

Program Review

School of Education

Submitted by the Curriculum & Instruction
Programs

January 2024

CRITERION 1: MISSION, HISTORY, IMPACT, AND DEMAND

1. Mission

Review Question #1: How does the program contribute to the mission of Andrews University and the Seventh-day Adventist Church?

The Curriculum and Instruction (C&I) Program Mission states “As companions in learning, faculty and students are committed to global Christian service through excellence in teaching, learning, and research”. This mission statement provides program specificity to the general mission of the School of Education (formerly known as the Department of Teaching, Learning, and Curriculum) “to prepare competent, compassionate and committed educators”. It also works in harmony with the broader university mission to “transform its students by educating them to seek knowledge and affirm faith in order to change the world”.

The Curriculum and Instruction (C&I) programs are housed in the School of Education (SED) within the College of Education and International Services (CEIS). C&I students can choose from three degree levels: MA, EdS, & PhD. They also have the opportunity to complete a general degree or select a specific concentration for some degree levels. At the masters level, C&I students can elect a concentration as K-12 Curriculum Specialist or Teacher Leader. Students may choose an Evaluation and Research concentration at the PhD level. Additionally, a Post-master's Certificate in College and University Teaching is offered.

The primary function of the Curriculum & Instruction Programs is the preparation of highly qualified education professionals for the Seventh-day Adventist Church (Adventist), specifically church-sponsored schools and universities throughout the North American Division of Seventh-day Adventists (NAD) and around the world. Curriculum and Instruction programs also prepare well qualified, curriculum and instruction experts for public school and university programs. During this reporting period this has included a diverse international population not associated with Seventh-day Adventist institutions.

We have negotiated partnership agreements with the Lake Union, Atlantic Union, Canadian Union, and Columbia Union to allow employees of partner organizations that meet the admission requirements for Curriculum and Instruction Program to complete the MA in Curriculum & Instruction offered online by Andrews University. An opportunity is also extended to qualified employees of partner organizations to pursue their PhD.

We are one of the few universities that offer a PhD program. Graduates of these programs can be found in many Adventist PK-12 school systems or Departments/Schools/Colleges of Education in the USA and around the world. Alumni of our graduate programs serve in a variety of positions including teaching, administration, and leadership.

The School of Education offers opportunities for courses to be taught in support of other university programs. These include: Educational Leadership, Doctor of Nursing, Post-Doc Physical Therapy Program, Religious Education with a Bible Teaching Concentration, PhD in Business Administration. Additionally, professional development (PD) is provided to Andrews University faculty and to faculty employed by other area colleges and universities. Some PD opportunities occur in the form of presentations given at Faculty Institute or the [Andrews University Teaching and Learning Conference](#). Faculty members take our formal courses focused on course or curriculum development, instruction, or assessment. Any faculty member with a Master's degree, may enroll in our [Post-Master's College and University Teaching Certificate](#) Program. The certificate requires 4 courses for a total of 12 semester credits. Graduate students are also invited to [serve as trauma education interns or fellows](#) in partnership with the International Center for Trauma Education and Care in the School of Social Work, of which the Director of Curriculum & Instruction Programs also serves as Director of K-12 Educational Initiatives. This provides a service to the students, the university, and the world church of educators.

Thus, Curriculum and Instruction programs play a contributing role to [Andrews University's consistently high rankings in US News Best Colleges Rankings and Niche Best College rankings](#): #1 for campus ethnic diversity (Tied with the University of Hawaii at Hilo), #1 Adventist University in America, #1 Private University in the State of Michigan, #1 Christian College in the State of Michigan, #3 Colleges with the Best Academics in Michigan #4 Best Colleges in Michigan, in the Top 10 Most International Students, #11 Christian University in America, and 9:1 Best Student-Faculty Ratio of National Universities in Michigan (2022–23 U.S. News Best Colleges; 2023 Niche Best Colleges).

2. History

Review Question #2: How does the history of the program define the contributions of the program to Andrews University?

Curriculum and Instruction programs at Andrews University were established first in the School of Graduate Studies, and later moved to the School of Education when it was established in the 1970s. With the creation of Andrews University's original School of Education, the C&I programs first were under Educational Leadership and Management and later under the Department of Teaching, Learning, and Curriculum. Institutional realignment of Colleges and the subsequent reorganization under these has led Curriculum and Instruction programs to now be housed in the newly established School of Education under the College of Education and International Services (CEIS) established in the [2019 academic bulletin](#).

The Master of Arts in Education (Curriculum & Instruction emphasis), was first recorded in the [1973-1974 academic bulletin](#). It was housed within the School of Graduate Studies and transitioned into the School of Education along with all the Curriculum and Instruction programs in the 1970s where it remained until it was phased out for the The Masters of Arts in Curriculum & Instruction established May 2, 2016. The [EdS in Curriculum & Instruction](#) was established on June 13, 1988 in response to trends toward attaining a terminal degree that differentiates the research component from the EdD or PhD by doing a project implementation instead of dissertation. The EdS continues today as an alternative route for students whose plans do not necessitate a PhD or EdD. The EdD was begun in 1974 and [deactivated in 2019](#) due to low enrollment. The influence of international higher education institutions desiring the PhD led more students to pursue the PhD rather than the EdD. The PhD in Curriculum and Instruction was first published in the [1983-1984 bulletin](#) as part of a concentration area of the Doctorate of Education in the Educational Leadership and Management program. It was later established within the Curriculum and Instruction programs within the Department of Teaching, Learning, & Curriculum (now known as the School of Education). Since its inception the PhD has had a variety of concentration areas available. These concentration areas have evolved to reflect the needs of stakeholders and current interests and needs established in the field at large. Some have been [deactivated](#) due to low enrollment (curriculum theory, higher education teaching,

international education, K-12 curriculum specialist, teacher education, and social justice concentrations).

The primary stakeholders of the C&I programs have remained Seventh-day Adventists within North American Division education systems and other Seventh-day Adventist education systems around the world. The Masters program partners heavily through MOUs established with four unions, with limited public and international serving students. The EdS program during this reporting period primarily served as an alternative program for earlier completion for a degree or those who want to stay in professional practice. The PhD program continues to serve the SDA NAD system, but does have a broader global reach both within the church and within this reporting period served a number of students sponsored from Middle Eastern countries- primarily Saudi Arabia.

Historically Curriculum and Instruction programs curricula followed the previous [SED Conceptual framework](#) along with [4 additional program learning outcomes](#). As the larger institution established institutional graduate outcomes, C&I programs revised our program outcomes to align with these. These new program outcomes were worked on during the 2020-2021 school year and formally adopted into the 2022-2023 academic bulletin.

As is the case for the university, a review of recent historical events for the C&I program must include the COVID-19 pandemic among other factors that impacted the program outcomes. The pandemic caused significant adverse impacts to the health and wellness of students, faculty, and staff. During the pandemic period and immediately after, the School of Education experienced reduced staffing levels due to retirements and other transitions. Those transitions affected all areas of C&I program operation, including data collection and analysis, program development, and collaborations across the university. Adverse impacts notwithstanding, the program has benefited from gifts of grace in the person of resilient students, faculty, and staff – the C&I program has remained stable and positioned for growth.

3. Impact

Review Question #3: How does the program contribute to the academic success of Andrews University?

Content requirements- EDCI 565 and EDCI 547 fulfill these requirements. In recent years, EDFN 500 has also been funded and offered through our program. Additionally, the faculty for the C&I programs teach and contribute to the other undergraduate and graduate programs within the The Curriculum Instruction programs contribute to the academic success of Andrews University. In addition to the programs themselves contributing to successful Higher Learning Commission accreditation, the C&I programs contribute to the success of programs in other departments and success in other programs within our same department/school.

The Curriculum and Instruction programs contribute to the success of programs in other departments by offering service courses and electives to other graduate programs. As part of their HLC Accredited program Educational Leadership requires students within the [MA Educational Leadership](#) to select between two courses (EDCI 565 and EDCI 547) as part of their core requirements. Additional EDCI courses are available as electives within this program. Additionally, these courses are also required for the [EdS in Educational Leadership](#). Educational Leadership also offers an [EdD](#) and [PhD](#) with cognates in curriculum that draw from C&I program courses. The [Advanced Practice Registered Nurse DNP Post-Master's program](#) also utilizes courses (EDCI 650 and EDCI 745) for those pursuing the Nursing Education focus. Physical Therapy DScPT added the post-Masters certificate in College and University Teaching to their program offerings during this reporting period and is now regularly utilizing three courses (EDCI 706, EDCI 745, EDCI 750) toward a higher education concentration within the [DScPT program with a focus in teaching in higher education](#). Additionally, EDCI courses are offered as [electives for cognates in ThD in Theology](#). The [PhD in Business Administration](#) currently utilizes 6 credits as Teacher Training electives from our program (EDCI 605 and EDCI 606). The [MS in Community and International Development](#) utilizes three EDCI courses (EDCI 650, EDCI 684, EDCI 696) for their Development Education concentration. [PhD Religious Education](#) required up to 6 psychology, curriculum and instruction electives within this reporting period.

