Lewis University – College of Education
Graduate Survey – Data Collected Fall 2012
(From December 2010, May 2011 and August 2011 Graduates)

Data and Summary

The College of Education sends a survey to its alumni who graduated in the academic year one year prior to the conducting of survey every year. The purpose of the survey is two folds. First the unit collects data on the demographic information and the subject area of specialization of the alumni as well as the geographic, grade level, and type of school setting in which they are employed. Secondly, the survey attempts to grasp the perception of the graduates about how well they have been prepared for conducting their responsibilities in their position as teachers or other school personnel.

Survey questions are focused on the unit standards and the Conceptual Framework of the College of Education. The survey inquires about how the ethical and moral orientation of their preparation helped them as an educator, whether or not the coursework was challenging, frequency of reflective and analytical practices, application of theory into practice, development of a vision of learning, developing a command of effective instruction, their knowledge and ease about assessment, collaboration and perspective taking. The survey finally examines the alumni's measures of their understanding of and willingness to be an agent of improvement in education for the marginalized individuals as an advocate for social justice, which are core values of the mission of Lewis University.

Sixty graduates of the COE participated in completing the survey distributed in fall of 2012. Participants included 45 female and 15 male graduates. The group included majority white individuals but also represented educators of Asian (1), Hispanic or Latino (4), and African-American (3) descent. Graduates had earned credentials at different level from bachelor's to doctoral degrees in different areas of teaching or other school personnel (administrators, reading specialists, counselors) and were employed in different capacities and different types of school settings. A variety of geographic and socio-economic areas where Lewis graduates are employed are represented.

A review, analysis, and the outcome of the survey questions inquiring participants about their academic preparation suggest the following patterns:

The majority of graduates (90% at the highest and 61.6% at the lowest) chose strongly agree or agree that they were academically well-prepared. The highest rating was given to the question about how well they reflected on their practices and analyzed their practices to improve it. The lowest rating was given to the question item about how well the program helped them understand the need for school-wide

Lewis University – College of Education
Graduate Survey – Data Collected Fall 2012
(From December 2010, May 2011 and August 2011 Graduates)

or district-wide transformation. We looked at how well this concept is covered in different program curricula to make sure that the concept is discussed in courses adequately. It may also be that the question was not very clear for all graduates.

There were some areas where candidates either strongly disagreed (15% at the highest and 1.7% at the lowest) or disagreed with certain statements about their academic preparation. 9 individuals or 15% disagreed that the program helped them understand what is needed for school-wide transformation. The COE faculty and discussed the concern and examined the curriculum to ensure that the topic is covered and emphasized in all programs.

These surveys provide an opportunity for us to learn and improve our practice. While most of our graduates feel well-prepared as a result of their academic preparation, reflecting on their feedback about areas that we can improve proves to be immensely valuable

Gender

	Frequency	Percent %
Female	46	75.4%
Male	15	24.6%
Total	61	100.0%

Ethnicity

	Frequency	Percent %
Asian	1	1.6%
Black or African-American	3	4.9%
Hispanic or Latino	4	6.6%
White Non-Hispanic	53	86.9%
Total	61	100.0%

Lewis University – College of Education
Graduate Survey – Data Collected Fall 2012
(From December 2010, May 2011 and August 2011 Graduates)

Degree

	Frequency	Percent %
Bachelor's Degree	19	31.1%
Certification (no degree)	2	3.3%
Doctoral Degree	5	8.2%
Endorsement (no degree)	2	3.3%
Master's Degree	33	54.1%
Total	61	100.0%

Program of Study

	Frequency	Percent %
Educational Leadership	15	24.6%
Elementary Education	6	9.8%
English as a Second Language (ESL)	7	11.5%
Instructional Technology	0	0.0%
Reading & Literacy	11	18.0%
Secondary Education	16	26.2%
Special Education	5	8.2%
School Counseling	0	0.0%
Superintendents Endorsement	1	1.6%
Total	61	100.0%

If Secondary Education, please choose content area:

	Frequency	Percent %
Secondary - Biology	2	12.5%
Secondary - Chemistry	3	18.8%
Secondary - English/Language Arts	5	31.3%
Secondary - History	3	18.8%
Secondary - Mathematics	2	12.5%
Secondary - Physics	1	6.3%
Total	16	100.0%

Lewis University – College of Education
Graduate Survey – Data Collected Fall 2012
(From December 2010, May 2011 and August 2011 Graduates)

Employment status: If employed, indicate current position.

