

ANDREWS UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

2005-2006

(Leave blank)

TABLE of CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	ii
SECTION 1: ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT OVERVIEW	1
The SED Candidate Assessment System	3
SECTION 2: CANDIDATE ASSESSMENT	8
Unit Report for All Programs	9
Unit Scores on Michigan Test of Teacher Certification (MTTC).....	9
Program Assessment Reports	11
Assessment by Decision Points	16
SECTION 3: FACULTY ASSESSMENT	17
Student Opinion of Teaching	18
Professional Development Assessment	19
Peer Evaluation of Faculty for Advancement	20
SECTION 4: UNIT OPERATIONS ASSESSMENT.....	21
Annual Departmental Reports to Administration	22
Administrative Performance Review	22
Financial Performance of Unit.....	23
Alumni Evaluations of Unit and Programs.....	23
Employer Ratings of Alumni	25
SECTION 5: IMPROVEMENTS RESULTING FROM EVIDENCE.....	27
APPENDICES (Microsoft Access Database).....	28
A. Initial Teacher Certification Programs.....	29
B. Advanced Programs in Curriculum & Instruction	34
C. School Counseling and Special Education Programs	41
D. Educational Administration Programs.....	48

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. School-based Programs in SED.....	2
Table 2. Unit Programs: Candidate Enrollment and Approval Status	4
Table 3. The SED Conceptual Framework.....	6
Table 4. Unit Report on Achievement of Conceptual Framework	10
Table 5. Annual Summary of MTTC Results for Andrews University	11
Table 6. Initial Program Reports: Summary of Unacceptable Teacher Education Assessments.	12
Tables 7 A,B. Advanced Programs: Summary of Unacceptable Assessments.....	13
Table 8. Summary of Candidate Performance at Key Gateway or Decision Points.....	16
Table 9. Student Evaluations of SED Courses and Teachers	20
Table 10. Efficacy Reported by Exiting Student Teachers in Michigan.....	24
Table 11. Alumni Ratings of Preparation in School Counseling.....	26

SECTION 1

ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

OVERVIEW

This Assessment Report is prepared for the academic year, 2005-06, and summarizes the data collected in that year from Summer 2005 through Spring term, 2006, on student learning outcomes and evidences of progress towards goals of completion. It also contains assessment of faculty and the Education unit. The Assessment System used was Assessment System, Version 2.2 as submitted to the National Council on Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) in 2004.

Section 2 focuses on the assessment of School of Education candidates through the use of data on Unit (SED) and program operations. Candidate information was possible for each enrolled person in the School of Education and available to be provided for them individually by their teachers or advisors. Aggregated data appears for candidates in this report in Section 2 under Program Decision Points.

Section 3 of the Report focuses on Faculty assessment through the use of student opinion surveys, professional development assessment and peer evaluations

Section 4 reports on Unit (SED) and program operations. The SED Programs are shown in Table 1 below. The enrollments in programs during 2005-06 and program approval status are shown in Table 2 below. Some programs are approved by NCATE SPA's while others have approval through the Michigan Department of Education (MDE).

Section 5 of this report concludes with a summary of changes and improvements which have resulted from reviews of the various data obtained.

Table 1. School-Based Programs in SED

PROGRAM	TYPE
Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education	Initial Teacher Education
Elementary Certification	Initial Teacher Education
Secondary Certification	Initial Teacher Education
Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) (Elementary and Secondary)	Initial Teacher Education
Curriculum and Instruction (C&I)	Advanced, Continuing Teacher Education
Special Education: Learning Disabilities	Advanced, Other School Personnel
School Psychology	Advanced, Other School Personnel
School Counseling	Advanced, Other School Personnel (Assessment part of CACREP accreditation)
Educational Administration	Advanced, Other School Personnel

SED ASSESSMENT SYSTEM, v 2.2

Assessment of learner outcomes and program improvement are accomplished by a comprehensive system which was successfully presented to NCATE and the State of Michigan during the 2003-2004 academic year. It contains three sections: Candidate Assessment, Faculty Assessment, and Unit Assessment, each of which provide a number of sources of data. Most of the data on Learner Outcomes were fed into a MicroSoft Access software database in 2005-06 which was designed with an extensive report feature. This database was created using the six

Key Elements of the Conceptual Framework and their subsections as organizers, shown in Table 3 below. The SED Conceptual Framework was designed, and has previously been confirmed to be aligned with the 2000 NCATE Standards¹.