The C&I program has helped other university schools and centers to continue the education of their professors or educators (School of Rehabilitation Sciences, School of Communication Sciences and Disorders, Center for Intensive Language Programs, and Ruth Murdoch

Elementary). One professor from the School of Communication Sciences and Disorders (Tammy Shilling, Associate Professor of Speech-Language Pathology and Undergraduate Program Director) completed her doctorate during this reporting period. Others (Jenica Joseph, Assistant Professor of Speech-Language Pathology; Luda Vine, Center for Intensive Language Programs Director) have engaged in the PhD program during this reporting period and have since successfully completed their doctoral programs.

A [Post-Master's Certificate in College and University Teaching](#) is also available for anyone at our university (or sister institutions and other universities) to equip teaching in higher education. C&I programs also collaborate with the International Center for Trauma Education and Care within the School of Social Work to offer unpaid [Trauma Education Internships and Fellowships](#) to graduate students in the School of Education.

C&I programs also contribute to the success of other programs within the same school. The [MA Learning Technologies](#) utilize EDCI 545, EDCI 605, EDCI 565, EDCI 610, EDCI 696, and EDCI 699 within their degree course offerings. The [MS in Special Education](#) are also required to take EDCI 699 and EDCI 545. Stakeholders working on [professional certification](#) through the North American Division Office of Education are also required to take courses meeting specific course content of which EDCI 565 and EDCI 547 fulfill.

4. Demand

Review Question #4: What is program enrollment and state of demand for graduates of the program? How has it changed over time?

During this reporting period Andrews University Curriculum and Instruction students have primarily been drawn from Seventh-day Adventists around the world, including our global sister institutions and from departments/schools on the campus of Andrews University. Additionally, the C&I program has drawn students through CEIS memoranda of understanding (MOU) with four union conferences within the NAD. These union conferences have demonstrated a consistent demand for training for their in-service educators. Seventh-day Adventist educators who complete masters degrees in curriculum and instruction add value to their unions and their institutions, including service on curriculum committees for their conferences and participation in a variety of NAD committees that develop and update education standards, review, and write curricula. The Curriculum and Instruction

also attracts international students from outside of North America, from the Seventh-day Adventist faith tradition and from a variety of backgrounds and faith traditions.

During this reporting period the PhD program generated 666 credits from its main campus students and 152 credits from its field-based students. The Doctor of Education generated 34 credits by its main campus students. The Master of Arts generated 93 credits from its main campus students and 114 credits from its field-based students. The total number of credits generated by the Curriculum & Instruction programs from Fall 2017-Spring 2021 was 1059. [[C&I Program Economics FA17-21](#)]

The PhD program showed steady demand with a peak during this reporting period in Fall, 2020. The MA showed slow growth through Fall, 2020, with the largest growth of enrollment during the Fall 2020 semester. The EdS experienced no demand as it is primarily used as an exit strategy for persons able to meet the EdS standards for scholarship/research who, for a variety of reasons, were unable to meet the standards for the PhD. The EdD began to be phased out due to low enrollment in 2016 and was formally discontinued in 2019. Both the MA and PhD program showed a slight decrease in enrollment in Fall 2021. This may have been impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic.

Program Demand and Effectiveness

Total Fall Enrollments

| Curriculum & Instruction | Fall 2017 | Fall 2018 | Fall 2019 | Fall 2020 | Fall 2021 |
|-------------------------------------------------------|----------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| MA Curriculum & Instruction | 1 | 1 | 4 | 8 | 6 |
| EDUC-Education - MA with Emphasis in C&I ^b | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| <i>MA subtotal</i> | 5 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 7 |
| EdS Curriculum & Instruction ^c | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| EdD Curriculum & Instruction ^d | 0 ^c | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| PhD Curriculum & Instruction | 18 | 17 | 19 | 19 | 16 |
| <i>Post MA Totals</i> | 18 | 17 | 19 | 19 | 16 |
| C&I Total Enrollment by Year | 23 | 18 | 24 | 28 | 23 |

^bBegan being phased out Fall 2016 and officially dropped in 2019.

^cWhile a standalone degree in its own right for those seeking to become curriculum specialists in school systems, the primary use of the EdS at the time of writing this report was as an exit strategy for persons able to meet the EdS standards for scholarship/research who, for a variety of reasons, were unable to meet the standards for the PhD.

^dProgram discontinued due to low enrollment.

Course Enrollment Trends

Dr. Greulich, School of Education chair, and Dr. Imasiku, the Curriculum & Instruction program director and advisor during this reporting period, and reduced our course offerings in general in conjunction with the reduction of concentration areas across programs. Additionally, as the summer term approaches, the advisors looked at the students' course plans to estimate enrollment in each course. If we notice a course looks to be under-enrolled and the course is not needed for students to graduate, the advisors work to develop an alternative schedule for the students who need the course in question.

Average Curriculum and Instruction Course Enrollment by Course Level

| Course Level | Fall 2017 | Fall 2018 | Fall 2019 | Fall 2020 | Fall 2021 |
|--------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| 500 & 600 | 2.3 | 3.6 | 3.5 | 3.9 | 2.8 |
| 700 & 800 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.4 | 6 | 2 |

The Curriculum and Instruction programs had 27 graduates during this reporting period. The largest number of graduates came from the PhD program (18), with Masters of Arts graduating eight (8), and the EdS graduating one (1).

Number of Curriculum and Instruction Graduates by Degree (N=27)

| Academic Degree & Major | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | Total |
|----------------------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|
| Curriculum & Instruction | | | | | | |
| Curriculum & Instruction - MA | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 8 |
| Education - MA (Curriculum & Instruction Emphasis) | 1 | 3 | | | | |
| Curriculum & Instruction - EdS | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Curriculum & Instruction - EdD | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Curriculum & Instruction - PhD | 4 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 18 |

Mean completion time for candidates who completed the Curriculum & Instruction PhD in the years 2017-2021 (N=18) was 20.4 semesters or 6.8 years.

Analysis of employment post-graduation indicates all graduates of the curriculum and instruction program are employed prior to or soon after graduation. Graduates are employed in educational settings across public, private, parochial, and for-profit sectors. Curriculum and Instruction graduates

fill education roles in administration, teaching, and consulting. Employment across a breadth of sectors and roles demonstrates both that graduates fill needs in the marketplace and that the program provides credentials that are relevant to knowledge and skills needed in the field of education.

Current Employment of 2017-2021 PhD Graduates (n=18)

| Employment Classification | n |
|---------------------------------------------|----------|
| Government Ministry of Education | 1 |
| Higher Education Faculty | 7 |
| Higher Education Administration | 1 |
| Higher Education Curriculum/Learning Design | 1 |
| K-12 Faculty | 1 |
| K-12 School Administration (Principal) | 1 |
| K-12 District Administration | 1 |
| Education Consulting (For-Profit) | 1 |
| Clergy | 1 |
| Unknown | 2 |
| Total | 17* |

*One (1) graduate deceased (2019)

Fourteen (14) of the students who graduated from the PhD program during this reporting period are known to be working within the field of education. Nine (9) are working within higher education, with the majority of those working as higher education faculty. One (1) is working for the government Ministry of Education. One (1) is working in consulting. The remaining three (3) graduates are working at various levels of K-12 education, with two fulfilling leadership roles. It is unknown where two (2) graduates are working. One (1) is working as a clergy. One (1) is deceased.

This employment data is a strong indicator of the demand for those that earn their PhD in Curriculum & Instruction.

Current Employment of 2017-2021 MA Graduates (n=8)

| Employment Classification | n |
|----------------------------------|----------|
| Higher Education Staff | 1 |
| K-12 Faculty | 5 |
| Unknown | 2 |

Five (5) of the students who graduated from the MA program during this reporting period are currently working as K-12 faculty. One (1) is a higher education staff. It is unknown where two (2) of the graduates are employed. This employment data is an indicator that the majority of students in the MA program are fulfilling the demand from within our partnership with SDA unions.

Employment of 2017-2021 MA & PhD Graduates by Sector (n=26)

| Employment Sector | n | % |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|----------|----------|
| Private K-12 (Christian, Seventh-day Adventist) | 5 | 19% |
| Private Higher Education (Christian, Seventh-day Adventist) | 4 | 15% |
| Private Higher Education (Christian) | 1 | 4% |
| Private Higher Education | 1 | 4% |
| Public Higher Education | 4 | 15% |
| Public K-12 | 3 | 12% |
| Government (Education) | 1 | 4% |
| For-Profit Education (Consulting) | 1 | 4% |
| Church (Christian, Seventh-day Adventist) | 1 | 4% |
| Unknown | 5 | 19% |

The greatest number of alumni that graduated during this reporting period are working for the Seventh-Day Adventist Church (38%), with 34% working within K-20 Seventh-day Adventist school systems and 4% working for the church sector. A further 4% of alumni are working within Christian education. 27% of graduates are working for the public education sector. 19% are unknown.

