Abstract

This paper reports the process experienced by faculty in a School of Education as they developed, administered, and analyzed data from their first exit survey of a Master's program and, based upon the findings, made program improvement changes.

Perceptions of Graduate Student Learning via a Program Exit Survey

This article reports the process experienced by faculty in a School of Education (SOE) as we developed the first exit survey in a Master's program, administered the survey, analyzed the data, and made data-driven decisions based upon the findings. We begin with a literature review that establishes the importance of program reviews and the inclusion of measures of student learning outcomes as part of the accountability picture. We then state the purpose of our study; describe the setting and background; provide an account of the planning, design, and construction of the survey; describe the methodology for administering the survey; and, finally, provide a summary of results, data analysis, and resulting change.

 Importance of Program Reviews and Inclusion of Student Learning Outcomes

The purpose of an internal program review is to provide opportunity for continuous improvement through a systematic and cyclical process in which strengths of a program and areas for growth are identified (Daniels, 2005; Kornuta, 2007; Louisiana State University [LSU] Planning & Review, 2006). Data for program reviews should come from multiple sources (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education [NCATE],...
2003; Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville [SIUE], 2006), and involve multiple measures such as teacher candidates' grades, including measures of achievement on specific learning outcomes; scores on standardized entrance and exit exams and portfolios; community service data; and employer surveys (Hess, 2002; Kornuta, 2007; University of Delaware, 2006).

The use of student learning outcomes to establish the accountability of institutions of higher education is relatively recent. Kimmell, Marquette, and Olsen (1998) stated that outcomes assessment had become an accepted part of accreditation in the 1980s; however, during the 1990s, the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC), NCATE, and other regional and national accreditation associations focused primarily on what resources an institution had or what reputation it had gained (NCATE, 2003; WASC, 2001). Such focus has now changed. Seybert (2002) noted that every regional and national accrediting agency currently includes some aspect of outcomes assessment in accreditation requirements. Outcomes assessment allows institutions to measure goals unique to particular programs and identify successes and the need for growth without regard to the size or prominence of the institution (Jones, 1996; NCATE, 2003; SIUE, 2006; WASC, 2001).

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of the study was to determine the value of a Master's program and competencies gained during the program as perceived by students who completed the capstone course in Fiscal Year (FY) 2004. Students earn a Master of Art in Teaching (MAT) degree upon program completion. The program is part of the University's SOE, and the data collected via the study contributed to the program review process. Survey questions focused on graduate students' perceptions of the value of each of the six MAT core courses in the program, as well as students' perceptions of competencies they gained by taking the core MAT courses.

**Setting and Background**

The study was conducted at a southern California multi-campus university, with 22,000 FTE students distributed over thirty centers, providing a diversity of programs through both onsite and online delivery systems. The mission of the university is to make lifelong learning accessible, challenging, and relevant to a growing population of learners who have a diversity of educational needs. The average age of students is 34. The university's accelerated one subject-per-month format allows students to attend classes while continuing a full-time work schedule.

The SOE's mission within the university is to prepare educators as lifelong learners, reflective practitioners, and ethical professionals, and it is accomplished in a learning community through professional preparation programs, partnerships with schools, and educational research.

Academic programs are reviewed at the university on a five-year cycle. The comprehensive review process addresses the viability, adequacy, and necessity of the programs. Within the program review process, a cross-check also occurs to ensure that program goals and learning outcomes are aligned with the mission of the university, the SOE mission, and requirements of both national and state accrediting agencies, including NCATE (2001), the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) (2005), and WASC (2001). Each agency defines its own unique assessment standards, which include data collection, analysis, and evaluation for the purposes of program improvement.

Lacking in our review process has been data gathered directly from students about program goals and the value of specific courses to overall student development of their knowledge, skills, and abilities. Gathering of such data is considered an indirect strategy for assessment, but “can
supplement and enrich what faculty can learn from direct assessment studies [analysis of student projects to measure mastery of a specific learning objective]” (Allen, 2001, p. 59). Collecting data through use of a survey documents student perceptions and is a self assessment of their learning. Within this context, we designed a survey for recent graduates of the MAT program. The data collected contributed to the overall MAT Program Review.

