

**CAEP Annual Report 2025
Academic Year
2023-2024**

**CAEP Annual Accountability Measures
2025 Report (2023-2024 Cycle)**

**Measure 2 (Initial and Advanced): Satisfaction of employers and stakeholder involvement.
(R4.2|R5.3| RA4.1)**

Initial

In 2024-2025 TPP used qualitative data via interviews as a data collection method to measure satisfaction of employers with initial program completers. Employers of completers who completed the TPP initial program within the years 2018-2024 were invited to participate in the interviews.

In previous cycles a survey was used to measure program impact and teacher effectiveness. The survey instrument was designed to provide measures for CAEP Standard 4 and to provide the TPP with an instrument that would inform continuous improvement.

Most completers are employed in private schools or parochial schools. Thus, the TPP does not have access to state assessment results/employer satisfaction data. The majority of completers are employed in the North American Division of Seventh-day Adventist (NAD) school system.

The TPP has designed their own survey instruments to facilitate measurement and reporting on CAEP Standard 4. Employers responded to closed-ended questions that asked them to rate their satisfaction with completers. Employers were asked to rate impact in 13 specific areas of professional knowledge, skill and disposition aligned to InTASC Core Teaching Standards.

The interviews were added as a method to enhance the understandings provided by the previous survey method employed by the TPP. In the future, the TPP will continue to distribute two surveys (collect data) to measure employer satisfaction with completers. And the TPP will also periodically conduct interviews to enhance the understanding provided by survey data.

Two individual employers participated in the interviews. For anonymity, the participants are described as Employer A, and Employer B. Each interview was conducted separately. With respect to satisfaction with completers, employers were asked: "Do you feel that the teacher education program prepared [Completer] well for teaching?" And employers were asked: "In what ways do you feel the teacher preparation program could have better prepared [Completer] for teaching?"

Responses were collected and analyzed for themes that correspond to CAEP and InTASC Core Teaching Standards. Themes emerged in which employers discussed satisfaction with completers in five standard areas:

1. InTASC 9, 10 - Collaboration with colleagues
2. InTASC 3 - Creating an effective learning environment

3. InTASC 1, 7 - Instructional planning skills
4. InTASC 3 - Managing student behavior
5. CAEP 4.4 - Overall quality of program

Table R4.2a below provides themes and sampled responses that illustrate ways in which employers describe satisfaction with completers in each standard area.

Table R4.2a

Employer Satisfaction with Completers: Themes with Sampled Responses

Standard	Description	Response
InTASC 9, 10	Collaboration with colleagues	Employer A: [The completer] has been working with a mentor in the school. "Veteran teachers would say, yes, she has been prepared for this." Employer A: [The completer] is able to do it, yet [the completer] has found a balance to ask others for opinions and help."
InTASC 3	Creating an effective learning environment	Employer A: "...the way [the completer] organizes [the] classroom."
InTASC 1, 7	Instructional planning skills	Employer A: "I think [the completer] has...self-perseverance...she will dig deeper into lesson plans..."
InTASC 3	Managing student behavior	Employer A: Provide support for classroom management. "...provide scenarios with videos, reenactments, where to go for support"
CAEP 4.4	Overall quality of program	Employer A: "...getting to know [Completer], I'm curious if all teachers come out the same...do all teachers come out with the same...similar work ethic, drive, and passion...?" Employer A: "...I feel like [the completer] was prepared well..." Employer B: "Yes. [the teacher preparation program] is very good...the candidate demonstrates the effectiveness of the program very well." Employer B: I would like to have the same experience" [as with the completer]. This is the quality of teacher that you...are presenting...to the schools. I think you guys are doing a great job."

Satisfaction of Employers with Advanced Level Program Completers (RA4.1)

Educational Leadership (EDAL)

EDAL Employer Survey: While the EDAL program standards are now aligned to National Educational Leadership Preparation (NELP) Standards (2018), this EDAL Employer Survey is aligned to the 2011 ELCC Standards, as the graduates in this data set were enrolled while we were still using the ELCC standards (2011). Thus, the purpose of the survey is to determine how satisfied the employers of our EDAL completers are with our program, and most importantly,

how they perceive the preparation, readiness, and competency of their employees in the areas of content knowledge and skills. The data cycle for these results was administered in spring 2025. Class Climate, an Internet-based survey tool that is used by many entities across Andrews University, was used to gather the data.

The survey uses a 5-point Likert scale (1=Not at All, 2=Somewhat, 3=Satisfactory, 4-Very Well, and 5=Excellent) corresponding to the five levels used by the Andrews University School of Education in its many rubrics.

Data from the 2023-2024 surveys had an 89% response rate (8 out of 9). The work experience of the completers being assessed consisted between 1-3 (25%), 4-7 (12.5%), and 8+ years in school leadership. 7 completers are employed within the Seventh-day Adventist system of Education and 2 are in the public sector.

