

APPENDIX A – Internal Quality Control

SECTION 1 - Results of the Internal Audit

SECTION 2 - Continuing Faculty Discussion and Decision Making based on Evidence

SECTION 3 –a. Findings of the Academic Program Review

-b. Description of the SJU Academic Program Review Process undertaken by St. John’s Faculty, November 26, 2001

SECTION 1

The faculty conducted an audit of the School of Education, in relation to Program Quality, between November 19, 2003 and December 3, 2003. (See Figure 1 for schematic diagram.) The Audit Team was comprised of twelve faculty and staff members, a subset of the TEAC Committee. A sampling of approximately 10% of students in each specialization was selected, picked by the random birthday of March 15th (totaling 160). The results of the audit, all of which apply not only to the programs under consideration but to the School as a whole, will be noted to provide program improvement and further inquiry. The Audit revealed some questions and concerns that are currently being discussed:

Curriculum

1. Course requirement/program sheets are not routinely kept in student folders, nor does each department use them the same way during student advisement. Advisors or faculty in each area of specialization utilize their own system. Of the 160 students files audited, 14 files were not found and 12 freshman files are maintained in the Freshman Center. Of the remaining student files audited, 107 (79%) contained program sheets. As a result of this finding, the School Policy Committee is being convened to discuss the creation of a program-wide advisement form. In addition, administrative support for faculty during advisement hours (having to do with student folders available for use at these times) will be systematized.

2. It was found that of the 116 courses offered in the program, 54 had syllabi less than three years old. As a result, Department Chairpersons have been requested by the Dean to insert their updated syllabi into the official folders maintained in the Dean’s office by October, 2004.

Full-time Faculty

Academic ranks for the 27 full-time faculty in the program as of the Fall of 2003 were as follows: 6 Full Professors (22%), 12 Associate Professors (45%), and 9 Assistant Professors (33%). This compares to the University percentages of 28% Full Professors, 49% Associate Professors, 22 % Assistant Professors and 1% Instructors. The reason for the difference has to do with the appointment of 19 new tenure-track faculty, beginning in 1996, after a twelve year lapse in appointing new faculty. This also coincides with the departure by resignation or retirement of 5 senior faculty and 6 non-tenured faculty.

As of Fall 2004, a total of 24 new replacement faculty will be have been added since 1996, the result of the University approval of all the Program's request for such faculty. In Fall 2004 there will be 7 Full Professors, 15 Associate Professors and 10 Assistant Professors new to the faculty bringing the overall number of full-time program faculty to 32.

Facilities

Supporting data from staff at the University indicate that the statements concerning faculty offices, classrooms, and technology are accurate. Claims of insufficient space and lack of classrooms outfitted properly with HVAC are also accurate. The Audit Team could find no evidence that the space and HVAC issues were being addressed except at the Staten Island and Oakdale campuses.

Fiscal and Administrative

The Internal Audit Committee found no deviation from that which is reported in the Brief. With respect to faculty salaries in The School of Education compared to salaries in the liberal arts college and other professional schools (excluding Law), please see table on page 11 of Appendix B.

The Audit Team found that, as compared with faculty in other schools and colleges at St. John's University, education faculty's salaries were comparable. A list of salaries of benchmark institutions (research-based universities in New York State) revealed that in 2000-2001 salaries at St. John's were higher at the Associate Professor level and about the same at the Professor and Assistant Professor level. Within the University itself, School of Education average salaries at the Professor level are slightly higher than the norm. Associate Professor and Assistant Professor salaries are slightly lower than the University average.

Student Support Services

This area was not covered in the Internal Audit.

Admissions

Student admission information for undergraduates is not maintained in each folder. This information is kept by the Admissions Office and later at the Freshman Center. We have SAT information about entering freshman in the School of Education (In 2003, combined SAT scores were 1047; In 1998 the mean SAT score for new freshman was 973).

The transcripts of students who enter education from other careers are given an initial review by the Coordinator of Career Change programs to determine whether they have satisfied the New York State Education Department requirements in the liberal arts and sciences. Such students are advised of the results of the review in their admission letter and given access to individual advisement concerning ways in which they may fulfill any deficiencies in those requirements.

Addendum to Internal Audit

The Internal Audit was conducted first by the TEAC Committee, then reported to the full faculty. The Committee found no deviation from the stated administrative or academic route in the Inquiry Brief. Deficiencies in details (e.g. lack of completely updated course syllabi) were noted and reported to the faculty. Monitored by the Dean, these deficiencies have been largely corrected. In regard to physical space, at the conclusion of the Brief (2003-2004), the needs of the School were not being sufficiently addressed by the Office of Facilities and Construction and the Executive Vice President. (By Spring of 2005, however, not included in this Brief, the situation had turned around and a serious plan had been developed for consolidating the School of Education in a single space.)

SECTION 2 Continuing Faculty Discussion and Decision Making based on Evidence

As a follow-up to the Internal Audit conducted in November 2002 and prior to and during the Faculty Council meeting of March 7, 2005, the faculty was asked to discuss their perceptions of the results of three surveys distributed prior to the last Faculty Council meeting:

- A. Student Satisfaction Inventory and Institutional Priorities Survey, 2004,*
 - B. Teacher Preparation Survey –School of Education: Undergraduate Division*
 - C. Teacher Preparation Survey –School of Education: Graduate Division*
- (Survey results are found beginning on page A-8)

As a basis for reflection on the survey data, three questions were posed to the faculty by the Dean:

1. How do we need to change our curriculum to respond to the data?
2. How do we need to change our own teaching strategies to respond to the data?
3. How can we ensure that our students receive the same information in courses whether taught by full or part time faculty?

In discussing these questions faculty were asked to consider the following:

- What are we doing now to address this issue
- What could we be doing?
- What are the external factors or limitations that challenge us in reaching our goal?

Question #1 How do we need to change our curriculum to respond to the data?

- Perhaps student focus groups could be utilized to provide additional data on teaching and learning issues.
- Faculty should incorporate individual student conferences (not just during advisement periods) into their schedules. Those that have invited students for informal meetings have been pleased with the amount of student feedback.
- The student government delegate at the meeting suggested a student “peer to peer” survey that they would conduct amongst themselves if not in conflict with the faculty union contract.
- Regarding the ELL issue of teacher preparedness, the TESOL department could offer workshops, IF the specific needs of the teachers could be clarified. Specialized seminars could be offered on topics such as “ELL for Special Ed” or “ELL for Math Ed”, etc.
- It was pointed out that the difficulties in teaching ELL students are systemic given the demographics of the New York City Schools. Discussion of ELL must be constant and continual in all classes because students do not realize the enormity of the diverse student population.
- The data received from the surveys is based on unclear questions. Specifically the graduate survey (question #9) indicates that teachers are unprepared to face non-English speaking students but 85% are teaching less than 2 years and additionally,

most have 75% minority students in their schools. The questions in our surveys need to be changed to better define our needs.

- ❑ As our graduates have actual teaching experience, their concerns and focus will change over time. Even if they are exposed to education theories in the university, they need to be trained to find links to practice. It is important for us to find ways to keep in close contact with prior alumni who are teaching to ask their assistance in informing the faculty of areas of deficiency in their teaching.
- ❑ A possible post-graduation, induction, mentoring project where faculty could serve as mentors for our graduates 1-2 years after they leave St. John's. (Approximately 15 faculty responded with interest.)
- ❑ Clinical site supervisors could keep those connections open with our alumni. Field courses could also maintain the mechanism for contact. It is imperative to keep our alumni connected to us.
- ❑ We need to look at our data and compare it to NY City Education Department recommendations. Theoretically, we train our teachers one way then NY City changes their direction. We must investigate that we are teaching our students the theories and practices they will utilize in the "real" classrooms of NY City. New York City D of E mandates that all teachers read from the "script" (or put their jobs in jeopardy) but we must try to give them a wider framework in order to improvise the script and solve problems and find alternative means to address issues.
- ❑ Dialogue between universities and New York City Education Department is lacking and there should be a connection established to deal with problems. Some faculty felt the connection should be established at a superintendent (or higher) level since changes do not occur from the ground up. Some felt that a connection should be made at the university faculty – NY City teacher and principal level to facilitate changes. Either way, faculty felt that a well-structured plan to work with NY City to develop intervention strategies is needed.
- ❑ One public school in Ridgewood, Queens employs 7 of our reading specialists that are challenged by the NY City guidelines and principal directives. They have asked Dr. Guastello to provide staff development, utilizing what is working presently and give help to implement practice.

Question #2 How do we need to change our own teaching strategies to respond to the data?

- ❑ It is imperative to keep adequate records and minutes of meetings, even those held by small groups, that effect changes in curriculum and practice.
- ❑ E-mail trails are effective means of documenting faculty discussions.
- ❑ DECCAE department revealed that the Undergraduate Committee was recently reactivated. The process of course revision was not as tight as previously thought. (This is evidenced in DECCAE department minutes). They will discuss this topic again at their April meeting.
- ❑ We need to establish a way to emphasize to our students the cultural diversity that they will find in the classroom, especially the career change majors. Even though there is a fieldwork component, is it being used to illuminate this particular area of need?

- ❑ We need to develop instruments for the future that will gather the type of data that we need to identify needed changes.

Question #3 How can we ensure that our students receive the same information in courses whether taught by full or part time faculty?

- ❑ Regular meetings of administrators and full time faculty with adjunct professors are needed to discuss course curriculum, share materials and syllabi. This does not challenge their academic freedom but will ensure that the outcome of each course taught is consistent.
- ❑ Each adjunct or new full-time professor, prior to teaching a unique or new course, should audit the class taught by an experienced professor. Two examples of this process of “inter-visitation” are those of Dr. Signer (Dr. Holmes audited her course prior to teaching) and Dr. Dunn (Dr. Burke sat in on Dr. Dunn’s course prior to teaching). A majority hand-vote of faculty agreed to make this a standard practice.
- ❑ Program coordinators should be the ones responsible for meeting with adjuncts to discuss course specification. Ultimately, faculty will take more ownership for adjuncts.