**Survey Planning, Design, and Construction**

The planning of the Exit Survey began with recognition that input from students was missing from the information used for program evaluation. The MAT faculty began a conversation to identify questions that would contribute useful information for program evaluation and improvement. In this early stage of the development of the survey, the insights the faculty gained were valuable outcomes of the study. The process caused us to look very carefully at what we expected students to demonstrate at the end of each course and how such outcomes aligned with the bigger picture of program goals. Upon close examination of existing course learning outcomes and program goals, we found the need for more clearly stated and measurable learning outcomes, which in turn, directly aligned with program goals.

Our first task became writing clear, unambiguous, measurable learning outcomes, and ensuring their alignment with program goals. Completing the task gave us a clearer understanding of what questions to ask in the survey so that we could make informed decisions about program improvement. The process of planning, designing, and constructing the survey came out of four sets of questions faculty asked. The process described below is the thinking process in which faculty engaged as evidenced by the questions they asked. The survey questions parallel the thinking process; however, for purposes of survey administration, the questions were organized in a difference sequence.

1. **Had students learned what faculty believed was taught?**

Responses to this question required clear, measurable learning outcomes for each course. As MAT faculty began the task of listing existing learning outcomes, it became evident that there was a need for more precise articulation of measurable learning outcomes within courses, and that alignment was needed between learning outcomes and MAT program goals. Faculty crafted clearly stated learning outcomes and aligned each outcome with MAT program goals. The learning outcomes and alignment were in harmony with what we were already doing, but gave a much sharper focus to our teaching. An example of how we showed alignment of course learning outcomes with program goals is provided in Figure 1, Appendix A.

2. **Were specific MAT courses of value to the students? If courses are not valued by students, what are the reasons?**

We began the survey by listing the six core MAT courses and asking respondents to rate how valuable each course was to the development of their teaching ability using a Likert scale where 1 = *Not at all valuable*; 2 = *Not too valuable*; 3 = *Somewhat valuable*; 4 = *Very valuable*. Faculty discussed the possibility of including an undecided option. Ary, Jacobs, and Razavieh (2002) noted that “neutral items are not used in a Likert scale” (p. 224) yet “most experts in the field recommend that the research include a neutral or undecided choice because some respondents actually feel that way and do not want to be forced into agreeing or disagreeing” (p. 225). We chose to exclude the neutral option because we wanted to hear a clear verdict from students on the questions asked.

When any course was rated negatively (choices 1 or 2), respondents were automatically invited to provide a reason for their response with the statement: “You have indicated the following course(s) listed below as not valuable to the development of your teaching...”
ability. Please help the School of Education improve the Master of Arts in Teaching Program by clarifying the reason(s) for your response.”

3. Did students believe that their knowledge, skills, and abilities had been further developed in relation to the 10 MAT program goals? Did the overall program improve students’ teaching? Meet students’ expectations? Influence students’ philosophy of education? If any responses were negative, why were they negative?

We listed the 10 MAT program goals (see Appendix A) and asked respondents to rate whether the MAT program developed their knowledge, skills, and abilities in relationship to each goal statement. As with the previous question, we provided a four-point scale for respondents to indicate how strongly they agreed or disagreed that the program goals were met. For any response indicating disagreement, respondents were invited to clarify the reason for their response with the statement: “You have indicated disagreement that the Master of Arts in Teaching Program developed your knowledge, skills, and abilities in the following student competency(s) listed below. Please help the School of Education to improve the Master of Arts in Teaching Program by clarifying the reason(s) for your response.”

Additionally, we asked the students to use a four-point scale to rate the overall program by asking whether they agreed or disagreed with three statements: “Overall the program improved my teaching”; “Overall the program met my expectations”; and “Overall the program influenced my philosophy of education.” If students did not agree with any of the statements, they were invited to clarify the reason in a written response.

4. If students could make a change in the program, what would it be?

An open-ended question invited students to share written responses about recommended change. The question asked: “If you could change anything about the Master of Arts in Teaching Program experience, what would it be?”

Survey Methodology

The web-based survey began with an e-mail invitation in May 2005 (see Appendix B) and was followed by three subsequent e-mail reminders. The survey was distributed to 514 students for whom the university had a valid e-mail address and who completed the capstone course MAT 640, Applications of Research to the Art of Teaching, in FY2004, a time period from July, 2003 through June, 2004.

