

**ANDREWS UNIVERSITY**  
**SCHOOL OF EDUCATION**

**ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT**

**2007-2008**

(Leave blank)

## TABLE of CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES .....	i
SECTION 1: ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT OVERVIEW .....	1
The SED Candidate Assessment System .....	3
SECTION 2: CANDIDATE ASSESSMENT .....	8
Unit Report for All Candidates .....	9
Unit Scores on Michigan Test of Teacher Certification (MTTC).....	9
Program Assessment Reports .....	11
Assessment by Gateway Points .....	13
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
SECTION 5: IMPROVEMENTS FROM EVIDENCE.....	23
APPENDICES (Microsoft Access Database)	
A. Teaching, Learning, and Curriculum (Initial and Advanced) Programs .....	28
B. School Counseling and Special Education Programs .....	40

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. School-based Programs in SED.....	3
Table 2. Unit Programs: Candidate Enrollment and Approval Status .....	3
Table 3. The SED Conceptual Framework.....	6
Table 4. Unit Performance Scores: State of Michigan .....	8
Table 5. Annual Summary of MTTC Results for Andrews University .....	10
Table 6. Course Grade Categories: Assessment Rating Scale.....	11
Table 7. Summary of Course Grade Evidences by CAS Departments: 2007-08.....	11
Table 8. Outcomes of EDTE 408. Principles of Teaching & Learning. ....	12
Table 9. Outcomes of EDTE 424. Classroom Testing and Evaluation .....	12
Table 10. Outcomes of EDTE 480. First Days of School. Test Creation Project Rubric.....	13
Table 11. Outcomes of EDFN 500. Philosophical Foundation. Synthesis Paper Rubric.....	13
Table 12. Outcomes of EDPC 514. Psychology of Learning. World View Rubric .....	14
Table 13. Outcomes of EDPC 515. Psychological Development – Growth Years .....	14
Table 14. Outcomes of EDPC 540. Behavioral and Emotional Problems of Children.....	15
Table 15. Outcomes of EDRM 710. Seminar in Research Methodology.....	15
Table 16. Student Evaluations of SED Courses and Teachers: 2007-08.....	19

**SECTION 1**

**ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT**

**OVERVIEW**

This Assessment Report is prepared for the academic year, 2007-08, and summarizes the data collected from Summer Semester 2007 through Spring Semester 2008, 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 adapted from the unit's assessment system approved in 2004 by the National Council on Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). However, influenced by recent changes in NCATE reporting directions, it was streamlined and downsized. The intent was to collect key data which would represent Year 1 for the self-study data required for the NCATE review in the fall of 2011.

Section 2 focuses on the assessment of School of Education candidates through the use of aggregated data from course rubrics, course grades, and program Gateway Points (gateways).

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 program operations. The SED Programs are shown in Table 1 below. The enrollments in programs during 2007-08 and program approval status are shown in Table 2 below, as reported in the university's Opening Enrollment Report for 2007-08.

Approval for some programs is in transition from the content folio approval of the Michigan Department of Education to Specialized Professional Associations (SPAs) who collaborate with NCATE in program recognition and approval. Beginning in 2007-08 data on content knowledge for required courses in the College of Arts and Sciences are included in this report.

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**

<b>PROGRAM</b>	<b>TYPE</b>
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. NASP approved.
School Counseling	Advanced, Other School Personnel (Assessment part of CACREP accreditation)
Educational Administration	Advanced, Other School Personnel

**Table 2. Unit Programs 2007-08: Candidate Enrollment and Approval Status**

	<b>Dept. Program</b>	<b>Award Level</b>	<b>Elemen. Cand</b>	<b>Secondary Cand.</b>	<b>Approval by MDE or Other</b>
CAS	Art Education	B	1	2	MDE, 2004
CAS	Biology	B			MDE, 2007
CAS	Chemistry	B			MDE, 2009
CAS	Communication	B		2	MDE, 2004
COT	Computer Science	B			MDE, 2007
SED	Curriculum & Instructn	EdS, D		16	N/A
SED	Educ. Admin., Supervision	MA D		1 7	MDE, pending
CAS	English	B		8	MDE, 2005
SED	Elem Education	B MAT	45 11		MDE, pending
SED	Secondary Education	MAT		6	See content areas
CAS	ESL	M		2	MDE, 2007

CAS	History	B	2	6	MDE, 2008
SED	Integr. Science	B		2	MDE, 2007, 2008
CAS	Language Arts	B	51		MDE, 2002
CAS	Lang: French	B			MDE, 2008
CAS	Lang: Spanish	B		4	MDE, 2008
SED	Learning Disabilities	MA		1	MDE, 2004
CAS	Math. & Math Ed	B, M		16	MDE, 2006
CAS	Music Educ	B, M		26	NASM
CAS	Physics	B, M			MDE, 2007
CAS	Political Science	B			MDE, 2009
SED	Reading	MA			MDE, 2002
CAS	Religion	B		5	SDA Church (AAA)
SED	School Counseling	MA		4	CACREP
SED	School Psychology	MA, D		20	NASP, 2008
SED	Educational Psych.	Doct.		14	CACREP
SED	Counseling Psych.	Doct		12	CACREP
CAS	Sociology	B			MDE, discontinuing
CAS	Social Studies	B		5	MDE

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

### **SED ASSESSMENT SYSTEM, v 2.2**

Assessment of learner outcomes and program improvement are accomplished by a comprehensive system which is based on the Assessment Plan, v. 2.2 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. The learner outcomes are aligned with both the

SED Conceptual Framework (CF) and NCATE requirements.

