

ANDREWS UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

2008-2009

(Leave blank)

TABLE of CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	ii
SECTION 1: ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT OVERVIEW	1
The SED Candidate Assessment System	5
SECTION 2: CANDIDATE ASSESSMENT.....	8
Unit Report for All Programs	9
Unit Performance Scores: State of Michigan.....	9
Unit Scores on Michigan Test of Teacher Certification (MTTC).....	10
Basic Skills: MTTC	10
Program Reports	11
SECTION 3: FACULTY ASSESSMENT.....	15
Student Opinion of Teaching	16
Professional Development Assessment	16
Peer Evaluation of Faculty for Advancement	18
SECTION 4: UNIT OPERATIONS ASSESSMENT.....	19
Annual Departmental Reports to Administration	20
Administrative Performance Review	20
Financial Performance of Unit.....	20
Alumni Evaluations of Unit and Programs.....	21
SECTION 5: IMPROVEMENTS from EVALUATION of EVIDENCE	22
Unit-Level Improvements	23
Department of Teaching, Learning, and Curriculum	24
Department of Educational Administration and Leadership.....	25
Department of Educational and Psychological Counseling	25
APPENDICES:	
A. Teaching, Learning, and Curriculum (Initial and Advanced) Programs	
B. School Counseling and Special Education Programs	
C. Unit Conceptual Framework Curriculum Map	

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. School-based Programs in SED.....	3
Table 2. Unit Programs: 2008-09 Candidate Enrollment and Approval Status	4
Table 3. The SED Conceptual Framework	7
Table 4. Unit Performance Scores: State of Michigan	10
Table 5. Report of MTTC Content Area Results	11
Table 6. Summary of Course Grade Evidences	12
Table 7. Learning Outcomes in Initial Teacher Education Program.....	13
Table 8. Learning Outcomes in Advanced Program: Curriculum and Instruction	14
Table 9. Learning Outcomes for Advanced Program Foundation Courses	14
Table 10. Learning Outcomes for EDPC Courses	14
Table 11. Student Evaluations of SED Courses and Teachers	17

SECTION 1

ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

OVERVIEW

This Assessment Report is prepared for the academic year, 2008-09, and summarizes the data collected from Summer Semester 2008 through Spring Semester 2009, on student learning outcomes and evidences of progress towards goals of completion. It also contains assessment of faculty and the Education Unit.

In 2004, the unit presented an assessment system to the National Council on Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), which was approved. However, influenced by recent changes in NCATE reporting directions, it was streamlined and downsized. The intent in 2008-09 was to collect key data which would represent self-study data for Year 2 which would be reviewed by NCATE in the fall of 2011.

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

Section 3 covers Faculty assessment through the use of student opinion surveys, professional development assessment and peer evaluations.

Section 4 reports on assessments of unit and program operations. The SED Programs are shown in Table 1 below.

The enrollments in programs during 2008-09 and program approval status are shown in Table 2 below, as reported by the Office of Institutional Research in the university's Opening Enrollment Report for 2008-09. At the end of this academic year, the Michigan Department of Education had approved all folios for teacher preparation in the unit.

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. Partner departments in the College of Arts and Sciences to apply for SPA approvals.
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. Applying for CEC approval
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. Applying for ELCC approval

All programs in the unit worked during this year on developing curriculum maps which are included in this report in the respective departmental appendices. See Appendices A and B. These curriculum maps were designed to display program information in two ways: (a) by identifying Gateways where candidate performance and achievement information would allow candidates to progress through the program; and (b) by allocation to NCATE and SPA requirements. The faculty endeavored to identify which data points would represent “key evidences” for review by external agencies.

Table 2. Unit Programs 2008-09: Candidate Enrollment and Approval Status

	Dept. Program	Award Level	Elem. Cand.	Secnd. Cand.	Advanced Programs	Approval by MDE or Other
CAS	Art Education	B		1		MDE, 2004
CAS	Biology	B MAT		2 1		MDE, 2007
CAS	Chemistry	B		0		MDE, 2009
CAS	Communication	B		3		MDE, 2004
SED	Curriculum & Instructn	M D			11 15	N/A
SED	Educ. Admin., Supervision	M D			20 16	Seeking ELCC approval
CAS	English	B MAT		6 1		MDE, 2005
SED	Elem Education	B MAT	46 9			MDE, pending new stds
SED	Secondary Education	MAT				See content areas
CAS	ESL	M		4		MDE, 2007
CAS	History	B		7		MDE, 2008
SED	Integr. Science	B	2	1		MDE, 2007, 2008
CAS	Language Arts	B	1			MDE, 2002
CAS	Lang: French	B				MDE, 2008
CAS	Lang: Spanish	B		4		MDE, 2008
SED	Learning Disabilities	M			2	MDE, 2004. Seeking CEC approval
CAS	Math. & Math Ed	B	2	8		MDE, 2006

CAS	Music Educ	B MMus		11	5	NASM
CAS	Physics	B M				MDE, 2007
CAS	Political Science	B				MDE, 2009
SED	Reading	M				MDE, 2002
CAS	Religion	B M		3		SDA Church (AAA)
SED	School Counseling	M			6	CACREP
SED	School Psychology	M			22	NASP, 2008
SED	Educational Psych.	M D			22	CACREP
SED	Counseling Psych.	D			17	CACREP
CAS	Social Studies Sec Ed	B	1	2		MDE 2001

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

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

SED ASSESSMENT SYSTEM

Assessment of learner outcomes and program improvement are described by the Assessment Plan¹. It contains three sections: Candidate Assessment, Faculty Assessment, and Unit Assessment, each of which provides a number of sources of data. The learner outcomes are aligned with both the SED Conceptual Framework (CF) and NCATE requirements.

¹ The Assessment Plan, v. 2.2 was successfully presented to NCATE and the State of Michigan during the 2003-2004 academic year.

Beginning in 2007-08, data collected for assessment purposes was entered into a LiveText database. Every student enrolled in a program in the unit is required to obtain a LiveText license. The current year serves as Year 2 of data obtained and assessed using the LiveText data management system.

Evaluation information comes from rubrics which use 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 to LiveText demanded extensive faculty training in 2007-08 which continued into 2008-09 in which the faculty who provide content instruction in the College of Arts and Sciences participated.

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 include the following:

- A. Formative and summative evaluation data which are available to provide candidates feedback on their progress.
- 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 2008-09, unit-level data on proficiencies achieved in the elements of the Conceptual Framework was not available. A unit Curriculum Map for Conceptual Framework items was prepared showing the course rubrics submitted with data for 2008-09. For those programs and departments² which had voted approval for curriculum maps, nearly all of these rubrics contained evaluations of the Conceptual Framework elements. This map is displayed in an attached file.

