

**ANDREWS UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION**

ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

2016-2017

April 30, 2018

Table of Contents

LIST OF TABLES.....	3
SECTION 1: ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT OVERVIEW	4
SED Assessment System	10
SECTION 2: CANDIDATE ASSESSMENT	12
DEPARTMENT OF Teaching, Learning & Curriculum.....	13
Michigan Test for Teacher Certification (MTTC).....	13
Course Grades.....	15
Assessments Using Rubrics	16
Foundations Courses.....	17
Department of Graduate Psychology & Counseling.....	17
Department of Leadership	18
Assessment Outcomes by Conceptual Framework Elements	18
SECTION 3: PROGRAM QUALITY	22
Summary of Program Data	23
Department of Teaching, Learning, and Curriculum.....	23
Department of Graduate Psychology & Counseling.....	26
Department of Leadership	27
Follow-up Data	28
SECTION 4: FACULTY ASSESSMENT	29
Professional Development Assessment	30
Peer Evaluation of Faculty for Advancement.....	30
Student Opinion of Teaching.....	30
Senior Survey	31
SECTION 5: UNIT OPERATIONS ASSESSMENT.....	33
Annual Departmental Reports to Administration	34
Administrative Performance Review.....	34
Financial Performance	34
Unit Performance Scores: State of Michigan.....	34
School of Education Follow-up Data.....	36
APPENDIX A. Assessment Documents for Teaching, Learning, and Curriculum Programs	40
APPENDIX B. Assessment Documents for Foundations Courses	56
APPENDIX C. Assessment Documents for Graduate Psychology and Counseling Programs	66

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Programs in the School of Education	6
Table 2. SED Programs 2016-2017: Candidate Enrollment* and Program Approval Status	7
Table 3. SED Program Completers, 2016-2017 and Five-Year Trend.....	9
Table 4. The SED Conceptual Framework.....	11
Table 5. MTTC Content Area, Initial & Cumulative, 3-Year Aggregated (2013-2016).....	14
Table 6. Andrews University and Statewide PRE Pass Rates (2014-2015)	14
Table 7. Summary of CAS Course Grade Evidences, 2016-2017 Compared With 2015-2016...	15
Table 8. Learning Outcomes in Initial Teacher Education Program, 2016-2017.....	16
Table 9. Learning Outcomes for Advanced Programs Foundations Courses (All Compared with Distance), 2016-17	17
Table 10. Learning Outcomes for GPC Courses, 2016-2017	17
Table 11. Educational Leadership Program Learning Outcomes (All vs. Distance), 2016-17	18
Table 12. All TLC Rubric Assessments Disaggregated by TLC Conceptual Framework Element, 2016-2017	20
Table 13. All TLC Course Evaluation Ratings (Course Section), 2016-2017.....	23
Table 14. Selected Senior Survey Ratings (SED vs. All Seniors), 2016-2017.....	25
Table 15. All GPC Course Evaluation Ratings (Course Section), 2016-2017	26
Table 16. All LEAD Course Evaluation Ratings (Course Section), 2016-2017	27
Table 17. Mean Scores of Student Evaluations of SED Courses & Teachers, 2016-2017.....	31
Table 18. EPI Score for Andrews University School of Education Compared to Michigan Mean and Range, 2014-2017	35
Table 19. SED Alumni Survey Results, 2014-2015	37
Table 20. SED Employer Survey Results, 2014-2015.....	39

**SECTION 1: ANNUAL
ASSESSMENT REPORT
OVERVIEW**

This School of Education (SED) Annual Assessment Report is prepared for the academic year 2016-2017, and summarizes the data collected by the SED Assessment System from Summer Semester 2016 through Spring Semester 2017 on student learning outcomes and evidences of progress towards goals of completion. It also contains assessment of faculty, programs, and the SED as a Unit. This section, Section 1, provides an overview.

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 provides data from the perspective of program quality. Section 5 reports on assessments of unit operations. Section 6 of this report concludes with a summary of changes and improvements which have resulted from reviews of the various data obtained.

The SED Programs are shown in Table 1. All teacher education programs, as well as other programs that are school-based, are aligned with the requirements of the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), which has replaced the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) as the national accrediting body. The Michigan Department of Education has approved all of the teacher preparation programs in the unit. Program enrollments for the 2016-2017 academic year, as reported by the Office of Institutional Research, and program approval status are shown in Table 2 below.

Table 1. Programs in the School of Education

Program	Type
Teaching, Learning, & Curriculum	
BSELED Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education	Initial Teacher Education, NCATE Accredited
BS with Secondary Certification	Initial Teacher Education, Partner departments in the College of Arts and Sciences, NCATE Accredited, Recognition by Specialized Professional Associations (SPA) in progress.
Elementary Certification	Initial Teacher Education, NCATE Accredited
Secondary Certification	Initial Teacher Education, NCATE Accredited, Recognition by Specialized Professional Associations (SPA) in progress.
MAT Master of Arts in Teaching (Elementary and Secondary)	Initial Teacher Education, NCATE Accredited
MA EdS, EdD, PhD Education - Curriculum and Instruction (C&I)	Advanced, Continuing Teacher Education, MA is NCATE Accredited
MS Special Education/Learning Disabilities	Advanced, Other School Personnel. Applying for CEC approval.
Graduate Psychology & Counseling	
EdS School Psychology	Advanced, Other School Personnel, NCATE Accredited. NASP approved.
MA School Counseling	Advanced, Other School Personnel, CACREP Accredited
MA Clinical Mental Health Counseling	Reviewed by CACREP in November 2012
MA, EdD, PhD Educational Psychology	
PhD Counseling Psychology	Accredited by APA in 2017.
Leadership	
Graduate Certificate, MA, EdS, EdD, PhD Educational Leadership	Advanced, Other School Personnel, MA is recognized by NCATE and ELCC.
MA, EdS, EdD, PhD Higher Education Administration	
Undergraduate Certificate, MA, EdS, EdD, PhD Leadership	

