Exhibit 4.4.B   Alumni Survey

CAEP Standards/Component: 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5,4.4,,5.2,5.4
InTASC Standards: 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10
NJPST: 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10

Purpose and Administration: The Alumni surveys are EPP designed and created assessments which measure the perceptions of graduates of the program in relationship to the four InTASC categories of the learner and learning, content knowledge, instructional practice, and professional responsibility. There are two surveys used, the original (2012 and 2014) was revised in 2017 (administered 2018) to more closely align to InTASC and the NJPST. The response rate for each were 2012: 21%; 2014: 23%; and 2018: 23% . The two alumni surveys included are as follows:

1. Alumni Survey: Administered Spring 2012 and Fall 2014
2. Revised Alumni Survey: Administered Spring 2018, and will be administered Fall 2019

Original Alumni Survey
The Spring 2012 and Summer 2014 Alumni surveys are based on a 28 item, 5 point likert scale. There are demographic questions as well, however the data presented by the previous coordinator of assessment did not include a break down by program, or raw data to determine what the results would be by program. The likert scale is as follows: 5; Strongly Agree; 4=Agree; 3: Neutral; 2: Disagree; 1; Strongly Disagree. The data presents the mean scores for each category of CAEP by program as well as the scores for each criteria by program. All criteria are aligned to NJPST/InTASC and CAEP. The survey was created in Lime Survey, an open survey tool that is free. The University no longer provides support to lime survey, and because there were issues in pulling down the raw data to try to align the standards and disaggregate by program, a new survey was developed and implemented on Qualtrics, a university supported survey application.

The original survey was distributed through Lime Survey by an uploaded database of graduate information. The survey is sent to the email addresses on the database. The survey was sent to any and all alumni in which the EPP had record of in both Spring 2012 and Summer of 2014. The data was collected and added to a database with demographic information. The former assessment coordinator left the position in 2016 and did not leave the raw data or access to the raw data. The data left did not allow for the new assessment coordinator (Assistant Dean hired in Fall 2016) to disaggregate the data by program. Therefore, data are the aggregate set. A new survey was created with the input of partnership school administration and a new alumni survey protocol was established.

Revised Alumni Survey
The revised 2017 Alumni Survey (results from early Spring 2018) is based on a 23 item, 4 point likert scale directly aligned to InTASC and the NJPST. The demographic questions preceding the likert scale allowed the EPP to disaggregate data by program. The likert scale points are assigned as follows: 4; Strongly Agree; 3=Agree; 2: Disagree; 1; Strongly Disagree. This survey has a direct alignment to the standards and is set up for ease of data collection and analysis. There will be one more administration of this assessment prior to the 2019 site visit. Data will be available at the site visit.

Exhibit 4.4.B   Alumni Survey

The new assessment protocol calls for distribution of the survey every two years to graduates that are 3-4 years out from graduation of initial programs. The pilot survey in 2018 was distributed anonymously by survey link to a Qualtics survey. Although surveys were distributed to all graduates in 2015, several surveys were "bounced" back due to failed email address, therefore only 100 surveys were counted as delivered. 23% completed surveys are represented by the data from multiple program areas. We will continue to work on ways to update our alumni database with the goal of increasing the number of responses received..

Use of Data: The data are used to assess the quality of preparation of the EPP's programs. The survey allows the EPP to explore areas of strength and those that need improvement. The survey does not purport to assess candidate's performance of the four InTASC categories, rather their perceived level of preparedness on the categories.

Instructions: All graduates assessed from the initial certification programs are asked to rate their perception of preparation against InTASC and NJPST standards using the likert scales above for the alumni surveys.

Scoring:
Alumni Survey (2012, 2014) is scored on a graded five point likert scale: 5; Strongly Agree; 4=Agree; 3: Neutral; 2: Disagree; 1; Strongly Disagree. Mean scores by item and InTASC category are presented in the data. An item is considered acceptable when 80% of the scores are at Agree or Strongly Agree. The revised Alumni Survey (2018) is scored on a four point likert scale: 4; Strongly Agree; 3=Agree; 2: Disagree; 1; Strongly Disagree. Mean scores by item and InTASC category are presented in the data. An item is considered acceptable when 80% of the scores are at Agree or Strongly Agree.