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. In 2008-09, Andrews University SED received a perfect score (70/70 pts) for the second consecutive year for its teacher education program offerings in 2007-08, as shown in Table 4.

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	Program Review Status 10 pts	Diversity 5 pts	High Need Content 5 pts	Principl Feedbk Received
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 Annual Summary of the Michigan Test for Teacher Certification (MTTC) for both initial and cumulative candidate attempts with comparisons to statewide averages for each program are received in April for the preceding academic year. Results for 2008-09 are shown in Table 5 below. A total of 45 candidates were tested of which 35 passed cumulative, making a Cumulative pass rate of 76.8%. The statewide rate for the 2008-09 period was 84.7.

The content areas in which some candidates did not pass in this report are: Reading, Integrated Science (Elem), Language Arts (Elem.), Social Studies, Spanish, Elementary Education, Reading, and Guidance Counselor. These data on pass rates will need further evaluation by the unit faculty.

BASIC SKILLS: MTTC

All prospective teacher education candidates are required to take the Michigan Basic Skills Test prior to entering student teaching. Between Sept. 2008 and August 2009, 33 candidates took this test at Andrews University. The Cumulative Pass Rate was 90.9% compared to the Statewide Pass Rate of 91.8%.

² The Educational Administration curriculum map was still under development at this report time.

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

	2008-09	2008-09	2008-09 Michigan	2007-2008 A.U.	2007-2008 A.U.	2007-2008 Michigan Statewide
Program	N taking	% Pass	% Cumult Pass	N	% Pass	% Pass
Content Areas:						
Behavioral Science	0	NA		1	100	100
Biology	0	NA		1	100	100
Chemistry	0	NA		3	100	100
English	3	100.0	80.8	8	100	100
French	1	100.0	72.2	3	100	100
History	2	100.0	80.3	11	100	100
Integr. Science (Elem)	1	0.0	68.0	2	50	NA
Integr. Science (Sec)	0	NA		1	100	100
Lang. Arts (Elem)	3	66.7	71.8	29	89.7	NA
Math (Elem)	1	100.0	83.2	7	85.7	NA
Math (Sec)	2	100.0	92.3	4	100	100
Music Education	3	100.0	89.3	10	90	100
Physics	1	100.0	89.6	1	100	NA
Political Science	0	NA		16	100	NA
Social Studies	7	57.1	65.4	10	75	NA
Spanish	7	85.7	92.5	4	90	99
Visual Arts Educ.	0	NA			100	NA
Elementary Educ.	12	75.0	96.8	57	98.2	100
Professional Areas:						
Reading	3	33.3	76.8	6	86.3	100
Learning Disabled	0	NA		6	100	100
All Tests	45	77.8	84.7	189	93.1	NA

PROGRAM REPORTS

College of Arts and Sciences

In addition to scores on the MTTC, one of the indicators of cognitive knowledge arises from 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) required for all secondary

teacher education students have been identified as core courses.

Data obtained from the Banner student information system for such courses were entered into LiveText, using a course grade rubric. Table 6 presents a summary, by CAS department, of

Table 6. SUMMARY OF CAS COURSE GRADE EVIDENCES¹

Department	2008-09 Students N =	% Grades Levels 3-5	2007-08 Students N =	% Grades Levels 3-5
Art Education	9	66.7	8	87.5
Biology	8	37.5	5	0.0
Chemistry	7	71.4	4	75.0
Communication Ed	2	100.0	4	100.0
English	83	85.5	39	97.4
ESL	4	100.0	NA	NA
Geography	12	100.0	20	100.0
History	31	51.6	59	79.7
International Languages	7	100.0	4	100.0
Physics	3	100.0	4	100.0
Political Science	16	56.2	16	81.2
Mathematics	37	75.7	25	60.0

the proportion of students whose undergraduate required class grades were considered Levels 3-5 (satisfactory). Among the sciences, Biology had the fewest students with grades in the satisfactory category. Art Education, History and Political Science courses were also courses with a number of students who did not reach the satisfactory level. These data can be compared to similar course data for 2007-08.

¹ Acceptable (Level 3) grades were undergraduate grades with C+ or better on courses required of all elementary or secondary teacher education students.

Department of Teaching, Learning, and Curriculum

Tables 7-10 display findings from assessment rubrics submitted for the initial and advanced teacher education programs of the Department of Teaching, Learning, and Curriculum. Spreadsheets giving complete data for all courses in this department are found in Appendix A.

Table 7. LEARNING OUTCOMES in INITIAL TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM

Course Acronym	Title of Rubric	N	Mean Level (all indicators)	% at Levels 3-5	Indicators showing below Satisfactory (Level 3)
EDTE 288	Clinical Observation & Interaction Matrix	24	3.65	75 66.7	20 hours documented Critical eval analysis
EDTE 408	Micro-Teaching Assess	27	4.29	92.6 85.2	Scope Reflection
EDTE 408	Portfolio. Element 1	15	3.53	86.7	Depth, Artifact Guidelines
EDTE 408	Portfolio. Element 2	15	3.65	93.3	Artifact Guidelines
EDTE 408	Portfolio. Element 3	15	3.63	93.3	Depth
EDTE 408	Portfolio. Element 4	15	3.45	93.3	Depth
EDTE 408	Portfolio. Element 5	15	3.48	80.0	Artifact Guidelines
EDTE 408	Portfolio. Element 6	15	3.42	73.3	Artifact Guidelines
EDTE 408	Portfolio. Element 7	15	3.49	86.7	Artifact Guidelines
EDTE 408	Portfolio. Intro, Closing	15	3.33	66.7	Reflective Conclusion
EDTE 420	Literacy Interv. Mini-Unit Scoring Guide	16	5.00	100.0	
EDTE 424	Test Creation Project	24	4.81	95.8 91.7	Specifications table Specific Objectives
EDTE 446	Annotated Biblio,Safety	25	4.63	96.0	
EDTE 459	Summative Eval. Rubric	8	4.45	87.5 87.5	Use of standards; Differentiation
EDTE 476	Final Test Rubric	9	4.19	55.6 88.9	Equity issues Networking & Formatting
EDTE 480	Classroom Management Plan	9	4.47	88.9	Content (3 indicators)
EDTE 487	Description of School Setting	26	4.75	96.2	Description of Instructional Environment
EDTE 487	Impact on K-12 Student Learning	12	4.29	91.7	Reflection on lesson delivery
EDTE 488	Student Teaching Summative Evaluation	16	4.51	100.0	