Table 2. SED Programs 2016-2017: Candidate Enrollment* and Program Approval Status

School	Dept. Program	Award Level	Elem. Cand.	Secnd. Cand.	Advanced Programs	Approval by MDE or Other
CAS	Biology	Bach MAT	- -	- -	-	MDE, 2007; recognized by NSTA Aug 2014
CAS	Chemistry	Bach	-	-	-	MDE, 2009; recognized by NSTA Aug 2014
CAS	Communication	Bach	-	-	-	MDE, 2004; SPA-like doc. for MDE site visit, Nov 2011
SED	Education, Elementary	Bach MAT	31 4	- -	-	MDE, 2011; recognized with conditions, Feb 2017
CAS	English	Bach MAT	- -	10 1	-	MDE, 2015; submitted to NCTE Mar 2011, Sept 2012, & Mar 2013; not recognized
CAS	ESL	MAT	-	-	-	MDE, 2007
CAS	History	Bach MAT	- -	2 -	-	MDE, 2011
SED	Integrated Science	Bach	2	2	-	MDE, 2007, 2008; recognized by NSTA February 2015
CAS	Language Arts	Bach	4	-	-	MDE, 2002; SPA-like doc. for MDE site visit, Nov 2011
CAS	Lang: French	Bach MAT	-	-	-	MDE, 2008; submitted to ACTFL Sept 2014; needs further development
CAS	Lang: Spanish	Bach MAT	-	-	-	MDE, 2008; submitted to ACTFL Sept 2014; needs further development
CAS	Math Ed	Bach	1	8	-	MDE, 2006; recognized by NCTM August 2013
CAS	Music Education	Bach MAT	- -	6 -	-	NASM recognition 2010, good until 2020
CAS	Physics	Bach MAT	- -	- -	-	MDE, 2007; recognized by NSTA Aug 2014
CAS	Political Science	Bach	-	-	-	MDE, 2011
CAS	Religion	Bach MAT	- -	4 -	-	SDA Church (AAA)
CAS	Social Studies Elem Ed	Bach	2	-	-	Submitted to MDE 2011; revised & approved 2012
CAS	Social Studies Sec Ed	Bach	-	5	-	MDE, 2011; recognized w/ conditions by NCSS July 2013; resubmitted September 2015, reverted to Not Recognized
CAS	Visual Arts Education	Bach	-	2	-	MDE, 2004; SPA-like doc. for MDE site visit, Nov 2011
SED/ CAS	Secondary (unspecified)	Bach MAT	-	1	-	N/A

Table 2. SED Programs 2016-2017: Candidate Enrollment & Approval Status (continued)

School	Dept. Program	Award Level	Elem. Cand.	Secnd. Cand.	Advanced Programs	Approval by MDE or Other
SED	Curriculum & Instruction	MA	-	-	5	N/A
		EdS	-	-	-	
		Doct	-	-	20	
SED	Educational Leadership	GrCert	-	-	5	Recognized by ELCC April 2013; re-applying for new cycle Mar 2018
		MA	-	-	3	
		EdS	-	-	1	
		Doct	-	-	20	
SED	Higher Education Administration	MA	-	-	2	N/A
		EdS	-	-	-	
		Doct	-	-	15	
SED	Leadership	UCert	-	-	-	N/A
		PDCert	-	-	3	
		MA	-	-	6	
		EdS	-	-	-	
		Doct	-	-	48	
SED	Special Education/ Learning Disabilities	MS	-	-	3	MDE, 2004; submission to CEC pending
SED	School Counseling	MA	-	-	2	CACREP accredited until October 31, 2020
SED	School Psychology	EdS	-	-	10	NASP, 2008; Recognized w/conditions February 2016; resubmitted Sept 2017
SED	Educational Psych.	MA	-	-	8	N/A
		EdS	-	-	-	
		Doct	-	-	15	
SED	Clinical Mental Health Counseling	MA	-	-	23	CACREP accredited until October 31, 2020
SED	Counseling Psych.	Doct	-	-	32	APA accredited, 2017
SED	Professional Development	Grad	-	-	-	N/A
TOTAL SED ENROLLMENT		Undergraduate			79	
		MAT			6	
		MA/MS			52	
		Grad & PostDoc Cert			8	
		EdS			11	
		Doctoral (EdD/PhD)			150	
		TOTAL			306	

*Note: Enrollments are calculated based on Fall Semester 2016. Program enrollment numbers include students with more than one major.

Table 3 shows the number of program completers (graduates) by degree over the last five years, that is, from Summer 2012 through Spring 2017, according to data provided by the Office of Institutional Research.

Table 3. SED Program Completers, 2016-2017 and Five-Year Trend

Program	Level	'12-'13	'13-'14	'14-'15	'15-'16	'16-'17	2012-2017 Completers
Elem Ed	Bach	9	14	6	12	1	42
Elem Ed	MAT	1	1	-	-	2	4
Sec Ed	Bach	9	10	12	7	3	41
Sec Ed	MAT	2	1	3	5	1	12
C & I	MA	-	-	-	4	2	6
C & I	EdS	-	-	-	-	0	0
C & I	Doct	2	4	5	8	3	22
Ed Lead (K-12)	GrCert	-	1	-	-	3	4
Ed Lead (K-12)	MA	-	-	-	2	5	7
Ed Lead (K-12)	EdS	-	1	-	-	1	2
Ed Lead (K-12)	Doct	2	1	-	-	0	3
Higher Ed Adm	MA	-	-	-	-	1	1
Higher Ed Adm	EdS	-	-	-	-	0	0
Higher Ed Adm	Doct	-	-	-	-	3	3
Leadership	GrCert	-	1	-	-	0	1
Leadership	MA	-	-	2	2	4	8
Leadership	EdS	-	-	-	-	0	0
Leadership	Doct	12	24	10	6	5	57
Spec Ed/LD	MS	4	1	2	1	1	9
School Counsel	MA	6	2	4	6	1	19
School Psych	MA	-	-	-	-	0	0
School Psych	EdS	7	6	2	2	8	25
Clin Ment H C	MA	4	10	9	9	12	44
Counsel Psych	MS	-	-	-	-	3	3
Counsel Psych	PhD	-	2	2	2	2	8
Educ Psych	MA	9	5	14	9	8	45
Educ Psych	PhD	-	1	-	1	4	6
Ed & Dev Psyc	PhD	-	-	-	-	-	0
TOTAL COMPLETERS	All Levels	67	85	71	76	73	372