A total of 38% of these alumni are working within the higher education field, 31% are working with K-12 education, 4% work at the government level of education, 4% work in consulting, and 4% as clergy.

The following additional information is provided by program faculty report based on personal contacts that have been otherwise unconfirmed addressing the 19% of alumni with unknown employment status:

1. Fatimah Al Nasser, a PhD graduate, returned to Saudi Arabia and has applied to a post-doctoral fellowship.
2. Pretoria Gittens-St.Juste, EdS graduate, was last known to have her own business and be substituting in local K-12 schools.
3. Heather Bell, MA graduate, was last known to be working for the Atlantic Union teaching in a multi-grade school.
4. Yijie Niu, MA graduate, is believed to have returned to China to teach.
5. Samuel Adamou, PhD, graduate remains unknown though program faculty continues to pursue updated employment information.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics indicates demand for graduates within curriculum and instruction programs. The following job outlook data from 2022 to 2032 is a 2% increase in demand (as fast as average) between for [Instructional Coordinators](#) and an 8% increase in demand for [Post-secondary Teachers](#) faster than average for all occupations). “About 19,200 openings for instructional coordinators are projected each year, on average, over the decade. About 118,800 openings for postsecondary teachers are projected each year, on average....Many of those openings are expected to result from the need to replace workers who transfer to different occupations or exit the labor force, such as to retire.”

College Navigator indicates that 164 Colleges and Universities in the United States offer graduate degrees in the field of Curriculum and Instruction. Five colleges/universities offer a Masters in the Curriculum and Instruction field. Two offer a PhD in Curriculum & Instruction field. Andrews offers a Curriculum & Instruction PhD with areas of concentration available. Michigan State University offers

a PhD in Curriculum, Instruction, and Teacher Education. In Michigan, Andrews University is the only to offer a fully distance Curriculum & Instruction PhD program. College Navigator does not provide data about EdS or EdD degrees within this field.

Michigan Curriculum and Instruction Graduate Degrees Conferred 2021-2022 (College Navigator)

| College/University | Post-Graduate Certificate | Masters | PhD |
|------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------|-----|
| Adrian College | 0 (distance) | 3 (distance) | - |
| Andrews University | 3* | 3 (distance) | 4 |
| Cornerstone University | - | 8 (distance) | - |
| Michigan State University | - | 69 (distance) | 15 |
| Northern Michigan University | - | 10 (distance) | - |

* First graduates of College & University Teaching Post-Masters Certificate

Andrews University School of Education is the only Seventh-day Adventist college and university system to offer a PhD in Curriculum and Instruction. La Sierra University offers an EdD in Curriculum & Instruction, with a focus on Higher Education. Other sister institutions around the globe offer a PhD in Education (Adventist International Institute of Advanced Studies offers a PhD in Education with a specialization in Curriculum & Instruction. Montemorelos University offers a PhD in Education. Avondale University offers a PhD aligned with Christian Education as a higher degree by research). We are only one of two to offer an EdS in Curriculum and Instruction. Seven of the benchmarked sister institutions offer masters degrees in curriculum and instruction, education with a concentration in curriculum and instruction, or similar areas.

Graduate Education Programs Offered by Selected Seventh-day Adventist Colleges and Universities

| Program | Andrews University | La Sierra University | Walla Walla University | Southern Adventist University | Southwestern Adventist University | Pacific Union College | Asia Pacific International University | Adventist International Institute of Advanced Studies |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| MA C&I | X | X | | | | | | |
| MA/MS Teaching | | X | | | | | | |
| MS/MA Education | | | X | X | x | X | | X |
| MA Learning Technologies | X | | | | | | | |
| MA Neuroscience and Education | | X | | | | | | |
| MA TESOL | X | X | | | | | | |
| M.Ed. (C&I Emphasis) | | | | | | | x | |
| M.Ed. (Education Administration) | | | | | | | x | |
| M.Ed. (TESOL) | | | | | | | x | |
| EdS C&I | X | X | | | | | | X |
| EdS Neuroscience and Education | | X | | | | | | |
| EdS TESOL | | X | | | | | | |
| EdD C&I | | X | | | | | | |
| PhD C&I | X | | | | | | | |
| PhD Education (specialization in C&I or Educational Administration) | | | | | | | | X |

CRITERION 2: PROGRAM QUALITY

1. Inputs and Processes

a. Human & Physical Resources

Review Question #5: Document and describe how the available human and physical resources contribute to a strong program of high quality that mentors students to succeed.

Human and physical resources contribute to a strong program of high quality that mentors students to succeed. During part of this reporting period there was one faculty member assigned half-time to the curriculum and instruction programs. All other faculty worked for undergraduate programs as well as the graduate programs. All faculty teaching curriculum & instruction courses during this reporting period have degrees and experience appropriate to the instruction they provided ([2023-2024 credentials- C&I Faculty](#)).

Course evaluation data provide further evidence that faculty provide high quality learning experiences. During this reporting period both [online](#) and [face-to-face](#) students have consistently evaluated curriculum and instruction courses between a 4.0-5.0 (agree to strongly agree when responding to course survey questions). During the height of COVID-19, both online and face-to-face students forced by the pandemic to move online [mid-Fall 2020](#), consistently evaluated curriculum and instruction a 4.4 or higher on a 5.0 scale. This is higher than when compared to the university as a whole, and equal to or higher to other College of Education and International Services (CEIS) courses (CEIS is still referred to as SED- the former SED).

These faculty are shared with the School of Education undergraduate and other graduate programs. During this reporting period long-time, full-time faculty member Dr. Larry Burton retired (2021) and Dr. Anneris Coria-Navia moved from working half-time for the School of Education to full-time position under the Provost's office (2020). During the period Fall 2018 through Summer 2021, 93% of instruction was offered by regular (full-time and part-time) faculty and 7% of classes were taught by adjunct faculty. All courses, including EDCI courses taught by adjunct faculty, were taught by highly qualified individuals.

The School of Education staff also support curriculum and instruction programs. Hannah Church, administrative assistant helps to take and file the agenda and minutes, as well as managing bulletin

copy and room assignments. The Certification Registrar inputs courses into the course schedule and works as a second tier of support to support teachers that unions sponsor.

During this reporting period there was one student worker assigned to the Curriculum & Instruction program for 10 hours a week. With the financial and pandemic impacts, student workers are now assigned to the School of Education in general. During the pandemic hit this was reduced to 2 hours a week and currently there is no student worker assigned.

While students have successfully completed their curriculum and instruction programs four main factors have stretched the human resources of our program. First, the number of retirements and position changes amidst and immediately following COVID. Second, accreditation work (CAEP, NAD) and the rewriting of undergraduate programs required for state accreditation by faculty that teach in both undergraduate and curriculum & instruction programs. Third, significant growth with the partnerships in the unions therefore teaching overloads increased in order to meet these needs. Fourth, funding and finding qualified Graduate Assistants to assist in the program work.

Additionally, leading up to and during the first years of this reporting period the curriculum and instruction programs piloted a shared program director responsibility in order to divide and alternate responsibilities. It became clear that one person needed to serve in the program director's role and Dr. Lori Imasiku took on the full responsibility amongst her other duties.

Physical space was consistently wet however, in 2019 two offices, two classrooms, lobby area, and storage areas were significantly flooded resulting in faculty and staff time and resources to clean out and redesign program spaces (new carpet, new paint, fixing the leak, etc.).

Library resources (particularly journals and ebooks) have been utilized and journals are well resources for the instruction of content and completion of various assignments or projects for both on-campus and online students. Technology equipment (computers, cameras, microphones, Zoom, etc) is a key resource used by the curriculum and instruction programs. Prior to the pandemic faculty taught classes hybrid (face-to-face and online students together). Bell Hall 015 was equipped with updated technology (mounted cameras, large screen TV, tabletop microphones) to assist in these efforts. Some technology glitches were experienced. Bell Hall 014 and 013 had some equipment to assist with hybrid course offerings. During the pandemic we were to move without significant difficulty to teaching remotely due to this experience. Updated technology has been updated and expanded since the reporting period. Access to a bathroom on the same level as the curriculum and

instruction program classes has been significantly limited during this reporting period and does not meet ADA requirements.