**Table 8. LEARNING OUTCOMES IN ADVANCED PROGRAM:
CURRICULUM & INSTRUCTION**

Course Acronym	Title of Rubric	N	Mean Level (all indicators)	% at Levels 3-5	Indicators showing below Satisfactory Level
EDCI 636 (online)	Eval. Proposal Scoring Guide	2	4.63	100.0	
EDCI 636 (F2F)	Eval. Proposal Scoring Guide	5	4.23	80.0	Personnel & Format
EDTE 588	Student Teaching Summative Eval.	2	4.30	100.0	

**Table 9. LEARNING OUTCOMES FOR ADVANCED PROGRAMS
FOUNDATIONS COURSES:**

Course Acronym	Title of Rubric	N	Mean Level (all indicators)	% at Levels 3-5	Indicators showing below Satisfactory Level
EDFN 500	Philosophical Foundations	35	4.25	91.4	Several
EDRM 505	Proposals Evaluation Sheet	22	3.26	72.7	All

Department of Educational and Counseling Psychology (EDPC).

Assessment data for the advanced programs in this department are found in Tables 10 and

11. Details of these assessment findings are located in Appendix B.

Table 10. LEARNING OUTCOMES FOR EDPC COURSES

Course Acronym	Title of Rubric	N	Mean Level (all indicators)	% at Levels 3-5	Indicators showing below Satisfactory Level
EDPC 514	Psychology of Learning	9	4.24	88.9	All
EDPC 654	Evaluation of Practicum	3	4.14	66.7	Prevention, crisis, intervention, and mental health (one indicator)
EDPC 672	Psycho-educational Consultation Project	4	4.48	75.0	Project Summary

Educational Administration Program. Data was not available for rubrics in 2008-09.

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 11 presents the Unit Mean vs. the University Mean for selected questions on student evaluations in Summer and Fall Semesters 2008 and Spring Semester 2009. The highest mean scores in all terms were for instructor enthusiasm and instructor respect for all people and other points of view. This continues the pattern seen in 2007-08 for these indicators. When compared to the 2004-05 Unit Mean or to the University Mean, no consistent trend emerges for results in 2008-09.

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

Table 12. STUDENT EVALUATIONS OF SED COURSES & TEACHERS, 2007-08

Selected Evaluation Statements:	Unit Mean Summer 2008 n=128	Unit Mean Fall 2008 n= 308	Unit Mean, Spring 2009 n=214	Unit Mean (Norm) 2004-05	Univ. Mean (Norm) 2004-05
The course was organized to accomplish the course objectives	4.23	4.19	4.32	4.38	4.32
The course was challenging intellectually.	4.28	4.36	4.41	4.28	4.28
Examinations and other methods of evaluation were fair and accurate measures of my learning.	4.11	3.97	4.21	4.20	4.13
The instructor was enthusiastic about the subject matter	4.61	4.49	4.69	4.62	4.55
Christian concepts were integrated into the course effectively.	4.39	3.92	4.08	4.36	4.37
The instructor motivated me to learn.	4.30	4.13	4.31	4.28	4.16
The way this course was taught helped me to learn.	4.13	4.09	4.22	4.19	4.08
The instructor was respectful of all people and other points of view.	4.50	4.44	4.50	4.51	4.45
This course helped me think clearly.	4.17	4.13	4.30	4.18	4.10
This course helped me communicate effectively.	4.24	4.12	4.24	4.18	4.03
This course helped me to respect gender and cultural diversity	4.33	4.24	4.35	4.26	4.14
I gained a good understanding of the concepts and principles taught in this course.	4.22	4.31	4.43	4.37	4.23
Independent of the instructor, my overall rating of this course is:	4.05	4.00	4.23	4.04	3.98
Independent of the course, my overall rating of this instructor's teaching effectiveness is:	4.25	3.97	4.29	4.19	4.07

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

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 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 2008-09, two SED faculty applied for promotion and/or continuous appointment; one was promoted and given continuous appointment 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 and achievements, efforts to improve teaching strategies, and departmental/school needs. This report was submitted in 2009.

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 2008-2009. 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. Financial performance of the unit continues to be strong.

ALUMNI EVALUATIONS

No surveys of graduate students or employers were conducted within the programs of the unit for 2008-09. The ratings in Table 4 from the State of Michigan Department of Education surveys are relevant.

SECTION 5:

**IMPROVEMENTS RESULTING from
EVALUATION of EVIDENCE**

UNIT-LEVEL IMPROVEMENTS

LiveText Implementation

Following a pilot test in Educational Administration in the Summer term, the LiveText data management system was launched with the fall 2008 term. All candidates pursuing a degree program in the unit, or teacher certification with a secondary teaching major in CAS, were required to purchase a LiveText license. Licenses were sold through the University Bookstore or could be purchased directly on-line. A letter from the dean to all candidates, significant promotional campaign using posters, and classroom training opportunities were used at the beginning of the fall term to assist candidates in understanding this new requirement. Faculty were provided copy to include in their syllabi explaining how to submit assignment artifacts to LiveText.

Generally, the faculty in the unit have demonstrated raised awareness and cooperation in evaluating student learning outcomes using rubrics mounted in LiveText. Reflecting on the changes which LiveText had facilitated during the year, the unit faculty affirmed that there was a strong sense of progress from the advantages provided with this new system. The greater ease of handling student portfolios was particularly noted for Curriculum and Instruction and Educational Administration.

The development of curriculum maps and identification of key evidences to meet NCATE and SPA expectations comprised faculty work in all programs through this academic year. In April, 2009, summary curriculum maps were formally voted by both initial and advanced teacher preparation program faculty and by EPC faculty for NASP and CEC SPAs.

In addition to the progress facilitated for the unit, other schools on the university campus

have expressed interest in adopting LiveText for their accreditation needs. Training in use of LiveText and a demonstration of LiveText student portfolio preparation was provided by the unit's LiveText administrator to faculty in the SDA Theological Seminary. Subsequently, Seminary faculty voted to adopt LiveText for their assessment management system, and planned to require LiveText licenses for all its entering M.Div students for the fall of 2009.

Improvement in Graduate Student Writing

Faculty across the unit had expressed concern about graduate student writing quality for major papers and theses. This was particularly problematic for second-language students. After discussion with the administration, additional assistance was provided by employing a writing instructor and a new course, LEAD 535, Graduate Writing Seminar, which was offered in Spring, 2009. Improvements have been evident in the movement of an increased movement of advanced candidates through the "thesis pipeline."