Table 2 summarizes the enrollment in the various unit programs during 2005-06 as

Table 2. Unit Programs: Candidate Enrollment and Approval Status

	Dept. Program	Award Level	Elem Cand	Second Cand.	Folio Submitted	Approval by MDE or Other
CAS	Art Education	B	1	3	2004	MDE
CAS	Biology	B		1	2002	MDE
CAS	Chemistry	B			2008	Pending MDE
CAS	Communication	B			2004	MDE
COT	Computer Science	B		1	2002	MDE
SED	Curriculum & Instructn	EdS, D		19	N/A	MDE
SED	Educ. Admin., Superv.	MA, D	13	10	N/A	MDE
CAS	English	B		9	2005	MDE
SED	Elem Education	B MAT	71 12		N/A	MDE
SED	Secondary Education	MAT		9	N/A	
CAS	ESL	M		1	2002	MDE
CAS	History	B	2	7	2001	MDE
SED	Integr. Science	B	1	2	2002	MDE

¹ Board of Education Report. NCATE Accreditation Visit to Andrews University, Nov. 13-14, 2004.

CAS	Language Arts	B	70		2002	MDE
CAS	Lang: French	B			2008	MDE
CAS	Lang: Spanish	B	1	2	2008	MDE
SED	Learning Disabilities	MA	5			MDE
CAS	Math. & Math Ed	B, M		10	2006	MDE
CAS	Music Educ	B, M	3	8	2002	NASM
CAS	Physics	B, M			2002	MDE
SED	Reading	MA			2002	MDE
CAS	Religion	B		1	2004	SDA Church (AAA)
CAS	Sociology	B		1	2007	MDE
SED	School Counseling	MA		8	2006	CACREP
SED	School Psychology	MA, D		17	2002	NASP
SED	Educational Psych.	Doct.		12		CACREP
SED	Counseling Psych.	Doct		21		CACREP
CAS	Sociology	B		1	2007	MDE
CAS	Social Studies	B		2	2001	MDE

Award Levels: B = Bachelors or post-baccalaureate licensing, M = Masters or Ed.S, D = Doctoral programs.

reported in the university's Opening Enrollment Report for 2005-06. The status of approval for the folios developed for these programs is also displayed.

A sample of SED courses were identified in the Assessment Plan to be reviewed for

2005-06². Faculty teaching these courses submitted evaluation reports for entry into the database for 2005-06, using rubrics or scoring tables based on either 3 or 4 levels of performance. However, the SED Faculty voted in January, 2007 to use five (5) levels of performance rather than 3 or 4 to do assessment work. Data provided by faculty in 2005-06 were then adjusted to fit into the appropriate level as they were entered into the Assessment Database.

This report accordingly gives information based on a five-point performance scale: Levels 4 and 5 represent “Target Performance,” meaning Proficient (4) or Exceptional (5) performance of the desired outcome; Level 3 is “Acceptable Performance”, and represents satisfactory mastery of the desired outcome; and Levels 1 and 2 represent “Unacceptable Performance” meaning Unsatisfactory (1) or Emerging (2) performance which does not demonstrate sufficient mastery of the outcome to be acceptable.

In addition, four further Concepts are used by the Department of Teaching, Learning, and Curriculum: VII. Content Knowledge; VIII.. Curriculum Knowledge; IX. Instructional Organization and Management; and X. Use of Assessments. These are used for Program Reports in the Department of Teaching, Learning, and Curriculum.

² Table 4. Three-Year Cycle for Evaluating Assessments. SED Assessment System (Version 2.2). Pg. 32.

Table 3. The SED Conceptual Framework

ELEMENT	SUBSECTION
I. Worldview	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Explain worldviews and trace their historical development• Critique worldviews from a Christian perspective• Integrate principles of a Christian worldview into their chosen field of study.
II. Human Growth and Change	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Describe human development• Apply current theories of learning
III. Groups, Leadership, and Change	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Facilitate change in groups and organizations• Relate effectively with various cultural, racial, and special interest groups• Identify political and legal issues• Manage human, financial, and material resources• Demonstrate servant leadership
IV. Communication and Technology	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Communicate effectively in written, verbal, and non-verbal forms.• Use electronic tools effectively for professional communication, teaching, and research.
V. Research and Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Read and evaluate research• Conduct research• Report research findings
VI. Personal and Professional Growth	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrate continuing professional development• Demonstrate ethical behavior in all professional activities.• Demonstrate balanced physical, mental, spiritual, and social development.