> **Validity and Reliability:** The 2016 CAEP Accreditation Handbook (p 167) states surveys are not required to meet these assessment attributes.

> **Data Included in this Report:**

> 1. 2012 Alumni Survey Data: 176 responses. It is estimated that the survey was delivered to 650. 27% response rate
> 2. 2014 Summer Alumni Survey Data: 180 responses. It is estimated that the survey was delivered to 625 graduates. 28% response rate
> 3. 2018 Alumni Survey (revised) Data: 23 responses out of 100 received by graduates. 23% response rate

> **Analysis and Interpretation**: The data clearly indicate that Monmouth University graduates of the EPP perceive they are prepared in all four categories of InTASC standards. In 2012 and 2014 Instructional Practice were the highest scores of the four. In 2018, the Learner and Learning Development category, on average, had the highest scores across content (with K-6 Art, Music, Health and PE) being the exception. Their highest was content knowledge. The analysis and interpretation by category is below.
> > A. The Learner and Learning: 100% of all survey responses were in Agree or Higher in the three series of data, with the exception of K-6 Music/Art/Health/PE (n=3) where only 75% were scored at the target level. The low n could be the contributing factor. On that survey there were not qualitative comments to further discuss this low perception. Although the mean score for all 2012 alumni was just under 4 (4=Agree), there were over 80% of responses that were at "agree" or

Exhibit 4.4.B   Alumni Survey

higher. In 2018, the Learner and Learning scores were the highest of the four categories for elementary majors. There were no programs in which this was the lowest perceived score. Also of note, in 2018 candidates across the EPP felt strongest in understanding how learners grow and develop and recognizing patterns of learning across multiple areas, averaging 3.13 on a 4-point scale. The EPP lowest scores on category 1 items was clearly designing and implementing developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences (2.19 on a 4 point scale). Graduate students faired better on their perceptions than undergraduates across the board. This could also be a result of the number of students who took the assessment (UG n=19; Grad n=4). K-6 Art/Music/Health/PE scored below a 3 for all areas. There were only 3 participants who completed the survey, so even one score under "Agree" would impact the mean tremendously. All P-3 scores in 2018 were at 3.33 (out of 4) in all criteria matched to category 1. The criteria where three disciplines in 2018 scored below the desired mean of "3=Agree" or better are (a) Collaborates to create environments that encourage engagement in learning, (b) collaborates to create an environment that encourages self-motivation and (c) designing and implementing developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences (5 items under a score of "3"). Designing and implementing developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences was clearly the relative weakness.

B. <u>Content Knowledge:</u> Content knowledge was a strength for the 2014 and 2012 applications of data, with both means being over the "agree" point value of 4, 4.02 and 4.17 respectively. For the 2018 series of data, this category was the lowest mean for the EPP as a whole with a mean of 2.96. That was more likely due to the sub-3 mean of 2.87 for all undergraduates. Content in which that score also fell below 3.00 were elementary (2.91), Secondary 2.93) K-6 Art/Music/Health/PE (2.80), and TSD (2.85). The only content grouping that score above the (3) "Agree" threshold were Graduate and P-3. Content knowledge was clearly the relative weakness across the board for the EPP as 4/5 disciplines means were below a "3= Agree. The lowest two criteria for the EPP were (a) create learning experiences that make the content accessible and (b) connect concepts to engage learners in collaborative problem solving related to authentic and local global issues. Graduate students and P-3 students scored above the desired "3= Agree" in all areas of content knowledge.

C. <u>Instructional Practice:</u> 2012 and 2014 data suggest Instructional Practice is a strength with it being the highest scores for both series of data, 4.11 and 4.27 respectively. In 2018, instructional practice was slightly below the learner and learning category at 3.01. This is a relative strength across all applications of data. The graduate, elementary, secondary, and P-3 clusters all demonstrate the mean scores of above "3-Agree" indicating the perceive their training in this category to be appropriate. Art/Music/Health/PE (n=3) scored the lowest in this category with a mean score of 2.37. The single assessment criteria in that category that had 100% responses above "3=Agree" or better was "creating plans that use appropriate pedagogy." The area in which 6/8 disaggregated groups scored below an average or "3=Agree" was "use multiple methods of assessment to guide decision making.