SED ASSESSMENT SYSTEM

The assessment of learner outcomes and program improvement within the SED are described in the SED Assessment System. It contains several sections, including Candidate Performance, Program Quality, Unit Operations, and Faculty Performance, each of which provides a number of sources of data. Learner outcomes are aligned with the SED Conceptual Framework (CF), and with state and national professional accrediting bodies.

Evaluation information comes from rubrics which use a five-point performance scale: Levels 4 (Proficient) and 5 (Exceptional) represent “Target performance” of the desired outcome, Level 3 (Satisfactory) is “Acceptable performance” of the desired outcome, and Levels 1 (Unsatisfactory) and 2 (Emerging) represent “Unacceptable performance,” which does not demonstrate sufficient mastery of the outcome to be acceptable.

Since 2007, much of the data collected for assessment purposes have been entered into a LiveText database. Every student enrolled in a program in the unit is required to obtain a LiveText license. The database uses the six Key Elements of the Conceptual Framework and their subsections as organizers (see Table 4 below). The Department of Teaching, Learning, and Curriculum uses an additional section, VII. Content. 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 CAEP 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.

Assessments within LiveText have been linked to these key elements and, since Fall 2010, can be aggregated for each element.

In 2010, the Unit voted a list of eight professional dispositions which align with the

Conceptual Framework (Table 4), and have been formally added into Unit assessments and into LiveText.

Table 4. The SED Conceptual Framework

ELEMENT	SUBSECTIONS	DISPOSITIONS
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. 	Value Fairness Value Service Value Diversity
II. Human Growth and Change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe human development • Apply current theories of learning 	Believe that all students can learn
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 	Recognize personal leadership responsibility
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. 	Value respectful communication
V. Research and Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Read and evaluate research • Conduct research • Report research findings 	Committed to inquiry
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. 	Value personal and professional growth

**SECTION 2:
CANDIDATE
ASSESSMENT**

DEPARTMENT OF TEACHING, LEARNING & CURRICULUM

Key evidences of candidate performance are collected from sources such as candidates' GPAs, course grades, standardized test scores (i.e., Michigan Test for Teacher Certification or Praxis), rubrics on individual assignments, portfolios, field/internship evaluations, and follow-up surveys. Care is taken to ensure that some key evidences come from external sources (such as national and state examinations and employer surveys) as well as from internal sources (such as self-assessments, peer-assessments, and faculty-assessments).

Michigan Test for Teacher Certification (MTTC)

Teacher candidates are required to take Michigan Test for Teacher Certification (MTTC) content area tests. Three-year aggregated data are reported by the Michigan Department of Education. From August 2013 to July 2016, 95 candidates took the content area tests, with a cumulative pass rate for all subject areas of 91.6%. The statewide three-year cumulative pass rate for all subject areas for 2013-2016 was 86.8%. See Table 5.

In addition to the MTTC content area tests, the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) has also administered a general skills test, called the Professional Readiness Examination (PRE), intended to be used as an admissions gateway for teacher education programs. During the 2014-2015 academic year, 16 of our candidates took the PRE, with a cumulative pass rate of 31.3%. The statewide pass rate on the PRE for the same period was 9.9%. See Table 6. It is clear that candidates across the state are struggling to pass the PRE. After much discussion and evaluation, the MDE has decided to discontinue the use of the PRE, replacing it with student scores on SAT or ACT tests as an admissions gateway.

Table 5. MTTC Content Area, Initial & Cumulative, 3-Year Aggregated (2013-2016)

Program:	Andrews University			Michigan		
	<i>N</i>	% Pass Initial	% Pass Cum.	<i>N</i>	% Pass Initial	% Pass Cum.
Biology	2			330	75.2	90.0
Chemistry	3			183	65.0	85.2
Communication Arts	4			10	70.0	80.0
Computer Science	-	-	-	16	93.8	93.8
English	10	100.0	100.0	1,138	81.9	89.9
English as a 2 nd Language	4			597	85.6	93.6
History	5			775	49.0	67.5
Integr. Science (Elem)	4			727	64.2	76.9
Integr. Science (Sec)	3			269	81.4	90.0
Lang. Arts (Elem)	9			1,724	72.7	82.3
Math (Elem)	1			986	81.8	87.8
Math (Sec)	5			714	90.2	96.5
Music Education	5			538	96.3	98.7
Physics	2			102	75.5	88.2
Political Science	-			90	42.2	54.4
Social Studies (Sec)	2			833	70.0	89.2
Social Studies (Elem)	2			554	45.8	58.3
Spanish	3			357	84.9	91.3
Visual Arts Educ.	2			266	90.6	97.7
Elem Education	15	93.3	93.3	4,451	74.4	89.6
Professional Areas:						
School Counselor	6			290	91.4	94.5
Learning Disabilities	2			707	86.6	94.6
Reading	4			226	75.7	84.5
All Tests	95	84.2	91.6	20,440	75.4	86.8

Note: Pass rates are provided only for subjects with 10 or more test takers, since numbers less than this may not be a valid indicator of program strength.