Between 2005-06 and 2007-08, most of the unit and course data on Learner Outcomes were fed into a Microsoft Access software database which was designed with an extensive report feature. However, increasing difficulties with using this Access database, which prevented data from being entered and retrieved during these years, led to a decision by the unit's NCATE Steering Committee in December 2007 to change management systems. The commercial software system, LiveText, was adopted and plans made to fully implement it in the fall of 2008. In order to gain access to assessment data needed for Year 1, data for 2007-08 was entered on a post-hoc basis into LiveText and is presented here from the LiveText system. The decision to change to LiveText's data management system is an example of unit-level improvement stimulated by unit operations evaluation. Further information about the process used is in Section 4.

This report gives evaluation 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.

The database uses the six Key Elements of the Conceptual Framework and their subsections as organizers, shown in Table 3 below. 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.

The transition demanded extensive faculty training along with collaborative planning with the faculty who provide content instruction in the College of Arts and Sciences.

**Table 3. THE SED CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK**

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

The sources of data include the following:

- A. Formative and summative data by student which are available to provide students feedback on their progress. Because of the transition to LiveText, such feedback was probably not systematic because data was entered on a post-hoc basis.
- B. Key assessment rubrics which provide evidences for mastery of NCATE or SPA required competencies.
- C. Program gateway information which provide evidences relating to Gateway 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.

**SECTION 2:**

**CANDIDATE ASSESSMENT**

## UNIT REPORT: ALL PROGRAMS

For 2007-08, unit-level data on proficiencies achieved in the elements of the Conceptual Framework was not available. It could not be retrieved from the previous Microsoft Access database, and the LiveText C-1 version had not yet been adapted for such collective reporting. A review of the course rubrics submitted with data for 2007-08 showed that nearly all of these rubrics contained evaluations of the Conceptual Framework elements.

## UNIT PERFORMANCE SCORES: STATE OF MICHIGAN

Each year the 32 institutions in Michigan who have teacher education programs are evaluated with multiple performance indicators and are ranked by the State Board of Education. A total of 70 points is possible. For the second year in a row, the Andrews University SED received a perfect score (70/70 pts) for 2007-08. In the previous year (2006-07), the unit was ranked the top school of the state. Table 4 shows the details of the 2007-08 rating.

Table 4. Unit Performance Score for Academic Year 2007-08.

Overall Score	MTTC 30 pts	Teacher Exit Surveys 5 pts	Supervs Surveys 5 pts	Program Compln Rate 10 pts	Progra m Review Status 10 pts	Diversit y 5 pts	High Need Content 5 pts	Principl Feedbk Recvd
Pts = 70	30	5	5	10	10	5	5	Yes
Percent	93%	92%	92%	100%	100%	46%	42%	Yes

## 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 in 2007-2008 are shown in Table 5. A total of

58 candidates were tested of which 58 were initial exam takers. Of these, 87.9% of the candidates passed on their initial try. In the Cumulative Test category, 54 passed, representing 93.1%. The fields in which less than 100% pass rate was achieved were:

- Computer Science
- Elementary Education
- Integrated Science (Elem.)
- Lang Art (Elem)
- Reading
- Social Studies

## **PROGRAM REPORTS**

### Department of Teaching, Learning, and Curriculum

In addition to scores on the MTTC, one of the indicators of cognitive knowledge is course grades in content courses. Beginning in the fall of 2008, all SPA organizations will permit course grades to be submitted for evaluation of content knowledge. The courses taught in the content departments of the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) which all teacher education students must take have been identified as core courses. Data obtained from the Banner student information system for these CAS undergraduate courses were entered into LiveText. The unit faculty voted to categorize course grades into 5 levels as shown in Table 6. Table 7 presents a summary, by CAS department, of the proportion of students whose undergraduate required class grades were considered Levels 3-5 (satisfactory).