DEPARTMENT OF TEACHING, LEARNING, AND CURRICULUM (TLC)

Approval of On-Line Curriculum & Instruction (C & I) Masters Degree

The Higher Learning Commission of the North-Central Association of Colleges and Schools formally approved an on-line masters degree for Curriculum & Instruction in 2008-09. However, C & I orientation done on-line was changed to face-to-face because candidate performance following the on-line orientation was unsatisfactory. During 2009-10, C & I will provide orientation to field-based and on-line candidates in partnership.

The faculty in the initial teacher preparation program developed an improved Summative Rubric for Student Teaching with an integrated evaluation of candidate dispositions

Curriculum & Instruction led the department in entering a template for LiveText for their required portfolio.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION and LEADERSHIP (EDAL)

A comprehensive candidate portfolio for Educational Administration was created and mounted in LiveText. Dr. Gary Randolph, former Director of Education in the Lake Union Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, was involved in the portfolio design and development for the new Educational Administration portfolio.

EDAL continued its work on curriculum design and mapping. Because changes in the Michigan Department of Education had delayed review of the EDAL folio, the faculty voted to pursue the ELCC recognition immediately. Minutes reflect the emphasis on identifying and matching candidate experiences to ELCC requirements.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL and COUNSELING PSYCHOLOGY

The department faculty met on July 29, 2008 to review and discuss evaluation data for assessment purposes. The following reports were reviewed:

1. The Assessment Reports 2007-08 for both the MA in Community Counseling and the MA in School Counseling.
2. Graduate Survey for the Class of 2008 in these two programs
3. Clinical Site Internship Supervisor Evaluations of Training Program for the Class of 2008 in both programs.
4. Graduate Follow-up Questionnaire for the Class of 2006 in both program

5. Employer of a Program Graduate Survey for the Class of 2006 Community Counseling Program. No data were available for the School Counseling Program Employer Survey because only one graduate was employed but that employer did not respond.

After reviewing the reports the faculty discussed three areas that they felt needed more attention based on data received: integrating a spiritual perspective in the counseling process, consultation, and crisis intervention. The faculty voted to focus on improving instruction in the area of crisis intervention counseling during the 2008-09 academic year. It was decided that instructors in EDPC 650 Practicum in Counseling would provide additional attention to crisis intervention in group supervision during Spring Semester, 2009.

Special Education: Learning Disabilities

Significant progress was made in the development of a curriculum map for CEC requirements for Learning Disabilities. The map was formally voted by the faculty in April, 2009.

APPENDIX A-1.

**Selected Data for Assessment in the
Department of Teaching, Learning, and Curriculum
Initial Teacher Education Programs**

EDTE 288. Clinical Observation/Interaction Matrix

Sept 23.09

2008-09.All Terms

	5 Exceptional (5 pts)	4 Proficient (4 pts)	3 Satisfactory (3 pts)	2 Emerging (2 pts)	1 Unsatisfactory (1 pts)	Mean	Mode	Stdev
Heading & Details: dates, times, locations, settings, schools visited included in grid.	0	17	5	1	1	3.58	4	0.76
Use of appropriate language and sensitive approach relative to exceptionality including person's 1st language or culture/ race.	0	25	0	0	0	4	4	0
Summary includes a brief reflection from each observation (how did you feel/what did you think?) and description of interaction in each setting.	0	24	0	1	0	3.92	4	0.39
Observations & interactive activities are presented w/ descriptions of students relative to sp. ed. disability labels, descriptions of room/school, and descriptions of programs viewed. (Objective details)	0	24	1	0	0	3.96	4	0.2

Critical, evaluative analysis of the observations as a whole in full page format. (Overall, what did you gain/learn/feel/think about this experience? How will you apply insights?) Knowledge of disabilities through research is evident. (Subjective analysis)

0 15 0 3 5 3.09 4 1.28

Thought and effort demonstrated through editing/revision of writing. (correct mechanics observed)

0 14 10 0 0 3.58 4 0.49

20 hours documented by signatures; student ID # on paper.

0 16 3 6 0 3.4 4 0.85

N =

24

Course Mean

3.647

% below Level 3

25.0%

20 hours document
Critical Eval
Analysis

33.3%

EDTE 408.Micro Teaching Assessment

Sept 23.09

2008-09.All terms

	5 Exceptional (5 pts)	4 Proficient (4 pts)	3 Satisfactory (3 pts)	2 Emerging (2 pts)	1 Un satisfactory (1 pts)	Mean	Mode	Stdev
Writing	17	8	1	0	1	4.48	5	0.88
Scope	16	9	0	1	1	4.41	5	0.95
Scope	12	10	3	1	1	4.15	5	1.01
Substance	17	7	2	0	1	4.44	5	0.92
Substance	17	8	1	0	1	4.48	5	0.88
Delivery	10	13	3	0	1	4.15	4	0.89
Reflection	12	6	5	3	1	3.93	5	1.18

N =

27

Course Mean

4.291

% below Level 3

7.4%

Scope

14.8%

Reflection

EDTE 408.Portfolio.Element 1.Worldview

Sept 23.09

2008-09.Fall Term

	5 Exceptional (5 pts)	4 Proficient (4 pts)	3 Satisfactory (3 pts)	2 Emerging (2 pts)	1 Unsatisfactory (1 pts)	Mean	Mode	Stdev
Outcome 1.A Understand basic philosophical perspectives	13	2	0	0	0	3.87	4	0.34
Outcome 1.B Critique philosophical approaches to education	11	3	1	0	0	3.67	4	0.6
Outcome 1.C Be able to articulate a personal and professional philosophy...	12	2	1	0	0	3.73	4	0.57
Depth of Coverage	10	3	0	2	0	3.4	4	1.02
Personalization	14	1	0	0	0	3.93	4	0.25
Artifact Guidelines	4	3	6	2	0	2.6	2	1.02

N =

15

Course Mean

3.53

% below Level 3

13.3%

Depth; Artifact
Guideline

EDTE 408.Portfolio.Element 2.Human Growth & Change

Sept 23.09

2008-09.Fall Term

	5 Exceptional (5 pts)	4 Proficient (4 pts)	3 Satisfactory (3 pts)	2 Emerging (2 pts)	1 Unsatisfactory (1 pts)	Mean	Mode	Stdev
Outcome II.B Describe developmentally appropriate educational practices.	14	1	0	0	0	3.93	4	0.25
OUtcome II.B Implement developmentally appropriate ed practices.	13	2	0	0	0	3.87	4	0.34
Depth of Coverage	11	1	3	0	0	3.53	4	0.81
Personalization	14	1	0	0	0	3.93	4	0.25
Artifact Guidelines	7	2	5	1	0	3	4	1.03