School of Education

Student Satisfaction Inventory and Institutional Priorities Survey, 2004

Summary

Introduction

The Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI, filled out by students), a standardized survey instrument from Noel-Levitz, is designed to measure students' satisfaction with a wide range of college experiences, programs, and services. The Institutional Priorities Survey (IPS, filled out by faculty, administrators, and staff), closely parallel to SSI, assesses the priority that faculty, administrators, and staff believe the institution should place on the same range of student experiences. SSI and IPS together can be used to set priorities that are closely aligned with those of the students, pinpoint distinctive competencies, and identify challenges in need of improvement.

SSI consists of 73 standard items and 10 additional ones supplied by St. John's University. Each item is expressed as a statement of expectation. For each item, students are asked to rate both the level of importance (a scale of 1 to 7, with 1 as NOT IMPORTANT AT ALL and 7 as VERY IMPORTANT) and level of satisfaction (a scale of 1 to 7, with 1 as NOT SATISFIED AT ALL and 7 as VERY SATISFIED). The difference in the importance and satisfaction ratings is considered as a performance gap. (For St. John's University as a whole, the median performance gap for Queens Campus is 1.5, and for Staten Island is 1.1.)

IPS consists of 50 standard items and 10 additional ones supplied by St. John's University. As with SSI, two questions are asked for each item. One question is "How important is it that your institution meets the student expectation?" and the other is "What is your level of agreement that your institution is meeting this expectation?" The level of importance is on a 7-point scale, the same as that in SSI, and the level of agreement is also on a 7-point scale (with 1 as STRONGLY DISAGREE and 7 as STRONGLY AGREE).

Both strengths and challenges have been identified in this summary. Strengths are the areas of high importance, high satisfaction, and small gaps. Challenges are the areas of high importance, low satisfaction, and large gaps, and they are the areas in need of improvement. (Appendix I provides the formulas used to identify strengths and challenges.)

In spring 2004, three separate sample groups were randomly selected for SSI at St. John's University. They were undergraduates on Queens campus (946 participants, 10% of student population), undergraduates on Staten Island (429, 25%), and graduate students

of both Queens and SI campuses (331, 7%). Students filled out SSI hardcopies in the classroom. For IPS, all St. John's full-time faculty, administrators, and staff were invited through email to fill out IPS online. The overall response rate is 24%, with 19% for faculty (Queens 18%, SI 30%), 37% for administrators (Queens 36%, SI 51%), and 15% for staff (Queens 15%, SI 7%).

The identification of challenges and strengths is based on the distribution of ratings on importance and satisfaction (agreement for IPS), and gaps within each category (students, faculty, administrators, and staff) of survey participants, not based on the cross-category comparative data. Therefore, it is meaningful to look at an item identified as a challenge from SSI and then see whether this item is a challenge or a strength from IPS, and it is sometimes misleading to compare a rating from SSI with a rating from IPS (e.g., comparing an SSI satisfaction score with an IPS agreement score to see which category is more satisfied) because the ranges of ratings differ from category to category. The Spring 2004 data indicate that both importance and satisfaction ratings by students (SSI) are fairly lower than by faculty, administrators, and staff (IPS).

Summary for School of Education

For School of Education, the undergraduate sample size is 123 (25% of student population) on Queens campus and 52 (35%) on Staten Island, and the graduate sample was 52 (4%, not separated by campus). On Queens campus, 6 faculty members, 8 administrators, and 4 staff participated in IPS, and on Staten Island 1 faculty and 2 administrators did. Since the number of IPS participants is too small to generate meaning results for SI campus or for staff of Queens, the IPS data are not presented for SI campus, and administrators and staff on Queens campus are combined into one group.

This summary consists of four parts. Part One: Undergraduates on Queens Campus; Part Two, Undergraduates on Staten Island Campus; Part Three, Graduate Students on Both Queens and SI Campuses; Part Four, Conclusion.

Part One: Undergraduates on Queens Campus

Overall satisfaction

There are three questions at the end of SSI that ask for student overall satisfaction, and the same three questions are also in IPS with the following instructions: "Indicate how you believe students at this institution would respond to the following questions". The mean scores of these three questions are as follows. (The ratings of these three questions are all on a 7-point scale. For Question 99, the value of 1 is defined as MUCH WORSE THAN I EXPECTED, 4 as ABOUT WHAT I EXPECTED, and 7 as MUCH BETTER THAN I EXPECTED; for Question 100, 1 is defined as NOT SATISFIED AT ALL, 4 as NEUTRAL, and 7 as VERY SATISFIED; for Question 101, 1 is defined as DEFINITELY NOT, 4 as I DON'T KNOW, and 7 as DEFINITELY YES.)

	Item	Ed. Students	Ed. Faculty	Ed. Adm & Staff	St. John's Students
99	So far, how has your college experience met your expectations?	3.9	5.0	4.2	4.0
100	Rate your overall satisfaction with your experience thus far.	4.6	5.7	5.4	4.4
101	All in all, if you had to do it over, would you enroll here again?	4.5	6.2	6.0	4.3

SSI strengths compared with IPS data

Following are the 8 strengths identified by students in School of Education, together with perceptions from IPS by faculty, administrators, and staff in School of Education. The results of all St. John's students on Queens campus are also provided for comparison purposes. The values are item mean scores, challenges are in blue and strengths in red, and a blank indicates that the item is not listed in IPS or the number of participants is too small (fewer than five) to generate meaningful results. The item number and contents are all from SSI unless noted with an asterisk which indicates an IPS item. (In the column headings, I = Importance; S = Satisfaction; A = Agreement).

	Item	Ed. Students		Ed. Faculty		Ed. Adm & Staff		St. John's Students	
		I	S	I	A	I	A	I	S
8	The content of the courses within my major is valuable.	6.5	5.2	7.0	5.2	6.8	5.8	6.5	5.0
33	My academic advisor is knowledgeable about requirements in my major.	6.6	5.4	7.0	6.2	7.0	5.3	6.5	5.0
16	The instruction in my major field is excellent.	6.4	5.1	7.0	6.0	7.0	5.2	6.5	4.8
79	St. John's Central is easy and convenient to use.	6.2	5.4	6.4	3.5	6.5	5.1	6.2	5.1
74	I have found quiet places to study on campus.	6.3	5.2	6.4	5.2	6.7	5.7	6.3	4.9
50	Class change (drop/add) policies are reasonable.	6.1	5.1	6.6	5.5	6.4	5.9	6.1	4.9
75	I have been able to socialize with other students on campus.	6.2	5.1					6.1	5.1
72	On the whole, the campus is well-maintained.	6.3	4.9	7.0	6.0	6.4	5.7	6.2	4.9

The above table indicates that students, administrators, and staff agree that the content of the courses is a strength, while faculty rate it as a challenge. The following two items are perceived as strengths by students but as challenges by administrators and staff: 1) academic advisors being knowledgeable, and 2) the instruction in the major field being excellent. The above table also demonstrates that students in School of Education share 5 of the 8 strengths with other students on Queens campus.

Additional strengths by faculty:

	Item	Ed. Students		Ed. Faculty		Ed. Adm & Staff		St. John's Students	
		I	S	I	A	I	A	I	S
65	Faculty are usually available after class and during office hours.	6.4	4.9	7.0	6.5	6.8	5.3	6.3	5.0
25	Faculty are fair and unbiased in their treatment of individual students.	6.4	4.7	7.0	6.5	6.9	5.6	6.4	4.5
55	Major requirements are clear and reasonable.	6.4	4.9	7.0	6.3	6.4	5.7	6.3	4.8
68	Nearly all of the faculty are knowledgeable in their field.	6.5	5.0	7.0	6.3	6.7	6.1	6.4	4.9
6	My academic advisor is approachable.	6.5	4.9	7.0	6.2	6.8	5.5	6.4	4.9

Additional strengths by administrators and staff:

	Item	Ed. Students		Ed. Faculty		Ed. Adm & Staff		St. John's Students	
		I	S	I	A	I	A	I	S
2	The campus staff are caring and helpful.	6.1	4.7	6.8	5.3	7.0	6.3	6.1	4.4
4	Admissions staff are knowledgeable.	6.0	4.5			6.9	6.3	6.1	4.4
76	There is an adequate variety of events and programs to attend on campus.	5.7	4.7	6.0	5.8	6.8	5.9	5.7	4.5
81	The use of technology by faculty in the classroom has been helpful to me.	5.9	5.2	6.4	6.3	6.8	5.8	5.8	5.0
3	Faculty care about me as an individual.	6.0	4.4	7.0	5.8	6.8	5.8	6.0	4.3
10	Administrators are approachable to students.	5.8	4.4	6.8	5.8	6.7	5.8	5.9	4.4

SSI challenges compared with IPS data

The following are challenges identified by students, together with the ratings by faculty, administrators, and staff of School of Education on Queens campus, and by all St. John's students on Queens campus.

	Item	Ed. Students		Ed. Faculty		Ed. Adm & Staff		St. John's Students	
		I	S	I	A	I	A	I	S
45	Students are made to feel welcome on this campus.	6.2	4.4	7.0	6.5	6.9	5.9	6.1	4.4
5	Financial aid counselors are helpful.	6.2	4.3			6.9	5.9	6.1	4.3
36	Security staff respond quickly in emergencies.	6.2	4.5	7.0	6.2	6.9	3.4	6.2	4.5
34	I am able to register for classes I need with few conflicts.	6.6	4.3	7.0	5.3	6.5	4.1	6.5	4.2
57	I seldom get the "run-around" when seeking information on this campus.	6.2	4.1	6.8	4.8	6.5	4.8	6.1	3.6
53	Faculty take into consideration student differences as they teach a course.	6.3	4.4	6.8	4.8	6.6	5.0	6.1	4.3
47	Faculty provide timely feedback about student progress in a course.	6.2	4.5	7.0	5.8	6.8	5.5	6.2	4.4

27	The personnel involved in registration are helpful.	6.2	4.5	7.0	6.0	6.6	5.7	6.2	4.5
59	This institution shows concern for students as individuals.	6.3	4.3	7.0	6.0	6.8	5.3	6.2	4.2
12	Financial aid awards are announced to students in time to be helpful in college planning.	6.1	4.3			7.0	5.7	6.2	4.1
17	Adequate financial aid is available for most students.	6.2	4.0			6.6	5.3	6.3	4.0
71	Channels for expressing student complaints are readily available.	6.1	3.9	6.8	5.8	6.6	5.1	6.0	3.9
11	Billing policies are reasonable.	6.0	3.8			6.5	5.3	6.1	3.6
73	Student activities fees are put to good use.	6.1	3.5			6.3	5.4	6.0	3.7
66	Tuition paid is a worthwhile investment.	6.5	3.5	7.0	6.2	6.7	5.5	6.4	3.7
21	The amount of student parking space on campus is adequate.	6.1	2.6			5.7	4.3	6.0	2.7