**Table 5. ANNUAL SUMMARY OF MTTC CONTENT AREA RESULTS.  
For Andrews University. Initial and Cumulative by Program.**

	2007-08 Only	2007-08	2007-08	2007-08	2005- 2008 A.U.	2005-200 8 A.U.	2005-2008 Michigan Statewide
<b>Program</b>	<b>InitialN</b>	<b>% Pass</b>	<b>Cumul N</b>	<b>% Cum Pass</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>% Pass</b>	<b>% Pass</b>
<b>Content Areas:</b>							
Behavioral Science	0	0			1	100	73.5
Biology	0	0			1	100	87.8
Chemistry	0	0			3	100	86.2
Computer Science	1	0	1	100.0	1	100	90.4
English	4	100.0	4	100.0	8	100	94.7
French	1	100.0	1	100.0	3	100	80.2
History	6	100.0	6		11	100	92.2
Integr. Science	1	0	1	100.0	2	50	83.2
(Elem)	0	0			1	100	87.8
Integr. Science (Sec)	6	83.3	5	83.3	29	89.7	
Lang. Arts (Elem)	3	100	3	100.0	7	85.7	
Math (Elem)	1	100	1	100.0	4	100	96.6
Math (Sec)	0				3	100	100
Music	2	100	2	100.0	10	90	96.6
Music Education	1	100	1	100.0	2	100	94.7
Physics	0	0			1	100	88.5
Political Science	0				2	100	82.8
Science	9	77.8	7	77.8	16	75	82.6
Social Studies	4	100.0	1		10	90	89.5
Spanish	0	0			4	100	96.2
Visual Arts Educ.							
<b>Professional Areas:</b>	4	75	3	100.0	6	86.3	93.7
Reading	0	0			6	100	97.3
Learning Disabled							
<b>Elementary Educ.</b>	14	92.9	13	92.9	57	98.2	98.2
<b>All Tests</b>	58	87.9	54	93.1	189	93.1	92.9 (n=44,741)

**Table 6. COURSE GRADE CATEGORIES: ASSESSMENT RATING SCALE**

<b>Undergraduate &amp; MAT Programs</b>		<b>Graduate Programs</b>	
<b>Grades</b>	<b>Level</b>	<b>Grades</b>	<b>Level</b>
F, D, & C-	1	Same	
C	2	C+, C	2
C+ & B-	3	B-, B and B+	3
B and B+	4	A-	4
A- and A	5	A	5

**Table 7. SUMMARY OF COURSE GRADE EVIDENCES<sup>1</sup> BY CAS DEPARTMENTS**

<b>Department</b>	<b>Students N =</b>	<b>% Grades Levels 3-5</b>
Art Education	8	87.5
Biology	5	0.0
Chemistry	4	75.0
Communication Ed	4	100.0
English	39	97.4
Geography	20	100.0
History	59	79.7
Physics	4	100.0
Political Science	16	81.2
Mathematics	25	60.0

Tables 8-11 display findings from assessment rubrics submitted for the initial and advanced teacher education programs of the Department of Teaching, Learning, and Curriculum.

---

<sup>1</sup> Acceptable grades were undergraduate CAS grades with C+ or better on courses required of all elementary or secondary teacher education students.

**Table 8. OUTCOMES OF EDTE 408. PRINCIPLES OF TEACHING & LEARNING**

<b>Selected Teacher Education Portfolio Rubrics</b>	<b>All Terms N=25</b>	<b>% Below Level 3</b>
Microteaching Rubric (N=11)	4.46	9.1
Element I: Worldview	3.92	12.5
Element III. Groups, Leadership, & Change	3.94	8.0
Element IV. Communication & Technology	3.95	12.5
Element VI. Personal and Professional Growth	4.00	8.0

**Table 9. OUTCOMES OF EDTE 424. CLASSROOM TESTING & EVALUATION**

<b>Rubric Elements</b>	<b>All Terms N=28</b>
Appropriate Topic	4.96
General Instructional Objective	4.29
Specific Objectives or Subject Topics	4.07
Specifications Table: Appropriate Outcomes	4.32
Specifications Table: Emphasis & Distribution of Questions	4.29
Test Instructions	4.79
Questions: Multiple-Choice	4.96
Questions: T/F, Matching, Interpretive Exercise	4.93
Questions: Short item	4.96
Questions: Essay	5.0
Performance/Alternative Assessment	5.0
Rubric: Performance/Alternative Assessment	4.86
Spelling, Grammar, etc.	4.64
Formatting of Test	4.57
Scoring Key	4.71
Bibliography	4.86
<b>Course Mean</b>	<b>4.70</b>
<b>% below Level 3</b>	<b>0%</b>

**Table 10. OUTCOMES OF EDTE 480. FIRST DAYS OF SCHOOL. TEST CREATION PROJECT RUBRIC**

<b>Rubric Elements</b>	<b>All Terms Mean N=18</b>
Scope (A)	4.83
Scope (B)	4.72
Substance (A)	4.72
Substance (B)	4.67
Substance (C)	4.33
Writing (A)	4.22
Writing (B)	4.61
Writing (C)	4.89
<b>Course Mean</b>	<b>4.62</b>
<b>% below Level 3</b>	<b>0%</b>

