **4 (4%)** |
| **Continuing education since graduating in the field of education**  | 6 (46%) | 4 (80%) | 11 (100%) | 4 (67%) | 8 (62%) | 20 (50%) | 17 (68%) | **79 (70%)** |
| **Continuing education since graduating outside the field of education**  | 2 (15%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (33%) | 1 (8%) | 2 (5%) | 0 (0%) | **7 (6%)** |

Based on green and red high-lights in the table above, the program that reveals the weakest next steps following graduation is Adolescence Science. 33% of respondents are employed outside of the field of education (n = 2) and only 67% (n = 4) have attained their teaching certification. Note that the sample size is low (n = 6) giving these results less power and significance. The strongest programs for next steps following graduation are Adolescence Social Studies and Early Childhood/ Childhood Education. For Social Studies, 92% of respondents attained teaching certification and 100% are currently employed in their field of study. For Early Childhood, 88% of respondents attained teaching certification, 92% are currently employed in their field of study, and no respondents are continuing education outside the field of education.

Comparing to the 2018 alumni survey (2015 – 2017 undergraduate alumni), the following significant changes are observed:

* AD English (Positive trends)
	+ 9% decrease in those currently employed outside their field of study
	+ 8% decrease in those currently not employed
	+ 13% increase in those continuing education in the field of education
* AD Foreign Language (Mixed trends)
	+ 30% increase in those who attained teaching certification
	+ 20% decrease in those currently employed in the field of education
	+ 20% increase in those currently employed outside the field of education
	+ 55% increase in those continuing education in the field of education
* AD Math (Mixed trends)
	+ 9% increase in those currently not employed
	+ 29% increase in those continuing education in the field of education
* AD Science (Mostly negative trends)
	+ 13% decrease in those who attained teaching certification
	+ 17% increase in those currently employed outside their field of study
	+ 17% increase in those continuing education in the field of education
	+ 33% increase in those continuing education outside the field of education
* AD Social Studies (Mostly negative trends)
	+ 17% increase in those currently employed in their field of study
	+ 38% decrease in those continuing education in the field of education
	+ 8% increase in those continuing education outside the field of education
* Childhood with Special Education (Mostly positive trends)
	+ 11% increase in those who attained teaching certification
	+ 8% decrease in those currently employed outside the field of education
	+ 11% decrease in those continuing education in the field of education
* Early Childhood / Childhood Education (Negative trends)
	+ 12% decrease in those who attained teaching certification
	+ 8% decrease in those currently employed in their field of study

**Graduate:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Adolescence MEd: English, French, & Social Studies (n = 4)** | **Literacy (n = 41)** | **Overall (n = 45)** |
| **Attained teaching certification**  | 0 (0%) | 37 (90%) | **37 (82%)** |
| **Currently employed related to field of study**  | 4 (100%) | 37 (90%) | **41 (91%)** |
| **Currently employed but not related to field of study**  | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | **0 (0%)** |
| **Currently not employed**  | 0 (0%) | 3 (7%) | **3 (7%)** |
| **Continuing education since graduating in the field of education**  | 1 (25%) | 10 (24%) | **11 (24%)** |
| **Continuing education since graduating outside the field of education**  | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | **0 (0%)** |

Both MEd and Literacy graduate programs have overall good next steps within the field of education (high rates of being employed or continuing education in the field of study and 0% of respondents being employed or continuing education outside the field of study).