Findings:

Of the 12 questions aligned to the ELCC standards, 11 out of the 12 had a very well or excellent score (92%) and 1 had a rating of satisfactory (8%). Employers reported that EDAL completers are making impact (satisfactory, very well or above) as educational leaders. Completers are performing satisfactorily, very well, or above level in their schools in the following areas of:

- Promotes continual and sustainable school improvement (ELCC 1.3; av.=4.63)
- School progress and revises school plans supported by school stakeholders (ELCC 1.4; av.=4.5)
- Sustains a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning through collaboration, trust, and a personalized learning environment with high expectations for students (ELCC 2.1; av.=4.63)
- Creates and evaluates a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular and instructional school program (ELCC 2.2; av.=4.63)
- Develops and supervises the instructional and leadership capacity of school staff (ELCC 2.3; av.=4.5)
- Promotes the most effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning in a school environment (ELCC 2.4; av.=4.75).
- Promotes the school-based policies and procedures that protect the welfare and safety of students and staff within the school (ELCC 3.3; av.=4.5)
- Ensures teacher and organizational time focuses on supporting high quality school instruction and student learning (ELCC 3.5; av.=4.63)
- Acts with integrity and fairness to ensure a school system of accountability for every student's academic and social success (ELCC 5.1; av.=4.63)
- Promotes social justice within the school to ensure that individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling (ELCC 5.5.; av.=4.75)
- Advocates for school students, families, and caregivers (ELCC 6.1; av.=4.5)
- Acts to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning in a school environment (ELCC 6.2; av.=4.13)

Analysis

Stakeholder Involvement:

The EDAL program engages stakeholder involvement in the following ways:

- **Employer Surveys (RA.4.1):** Information is sought from employers, and upon review and reflection, substantive feedback is used to improve candidate preparation and course offerings.
- **Internship Mentor & Evaluations (RA.4.1B):** EDAL mentors are surveyed throughout the internship experience to solicit feedback on our candidates. The following forms are used:
 - Mentor's Assessment of Internship Form
 - Supervision/Mentor Evaluation Educational Leadership
 - Candidate Disposition Evaluation

At the conclusion of each internship experience, the forms are reviewed to determine strengths, weaknesses, and suggestions for how to best prepare our candidates in the future.

- **Partners:** Currently we have several SDA Conferences who financially sponsor candidates from their respective districts and regions. Twice a year (Fall and Spring), we meet at the Association of College Deans in Education with our partners to understand how we may best continue to collaborate, and most importantly, how best to meet the needs of the candidates they sponsor.
- **ZOOM Debriefing Sessions:** In the fall and spring of 2023-2024, we conducted ZOOM sessions with our partners to dialog on our mutually beneficial relationship. The area of focus was how best to meet needs in the field when students are employed as well as how we may better prepare our completers.

School Psychology

Stakeholder involvement and feedback is critical to the School of Psychology program's improvement goals. Program stakeholder involvement includes but is not limited to:

- Employer surveys
- Alumni surveys
- Annual candidate disposition forms and evaluation of field experiences
- Regular (weekly and monthly) faculty meetings
- Field supervisor meetings and exit interviews

In the 2023-2024 data set, 1 of 1 (100%) of program completers were employed. Thus, one employer survey was sent out. Employers were asked to rate the effectiveness of the Andrews University school psychology graduate training in all 10 NASP domains. Ratings range from 1 - No training in this area to 5- Training Excellent in this area (See [Artifact 2025SP1](#)).

Survey results indicate that the employer found the training provided by Andrews University school psychology program to be effective, with a mean rating of adequate and approaching exceptional (mean 3.27). Notably, the employer rated the program's effectiveness in preparing students to communicate with family and school staff as excellent with a score of 5.

Furthermore, the responder evaluated the Andrews University school psychology candidate as "just as prepared" (mean = 3) when compared to graduates from other programs. These findings align with previous employer feedback, demonstrating the program's consistent ability to meet

industry standards.

Program data are frequently shared with and discussed among core faculty at monthly meetings and with additional faculty at weekly meetings. The frequency of such meetings allows for constant reflection and immediate changes when necessary. To that end, Alumni and Employer survey results are regularly shared and discussed with faculty. Survey results also serve as affirmations of how strong the program currently is.

Some measures, such as the annual candidate disposition evaluations, are shared with students, and they are invited to provide suggestions for program improvement or respond to disposition ratings. At the end of the internship, interns are also invited to evaluate their field experiences. During the final internship meeting, field supervisors are given the opportunity to provide feedback about the internship experience and make recommendations for future partnerships.

Additional data such as the rate at which completers are hired and employer satisfaction are shared with current students and potential students who apply or interview for acceptance into the program.