Additional challenges by faculty:

	Item	Ed. Students		Ed. Faculty		Ed. Adm & Staff		St. John's Students	
		I	S	I	A	I	A	I	S
18	Library resources and services are adequate.	5.9	4.9	7.0	4.8	6.8	5.0	6.1	4.8
62	There is a strong commitment to racial harmony on this campus.	6.2	4.6	7.0	4.7	6.7	5.7	6.0	4.6
7	The campus is safe and secure for all students.	6.4	5.0	7.0	5.3	6.8	5.4	6.4	5.1
28	Parking lots are well-lighted and secure.	6.1	4.5	7.0	5.2	6.8	5.5	6.0	4.5

Additional challenges by administrators and staff:

	Item	Ed. Students		Ed. Faculty		Ed. Adm & Staff		St. John's Students	
		I	S	I	A	I	A	I	S
39	I am able to experience intellectual growth here.	6.2	4.8	7.0	6.2	6.8	5.3	6.3	4.7
58	The quality of instruction I receive in most of my classes is excellent.	6.4	4.8	7.0	6.2	6.9	5.0	6.3	4.6
44	Academic support services adequately meet the needs of students.	6.0	4.6	7.0	6.0	6.8	5.0	5.9	4.4
53	* Communication between the Administration and the student body is adequate.			6.6	5.6	6.6	4.7		
55	* The University website is easy and convenient to use.			6.6	2.7	6.7	4.5		
83	I have found places on campus to study or work in groups.	6.0	4.9	5.4	4.3	6.6	4.3	5.9	4.8

Part Two: Undergraduates on Staten Island Campus

Overall satisfaction

	Item	Ed. Students	St. John's Students
99	So far, how has your college experience met your expectations?	4.6	4.3
100	Rate your overall satisfaction with your experience thus far.	5.2	4.8
101	All in all, if you had to do it over, would you enroll here again?	5.1	4.8

SSI strengths

The following are strengths identified by students of School of Education on SI campus, together with the ratings by all St. John's students on SI campus.

	Item	Ed. Students		St. John's Students	
		I	S	I	S
51	This institution has a good reputation within the community.	6.2	5.6	6.1	5.3
65	Faculty are usually available after class and during office hours.	6.3	5.5	6.1	5.3
75	I have been able to socialize with other students on campus.	6.2	5.5	6.0	5.2
50	Class change (drop/add) policies are reasonable.	6.2	5.3	6.1	5.2
16	The instruction in my major field is excellent.	6.4	5.7	6.3	5.3
74	I have found quiet places to study on campus.	6.2	5.6	5.8	5.3

SSI challenges

The following are challenges identified by students of School of Education on SI campus, together with the ratings by all St. John's students on SI campus.

	Item	Ed. Students		St. John's Students	
		I	S	I	S
69	There is a good variety of courses provided on this campus.	6.4	4.9	6.2	4.6
25	Faculty are fair and unbiased in their treatment of individual students.	6.4	4.7	6.3	4.8
17	Adequate financial aid is available for most students.	6.3	4.6	6.1	4.5
36	Security staff respond quickly in emergencies.	6.3	4.5	6.1	4.8
53	Faculty take into consideration student differences as they teach a course.	6.3	4.4	6.0	4.8
28	Parking lots are well-lighted and secure.	6.4	4.2	6.0	4.6

73	Student activities fees are put to good use.	5.9	4.2	5.9	4.2
57	I seldom get the “run-around” when seeking information on this campus.	6.3	4.2	6.0	4.3
66	Tuition paid is a worthwhile investment.	6.3	4.1	6.2	4.2
11	Billing policies are reasonable.	6.2	3.8	6.0	4.0
21	The amount of student parking space on campus is adequate.	6.7	2.5	6.3	2.6
35	The assessment and course placement procedures are reasonable.	6.3	4.9	6.1	4.9
27	The personnel involved in registration are helpful.	6.3	4.9	6.1	4.9
72	On the whole, the campus is well-maintained.	6.5	4.8	6.1	4.9
4	Admission staff are knowledgeable.	6.3	4.5	6.1	4.9

Part Three: Graduate Students on Both Queens and SI Campuses

Overall satisfaction

Item		Ed. Students		St. John’s Students	
99	So far, how has your college experience met your expectations?	4.2		4.3	
100	Rate your overall satisfaction with your experience thus far.	4.9		4.8	
101	All in all, if you had to do it over, would you enroll here again?	5.0		4.8	

SSI strengths

The following are strengths identified by graduate students of School of Education (Queens and SI campuses combined), together with the ratings by all St. John’s graduate students on Queens and SI campuses (combined).

Item	Ed. Students		St. John’s Students		
	I	S	I	S	
72	On the whole, the campus is well-maintained.	6.1	5.3	6.0	5.1
61	Adjunct faculty are competent as classroom instructors.	6.1	5.4	6.0	4.7
63	Student disciplinary procedures are fair.	6.0	5.2	5.7	4.8

SSI challenges

The following are challenges identified by graduate students of School of Education (Queens and SI campuses combined), together with the ratings by all St. John’s graduate students on Queens and SI campuses (combined).

Item	Ed. Students		St. John’s Students		
	I	S	I	S	
27	The personnel involved in registration are helpful.	6.3	4.7	6.0	4.5
20	The business office is open during hours which are convenient for most students.	6.4	4.3	5.9	4.5
57	I seldom get the “run-around” when seeking information on this campus.	6.2	4.1	6.0	4.1

21	The amount of student parking space on campus is adequate.	6.3	4.0	6.1	3.3
66	Tuition paid is a worthwhile investment.	6.4	4.0	6.3	4.3
71	Channels for expressing student complaints are readily available.	6.0	4.0	5.8	4.1
11	Billing policies are reasonable.	6.2	3.9	6.0	4.1
17	Adequate financial aid is available for most students.	5.9	3.9	6.0	4.1
73	Student activities fees are put to good use.	5.6	3.6	5.7	4.0
47	Faculty provide timely feedback about student progress in a course.	6.3	4.8	6.1	4.9
59	This institution shows concern for students as individuals.	6.0	4.6	6.0	4.6
19	My academic advisor helps me set goals to work toward.	6.3	4.6	6.0	4.8
36	Security staff respond quickly in emergencies.	6.5	4.5	6.2	4.7
5	Financial aid counselors are helpful.	6.1	4.5	5.8	4.5
12	Financial aid awards are announced to students in time to be helpful in college planning.	5.6	3.9	5.7	4.2

Part Four: Conclusion

For St. John’s University as a whole, the performance gaps are smaller for Staten Island campus than for Queens campus, and that is true of School of Education.

The following three items are identified as strengths by undergraduates on both Queens and SI campuses: 1) the instruction in the major field, 2) class change policies, and 3) students being able to socialize. Academic advisors being knowledgeable (Queens), and availability of faculty (SI), competency of adjunct faculty (Graduate), and discipline procedures (Graduate) are also perceived as strengths by students.

Students on both campuses share the following two as challenges: 1) faculty taking student differences into consideration as they teach a course, and 2) tuition paid as a worthwhile investment.

Additional challenges on Queens campus are: 1) faculty providing timely feedback, 2) conflicts in registering classes, 3) channels for expressing student complaints, and 4) students being made to feel welcome.

Additional challenges on Staten Island campus are: 1) variety of courses provided, and 2) faculty being fair and unbiased in their treatment of individual students.

Challenges identified by graduate students include: 1) business office hours, 2) academic advisors helping students set up goals.

It should be stressed that there are several items of which the perceptions by students are different from the perceptions by faculty, administrators, or staff. Students being made to feel welcome (Queens), for instance, is a challenge for students, but perceived as a strength by faculty, administrators, and staff. The content of courses in the majors (Queens) is identified as a challenge by faculty, but it is strength by students, administrators, and staff.

The SSI and IPS data can be used to identify, develop, and market distinctive competencies, target areas for improvement, develop and implement strategies for improvement, and monitor performance.

Prepared by: Office of Institutional Research (pn, yl)
01/09/2005

**B. Teacher Preparation Survey –School of Education:
Undergraduate Division (conducted May 2004)**

RESULTS

Using the following scale (5 – Very Well; 4 – Well; 3 – Adequately ; 2 – Minimally; 1 – Poorly) for each question below, respondents were asked to rate how well they felt their pre-service teacher education program at St. John’s University equipped them to perform the following tasks:

1. Teach subject matter concepts, knowledge and skills in ways that help all students achieve high academic standards.

	5	4	3	2	1	Total
Frequency (N=)	35	66	21	6	1	129
Percent *	27.0	51.2	16.3	4.7	.8	100

Mean	Median	Mode	SD
3.99	4	4	0.83

2. Develop curriculum that builds upon students’ experiences, interests and abilities.

	5	4	3	2	1	Total
Frequency (N=)	39	59	23	7	1	129
Percent	30.3	45.7	17.8	5.4	.8	100

Mean	Median	Mode	SD
3.99	4	4	0.87

3. Create interdisciplinary curriculum.

	5	4	3	2	1	Total
Frequency (N=)	49	49	22	7	2	129
Percent	38	38	17.1	5.4	1.5	100

Mean	Median	Mode	SD
4.04	4	4	0.97

4. Relate classroom experience to the real world.

	5	4	3	2	1	Total
Frequency (N=)	43	49	27	7	3	129
Percent	33.4	38.0	20.9	5.4	2.3	100

Mean	Median	Mode	SD
3.94	4	4	0.98

5. Understand how students' social, emotional, physical, and cognitive development may influence learning.

	5	4	3	2	1	Total
Frequency (N=)	54	48	20	7	0	129
Percent	41.9	37.2	15.5	5.4	0	100

Mean	Median	Mode	SD
4.15	4	5	0.87

6. Understand how students' family and cultural background may influence learning.

	5	4	3	2	1	Total
Frequency (N=)	48	51	23	6	1	129
Percent	37.2	39.5	17.8	4.7	.8	100

Mean	Median	Mode	SD
3.73	4	4	0.89

7. Comfort in working with parents and families to create and sustain mutually supportive relations to support student engagement and achievement.