The sources of data were designed to include the following:

- A. Formative Assessment Reports provided to give individual candidates information about their development as teachers and other school personnel.
- B. Decision-Point Reports for giving individual candidates information on their progress in their program. These reports could also be aggregated by type into Decision-Point Reports: Admission to program, Program performance, Internship, Completion of student teaching, Program completion, and Post-graduate followup.
- C. Generic Program Assessment using aggregated data from course-based scoring guides or rubrics.
- D. Class Reports to give instructors information drawn from evaluations made within specific courses.
- E. Specific Assessments based on individual rubrics.

F. The Unit Report which provided evaluation data on achievement of the Conceptual Framework elements for all programs within the School of Education.

Added to these data were evidences relating to Decision Points (admission to program, program performance, internship, completion of student teaching, and program completion).

The unit also collected standardized test scores (Michigan Test for Teacher Certification or MTTC), comprehensive exam results, and alumni and employer survey data.

Assessment of unit and program quality was facilitated by use of the reports which the MicroSoft Access Database could generate.

Unfortunately, the author of the MicroSoft Access software completed his studies at Andrews University and left the campus in 2005. Because of limited programmer Access capacity on-campus, several Reports features of the database could not be utilized. Provision of individual feedback to candidates on personal or class performance was provided by faculty directly and therefore is not included in this report. Departmental discussions of program data occurred in spite of lack of Access reports. However, program and unit faculty minutes show that improvements did occur and these are described in Section 3.

After several unsuccessful efforts to restore its workability, the unit faculty voted in December, 2007 to end the use of the MicroSoft Access database after the 2007-08 academic year and adopted a commercial data management system, LiveText for use, beginning fall, 2008. This change is an example of unit-level improvement based on unit operations evaluation.

SECTION 2:

CANDIDATE ASSESSMENT

UNIT REPORT: ALL PROGRAMS

All assessment data for the School of Education was aggregated into a Unit Report. Data from 67 candidates shown in 31 different assessment tools have been included. The largest data input was connected with communication (Element IV-A), at n=295 entries. The fewest number of data points in unit-wide assessment were in Element I-B, Critiquing worldview, where only 23 responses were recorded. Table 4 below presents this summary report. Level 1 performance (Unacceptable) was present > 5% in four CF Elements: I-A, II-B, III-C, V-B, and VI-B.

UNIT SCORES ON

MICHIGAN TEST FOR TEACHER CERTIFICATION (MTTC)

The results of the Unit's results on the Michigan Test for Teacher Certification (MTTC) for both initial and cumulative candidate attempts is shown in Table 5. A total of 71 candidates were tested of which 58 were initial exam takers. Of these, 81.7 % of the candidates passed. There were 62 in the Cumulative Test category of which 87.3 % passed. The statewide summary of 18,230 candidate attempts showed that 85.7% of initial attempts were successful while 89.8% of cumulative attempts were successful.

Although numbers in individual content areas are small for AU, limiting conclusions, the fields in which AU test takers were below the statewide cumulative pass average in 2005-06 were:

- Integrated Science (Elem.)
- Music Education
- Social Studies
- Spanish
- Visual Arts Education
- Reading.