**If employed in your field of study, please indicate your salary:**

**Undergraduate:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Adol. Eng. (n = 10)** | **Adol. FL (n = 5)** | **Adol. Math (n = 8)** | **Adol. Sci. (n = 5)** | **Adol. SS (n = 12)** | **Childhood with Special Education (n = 34)** | **Early Childhood / Childhood Education (n = 23)** | **Total (n = 97)** |
| Less than $30,000  | 4 (40%) | 3 (60%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (40%) | 3 (25%) | 6 (18%) | 4 (17%) | **22 (23%)** |
| $30,001 - $35,000  | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (8%) | 3 (9%) | 1 (4%) | **5 (5%)** |
| $35,001 - $40,000  | 1 (10%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (38%) | 1 (20%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (9%) | 1 (4%) | **9 (9%)** |
| $40,001 - $45,000  | 4 (40%) | 1 (20%) | 2 (25%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (25%) | 8 (24%) | 0 (0%) | **18 (19%)** |
| $45,001 - $50,000  | 1 (10%) | 1 (20%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 4 (12%) | 2 (9%) | **8 (8%)** |
| $50,001 - $55,000  | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (8%) | 3 (9%) | 2 (9%) | **6 (6%)** |
| $55,001 - $60,000  | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (13%) | 1 (20%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (3%) | 0 (0%) | **3 (3%)** |
| More than $60,000  | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (25%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (40%) | 4 (12%) | 2 (9%) | **10 (10%)** |
| Prefer not to answer  | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (20%) | 1 (8%) | 2 (6%) | 3 (13%) | **7 (7%)** |

Based on green and red high-lights in the table above, the programs that reveal the lowest salaries following graduation are Adolescence English and Foreign Language. Respectively, 40% and 60% of respondents make less $30,000 and neither programs have alumni that make more than $50,000. The programs that reveal the highest salaries following graduation are Adolescence Math and Social Studies. Respectively, 25% and 40% make more than $60,000. For Adolescence Math alumni, none make less than $35,001.

**Graduate:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Adolescence MEd (n = 4)** | **Literacy (n = 36)** | **Overall (n = 40)** |
| Less than $30,000  | 3 (75%) | 7 (19%) | **10 (25%)** |
| $30,001 - $35,000  | 0 (0%) | 1 (3%) | **1 (3%)** |
| $35,001 - $40,000  | 0 (0%) | 2 (6%) | **2 (5%)** |
| $40,001 - $45,000  | 0 (0%) | 9 (25%) | **9 (23%)** |
| $45,001 - $50,000  | 0 (0%) | 8 (22%) | **8 (20%)** |
| $50,001 - $55,000  | 0 (0%) | 4 (11%) | **4 (10%)** |
| $55,001 - $60,000  | 1 (25%) | 1 (3%) | **2 (5%)** |
| More than $60,000  | 0 (0%) | 3 (8%) | **3 (8%)** |
| Prefer not to answer  | 0 (0%) | 1 (3%) | **1 (3%)** |

75% of MEd graduates make less $30,000 (n = 3, Substitute, Graduate Assistant at Geneseo, and International Teacher). The one MEd teacher who makes between $55,001 - $55,000 is a French teacher. 58% of literacy graduates make $40,001 - $55,000 and an additional 25% of literacy graduates make less than $30,000 (AIS, RTI, Graduate Assistant, and Substitutes; only 1 is a full-time teacher).

**If employed in a school, please check the population(s) served**

**Undergraduate:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Adol. Eng. (n = 10)** | **Adol. FL (n = 5)** | **Adol. Math (n = 8)** | **Adol. Sci. (n = 5)** | **Adol. SS (n = 12)** | **Childhood with Special Education (n = 33)** | **Early Childhood / Childhood Education (n = 22)** | **Total (n = 95)** |
| Rural  | 6 (60%) | 1 (20%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (8%) | 11 (33%) | 3 (14%) | **22 (23%)** |
| Suburban  | 2 (20%) | 4 (80%) | 7 (88%) | 5 (100%) | 7 (58%) | 17 (56%) | 15 (68%) | **57 (60%)** |
| Urban  | 2 (20%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (13%) | 0 (0%) | 4 (33%) | 5 (15%) | 4 (18%) | **16 (17%)** |

Overall, across all graduating years, suburban populations are served 50% or more of the time by all programs except Adolescence English. For English, the rural population is served 60% of the time showing service to high need schools where as for Adolescence Science, no high need schools are served by those who responded. For service to urban populations, Adolescence Social Studies 33% of alumni responded with serving these schools (this is a 17% decrease from the 2018 alumni survey).