Table 6. Andrews University and Statewide PRE Pass Rates (2014-2015)

	Andrews University			Michigan		
	<i>N</i>	% Pass Initial	% Pass Cum	<i>N</i>	% Pass Initial	% Pass Cum
PRE (overall)	16	25.0	31.3	2,362	7.1	9.9
PRE: Reading	16	81.3	81.3	1,766	74.1	79.2
PRE: Math	16	50.0	50.0	1,828	33.9	40.1
PRE: Writing	16	25.0	37.5	2,232	18.4	25.0

Course Grades

In addition to scores on the MTTC, one of the indicators of cognitive knowledge arises from course grades in content courses. Grade data was obtained from the Banner student information system for all students who have declared elementary or secondary education and/or certification. This includes students who may not yet be accepted into the teacher education program. Grade ratings, using the SED 1-5 scale, were calculated using a course grade rubric. Table 7 presents a summary, by CAS subject area, of the proportion of students whose undergraduate course grades were considered Levels 3-5 (satisfactory or above, where C+ is considered satisfactory for undergraduates) in 2016-2017 (with comparisons to 2015-2016 grade data). Political Science, History, and Physics had the lowest percentages of students achieving Level 3 or better.

Table 7. Summary of CAS Course Grade Evidences, 2016-2017 Compared With 2015-2016

Subject	2016-2017		Mean	StDev	2015-2016		Mean	StDev
	#* of Students	% Grades Levels 3-5			#* of Students	% Grades Levels 3-5		
Biology	4	100%	3.00	0.000	8	100%	4.38	0.696
Chemistry	8	100%	4.50	0.500	1	100%	1.00	0.000
Communication & Journalism	15	87%	4.53	1.204	23	100%	4.57	0.577
Economics	8	88%	3.50	0.866	4	75%	3.25	1.479
English	26	96%	4.08	0.917	39	95%	4.36	1.000
Geography	25	100%	4.76	0.585	18	100%	4.83	0.500
History	26	73%	3.54	1.447	31	71%	3.42	1.582
International Languages	8	100%	5.00	0.000	4	100%	4.00	0.000
Mathematics	23	83%	3.48	1.175	19	74%	3.58	1.270
Physics	13	77%	3.92	1.206	8	88%	3.88	1.053
Political Science	14	55%	3.27	1.483	17	82%	3.94	1.392
Psychology	4	100%	4.25	0.829	-	-	-	-
Visual Arts Education	4	100%	5.00	0.000	4	100%	4.25	0.829

*Combined totals from all tracked courses for declared elementary & secondary majors

Assessments Using Rubrics

Table 8 displays findings from assessment rubrics submitted for the initial teacher education program of the Department of Teaching, Learning, and Curriculum. Tables giving complete data for all courses in this section are found in Appendix A.

Table 8. Learning Outcomes in Initial Teacher Education Program, 2016-2017

Course Acronym	Title of Rubric	<i>N</i>	% at Levels 3-5 (all indicators)*	Mean Level (all indicators)
EDTE 165/630	Portfolio Rubric		Data not available	
EDTE 165/630	Personal Philosophy Paper Rubric		Data not available	
EDTE 228	Clinical Observation & Interaction Matrix	14	100%	4.93
EDTE 408	Micro-Teaching Assessment	6	100%	4.40
EDTE 408	Portfolio 1: Worldview	10	90%	4.23
EDTE 408	Portfolio 2: Human Growth & Change	10	100%	4.28
EDTE 408	Portfolio 3: Groups, Leadership, Change	10	87%	4.10
EDTE 408	Portfolio 4: Communication, Technology	10	95%	4.14
EDTE 408	Portfolio 5: Research & Evaluation	10	90%	4.06
EDTE 408	Portfolio 6: Personal, Profession. Growth	10	96%	4.14
EDTE 408	Portfolio 7: Content Area Knowledge	10	92%	4.16
EDTE 408	Portfolio Introduction & Closing	10	88%	4.26
EDTE 420	Literacy Intervention Strategies	6	100%	4.89
EDTE 424	Philosophy of Assessment	8	94%	4.36
EDTE 447	Lesson Observation	3	93%	3.45
EDTE 476	Final Exam	10	99%	4.73
EDTE 480	Philosophy of Classroom Management		Data not available	
EDTE 480	Classroom Management Plan		Data not available	
EDTE 488/588	Student Teaching Summative Evaluation by University Supervisors (General)		Data not available	
EDTE 488/588	Student Teaching Summative Evaluation by University Supervisors (English)		Data not available	

* For indicators showing below Satisfactory (Level 3) see Appendix A-1.

FOUNDATIONS COURSES

Table 9 provides rubric data on foundations courses for all advanced programs in the School of Education. Tables giving complete data for all courses in this section are found in Appendix A-3.

Table 9. Learning Outcomes for Advanced Programs Foundations Courses (All Compared with Distance), 2016-17

Course Acronym	Title of Rubric	All Students			Distance Students		
		N	% at Levels 3-5 (all indicators)*	Mean Level (all indicators)	N	% at Levels 3-5 (all indicators)*	Mean Level (all indicators)
EDFN 500	Pers & Prof Synthesis	25	88%	3.83	13	95%	4.39
EDRM 505	Essay Res Ethics	8	100%	5.00	-	-	-
EDRM 505	Essay Res Prof Role	8	100%	5.00	-	-	-
EDRM 505	Lit Review	8	95%	4.50	-	-	-
EDRM 505	Chapter 1, Intro	8	100%	4.60	-	-	-
EDRM 505	Chapter 3, Method	8	100%	4.70	-	-	-
EDRM 505	Final Exam, Art Eval	8	100%	4.88	-	-	-
EDRM 505	Research Proposal	7	99%	4.56	-	-	-

* For indicators showing below Satisfactory (Level 3) see Appendix A-3.

DEPARTMENT OF GRADUATE PSYCHOLOGY & COUNSELING

Assessment data for advanced programs in Graduate Psychology & Counseling are found in Table 10. Details of these assessment findings are located in Appendix B.