D. <u>Professional Responsibility</u>: The 2014 survey indicated that candidates scored highest on Professional Responsibility (4.27 mean on a 5 point scale). It was also the second highest

Exhibit 4.4.B   Alumni Survey

category on the 2012 application of the survey. In 2012 candidates scored higher on the items dealing with professional development and research, and relatively lower in communication and collaboration. In 2018 the mean score for this category was just under the target of "3=Agree." This data could have been slightly skewed by the K-6 art/music/health/PE mean score of 2.06 which is slightly above the "2.0=Disagree" score. Professional responsibility was the lowest of scores for that discipline. Graduate, Elementary, Secondary, P-3 and TSD students all achieved a mean score above "3=Agree". K-6 Art/Music/Health/PE scored a mean of 1.67 on "collaborates with learners, families, colleagues, and other professionals to ensure learner growth. This was the lowest mean of any criteria across disciplines and the three cycles of data. Although the number of participants was small, this is certainly an area in which improvement must be targeted. In fact, that was the one item that was lowest across the criteria for category four, indicating we must improve collaboration activities throughout the program.

Use for Continuous Improvement: The alumni survey data provides the EPP with valuable information that can be used to inform program improvements. The data is shared with multiple constituency groups, including the University Teacher Education Advisory Committee made up of faculty and administration from all disciplines across the MU campus. Art/Music/Health/PE faculty are included in those meetings. Data have been triangulated with other assessments to help determine areas of need. Some examples of content area changes happening outside of the school of education include health curriculum revision, PE curriculum revisions, and increased clinical practice hours that will increase opportunities to practice skills. The EPP systematically reports findings on an ongoing basis through these constituency group meetings.

Exhibit 4.4.B   Alumni Survey

Alumni Survey used Spring 2012 and Summer 2014-

Alumni Survey

Dear School of Education Alumnus,

Welcome! In an effort to keep you updated through newsletters and invitations of news and events pertaining to the School of Education and to insure that Monmouth University's School of Education programs remain strong, we are updating our Alumni database. We ask that you spend a few minutes of your valuable time to complete a few questions to aid in this effort. If you have completed more than one School of Education program at Monmouth, we would like you to provide feedback about the program you completed most recently.

We look forward to hearing from you. Thank You! Dr. John Henning, Dean
There are 25 questions in this survey

Program

[]
We are interested in gathering your feedback on the most recent program you completed at Monmouth University. What level (undergraduate, MAT, or advanced graduate) program did you most recently complete?

Choose one of the following answers
Please choose **only one** of the following:

○ Undergraduate Initial Teacher Preparation Program

○ Advanced Graduate Program (**not** MAT Teacher Preparation)

○ Graduate Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) Program

[]When did you most recently complete a program at Monmouth University?

Choose one of the following answers
Please choose **only one** of the following:

○ 2015

○ 2014

○ 2013

○ 2012

○ 2011

○ Other

Exhibit 4.4.B   Alumni Survey

Initial Teacher Prep Questions

For the following survey items, you will be asked to evaluate the preparation you received in your teacher preparation program at Monmouth University. You will identify your level of agreement regarding your preparation across several areas.

[]
My initial teacher preparation program at Monmouth University prepared me to:

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:
Answer was 'Undergraduate Initial Teacher Preparation Program' or 'Graduate Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) Program' at question '1 [q1]' (We are interested in gathering your feedback on the most recent program you completed at Monmouth University. What level (undergraduate, MAT, or advanced graduate) program did you most recently complete?)