Comparing to the 2018 alumni survey (2015 – 2017 undergraduate alumni), the following significant changes are observed:

* AD English (Positive trend)
	+ 31% increase in serving rural populations
* AD Foreign Language (Negative trend)
	+ 55% decrease in serving rural populations
* AD Math (Negative trend)
	+ 29% decrease in serving rural populations
* AD Science (Negative trends)
	+ 33% decrease in serving rural and urban populations
* AD Social Studies (Negative trend)
	+ 17% decrease in serving urban populations
* Childhood with Special Education (Negative trend)
	+ 18% decrease in serving urban populations
* Early Childhood / Childhood Education (Negative trend)
	+ 20% decrease in serving urban populations

**Graduate:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Adolescence MEd (n = 4)** | **Literacy (n = 36)** | **Overall (n = 40)** |
| Rural  | 3 (75%) | 11 (31%) | **14 (35%)** |
| Suburban  | 0 (0%) | 22 (61%) | **22 (55%)** |
| Urban  | 1 (25%) | 3 (8%) | **4 (10%)** |

MEd alumni who responded to this survey are employed in high need schools only (75% rural and 25% urban). This is an increase in service to high needs schools from the 2018 alumni survey where MEd alumni were employed in 67% rural schools, 33% suburban schools, and 0% urban schools.

Literacy alumni who responded to this survey, serve more in suburban schools about twice as often as rural schools and about eight times as often as urban schools. This is a significant shift in service to high need schools from the 2018 alumni survey where literacy alumni served 55% rural school (24% decrease in 2021), 48% suburban schools (13% increase in 2021), and 24% urban schools (16% decrease in 2021).

**The degree to which I believe I was prepared at SUNY Geneseo to do the following:**

**Mean (Standard Deviation)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **3 - Completely** | **2 - Mostly** | **1 - Somewhat** | **0 - Not at all** |