Table 10. Learning Outcomes for GPC Courses, 2016-2017

Course Acronym	Title of Rubric	N	% at Levels 3-5 (all indicators)	Mean Level (all indicators)
GDPC 514	Worldview Paper			Data not available
GDPC/SPED 525	PBS Website Review			Data not available
GDPC/SPED 525	RTL			Data not available

GDPC/SPED 525	Journal Article Review			Data not available
GDPC 654	Evaluation of Practicum 2.1			Data not available
GDPC	School Psych Portfolio Evaluation	8	100%	4.28
GDPC	School Counseling Dispositions			Data not available
GDPC	Clinical Mental Health Counseling Dispositions			Data not available
GDPC	School Psych Pract Supervisor Eval	13	100%	3.69*
GDPC	School Psych Counseling Eval	3	100%	4.15**
GDPC	Counseling Psychology Internship	4	100%	4.53
GDPC	Counseling Psychology Dispositions			Data not available
GDPC	Educational Psychology Dispositions			Data not available
GDPC	Counseling Psychology Practicum			Data not available

*Based on a 1-4 scale where 4 = Excellent, 3 = Above Average, 2 = Average, 1 = Needs to Improve.

**Not Observed was marked for 4 indicators on this evaluation.

DEPARTMENT OF LEADERSHIP

Assessment data for courses in the Educational Leadership program are found in Table 11. Details of these assessment findings are located in Appendix C. Assessment data for the Higher Education Administration programs are not available. Assessment data for the Leadership program are not available.

Table 11. Educational Leadership Program Learning Outcomes (All vs. Distance), 2016-17

Course Acronym	Title of Rubric	All Students			Distance Students		
		<i>N</i>	% at Levels 3-5 (all indicators)	Mean Level (all indicators)	<i>N</i>	% at Levels 3-5 (all indicators)	Mean Level (all indicators)
EDAL 520	Vision Statement			Data not available			
EDAL 520	Final Project			Data not available			

ASSESSMENT OUTCOMES BY CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK ELEMENTS

All rubric assessment data that have been collected for Teaching, Learning and Curriculum courses for the 2016-2017 academic year were aggregated then disaggregated by SED-TLC Conceptual Framework (SED TLC CF) elements. Across all TLC CF elements, 96% of rubric assessments were scored as Satisfactory or better (at least 3 on a five-point scale).

Among the TLC CF indicators, the highest mean ratings were given on TLC-CF 6.A “Demonstrate continuing professional development” (4.84) and TLC-CF 4 “Communication and Technology” (4.75). The TLC CF items that received the lowest mean ratings were TLC-CF 1 “Worldview” (3.80) and TLC-CF 2.B “Implement developmentally appropriate educational practices” (3.80), See Table 12.

Table 12. All TLC Rubric Assessments Disaggregated by TLC Conceptual Framework Element, 2016-2017

Standard	Description	# of Rubrics	# of Asmnts	5*	4	3	2	1	Mean
TLC-CF.1	Worldview: This Element addresses appreciation of the perspectives of others and development of a personal philosophy from which action and service arise.	1	5	0	4	1	0	0	3.80
TLC-CF.1.A	Understand basic philosophical perspectives...	1	10	3	6	0	1	0	4.10
TLC-CF.1.B	Critique philosophical approaches to education.	1	10	3	6	0	1	0	4.10
TLC-CF.1.C	Be able to articulate a personal and professional philosophy and construct support for it based on literature. Select educational practices based on philosophical perspective....	5	60	35	20	4	1	0	4.48
TLC-CF.2	Human Growth and Change: This Element addresses principles of growth behavior and the use of these principles to effect positive change for individuals and organizations.	1	5	0	4	1	0	0	3.80
TLC-CF.2.A	Describe developmentally appropriate educational practices. ...	4	57	35	14	8	0	0	4.47
TLC-CF.2.B	Implement developmentally appropriate educational practices. ...	4	88	17	40	27	4	0	3.80
TLC-CF.3.A	Implements effective planning to promote learning in the classroom....	3	41	9	18	12	2	0	3.83
TLC-CF.3.B	Works effectively with ALL students, parents, teachers, administrators and community members....	5	58	38	7	8	5	0	4.34
TLC-CF.3.C	Evaluate and articulate opinions of current political and legal issues that affect classroom practice....	1	10	4	4	0	2	0	4.00
TLC-CF.3.D	Creates effective learning environments which efficiently manage students, classroom assistants, and classroom resources....	3	30	13	5	8	4	0	3.90
TLC-CF.3.E	Consistently uses positional power and personal influence to optimize student learning....	2	11	4	5	1	1	0	4.09
TLC-CF.4	Communication and Technology:	1	16	14	1	0	1	0	4.75
TLC-CF.4.A	Communicate effectively in written, verbal, and non-verbal forms...	6	137	84	39	11	3	0	4.49
TLC-CF.4.B	Use electronic tools effectively for professional communication, teaching, research, and evaluation of student progress....	5	47	33	11	1	2	0	4.60
TLC-CF.5.A	Read, evaluate, interpret and use appropriate literature....	3	36	24	8	3	1	0	4.53
TLC-CF.5.B	Read, evaluate and interpret standardized and non-standardized assessments....	5	49	34	8	6	1	0	4.53
TLC-CF.5.C	Demonstrate and document ability to affect student learning....	2	10	6	2	2	0	0	4.40

Table 12. All TLC Rubric Assessments Disaggregated by TLC Conceptual Framework Element, 2016-2017 (continued)