Table 4. Unit Report on Achievement of Conceptual Framework

Conceptual Framework	N =	% Target Level 3	% Acceptable Level 2	% Unaccept Level 1	Unit Average
I. Worldview					
A. Explain worldviews...	36	61.1	30.6	8.3	2.53
B. Critique from Christian perspective...	23	65.2	34.8	0.0	2.65
C. Integrate principles...	119	79.0	16.8	4.2	2.75
II. Human Growth and Change					
A. Describe human develop.	122	63.9	30.3	5.7	2.58
B. Apply current learning theories	196	59.7	32.1	8.2	2.52
III. Groups, Leadership and Change					
A. Facilitate change in groups & organiz.	142	59.2	37.3	3.5	2.56
B. Relate effectively with various groups	179	62.0	34.6	3.4	2.59
C. Identify political & legal issues	42	54.8	35.7	9.5	2.45
D. Manage human, financial, & material resources	134	58.2	38.8	3.0	2.55
E. Demonstrate servant leadership	85	62.4	36.5	1.2	2.61
IV. Communication and Technology					
A. Communicate effectively...	295	63.7	33.6	2.7	2.61
B. Use electronic tools effectively...	114	55.3	43.0	1.8	2.54
V. Research and Evaluation					
A. Read and evaluate research	73	60.3	35.6	4.1	2.56
B. Conduct research	115	67.8	23.5	8.7	2.59
C. Report research findings		64.5	30.6	4.8	2.60
VI. Personal and Professional Growth					
A. Continuing professional development	146	59.6	36.3	4.1	2.55
B. Ethical behavior in all activities	45	57.8	31.1	11.1	2.47
C. Balanced development	30	66.7	33.3	0.0	2.67
VII. Knowledge of Content Area					
A. Competency in specific content area	9	77.8	22.2	0.0	2.78
B. Knowledge of current issues	NA	NA			
VIII. Curriculum					
A. Understand curriculum literature...	11	45.4	54.5	0.0	2.45
B. Apply curriculum development processes .	21	76.2	23.8	0.0	2.76
C. Apply processes in systems perspective	17	64.7	35.3	0.0	2.65
IX. Organizing Instruction					
A. Frameworks for organizing instructn.	7	42.8	57.1	0.0	2.43
B. Demonstrate repertoire of teaching strategies for all students	13	69.2	30.8	0.0	2.69
C. Use staff development models for change	9	55.6	44.4	0.0	2.56

X. Assessment					
A. Create curriculum-based assessments...	9	77.8	22.2	0.0	2.78
B. Provide formative assess; CQI plans	6	66.7	33.3	0.0	2.67

Table 5. Annual Summary of MTTC Results for Andrews University. Initial and Cumulative by Program.

Program	Total N	Initial N	% Initial Pass	Cumul. N	% Cumul. Pass	Mich N	Mich % Cumul Pass
Content Areas:							
Chemistry	1	0	0	1	100	164	81.1
English	3	3	100	3	100	1254	91.5
History	4	4	100	4	100	932	89.2
Integr. Science (Elem)	1	0	0	0	0	286	82.5
Integr. Science (Sec)	1	1	100	1	100	31	83.5
Lang. Arts (Elem)	14	11	78.6	13	92.9	1270	86.4
Math (Elem)	2	2	100	2	100	475	89.7
Math (Sec)	2	2	100	2	100	473	96.2
French	1	1	100	1	100	73	83.6
Music Education	4	3	75	3	75	227	90.7
Physics	1	1	100	1	100	74	93.2
Political Science	1	1	100	1	100	210	83.8
Social Studies	2	1	50	1	50	1273	78.9
Spanish	2	1	50	1	50	282	84.8
Visual Arts Educ.	2	1	50	1	50	108	93.5
Professional Areas:							
Reading	1	0	0	0	0	147	95.9
Learning Disabled	2	2	100	2	100	591	92.0
Elementary Educ.	27	24	88.9	25	92.6	4267	95.9

PROGRAM REPORTS

Department of Teaching, Learning, and Curriculum

The next two Tables display findings from assessment rubrics submitted for the Department of Teaching, Learning, and Curriculum. Although this department uses four additional Conceptual Framework (CF) measures, Table 6 which displays programs at the Initial Stage, shows only CF measures I-VI. The percent of candidate assessments on a Conceptual Framework item for which more than 5% of the scores fell into the Unacceptable category (Level

1) is displayed. Because in some CF items, about 10% or more of the candidates had

Table 6. Initial Type Program Reports: Summary of Unacceptable Category Assessments