**Undergraduate:**

|  | **Adol. Eng. (n = 12)** | **Adol. FL (n = 5)** | **Adol. Math (n = 11)** | **Adol. Sci. (n = 6)** | **Adol. SS (n = 13)** | **Childhood with Special Education (n = 35)** | **Early Childhood / Childhood Education (n = 23)** | **ANOVA**  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Demonstrate an understanding of students' strengths and different learning styles (InTASC 1) | 2.08 (0.900) | 2.40 (0.548) | 2.64 (0.505) | 2.50 (0.548) | 2.31 (0.855) | 2.63 (0.547) | 2.48 (0.790) | 0.330 |
| 2. Integrate multiple perspectives to the discussion of content, including attention to learners’ cultural norms (InTASC 2) | 2.33 (0.778) | 1.80 (0.837) | 2.09 (0.944) | 2.33 (0.516) | 2.46 (0.660) | 2.26 (0.657) | 2.04 (0.825) | 0.542 |
| 3. Integrate multiple perspectives to the discussion of the content, including attention to learners’ personal, family, and community experiences (InTASC 2) | 2.17 (0.937) | 2.00 (0.707) | 1.91 (0.944) | 2.17 (0.408) | 2.23 (0.725) | 2.38 (0.604) | 2.52 (0.665) | 0.282 |
| 4. Display cultural sensitivity and respect cultural differences (InTASC 2) | 2.33 (0.651) | 2.00 (1.000) | 1.64 (0.924) | 2.67 (0.516) | 2.31 (0.751) | 2.15 (0.744) | 2.22 (0.736) | 0.164 |
| 5. Create an active learning environment where students develop collaborative and independent inquiry skills (InTASC 3) | 2.50 (0.798) | 2.00 (0.707) | 2.64 (0.505) | 2.83 (0.408) | 2.46 (0.519) | 2.54 (0.505) | 2.61 (0.722) | 0.403 |
| 6. Create an active learning environment where all students are able to be successful learners (InTASC 3) | 2.42 (0.669) | 2.20 (0.837) | 2.55 (0.522) | 2.67 (0.516) | 2.31 (0.751) | 2.51 (0.507) | 2.65 (0.647)+ | 0.588 |
| 7. Foster respectful communication within the learning community (InTASC 3) | 2.25 (1.055) | 2.60 (0.548) | 2.55 (0.688) | 2.33 (0.516) | 2.46 (0.967) | 2.49 (0.612) | 2.61 (0.722) | 0.893 |
| 8. Understand major concepts and processes of inquiry to the discipline you teach (InTASC 4) | 2.08 (0.996) | 2.20 (0.447) | 2.73 (0.467) | 2.33 (0.816) | 2.31 (0.751) | 2.51 (0.507) | 2.26 (0.752)+ | 0.266 |
| 9. Foster creative and critical thinking related to global issues (InTASC 5) | 2.33 (0.651) | 1.80 (1.095) | 1.80 (0.919) | 2.33 (0.816) | 2.31 (0.630) | 1.94 (0.906) | 1.87 (1.058) | 0.502 |
| 10. Foster creative and critical thinking related to issues in the local community (InTASC 5) | 1.75 (0.866) | 1.40 (0.548) | 2.00 (0.632) | 2.33 (0.816) | 1.54 (0.967) | 2.26 (0.618) | 2.22 (0.902) | 0.024\* |
| 11. Implement a variety of strategies for communicating feedback to learners (InTASC 6) | 2.42 (0.900) | 2.40 (0.894) | 2.64 (0.505) | 2.50 (0.548) | 2.23 (0.832) | 2.51 (0.612) | 2.04 (1.022) | 0.324 |
| 12. Base instructional decisions on documentation of student learning (InTASC 6)  | 2.25 (0.965) | 2.40 (0.548) | 2.36 (0.809) | 2.67 (0.816) | 2.08 (1.115) | 2.49 (0.612) | 2.13 (1.058) | 0.610 |
| 13. Use data from multiple assessments to revise practices that meet learner needs (InTASC 6) | 2.08 (0.669) | 2.00 (1.000) | 2.18 (0.603) | 2.33 (1.033) | 2.08 (1.038) | 2.37 (0.690) | 2.35 (0.935) | 0.837 |
| 14. Use district, state, and national learning standards for planning and instruction (InTASC 7) | 2.67 (0.651) | 2.20 (0.837) | 2.55 (0.522) | 2.50 (0.837) | 2.62 (0.650) | 2.66 (0.482) | 2.83 (0.388) | 0.373 |
| 15. Demonstrate an understanding of the role of educational research in the classroom (InTASC 7)  | 2.08 (0.793) | 1.80 (0.837) | 2.45 (0.688) | 2.50 (0.837) | 2.15 (1.214) | 2.31 (0.676) | 2.13 (0.757) | 0.652 |
| 16. Apply educational research in classroom teaching (InTASC 7) | 2.25 (1.055) | 1.80 (0.837) | 2.55 (0.688) | 2.50 (0.837) | 1.77 (0.927) | 2.06 (0.765) | 2.26 (0.689) | 0.205 |
| 17. Be effective in oral communication (InTASC 8)  | 2.67 (0.651) | 2.00 (1.000) | 2.36 (0.674) | 2.50 (0.837) | 2.67 (0.492) | 2.54 (0.611) | 2.43 (0.662) | 0.509 |
| 18. Be effective in written communication (InTASC 8) | 2.33 (0.985) | 2.00 (1.000) | 2.18 (0.751) | 2.33 (0.816) | 2.09 (0.831)- | 2.46 (0.701) | 2.52 (0.790) | 0.636 |
| 19. Use technology to enhance instruction and to promote active learning (InTASC 8) | 2.27 (0.905) | 2.20 (1.304) | 2.36 (0.809) | 2.83 (0.408) | 2.54 (0.660)+ | 2.46 (0.701) | 2.48 (0.730)+ | 0.805 |
| 20. Pursue continuing professional growth (InTASC 9) | 2.25 (0.965) | 1.80 (1.095) | 2.64 (0.505) | 2.50 (0.837) | 1.85 (0.801) | 2.40 (0.695) | 2.52 (0.730) | 0.083 |
| 21. Demonstrate an understanding of professional and ethical standards of the profession (InTASC 9) | 2.83 (0.389) | 2.40 (0.548) | 2.55 (0.522) | 2.67 (0.516) | 2.75 (0.452) | 2.66 (0.482) | 2.65 (0.647) | 0.746 |
| 22. Foster positive relationships with colleagues to support students' learning and well-being (InTASC 10) | 2.08 (0.793) | 1.80 (1.304) | 2.55 (0.522) | 2.17 (0.753) | 2.50 (0.674) | 2.49 (0.702) | 2.48 (0.846) | 0.333 |
| 23. Foster positive relationships with parents to support students' learning and well-being (InTASC 10) | 1.42 (0.900) | 1.40 (0.894) | 1.82 (0.982) | 2.33 (0.516) | 1.58 (0.996)- | 2.40 (0.695) | 2.30 (0.822) | 0.001\* |
| 24. Foster positive relationships with community organizations to support students' learning and well-being (InTASC 10) | 1.42 (0.793) | 0.80 (0.837) | 1.82 (0.874) | 2.17 (0.753) | 2.08 (0.900) | 2.31 (0.718) | 2.30 (1.020) | 0.001\* |
| Total High Rated Categories (Dark Green, ≥ 2.65)  | 3 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 3 |  |
| Total Low Rated Categories (Orange / Red / Dark Red, ≤ 1.94) | 3 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 |