**Table 11. OUTCOMES FOR EDFN 500 PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATIONS: SYNTHESIS PAPER RUBRIC**

<b>Rubric Elements</b>	<b>All Terms Mean N=44</b>
Analysis of personal worldview (WV) using a philosophical, worldview, or narrative framework	4.19
Rationale for chosen WV given other options	3.91
Strengths and challenges of the chosen WV	3.38
Areas in which WV needs further development & strengthening	3.62
Implications of WV for chosen field of study and professional life	4.06
Implications of WV for understanding and relating to diversity	3.6
Well-presented document applying AU standards for written work and assignments	3.74
Summary sheet appropriate for inclusion in a portfolio for job search	2
<b>Course Average</b>	<b>3.56</b>

Spreadsheets giving complete data for all these TLC courses are found in Appendix A.

Department of Educational and Counseling Psychology (EDPC).

Assessment data for the advanced programs in this department are found in Tables 12-15.

The department submitted the first application for Specialized Professional Association (SPA) recognition in the fall, 2007 to the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP). The School Psychology program was approved by NASP in the spring of 2008.

**Table 12. OUTCOMES OF EDPC 514. PSYCHOLOGY OF LEARNING**

<b>World View Paper Rubric Elements</b>	<b>Summer &amp; Fall 2007 N=33</b>	<b>No. Students Below Level 3</b>
Thesis Statement	4.33	3
Flow	4.33	3
Content Coverage	4.33	3
Clarity	4.30	3
Grammar and Mechanics	4.27	3
<b>Course Average</b>	<b>4.31</b>	<b>3 or 9.1%</b>

**Table 13. OUTCOMES OF EDPC 515. PSYCH. DEVELOPMENT – GROWTH YEARS**

<b>Paper Rubric Elements</b>	<b>All Terms Mean N=12</b>	<b>No. Students Below Level 3</b>
Peer Review Articles	4.62	1
Research Review Format	4.69	1
Introduction	4.54	0
Review of Sources	3.0	3
Conclusion/Summary	3.85	2
Own Words	4.54	1
Connections & Transitions	3.62	4
APA Style	3.77	4

Course Average	4.31	4 or 33.3%
----------------	------	------------

**Table 14 OUTCOMES OF EDPC 540. BEHAVIORAL & EMOTIONAL PROBLEMS OF CHILDREN.**

Resource Notebook Grading Rubric Elements	All Terms Mean N=10	No. Students Below Level 3
Element 1	3.8	0
Element 2	4.6	0
Element 3	4.1	0
Element 4	3.8	1
Element 5	3.9	0
Element 6	3.3	3
Element 7	3.5	2
Element 8	4.2	0
Element 9	3.8	1
<b>Course Average</b>	<b>4.31</b>	<b>3 or 33.3%</b>

**Table 15. OUTCOMES OF EDRM 710. SEMINAR IN RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

Proposal's Evaluation Sheet Rubric Elements	Summer & Fall 2007 N=10	No. Students Below Level 3
Indication of purpose	4.9	0
Defined criteria for selection of sources	4.8	0
Literature are relevant to the problem	4.5	0
Primary literature emphasized	3.8	0
Quotation format/references	5.0	0
Complete bibliographic data	4.8	0
Logical organization of the content	3.89	0

Comparison and contrast of studies	4.1	0
Major studies discussed in detail	3.7	0
Interpretation and understanding of prior research	4.3	0
Methodological analyses appropriate for sustaining design	4.1	0
Establish the importance and significance of the study.	4.6	0
<b>Course Average</b>	<b>4.37</b>	<b>0%</b>

Spreadsheets giving data for EDPC and EDRM assessments are found in Appendix B.

### ASSESSMENT BY GATEWAY POINTS

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

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

For programs which provide advanced instruction to candidates in curriculum & instruction, school administration, or school counseling, the Gateway points are as follows:

- Admission into the program
- Progress Point #1 permitting entry into clinical or practica experiences
- Progress Point #2 at completion of clinical or practica
- Program completion

Because the LiveText program was not yet implemented for 2007-2008, data for the Gateway progress was not available.

**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 14 presents the Unit Mean vs. the University Mean for selected questions on student evaluations in Summer and Fall Semesters 2007 and Spring Semester 2008. The highest mean scores in all terms were for instructor enthusiasm and instructor respect for all people and other points of view. When compared to the 2004-05 Unit Mean or to the University Mean, no consistent trend emerges for results in 2007-08.

Undergraduate students are also given the opportunity by the Student Success Office to evaluate their 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 2007-08, only four advisors (from the Department of Teaching Learning, and Curriculum) were evaluated. On a Likert agreement scale, where 5 = Strongly Agree, the mean ratings for these four advisors was 3.31, 4.62, 4.85, and 4.81 for an overall average of 4.40. The mean for all undergraduates for 2007-08 was 4.48.