Conceptual Framework	B.S. Elem. Education N = 99	MAT Elem Education	B.A./B.S. Secondary Education	MAT Secondary Education
Number of Candidates Assessed	102	151	99	135
Candidates Averaging Unacceptable Level	3	4	4	5
Number of Assessment Tools Included	20	27	20	25
	Categ 1, %	Categ 1, %	Categ 1, %	Categ 1, %
I. Worldview A. Explain worldviews... B. Critique from Christian perspective... C. Integrate principles...	10.0	10.7	10.0 6.1	13.0
II. Human Growth and Change A. Describe human develop. B. Apply current learning theories	10.4	10.1	9.7	5.7 10.1
III. Groups, Leadership and Change A. Facilitate change in groups & organiz. B. Relate effectively with various groups C. Identify political & legal issues D. Manage human, financial, & material resources E. Demonstrate servant leadership	7.7	9.4	7.7	10.3
IV. Communication and Technology A. Communicate effectively... B. Use electronic tools effectively...				
V. Research and Evaluation A. Read and evaluate research B. Conduct research C. Report research findings	5.1 9.6	5.6 9.1 5.8	6.4 9.6 5.1	8.6 9.4 7.1
VI. Personal and Professional Growth A. Continuing professional development B. Ethical behavior in all activities C. Balanced development (physical, mental, spiritual, and social)	6.0 15.4	5.7 14.7	15.4	16.7

assessments falling into Category 1 (Unacceptable), the following items could appropriately be considered for falling into Category 1 (Unacceptable), the following items could appropriately be considered for faculty attention: CF I-A, CF II-B, CF III-C, CF V-B., and CF VI-B.

Appendix A contains Assessment System printouts with complete data for these Initial programs.

Data for Advanced program levels are displayed in Tables 7A and 7B below. Again, these tables display the number of assessments where candidates had >5% of assessments falling into Category 1 (Unacceptable). The Advanced programs differ widely in curricular requirements. However, the categories of CF I-A, CF II-A, and III-C appear to pose performance difficulties for a number of candidates in most programs.

Appendix B provides database tables for Curriculum and Instruction, and Special Education; Appendix C provides database tables for Educational Administration; and Appendix D contains database tables for School Psychology.

Table 7A. Advanced Type Program Reports: Summary of Unacceptable Category Assessments

Conceptual Framework	Masters C & I	Doctoral C & I	Masters Special Ed.
Number of Candidates Assessed	47	74	92
Candidates Averaging Unacceptable Level	2	2	5
Number of Assessment Tools Included	14	24	21
I. Worldview			
A. Explain worldviews...	9.1	7.0	18.2
B. Critique from Christian perspective...			
C. Integrate principles...	6.2		
II. Human Growth and Change			
A. Describe human develop.	11.1		5.8
B. Apply current learning theories			8.7
III. Groups, Leadership and Change			
A. Facilitate change in groups & organiz.			
B. Relate effectively with various groups			
C. Identify political & legal issues	13.3	7.1	
D. Manage human, financial, & material resources	8.3		
E. Demonstrate servant leadership			
IV. Communication and Technology			
A. Communicate effectively...			
B. Use electronic tools effectively...			
V. Research and Evaluation			
A. Read and evaluate research			9.1
B. Conduct research			10.6
C. Report research findings	7.7		11.1
VI. Personal and Professional Growth			
A. Continuing professional development			
B. Ethical behavior in all activities	7.1		18.8
C. Balanced development			
VII. Knowledge of Content Area			
A. Competency in specific content area			
B. Knowledge of current issues			
VIII. Curriculum			
A. Understand curriculum literature...			
B. Apply curriculum development processes...			
C. Apply processes in systems perspective			
IX. Organizing Instruction			
A. Frameworks for organizing instruction.			
B. Demonstrate repertoire of strategies for all students			
C. Use staff development models for change			
X. Assessment: A. Create curriculum-based assessments...			
B. Provide formative assessment; CQI plans			