Please choose the appropriate response for each item:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Use instructional methods to teach the New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards.	O	O	O	O	O
Plan instruction based on learners' needs, developmental progress, and prior knowledge.	O	O	O	O	O
Engage in interdisciplinary unit planning.	O	O	O	O	O
Develop students' literacy and/or numeracy skills to enable them to construct meaning within a particular content area.	O	O	O	O	O
Identify differences in student learning styles to teach to the developmental ability of the student.	O	O	O	O	O
Use strategies to support the learning of ESL/bilingual students.	O	O	O	O	O

Exhibit 4.4.B   Alumni Survey

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Use available and appropriate resources for instructional planning.	O	O	O	O	O
Use educational technology effectively for instruction.	O	O	O	O	O
Use multiple assessment strategies for evaluating student learning (e.g., criterion-referenced tests, norm-referenced tests, performance-based tests, observations, formative and summative assessments, etc.)	O	O	O	O	O
Understand assessment and measurement related issues to interpret test score data.	O	O	O	O	O
Apply strategies for effective classroom management.	O	O	O	O	O
Establish a positive classroom environment conducive to learning.	O	O	O	O	O
Motivate students to engage in learning.	O	O	O	O	O
Modify instruction to accommodate the learning needs of all students.	O	O	O	O	O

Exhibit 4.4.B   Alumni Survey

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Interpret and implement an Individualized Education Plan (IEP).	O	O	O	O	O
Develop questioning techniques to stimulate critical thinking.	O	O	O	O	O
Use effective verbal, non-verbal, and written communication techniques to foster learning in the classroom.	O	O	O	O	O
Effectively communicate and collaborate with parents, peers, and community members.	O	O	O	O	O
Effectively communicate and collaborate with school administration and other school personnel.	O	O	O	O	O
Use educational research to make decisions that benefit my teaching.	O	O	O	O	O
Engage in professional development activities and reflection to promote learning in the students I serve.	O	O	O	O	O

Exhibit 4.4.B   Alumni Survey

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Use instructional methods related to Specialty Professional Association (SPA) Standards.	O	O	O	O	O
Use instructional methods related to New Jersey Professional Standards for Teachers (NJPST).	O	O	O	O	O
Effectively teach in my content area.	O	O	O	O	O
Reflect on and develop appropriate teaching dispositions.	O	O	O	O	O
Design learner outcomes that are linked to assessment.	O	O	O	O	O
Compare pre and post data to analyze student learning.	O	O	O	O	O
Reflect on assessment and instruction to identify ways to improve teaching and student learning.	O	O	O	O	O

Exhibit 4.4.B   Alumni Survey

<mark>REVISED</mark> Alumni Survey administered 2018

Monmouth University Alumni Survey for Initial Teaching Programs

Please take a few minutes to help us gain information about your experiences since the time you graduated from one of our initial teacher preparation programs. Responses are anonymous and you will not be identified in any reports generated. Thank you in advance for your time, interest and support of Monmouth University's School of Education.

Q1 We are interested in gathering your feedback on the most recent program you completed at Monmouth University. What level (undergraduate, MAT or advanced program) did you most recently complete? Undergraduate Initial Teacher Preparation Program (1)

○ Advanced Graduate Program (Not MAT Teacher Preparation) (2)

○ Graduate Masters in Arts in Teaching (MAT) Program (3)

Q13 In what year did you graduate?
Year (1)

▼ 2004 (1) ... 2025 (22)

Q15 In which type of school setting are you working?

○ Public School (1)

○ (Public) Charter School (2)

○ Private School (3)

Exhibit 4.4.B   Alumni Survey

Q2 What is your license area? (check all that apply)

☐ P-3/Early Childhood (1)

☐ K-8 (2)

☐ K-6 (Elementary) (3)

☐ 6-8 (Middle School) (4)

☐ 7-12 (5)

☐ 9-12 (Secondary) (6)

☐ Teacher of Students with Disabilities/Special Education (7)

☐ English as a Second Language (8)

☐ Reading Specialist (9)

☐ K-12 Art, Music, PE/Health (10)

☐ Math (11)

☐ Science (12)

☐ Foreign Language (14)

☐ History/Social Studies (15)

☐ Language Arts (16)

Exhibit 4.4.B　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　Alumni Survey

Q3 What is your current Position

☐Preschool Teacher (1)

☐General Education Elementary Classroom Teacher (6)

☐General Education Secondary Teacher (8)

☐Special Education Teacher (2)

☐Reading Specialist (7)

☐I am not working in the field of education at this time (9)

Please evaluate your preparation received in your teacher preparation program at Monmouth University. you will identify your level of agreement regarding your preparation across the InTASC standards

Exhibit 4.4.B   Alumni Survey

Q6 InTASC Category 1: The Learner and Learning
Monmouth University prepared me to:

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Agree (3)	Strongly Agree (4)
(1) Understand how learners grow and develop (1)	○	○	○	○
(1) recognizes patterns of learning and development vary across the cognitive, social, emotional and physical areas (2)	○	○	○	○
(1) design and implement developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences (3)	○	○	○	○
(2) Use understanding of individual differences to ensure inclusive environments to meet high standards (4)	○	○	○	○
(3) Collaborate to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning (5)	○	○	○	○
(3) Collaborate to create environments that encourage	○	○	○	○

Exhibit 4.4.B   Alumni Survey

positive social interaction (6)

(3)Collaborate to create environments that encourage active engagement in learning (7)

○   ○   ○   ○

(3) Collaborate to create environments that encourage self-motivation. (8)

○   ○   ○   ○

**Q7
InTASC
Category
2: Content**

Exhibit 4.4.B   Alumni Survey

Knowledge
Monmouth University prepared me to:

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Agree (3)	Strongly agree (4)
(4)utilize the central concepts, tools of inquiry and structures of the discipline (1)	○	○	○	○
(4) create learning experiences that make the content accessible (2)	○	○	○	○
(4) make the content meaningful to assure mastery (3)	○	○	○	○
(5) connect concepts using different perspectives to engage learners in critical thinking (4)	○	○	○	○
(5 connect concepts to engage learners in collaborative problem solving related to authentic and local global issues (5)	○	○	○	○

Exhibit 4.4.B   Alumni Survey

Q8 InTASC Category 3: Instructional Practice
Monmouth University prepared me to:

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Agree (3)	Strongly agree (4)
(6) understand and use multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their growth (1)	○	○	○	○
(6) use multiple methods of assessment to monitor learner progress (2)	○	○	○	○
(6) use multiple methods of assessment to guide decision making (3)	○	○	○	○
(7) plan instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals (4)	○	○	○	○
(7) create plans that draw upon knowledge of content areas and curriculum (5)	○	○	○	○
(7) create plans that use appropriate pedagogy (6)	○	○	○	○
(7) create plans that include knowledge of learners and the community (7)	○	○	○	○

Exhibit 4.4.B

Alumni Survey

(8) understand and uses a variety of instructional strategies (8)

○   ○   ○   ○

Q9
InTASC

(8) provide instruction that encourages deep understanding of content (9)

○   ○   ○   ○

(8) use strategies to apply knowledge in meaningful ways (10)

○   ○   ○   ○

Exhibit 4.4.B   Alumni Survey

Category #4: Professional Responsibility
Monmouth University Prepared me to:

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Agree (3)	Strongly Agree (4)
(9) engage in ongoing professional learning (1)	○	○	○	○
(9) continually evaluate my practice (2)	○	○	○	○
(9) adapt practice to meet the needs of each learner (3)	○	○	○	○
(10) seek appropriate leadership roles (4)	○	○	○	○
(10) seek opportunities to take responsibility for students learning (5)	○	○	○	○
(10) collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, and other professionals to ensure learner growth (6)	○	○	○	○

Q11 Thank you for your cooperation in assisting our programs as we strive for excellence in teacher preparation.

Q12 Comments :

_____

_____

_____

_____

Exhibit 4.4.B   Alumni Survey

Data By InTASC Category

2014-2015 Alumni Survey (old form: see notes about disaggregated data above)

InTASC Category	Spring 2012	Summer 2014
My initial teacher preparation program at Monmouth University prepared me to:	Mean (N=176)	Mean (N=180)
Category 1: The Learner and Learning	3.99	4.16
Category 2: Content Knowledge	4.02	4.17
Category 3: Instructional Practice	4.11	4.27
Category 4: Professional Responsibility	4.04	4.27