**Table 16. STUDENT EVALUATIONS OF SED COURSES & TEACHERS, 2007-08**

<b>Selected Evaluation Statements:</b>	<b>Unit Mean Summer 2007 n=209</b>	<b>Unit Mean Fall 2007 n=344</b>	<b>Unit Mean, Spring 2008 n=256</b>	<b>Unit Mean (Norm) 2004-05</b>	<b>Univ. Mean (Norm) 2004-05</b>
The course was organized to accomplish the course objectives	4.49	4.38	4.30	4.38	4.32
The course was challenging intellectually.	4.37	4.16	4.32	4.28	4.28
Examinations and other methods of evaluation were fair and accurate measures of my learning.	4.30	4.06	4.15	4.20	4.13
The instructor was enthusiastic about the subject matter	4.74	4.45	4.54	4.62	4.55
Christian concepts were integrated into the course effectively.	4.44	4.22	4.25	4.36	4.37
The instructor motivated me to learn.	4.44	4.10	4.26	4.28	4.16
The way this course was taught helped me to learn.	4.39	3.99	4.18	4.19	4.08
The instructor was respectful of all people and other points of view.	4.63	4.46	4.48	4.51	4.45
This course helped me think clearly.	4.32	3.98	4.24	4.18	4.10
This course helped me communicate effectively.	4.24	4.01	4.22	4.18	4.03
This course helped me to respect gender and cultural diversity	4.40	4.17	4.32	4.26	4.14
I gained a good understanding of the concepts and principles taught in this course.	4.44	4.13	4.32	4.37	4.23
Independent of the instructor, my overall rating of this course is:	4.29	3.77	3.85	4.04	3.98
Independent of the course, my overall rating of this instructor's teaching effectiveness is:	4.42	3.93	3.90	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 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 2007-08, 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. The process requires a choice of Faculty Advancement Plan which is reviewed by each SED faculty member with the Department Chair in January of each year when the Annual Faculty Professional Evaluation occurs ("the January Report"). 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 2007-08 three SED faculty applied for promotion or continuous appointment; one was promoted and two were denied.



**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 2008 by Educational Psychology and Counseling for Community Counseling and School Counseling.

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PERFORMANCE REVIEW**

The Dean of the School of Education receives an annual performance review from the Provost. 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 2007-2008. 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.

## **ALUMNI EVALUATIONS**

No surveys of graduate students or employers were conducted within the programs of the unit for 2007-2008. The ratings in Table 4 from the State of Michigan surveys are relevant.

**SECTION 5:**

**IMPROVEMENTS RESULTING FROM EVIDENCE**

The most significant change during 2007-08 arose in the need to change the database system used to collect assessment data. As noted in Section 1, the Microsoft Access database created in 2002 could not be maintained. Some data was obtained for a 2005-06 report, but data could not be retrieved for 2006-07. Accordingly, the NCATE Assessment Committee voted in the fall of 2007, to seek a different system. Five commercial database management systems were examined and two organizations made on-campus presentations to the unit administration and faculty. The final choice was LiveText, Inc.

A number of administrative decisions facilitated the transition into the new assessment system. A LiveText Implementation Team met weekly through the spring and summer semesters to attend to details of the transition. A timeline for implementation was established, calling for all candidates pursuing programs in the unit to obtain LiveText licenses by the fall of 2008. Faculty were provided syllabus material about using LiveText and posters throughout the unit displayed the oncoming implementation of this software system. A unit webpage for on-campus LiveText support at <http://www.andrews.edu/sed/resources/livetext/> was created. Coordinators for both faculty support services and student support services were appointed. Several opportunities were provided<sup>2</sup> for unit faculty and staff to learn the use of this system.

Meetings were held throughout the year by the Dean and the NCATE Assessment Coordinators with the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) chairs of departments who teach discipline content for secondary education<sup>3</sup>. These meetings covered the change from Michigan Department of Education folio approval to SPA approval, the adoption of LiveText, and related

---

<sup>2</sup> All-unit required LiveText workshops were held in February and April, 2008, as well as personal coaching of faculty. Topics included rubric development and hands-on experience with the software.

<sup>3</sup> Meetings with all relevant CAS departments were scheduled for Nov., 2007, Feb. and April, 2008.

information about the transition. One important item discussed was identifying courses which were required for all teacher certification majors that might use course grades as an evidence of cognitive competency.<sup>4</sup> A master list of such courses was identified so that course grades could be downloaded into LiveText for 2007-08 courses. The CAS faculty were also urged to attend the LiveText workshops and most of the program coordinators did. This resulted both in greater skill and understanding of how rubrics may be used for assessment purposes, as well as stronger partnership between CAS and the education unit.

Because of the unavailability of assessment data for faculty review from 2006-07, programs were disadvantaged in obtaining direct information for program improvement discussions during 2007-08. However, a review of the minutes of the three departments within the unit revealed that concerns about program improvement were given attention.