Standard	Description	# of Rubrics	# of Asmnts	5*	4	3	2	1	Mean
TLC-CF.6.A	Demonstrate continuing professional development ...	3	74	66	5	2	1	0	4.84
TLC-CF.6.B	Demonstrate ethical behavior in all professional activities...	1	10	3	4	2	1	0	3.90
TLC-CF.6.C	Document personal application in maintaining physical, mental, spiritual, and social balance....	1	10	4	5	1	0	0	4.30
TLC-CF.6.D	Reflects on practice and implements plans for growth and change....	2	19	12	5	2	0	0	4.53
TLC-CF.7.A	Demonstrate continued growth in an understanding and appreciation of general and liberal arts. ...	1	10	3	5	2	0	0	4.10
TLC-CF.7.B	Demonstrate continued growth in knowledge of subject matter and pedagogy....	3	53	17	22	11	3	0	4.00
Total Assessments				461	248	113	34	0	
				54%	29%	13%	4%	0%	
Avg Mean									4.24
(April 2018)									

*5 = Exceptional, 4 = Proficient, 3 = Satisfactory, 2 = Emerging, 1 = Unsatisfactory

SECTION 3:
PROGRAM
QUALITY

Departments assess the quality of their programs by examining data throughout the program. Much of this data is from the assessments of candidates in the programs by SED faculty, as shown in the previous section. The assessment of candidates in field experiences and clinical practice provides feedback from educational professionals outside of the SED (see appendices). Key program data have been identified by each program for use in assessing program quality. This data is summarized in the following section by department.

SUMMARY OF PROGRAM DATA

Department of Teaching, Learning, and Curriculum

Many of the questions in the course evaluations conducted by the university are relevant to program quality. Since the evaluation data are disaggregated by department, but not by program, the following results apply to the Department of Teaching, Learning, and Curriculum (TLC) as a whole. There were 171 respondents to the 2016-2017 course evaluations. The average of the TLC students' mean ratings on the five questions in the "Course" section of the survey was 4.26. On one other relevant survey item, "Independent of the instructor, my overall rating of this course is:" students' mean rating was 3.99. Table 13 gives mean ratings on the five "Course" section questions and the overall rating question.

Table 13. All TLC Course Evaluation Ratings (Course Section), 2016-2017

Question	N	% at Levels 4 & 5	Mean ^a	StDev
This course helped me to express my ideas more clearly.	171	85	4.22	0.82
The learning objectives or goals for this course were clearly stated.	171	89	4.30	0.83
The grading system of this course was appropriate for the objectives of the course.	170	87	4.26	0.88
Methods of evaluation were fair and accurate measures of my learning.	170	82	4.18	0.98
This course helped me to critically evaluate different sources and/or points of view.	169	91	4.34	0.79
Independent of the instructor, my overall rating of this course is:	171	73	3.99	0.99

^a5 = Strongly Agree, 4 = Agree, 3 = Neutral, 2 = Disagree, 1 = Strongly Disagree

Teacher Education

In 2016-2017, the Teacher Education program had approximately 85 students, including those who have not yet been accepted into the program. On 14 key assessments across the program, the lowest mean rating was 3.45/5.00, while the average of the mean level across these 14 assessments is 4.30/5.00. On all but 2 of the key assessments reported, more than 90% of candidates scored at least 3.00/5.00.

Data from the 2016-2017 Senior Exit Surveys conducted across the University are disaggregated by program. This year, the low number of seniors in TLC's elementary and secondary education programs left a very small n in the senior survey: five secondary education seniors and three elementary education seniors took the survey. As such, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness only reported the results of secondary candidates to us. Secondary education seniors rated their program noticeably lower than the 2015-2016 seniors. While last year's seniors ($n = 18$) gave ratings of 4.00 (mean rating of 18 seniors on a five-point scale) or more on all 16 indicators related to program and faculty quality, this year's seniors (2016-2017, $n = 5$) gave ratings of 4.00 or more on only 5 out of 16 indicators. Of those indicators rated below 4.00, three were rated 3.40 ("academic advising was helpful," "faculty provided good advice about opportunities for careers and graduate school," and "I would recommend this program to a friend") and one was rated 3.20 ("there were adequate facilities and specialized equipment"). It should be noted, however, that even the lowest mean rating given by SED students (3.20) is still in the "agree" range of the survey. While the data also show that these SED students rated their program and faculty lower than the mean of all seniors across the university on most of the indicators, it is not clear from the survey if these secondary candidates were rating the education program and faculty or the program and faculty of their major field (e.g., English, sciences, etc.). (See Table 14.)

Table 14. Selected Senior Survey Ratings (SED vs. All Seniors), 2016-2017

Indicator	Elementary (<i>n</i> = 0)	Secondary (<i>n</i> = 5)	All Seniors
The program was academically stimulating	-	4.00	4.30
The program had sufficient variety in advanced course and program offerings	-	3.60	4.05
Advanced course and program offerings had sufficient depth of subject matter	-	3.80	4.19
There was appropriate opportunity for research and/or creative work.	-	3.60	4.02
There were sufficient opportunities for the practical application of learning (e.g., internships).	-	3.80	3.86
There were adequate facilities and specialized equipment	-	3.20	3.92
Library resources were adequate for the program	-	4.20	4.13
Academic advising was helpful	-	3.40	4.15
Faculty provided good advice about opportunities for careers and graduate school	-	3.40	4.05
Faculty were aware of new developments in their field or discipline	-	4.20	4.22
Faculty used technology effectively to enhance their teaching	-	3.80	4.12
Faculty used effective teaching methods that helped me learn	-	3.80	4.13
Faculty members showed genuine interest in each student.	-	3.80	4.31
Faculty taught me how Christian faith and ethics relate to my field	-	4.00	4.20
Upon graduation, I believe that I will be well prepared for a job or further study in my field	-	4.60	4.20
I would recommend this program to a friend.	-	3.40	4.08

Curriculum and Instruction

The Curriculum & Instruction program had 25 students enrolled during the 2016-2017 academic year.