N =

15

Course Mean

3.65

% below Level 3

6.7%

Artifact
Guidelin

EDTE 408.Portfolio.Element 3.Groups Leadership Change

Sept 23.09

	2008-09.Fall Term					Mean	Mode	Stdev
	5 Exceptional (5 pts)	4 Proficient (4 pts)	3 Satisfactory (3 pts)	2 Emerging (2 pts)	1 Unsatisfactory (1 pts)			
Outcome III.A Implements effective planning....	13	1	1	0	0	3.8	4	0.54
Outcome III.B Works effectively with all students...	14	0	1	0	0	3.87	4	0.5
Outcome III.C Evlauate and articulate opionos of current political and legal issues...	13	0	2	0	0	3.73	4	0.68
Outcome III.D Creates effective learning environments...	14	0	1	0	0	3.87	4	0.5
Outcome III.E Consistently uses positional power and personal influence ...	13	0	2	0	0	3.73	4	0.68
Depth of Coverage	10	1	3	1	0	3.33	4	1.01
Personalization	14	0	1	0	0	3.87	4	0.5
Artifact Guidelines	7	1	5	2	0	2.87	4	1.15
N =	15					3.63		
						6.7%	Depth	

EDTE 408.Portfolio.Element 4.Commun & Tech

Sept 23.09

2008-09.Fall Term

	5 Exceptional (5 pts)	4 Proficient (4 pts)	3 Satisfactory (3 pts)	2 Emerging (2 pts)	1 Unsatisfactory (1 pts)	Mean	Mode	Stdev
Outcome IV.A Communicate effectively in written, verbal, and non-verbal forms.	13	1	0	1	0	3.73	4	0.77
Outcome IV.B Use electronic tools effectively for professional communication...	11	3	0	1	0	3.6	4	0.8
Depth of Coverage	8	1	4	1	0	3.14	4	1.06
Personalization	14	0	1	0	0	3.87	4	0.5
Artifact Guidelines	7	1	6	1	0	2.93	4	1.06
N =	15					Course Mean 3.45		
						% below Level 3 6.7%	Depth	

EDTE 408.Portfolio.Element 5.Research and Evaluation

Sept 23.09

2008-09.Fall Term

	5 Exceptional (5 pts)	4 Proficient (4 pts)	3 Satisfactory (3 pts)	2 Emerging (2 pts)	1 Un satisfactory (1 pts)	Mean	Mode	Stdev
Outcome V.A Read, evaluate, interpret and use appropriate literature.	14	0	0	1	0	3.8	4	0.75
Outcome V.B Read, evaluate and interpret ...assessments	13	0	1	1	0	3.67	4	0.87
Depth of Coverage	9	1	4	1	0	3.2	4	1.05
Personalization	14	0	1	0	0	3.87	4	0.5
Artifact Guidelines	7	1	3	3	0	2.86	4	1.25
N =	15							
						3.48		
						6.7%		
						20.0%	Artifact Guidelines	

EDTE 408.Portfolio.Element 6.Personal and Professional Growth

Sept 23.09

	2008-09.Fall Term					Mean	Mode	Stdev
	5 Exceptional (5 pts)	4 Proficient (4 pts)	3 Satisfactory (3 pts)	2 Emerging (2 pts)	1 Unsatisfactory (1 pts)			
Outcome VI.A Demonstrate continuing professional development	13	1	0	1	0	3.73	4	0.77
Outcome VI.B Demonstrate ethical behavior in all professional activities	14	0	0	1	0	3.8	4	0.75
Outcome VI.C Document personal application in maintaining ...balance.	12	0	2	1	0	3.53	4	0.96
Outcome VI.D reflects on practice and implements plans for growth and change	11	1	2	1	0	3.47	4	0.96
Depth of Coverage	8	1	5	1	0	3.07	4	1.06
Personalization	13	0	1	1	0	3.67	4	0.87
Artifact Guidelines	7	1	3	3	1	2.67	4	1.4

N =

15

Course Mean
% below Level 3

3.42
6.7%
26.7%

Artifact
Guidelines

EDTE 408.Portfolio Element 7. Content Area Knowledge

Sept.27.2009

2008-09.Fall Term

	5 Exceptional (5 pts)	4 Proficient (4 pts)	3 Satisfactory (3 pts)	2 Emerging (2 pts)	1 Un satisfactory (1 pts)	Mean	Mode	Stdev
Outcome VII.A Demonstrate continued growth in an understanding and appreciation of general and liberal arts.	14	0	1	0	0	3.87	4	0.5
Outcome VII.B Demonstrate continued growth in knowledge of subject matter and pedagogy.	12	1	2	0	0	3.67	4	0.7
Depth of Coverage	9	1	5	0	0	3.27	4	0.93
Personalization	13	0	2	0	0	3.73	4	0.68
Artifact Guidelines	7	2	4	2	0	2.93	4	1.12

N =

15

Course Mean

3.49

% below Level 3

13.3%

Artifact Guidelines

EDTE 408.Portfolio.Intro & Closing Rubric

Sept.27.2009

2008-09.Fall Term

	5 Exceptional (5 pts)	4 Proficient (4 pts)	3 Satisfactory (3 pts)	2 Emerging (2 pts)	1 Un satisfactory (1 pts)	Mean	Mode	Stdev
Cover Page	11	3	1	0	0	3.67	4	0.6
Title Page	8	3	4	0	0	3.27	4	0.85
Resume	10	3	2	0	0	3.53	4	0.72
Autobiographical Essay	10	2	3	0	0	3.47	4	0.81
Reflective Conclusion	9	0	1	3	2	2.73	4	1.61