**Table 7B. Advanced Type Program Reports, continued.
Summary of Unacceptable Category Assessments.**

Conceptual Framework	Educ Admin Masters	Educ Admin Doctoral	School Psych EdS
Number of Candidates Assessed	36	48	77
Candidates Averaging Unacceptable Level	2	2	3
Number of Assessment Tools Included	14	16	20
I. Worldview			
A. Explain worldviews...	9.1	9.1	6.2
B. Critique from Christian perspective...			
C. Integrate principles...	7.1	6.2	
II. Human Growth and Change			
A. Describe human develop.	12.0	12.0	6.0
B. Apply current learning theories	6.2		8.5
III. Groups, Leadership and Change			
A. Facilitate change in groups & organiz.	7.1	5.6	
B. Relate effectively with various groups			
C. Identify political & legal issues	13.3	13.3	11.1
D. Manage human, financial, & material resources	7.1	6.7	
E. Demonstrate servant leadership			
IV. Communication and Technology			
A. Communicate effectively...			
B. Use electronic tools effectively...			
V. Research and Evaluation			
A. Read and evaluate research	5.9		
B. Conduct research			7.4
C. Report research findings	7.7	7.1	
VI. Personal and Professional Growth			
A. Continuing professional development			
B. Ethical behavior in all activities	7.1	6.7	
C. Balanced development			
VII. Knowledge of Content Area			
A. Competency in specific content area			
B. Knowledge of current issues			
VIII. Curriculum			
A. Understand curriculum literature...			
B. Apply curriculum development processes...			
C. Apply processes in systems perspective			
IX. Organizing Instruction			
A. Frameworks for organizing instruction.			
B. Demonstrate repertoire of strategies for all students			
C. Use staff development models for change			
X. Assessment: A. Create curriculum-based assessments...			
B. Provide formative assessment; CQI plans			

ASSESSMENT BY DECISION POINTS

This section presents the assessments that are used as decision points, or gateways, in each of our school-based programs. These decision points are as follows:

- Admission into the program
- Program performance permitting entry to student teaching
- Completion of student teaching
- Program completion.

Table 8 below presents a summary of the number of candidates and their performance at these gateways for the Conceptual Framework items I through VI. As can be noted, the proportion of candidates who averaged < 2 in ratings on CF items was less than 3% in evaluations at Admission or Program Performance; none of the candidates assessed averaged at this unacceptable rating at either Completion of Student teaching or Completion of Program.

Appendix E contains the Assessment System printouts on Decision Points.

Table 8. Summary of Candidate Performance at Key Gateways or Decision Points

Measure	Admission to Program	Program Performance	Completion Student Teach.	Program Completion
Number of assessments	147	122	4	4
No. Candidates < 2 Average	3 (2%)	3 (2.4%)	0	0
No. Candidates with at least 1 Level 1 assess.	9 (6.1%)	8 (6.6%)	0	0

SECTION 3:
FACULTY ASSESSMENT

STUDENT OPINION OF TEACHING

At the conclusion of each course, all students in the university are invited to evaluate faculty performance through the use of the university Student Opinion of Teaching which seeks feedback on the instructor's pedagogy and the value of the course. Table 9 presents the Unit mean vs. the University Mean for selected questions on student evaluations in the Fall, 2005 and Spring, 2006. The highest mean scores were for instructor enthusiasm and instructor respect for all people and other points of view. Mean scores in the lower group were connected to opinions about exam fairness, course presentation ("the way this course was taught helped me to learn"), course development of clear thinking, and overall instructor's teaching effectiveness. Overall, the unit's courses in 2005-06 were rated slightly lower compared to the unit's data in 2004-05, and about the same as the University mean rating for 2004-05.

Undergraduate students are also given the opportunity by the Student Success Office to evaluate his or her faculty advisor each year. Results may be requested from that office by individual faculty. Because nearly all undergraduate advising is done by the content departments in Arts and Sciences, during 2005-06, only two advisors (from the Department of Teaching Learning, and Curriculum) were evaluated. On a Likert agreement scale, where 5 = Strongly Agree, the mean ratings were 4.04 and 4.52.

Table 9. Student Evaluations of SED Courses and Teachers

Selected Evaluation Statements: 2005-06	Unit Mean Fall, 2005 n=337	Unit Mean, Spring³ 2006 n=291	Unit Mean (Norm) 2004-05	Univ. Mean (Norm) 2004-05
The course was organized to accomplish the course objectives	4.20	4.28	4.38	4.32
The course was challenging intellectually.	4.23	4.17	4.28	4.28
Examinations and other methods of evaluation were fair and accurate measures of my learning.	4.04	4.12	4.20	4.13
The instructor was enthusiastic about the subject matter	4.52	4.60	4.62	4.55
Christian concepts were integrated into the course effectively.	4.24	4.26	4.36	4.37
The instructor motivated me to learn.	4.14	4.18	4.28	4.16
The way this course was taught helped me to learn.	4.04	4.12	4.19	4.08
The instructor was respectful of all people and other points of view.	4.45	4.42	4.51	4.45
This course helped me think clearly.	4.04	4.16	4.18	4.10
This course helped me communicate effectively.	4.06	4.15	4.18	4.03
This course helped me to respect gender and cultural diversity	4.32	4.27	4.26	4.14
I gained a good understanding of the concepts and principles taught in this course.	4.20	4.53	4.37	4.23
Independent of the course, my overall rating of this instructor's teaching effectiveness is:	3.92	4.09	4.19	4.07