	Frequency	Percent %
No Response	2	3.3%
Building Administrator, public school	1	1.6%
Certified position, private school	7	11.5%
Certified position, public school	45	73.8%
District Administrator, public system	2	3.3%
Non-certified position, private school	1	1.6%
Non-teaching related, seeking teaching position	1	1.6%
Not applicable	1	1.6%
Substitute Teacher	1	1.6%
Total	61	100.0%

Type of school/district where you work:

	Frequency	Percent %
No Response	4	6.6%
Private school; non-religious	1	1.6%
Private school: religious	7	11.5%
Public school	49	80.3%
Total	61	100.0%

School Setting:

	Frequency	Percent %
No Response	4	6.6%
Rural	3	4.9%
Suburban	42	68.9%
Urban	12	19.7%
Total	61	100.0%

Lewis University – College of Education
Graduate Survey – Data Collected Fall 2012
(From December 2010, May 2011 and August 2011 Graduates)

How would you describe your school? Choose all that apply.

	Frequency	Percent %
No Response	4	6.6%
Diverse teaching population	1	1.6%
High percentage of students on free/reduced lunch	1	1.6%
High percentage of students on free/reduced lunch, Diverse teaching population, Has difficulty Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), Not made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)	1	1.6%
Limited diversity	2	3.3%
Limited diversity, Achieves Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)	2	3.3%
Limited diversity, Has difficulty Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)	1	1.6%
Limited diversity, High percentage of students on free/reduced lunch	1	1.6%
Limited diversity, High percentage of students on free/reduced lunch, Achieves Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)	1	1.6%
Limited diversity, High percentage of students on free/reduced lunch, Diverse teaching population, Not made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)	1	1.6%
Limited diversity, High percentage of students on free/reduced lunch, Limited diversity in teaching population, Has difficulty Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)	1	1.6%
Limited diversity, High percentage of students on free/reduced lunch, Not made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)	1	1.6%
Limited diversity, Limited diversity in teaching population	1	1.6%
Limited diversity, Limited diversity in teaching population, Has difficulty Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)	1	1.6%
Limited diversity, Limited diversity in teaching population, Not made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)	1	1.6%
Limited diversity, Low percentage of students on free/reduced lunch, Achieves Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)	2	3.3%
Limited diversity, Low percentage of students on free/reduced lunch, Has difficulty Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)	2	3.3%
Limited diversity, Low percentage of students on free/reduced lunch, Limited diversity in teaching population, Achieves Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)	5	8.2%
Limited diversity, Low percentage of students on free/reduced lunch, Limited diversity in teaching population, Has difficulty Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)	1	1.6%
Limited diversity, Low percentage of students on free/reduced lunch, Not made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)	1	1.6%
Low percentage of students on free/reduced lunch, Achieves Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)	1	1.6%
Very diverse student population	3	4.9%
Very diverse student population, Achieves Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)	1	1.6%

Lewis University – College of Education
Graduate Survey – Data Collected Fall 2012
(From December 2010, May 2011 and August 2011 Graduates)

Very diverse student population, High percentage of students on free/reduced lunch	3	4.9%
Very diverse student population, High percentage of students on free/reduced lunch, Achieves Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)	1	1.6%
Very diverse student population, High percentage of students on free/reduced lunch, Diverse teaching population, Achieves Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)	2	3.3%
Very diverse student population, High percentage of students on free/reduced lunch, Diverse teaching population, Achieves Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP),Has difficulty Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)	1	1.6%
Very diverse student population, High percentage of students on free/reduced lunch, Diverse teaching population, Has difficulty Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)	2	3.3%
Very diverse student population, High percentage of students on free/reduced lunch, Diverse teaching population, Not made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)	2	3.3%
Very diverse student population, High percentage of students on free/reduced lunch, Has difficulty Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)	3	4.9%
Very diverse student population, High percentage of students on free/reduced lunch, Limited diversity in teaching population, Achieves Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)	1	1.6%
Very diverse student population, High percentage of students on free/reduced lunch, Limited diversity in teaching population, Has difficulty Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)	4	6.6%
Very diverse student population, High percentage of students on free/reduced lunch, Limited diversity in teaching population, Not made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)	3	4.9%
Very diverse student population, Limited diversity in teaching population	1	1.6%
Very diverse student population, Low percentage of students on free/reduced lunch, Achieves Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)	1	1.6%
Very diverse student population, Low percentage of students on free/reduced lunch, Limited diversity in teaching population, Achieves Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)	1	1.6%
Total	61	100.0%

Lewis University – College of Education
Graduate Survey – Data Collected Fall 2012
(From December 2010, May 2011 and August 2011 Graduates)

Grade Level: Check all that apply.