Additionally, in order for the curriculum and instruction programs to be strengthened, resources need to be focused and reallocated to exploring an updated EdS and the rewriting and expansion of the PhD program. This includes discontinuing the Master of Arts and completing a teach out of current students completed, as well as redesigning the PhD to imbed students into faculty research.

b. Library Resources

Review Question #6: Are library holdings adequate for the program, and to what extent are they available and utilized?

[The library report](#) for this reporting period indicates that the library holdings have been adequate for the program. There were 3465 books, 44 ebooks, and 72 DVDs with publication dates between 2015-2023 available for a total of 3581 resources across thirteen topics aligned to curriculum and instruction programs. Further ebooks and streaming media are available, as are 1,107 e-journals available to both on-campus and off-campus students on the topics of curriculum, teaching/instruction, curriculum theory, and Christian education. Further multi-disciplinary databases are available that provide education related content through the library's website. An online review of library materials available at similar-sized, Christian institutions indicate that Andrews University library resources are equal to or better within the curriculum and instruction field. When benchmarked against larger institutions (University of Michigan) that also have PhD programs, it appears that their libraries have more specific resource materials in both books and specific journals.

[Course survey data](#) indicated that students taking interactive online courses during this reporting period reported an average of a 4.10 out of 5, indicating agreement with the following statement, "The library resources were adequate to complete the assignments for this course". Course survey data did not include this question for on-campus students.

The library support for our program strengthens other education-based programs, such as the MA in Learning Technologies and MA in Educational Leadership resources. Library resources are utilized to assist professors in the development of curricula and students in the completion of a wide variety of

assignments. Digital resources, particularly online journals are the most heavily used in the completion of student projects and research.

c. Curriculum & Technology

Review Question #7: How well does the program “engage students in collecting, analyzing, and communicating information, in mastering modes of intellectual inquiry or creative work, and in developing skills adaptable to changing environments” (2020, HLC Core Component 3.B)? How does the curriculum prepare graduates “to live and work in a multi-cultural world” (2020, HLC sub-component 3.B.3.)? (Please note if the program is taught online or off-campus.)

The Curriculum and Instruction program curricula engages students in collecting, analyzing, and communicating information, mastering intellectual inquiry into foundational curriculum understandings, and developing curriculum development and instruction skills for the changing world of education. Course work across C&I programs was aligned to the (now former) School of Education framework [insert SED framework here] during this reporting period. After the dissolving of the former School of Education as we became part of the College of Education and International Services, C&I programs worked on aligning program outcomes to updated institutional outcomes for graduate students (2020-2021). Current C&I courses across programs are now aligned to the new program outcomes (first appearing in the 2022-2023 bulletin) and [curriculum mapped](#) according to when the outcome is introduced, developed, or demonstrated. The bulletin is accurate and reflects the changes that have been made since the reporting period (i.e. Department of Teaching, Learning, & Curriculum is now School of Education, concentrations have been reduced, etc.)

All Curriculum and Instruction programs are offered on campus or synchronously online with field-based students joining on-campus students in a hybrid format for EDCI courses. Courses from other departments that are utilized for C&I programs are usually either offered on-campus or online (EDRM courses live synchronously via Zoom; EDAL asynchronously). This occurred pre-COVID and with the exception of during the height of COVID continued during this reporting period. The C&I programs shared space and classrooms outfitted with technology to aid in hybrid instruction with other School of Education programs. Technology needs regularly need to be updated and plans have been made to continue to do so.

Students across C&I programs typically begin their course work with an Orientation course before proceeding with other coursework. Other coursework is completed without prerequisites.

Comprehensive exams inclusive of a written defense, portfolio completion, and verbal defense of portfolio is required across all C&I programs. A specific project is implemented or thesis completed (MA), advanced project conducted (EdS), or dissertation defended (PhD) in order to complete the programs. The program handbook provides guidance and information [[C&I Program Handbook](#)].

All of the curriculum and instruction programs prepare students to live and work in the multicultural world through including a full course, EDCI [686/884 Internationalizing Curriculum](#), that focuses on this topic. Many other courses also embed preparation to live and work in a multicultural world. For example, [EDCI 565 Improving Instruction](#) incorporates cultural responsiveness and instructional planning (plans and resources) bias analysis into the coursework. [EDCI 545/745 Assessment of Learning](#) embeds cultural considerations on assessment. Additionally, [SPED 525](#) focuses on families and cultures and incorporates learning activities such as a Me Museum Family, food, holidays, and favorite books. [EDCI 645](#) talks heavily about cultural differences in the foundations of reading and dialects and embeds preparation for working in a multicultural world through the analysis and planning of intervention for English Language Learners and various skill levels.

We have a number of cross-listed and swing courses that have course numbers for the Masters/Doctoral programs. Rigor has been assured through the differentiated course work, inclusion of additional depth and length of reading and papers, and/or additional assessments. Our programs have a greater number of swing and cross-listed courses than other institutions. This, combined with updated university policy and the deep discussions during this program review, is leading to upcoming changes to C&I programs.

The Masters offers a more narrow focus on curriculum and instruction than the majority of other Adventist and public universities whose MA or MS focus more broadly on Education with a variety of concentration areas or on

When compared to other institutions, the EdS in Curriculum & Instruction is similar to La Sierra's EdS in Curriculum & Instruction program. Other universities do not offer the EdS.

When compared to other institutions, the PhD offers more specific course work in curriculum and instruction, particularly that of curriculum foundations and theory, as well as assessment, and less concentration areas than La Sierra (the competing Adventist university offering an EdD in Curriculum and Instruction, with a focus in higher education). Alternatively, we offer a more narrow focus than a broader pool of PhD in Education programs in other sister institutions. Within Michigan, the only university offering a similar degree is Michigan State University with a PhD in Curriculum, Instruction,

and Teacher Education. This program requires similar research courses (with additional options) than our program, but adds a 1-3 credit 900 level course in Research Practicum in Curriculum, Instruction, and Teacher Education prior to working on their dissertation.

Curriculum and Instruction programs do need to further adapt and evolve. This includes consideration of which programs need to be discontinued in order for other masters degrees to best equip students for the field. It also includes continue to expand and incorporating the latest content and educational research (i.e. educational neuroscience, standards-based learning practices, approaches and strategies for English Language Learners, trauma-informed practices, etc.), grappling and assisting students in grappling with emerging technologies in the field (i.e. AI), and considering the shifting field of education- including in preparing doctoral students in ways that strengthen student skill and aid faculty research and publication.

This will further strengthen the program offerings for whole person development. Currently there is strong support for intellectual development of students, but need to expand writing supports. Time is given during courses for students to engage in the integration of faith and learning during class worship and within the course content itself, particularly the development of their educational philosophy, practice, and theories. Hybrid, synchronous classes help create some space for social development. This is an area that could be further strengthened, with special attention given to the adult learner.

2. Outputs and Outcomes

a. Outputs

Review Question #8: How do the various measures of outputs demonstrate the quality of the program?

The skills and abilities of the graduates from Curriculum and Instruction programs make them sought after by prospective employers. Graduates have been successful in securing employment and/or are applying to fellowship programs.

Across the Curriculum and Instruction programs graduates have met target level or higher on program learning outcomes (see below). Many students have engaged in presenting at the annual [Teaching and Learning Conference](#), highlighting what they have learned in classes and are applying

into their classrooms, preparing to engage in further original research, or sharing what their research found. Masters students implemented a range of projects that have actionized knowledge and skills within the field and have had a direct impact on their field-based work. For example Melanie Kartik utilized what she was learning in her curriculum and instruction courses and in her research methods courses to engage in a [project that positively impacted](#) the Columbia Conference of Adventist Education System during COVID-19 online emergency teaching. Here is a selection of doctoral students have published, both during the reporting period and after: [Eduardo Sola Chagas Lima](#), [Mohammed Al Harbi](#), [Josephine Katenga](#), [Tammy Shilling](#), [Alya A.K. Suliman](#), and [Alozie Ogbonna](#). Additionally, two doctoral students have served as trauma education fellows in partnership between the School of Education and the International Center for Trauma Education and Care. Stephanie Wilczynski has assisted in preparing and providing interactive online trauma education training for educators. Yanina Jimenez incorporated the knowledge and understanding gained through her coursework with trauma-informed educational neuroscience to the writing of her book [Brain-friendly Teacher: How to Create Lasting Learning through Classroom Design & Instruction](#). She also presented at the 2021 ASHRA virtual conference on the topic of [Educational Neuroscience and Equity, Trauma & Online Learning University](#) is also using her skills and abilities to help teachers [@braintipsforteachers](#) on TikTok, [@lets.celebrate.learning](#) on Instagram. Additionally, Yanina has been instrumental in helping the North American Division Office of Education on standards development and to prepare resources and train teachers on standards-based teaching and learning within their classrooms.