	5	4	3	2	1	Total
Frequency (N=)	30	51	34	9	4	128
Percent	23.5	39.8	26.6	7.0	3.1	100

Mean	Median	Mode	SD
3.73	4	4	0.99

8. Identify and address special learning needs and/or difficulties.

	5	4	3	2	1	Total
Frequency (N=)	36	55	25	10	2	128
Percent	23.5	39.8	26.6	7.0	3.1	100

Mean	Median	Mode	SD
3.88	4	4	0.96

9. Teach in ways that assure academic achievement of new English language learners.

	5	4	3	2	1	Total
Frequency (N=)	25	38	36	20	8	127
Percent	19.8	29.9	28.3	15.7	6.3	100

Mean	Median	Mode	SD
3.4	4	3	1.15

10. Create and maintain a classroom environment that promotes social development, collaboration and social responsibility.

	5	4	3	2	1	Total
Frequency (N=)	50	43	28	4	1	126
Percent	39.7	34.1	22.2	3.2	.8	100

Mean	Median	Mode	SD
4.08	4	5	0.90

11. Develop students' questioning and discussion skills.

	5	4	3	2	1	Total
Frequency (N=)	44	53	26	4	1	128
Percent	34.5	41.4	20.3	3.1	.7	100

Mean	Median	Mode	SD
4.05	4	4	0.86

12. Assign work that helps students use their higher-order thinking skills to think critically and solve problems.

	5	4	3	2	1	Total
Frequency (N=)	44	52	22	9	1	128
Percent	34.4	40.6	17.2	7.0	.8	100

Mean	Median	Mode	SD
4.0	4	4	0.93

13. Plan instruction, create curriculum, and solve problems with colleagues.

	5	4	3	2	1	Total
Frequency (N=)	49	50	22	7	1	129
Percent	38.0	38.7	17.1	5.4	.8	100

Mean	Median	Mode	SD
4.1	4	4	0.91

14. Assume leadership responsibility in your school.

	5	4	3	2	1	Total
Frequency (N=)	33	48	30	13	4	128
Percent	25.8	37.5	23.4	10.2	3.1	100

Mean	Median	Mode	SD
3.72	4	4	1.05

15. Equipped you to teach reading to the students with whom you will be working.

	5	4	3	2	1	Total
Frequency (N=)	46	37	29	12	3	127
Percent	36.3	29.1	22.8	9.4	2.4	100

Mean	Median	Mode	SD
3.87	4	5	1.08

16. Equipped you to teach writing to the students with whom you will be working.

	5	4	3	2	1	Total
Frequency (N=)	33	43	31	15	5	127
Percent	26.0	33.9	24.4	11.8	3.9	100

Mean	Median	Mode	SD
3.66	4	4	1.10

17. Evaluate curriculum for its usefulness and appropriateness for your students.

	5	4	3	2	1	Total				
Frequency (N=)	33	56	26	11	2	128				
Percent	25.7	43.8	20.3	8.6	1.6	100				
							Mean	Median	Mode	SD
							3.83	4	4	0.62

18. Use a variety of assessments such as observations, portfolios, tests, student work, parental feedback, knowledge of student interests to determine student strengths, needs and programs.

	5	4	3	2	1	Total				
Frequency (N=)	51	48	19	8	2	128				
Percent	39.8	37.5	14.8	6.3	1.6	100				
							Mean	Median	Mode	SD
							4.07	4	5	0.96

19. Encourage and promote relationships with school colleagues, parents and community resources to aid student learning and well-being.

	5	4	3	2	1	Total				
Frequency (N=)	43	44	31	9	1	128				
Percent	33.6	34.4	24.2	7.0	.8	100				
							Mean	Median	Mode	SD
							3.92	4	4	3.92

20. Reflect upon, evaluate and improve my practice and thereby grow professionally.

	5	4	3	2	1	Total				
Frequency (N=)	50	49	22	7	0	128				
Percent	39.1	38.2	17.2	5.5	0	100				
							Mean	Median	Mode	SD
							4.10	4	5	0.88

(* Percentages rounded to total 100%)

**C. Teacher Preparation Survey –School of Education:
Graduate Division (conducted December 2004)**

Results

Using the following scale (5 – Very Well; 4 – Well; 3 – Adequately ; 2 – Minimally; 1 – Poorly) for each question below, respondents were asked to rate how well they felt their Master of Education program at St. John’s University equipped them to perform the following tasks

1. Teach subject matter concepts, knowledge and skills in ways that help all students achieve high academic standards.

	5	4	3	2	1	Total				
Frequency (N=)	29	43	16	6	2	96				
Percent *	30.2	44.8	16.7	6.3	2.1	100				
							Mean	Median	Mode	SD
							3.95	4.0	4	.95

2. Develop curriculum that builds upon students’ experiences, interests and abilities.

	5	4	3	2	1	Total				
Frequency (N=)	27	40	26	3	2	98				
Percent	27.6	40.8	26.5	3.1	2.0	100				
							Mean	Median	Mode	SD
							3.89	4.0	4	0.91

3. Create interdisciplinary curriculum.

	5	4	3	2	1	Total				
Frequency (N=)	21	40	28	5	4	98				
Percent	21.4	40.8	28.6	5.1	4.1	100				
							Mean	Median	Mode	SD
							3.70	4.0	4	0.99

4. Relate classroom experience to the real world.

	5	4	3	2	1	Total				
Frequency (N=)	31	41	22	3	1	98				
Percent	31.7	41.8	22.4	3.1	1.0	100				
							Mean	Median	Mode	SD
							4.00	4	4	0.87

5. Understand how students’ social, emotional, physical, and cognitive development may influence learning.

	5	4	3	2	1	Total				
Frequency (N=)	35	46	13	4	0	98				
Percent	35.7	46.9	13.3	4.1	0	100				
							Mean	Median	Mode	SD
							4.14	4.0	4	0.79

6. Understand how students' family and cultural background may influence learning.

	5	4	3	2	1	Total				
Frequency (N=)	31	36	26	5	0	98				
Percent	31.7	36.7	26.5	5.1	0	100				
							Mean	Median	Mode	SD
							3.95	4.0	4	0.88

7. Comfort in working with parents and families to create and sustain mutually supportive relations to support student engagement and achievement.

	5	4	3	2	1	Total				
Frequency (N=)	17	39	29	9	1	95				
Percent	17.9	41.1	30.4	9.5	1.1	100				
							Mean	Median	Mode	SD
							3.65	4.0	4	0.92

8. Identify and address special learning needs and/or difficulties.

	5	4	3	2	1	Total				
Frequency (N=)	26	34	33	3	0	96				
Percent	27.1	35.4	34.4	3.1	0	100				
							Mean	Median	Mode	SD
							3.86	4.0	4	0.85

9. Teach in ways that assure academic achievement of new English language learners.

	5	4	3	2	1	Total				
Frequency (N=)	13	17	44	19	3	96				
Percent	13.6	17.7	45.8	19.8	3.1	100				
							Mean	Median	Mode	SD
							3.19	3.0	3	1.00

10. Create and maintain a classroom environment that promotes social development, collaboration and social responsibility.

	5	4	3	2	1	Total				
Frequency (N=)	25	45	21	4	0	95				
Percent	26.3	47.4	22.1	4.2	0	100				
							Mean	Median	Mode	SD
							3.96	4.0	4	0.81

11. Develop students' questioning and discussion skills.

	5	4	3	2	1	Total				
Frequency (N=)	24	44	26	0	2	96				
Percent	25.0	45.8	27.1	0	2.1	100				
							Mean	Median	Mode	SD
							3.92	4.0	4	0.84

12. Assign work that helps students use their higher-order thinking skills to think critically and solve problems.

	5	4	3	2	1	Total
Frequency (N=)	33	39	19	3	2	96
Percent	34.4	40.6	19.8	3.1	2.1	100

Mean	Median	Mode	SD
4.02	4.0	4	0.92

13. Plan instruction, create curriculum, and solve problems with colleagues.

	5	4	3	2	1	Total
Frequency (N=)	26	44	20	4	2	96
Percent	27.1	45.6	20.2	5.0	2.1	100

Mean	Median	Mode	SD
3.92	4.0	4	0.91

14. Assume leadership responsibility in your school.

	5	4	3	2	1	Total
Frequency (N=)	20	39	25	10	2	96
Percent	20.8	40.6	26.1	10.4	2.1	100

Mean	Median	Mode	SD
3.68	4.0	4	0.98

15. Equipped you to teach reading to the students with whom you will be working.

	5	4	3	2	1	Total
Frequency (N=)	20	33	31	10	2	96
Percent	20.8	34.4	32.3	10.4	2.1	100

Mean	Median	Mode	SD
3.61	4.0	4	0.99

16. Equipped you to teach writing to the students with whom you will be working.

	5	4	3	2	1	Total
Frequency (N=)	18	26	34	12	6	96
Percent	18.7	27.1	35.4	12.5	6.3	100

Mean	Median	Mode	SD
3.40	3.0	3	1.11

17. Evaluate curriculum for its usefulness and appropriateness for your students.

	5	4	3	2	1	Total
Frequency (N=)	20	42	27	6	1	96
Percent	20.8	43.8	28.1	6.3	1.0	100

Mean	Median	Mode	SD
3.77	4.0	4	0.88

18. Use a variety of assessments such as observations, portfolios, tests, student work, parental feedback, knowledge of student interests to determine student strengths, needs and programs.

	5	4	3	2	1	Total				
Frequency (N=)	34	36	23	2	0	95				
Percent	35.8	37.9	24.2	2.1	0	100				
							Mean	Median	Mode	SD
							4.07	4.0	4	0.82

19. Encourage and promote relationships with school colleagues, parents and community resources to aid student learning and well-being.