	Frequency	Percent %
No Response	4	6.6%
Early Elementary (K-2)	4	6.6%
Early Elementary (K-2),Late Elementary (3-5)	4	6.6%
Early Elementary (K-2),Late Elementary (3-5),Jr. High or Middle School	1	1.6%
High School	20	32.8%
Jr. High or Middle School	17	27.9%
Jr. High or Middle School, High School	1	1.6%
Late Elementary (3-5)	6	9.8%
Pre-school or day care, Early Elementary (K-2),Late Elementary (3-5),Jr. High or Middle School	2	3.3%
PreK-12	2	3.3%
Total	61	100.0%

What is your primary role? Check all that apply.

	Frequency	Percent %
No Response	4	6.6%
Classroom teacher	39	63.9%
Classroom teacher, Lead Teacher or Department Chair	2	3.3%
Classroom teacher, Other	1	1.6v
Classroom teacher, Specialist	1	1.6%
District or Regional Administrator	2	3.3%
Other	3	4.9%
School Administration	1	1.6%
Specialist	5	8.2%
Specialist, Other	1	1.6%
Substitute Teacher, Other	1	1.6%
Substitute Teacher, Teaching Assistant	1	1.6%
Total	61	100.0%

Lewis University – College of Education
Graduate Survey – Data Collected Fall 2012
(From December 2010, May 2011 and August 2011 Graduates)

Are you working in the subject/specialty area for which you prepared at Lewis?

	Frequency	Percent %
No Response	3	4.9%
N	20	32.8%
Y	38	62.3%
Total	61	100.0%

**Lewis University – College of Education
Graduate Survey – Data Collected Fall 2012
(From December 2010, May 2011 and August 2011 Graduates)**

Survey Questions

The ethical and moral orientation helped me as a professional educator.

	Initial Programs			Advanced Programs				Total #	Total %
	Elementary Education	Secondary Education	Special Education	Educational Leadership	ESL	Reading & Literacy	Superintendents Endorsement		
Not Applicable	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	3.3%
Strongly Disagree	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	3.3%
Disagree	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.7%
Somewhat Agree	2	2	0	1	1	1	0	7	11.7%
Agree	1	6	3	3	3	5	0	21	35.0%
Strongly Agree	3	6	0	10	2	4	2	27	45.0%
# & % within Group	6	16	5	14	6	11	2	60	100.0%
	10.0%	26.7%	8.3%	23.3%	10.0%	18.3%	3.3%	100.0%	

The coursework was challenging and intellectually stimulating.

	Initial Programs			Advanced Programs				Total #	Total %
	Elementary Education	Secondary Education	Special Education	Educational Leadership	ESL	Reading & Literacy	Superintendents Endorsement		
Not Applicable	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Strongly Disagree	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1.7%
Disagree	1	3	0	0	1	0	0	5	8.3%
Somewhat Agree	1	3	1	3	3	2	0	13	21.7%
Agree	2	4	3	2	0	2	0	13	21.7%
Strongly Agree	2	6	0	9	2	7	2	28	46.7%
# & % within Group	6	16	5	14	6	11	2	60	100.0%
	10.0%	26.7%	8.3%	23.3%	10.0%	18.3%	3.3%	100.0%	

Lewis University – College of Education
Graduate Survey – Data Collected Fall 2012
(From December 2010, May 2011 and August 2011 Graduates)

I was often asked to reflect on practice and analyze how to improve it

	Initial Programs			Advanced Programs					
	Elementary Education	Secondary Education	Special Education	Educational Leadership	ESL	Reading & Literacy	Superintendents Endorsement	Total #	Total %
Not Applicable	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Strongly Disagree	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1.7%
Disagree	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	3.3%
Somewhat Agree	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	3	5.0%
Agree	2	6	3	6	2	3	0	22	36.7%
Strongly Agree	4	8	0	7	3	8	2	32	53.3%
# & % within Group	6	16	5	14	6	11	2	60	100.0%
	10.0%	26.7%	8.3%	23.3%	10.0%	18.3%	3.3%	100.0%	

The program integrated theory and practice

	Initial Programs			Advanced Programs					
	Elementary Education	Secondary Education	Special Education	Educational Leadership	ESL	Reading & Literacy	Superintendents Endorsement	Total #	Total %
Not Applicable	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1.7%
Strongly Disagree	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1.7%
Disagree	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	3.3%
Somewhat Agree	1	7	1	1	1	0	0	11	18.3%
Agree	4	6	1	5	2	4	0	22	36.7%
Strongly Agree	1	2	1	8	2	7	2	23	38.3%
# & % within Group	6	16	5	14	6	11	2	60	100.0%
	10.0%	26.7%	8.3%	23.3%	10.0%	18.3%	3.3%	100.0%	

Lewis University – College of Education
Graduate Survey – Data Collected Fall 2012
(From December 2010, May 2011 and August 2011 Graduates)