#### **DEPARTMENT OF TEACHING, LEARNING, AND CURRICULUM (TLC)**

After discussion during June 2007, the department voted to increase the GPA requirement for program entrance to 2.75. Consideration of student concerns about the length of time required for practical experience resulted in increasing field experience time. Through the year, the need for an electronic portfolio had been discussed. The adoption of LiveText, which facilitates portfolio development, facilitated the development of such a requirement for the programs in the department, particularly for the teacher certification (initial) program.

A number of course changes based on faculty recommendations were adopted for the

---

<sup>4</sup> Beginning Fall, 2008, SPAs were willing to accept course grades as evidence of knowledge performance if the courses were required of all program majors and used standard university grading procedures.

2008-09 University Bulletin as documented in department minutes.<sup>5</sup>

All regular faculty participated in the training for LiveText which was offered during the second semester. Discussion about whether to invite student teaching supervisors to become skilled in LiveText use led to the decision that TLC faculty who work with such personnel would take responsibility to enter their performance evaluations into LiveText.

### **DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION and LEADERSHIP**

Discussions about comprehensive assessment plans for all departmental programs, including the K-12 Educational Administration, have benefitted from consultation with Dr. Eileen White. Plans were laid in June 2007 for an assessment survey of 2007 graduates at the summer Roundtable 2007.

Much time in the fall semester was spent in preparing for a special visit from North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA). This visit in November 2007 evaluated departmental readiness to offer on-line degrees and resulted in NCA approval in May 2008.

Subsequent to the NCA visit, the faculty decided to create a rubric for portfolio assessment for all programs. The K-12 Educational Administration program began aligning their program requirements with expectations of the SPA, Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC). Minutes through the year demonstrate that portfolio development and improvement, including use of feedback from students, was a major faculty task.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> See Minutes of TLC Faculty, September 18, 2007, and November 27, 2007.

<sup>6</sup> See Minutes of EDAL Faculty: August 31, 2007; December 12, 2007; January 30, 2008; March 5, 2008; April 2, 2008; and May 30, 2008.

## **DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL and COUNSELING PSYCHOLOGY**

This department applied to the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) in the spring of 2007 for approval of the advanced program (M.S.) in School Psychology. Notification of approval was obtained in June 2008, making this the first unit program recognized by a Specialized Professional Association (SPA).

During 2007-08, the advanced program (M.A.) in Learning Disabilities was transferred to this department from the Department of Teaching, Learning, and Curriculum. The faculty decided to pursue approval from the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) for its new program in the coming year.

Faculty participated in training for the LiveText data management software system. They were encouraged to seek ways to update and streamline assessment tools to match what is being expected by the accreditation and SPA organizations. Rubrics within courses used for evaluation purposes were identified to match the NASP and CEC requirements. To make clear to students what performances are expected, faculty worked on further alignment of NASP standards with individual course objectives within pertinent syllabi<sup>7</sup>. Generally, faculty minutes display the awareness and involvement of the faculty in understanding and meeting accreditation and SPA requirements.

Student comments about two issues were addressed through the year: (a) how to integrate more effectively a spiritual perspective in counseling, and (b) the lack of DSM-IV training. Further study of how faculty have integrated spiritual perspectives was planned and the faculty decided to do more to inform students in classes about the importance of learning DSM-IV.

---

<sup>7</sup> See Minutes of EDCP Faculty. October 23, 2007.

**APPENDIX A.**

**Selected Data for Assessment in the  
Department of Teaching, Learning, and Curriculum**

<b>Rubric Elements</b>	<b>Exceptional (5 pts)</b>	<b>Proficient (4 pts)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (3 pts)</b>	<b>Emerging (2 pts)</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory (1 pts)</b>	<b>Mean N = 11</b>	<b>Mode Fall 2007 only</b>	<b>Stdev</b>
<b>MICROTEACHING RUBRIC</b>								
Writing	10	0	1	0	1	4.5	5	1.19
Scope	10	1	0	0	1	4.58	5	1.11
Scope	8	2	1	0	1	4.33	5	1.18
Substance	9	2	0	0	1	4.5	5	1.12
Substance	9	2	0	0	1	4.5	5	1.12
Delivery	11	0	0	0	1	4.67	5	1.11
Reflection	6	4	1	0	1	4.17	5	1.14
<b>Course Mean</b>						4.46		
<b>% below Level 3</b>						9.10%		
<b>PORTFOLIO ELEMENT I. WORLDVIEW</b>								
Outcome 1.A Understand basic philosophical perspectives	9	5	7	1	2	3.75	5	1.23
Outcome 1.B Critique philosophical approaches to education	9	5	7	1	2	3.75	5	1.23
Outcome 1.C Be able to articulate a personal and professional philosophy...	9	5	7	1	2	3.75	5	1.23
Depth of Coverage	9	5	8	0	2	3.79	5	1.19
Personalization	14	7	1	0	2	4.29	5	1.14
Artifact Guidelines	14	5	2	1	2	4.17	5	1.25
<b>Course Mean</b>						3.92		
<b>% below Level 3</b>						3 or 12.5%		