The e-mail invitation requested participation in the 2004 MAT Exit Survey, provided a link to the survey site, and identified the sponsor, objectives, data collection time period, and incentive for responding. The invitation also reviewed the steps taken to ensure the confidentiality of individual responses and security of the survey site. Reminders contribute to yielding a higher response rate (Rea & Parker, 1997). The three subsequent e-mail reminder invitations to participate were sent out over a three-week period to those who had not yet responded to the survey. All e-mail invitations included the link to the survey site as well as a unique personal identification number (PIN) code for each potential respondent. Furthermore, each invitation discussed the relevance and importance of this research survey. An incentive in the form of a drawing for a book or an educational journal was also offered with the hope of increasing the response rate.

Respondents were asked to use a Likert-scale to rank the value of each of the six MAT core courses in terms of how valuable each course was to the development of their teaching ability. Additionally, respondents were asked to rank how strongly they agreed that the MAT program helped to develop their knowledge, skills, and abilities in regard to each of the learning outcomes. The order of individual questions in each section was randomized to minimize the risk of survey fatigue occurring and contributing to skewed results. Composing survey questions based on course learning outcomes and the MAT program
goals contributed to the validity of the survey. Thus, responses provided meaningful data usable for decision-making purposes. Screen shots of the web-based survey are found in Appendix C.

The survey asked respondents about the professional impact of program completion by asking two questions: “Do you anticipate an increase in your responsibility at your school district as a result of completing the Master of Arts in Teaching Program?” and “Do you anticipate a promotion within your school district as a result of completing the Master of Arts in Teaching Program?” Demographic information was asked, including years of teaching experience and types of credentials held.

Survey Results and Data Analysis

By May 20, 2005, a total of 80 surveys were completed, with no participant responding more than once. Five members of the SOE Teacher Education faculty formed the MAT Exit Survey data analysis team. The team met to review the data, analyze the results, and prepare a summary distribution to the other 34 members of the Teacher Education faculty.

The team received an annotated report from the university’s Office of Educational Effectiveness and Assessment. The report included scores for each of the five items in the survey. Cross-tabulation of survey results included the question number as well as the complete question wording. The cross-tabulation independent variables were total respondents, student ethnicity, and regional location. Descriptive statistics charted and graphed results; qualitative analysis was used to analyze written responses for themes.

Surveys were received from each of the five regions in the state. Students identified as completing three or more of the six core courses online were separated into the online location category. Respondents had an average of 10 years teaching experience, and 64% held elementary school teaching credentials.

The administration of this survey, while having an apparently low response rate, is typical of the response rate the university achieves using a web-based survey. As Ary et al. (2002) noted, “Missing data represents a serious problem” (p. 382). However, Suskie (1996) stated, “It is more important to have respondents who are representative of the group from which you are sampling than to have a large return rate” (p. 69). Table 1 provides a profile of the population distribution of students eligible to participate in the study and the respondent sample distribution by location statewide. Comparison of the profiles of the two distributions indicates that the sample population is representative of the population that completed MAT 640, the capstone course of the MAT program in terms of region ($\chi^2 = 3.14, df. = 5, p > .1$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Location</th>
<th>Population Distribution of MAT 640 completers (Current email address)</th>
<th>Respondent Sample Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Campus</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Central Campus</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Campus</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Central Campus</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is a common phenomenon that “too few institutions routinely provide information to various groups (faculty and staff members, trustees, students) about whether or how they are using assessment data” (Kuh, Gonyea, & Rodriguez, 2002, p. 125). The MAT Survey Team was committed to share results with faculty. At a statewide faculty meeting, the Team presented a report summarizing students’ quantitative and qualitative responses. Faculty were invited to complete a Response Form that asked:

- What information did you find most encouraging?
- Based on the survey results, what specific changes in the MAT program should be our first priority?
- What action do you recommend?
- Additional comments.

The MAT Survey team summarized faculty responses and recommendations for action. They are reported in the following section as Reflection and Results.

Survey Response Summary

This section summarizes findings in four sections of the survey, recounts faculty reflection on the findings, and identifies the resulting action.

1. Response to the value of MAT Core Courses

Students were asked to rate how valuable each of the six core courses were to the development of their teaching ability. Over 80% of respondents rated five of six core courses as valuable and provided constructive criticism about what did not work well. One course was seen as less valuable than others.

Reflection and Results: As a result of student ratings and comments, faculty changed the focus of the one course and changed the text. Additionally, we recognized that students should also be provided opportunity to respond about the strengths of specific courses and the program. The next administration of the survey will provide this opportunity.