\* p < 0.05: significant difference between programs

- Significant decrease from 2018 Alumni Survey

+ Significant increase from 2018 Alumni Survey

Three items (related to parents/community; also low rated items overall) are statistically significantly different between majors:

* 10. Foster creative and critical thinking related to issues in the local community (InTASC 5)
* 23. Foster positive relationships with parents to support students' learning and well-being (InTASC 10)
* 24. Foster positive relationships with community organizations to support students' learning and well-being (InTASC 10)

Childhood programs (Early and Special) rated highest for all three of these items and Adolescence Science alumni rated items 10 and 23 the highest. Adolescence Foreign Language alumni rated all of these items the lowest, particularly item #24 with an average rating of 0.8 which is less than 1 (Somewhat). Adolescence Social Studies alumni rated items 10 and 23 the lowest and Adolescence English alumni rated items 23 and 24 the lowest.

For Early Childhood, the 2018 - 2020 alumni rated 3 items significantly higher compared to the 2015 – 2017 alumni:

* 6. Create an active learning environment where all students are able to be successful learners > 0.9 point increase
* 8. Understand major concepts and processes of inquiry to the discipline you teach > 0.8 point increase
* 19. Use technology to enhance instruction and to promote active learning > 0.6 point increase

For Adolescence Social Studies, the 2018 - 2020 alumni rated 3 items significantly different compared to the 2015 – 2017 alumni:

* 18. Be effective in written communication > 0.9 point decrease
* 19. Use technology to enhance instruction and to promote active learning >0.9 point increase
* 23. Foster positive relationships with parents to support students' learning and well-being > 1.2 point decrease

Adolescence Science alumni had the most high rated items (6 of 24) and no low rated items. Adolescence Foreign Language alumni had the most low rated items (9 of 24) and no high rated items.

**Mean (Standard Deviation)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **3 - Completely** | **2 - Mostly** | **1 - Somewhat** | **0 - Not at all** |