Additionally, eighteen (18) [dissertations](#) were completed and fourteen of which are housed on Andrews University [library digital commons](#).

b. Student Learning Outcomes

Review Question #9: Attach a curriculum map that shows learning outcomes mapped to required courses in the order they are typically taken. How well are students meeting the program's outcomes?

The [C&I curriculum map](#) shows learning outcomes mapped to required courses in the order they are typically taken. Curriculum & Instruction programs having rolling admissions and provides a sequenced, but not fixed, progression. All students must complete an Orientation course at their

graduate program level. EDFN 500 is to be taken as early in the program as possible. Research courses are taken by number, with the lower numbers being taken before the higher numbers. EDCI 747 must be completed before EDCI 893. All coursework must be completed and comprehensive exams should be taken before dissertation.

Program outcome data from the 2020 Fall Yearly Report indicate that students across Curriculum & Instruction programs are meeting the program outcomes. This data was collected via student LiveText submissions and analyzed by Dr. Larry Burton, our previous assessment coordinator. Data from 2020-2021 was collected and will be analyzed when an updated data management system has been formally implemented.

Thirteen (13) key assessments evaluated the curriculum and instruction program learning outcomes during this reporting period. Program outcomes had one or more assessment measures. Key assessments evaluated one more of the program outcomes. 100% of students met or exceeded the target value or benchmark/previous results.

Program Outcome Tables from FYE 2020 Annual Report for the Years 2015-2019

Major: Curriculum & Instruction – MA through PhD Combined

C&I PLO 1: Explain worldviews and trace their historical development (SED-CF 1A)

| | Assessment Plan | | | | Assessment Results | |
|----------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Course Outcome | Key Assessment Description | Where and when the key assessment occurs | Assessment Tool embedded below | Target Value or Benchmark / Previous Results | Assessment Results & Analysis | Action Plan for Improvement |
| | Personal and Professional Synthesis | EDFN 500 | | 80% of students score at or above level 3 on the rubric | 96% of students* scored 3 or higher | None needed for the SED. Need disaggregated data to make decision for C&I Program |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|--|---------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| | Autobiographical Curriculum Critique | EDCI 547/ EDCI 747 | | 80% of students score at or above level 3 on the rubric | 100% of students scored at or above level 3 on the rubric | None needed |
|--|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|--|---------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|-------------|

C&I PLO 2: Critique worldviews from a Christian perspective (SED-CF 1B)

| | Assessment Plan | | | | Assessment Results | |
|----------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Course Outcome | Key Assessment Description | Where and when the key assessment occurs | Assessment Tool embedded below | Target Value or Benchmark / Previous Results | Assessment Results & Analysis | Action Plan for Improvement |
| | Personal and Professional Synthesis | EDFN 500 | | 80% of students score at or above level 3 on the rubric | 96% of students* scored 3 or higher | None needed for the SED. Need disaggregated data to make decision for C&I Program |
| | Autobiographical Curriculum Critique | EDCI 547/ EDCI 747 | | 80% of students score at or above level 3 on the rubric | 100% of students scored at or above level 3 on the rubric | None needed |

C&I PLO 3: Integrate principles of a Christian worldview into their chosen fields of study (SED-CF 1c)

| | Assessment Plan | | | | Assessment Results | |
|----------------|----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Course Outcome | Key Assessment Description | Where and when the key | Assessment Tool embedded below | Target Value or Benchmark / Previous | Assessment Results & Analysis | Action Plan for Improvement |

| | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|--|---------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | assessment occurs | | Results | | |
| | Personal and Professional Synthesis | EDFN 500 | | 80% of students score at or above level 3 on the rubric | 96% of students* scored 3 or higher | None needed for the SED. Need disaggregated data to make decision for C&I Program |
| | Research Ethics Essay | EDRM 505 | | 80% of students score at or above level 3 on the rubric | 100% of students* scored at level 5 | None needed |
| | Autobiographical Curriculum Critique | EDCI 547/ EDCI 747 | | 80% of students score at or above level 3 on the rubric | 100% of students scored at or above level 3 on the rubric | None needed |
| 3. Evaluate curriculum design models using personally held philosophies of education | Curriculum Development Project | EDCI 650 EDCI 750 | | 80% of students score at or above level 3 on the rubric | 100% of C&I students met the standard (Fall 16) | None needed |

C&I PLO 4: Describe human development (SED-CF 2A)

| | Assessment Plan | | | | Assessment Results | |
|----------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Course Outcome | Key Assessment Description | Where and when the key assessment occurs | Assessment Tool embedded below | Target Value or Benchmark / Previous Results | Assessment Results & Analysis | Action Plan for Improvement |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|--|---------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| | | | | | | |
| | Autobiographical Curriculum Critique | EDCI 547/ EDCI 747 | | 80% of students score at or above level 3 on the rubric | 100% of students scored at or above level 3 on the rubric | None needed |

C&I PLO 5: Apply current theories of learning (SED-CF 2B)

| | Assessment Plan | | | | Assessment Results | |
|----------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Course Outcome | Key Assessment Description | Where and when the key assessment occurs | Assessment Tool embedded below | Target Value or Benchmark / Previous Results | Assessment Results & Analysis | Action Plan for Improvement |
| | Autobiographical Curriculum Critique | EDCI 547/ EDCI 747 | | 80% of students score at or above level 3 on the rubric | 100% of students scored at or above level 3 on the rubric | None needed |

C&I PLO 6: Understand and use frameworks for organizing instruction (SED-CF 2B1)

| | Assessment Plan | | | | Assessment Results | |
|----------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Course Outcome | Key Assessment Description | Where and when the key assessment occurs | Assessment Tool embedded below | Target Value or Benchmark / Previous Results | Assessment Results & Analysis | Action Plan for Improvement |
| | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|----------------------|--|---------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| | Curriculum Development Project | EDCI 650 EDCI 750 | | 80% of students score at or above level 3 on the rubric | 100% of C&I students met the standard (Fall 16) | None needed |
|--|--------------------------------|----------------------|--|---------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------|

C&I PLO 7: Demonstrate a repertoire of effective teaching strategies for teaching ALL students (SED-CF 2B2)

| | Assessment Plan | | | | Assessment Results | |
|----------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Course Outcome | Key Assessment Description | Where and when the key assessment occurs | Assessment Tool embedded below | Target Value or Benchmark / Previous Results | Assessment Results & Analysis | Action Plan for Improvement |
| | Curriculum Development Project | EDCI 650 EDCI 750 | | 80% of students score at or above level 3 on the rubric | 100% of C&I students met the standard (Fall 16) | None needed |

C&I PLO 10: Relate effectively with various cultural, racial, and special interest groups (SED_CF 3B)

| | Assessment Plan | | | | Assessment Results | |
|----------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Course Outcome | Key Assessment Description | Where and when the key assessment occurs | Assessment Tool embedded below | Target Value or Benchmark / Previous Results | Assessment Results & Analysis | Action Plan for Improvement |
| | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|----------|--|---------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | Personal and Professional Synthesis | EDFN 500 | | 80% of students score at or above level 3 on the rubric | 80% of students* scored 3 or higher | Unsure of action needed. Need disaggregated data to know if our students are in the 20% of students who did not pass the assessment |
|--|-------------------------------------|----------|--|---------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

C&I PLO 13: Understand and apply curriculum development processes within a systems perspective (SED-CF 3D1)

| | Assessment Plan | | | | Assessment Results | |
|----------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Course Outcome | Key Assessment Description | Where and when the key assessment occurs | Assessment Tool embedded below | Target Value or Benchmark / Previous Results | Assessment Results & Analysis | Action Plan for Improvement |
| | Curriculum Development Project | EDCI 650 EDCI 750 | | 80% of students score at or above level 3 on the rubric | 100% of C&I students met the standard (Fall 16) | None needed |

C&I PLO 15: Communicate effectively in written, verbal, and non-verbal forms (SED-CF 4A)

| | Assessment Plan | | | | Assessment Results | |
|----------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Course Outcome | Key Assessment Description | Where and when the key assessment occurs | Assessment Tool embedded below | Target Value or Benchmark / Previous Results | Assessment Results & Analysis | Action Plan for Improvement |
| | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|--|---------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | Personal and Professional Synthesis | EDFN 500 | | 80% of students score at or above level 3 on the rubric | 80% of students* scored 3 or higher | Unsure of action needed. Need disaggregated data to know if our students are in the 20% of students who did not pass the assessment |
| | Autobiographical Curriculum Critique | EDCI 547/ EDCI 747 | | 80% of students score at or above level 3 on the rubric | 96.9% of students scored at or above level 3 on the rubric | None needed |