	5	4	3	2	1	Total				
Frequency (N=)	27	36	22	9	1	95				
Percent	28.3	37.9	23.2	9.5	1.1	100				
							Mean	Median	Mode	SD
							3.83	4.0	4	0.98

20. Reflect upon, evaluate and improve my practice and thereby grow professionally.

	5	4	3	2	1	Total				
Frequency (N=)	37	36	18	4	0	95				
Percent	38.9	37.9	18.9	4.3	0	100				
							Mean	Median	Mode	SD
							4.12	4.0	5	0.86

(Percentages rounded to total 100%)

SECTION 3

An academic program review was conducted by the entire St. John's University faculty in November 2001.

A. The following table, Table A-2, summarizes the findings of that review as they pertain to The School of Education.

B. A description of the criteria for that review are found at the end of Section 3.

A. Table A-2

Academic Program Review: The School of Education

Program Title	Review Team's Recommendation	Dean's Initial Recommendations	Provost's Recommendation	Dean's Final Recommendation
Special Education	Maintain	Maintain but Monitor	Maintain/Monitor: Declining enrollment (90 majors in '99 to 47 in '02 on Queens and down to only 8 on SI). Acceptance rate of 65% on Queens and 83% on SI. Faculty beginning to take interest in finding support for students; new faculty are showing signs of potential strength; considerable faculty energy may lead to opportunities for enhancement.	A) An already approved Career Change specialization and an additional Field Change program under development are anticipated to increase non-grant enrollment 40% by 2007. B) A newly received Federal grant will increase enrollment (25 students) by 2005
TESOL and Bilingual/Multi-cultural Programs Bilingual Ed	Maintain	Maintain but Monitor	Maintain/Monitor: Curricula are at cutting edge; teaching in specialization is excellent; creativity in obtaining support for students is exemplary; publications of Dr. Nero are excellent; enrollment has been uneven; more investment needed in recruiting regular students. 81 TESOL majors and 21 bilingual majors in '02. 78% acceptance rate on Queens.	Currently, there are 65 students enrolled in the bilingual extension. We anticipate 20 of these will matriculate into the TESOL masters. A newly approved Career Change specialization in Childhood Education/TESOL should result in additional enrollment of 20 students by 2005.
Adolescent Ed	Not provided	Enhance	Maintain/Monitor: Specialization attracts SJC students, but more can be recruited; raised standards and continuing shortage of teachers is likely to increase enrollments; quality of students continues to increase as measured by SAT scores (SAT 1020 in '01) on Queens and 1000 on SI); redesigned program to form a major in 2000; need time to see results; needs to be more full-time faculty associated with teaching in program. 95 majors across specialties in Queens and 24 on SI in '02. Monitor to determine if additional full-time faculty are needed.	Enrollments in the BSEd rose from 47 in 2001 to 167 in Fall 2003. Transfer students should account for additional growth of 10-15% by 2004 if Enrollment Management continues its current efforts. <i>We note that SJC projects doubling Italian and French majors on basis of French/Italian Adolescent Education program to be submitted. The School of Education does not plan to submit such a program. However, the school's needs and students' opportunities remain strong in Adolescent Education/Spanish.</i>

B. This section describes criteria for the major review of all programs in the University undertaken under the auspices of the University Provost's office during 2002.

SJU Academic Program Review by St. John's Faculty, November 26, 2001

Academic program review is an essential activity to maintain and strengthen the quality of our undergraduate and graduate programs. The University is currently engaged in several types of reviews in response to external demands. The broadest form of review is the periodic institutional self-assessment in response to the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools reaccreditation mandate. More focused reviews are underway at the unit and program level. These assessments include a wide array of programs from recertification of licensure to State of New York doctoral program authorization. In addition to state government agency review, graduate and professional programs engage in periodic assessment for specialized accreditation. While graduate and professional programs must respond to external mandates for program review, undergraduate programs are seldom subject to such demands.

Maintaining and strengthening the quality of our undergraduate programs is essential stewardship. Program review is a straightforward methodology to promote academic quality assurance. Its elements traditionally include: (1) articulation of program goals and objectives and their relationship to institutional mission; (2) identification of programmatic outcomes expressed as knowledge to be mastered and skills to be demonstrated by students or as contributions to the body of knowledge and its dissemination by faculty; (3) measurement of success in achieving program goals and objectives; and (4) documentation of how program review information resulted in improvements. Program review, unlike more episodic institutional assessments, is intended to foster a culture of continuous quality assurance.

While program reviews can produce essential information to strengthen existing programs, they seldom are guided by institutional constraints. The unstated assumption is that the pie will always get larger to accommodate program expansion. Effective program review is a process that assumes the pie is relatively fixed. Thus, programs must compete for the allocation of scarce resources. The criteria by which resource allocation decisions are made become crucial in the process. Dickeson (1999) suggests the use of ten criteria for reviewing programs. The model developed below applies these ten and provides illustrative measures for use with academic programs. Following the list of measures is a recommended way to assess a program using a variety of weights.

The model for academic program review follows Dickeson's definition of program. What the model does not address is a set of measures and weights by which to assess the quality of either administrative, academic support service, or student life programs. The administrative programs, e.g. dean's office, or academic support service programs, the Freshmen Center, require their own set of measures and methods. These are not discussed in this model.

Criterion One: History, Development, and Expectations of the Program

1. To what extent does the program contribute to the mission of SJU and to the realization of its vision?

Focus: This criterion focuses on a program's contributions in meeting the University's mission and commitment to a learner-centered environment. The measures emphasize the four characteristics of the University: Academic excellence, Catholic, Vincentian, and metropolitan. Of special interest is the degree of innovation in curricular, pedagogical, and assessment practices. It also seeks to assess a program's consistency with the University mission as a Catholic, Vincentian, and metropolitan university.

Criterion Two: External Demand for the Program

2. To what extent is the program attractive to students from within and outside the University?

Focus: This criterion is primarily concerned with the pattern of demand for the program and its relative market share. Demand is measured by trends in the number of declared majors for the program and, if available, trends in the number of majors regionally or nationally, especially peer and/or competitor institutions as defined by the program. Reviewers should also be concerned with the probable future of the program in light of trends in its core discipline.

Criterion Three: Internal Demand for the Program

3. To what extent does the program meet the curricular needs of other programs in the school, college, or University?

Focus: This criterion is primarily concerned with the pattern of demand for a program in meeting the needs of other programs in the school, college or University. This measure is sensitive especially to departments and/or school and colleges that share courses and faculty in support of multiple programs. Demand is measured by trends in the number of credit hours taught by program faculty in support of other formal programs in the University and the number of credits taught in support as service to other programs. Reviewers should also be sensitive to student credit hour demand from elective courses taken by students from other colleges.

Criterion Four: Quality of Program Inputs and Processes

4. To what extent does the program's human resources, student characteristics, curriculum, pedagogy, and stewardship contribute to the University vision:

Focus: This criterion is a very significant variable in program review. Using sixteen measures, it examines the quality of a program's resources and processes, especially the faculty, students, curriculum, pedagogy, and stewardship. Reviewers should be sensitive to the mission of the college or school and any statutory mandates that apply.

Criterion Five: Quality of Program Outcomes

5. To what extent does the program produce desirable results given its resources and given the mission of the college?

Focus: The focus of this criterion is the documented results of the program in the areas of faculty performance, student success, and alumni as well as employer satisfaction. The criterion is composed of twelve measures. For graduate programs, this criterion is also concerned with the program’s contribution to new knowledge in the field, knowledge that gains respect for the program and eventually the University. Reviewers should be sensitive to the mission of the college or school and any statutory mandates that may apply.

Criterion Six: Size, Scope, and Productivity of the Program

6. To what extent does the program deliver results consistent with its mission and goals?

Focus: The focus of this criterion is the productivity of the program expressed in degrees conferred, credit hours generated, and the volume of funded research if consistent with the college’s mission and statutory mandates that may apply.

Criterion Seven: Revenue and Other Resources Generated by the Program

7. To what extent does the program generate financial and community resources essential to achieve program success?

Focus: The focus of this criterion is on the ability of the program to generate resources sufficient to achieve intended program success. Resources include traditional areas, e.g., tuition-generated, as well as non-financial resources developed by the program, e.g., community partnerships established and maintained during the last five years. Reviewers should be sensitive to the mission of the college or school and any statutory mandates that may apply.

Criterion Eight: Costs and Other Expenses Associated with the Program

8. What does it cost to maintain the program?

Focus: The focus of this criterion is the resources used to sustain the program. Reviewers should be sensitive to the mission of the college or school and any statutory mandates that may apply.

Criterion Nine: Impact, Justification, and Overall Essentiality of the Program

9. Does the program’s contribution to the strategic vision of the University justify its continuation of its candidacy for investment?

Focus: The focus of this criterion is determining the investment potential of the program. Using information developed from the first eight criteria and the strategic planning within the unit, this criterion ranks a program’s overall significance to the University’s future.

Criterion Ten: Opportunity Analysis of the Program

10. Given the program’s history, are there environmental opportunities in the short run that can be seized by the program to strengthen its viability?

Focus: The focus of this criterion is the identification of opportunities to strengthen the viability of a program. It looks at the program’s significance to the school or college strategic plan along with its track record in responding to environmental opportunities.

In summary, the ten broad criteria have been refined to a set of measures and weights that are sensitive to the mission and mandates of the home college or school. No attempt has been made to weigh one criterion more heavily than another. Two criteria, however, seem especially significant: (1) the overall essentiality of the program from criterion nine and (2) the future opportunities for the program from criterion ten. The measures are displayed in Table One: Summary of Measure and Weights.

CRITERION	Minimum Score	Maximum Score
One	0	3
Two	0	3
Three	0	3
Four	0	3
Five	0	3
Six	0	3
Seven	0	3
Eight	0	3
Nine	0	3
Ten	0	3
Maximum Total Weighted Score	0	33

Guidelines for Reviewers of Program Self-Studies

The academic program self-study process has produced a deeper understanding of the quality of our undergraduate and graduate programs. To ensure that the thoughtful work of our faculty can be translated in strategic choices in meeting the University’s mission and vision, program reviewers must analyze the studies and offer recommendations about a program’s future. Important judgments must be made to guide the allocation of our resources.

Informed by the program self-study, reviewers are asked to recommend on of five possible alternatives. A program should be:

1. Enhanced
2. Maintained
3. Maintained but monitored
4. Reduced in support
5. Suspended or eliminated

The following guidelines are intended to assist reviewers in developing their recommendations. These guidelines reflect the integration of a wide range of academic quality indicators. These indicators intentionally are not weighted in favor of one factor over another. Rather, they should be viewed as suggestive of the current condition of a program taken as a whole.