Strongly Agree: 5; Agree:4; Not Sure:3; Disagree: 2; Strongly Disagree: 1

2018 Alumni Survey Revised

	EPP	UG	Graduate n=4	ELEM n=11	Secondary n=6	K-6 Art, Music, Health, PE n=3	P-3 n=3	TSD
	2018 (n=23)	2018 (n=19)	2018 n=4	2018 n=11	2018 (n=6)	2018 (n=3)	2018 (n=3)	2018 (n=13)
1: Learner and Learning	3.05	3.01	3.28	3.14	3.02	2.54	3.33	3.01
2: Content Knowledge	2.96	2.87	3.35	2.91	2.93	2.80	3.33	2.85
3: Instructional Practice	3.01	2.98	3.13	3.01	3.17	2.37	3.33	2.98
4: Professional Responsibility	2.97	2.97	3.00	3.06	3.14	2.06	3.33	3.00

Strongly Agree: 4; Agree:3; Disagree: 2; Strongly Disagree: 1

Exhibit 4.4.B   Alumni Survey

Alumni Data Survey 2012 & 2014 By Criteria

InTASC/ NJPST	CAEP	Element	Spring 2012	Summer 2014
		My initial teacher preparation program at Monmouth University prepared me to:	Mean (N=176)	Mean (N=180)
4	1.1	1. Use instructional methods to teach the New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards.	4.25	4.37
1	1.1	2. Plan instruction based on learner's needs, developmental progress, and prior knowledge.	4.22	4.39
5	1.1	3. Engage in interdisciplinary unit planning.	4.06	4.13
4	1.1	4. Develop students' literacy and/or numeracy skills to enable them to construct meaning within a particular content area.	4.07	4.15
2	1.1	5. Identify differences in student learning styles to teach to the development ability of the student.	4.16	4.34
2	1.1	6. Use strategies to support the learning of ESL/bilingual students.	3.57	3.79
7	1.1, 1.5	7. Use available and appropriate resources for instructional planning.	4.17	4.38
8	1.1,1.5	8. Use educational technology effectively for instruction.	3.97	4.14
6	1.1,1.5	9. Use multiple assessment strategies for evaluating student learning (e.g. criterion-referenced tests, norm-referenced tests, performance-based tests, observations, formative and summative assessments, etc.). (	4.21	4.32
6	1.1	10. Understand assessment and measurement related issues to interpret test score data.	3.98	4.12
3	1.1	11. Apply strategies for effective classroom management.	3.9	4.11
3	1.1	12. Establish a positive classroom environment conducive to learning.	4.29	4.34
3	1.1	13. Motivate students to engage in learning.	4.2	4.23
2	1.1	14. Modify instruction to accommodate the learning needs of all students.	4	4.31
2	1.1	15. Interpret and implement an Individualized Education Program (IEP).	3.45	3.70
8	1.1	16. Develop questioning techniques to stimulate critical thinking.	4.08	4.15
3	1.1	17. Use effective verbal, non-verbal, and written communication techniques to foster learning in the classroom.	4.1	4.27
10	1.1	18. Effectively communicate and collaborate with parents, peers, and community members.	3.97	4.19
10	1.1	19. Effectively communicate and collaborate with school administration and other school personnel.	3.86	4.14
9	1.1	20. Use educational research to make decisions that benefit my teaching.	4	4.28
9	1.1	21. Engage in professional development activities and reflection to promote learning in the students I serve.	4.18	4.37
4	1.1	22. Use instructional methods related to Specialty Professional Association (SPA) Standards	3.64	3.93
5	1.1	23. Use instructional methods related to New Jersey Professional Standards for Teachers.	3.86	4.12
5	1.1	24. Effectively teach in my content area.	4.22	4.31
9	1.1	25. Reflect on and develop appropriate teaching dispositions.	4.2	4.37
6	1.1	26. Design learner outcomes that are linked to assessment.	4.19	4.45
6	1.1	27. Compare pre and post data to analyze student learning.	4.07	4.23
6	1.1	28. Reflect on assessment and instruction to identify ways to improve teaching and student learning.	4.21	4.36
		Average	**4.04**	**4.21**