2. Response to Specific Program Goals

Students rated how strongly the MAT program goals developed their teaching competencies as defined by the 10 program goals. The only program goal to receive less than 90% agreement was the statement that the MAT program helped students to build professional relationships. The statement received 87% agreement.

At the other end of the scale, 97% of respondents agreed that the MAT program helped them to reflect on their own teaching practice. This finding provided evidence of alignment between students achieving the program goal, faculty and students accomplishing part of the SOE mission (developing reflective practitioners), and the SOE meeting external accrediting agency standards.

Reflection and Results: For faculty, the most valuable outcome was the process of visualizing learning outcomes through the eyes of others (students and other faculty) and writing the learning outcomes so that they were clear, measurable, and aligned with program goals. The learning outcomes, as written, are now included in each course syllabus.

3. Response to Overall Program Statements

Students rated agreement or disagreement to three statements about the overall MAT program. Respondents replied with strong agreement that the program met their expectations (92%) and that the program improved their teaching (91%). There was lower agreement (85%) that the program influenced their philosophy of education. A theme from students' comments about their philosophy being influenced is reflected in the statement, “I did not change my philosophy of education because of this program. I did find data to support my philosophy—students first and foremost.” Thus, when students responded negatively to the query about the program influencing their philosophy, they meant that their philosophy did not change—not that they rejected the beliefs and values represented in the program.
Reflection and Results: Most students’ who responded that the program did not influence their educational philosophy implied by way of their comments that they understood the question to ask whether their philosophy had changed. For the next iteration of the survey, we will re-word the question to better understand how the program may have provided support for beliefs and values already held.

4. Response to Open Ended Responses

Students were invited to write comments about the MAT program including suggested changes. A theme that emerged very clearly showed student dissatisfaction with some adjunct instructors.

Reflection and Results: Two specific results followed from the finding: faculty increased their efforts for professional development of adjunct instructors through workshops; and faculty were granted access to a previously inaccessible database that summarized student evaluations of adjunct instructors. Access to the database was needed to identify and schedule adjunct instructors who were rated as most effective in their teaching. Such access is one that faculty had asked for many times. Data from the survey became the tipping point for an administrative decision to grant access.

Initiatives for Change

Faculty reflections on the findings from the FY2004 survey contributed to recommendations and to change in two areas: in the survey itself and its next iteration; and in faculty’s own teaching/learning process.

Next Iteration of the Survey

The next Program Exit Survey process will repeat the elements that made the initial survey work well. In addition, the next survey will incorporate changes that faculty believed would improve the quality and usefulness of the data gathered. The next iteration of the survey will:

- Be administered to students who completed MAT 640 in subsequent years for subsequent cohorts on an annual basis;
- Prepare, as previously compiled, a tabulation of responses from various centers around the state to determine survey reliability;
- Use the disaggregated data to identify similarities and differences in responses amongst centers, and formulate action plans;
- Review response items to separate double items into two single items (e.g., “Use multiple teaching models and assessment strategies” will be separated into “Use multiple teaching models” and “Use multiple assessment strategies”);
- Invite respondents to indicate why they agreed to statements in the Course Value and Program Goals sections as well as why they disagreed;
- Disaggregate the data by streams within the program (i.e., separate data of those who earn a Master’s degree by combining MAT courses with Teacher Credential courses from those who take only MAT courses);
- Alert instructors of the capstone course, MAT 640, Applications of Research to the Art of Teaching, that students will be receiving the Program Exit Survey. Since the course engages students in their own action research, instructors will encourage students to see the importance of participating in the survey when they receive it;
- Report, as communicated previously, the results to faculty, and invite their response;
- Report data-driven decisions and or changes to respondents and thereby “close the loop.” We also want to communicate with alumni about program improvements that have occurred as a result of their input; and
- Try additional strategies to improve the response rate. Additionally, we recommend that administration of the survey occur during students’ capstone course as an additional way to increase the response rate. As classes in this course are
taught monthly, data collected from each class would then be aggregated and compiled using the fiscal year-end as a census date.