Enhanced: These programs are strong contributors to the mission of the University; have a growing rate of student interest; and have a growing number of graduates in the past five years. Faculty members in these programs are fully engaged and show strong signs of vibrancy as reflected in their scholarship, teaching excellence, innovativeness in assessment practices, and service to the University's communities. These programs embrace stewardship as reflected in their ongoing monitoring of curricula, levels of student satisfaction, alumni success, and responding to opportunities in the external environment. Finally, while the resources of the sponsoring department are adequate to support the current array of programs, enhancing the level of this program's quality will require additional investment, e.g., one or more new full-time faculty, increased staff support, upgraded equipment and facilities, reallocated space, or faculty development funding.

Maintained: These programs are strong contributors to the mission of the University; have a steady rate of student interest; and have a steady number of graduates in the past five years. Faculty members show evidence of vibrancy as reflected in scholarship, teaching excellence, innovativeness in assessment practices, and service to the University's communities. Similar to Enhanced Programs, these programs embrace their stewardship role. The resources of the sponsoring department are adequate to support the current array of programs, including this specific program.

Maintained While consistent with the mission of the University, these programs

But Monitored: have not attracted sufficient interest among students and have not graduated at least 20 undergraduates or 10 masters-level graduate students annually for the past several years. Faculty vibrancy is uneven with only a few engaged in scholarly pursuits. The program curriculum is not subject to ongoing review in recent

years and little evidence exists for innovations in pedagogy or assessment practices have been attempted. The resources of the sponsoring department are adequate to support the current array of programs, including this specific program

Reduced in Support:

Although mission related, these programs have been unable to attract sufficient interest among students and have not graduated less than 15 undergraduates or five masters-level graduate students annually for the past several years. Some evidence exists of faculty vibrancy, but the resources of the sponsoring department are better served in support of other programs in the current array.

Suspended or Eliminated:

These programs are mission related, but the level of student interest and rates of graduation are too low to support continuation of the program. Little evidence exists of faculty vibrancy and the resources of the sponsoring department are insufficient to support this program.

APPENDIX B - CAPACITY FOR PROGRAM QUALITY

4.1. CURRICULUM

a. Each specialization (referred to as a “program”, by New York State) has been submitted to the State Education Department for its review and approval and has been so approved. Curriculum is set and controlled by program faculty in accordance with New York State requirements and St. John’s University Statutes.

b. At the graduate level, the State’s requirements for meeting education standard and an academic concentration vary from regular through alternative programs. Students who complete these programs (specializations) are expected to meet the academic concentration in several ways.

(See Program Requirements in Appendix D.)

c. Curriculum standards for undergraduate education majors meet those of other programs at the University. At the undergraduate level all students in all programs must meet the University’s new “academic core” requirements (see list in Dean’s office) as well as the State approved sequence of education courses and the mandated academic minor. The School of Education does not deviate from any State or University requirement.

4.2 FACULTY

4.2.1 Faculty Understanding and Acceptance. - The School of Education has chosen to present this Inquiry Brief using the entire faculty of the School associated with the program presented for TEAC approval as those accountable for the quality of the program. This Inquiry Brief has been developed by members of the faculty and administration, reviewed and approved first by an appointed TEAC Committee and ultimately by the entire faculty.

4.2.2 At its meeting on December 1, 2003, the Faculty Council voted unanimously to approve the final draft of this Inquiry Brief with the understanding that certain changes in format and sequence might have to be made. There were no substantive changes following the vote.

The TEAC Committee, established by the Dean, consisting of school administrators, Department Chairs, and faculty representatives from each of the two Departments being reviewed by TEAC. Members of the committee are listed below:

Dr. Jerrold Ross, Dean of the School of Education,
Dr. Barbara Nelson, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Assistant Professor,
Dr. William Sanders, Chairperson Department of Early Childhood, Childhood and Adolescence Education, Associate Professor of Education,
Dr. Richard Sinatra, Chairperson Department of Human Services and Counseling, Professor of Education,

Dr. Gene Geisert, Chairperson Department of Administrative and Instructional Leadership, Associate Professor,
Sr. Colleen Fogarty, O.P., Associate Dean for Graduate Studies,
Dr. Steve Kuntz, Associate Dean, Staten Island,
Ms. Charisse Willis, P.D., Assistant Dean, Director Undergraduate Advisement,
Dr. Brett Blake, Associate Professor of Education,
Dr. Rebekah Fassler, Associate Professor of Education,
Dr. E. Francine Guastello, Assistant Professor of Education,
Dr. James Gregory, Associate Professor of Education,
Dr. Mary Ann Maslak, Assistant Professor of Education,
Dr. Deidre Mithaug, Assistant Professor of Education,
Dr. Nancy Montgomery, Associate Professor of Education,
Dr. Shondel Nero, Associate Professor of Education,
Dr. Barbara Peltzman, Associate Professor of Education,
Dr. Peter J. Quinn, Associate Professor of Education,
Dr. Deborah Saldana, Associate Professor of Education,
Dr. Gene Sampson, Associate Professor of Education,
Dr. Barbara Signer, Professor of Education,
Dr. John Spiradakis, Professor of Education,
Dr. John Tarter, Professor of Education,
Mr. Steve Rosenberg, Director of Field Experience; Coordinator NYC Teaching Fellows,
Mr. Paul Pedota, Coordinator of NYC Teaching Fellows,
Mr. Patrick Dunphy, Director of Planning and Fiscal Affairs,
Ms. Nancy Garaufis, Coordinator of TEAC Accreditation

4.2.3 Faculty Qualifications - One hundred percent of the full-time faculty hold either the Ed.D. or Ph.D. (See Appendix C) In a few instances, because of special needs for faculty whose expertise and long experience lies in areas such as advanced mathematics (particularly in the alternate certification programs), an exception has been made.

Faculty are appointed based on their graduate degrees in such fields as childhood education, adolescence education (including both middle and high school), and/or special education, bilingual or ESL education, and additional qualifications working with children in urban, multicultural settings

Faculty workload is uniform across the University, except for the College of Professional Studies, under the terms of the new Collective Bargaining Agreement. The maximum number of courses taught by a faculty member does not exceed three per semester. In instances where faculty teach both graduate and undergraduate courses, the load may be reduced to two courses in one semester per year. (By exception, and only should a faculty member petition to do so, does that load grow to four courses. Faculty who elect to pursue this route are not expected to conduct research.)

Research support for faculty exists in the form of

- ❑ research reductions (reduction of one teaching course per semester) which must be recommended by the Departmental P&B Committee to the Chair and then to the Dean who makes the final decision;
- ❑ summer research grants (\$7,000) selected by the Dean and recommended to the Provost;
- ❑ funds from the Dean’s Discretionary Account for faculty travel, data collection, or student workers to provide secretarial help. As noted below, the University also returns a percentage of external grant funds to the Dean for additional faculty research or professional development support.
- ❑ Small “seed” grants from the University if the project may yield external funding.

Table B-1 Funding sources for research support

	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2003</u>
Summer Research Grants	\$14,000	\$14,000	\$14,000
Dean’s Discretionary Grants	\$ 57,056	\$ 54,131	\$49,526
Research Reductions*	10	2	2

*(Number of faculty with a reduced course load in order to engage in significant research)

Non-tenured faculty are subject to the same review regarding all faculty at the University (see Minutes of the Department, School, and University Personnel Committees).

Faculty involved in creating, developing, and presenting the academic program are regularly involved in research and publication in areas directly impinging upon the courses they teach (see Faculty curriculum vitae on file in the Dean’s office.) Moreover, School of Education faculty regularly involve themselves with school districts through working directly with students in the field and/or by means of the many professional development contracts and projects supported by external agencies. Indeed, as the chart below indicates, faculty in The School of Education are responsible for more external funding than faculties in most of the other schools of the University for the past five years. (*Office of Grants and Sponsored Research, 2003*)

Table B-2 - Funding through Grants for University over past 5 years by Faculty in School of Education and percentage of total University faculty

	1998-1999	1999-2000	2000-2001	2001-2002	2002-2003
Total University Grants Awarded (in dollars)	5,703,884	7,138,930	6,840,926	8,405,833	8,149,494
School of Education Grants	2,202,707	2,984,289	2,587,802	4,008,993	3,175,343
School of Education % of total grants received	39%	42%	38%	48%	39%
School of Ed % of total faculty	16%	14%	14%	14%	15%

In the School of Education, 100% of full-time faculty hold terminal degrees. For the University as a whole, 90% of faculty are similarly qualified. The ratio of full to part-time faculty is 43% (School of Education) and 46% for the entire University. This percentage will change in Fall 2004 as a direct result of five (5) authorized new full-time positions, which will bring us well within the University range

Complement of Faculty

In line with the Master Plan for the School, a complement of 40 full-time faculty (as opposed to less than 30 eight years ago) was to have been in place by 2002. The count stood at 37, 24 of whom are in the program under review. If qualified people are found, three more in the program will be appointed in Fall 2004, along with three others not associated with these program, bringing the full School of Education complement of faculty to 43. Over and above this has been the appointment of two full-time administrators who are attached to the New York City Department of Education Teaching Fellows program and two other administrators responsible for on-line teaching and outreach to the schools. These administrators are also allowed to teach one course each during the academic year.

4.3 FACILITIES, EQUIPMENT & SUPPLIES

4.3.1 Budgetary resources for program space and equipment are excellent. Offices of the faculty on the Queens campus are among the best in the University. Of average size, they range from good to superior (63-186 square feet, the average being 107 square feet.) Most are separated by partitions (22). Other offices (18) are either separate rooms or fully enclosed. Sixteen (16) out of 40 faculty offices were created or renovated over the past three years. (Evidence: File in Associate Dean's Office – Facilities/Office Allocations).

All offices are located in Marillac Hall on the first, second, and third floors. Marillac also houses general as well as education classrooms, all with full technological “platforms”, offices and laboratories of other Schools and central University functions. The main University Auditorium/Lecture Hall is located on the ground level.

The School's main office was renovated seven years ago. It models “openness” for the rest of the University. The office is still adequate to serve the students who come for advisement, or for other services including such areas as teacher certification, graduation, course changes, and consultation.