Exhibit 4.4.B   Alumni Survey

2018 REVISED Survey Item by Program and InTASC Category

	EPP		UG		Graduate n=4		ELEM n=11	
	2018 (n=22)	2019	2018 (n=19)	2019	2018 n=4	2019	2018 n=11	2019
InTASC Category 1: (1) Understand how learners grow and develop	3.13		3.11		3.25		3.18	
InTASC Category 1: (1) recognizes patterns of learning and development vary across the cognitive, social, emotional and physical areas	3.13		3.11		3.25		3.09	
InTASC Category 1: (1) design and implement developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences	2.91		2.84		3.25		3	
InTASC Category 1: (2) Use understanding of individual differences to ensure inclusive environments to meet high standards	3.09		3.05		3.25		3.09	
InTASC Category 1: (3) Collaborate to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning	3.04		3		3.25		3.27	
InTASC Category 1: (3) Collaborate to create environments that encourage positive social interaction	3.09		3.05		3.25		3.18	
InTASC Category 1: (3)Collaborate to create environments that encourage active engagement in learning	3.04		2.95		3.5		3.18	
InTASC Category 1: (3) Collaborate to create environments that encourage self-motivation.	3		2.95		3.25		3.09	
	3.05		3.01		3.28		3.14	

2018 Revised Items by InTASC Cateogry	EPP 2018 (n=22)	UG 2018 (n=19)	Graduate 2018 (n=4)	Elementary 2018 (n=11)
InTASC Category 1: (1) Understand how learners grow and develop	3.13	3.11	3.25	3.18
InTASC Category 1: (1) recognizes patterns of learning and development vary across the cognitive, social, emotional and physical areas	3.13	3.11	3.25	3.09
InTASC Category 1: (1) design and implement developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences	2.91	2.84	3.25	3
InTASC Category 1: (2) Use understanding of individual differences to ensure inclusive environments to meet high standards	3.09	3.05	3.25	3.09
InTASC Category 1: (3) Collaborate to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning	3.04	3	3.25	3.27
InTASC Category 1: (3) Collaborate to create environments that encourage positive social interaction	3.09	3.05	3.25	3.18
InTASC Category 1: (3)Collaborate to create environments that encourage active engagement in learning	3.04	2.95	3.5	3.18
InTASC Category 1: (3) Collaborate to create environments that encourage self-motivation.	3	2.95	3.25	3.09
	3.05	3.01	3.28	3.14

Exhibit 4.4.B   Alumni Survey

Category 1 The Learner and Learning

2018 Items by InTASC Category	EPP 2018 (n=22)	UG 2018 (n=19)	Graduate n=4 2018 n=4	ELEM n=11 2018 n=11	Second ary n=6 2018 (n=6)	K-6 Art, Music, Health, PE n=3 2018 (n=3)	P-3 n=3 2018 (n=3)	TSD 2018 (n=13)
InTASC Category 1: (1) Understand how learners grow and develop	3.13	3.11	3.25	3.18	3.33	2.33	3.33	3.15
InTASC Category 1: (1) recognizes patterns of learning and development vary across the cognitive, social, emotional and physical areas	3.13	3.11	3.25	3.09	3.33	2.67	3.33	3.08
InTASC Category 1: (1) design and implement developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences	2.91	2.84	3.25	3	2.83	2.33	3.33	2.92
InTASC Category 1: (2) Use understanding of individual differences to ensure inclusive environments to meet high standards	3.09	3.05	3.25	3.09	3.33	2.33	3.33	3.15
InTASC Category 1: (3) Collaborate to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning	3.04	3	3.25	3.27	2.67	2.67	3.33	3
InTASC Category 1: (3) Collaborate to create environments that encourage positive social interaction	3.09	3.05	3.25	3.18	3	2.67	3.33	3
InTASC Category 1: (3)Collaborate to create environments that encourage active engagement in learning	3.04	2.95	3.5	3.18	2.83	2.67	3.33	2.92
InTASC Category 1: (3) Collaborate to create environments that encourage self-motivation.	3	2.95	3.25	3.09	2.83	2.67	3.33	2.85
	3.05	3.01	3.28	3.14	3.02	2.54	3.33	3.01