**Informing Teaching, Learning, and Decision Making**

The analysis of student ratings and comments provided an initiative for change as faculty were able to inform their teaching, learning, and decision making. Faculty reflections and recommendations resulted in:

- Changing the focus of the one course and changing the text;
- Including clearly written learning outcomes in each course syllabus. For faculty, the most valuable result of this survey process was visualizing learning outcomes through the eyes of others, and writing the learning outcomes so that they were clear, measurable, and aligned with program goals;
- Increasing efforts to develop adjunct instructors through workshops;
- Granting full-time faculty access to previously inaccessible student evaluations of adjuncts’ teaching. Data from the survey was the tipping point for an administrative decision to grant such access to a database that summarizes students’ perceptions of the quality of teaching in each class. The database is now used to help identify and schedule the most effective adjunct instructors.

**Looking Back**

The process of using an exit survey to collect program data from students as part of program review is new to the SOE and its faculty. The construction of the initial survey and its administration provided several opportunities for development and growth. Through our reflections, we have recognized:

- Constructing an exit survey is a learning process;
- Collaborating with state-wide faculty to collectively participate in data analysis and to prepare recommendations for change requires time;
- Reviewing course learning outcomes and program goals strengthened the MAT program by aligning assessment to learning outcomes, program goals, mission statements, and requirements of both national and state accrediting agencies;
- Including student data in a program review was a first for the university and was soon replicated by other Schools within the university;
- Working with a vendor to create the web-based survey with real-time responses improved the process;
- Analyzing responses by location and by course leads to important findings; and
- Increasing professional development opportunities for full-time and adjunct instructors is needed to support consistency of course delivery throughout the university’s campuses across the state.

The experience of developing and administering the first exit survey in a Master’s program, analyzing data to inform teaching and learning, and making data-driven decisions based on the findings had very positive results. The process contributed to the professional growth of faculty and resulted in data-driven decisions that led to program improvement.
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Appendix A

The Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) Program Goals

By the end of the MAT program, students are expected to be able to:

1. Reflect on teaching practice;
2. Build professional relationships/networks;
3. Build learning communities within schools/classroom;
4. Analyze cross-cultural educational issues;
5. Identify, describe, and apply theories of curriculum as they relate to State-approved standards;
6. Implement standards-based assessment in the classroom, school and district;
7. Use technology for research and teaching;
8. Apply multiple teaching models and assessment strategies;
9. Implement, assess, and evaluate standards-based curriculum;
10. Conduct a literature review in the context of an application to teaching; and
11. Use APA conventions in writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes for Course MAT640</th>
<th>Course Assignments</th>
<th>Course Assessments</th>
<th>Program Goals Met Directly</th>
<th>Program Goal Met Indirectly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Identify a topic to investigate relative to your teaching practice.</td>
<td>Topic identification Planning Worksheet Purpose statement development Exercise</td>
<td>Planning Worksheet and Exercise feedback</td>
<td>1. Reflect on teaching practice</td>
<td>Potentially, all program goals depending on topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Write a clear, precise purpose statement that identifies what and how you will investigate.</td>
<td>Planning Worksheet Chapter drafts, each having clear purpose, evident and logical organization, graduate quality writing (Chapter 1: Introduction Chapter 2: Literature Review; Chapter 3: Application of Research Learning reflection)</td>
<td>Worksheet feedback Tracking feedback within drafts and Writing Rubric Final evaluation rubric</td>
<td>1. Reflect on teaching practice</td>
<td>4. Analyze cross-cultural educational issues 5. Identify, describe, and apply theories of curriculum as they relate to State-approved standards. 8. Apply multiple teaching models and assessment strategies 9. Implement, assess, and evaluate standards-based curriculum Other program goals depending on topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Formulate, prepare, and organize a three chapter capstone project applicable to your professional education needs.</td>
<td>Planning Worksheet Chapter drafts, each having clear purpose, evident and logical organization, graduate quality writing (Chapter 1: Introduction Chapter 2: Literature Review; Chapter 3: Application of Research Learning reflection)</td>
<td>Worksheet feedback Tracking feedback within drafts and Writing Rubric Final evaluation rubric</td>
<td>1. Reflect on teaching practice</td>
<td>4. Analyze cross-cultural educational issues 5. Identify, describe, and apply theories of curriculum as they relate to State-approved standards. 8. Apply multiple teaching models and assessment strategies 9. Implement, assess, and evaluate standards-based curriculum Other program goals depending on topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a. Write a review of literature that is related to teaching practice.</td>
<td>Draft of chapter 2. Access scholarly books and peer reviewed journal articles related to the research application. Synthesize and report information in a literature review relevant to the topic of the proposal.</td>
<td>Worksheet feedback Feedback within drafts (MSWord Tracking) and Writing Rubric</td>
<td>7. Use technology in research 10. Conduct a literature review in the context of an application to teaching 11. Use APA conventions in writing</td>
<td>Several program goals depending on topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b. Write an introductory chapter.</td>
<td>Draft of chapter 1. Include background, purpose, significance, limitations, and delimitations.</td>
<td>Worksheet feedback Tracking feedback within drafts and Writing Rubric Final evaluation rubric</td>
<td>1. Reflect on teaching practice</td>
<td>Several program goals depending on topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c. Create/ write an application for the completed literature review.</td>
<td>Draft of chapter 3 Complete final project.</td>
<td>Tracking feedback within drafts and Writing Rubric Final evaluation rubric</td>
<td>1. Reflect on teaching practice</td>
<td>Several program goals depending on topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d. Use APA conventions for formatting.</td>
<td>All writing</td>
<td>Worksheet feedback Tracking feedback and Writing Rubric Final evaluation rubric</td>
<td>11. Use APA conventions in writing</td>
<td>Several program goals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Alignment of course learning outcomes and programs goals within the Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) Program.
Appendix B