A five-point Likert scale was used where 5 = Strongly Agree and 1 = Strongly Disagree.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSESSMENT

Each faculty member prepares materials annually for the Faculty Annual Report. This document contains four sections: (1) The Annual Professional Evaluation, showing goals for the past year, achievement of such goals, and plan for the coming year; (2) the current professional

³ An initial attempt to collect student feedback by on-line survey began in Spring, 2006 in a few classes. This on-line data for 39 students is not included here.

resume; (3) the Annual Faculty Activity Report; and (4) if appropriate, the Graduate Faculty Status Review. The document is discussed with the chair of the department who endorses it with comments, and the completed forms are submitted to the Dean of SED and with the Dean's endorsement to the office of the Chief Academic Officer and Human Resources. During 2005-06, there were 24 SED Faculty who received this annual review with satisfactory outcomes.

PEER EVALUATION OF FACULTY FOR ADVANCEMENT

Peer evaluation of faculty is done through the process of review for advancement by rank promotion and continuous appointment (a.k.a. tenure). This is a centralized process which was substantively revised during 2002-2004. Dr. Jerome Thayer representing SED served as a member of a Criteria Task Force appointed by the Vice-President for Academic Administration and played a major role in building a philosophical framework for the process, which was approved by vote of the General Faculty in the spring, 2004. The process requires a choice of Faculty Advancement Plan which is reviewed by SED faculty with the Department Chair at the time of the Annual Faculty Professional Evaluation. When the individual faculty member meets the requirements for readiness to apply for promotion or continuous appointment, he or she completes the Faculty Member Self-Appraisal Form as a professional portfolio. During 2005-06 no SED faculty applied for promotion or continuous appointment.

SECTION 4:
UNIT OPERATIONS ASSESSMENT

ANNUAL DEPARTMENTAL REPORTS TO ADMINISTRATION

At the conclusion of the academic year, the Dean of the Unit submits to academic administration a comprehensive report on the School of Education and its Departments. This report includes summary data about candidates enrolled, departmental organization, faculty work loads, success of graduates, curricular changes, assessment of learner outcomes (forwarded to the university Office of Assessment), faculty scholarly and professional activities & achievements, efforts to improve teaching strategies, and departmental/school needs. This report was submitted in 2006 by Educational Psychology and Counseling for Community Counseling and School Counseling.

A Graduate Survey was used to assess program graduates in School Counseling who had completed in the Class of 2004 (n=5) and the Class of 2006 (n=3). On the fifteen MA in School Counseling program objectives, 100% of the graduates stated their preparation was average or better with the exception for the ability to provide multicultural counseling. Only half of the 2006 graduates and 80% of the 2004 graduates thought their multicultural knowledge was this good. In the 2004 class, 60% had joined a professional association showing evidence of commitment to professional development (objective #12) and 80% had passed the National Counselor Examination, thus becoming licensed counselors.

ADMINISTRATIVE PERFORMANCE REVIEW

The Dean of the School of Education receives an annual performance review from the Chief Academic Officer. In this review, the dean's leadership objectives for the unit and their achievement are reviewed, and plans for the coming year are discussed. This review frequently

contains an emphasis on fiscal and strategic planning for the unit. This annual review was conducted in 2005-06 with a new instrument which contained specific administrative performance indicators, modified from a tool created by the Office of Human Resources for administrative evaluation. The findings were highly positive for the Dean of the unit.

FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE

The SED Dean participates, through membership in the university Budget Committee and Financial Management Committee, in discussions regarding the setting and monitoring of unit budget targets and performance. Unit requests for a reduced unit “contributions” target was also given consideration and some adjustment. There were three unfilled budget lines considered, two of which were cared for by successful faculty searches and hires and one which was covered by course contracts pending continued searches.