<b>PORTFOLIO ELEMENT III. GROUPS, LEADERSHIP, &amp; CHANGE</b>						N = 25		
Outcome III.A Implements effective planning....	9	6	8	0	2	3.8	5	1.17
Outcome III.B Works effectively with all students...	9	6	8	0	2	3.8	5	1.17
Outcome III.C Evaluate and articulate opinions of current political and legal issues...	9	6	8	0	2	3.8	5	1.17
Outcome III.D Creates effective learning environments...	9	6	8	0	2	3.8	5	1.17
Outcome III.E Consistently uses positional power and personal influence ...	9	6	8	0	2	3.8	5	1.17
Depth of Coverage	10	5	8	0	2	3.84	5	1.19
Personalization	17	6	0	0	2	4.44	5	1.1
Artifact Guidelines	16	4	2	1	2	4.24	5	1.24
<b>Course Mean</b>						3.94		
<b>% below Level 3</b>						2 or 8%		

<b>PORTFOLIO ELEMENT IV. COMMUNICATION &amp; TECHNOLOGY</b>						N=24		
Outcome IV.A Communicate effectively in written, verbal, and non-verbal forms.	8	5	9	0	2	3.71	3	1.17
Outcome IV.B Use electronic tools effectively for professional communication...	8	5	9	0	2	3.71	3	1.17
Depth of Coverage	10	5	6	1	2	3.83	5	1.25
Personalization	15	7	0	0	2	4.38	5	1.11

Artifact Guidelines	14	4	3	1	2	4.12	5	1.27
						<b>Course Mean</b>	3.95	
						<b>% below Level 3</b>	3 or 12.5%	

**PORTFOLIO ELEMENT VI. PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL GROWTH**

N=25

Outcome VI.A Demonstrate continuing professional development	11	4	8	0	2	3.88	5	1.21
Outcome VI.B Demonstrate ethical behavior in all professional activities	11	4	8	0	2	3.88	5	1.21
Outcome VI.C Document personal application in maintaining ...balance.	11	4	8	0	2	3.88	5	1.21
Outcome VI.D reflects on practice and implements plans for growth and change	11	4	8	0	2	3.88	5	1.21
Depth of Coverage	11	4	8	0	2	3.88	5	1.21
Personalization	17	6	0	0	2	4.44	5	1.1
Artifact Guidelines	15	4	3	1	2	4.16	5	1.25
						<b>Course Mean</b>	4	
						<b>% below Level 3</b>	2 or 8%	

**EDTE 424. Classroom Testing and Evaluation. 2007-08**

6/8/200

**TEST CREATION PROJECT RUBRIC**

**N=28**

<b>Rubric Elements</b>	<b>Exceptional (5 pts)</b>	<b>Proficient (4 pts)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (3 pts)</b>	<b>Emerging (2 pts)</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory (1 pts)</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Mode</b>	<b>Stdev</b>
Appropriate Topic	27	1	0	0	0	4.96	5	0.19
General Instructional Objectives	14	10	2	2	0	4.29	5	0.88

Specific Objectives or Subject Topics	13	6	7	2	0	4.07	5	1
Specifications Table: Appropriate Outcomes	16	8	1	3	0	4.32	5	0.97
Specifications Table: Emphasis & Distribution of ?s	17	5	3	3	0	4.29	5	1.03
Test Instructions	23	4	1	0	0	4.79	5	0.49
Questions: Multiple-Choice	27	1	0	0	0	4.96	5	0.19
Questions: T/F, Matching, Interpretive Exercise	26	0	1	0	0	4.93	5	0.38
Questions: Short Item	26	1	0	0	0	4.96	5	0.19
Questions: Essay	28	0	0	0	0	5	5	0
Performance/Alternative Assessment	28	0	0	0	0	5	5	0
Rubric: Performance/Alternative Assessment	24	4	0	0	0	4.86	5	0.35
Spelling, Grammar, etc.	23	1	3	1	0	4.64	5	0.81
Formatting of Test	21	3	3	1	0	4.57	5	0.82
Scoring Key	22	4	2	0	0	4.71	5	0.59
Bibliography	27	0	0	0	1	4.86	5	0.74
						<b>Course Mean</b>		<b>4.7</b>
						<b>% below Level 3</b>		<b>3 or 10.7%</b>