The program helped me articulate a rich and compelling vision of learning

	Initial Programs			Advanced Programs					
	Elementary Education	Secondary Education	Special Education	Educational Leadership	ESL	Reading & Literacy	Superintendents Endorsement	Total #	Total %
Not Applicable	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Strongly Disagree	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1.7%
Disagree	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.7%
Somewhat Agree	2	8	1	1	1	0	0	13	21.7%
Agree	2	1	2	4	4	5	0	18	30.0%
Strongly Agree	2	6	1	9	1	6	2	27	45.0%
# & % within Group	6	16	5	14	6	11	2	60	100.0%
	10.0%	26.7%	8.3%	23.3%	10.0%	18.3%	3.3%	100.0%	

The program helped me know how to analyze and recommend effective curriculum, instruction and assessment

	Initial Programs			Advanced Programs					
	Elementary Education	Secondary Education	Special Education	Educational Leadership	ESL	Reading & Literacy	Superintendents Endorsement	Total #	Total %
Not Applicable	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Strongly Disagree	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1.7%
Disagree	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.7%
Somewhat Agree	3	2	1	2	2	0	0	10	16.7%
Agree	1	8	3	4	2	4	0	22	36.7%
Strongly Agree	2	5	0	8	2	7	2	26	43.3%
# & % within Group	6	16	5	14	6	11	2	60	100.0%
	10.0%	26.7%	8.3%	23.3%	10.0%	18.3%	3.3%	100.0%	

Lewis University – College of Education
Graduate Survey – Data Collected Fall 2012
(From December 2010, May 2011 and August 2011 Graduates)

The program helped me understand the importance of collaborating with all the stakeholders and gaining multiple perspectives on issues.

	Initial Programs			Advanced Programs				Total #	Total %
	Elementary Education	Secondary Education	Special Education	Educational Leadership	ESL	Reading & Literacy	Superintendents Endorsement		
Not Applicable	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.7%
Strongly Disagree	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1.7%
Disagree	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	3.3%
Somewhat Agree	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	5	8.3%
Agree	3	6	2	4	3	5	0	23	38.3%
Strongly Agree	2	5	1	9	3	6	2	28	46.7%
# & % within Group	6	16	5	14	6	11	2	60	100.0%
	10.0%	26.7%	8.3%	23.3%	10.0%	18.3%	3.3%	100.0%	

The program helped me understand what is needed for school-wide/district-wide transformation.

	Initial Programs			Advanced Programs				Total #	Total %
	Elementary Education	Secondary Education	Special Education	Educational Leadership	ESL	Reading & Literacy	Superintendents Endorsement		
Not Applicable	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	3	5.0%
Strongly Disagree	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1.7%
Disagree	2	4	1	1	0	0	0	8	13.3%
Somewhat Agree	3	6	1	0	0	1	0	11	18.3%
Agree	0	4	1	3	3	6	0	17	28.3%
Strongly Agree	1	1	1	9	2	4	2	20	33.3%
# & % within Group	6	16	5	14	6	11	2	60	100.0%
	10.0%	26.7%	8.3%	23.3%	10.0%	18.3%	3.3%	100.0%	

Lewis University – College of Education
Graduate Survey – Data Collected Fall 2012
(From December 2010, May 2011 and August 2011 Graduates)

The program increased my awareness of marginalized populations.

	Initial Programs			Advanced Programs				Total #	Total %
	Elementary Education	Secondary Education	Special Education	Educational Leadership	ESL	Reading & Literacy	Superintendents Endorsement		
Not Applicable	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Strongly Disagree	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1.7%
Disagree	0	2	1	1	1	0	0	5	8.3%
Somewhat Agree	1	6	0	1	0	2	0	10	16.7%
Agree	2	5	2	3	4	4	0	20	33.3%
Strongly Agree	3	3	1	9	1	5	2	24	40.0%
# & % within Group	6	16	5	14	6	11	2	60	100.0%
	10.0%	26.7%	8.3%	23.3%	10.0%	18.3%	3.3%	100.0%	

The program adequately prepared me to assume the role and responsibilities of a multicultural and transformative educator and a social justice advocate.

	Initial Programs			Advanced Programs				Total #	Total %
	Elementary Education	Secondary Education	Special Education	Educational Leadership	ESL	Reading & Literacy	Superintendents Endorsement		
Not Applicable	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Strongly Disagree	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1.7%
Disagree	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	3.3%
Somewhat Agree	1	3	2	1	2	1	0	10	16.7%
Agree	3	8	1	5	3	5	0	25	41.7%
Strongly Agree	2	3	1	8	1	5	2	22	36.7%
# & % within Group	6	16	5	14	6	11	2	60	100.0%
	10.0%	26.7%	8.3%	23.3%	10.0%	18.3%	3.3%	100.0%	