ALUMNI EVALUATIONS

Obtaining information from alumni and employers is a responsibility of the individual programs. During 2005-06, the Departments of Teaching, Learning, and Curricula (TLC) and Educational Psychology & Counseling (EPC) obtained information about their alumni. The results are summarized below.

Department of Teaching, Learning, and Curriculum The results of the Michigan Department of Education survey of exiting student teachers are the data used. The 2005-06 results for Andrews compared with the total state respondents are shown in Table 10 below. In nearly every factor, proportionately more Andrews University alumni reported efficacy than statewide. In two

factors, the difference is noteworthy: Teaching for ALL students (93% AU vs. 81% Mich) and Pedagogy Certificate-Specific (95% AU vs. 84% Mich).

Table 10. Efficacy Reported by Exiting Student Teachers in Michigan: 2005-06

Efficacy = Percentage of exiting student teachers who reported they were well or highly prepared in the program elements.

Efficacy Factors	Andrews University	Total Michigan Graduates
	N = 25	N = 6492
Literacy Support	95	88
Liberal Arts	99	93
Teaching for ALL Students	93	81
Subject Matter	98	97
Organizing for Student Learning	99	95
Managing Professional Learning	99	93
Strategic Partnerships	97	89
Technology	95	90
Pedagogy (Certificate-Specific)	95	84

Educational Psychology and School Counseling. A survey of the Ed.S alumni in School Psychology was conducted in the fall, 2006 for the two preceding years, 2004-05 and 2005-06. Ten alumni responded. Table 11 below presents the findings on the 11 competencies evaluated.

All of the mean competency scores exceeded 3 (Prepared Me Adequately). Only one sub-category, “Contribution to prevention programs” within the domain “Prevention, Crisis Intervention, and Mental Health” was below 3 (rating 2.80).

EMPLOYER RATINGS OF ALUMNI

Another source of assessment information comes from evaluations by employers. In 2005-06, the ECP Department obtained feedback from 4 employers of alumni from 2004-05 and 2005-06. For all domains, the mean ratings exceeded 4, on a 5 point scale, where 4 = Prepared Employee Well. In only one sub-category, “Understanding of school settings and systems” within the domain “School and Systems Organization” was the mean rating at 3.67, still in Prepared Employee Adequately.

Table 11. Alumni Ratings of Preparation in School Counseling Competencies

Competencies Matched to NASP Domains	2004-2006 Alumni N = 10
Data-based Decision-Making and Accountability	3.83
Consultation and Collaboration	4.15
Effective Instruction and Development of Cognitive Academic Skills	3.48
Socialization and Development of Life Skills	3.43
Student Diversity in Development and Learning	3.88
School and Systems Organization, Policy Development and Climate	3.38
Prevention, Crisis Intervention, and Mental Health	3.50

Home/School/Community Collaboration	3.53
Research and Program Evaluation	3.73
School Psychology Practice and Development	3.86
Informational Technology	3.35

A 5 point rating scale was used: 1 = Prepared Me Poorly; 5 = Prepared Me Very Well

SECTION 5:

IMPROVEMENTS RESULTING FROM EVIDENCE

A review of departmental minutes in TLC and EPC reveal that changes were made during and after 2005-06 by faculty to improve programs on the basis of faculty observations and feedback from students. The major changes are summarized below. Minutes for Leadership and Educational Administration departmental meetings were not available during 2006. However, in April, 2007, the program voted to hire a consultant on a contract basis to assist in preparing a consolidated departmental assessment program, including interviewing EDAL graduates. The needs for assessment improvement were discussed later that month with the Provost. Throughout 2007, LEAD minutes show that multiple occasions when assessment rubrics and methods were discussed by the faculty.

DEPARTMENT OF TEACHING, LEARNING, AND CURRICULUM (TLC)

The department made minor revisions in the assessment rubric for the Portfolio, as displayed in the Portfolio Handbook. After discussion, a faculty proposal to make changes in the MA in Education to a Master of Education for use at Spicer College extension site was adopted. Appropriate plans were made to orient the incoming Director of Teacher Education to the First Days of School experience by the presence and assistance of the exiting Director.

APPENDIX A

INITIAL TEACHER CERTIFICATION PROGRAMS

APPENDIX B

**ADVANCED PROGRAMS IN CURRICULUM
& INSTRUCTION**

APPENDIX C

EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION PROGRAMS

APPENDIX D

SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY and SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