In 2003 handsome new spaces for graduate study and small meetings were created in the Library.

(It should be noted that this self-study was submitted first, two years ago. Since that time, brand new offices for the School of Education have been created in a state-of-the-

art building on the Staten Island campus and the Queens facilities are due to be moved to the University's newest building in the Fall of 2005. This building, Sullivan Hall, a fully air-conditioned facility, will house all offices, classrooms, and laboratories of The School of Education. An investment of somewhere between \$350,000 and \$500,000 has been budgeted for this move in Queens. The new building on Staten Island cost well over \$12 million.)

4.3.2 The Office of Facilities and Construction monitors equipment and space. The School of Education receives a proportionately fair share (Evidence: Mr. Ciampo's office).

4.3.3 Support Facilities

a. Computer Technology - Since 1996, St. John's University has invested nearly \$50,000,000 in state-of-the-art computer technology. Every faculty member's office has been outfitted with a desktop or laptop computer, all of which are replaced on a rotating basis (normally, every 3 years).

Additional equipment or high-powered computer support has been purchased through grant monies. The School of Education has its own "help desk" personnel, housed in Marillac Hall, and available on an "as needed" basis, to help with technological problems. Each school/college of the University is similarly staffed.

Of the 48 classrooms used by the School of Education throughout the University, 37 are "podium" classrooms, enabling faculty to present material ranging from simple overhead needs to PowerPoint presentations, to using the Internet in any class session. (*Classroom Capacity Study, Registrar's Office, 1/17/03 and Course Schedule Report, The School of Education, 12/12/02*) The Registrar reports that faculty in Education use these multimedia classrooms extensively and in some instances, more than many of the other faculties of the University.

Computer laboratories were opened several years ago, and have been regularly updated. However, the numbers of available computers were deemed insufficient by both faculty and administration. So, in the fall semester of 2003, the University instituted a new policy whereby every entering freshman was given a laptop computer. This practice will continue each year. Wireless accessibility to the Internet is possible in several common spaces. Over the next four years every undergraduate student will have his/her own laptop. A new office was created to service this hardware. Discounts on personal computers for faculty have been made available, as well.

Other equipment such as overhead projectors, screens and VCRs are readily available for classroom instruction. As a direct result of the availability of technology, most courses utilize technology to present, gather, and/or analyze content appropriate to the course

b. Library Facilities - Total book stock in the Main Library is 626,005 and 154,129 in the Staten Island Library. The Main Library houses the Education collection of monographs,

totaling about 16,000 volumes. The Staten Island Library holds 4,900 volumes in Education. The allied discipline of Psychology, in the Main Library, has 9500 volumes and 4,900 in the Staten Island Library. There are about 100 print journal titles and 300 online journal titles in the area of Education. University-wide, on all campuses, the Library holds 6,206 subscriptions and provide access to about 12,000 online journals from various publishers and aggregators.

New acquisitions to the Library's Education holdings are made following review of course syllabi (to insure required reading sources), course curriculum (to insure basic resources for teaching an educational subject), major indexes and abstracts (i.e. Education Index, ERIC, Wilson Education Abstracts, etc.), and major definitive bibliographies in the field of Education and related disciplines. The Library will acquire all necessary items.

Any student, faculty member or administrator can suggest a title for purchase at any time. There is an electronic form designed for this purpose on the Library's web page and paper requests are accepted as well. Library liaisons to various academic departments solicit purchase recommendations as well as inform teaching faculty of new acquisitions and available resources. Requests are also generated by all library faculty and subject selectors/bibliographers. Publishers' catalogs are distributed daily to selectors in order to facilitate the process. Requests are processed promptly and ordered materials are usually available on the shelves within 4-6 weeks. Funds available for new purchases have always been sufficient to respond to the requests of faculty.

Subscription requests for journals are handled immediately (24 hours). Also, the Library has approved plans with two major vendors to ensure our acquisition of the most recent titles in the field of Education. YBP Booksellers supplies the Library with the latest university press books in the area (e.g. Teacher's College Press.) Coutts Library Services supplies us with the majority of other publications dealing with education (e.g. Corwin Press). The Instructional Materials Center (IMC) Librarian meets with the School of Education faculty on a regular basis and attends the School of Education's faculty council meetings in order to assess their educational needs

The faculty input for educational resources is higher than some other units in the University. The Library has a Collection Development Policy statement governing collection building in this area. All areas of Education are covered by this statement. Consequently, the Library collects all major published source materials containing research reporting, new findings, scientific experimental resources and other information useful to researchers. The collection includes all major reference works and a wide selection of specialized monographs.

The Library also provides an Instructional Media Center (IMC) located in the Main Library, which contains PreK-12 curriculum materials used by the School of Education students, reference services (in person and online), Interlibrary Loan services (ILL) and a subject specialist/bibliographer in the area of Education.

4.4 FISCAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE CAPACITY

4.4.1 The financial condition of the Institution is sound. Overall, the University has had a balanced budget for more than two decades. The fiscal viability of the School is also sound (see Table B-4). The operating budget in Table B-4 does not include external funds raised by faculty and administration. Part of the indirect costs are returned by the University to the Dean for reallocation to the department or faculty member(s) who are principal investigators.

4.4.2 Funds for faculty development, including workloads, available research and travel funds, and funds to support local, regional, and national service appear elsewhere in the Brief. (See 4.2.3 Research Support, Tables B-1 and B-2) There is equity in workloads and internal funds due to long standing collective bargaining. (Evidence: University Statutes and Collective Bargaining Agreement available in Dean’s Office.) Table B-5 illustrates full-time faculty salaries. Except for the rank of assistant professor these compare favorably with other units of the University. This is due to the appointment of many new assistant professors since 1997, after a period of retirements and resignations that were not replaced.

Table B - 3 Full Time Faculty Salary Comparison based on 2003 data

School of Education (Full –Time Program faculty only)	St. John’s University (Full Time Faculty)
Average Salary of FT Faculty \$71,750	Average University Salary \$75,532
<u>Average Salary by Rank</u>	<u>Average Salary by Rank</u>
Professor \$98,259	Professor \$96,622
Associate Professor 70,421	Associate Professor 72,211
Assistant Professor 54,778	Assistant Professor 60,086
Instructor (Only 1 individual at this rank)	Instructor 56,108

4.4.3 The system monitoring and controlling financial resources flows from the Director of Planning in the School to the Assistant Provost in charge of fiscal affairs, to the University Office of Fiscal Affairs. Annual budgets are developed by the Department Chairs, to the Director of Planning, to the Dean, who then forwards the final draft of the budget to the Provost.

4.4.4 Table B-4 presents the overall picture of internal financial resources of The School of Education relative to the other academic schools and colleges of the University.

Table B-4 Budget for the School of Education and other Schools/Colleges of the University with allocation per student

<i>St. John's University</i>	Fiscal Year ending 2002	Fiscal Year ending 2003	Fiscal Year ending 2004
School of Education			
Salary Total	4,896,982	5,285,704	5,785,627
Fringe Total	1,724,595	1,869,835	1,962,261
Other Total	371,711	353,793	431,292
Grand Total	6,993,288	7,509,332	8,179,180
FTE Student Credit Hours	838	928	1003
Allocation per student	8,345	8,092	8,155
St. John's College			
Salary Total	21,326,352	22,450,279	24,341,192
Fringe Total	8,246,761	8,474,988	8,671,237
Other Total	936,317	1,012,867	1,081,258
Grand Total	30,509,430	31,938,134	34,093,687
FTE Student Credit Hours	5,552	6,087	6,204
Allocation per student	5,495	5,247	5,495
Tobin College of Business			
Salary Total	13,032,185	13,410,697	14,213,141
Fringe Total	4,719,228	4,580,190	4,724,319
Other Total	1,651,592	1,858,376	1,863,538
Grand Total	19,403,005	19,849,263	20,800,998
FTE Student Credit Hours	1,898	1,861	1,870
Allocation per student	10,223	10,666	11,124
College of Pharmacy			
Salary Total	5,933,808	6,361,095	7,477,703
Fringe Total	2,814,873	2,846,729	3,016,031
Other Total	2,419,061	2,313,338	2,221,642
Grand Total	11,167,742	11,521,162	12,715,376
FTE Student Credit Hours	982	1,028	1,051
Allocation per student	11,372	11,207	12,098
College of Professional Studies			
Salary Total	9,951,297	10,514,421	11,273,605
Fringe Total	3,136,101	3,246,733	3,484,554
Other Total	333,392	343,142	424,014
Grand Total	13,420,790	14,104,296	15,182,173
FTE Student Credit Hours	4,500	4,526	4,393
Allocation per student	2,982	3,116	3,456
School of Law			
Salary Total	11,210,218	11,481,301	12,043,805
Fringe Total	3,240,849	3,237,907	3,284,765
Other Total	2,312,384	2,383,737	2,853,060
Grand Total	16,763,451	17,102,945	18,181,630
FTE Student Credit Hours	921	920	990
Allocation per student	18,201	18,590	18,365

* Student enrollment number includes entire School of Education

TEAC Accreditation

An administrator was added to the staff of the School beginning with the 2002-2003 academic year whose responsibility is to coordinate the data collection, set meetings, and act as liaison with other University administrators in the publication of the Inquiry Brief. Additional budget allocations have also been made available to the School for whatever is necessary in the preparation of the Brief and the visit of TEAC and State auditors.

The Marketing and Communications Department of the University has acted as one of the principal agents in collecting data from Cooperating Principals and Associate Teachers regarding the success of student teachers assigned to their schools. A total of 48 questionnaires from 42 different schools out of 77 mailed were returned (a 55% return rate.) The 52-page study is available in the Dean's office and is discussed under the section in this report related to Quality Principle 1. (Summary appears in Methods and Results section)

Finally, the Office of Institutional Research has been an invaluable support service in requests for data analysis.