C&I PLO 16: Use electronic tools effectively for professional communication, teaching, and research (SED-CF 4B)

| | Assessment Plan | | | | Assessment Results | |
|----------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Course Outcome | Key Assessment Description | Where and when the key assessment occurs | Assessment Tool embedded below | Target Value or Benchmark / Previous Results | Assessment Results & Analysis | Action Plan for Improvement |
| | Curriculum Development Project | EDCI 650 EDCI 750 | | 80% of students score at or above level 3 on the rubric | 100% of C&I students met the standard (Fall 16) | None needed |

C&I PLO 17: Create professional-quality curriculum documents (SED-CF 4B1)

| | Assessment Plan | Assessment Results |
|--|-----------------|--------------------|
|--|-----------------|--------------------|

| Course Outcome | Key Assessment Description | Where and when the key assessment occurs | Assessment Tool embedded below | Target Value or Benchmark / Previous Results | Assessment Results & Analysis | Action Plan for Improvement |
|----------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | Curriculum Development Project | EDCI 650 EDCI 750 | | 80% of students score at or above level 3 on the rubric | 100% of C&I students met the standard (Fall 16) | None needed |

C&I PLO 18: Read and evaluate research (SED-CF 5A)

| | Assessment Plan | | | | Assessment Results | |
|----------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Course Outcome | Key Assessment Description | Where and when the key assessment occurs | Assessment Tool embedded below | Target Value or Benchmark / Previous Results | Assessment Results & Analysis | Action Plan for Improvement |
| | Autobiographical Curriculum Critique | EDCI 547/ EDCI 747 | | 80% of students score at or above level 3 on the rubric | 100% of students scored at or above level 3 on the rubric | None needed |
| | Final Exam: Article Evaluation | EDFN 505 | | 80% of students score at or above level 3 on the rubric | 100% of students* scored 4 or higher | None needed |
| | Literature Review Evaluation | EDFN 505 | | 80% of students score at or | 95% of students* | None needed |

| | | | | | | |
|--|------------------------------|----------|--|---------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|
| | | | | above level 3 on the rubric | scored 3 or higher | |
| | Research Proposal Evaluation | EDFN 505 | | 80% of students score at or above level 3 on the rubric | 99% of students* scored 3 or higher | None needed |

C&I PLO 19: Conduct research (SED-CF 5B)

| | Assessment Plan | | | | Assessment Results | |
|----------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Course Outcome | Key Assessment Description | Where and when the key assessment occurs | Assessment Tool embedded below | Target Value or Benchmark / Previous Results | Assessment Results & Analysis | Action Plan for Improvement |
| | Chapter 1 Introduction | EDFN 505 | | 80% of students score at or above level 3 on the rubric | 100% of students* scored 4 or higher | None needed |
| | Chapter 3 Methodology | EDFN 505 | | 80% of students score at or above level 3 on the rubric | 100% of students* scored 4 or higher | None needed |

C&I PLO 20: Understand and create curriculum-based assessments closely aligned to curriculum documents, including standards and curriculum guides (SED-CF 5B1)

| | Assessment Plan | | | | Assessment Results | |
|----------------|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Course Outcome | Key Assessment | Where and when the key | Assessment Tool | Target Value or Benchmark / | Assessment Results & Analysis | Action Plan for Improvement |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|----------------------|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| | Description | assessment occurs | embedded below | Previous Results | | |
| | Curriculum Development Project | EDCI 650 EDCI 750 | | 80% of students score at or above level 3 on the rubric | 100% of C&I students met the standard (Fall 16) | None needed |
| | | EDCI 545 EDCI 745 | | 80% of students score at or above level 3 on the rubric | | |

C&I PLO 22: Report research findings (SED-CF 5C)

| | Assessment Plan | | | | Assessment Results | |
|----------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Course Outcome | Key Assessment Description | Where and when the key assessment occurs | Assessment Tool embedded below | Target Value or Benchmark / Previous Results | Assessment Results & Analysis | Action Plan for Improvement |
| | Capstone Project | EDCI 696 | | | | |
| | Doctoral Dissertation Defense | EDCI 899 | Graduate School Rating Form for Dissertation Defenses | 90% of students will successfully defend their dissertations on their first attempt | All 3 PhD students who defended dissertations were successful on their first attempt | None needed |

C&I PLO 23: Demonstrate continuing professional development (SED-CF 6A)

| | Assessment Plan | | | | Assessment Results | |
|----------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Course Outcome | Key Assessment Description | Where and when the key assessment occurs | Assessment Tool embedded below | Target Value or Benchmark / Previous Results | Assessment Results & Analysis | Action Plan for Improvement |
| | Personal and Professional Synthesis | EDFN 500 | | 80% of students score at or above level 3 on the rubric | 80% of students* scored 3 or higher | Unsure of action needed. Need disaggregated data to know if our students are in the 20% of students who did not pass the assessment. |
| | Research Essay – Professional Role | EDRM 505 | | 80% of students score at or above level 3 on the rubric | 100% of students* scored at level 5 | None needed |

C&I PLO 24: Demonstrate ethical behavior in all professional activities (SED-CF 6B)

| | Assessment Plan | | | | Assessment Results | |
|----------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Course Outcome | Key Assessment Description | Where and when the key assessment occurs | Assessment Tool embedded below | Target Value or Benchmark / Previous Results | Assessment Results & Analysis | Action Plan for Improvement |
| | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|----------|--|---------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|
| | Research Ethics Essay | EDRM 505 | | 80% of students score at or above level 3 on the rubric | 100% of students* scored at level 5 | None needed |
|--|-----------------------|----------|--|---------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|

C&I PLO 26: Demonstrate competency in a specific content area (SED-CF 7A)

| | Assessment Plan | | | | Assessment Results | |
|----------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Course Outcome | Key Assessment Description | Where and when the key assessment occurs | Assessment Tool embedded below | Target Value or Benchmark / Previous Results | Assessment Results & Analysis | Action Plan for Improvement |
| | Autobiographical Curriculum Critique | EDCI 547/ EDCI 747 | | 80% of students score at or above level 3 on the rubric | 100% of students scored at or above level 3 on the rubric | None needed |

C&I PLO 28: Understand and discuss curriculum literature appropriate to the candidate's degree level (SED-CF 7B1)

| | Assessment Plan | | | | Assessment Results | |
|----------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Course Outcome | Key Assessment Description | Where and when the key assessment occurs | Assessment Tool embedded below | Target Value or Benchmark / Previous Results | Assessment Results & Analysis | Action Plan for Improvement |
| | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5. Master the vocabulary, concepts, processes, and tasks involved in the Understanding by Design (UBD) approach to curriculum development | Curriculum Development Project | EDCI 650 EDCI 750 | | 80% of students score at or above level 3 on the rubric | 100% of C&I students met the standard (Fall 16) | None needed |
| NA | Comprehensive Examinations | Before Advancement to Candidacy | | 80% of students pass the comprehensive examination on their first attempt | 86% of students passed the comprehensive examinations on the first attempt | None needed. However, we are not satisfied with our comprehensive examination process and have begun (as of Fall 2018) a process of benchmarking best practices for comprehensive examinations. We have voted a proposed revision to the process in order to get earlier measures on students' likelihood of successfully completing their degree. We hope to implement our new process within one year. |

c. Student & Employer Satisfaction

Review Question #10: How successful are program graduates in seeking graduate and professional admission? What is the level of satisfaction among students, alumni, and employers of alumni with the program and its outcomes?

Program graduates are very successful in seeking employment in Christian education (38%), mainly in the Seventh-day Adventist education system (34%), and other Christian education (4%). Additionally, graduates are employed in government level service (4%), the public education sector (27%), and for-profit consulting (4%). Program graduates are primarily fulfilling roles in higher education (38%) or within various levels of leadership within K-12 education (31%). Placement within these roles and range of education sectors indicate a high degree of program success.

[Andrews University alumni survey data](#) provided from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness for curriculum and instruction program alumni surveyed in 2021-2022 were graduates of 2017-2018. University alumni surveys are sent to graduates five-six years after graduation. Alumni indicated an average evaluation of preparation to be 4.75 and Spirituality to be a 4.63 (on a 5 point scale). While the number of responses was low (n=4), the data does indicate a positive level of satisfaction with both curriculum and instruction programs. When students were asked what they felt were the strongest aspects of their program, respondents identified professor modeling of curriculum and instruction theories and practices in their courses, providing examples and experiences to draw from, challenging classes that they loved, and an overall positive and supportive connection cross-culturally and across staff, faculty and students. Areas for improvement were identified as course offerings not being consistent and a lack of mentor program and internships to gain further real world experience. Suggestions were aligned with stated areas of weakness, as well as a desire to socialize and collaborate between departments.