Department of Graduate Psychology & Counseling

The Department of Graduate Psychology and Counseling (GPC) had 90 students enrolled during the 2016-2017 school year, distributed among the programs as follows: 2 in School Counseling (MA), 23 in Clinical Mental Health Counseling (CMHC) (MA), 10 in School Psychology (EdS), 23 in Educational Psychology (MA, EdD, and PhD), and 32 in Counseling Psychology (PhD).

There were 273 student course evaluation respondents in GPC. The average of the GPC students' mean ratings on the five questions related to the course (independent of the instructor) was 4.23. On one other relevant survey item, "Independent of the instructor, my overall rating of this course is:" students' mean rating was 3.91. Table 15 gives mean ratings on the five "Course" section questions and the overall rating question.

Table 15. All GPC Course Evaluation Ratings (Course Section), 2016-2017

Question	N	% at Levels 4 & 5	Mean ^a	StDev
This course helped me to express my ideas more clearly.	265	82	4.12	1.01
The learning objectives or goals for this course were clearly stated.	266	89	4.33	0.95
The grading system of this course was appropriate for the objectives of the course.	266	86	4.27	0.97
Methods of evaluation were fair and accurate measures of my learning.	266	83	4.19	1.00
This course helped me to critically evaluate different sources and/or points of view.	265	82	4.26	1.00
Independent of the instructor, my overall rating of this course is:	264	71	3.91	1.07

^a5 = Strongly Agree, 4 = Agree, 3 = Neutral, 2 = Disagree, 1 = Strongly Disagree

In 4 key assessments sampled across the GPC programs, the lowest mean rating was 3.69/5.00. The average of the mean levels is 4.23/5.00. Across the 4 assessments, 100% of all ratings were at least 3.00/5.00.

Department of Leadership

In the Department of Leadership (LEAD), there were 170 student course evaluation respondents. The average of the LEAD students' mean ratings on the five questions related to the course (independent of the instructor) was 4.39. On one other relevant survey item, "Independent of the instructor, my overall rating of this course is:" students' mean rating was 4.24. Table 16 gives mean ratings on the five "Course" section questions and the overall rating question.

Table 16. All LEAD Course Evaluation Ratings (Course Section), 2016-2017

Question	N	% at Levels 4 & 5	Mean ^a	StDev
This course helped me to express my ideas more clearly.	169	92	4.43	0.70
The learning objectives or goals for this course were clearly stated.	169	89	4.40	0.79
The grading system of this course was appropriate for the objectives of the course.	169	85	4.32	0.82
Methods of evaluation were fair and accurate measures of my learning.	169	86	4.33	0.80
This course helped me to critically evaluate different sources and/or points of view.	168	90	4.48	0.75
Independent of the instructor, my overall rating of this course is:	169	82	4.24	0.89

^a5 = Strongly Agree, 4 = Agree, 3 = Neutral, 2 = Disagree, 1 = Strongly Disagree

Leadership

In 2016-2017, there were 57 students enrolled in the Leadership program. Of 12 candidates who presented their portfolios, 100% were rated at least 3.00/5.00 on all 15

competencies. The average of the mean ratings across all 15 competencies is 3.97/5.00. Of 9 candidates who defended their dissertations, 100% were rated at least 3.00/4.00 across 16 of 18 indicators. The average of the mean ratings across all 18 indicators is 3.19/4.00.

Educational Leadership

Twenty-eight (28) students were enrolled in the Educational Leadership program during the 2016-2017 academic year.

Higher Education Administration

There were 17 students enrolled in the Higher Education Administration program in the 2016-2017 academic year (2 MA and 15 doctoral).

FOLLOW-UP DATA

Follow-up data from program graduates and their employers can provide valuable feedback as to how well the program prepared students for their professions. An exit survey of teacher education candidates is conducted by the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) at the end of each semester. Each candidate who is completing student teaching is surveyed; additionally, the Director of Student Teaching completes a survey (Supervisor survey) regarding each of these completers. The survey indicators are rated on a 4-point Likert scale. Data for 2016-2017 were not available.

SECTION 4:
FACULTY
ASSESSMENT

School of Education faculty members are assessed by administration, peers, and students, using several assessment methods, described in below.

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.

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 (tenure). 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.

STUDENT OPINION OF TEACHING

For many years, Andrews University students have been asked at the conclusion of each course to evaluate faculty performance and courses using the university's Student Opinion of Teaching form, which seeks feedback on the instructor's pedagogy and the value of the course.

One section of the course evaluation consists of nine questions related to the instructor. Across the SED, there were 614 respondents to the 2016-2017 course evaluations. The average of the SED students' mean ratings on the nine questions related to the instructor was 4.36. The highest mean score was for "the instructor was sensitive to and respectful of all people" (4.55), while the lowest mean score was for "timely, thoughtful, and helpful feedback was provided on tests and other work" (4.14). On one other relevant question, "Independent of the course, my

overall rating of this instructor’s teaching,” students’ mean rating was 4.15. Table 17 presents the means and distribution of scores.

Table 17. Mean Scores of Student Evaluations of SED Courses & Teachers, 2016-2017

Evaluation Statements	N	% at Levels 4 & 5	Mean^a	St Dev
The instructor was well prepared and organized.	606	89	4.40	0.84
The instructor made the subject clear and understandable.	604	87	4.34	0.93
The instructor stimulated my interest in the subject.	605	86	4.33	0.97
The instructor kept me involved in the learning process.	605	90	4.40	0.86
The instructor motivated me to do my best work.	605	85	4.33	0.95
The instructor was sensitive to and respectful of all people.	606	93	4.55	0.82
The instructor was available to provide help when needed.	604	90	4.45	0.83
The instructor helped me to understand the course content from a Christian perspective.	604	82	4.31	0.91
Timely, thoughtful, and helpful feedback was provided on tests and other work.	605	79	4.14	1.06
Independent of the course, my overall rating of this instructor’s teaching effectiveness is:	603	77	4.15	1.09