Invitation Letter to Participate in Survey

University Letterhead

May 4, 2005

Dear Alumna/Alumnus and those who are soon to be!

The School of Education requests each Master of Arts in Teaching Program student to contribute to the development of future educators. To that end, we are asking that you complete our Exit Survey. Your response to this Exit Survey will provide information for the purpose of program improvement. Survey questions will collect information about coursework effectiveness and student competencies. Your thoughtful and honest responses are important.

The School of Education and the Office of Educational Effectiveness and Assessment have commissioned Advantage Business Research, Inc. to conduct this research initiative.

Please take the online survey by clicking on the link provided: (The link is no longer active, but screen shots are shown in Appendix C.) and enter your PIN Code (XXXXXX). Completion of this survey is voluntary and will take approximately 10 minutes of your time. Your responses will be completely confidential and will only be represented in aggregate form. We have taken the extra step of using PIN Codes to ensure the security of the survey site and the confidentiality of your responses. Once you have entered your PIN Code, completed the survey, and hit the submit button, your PIN Code will no longer be valid.

All alumni who complete this survey by the close date of Friday, May 20, 2005 and include their e-mail address at the end of the survey will be automatically entered into a random prize drawing for a one year print subscription to Educational Leadership magazine or a print edition of C. A. Tomlinson's book, How to differentiate instruction in mixed-ability classrooms. Three (3) lucky winners will be randomly selected in the prize drawing. The choice is yours! The odds of winning depend on the total number of responses. The winners will be notified via e-mail.

If you have any questions or concerns about this survey or your rights as a participant, please contact the Office of Educational Effectiveness and Assessment at [insert telephone number] or [insert email address].

Thank you for your participation.

Sincerely,

Teacher Education Department

Educational Effectiveness and Assessment
Appendix C
Master of Arts in Teaching Program Exit Survey Screen Shots
Please indicate how strongly you disagree or agree that the Master of Arts in Teaching Program developed your knowledge, skills, and abilities using a scale where, 1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, and 4 = Strongly agree.

1. Analyze current educational issues.
2. Reflect on my own teaching practice.
3. Use multiple teaching methods and assessment strategies.
4. Build learning communities within my school and/or classroom.
5. Use terminology for research and teaching.
7. Implement standards-based assessment in my educational setting.
8. Utilize professional relationships.
9. Conduct action research in my teaching.
10. Involve, support, and engage classroom-based curriculum.

Overall, the National University Masters of Arts in Teaching Program influenced my teaching.

I would recommend the National University Masters of Arts in Teaching Program to others.

The online technology supported (e.g., computers, plenaries, DVC/VCR) available was adequate to support my learning.

You have indicated disagreement that the Master of Arts in Teaching Program developed your knowledge, skills, and abilities in the following student competency(s) listed below. Please help the School of Education to improve the Master of Arts in Teaching Program by clarifying the reason(s) for your response.

1. Analyze current educational issues.

Overall, the National University Masters of Arts in Teaching Program improved my teaching.

You have indicated disagreement with the Master of Arts in Teaching Program statements listed below. Please help the School of Education to improve the Master of Arts in Teaching Program by clarifying the reason(s) for your response.

If you could change anything about the Master of Arts in Teaching Program experience, what would it be?
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