An Alumni Survey sent out by the Curriculum & Instruction program in Summer 2023 and Fall 2024 to graduates of this reporting period did not receive any response. This survey asked for employer information and for graduate permission for the C&I program to contact their employers. Due to the low number of alumni surveys returned, employers were not sent a survey. However, ongoing partnerships with four unions, along with confirmed employment data does indicate a continued desire to hire graduates from curriculum and instruction programs.

Course surveys indicate that both [online](#) and [face-to-face](#) students are “satisfied” to “very satisfied” with their Curriculum & Instruction course experiences.

d. Program Improvement

Review Question #11: How have the above data contributed to decisions for program improvement? What impacts have these evidence-based changes had on student learning and student success?

The above data contributed to decisions for Curriculum and Instruction programs changes and needs. Program improvements fall within two main categories: strategic reduction of degrees and concentrations offered and formalizing comprehensive exam preparation.

First, the EdD was discontinued due to low enrollment. Also the number of concentrations across the C&I programs were reduced due to low enrollment. Rather than deactivating the EdS, it remained open to allow students an alternative route to terminal degree completion. This resulted in one student in this reporting period graduating with a degree rather than becoming an inactive doctoral student.

Second, a review of comprehensive exams took place after the 2020 Fall Yearly Report. A formalized comprehensive course was developed first as a 0 credit course, then in Spring 2024 became a credit-bearing course for all C&I degree programs in order to better prepare students for their comprehensive exams. Students have expressed interest and appreciation for the formalized preparation and practice.

CRITERION 3: FINANCIAL ANALYSIS

1. Cost & Income

Review Question #12: What is the relationship between the cost of the program and its income and how has that been changing over time?

For the reporting period of 2017-2021, [the Curriculum & Instruction programs contributed a net margin of 10%.](#)

The Doctor of Philosophy program has a 13-15% contribution margin, with field-based making slightly more contribution than main campus. This is based on an active enrollment of 7-24 students. The Doctor of Education on the main campus has a contribution margin of 9% based on 2 students. This program has been discontinued due to lack of enrollment. Cost margin analysis is not available for the EdS due to low enrollment.

The Master of Arts program has a contribution margin of 11% for main campus based on 4 students. These students are paying full tuition cost and fees. In contrast, a -31% contribution margin for field-based is based upon 10 students. These students are largely part of memoranda of understanding with four unions (Canadian, Columbia, Atlantic, and Lake) which allows their teachers to attend degree-seeking programs for the tuition cost of \$500 per credit hour paid for by the union and conference. The number of credits generated per year have direct impact upon the contribution margin. Students within this program often take the majority of their credits in the summer, and may take one course for another semester of the school year. However, some of the MA of Curriculum & Instruction students take courses from other programs (the SPED, GDPC, and EDAL) and therefore the number of credits generated may not provide a complete picture of the contribution of our program to the university.

In 2017, The School of Education (then the Department of Teaching, Learning, & Curriculum) had just relocated the MS in Special Education from GDPC in order to grow that program and in 2019 a new masters program, the MA Learning Technologies, was launched. The department and graduate enrollment shifted their recruitment focus to these two programs, resulting in their growth but slowed growth in Curriculum and Instruction programs.

The operating costs for research are currently embedded into the fees for specific courses. There is no cost for on-going laboratory experiences. Currently, there are no external grants associated with the curriculum & instruction programs.

2. Overall Financial Health

Review Question #13: What is the (financial and other) impact of the program on the University and, based on trends, how is that likely to change in the future? How adequate is University support to maintaining the health of the program?

The overall contribution margin of the Curriculum & Instruction programs is 10%. We are a small program that helps to fulfill the denominational and university mission. Adventist education is one of the core three foundational mission pathways. The consequences for discontinuing curriculum and instruction programs would result in elimination of the ability to offer graduate programs as a continued learning site for alumni. There would be a ripple effect in the preparation of Adventist educators at all levels (PK-20), creating a void of highly qualified educators to lead committees across the NAD and around the world.

We provide for NAD professional development for in-service teachers, courses supporting the certification for in-service teachers, advancement of teachers professional knowledge and skills, and advancement of higher education faculty.

When taken into consideration the other graduate programs within our School of Education, along with the undergraduate programs the School of Education has a 36% margin of contribution to the university. Faculty teaching for the curriculum and instruction program also teach for the other School of Education undergraduate programs.

There have been additional recruitment challenges during this reporting period, due to COVID-19, the disenchantment within and for the field of education, and with the expectation that programs take the full responsibility for marketing their graduate programs without a marketing budget. During this time graduate enrollment has experienced a transitional phase that has impacted the enrollment process for students, resulting in lower numbers.

With the plans cited in Criterion 4 as part of the strategic analysis and plan development, we anticipate that the strengthening of the curriculum and instruction programs will increase the number of applications, yield rate, graduations, and skilled individuals providing leadership in the areas of PK-20 curriculum and instruction, resulting in a larger contribution rate for the university.

CRITERION 4: STRATEGIC ANALYSIS

1. Strengths

Review Question #14: Describe the strengths of the program.

The Curriculum & Instruction program has many strengths.

National and international reputation of rigor that includes and expands beyond the Adventist world has attracted diverse candidates from around the world thus fulfilling university mission. EDCI courses offered hybrid have enabled teachers to pursue their graduate degrees through partnerships with four unions within the North American Division. Additionally, hybrid courses have allowed for students to continue working in their places of employment across the United States and Canada while taking their coursework and allowing for field-based practice. Several C&I graduates earned their terminal degree through our program and are faculty at Andrews University.

Highly qualified faculty have taught program courses and students have met program goals. Students during this reporting period indicated that they are “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with their courses- both before and during the height of the COVID-19 pandemic. Faculty were able to facilitate the switch to fully-online courses mid-Fall 2020 without a significant dip in student satisfaction. During this reporting period, the PhD also made a financial contribution to the university (13% main; 15% field-based).

Courses are taught from a distinctly Biblical worldview. Faith and learning is embedded throughout C&I courses as students engage in their course content that integrates current educational topics and issues such as technology, internationalization, the science of reading, cultural responsiveness, and trauma informed educational practices. A unique unpaid internship (for MA students) or fellowship (for EdS & PhD students) have allowed for our C&I students to engage deeper in the topic of trauma-informed educational practices through our School of Education collaboration with the International Center for Trauma Education and Care.

Students and graduates across the curriculum and instruction programs are contributing to scholarship and best practices. Students have engaged in the annual Teaching and Learning Conference, gaining experience in a conference setting alongside other scholars in the field. Students within the MA and EdS program are implementing projects that are positively impacting their field-based contexts. Doctoral students are conducting research, beginning their publication journey, and contributing to scholarship. Graduates are employed across educational sectors and living out the Andrews University call to be world changers within their field.

2. Weakness

Review Question #15: Describe the weaknesses of the program and the plans that are in place to address them.

Curriculum and Instruction programs also have areas of weakness. What is an area of strength for the School of Education both academically and financially becomes an area of weakness for the Curriculum & Instruction programs. Due to the small number of faculty shared with multiple programs students often take multiple courses from the same professor and do not receive a variety of perspectives within the field. Early in this reporting period one faculty was more dedicated to the

teaching of curriculum and instruction courses. Since this professor retired, this has been less of an issue but has increased responsibilities of the remaining faculty. Additionally, online courses outside of EDCI offerings were very difficult to access during this reporting period. Access to online classes improved during COVID, but a lack of hybrid classes remains. This limits the availability to courses and program completion in a timely fashion for both online and face-to-face students. During this reporting period there has also been a lack of graduate resources at the university level for both on-campus and distance populations, leaving the C&I programs at a disadvantage when we cannot provide the needed resources to support our students holistically (writing lab, student success, lack of academic and mental health supports). Distance students prior to COVID also have reported anecdotally that they miss a sense of belonging within their program. They see emails or social media posts about what is happening on-campus. A plan to enhance community amongst and introduce mentorship between C&I program students was developed prior to COVID occurring. Post-COVID students seem pleased with the community found during synchronous classes and have expressed less of a desire and/or less time to connect outside of class. Discussions of exploring a cohort model has been discussed, but does not seem viable given the nature of the partnerships that largely feed C&I programs. Plans, with student input, will be considered during Spring-Fall, 2024.

Within C&I programs there is also an inbuilt weakness of a multiple swing and cross-listed courses utilized for the MA, EdS, and PhD. This has resulted in significant challenges in moving students through from one program to another as they continue their graduate level education. New university policy limiting overlapping courses to 12% (check with Amy) now means that those that complete an MA or EdS in curriculum and instruction cannot go on to the PhD as currently written.

The Master of Arts program has a negative contribution margin (-31%) within the MA program. This is primarily due to a combination of external factors (i.e. the education field at large coming under fire and not attracting as many education professionals into the field or advancement within the field and the direction of the education field itself is heading in. These are further discussed under the “threats” section) and the vast majority of students within this program being union-sponsored, practicing teachers generating a low number of credits as they slowly progress through their program. Additionally, more recent union-sponsored students began to take either the MA Learning Technologies or MS Special Education that are more aligned to the current direction of the education field. This has resulted in a decrease in concentration areas and course choices due to enrollment.