N =

15

Course Mean

3.33

% below Level 3

33.3%

Reflective
Conclusion

EDTE 420.Literacy Intervention Strategies.Mini-Unit Scoring Guide

Sept 28.09

	All Terms					Mean	Mode	Stdev
	5 Exceptional (5 pts)	4 Proficient (4 pts)	3 Satisfactory (3 pts)	2 Emerging (2 pts)	1 Unsatisfactory (1 pts)			
Provided details of all components of unit in a 1-2 page outline; submitted on time.	16	0	0	0	0	5	5	0
Lesson plans use language appropriate to church standards and to culture or ethnic group chosen for focus of mini-unit.	16	0	0	0	0	5	5	0
Lesson plans integrate content selection, timeline and organizational structures; objectives aligned with content standards and benchmarks. Formative and summative assessments completed.	16	0	0	0	0	5	5	0
A total of ten mini-unit lessons completed on time, unit shows field experience and meets all performance (no absences or late arrivals) criteria.	16	0	0	0	0	5	5	0
Mini-unit culminating activity presentation. ••• teacher/tutor presents mini-unit to class through power point demonstration, with student work included. Presentation is 10 to 15 minutes in length.	16	0	0	0	0	5	5	0
N =	16						5.00	
					Course Mean		5.00	
					% below Level 3		0.0%	

EDTE 424 Test Creation Project

Sept 28.09

2008-09 All Terms

	5 Exceptional (5 pts)	4 Proficient (4 pts)	3 Satisfactory (3 pts)	2 Emerging (2 pts)	1 Un satisfactory (1 pts)	Mean	Mode	Stdev
Appropriate Topic	24	0	0	0	0	5	5	0
General Instructional Objectives	22	2	0	0	0	4.92	5	0.28
Specific Objectives or Subject Topics	17	4	1	2	0	4.5	5	0.91
Specifications Table: Appropriate Outcomes	20	0	1	1	0	4.77	5	0.73
Specifications Table: Emphasis & Distribution of ?s	21	0	0	1	0	4.86	5	0.62
Test Instructions	11	10	3	0	0	4.33	5	0.69
Questions: Multiple-Choice	16	6	2	0	0	4.58	5	0.64
Questions: T/F, Matching, Interpretive Exercise	21	2	1	0	0	4.83	5	0.47
Questions: Short Item	24	0	0	0	0	5	5	0
Questions: Essay	18	1	0	0	0	4.95	5	0.22
Performance/Alternative Assessment Rubric: Performance/Alternative Assessment	21	1	0	0	0	4.95	5	0.21
Spelling, Grammar, etc.	24	0	0	0	0	5	5	0
Formatting of Test	15	4	4	1	0	4.38	5	0.9
Scoring Key	21	3	0	0	0	4.88	5	0.33
Bibliography	22	0	0	0	0	5	5	0

N =

24

Course Mean

4.81

% below Level 3

4.2%

8.3%

Specifications Table
Specific Objectives

EDTE 446.Annotated Bibliography & Safety Rules

Sept 28.09

2008-09.All Terms

	5 Exceptional (5 pts)	4 Proficient (4 pts)	3 Satisfactory (3 pts)	2 Emerging (2 pts)	1 Un satisfactory (1 pts)	Mean	Mod e	Stdev
Formatting	15	10	0	0	1	4.46	5	0.84
Summary Writing	19	6	0	0	1	4.62	5	0.84
Quality of Information	20	4	1	0	1	4.62	5	0.88
Age Appropriate	25	0	0	0	1	4.85	5	0.77
4 Sciences	19	6	0	0	1	4.62	5	0.84
Rules Poster	19	4	1	0	2	4.46	5	1.12
Lesson Plan	20	6	0	0	0	4.77	5	0.42

N =

25

Course Mean

4.63

% below Level 3

4.0%

8.0%

Rules
Poster

EDTE 459.Summative Evaluation Rubric.

Sept 28.09

2008-09.All Terms

	5 Exceptional (5 pts)	4 Proficient (4 pts)	3 Satisfactory (3 pts)	2 Emerging (2 pts)	1 Un satisfactory (1 pts)	Mean	Mode	Stdev
Oral Presentation	4	3	1	0	0	4.38	5	0.7
Use of Standards	4	3	0	1	0	4.25	5	0.97
Purpose & rationale	5	3	0	0	0	4.62	5	0.48
Unit Timeline	5	3	0	0	0	4.62	5	0.48
Variety of Teaching Strategies	2	6	0	0	0	4.25	4	0.43
Content	8	0	0	0	0	5	5	0
Language Arts Skills	6	1	1	0	0	4.62	5	0.7
Differentiation Possibilities	3	3	1	0	1	3.88	5	1.27

N = **8**

Course Mean **4.45**

% below Level 3 **12.5%**

Use of Standards;
Differentiation

EDTE 476.Final Test Rubric
2008-09.All Terms

Sept 22.09

	5 Exceptional (5 pts)	4 Proficient (4 pts)	3 Satisfactory (3 pts)	2 Emerging (2 pts)	1 Unsatisfactory (1 pts)	Mean	Mode	Stdev
Technology Requested	6	3	0	0	0	4.67	5	0.47
Networking/Internet	1	3	4	1	0	3.44	3	0.83
Rational	3	1	5	0	0	3.78	3	0.92
Formatting of Letter	5	3	0	1	0	4.33	5	0.94
Philosophy	8	1	0	0	0	4.89	5	0.31
Ideal plan for use of Internet at grade level and relationship to NETS	2	6	1	0	0	4.11	4	0.57
Safety in use of technology	5	4	0	0	0	4.56	5	0.5
Equity issues	5	0	0	1	3	3.33	5	1.89
Types of technology activities for both students and teachers	5	4	0	0	0	4.56	5	0.5
Future of the Internet and technology.	5	1	3	0	0	4.22	5	0.92
N =	9							
				Course Mean		4.19		
				% below Level 3		44.4%	on Equity issues on Networking & Formatting	
						11.1%		

EDTE 480.Classroom Management Plan Rubric

Sept 23.09

2008-09.All Terms

	5 Exceptional (5 pts)	4 Proficient (4 pts)	3 Satisfactory (3 pts)	2 Emerging (2 pts)	1 Un satisfactory (1 pts)	Mean	Mode	Stdev
Format	5	4	0	0	0	4.56	5	0.5
Writing	9	0	0	0	0	5	5	0
Content	6	2	1	0	0	4.56	5	0.68
Content	5	1	3	0	0	4.22	5	0.92
Content	4	2	1	2	0	3.89	5	1.2
Content	7	1	0	1	0	4.56	5	0.96
Content	6	0	2	1	0	4.22	5	1.13
Appropriate to the Situation	7	2	0	0	0	4.78	5	0.42