**Graduate:**

|  | **AD MEd: English, SS, & French (n = 3)** | **Literacy (n = 29)** | **ANOVA** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Demonstrate an understanding of students' strengths and different learning styles (InTASC 1) | 1.33 (0.577) | 2.66 (0.614) | 0.001\* |
| 2. Integrate multiple perspectives to the discussion of content, including attention to learners’ cultural norms (InTASC 2) | 1.33 (0.577)- | 2.41 (0.682) | 0.013\* |
| 3. Integrate multiple perspectives to the discussion of the content, including attention to learners’ personal, family, and community experiences (InTASC 2) | 1.33 (0.577) | 2.48 (0.634) | 0.005\* |
| 4. Display cultural sensitivity and respect cultural differences (InTASC 2) | 2.00 (0.000) | 2.46 (0.693) | 0.262 |
| 5. Create an active learning environment where students develop collaborative and independent inquiry skills (InTASC 3) | 1.33 (1.155) | 2.55 (0.572) | 0.003\* |
| 6. Create an active learning environment where all students are able to be successful learners (InTASC 3) | 1.00 (1.000) | 2.83 (0.384) | 0.000\* |
| 7. Foster respectful communication within the learning community (InTASC 3) | 1.33 (1.528) | 2.76 (0.511) | 0.001\* |
| 8. Understand major concepts and processes of inquiry to the discipline you teach (InTASC 4) | 1.33 (1.155) | 2.52 (0.634) | 0.008\* |
| 9. Foster creative and critical thinking related to global issues (InTASC 5) | 1.33 (0.577) | 2.21 (0.774) | 0.068 |
| 10. Foster creative and critical thinking related to issues in the local community (InTASC 5) | 1.00 (1.000) | 2.25 (0.799) | 0.017\* |
| 11. Implement a variety of strategies for communicating feedback to learners (InTASC 6) | 0.67 (1.155) | 2.55 (0.632) | 0.000\* |
| 12. Base instructional decisions on documentation of student learning (InTASC 6)  | 0.67 (0.577) | 2.45 (0.870) | 0.002\* |
| 13. Use data from multiple assessments to revise practices that meet learner needs (InTASC 6) | 1.00 (1.000) | 2.59 (0.628) | 0.000\* |
| 14. Use district, state, and national learning standards for planning and instruction (InTASC 7) | 1.00 (1.732) | 2.76 (0.435) | 0.000\* |
| 15. Demonstrate an understanding of the role of educational research in the classroom (InTASC 7)  | 1.00 (1.000) | 2.38 (0.775) | 0.007\* |
| 16. Apply educational research in classroom teaching (InTASC 7) | 1.67 (1.528) | 2.31 (0.761) | 0.213 |
| 17. Be effective in oral communication (InTASC 8)  | 2.00 (0.000) | 2.66 (0.553) | 0.052 |
| 18. Be effective in written communication (InTASC 8) | 1.67 (1.155) | 2.62 (0.622) | 0.026\* |
| 19. Use technology to enhance instruction and to promote active learning (InTASC 8) | 1.00 (1.000) | 2.28 (0.702) | 0.007\* |
| 20. Pursue continuing professional growth (InTASC 9) | 0.67 (0.577)- | 2.34 (0.769) | 0.001\* |
| 21. Demonstrate an understanding of professional and ethical standards of the profession (InTASC 9) | 1.00 (1.000) | 2.76 (0.511) | 0.000\* |
| 22. Foster positive relationships with colleagues to support students' learning and well-being (InTASC 10) | 1.33 (1.155) | 2.79 (0.491) | 0.000\* |
| 23. Foster positive relationships with parents to support students' learning and well-being (InTASC 10) | 1.00 (1.000) | 2.38 (0.775) | 0.007\* |
| 24. Foster positive relationships with community organizations to support students' learning and well-being (InTASC 10) | 1.00 (1.000) | 2.21 (0.861) | 0.030\* |
| Total High Rated Categories (Dark Green, ≥ 2.65)  | 0 | 8 |  |
| Total Low Rated Categories (Orange / Red / Dark Red, ≤ 1.94) | 22 | 0 |  |

\* p < 0.05: significant difference between programs

- Significant decrease from 2018 Alumni Survey

For Adolescence MEd graduates, alumni ratings either remained the same or decreased between those who responded in 2018 to those who responded in 2021 except for Item 16 (Apply educational research in classroom teaching) which increased by 0.67 points. These two items significantly decreased from 2018 ratings to 2021 ratings:

* 2. Integrate multiple perspectives to the discussion of content, including attention to learners’ cultural norms > 1.4 point decrease
* 20. Pursue continuing professional growth > 1.4 point decrease

For Literacy graduates, there are no significant differences between ratings from the 2018 alumni survey and the 2021 alumni survey.

All items are rated higher by literacy graduates as compared to MEd graduates and 20 of these 24 items have significantly different ratings (p < 0.05).