Table B-5

FTE Student Credit Hours Taught

Fall 2001 - Fall 2003

		01-02			02-03			Fall 2003*
		Fall 2001	Spring 2002	Total	Fall 2002	Spring 2003	Total	
The School of Education	UG	319	302	621	309	336	645	301
	GR	519	580	1,099	619	635	1,254	702
	Total	838	882	1,720	928	971	1,899	1,003
St. John's College	UG	5,068	4,520	9,588	5,552	4,882	10,434	5,671
	GR	484	473	957	535	521	1,056	533
	Total	5,552	4,993	10,545	6,087	5,403	11,490	6,204
The Peter J. Tobin College of Business	UG	1,411	1,461	2,872	1,381	1,395	2,776	1,353
	GR	487	464	951	480	464	944	517
	Total	1,898	1,925	3,823	1,861	1,859	3,720	1,870
College of Pharmacy	UG	872	895	1,767	869	935	1,804	955
	GR	110	102	212	159	151	310	96
	Total	982	997	1,979	1,028	1,086	2,114	1,051
College of Professional Studies	UG	4,489	4,338	8,827	4,498	4,233	8,731	4,356
	GR	11	27	38	28	26	54	37
	Total	4,500	4,365	8,865	4,526	4,258	8,784	4,393
School of Law		921	894	1,795	920	874	1,794	990
University total	UG	12,159	11,516	23,675	12,609	11,781	24,390	12,636
	GR	2,048	2,540	5,052	2,206	2,670	5,411	2,342
	Total	14,207	14,056	28,727	14,815	14,451	29,801	14,978

Undergraduate FTE= Total credits taught/15

Graduate FTE=Total credits taught/12

School of Law FTE=JD credits/14 + LLM credits/12

4.5 STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES

Services such as career advisement and placement, media access and computing facilities, counseling and health services, student orientation, and all other resources are offered equally to all students.

4.6 RECRUITING AND ADMISSIONS

Freshman entering the School of Education in 2003 had combined SAT scores of 1047 (It is significant to note that the combined SAT score has risen from 978 in 1998). Across the University, entering 2003 Freshman SAT scores (combined) averaged 1040.

Undergraduate recruitment is assigned to the University's central Enrollment Management Division. That Division maintains close contact with the School of Education.

Graduate recruitment is handled directly by The School of Education, under an Assistant Dean for Graduate Admissions.

Gender and ethnicity figures, the result of student recruitment, are available for undergraduate students AFTER admission. Graduate statistics are available based on graduating numbers of students. All such figures rely upon self-identification; some students decline to provide this information, however, the number of those who do report is substantial.

4.7 STUDENT COMPLAINTS

4.7.1 Grading policy (standard throughout the University) and the Academic Calendar for the University can be found in the Undergraduate and Graduate Bulletins. Calendars are also found on the University website.

4.7.2 Course Evaluations As of 2002, all courses undergo student evaluation (SIR II), the results of which are reported to Department Chairs. Aggregated results for The School of Education SIR II evaluations at the undergraduate and graduate levels, compared to the University-wide evaluations are given in two charts that follow. As of 2003, all faculty were required to submit an annual report of their academic and professional activities whose results are reported to the Chairs and to the Dean. This annual report, part of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (see copy in Dean's office) is also used for the purpose of "Faculty Recognition Awards" recommended by the Dean, in consultation with the Department Chairs, to the University Provost.

Undergraduate and graduate student evaluation of courses compared, almost consistently, with one another. These scores roughly parallel one another and appear to be positive at first glance. However, the consistent low score on "course difficulty" has raised a concern among faculty that their expectations of students who are known to come from backgrounds of less privilege, may well be too low. A concomitant issue, related to

course difficulty, is that of possible grade inflation. This has been the subject of discussion at Faculty meetings but, until recently, with the publication of the survey, has not been supported by evidence of a potential, or actual, problem.

Figure B - 6
Means for SIR II Report on evaluations of School of Education compared to St. John's University For Undergraduate Classes, Spring 2003

Section		St. John's University Mean (range 1-5)*	School of Education Mean (range 1-5)*
A	Course Organization and Planning	4.36	4.43
B	Communication	4.37	4.48
C	Faculty/Student Interaction	4.33	4.43
D	Assignments, Exams and Grading	4.22	4.29
A-D	Instructor Vibrancy	4.32	4.40
E	Supplementary Instructional Method	4.24	4.33
F	Course Outcomes	3.79	4.04
G	Student Effort and Involvement	3.80	3.95
H	Course Difficulty	3.38	3.27
	Course Workload	3.24	3.40
	Course Pace	3.22	3.13
I	Overall Evaluation	4.02	4.16

*Range of responses 1=Ineffective, 2=Somewhat Ineffective, 3=Moderately Effective, 4=Effective, 5=Very Effective

Table B - 7 - Means for SIR II Report on evaluations of School of Education compared to St. John's University For Graduate Classes, Spring 2003

Section		St. John's University Mean Results (range 1-5)*	School of Education (range 1-5)*
A	Course Organization and Planning	4.39	4.38
B	Communication	4.49	4.51
C	Faculty/Student Interaction	4.47	4.47
D	Assignments, Exams and Grading	4.28	4.29
A-D	Instructor Vibrancy	4.40	4.41
E	Supplementary Instructional Method	4.32	4.35
F	Course Outcomes	3.94	4.03
G	Student Effort and Involvement	3.90	4.06
H	Course Difficulty	3.44	3.38
	Course Workload	3.36	3.49
	Course Pace	3.19	3.17
I	Overall Evaluation	4.15	4.17

*Range of responses 1=Ineffective, 2=Somewhat Ineffective, 3=Moderately Effective, 4=Effective, 5=Very Effective

4.7.3 Student Complaint Procedures

The Student Handbook of St. John's University mandates an "Academic Fairness" Procedure under which each School/College of the University has established such a procedure by the respective Faculty Council. Regulations include a process whereby students attempt to resolve the complaint informally. If this is not satisfactory, the department faculty become involved, then the chair of the department, and if neither of these work, the Associate Dean and then the Dean. The Procedure must assure objective and impartial hearings done in a timely manner. It must also provide an "appropriate academic remedy of any injustice..." The Faculty Council of the School of Education has included this Academic Fairness process in the Bylaws of the School.

4.7.4 Retention Rate

The School of Education has an 89% retention rate after 1 year, compared to an 83% rate for the University. The retention rate in the School of Education after 2 years is 82% compared to 75% for the University.

4.8 PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN THE PROGRAM AND THE SCHOOLS

- 4.8.1** Analysis of ratings of student teaching evaluations was provided as evidence for TEAC Claim 1.3 in the Inquiry Brief.
- 4.8.2** Work samples of students taught by St. John's teacher candidates are available for auditors during the site visit. Additionally, sample of University Supervisors' and Cooperating Teachers' evaluations of teacher candidates' teaching effectiveness will be provided. Minutes of principals' focus groups are also on file.
- 4.8.3** It has not been our practice to negotiate formal, written agreements between the program and the clinical sites because to do so would involve a negotiated agreement requiring City Department of Education approval and would have to be effective for the entire New York City Department of Education. In suburban districts, it is also not the practice of the school systems to require an agreement, nor would they be especially willing to establish one with every cooperating School of Education
- 4.8.4** The School of Education monitors success of students after graduation through the use of surveys and principals' focus groups as well as occasionally focus groups of the graduates, themselves.

Table B-8
Sampling of Collaborations between schools and St. John’s University School of Education

Professor	Grant Project	Funding Source
Dr. Richard Sinatra	After School All Stars-CAMPUS	
	Inner City Games – Multiple Programs	Inner City Games Foundation / NY City
	Literacy Instruction and Professional Development Services	NYCDOE
	Project ACCLAIM	
	Freeport School District	
	SES Tutoring Program	NYS/NYC
	Region #4, IS 296 & PS 111; Summer School @SJU	NYSDOE
Dr. John Spiridakis	CAMPUS for Homeless Children @CUNY	Laureaus Sport for Good Foundation
	After School Comprehensive Program, 7 th -9 th Grades @IS 237	ASAS, Swarzenegger Youth Foundation
	Extension of Title VII – Bilingual Teachers and Personnel Training	USDOE
Dr. Barbara Nelson	Region 4, District 30: Magnet Schools Region 4, District 30: 21 st Century Community Region 4, District 30: Teacher as Historian Intensive Teachers Institute	NYCDOE
	Teaching Fellows Program	NYS
Dr. Deborah Saldana	Transition to Teaching Project	
	Preparation of Personnel in Minority Inst.	USDOE
	Brooklyn Bridge	Federal
	Project ReConnect	
	Middle Schools Reform Project	Freeport Public Schools
	Professional Development Trainer’s Institute – CSD 31	NYCDOE
	Post 5-Community Based Organizations – Brooklyn Bridge Program	NYCDOE
Dr. Barbara Signer	Student Support Services	NYCDOE
	Cyber Secondary Schools Project	Research Foundation of CUNY
	GEAR-UP: Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Program	USDOE
	NYGEAR-UP and Supplements	NYS Higher Ed Services Corp (HESC)
	Title III Technology Literacy Challenge	NYCDOE
Dr. Michele Nowosad	Web Based Instructional Services	NYCDOE
	Student Multimedia Internet Language Exchange (SMILE) 2	A T & T Foundation
	Region 7, District 31, Life Designs	NYCDOE
Dr. Gene Geisert	Region 7, District 31, Evaluation of 21 st Century	NYCDOE
	Long Island Regional School Support Center Technical Assistance Alliance	LIRSSC
	SPINS – Partners for Prevention	NYCDOE
Dr. Deirdre Mithaug	Petrides	NYCDOE
	Bilingual Special Ed Grant	USDOE
Drs. Fran Guastello and Regina Mistretta	Special Ed Grant	USDOE
	Project TIE	NYCDOE
Dr. Joann Noto	Region 7, Individual Schools-	
	Multiple (15+) Professional Development Projects	NYCDOE
Dr. Robert Brasco	Multiple Professional Development Projects	NYCDOE
Dr. Zarif F. Bacilius	Professional Development of Teacher Leaders	Egyptian Ministry of Education
Dr. Jerrold Ross	NYC Teaching Fellows Program	NYCDOE
	Para-Educators Program	Various
	State Certification Program Development	NY Times Foundation
Judith Margolis	Grant Support at PS 131	Beaumont Foundation
	Para-Educators Program	Various
Charisse Willis	Jump Start	USDOE/NYSDOE
	Teacher Opportunity Corps (TOC)	NYCDOE
	Professional Career Training Program	NYCDOE