## EDTE 480. FIRST DAYS OF SCHOOL. 2007-08

TEST CREATION PROJECT RUBRIC						N=28		
	Exceptional (5 pts)	Proficient (4 pts)	Satisfactory (3 pts)	Emerging (2 pts)	Unsatisfactory (1 pts)	Mean	Mode	Stdev
Scope A	15	3	0	0	0	4.83	0.37	0.19
Scope B	13	5	0	0	0	4.72	0.45	0.88
Substance A	13	5	0	0	0	4.72	0.45	1
Substance B	12	6	0	0	0	4.67	0.47	0.97
Substance C	6	12	0	0	0	4.33	0.47	1.03
Writing A	6	11	0	1	0	4.22	0.71	0.49
Writing B	12	5	1	0	0	4.61	0.59	0.19
Writing C	16	2	0	0	0	4.89	0.31	0.38
<b>Course Mean</b>						<b>4.62</b>		
<b>% below Level 3</b>						<b>0</b>		

All Courses in 2007-2008

**EDFN 500 Philosophical Foundations of Education and Psychology**  
**Number of Students Scoring by Level**

	Level 5 Exceptional (5 pts)	Level 4 Proficient (4 pts)	Level 3 Satisfactory (3 pts)	Level 2 Emerging (2 pts)	Level 1 Unsatisfactory (1 pts)	Line Mean	Mode	Stdev
Analysis of personal worldview (WV) using a philosophical, worldview, or narrative framework	18	23	3	3	0	4.19	4	0.82
Rationale for chosen WV given other options	15	17	12	2	1	3.91	4	0.96
Strengths and challenges of the chosen WV	7	12	20	8	0	3.38	3	0.94
Areas in which WV needs further development and strengthening	7	22	12	5	1	3.62	4	0.94
Implications of WV for chosen field of study and professional life	11	29	6	1	0	4.06	4	0.67
Implications of WV for understanding and relating to diversity	10	15	15	7	0	3.6	3	0.98
Well presented document applying AU standards for written work and assignments	10	20	12	5	0	3.74	4	0.91
Summary sheet appropriate for inclusion in a portfolio for job search	2	9	3	6	27	2	1	1.34
						<b>Course Mean</b>		<b>3.56</b>

## **APPENDIX B.**

### **Selected Data for Assessment in the Department of Educational and Counseling Psychology**

**EDPC 514. Psychology of Learning.2007-08**

6/8/2009

**Summer 2007**

	<b>5 Exceptional (5 pts)</b>	<b>4 Proficient (4 pts)</b>	<b>3 Satisfactory (3 pts)</b>	<b>2 Emerging (2 pts)</b>	<b>1 Unsatisfactory (1 pts)</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Mode</b>	<b>Stdev</b>
Thesis Statement	6	0	5	1	2	3.5	5	1.45
Flow	6	0	5	1	2	3.5	5	1.45
Content Coverage	6	0	5	1	2	3.5	5	1.45
Clarity	6	0	5	1	2	3.5	5	1.45
Grammar and Mechanics	6	0	5	1	2	3.5	5	1.45
<b>Course Mean</b>						<b>3.50</b>		
<b>% below Level 3</b>						<b>21.4%</b>		

6/8/2009

## EDPC 515. Psychological Development--Growth Years. 2007-08

9

	<b>5 Exceptional (5 pts)</b>	<b>4 Proficient (4 pts)</b>	<b>3 Satisfactory (3 pts)</b>	<b>2 Emerging (2 pts)</b>	<b>1 Unsatisfactory (1 pts)</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Mode</b>	<b>Stdev</b>
Peer Review Articles	11	1	0	0	1	4.62	5	1.08
Research Review Format	12	0	0	0	1	4.69	5	1.07
Introduction	8	4	1	0	0	4.54	5	0.63
Review of Sources	2	2	6	0	3	3	3	1.3
Conclusion/Summary	6	2	3	1	1	3.85	5	1.29
Own Words	11	0	1	0	1	4.54	5	1.15
Connections & Transitions	6	2	1	2	2	3.62	5	1.55
APA Style	6	3	0	3	1	3.77	5	1.42
						<b>Course Mean</b>	<b>4.08</b>	
						<b>% Below Level</b>		
					<b>3</b>	<b>30.80%</b>		

**EDPC 540. Behavioral Emotional Problems Children. 2007-08**  
**Resource Notebook Grading Rubric**

N = 10

	<b>Exceptional (5 pts)</b>	<b>Proficient (4 pts)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (3 pts)</b>	<b>Emerging (2 pts)</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory (1 pts)</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Mode</b>	<b>Stdev</b>
Element 1	2	5	2	1	0	3.8	4	0.87
Element 2	7	2	1	0	0	4.6	5	0.66
Element 3	6	0	3	1	0	4.1	5	1.14
Element 4	3	4	2	0	1	3.8	4	1.17
Element 5	5	2	0	3	0	3.9	5	1.3
Element 6	3	3	1	0	3	3.3	4	1.62
Element 7	4	2	1	1	2	3.5	5	1.57
Element 8	7	0	1	2	0	4.2	5	1.25
Element 9	4	2	3	0	1	3.8	5	1.25

**Course Mean            3.89**  
**% below Level 3      30.00%**