N =

9

Course Mean

4.47

% below Level 3

11.1%

Content, 3
lines

EDTE 480.Philosophy of Management Summary

Sept 28.09

2008-09.All Terms

	5 Exceptional (5 pts)	4 Proficient (4 pts)	3 Satisfactory (3 pts)	2 Emerging (2 pts)	1 Un satisfactory (1 pts)	Mean	Mod e	Stdev
Scope	15	3	0	0	0	4.83	5	0.37
Scope	15	3	0	0	0	4.83	5	0.37
Substance	14	4	0	0	0	4.78	5	0.42
Substance	18	0	0	0	0	5	5	0
Substance	17	1	0	0	0	4.94	5	0.23
Writing	16	2	0	0	0	4.89	5	0.31
Writing	15	3	0	0	0	4.83	5	0.37
Writing	16	2	0	0	0	4.89	5	0.31

N =

18

Course Mean

4.87

% below Level 3

0.0%

EDTE 487. Description of School Setting

Sept 28.09

2008-09.All Terms

	5 Exceptional (5 pts)	4 Proficient (4 pts)	3 Satisfactory (3 pts)	2 Emerging (2 pts)	1 Un satisfactory (1 pts)	Mean	Mode	Stdev
Writing	18	7	1	0	0	4.65	5	0.55
Research & Evaluation	21	5	0	0	0	4.81	5	0.39
Substance & Communication								
Technology	20	6	0	0	0	4.77	5	0.42
Personal & Professional Growth	24	2	0	0	0	4.92	5	0.27
List of General Information	17	5	4	0	0	4.5	5	0.75
Description of the Physical Environment	21	5	0	0	0	4.81	5	0.39
Description of the Social Environment	21	5	0	0	0	4.81	5	0.39
Description of the Instructional Environment	22	3	0	0	1	4.73	5	0.81

N =

26

Course Mean

4.75

% below Level 3

3.8%

Description of Instructn
Environ

EDTE 487. Impact on K-12 Student Learning

Sept 28.09

2008-09.All Terms

	5 Exceptional (5 pts)	4 Proficient (4 pts)	3 Satisfactory (3 pts)	2 Emerging (2 pts)	1 Un satisfactory (1 pts)	Mean	Mode	Stdev
Candidate created written Lesson Plan - incorporated all essential elements	7	3	2	0	0	4.42	5	0.76
Supervisor/Peer Evaluation of Lesson Plan Implementation	5	6	1	0	0	4.33	4	0.62
Candidate created student materials -pre-lesson, during lesson, post-lesson - original/adapeted - appropriate to lesson goal -organized	3	8	1	0	0	4.17	4	0.55
Candidate created lesson delivery materials - original/adapted, - visual, -organized	5	6	1	0	0	4.33	4	0.62
Candidate written reflection on student baseline data and learning growth (achievement)	6	5	1	0	0	4.42	5	0.64
Candidate written reflection of self growth in lesson delivery	5	4	1	0	1	4.09	5	1.16

N =

12

Course Mean

4.29

% below Level 3

8.3%

Reflection on lesson delivery

EDTE 488.Student Teaching Summative Eval

Sept 23.09

2008-09.All Terms

	5 Exceptional (5 pts)	4 Proficient (4 pts)	3 Satisfactory (3 pts)	2 Emerging (2 pts)	1 Un satisfactory (1 pts)	Mean	Mod e	Stdev	
An understanding and appreciation of what to teach	9	7	0	0	0	4.56	5	0.5	
An understanding of how to teach and the skills to teach effectively	9	7	0	0	0	4.56	5	0.5	
The knowledge and skills to create and manage a classroom environment which nurtures learning	9	6	1	0	0	4.5	5	0.61	
The knowledge and skills to monitor and manage student behavior	7	7	2	0	0	4.31	4	0.68	
A knowledge and understanding of a teacher's professional role, and the skills and dispositions to fulfill those roles.	11	4	1	0	0	4.62	5	0.6	
N =	16					Course Mean	4.51		
						% below Level 3	0.0%		

APPENDIX A-2.

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

EDCI 636-001. Eval Proposal Scoring Guide

Sept 23.09

2008-09.All Terms.F2F Students

	5 Exceptional (5 pts)	4 Proficient (4 pts)	3 Satisfactory (3 pts)	2 Emerging (2 pts)	1 Un satisfactory (1 pts)	Mean	Mod e	Stdev
Need for the Evaluation Project (~3 pages)	2	2	1	0	0	4.2	4	0.75
The Evaluation Design (~2 pages)	1	2	2	0	0	3.8	3	0.75
The General Study Plan (Research Protocol) (~2 pages)	1	2	2	0	0	3.8	3	0.75
Project Personnel (~1 page)	3	1	0	1	0	4.2	5	1.17
Project Performance Plan (~4 pages)	3	1	1	0	0	4.4	5	0.8
Proposal Appendix (~2-6 pages)	5	0	0	0	0	5	5	0
Document Format	1	1	2	1	0	3.4	3	1.02
IRB Application	5	0	0	0	0	5	5	0

N =

5

Course Mean

4.23

% below Level 3

20.0%

Personnel
&
Format
lines

EDCI 636-999. Eval Proposal Scoring Guide

Sept 22.09

2008-09.All Terms.Online Students

	5 Exceptional (5 pts)	4 Proficient (4 pts)	3 Satisfactory (3 pts)	2 Emerging (2 pts)	1 Unsatisfactory (1 pts)	Mean	Mod e	Stdev
Need for the Evaluation Project (~3 pages)	2	0	0	0	0	5	5	0
The Evaluation Design (~2 pages)	2	0	0	0	0	5	5	0
The General Study Plan (Research Protocol) (~2 pages)	2	0	0	0	0	5	5	0
Project Personnel (~1 page)	2	0	0	0	0	5	5	0
Project Performance Plan (~4 pages)	0	2	0	0	0	4	4	0
Proposal Appendix (~2-6 pages)	2	0	0	0	0	5	5	0
Document Format	0	0	2	0	0	3	3	0
IRB Application	2	0	0	0	0	5	5	0

N =

2

Course Mean
% below Level 3

4.63
0.0%

EDTE 588. Student Teaching Summative Eval

Sept 23.09

2008-09.All Terms

	5 Exceptional (5 pts)	4 Proficient (4 pts)	3 Satisfactory (3 pts)	2 Emerging (2 pts)	1 Unsatisfactory (1 pts)	Mean	Mode	Stdev
An understanding and appreciation of what to teach	2	0	0	0	0	5	5	0
An understanding of how to teach and the skills to teach effectively	0	1	1	0	0	3.5	4	0.5
The knowledge and skills to create and manage a classroom environment which nurtures learning	0	2	0	0	0	4	4	0
The knowledge and skills to monitor and manage student behavior	1	1	0	0	0	4.5	4	0.5
A knowledge and understanding of a teacher's professional role, and the skills and dispositions to fulfill those roles.	1	1	0	0	0	4.5	4	0.5

N =

2

Course Mean

4.30
%
below
Level
3

0.0%

APPENDIX 3.