2018 REVISED Category 2 Content Knowledge (revised)

InTASC Category 2: Content Knowledge	EPP 2018 (n=22)	UG 2018 (n=19)	Graduate n=4 2018 n=4	ELEM n=11 2018 n=11	Second ary n=6 2018 (n=6)	K-6 Art, Music, Health, PE n=3 2018 (n=3)	P-3 n=3 2018 (n=3)	TSD 2018 (n=13)
InTASC Category 2: (4)utilize the central concepts, tools of inquiry and structures of the discipline	2.96	2.89	3.25	3	3	2.33	3.33	2.92
InTASC Category 2: (4) create learning experiences that make the content accessible	2.91	2.79	3.5	2.91	2.83	2.67	3.33	2.85
InTASC Category 2: (4) make the content meaningful to assure mastery	3	2.89	3.5	2.82	3.17	3	3.33	2.92
InTASC Category 2: - (5) connect concepts using different perspectives to engage learners in critical thinking	3	2.95	3.25	3	2.83	3	3.33	2.77
InTASC Category 2:(5) connect concepts to engage learners in collaborative problem solving related to authentic and local global issues	2.91	2.84	3.25	2.82	2.83	3	3.33	2.77
	2.96	2.87	3.35	2.91	2.93	2.80	3.33	2.85

Exhibit 4.4.B   Alumni Survey

2018 (Revised) Category 3 Instructional Practice

InTASC Category 3 Instructional Practice	EPP 2018 (n=22)	UG 2018 (n=19)	Graduate n=4 2018 n=4	ELEM n=11 2018 n=11	Secondary n=6 2018 (n=6)	K-6 Art, Music, Health, PE n=3 2018 (n=3)	P-3 n=3 2018 (n=3)	TSD 2018 (n=13)
InTASC Category 3:(6) understand and use multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their growth	3	3	3	3	3.33	2	3.33	3
InTASC Category 3: (6) use multiple methods of assessment to monitor learner progress	3.04	3	3.25	2.91	3.5	2.33	3.33	3
InTASC Category 3: Instructional Practice Monmouth University prepared me to: - (6) use multiple methods of assessment to guide decision making	2.83	2.84	2.75	3	2.67	2	3.33	2.77
InTASC Category 3: (7) plan instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals	2.91	2.89	3	3	2.83	2.33	3.33	2.77
InTASC Category 3: (7) create plans that draw upon knowledge of content areas and curriculum	3.09	3.05	3.25	3.18	3.33	2	3.33	3.08
InTASC Category 3: (7) create plans that use appropriate pedagogy	3.22	3.16	3.5	3.18	3.33	3	3.33	3.15
InTASC Category 3: Instructional Practice Monmouth University prepared me to: - (7) create plans that include knowledge of learners and the community	3.09	3.11	3	3.09	3.17	2.67	3.33	3.15
InTASC Category 3: (8) understand and uses a variety of instructional strategies	3	2.89	3.5	2.9	3.17	2.67	3.33	2.92
InTASC Category 3: (8) provide instruction that encourages deep understanding of content	2.96	2.95	3	2.91	3.17	2.33	3.33	3
InTASC Category 3: (8) use strategies to apply knowledge in meaningful ways	2.96	2.95	3	2.91	3.17	2.33	3.33	3
	3.01	2.98	3.13	3.01	3.17	2.37	3.33	2.98

2018 (Revised) Category 4: Professional Responsibility

InTASC Category 4 Professional Responsibility	EPP 2018 (n=22)	UG 2018 (n=19)	Graduate n=4 2018 n=4	ELEM n=11 2018 n=11	Secondary n=6 2018 (n=6)	K-6 Art, Music, Health, PE n=3 2018 (n=3)	P-3 n=3 2018 (n=3)	TSD 2018 (n=13)
learning	3	3	3	2.91	3.5	2	3.5	2.92
InTASC Category #4: (9) continually evaluate my practice	3.14	3.11	3.25	3.18	3.33	2.33	3.5	3.23
InTASC Category #4: (9) adapt practice to meet the needs of each learner	3.09	3.06	3.25	3.09	3.33	2.33	3.5	3.15
InTASC Category #4: (10) seek appropriate leadership roles	2.95	3	2.75	3.18	2.83	2	3	2.92
InTASC Category #4: (10) seek opportunities to take responsibility for students learning	2.95	2.94	3	3	3.17	2	3.5	2.92
InTASC Category #4: (10) collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, and other professionals to ensure learner growth	2.71	2.71	2.75	3	2.67	1.67	3	2.83
	2.97	2.97	3.00	3.06	3.14	2.06	3.33	3.00