The plan to address these weaknesses in the MA program is to discontinue this program and do a teach out for the remaining students in the program.

The main weakness for the Educational Specialist program is its lack of enrollment. During this reporting period it has been used as an alternative route to successful degree completion for one student and is currently serving another student as they finish their project. As the direction of the field of education continues to shift, the plan is to keep this program as an alternative route for PhD degree completion while exploring the potential of revising the Educational Specialist program to include an emphasis in literacy or mathematics. This is aligned to current educational field employment trends and would provide an opportunity to fulfill the need for educational specialists within the PK-12 field (for which there is consistent, average growth indicated by labor statistics).

In addition to the overall curriculum & instruction program weaknesses indicated in the first paragraph of this section, the Doctorate in Philosophy program has one main area of weakness. International students outside of North America that are self-sponsored PhD students and remain in the United States are not employed in higher education or research. This is primarily due to teacher education programs requiring certification and a minimum of three years of experience in addition to a PhD. Also, these students have families which have assimilated into the US context and do not wish to return to their home country or move to another country in which they could be employed within their field of study. Plans going forward include informing students during the interview portion of their application process and intensive advising of students of this reality throughout their PhD program. Additionally, the small number of faculty teaching across multiple programs and focusing on undergraduate accreditation and redevelopment of the undergraduate programs to meet updates to accreditation requirements, has resulted in decrease in time for active engagement in research and publication.

Data management and reporting have been impacted by faculty and staff transitions both within the School of Education and across the university. Changes and delays in data management platforms influenced the SED to develop a reporting system within the department. Additionally, alumni surveys have had low response numbers and alumni employment data.

3. Opportunities

Review Question #16: Describe the opportunities likely to present themselves to the program in the coming years and the changes and resources necessary to take advantage of them.

There are several opportunities for the curriculum and instruction programs in the upcoming years. There are opportunities to align to current educational trends in order to support growth in the School of Education masters programs, adjust the Educational Specialist program, and rewrite to grow the PhD program.

External factors that may affect the program and demand for its graduates reflect the ongoing challenges within the field of education. Demand for graduates is likely to grow as an increasing amount of those in the field retire or pursue a career outside the field. Data shows a steady average area of growth within educational specialists and a higher than average growth rate for higher education professors. Attracting those that remain in the field of education to pursue their graduate degree while facing unprecedented levels of burnout is a challenge. Programs need to be attractive to adult learners and align with addressing current educational issues.

C&I courses taught within the School of Education have regularly offered hybrid synchronously, with a short adjustment to fully online during the peak of COVID-19. There is an opportunity to explore which courses must remain offered synchronously and the possibility of some courses being offered asynchronously. Balancing international student policy and visa requirements, what technology allows, the needs of the adult learner, and student need for connection and engaged learning, along with mentorship possibilities. Continuous technology upgrades have been and will continue to take place.

Partnership will continue with the NAD unions to teach out the Master of Arts in Curriculum and Instruction and possibly expand as we explore interest in Educational Specialist literacy and/or math areas.

Expand the collaboration within Andrews University and expand partnership with sister institutions around the world to provide the Certificate in College and University Teaching, providing terminal degree opportunities to sister universities that offer masters programs. This would include an emphasis on recruiting these students and marketing the EdS and PhD more broadly to educators within and beyond the Adventist education world.

Additionally, a formalized plan for data management collection and analysis is taking place.

4. Threats

Review Question #17: Describe the threats that may negatively impact the program in the coming years and the changes and resources necessary to mitigate them.

There are a number of threats that may negatively impact the curriculum and instruction programs in the coming years. The field of education has increasingly come under fire in recent years. This has led to a “great resignation” amongst the teaching profession, discouraged people from entering into the profession, and resulted in a significant increase in educational professionals to pursue other careers or retire rather than advance in the education field. The [National Education Association \(2022\)](#) reports that “Educator burnout is... the top issue facing educators right now... with 67% reporting it as a very serious issue and 90% a very serious or somewhat serious issue.” Additionally, “more than half (55%) of [NEA] members say they are more likely to leave or retire from education sooner than planned because of the pandemic, almost double the number saying the same in July 2020. Black and Hispanic educators are more likely to say they are more likely to retire or leave early, which could leave the teaching profession less diverse.” Discussion with NAD, union, and conference representatives indicate that this seems likely that this is also occurring within PK-12 Adventist Education. We are seeing this reality within the field negatively impact demand for MA Curriculum & Instruction, as there are fewer interested in pursuing their masters and those that do showing a shift interest toward other masters degrees (MA Learning Technologies and MS Special Education) that will better equip the remaining teachers to meet the challenges in the field today.

Linked to these realities is a significant threat to the continued viability of the C&I programs- enrollment and number of credits generated resulting in an impact of contribution margin. There has been low enrollment- particularly in the Master of Arts and Educational Specialist programs. Additionally, there has been a low number of credits generated by union-sponsored students’ slow progression through the MA program. Also, across C&I programs courses are required and/or available from other schools or departments. While these courses are necessary for gaining research skills or concentration areas, these credits (and therefore revenue) are being generated for other departments and impact contribution margin. Another threat impacting enrollment may be the number of overlapping cross-listed/swing courses that the Master of Arts, Educational Specialist, and Doctor of Philosophy share [exceeds now the number allowed](#) for students to continue their educational progression and therefore does not allow for students to easily continue from their MA to the EdS or PhD. Additionally, across programs, sister institutions offer the same (La Sierra) programs to the same pool of potential SDA students (insert matrix here) or offer graduate programs in education that allow more focused concentration areas within the education field in general increasing student choice and aligned with the direction of the field of education in general.

Threats to program quality across the C&I programs include: both on-campus and distance students being able to access courses in a timely manner, foundational writing courses and writing support availability to all graduate students, and adequate time for faculty to engage in original research and publications to attract PhD students.

Additionally, there is an opportunity for a formalized plan for data management collection and analysis to take place.

5. Strategic Plan

Review Question #18: What should be the future direction of your program and what steps and resources are necessary to take your program in that direction? How might changes and trends in technology, student demographics, and enrollment impact this direction?

In light of the review questions answered thus far, the School of Education faculty has engaged in deep discussion about the direction in which our Curriculum & Instruction programs should be moving. A plan for data management is being developed. Exit interviews will be conducted, during which current employer information and best ongoing contact information will be shared for future data collection. Yearly surveys will be conducted for current students, alumni, and employers.

We have voted to discontinue the Master of Arts in Curriculum and Instruction. We will engage in a teach out of the current students and direct interested students to the other masters programs offered in the School of Education. Other programs that utilize courses within this program will be notified and a discussion to identify which classes may fulfill the need of the other programs will take place.

Additionally, it has been voted to keep EdS as an exit ramp for the PhD while actively revising the EdS to meet the demand of the field (i.e. literacy and math). This would better align with current educational trends and become a potential feeder for the PhD program. Next steps include meeting with union and public partners to garner their further feedback.

Lastly, it has been voted to rewrite the PhD to more fully meet the changing demand in the field. Benchmarking indicates that this will be a PhD in Education, with various concentration areas allowing for a greater degree of choice and specialization. This will allow the remaining School of Education masters degrees (MA Learning Technologies; MA TESOL; MS Special Education) to be

feeders to the PhD program. Next steps will be to rewrite this program over Summer, 2024 so that the program is active by the time that the cross-listed MA in C&I courses are taught out. Special consideration to the anticipated contribution margin of the program will be given, the continued use of hybrid courses, utilization of the current Certificate in College & University Teaching, and ways in which PhD students can gain experiences in research, teaching, and service while supporting an increase in faculty research, co-teaching with a range of faculty, and coming alongside a variety of service activities. Once updated, an intentional effort will be made to actively recruit for our terminal degrees from sister institutions within the North American Division and around the globe.

In addition, a formalized plan for data management collection and analysis is taking place.

6. Additional Information & Recommendations

Review Question#19: Give any additional information that should be included in the self-study. Describe program recommendations.

C&I programs have consistently been aligned to mission, adapted to changes within the education field at large, and balanced financial responsibility. Flexibility and adaptability focused on continuous improvement based upon feedback from the field/employers of the programs. We realize that data has been a mix of anecdotal data and limited survey data. We are working to improve the data collection process, and potentially expand the scope of the unions and conferences rather than focusing solely on student, alumni, and school employers. Gaining an advisory conversation about what they need, in detail, with regard to preparation for positions and skills. We continue to work in partnerships with the NAD and unions, and look forward to expanding our working relationships with sister institutions worldwide.