Selected Data for Assessment in the Foundation Courses

Courses in 2008-2009

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	22	8	5	0	0	4.49	5.00	0.73	
Rationale for chosen WV given other options	19	9	7	0	0	4.34	5.00	0.79	
Strengths and challenges of the chosen WV	7	17	8	3	0	3.80	4.00	0.86	
Areas in which WV needs further development and strengthening	6	16	10	3	0	3.71	4.00	0.85	
Implications of WV for chosen field of study and professional life	13	15	4	1	2	4.03	4.00	1.06	
Implications of WV for understanding and relating to diversity	6	14	11	2	1	3.65	4.00	0.94	
Well presented document applying AU standards for written work and assignments	12	18	2	3	0	4.11	4.00	0.85	
Summary sheet appropriate for inclusion in a portfolio for job search	6	14	5	2	5	3.44	4.00	1.30	
N =	35					Course Mean	4.25		
						% Below Level 3	8.57%		

EDRM 505.Proposals Evaluation Sheet

Sept 20.09

	All Terms.2008-09					Mean	Mode	Stdev
	5 Exceptional (5 pts)	4 Proficient (4 pts)	3 Satisfactory (3 pts)	2 Emerging (2 pts)	1 Unsatisfactory (1 pts)			
Statement of the Problem. Research Question	5	5	7	4	1	3.41	3	1.15
Significance of the study	6	7	7	2	0	3.77	4	0.95
Literature Review	3	6	7	5	1	3.23	3	1.08
Research design	3	4	9	3	3	3.05	3	1.19
Sampling	4	6	9	2	1	3.45	3	1.03
Definition of variables	3	5	5	7	2	3	2	1.21
Instrumentation	4	5	7	4	2	3.23	3	1.2
Data Collection	4	3	11	3	1	3.27	3	1.05
Data Analysis	4	3	9	5	1	3.18	3	1.11
Overall Quality of the Proposal	2	4	11	3	2	3.05	3	1.02
N =	22							

Course Mean

3.26

% below Level 3

27.3%

Used 6 as avg of Levels 1,2

APPENDIX B.

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

EDPC 514.Psychology of Learning.2008-2009

Sept 20.09

All Terms

	5 Exceptional (5 pts)	4 Proficient (4 pts)	3 Satisfactory (3 pts)	2 Emerging (2 pts)	1 Un satisfactory (1 pts)	Mean	Mod e	Stdev
Thesis Statement	6	0	2	1	0	4.22	5	1.13
Flow	6	2	0	1	0	4.44	5	0.96
Content Coverage	3	4	1	1	0	4	4	0.94
Clarity	6	0	2	1	0	4.22	5	1.13
Grammar and Mechanics	7	0	1	0	1	4.33	5	1.33
N =	9							
						Course Mean	4.24	
						% below Level 3	11.1%	

EDPC 654 Evaluation of Practicum

Sept 20.09

	All Terms					Mean	Mode	Stdev
	5 Exceptional (5 pts)	4 Proficient (4 pts)	3 Satisfactory (3 pts)	2 Emerging (2 pts)	1 Unsatisfactory (1 pts)			
Decision Making & Accountability	1	2	0	0	0	4.33		4
Decision Making & Accountability	1	2	0	0	0	4.33		4
Decision Making & Accountability	1	2	0	0	0	4.33		4
Decision Making & Accountability	0	1	2	0	0	3.33		3
and Collaboration	0	1	2	0	0	3.33		3
and Collaboration	1	2	0	0	0	4.33		4
struction and Development of ademic Skills	0	3	0	0	0	4		4
and Development of Life Skills	0	2	1	0	0	3.67		4
and Development of Life Skills	1	1	1	0	0	4		4
ersity in Development and	2	1	0	0	0	4.67		5
ystems Organization, Policy , and Climate	2	0	1	0	0	4.33		5
Crisis, Intervention, and Mental	1	1	0	1	0	3.67		4
Crisis, Intervention, and Mental	1	1	1	0	0	4		4
d Program Evaluation	1	0	2	0	0	3.67		3
ology Practice and Development	1	1	1	0	0	4		4
ology Practice and Development	1	1	1	0	0	4		4
echnology	2	1	0	0	0	4.67		5
	1	1	1	0	0	4		4
	1	2	0	0	0	4.33		4
	3	0	0	0	0	5		5
	2	1	0	0	0	4.67		5
	2	1	0	0	0	4.67		5
	1	1	1	0	0	4		4
3	Course Mean					4.14		
	% below Level 3					33.3%		Prevention, Crisis, Intervention Health

EDPC 672.Psychoeducational Consult Proj. Academic

	All Terms					Mean	Me e
	5 Exceptional (5 pts)	4 Proficient (4 pts)	3 Satisfactory (3 pts)	2 Emerging (2 pts)	1 Unsatisfactory (1 pts)		
Problem Solving Process			3	0	1	0	4.5
Observation			2	1	1	0	4.25
Functional Assessment			3	1	0	0	4.75
Interventions			4	0	0	0	5
Progress Monitoring			4	0	0	0	5
Consultation Notes			0	3	1	0	3.75
Reflective Journal			1	3	0	0	4.25
Consultee Evaluation			3	0	0	0	5
Project Summary			1	2	0	1	3.75

Case Presentation	2	2	0	0	0	4.5
N =	4					
					Course Mean	4.48
					% below Level 3	25.0%

EDPC 672.Psychoeducational Consult Proj. Behavioral

Sept 20.0

	All Terms					Mean	Mode	S	
	5 Exceptional (5 pts)	4 Proficient (4 pts)	3 Satisfactory (3 pts)	2 Emerging (2 pts)	1 Unsatisfactory (1 pts)				
Problem Solving Process	3	0	1	0	0	4.5	5		
Observation	2	1	1	0	0	4.25	5		
Functional Assessment	3	1	0	0	0	4.75	5		
Interventions	4	0	0	0	0	5	5		
Progress Monitoring	4	0	0	0	0	5	5		
Consultation Notes	0	3	1	0	0	3.75	4		
Reflective Journal	1	3	0	0	0	4.25	4		
Consultee Evaluation	3	0	0	0	0	5	5		
Project Summary	1	2	0	1	0	3.75	4		
Case Presentation	2	2	0	0	0	4.5	4		
N =	4								
						Course Mean	4.48		
						% below Level 3	25.0%		