^a5 = Strongly Agree, 4 = Agree, 3 = Neutral, 2 = Disagree, 1 = Strongly Disagree

SENIOR SURVEY

As was noted earlier in this report, the low numbers of seniors in TLC’s elementary and secondary education programs left a very small *n* in the senior survey: five secondary education seniors and three elementary education seniors took the survey. This year’s seniors (2016-2017, *n* = 5) gave ratings of 4.00 or more on only 2 out of 7 indicators related to faculty (“faculty were aware of new developments in their field or discipline” and “faculty taught me how Christian faith and ethics relate to my field.” Of those indicators rated below 4.00, three were rated 3.80 (“faculty used technology effectively to enhance their teaching,” “faculty used

effective teaching methods that helped me learn,” and “faculty members showed genuine interest in each student”) and one was rated 3.40 (“academic advising was helpful”). It should be noted, however, that even the lowest mean rating given by SED students (3.40) is still in the “agree” range of the survey. While the data also show that these SED students rated their faculty lower than the mean of all seniors across the university on most of the indicators, it is not clear from the survey if these secondary candidates were rating the education faculty or the faculty of their major field (e.g., English, sciences, etc.). (See Table 14.)

SECTION 5: UNIT OPERATIONS
ASSESSMENT

ANNUAL DEPARTMENTAL REPORTS TO ADMINISTRATION

At the conclusion of the 2016-2017 academic year, the Dean of SED submitted the Unit's departmental reports to academic administration. These reports include summary data about candidates enrolled, departmental organization, faculty workloads, success of graduates, curricular changes, assessment of learner outcomes (forwarded to the university Office of Institutional Effectiveness), faculty scholarly and professional activities and achievements, efforts to improve teaching strategies, and departmental/school needs. In addition, these items are discussed in regular monthly briefings with the Provost.

All SED Curricular changes are approved through the Academic Policies and Curricula Committee (AP & CC) and are reviewed by the SED General Faculty. Off-campus programs are approved through the Affiliation and Extension Office and Committee. In addition, these initiatives go through the Financial Management Committee (25 members include the President, Provost, VP for Finance, the other five Academic Deans, Human Resources, etc.).

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 (and goals for the following year) 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.

FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE

The Dean, through membership in the university Budget and Financial Management Committees, participates in discussions regarding the setting and monitoring of unit budget targets and performance. The unit's financial performance continues to be relatively stable.

UNIT PERFORMANCE SCORES: STATE OF MICHIGAN

Beginning with the 2012-2013 academic year, the MDE has developed a new evaluation system for what they are now calling Educator Preparation Institutions (or EPIs). This new EPI Score is based on three elements: "the performance scores for the Michigan Test of Teacher Certification three-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the [academic year] Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points

attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84.5 [out of 100] is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year’s report” (from EPI score report). The new system categorizes EPIs as Satisfactory, At Risk, or Low Performing. The School of Education’s 2017 EPI Score (overall) is 89.6. (See Table 18.)

Table 18. EPI Score for Andrews University School of Education Compared to Michigan Mean and Range, 2014-2017

2014				
	SED Score	Michigan Mean	Michigan Range	Cut Score
MTTC	91.0	87.0	70.8–95.8	-
SURV	93.9	94.1	90.7–99.3	-
EFF	80.0	80.4	71.0–90.0	-
Overall	92.5	87.8	81.1–93.5	84
2015				
	SED Score	Michigan Mean	Michigan Range	Cut Score
MTTC	93.4	86.1	70.3–95.8	-
SURV	96.1	94.4	88.8–99.4	-
EFF	80.0	81.8	75.7–87.7	-
Overall	94.7	88.1	82.4–94.7	84.5
2016				
	SED Score	Michigan Mean	Michigan Range	Cut Score
MTTC	94.0	85.6	62.5–95.6	-
SURV	96.5	94.5	88.3–99.5	-
EFF	80.0	82.6	77.8–89.6	-
Overall	95.3	88.0	77.2–95.3	84.5
2017				
	SED Score	Michigan Mean	Michigan Range	Cut Score
MTTC	88.3	88.7	65.0–100.0	-
SURV	97.0	95.2	83.3–100.0	-
EFF	82.4	80.4	69.8–88.7	-
Overall	89.6	88.3	76.5–99.4	84.5

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION FOLLOW-UP DATA

The School of Education continues to conduct follow-up surveys of alumni and employers. Graduates surveyed are those who have graduated two years ago. This year, the SED Alumni Survey was sent to 83 alumni who graduated during the 2014-2015 school year. Of those 83 alumni, 25 responded, giving an overall response rate of 30.12%. Mean alumni ratings were above “Satisfactory” (3 or more on a five-point scale) on all questions. The questions with the lowest mean ratings were “relate effectively with individuals with special needs or disabilities” (3.65) and “grow spiritually” (3.76), while the highest mean ratings were for “practice the professional and ethical standards of your profession” (4.52) and “apply fair practices in your profession” (4.40). (See Table 19.)

On 13 out of 25 indicators, all respondents (100%) rated their preparation in the School of Education as at least “Satisfactory” (3 or higher on the 5-point scale). On only two indicators did fewer than 90% of respondents give a score of “Satisfactory” or better: “grow spiritually” (84%) and “collect data in a systematic way for professional use” (88%). (See Table 19.)

Table 19. SED Alumni Survey Results, 2014-2015

The School of Education has prepared you to...	<i>n</i>	Mean ^a	SD	% ^b
have the necessary knowledge of your content area	24	4.25	0.68	100
have the necessary skills of your profession	25	4.24	0.66	100
effectively apply skills in professional responsibilities	25	4.20	0.65	100
practice professional/ethical standards of profession	25	4.52	0.65	100
understand and interpret research in your profession	24	4.17	0.82	96
use research findings for decision making	25	4.08	0.91	96
collect data in a systematic way for professional use	25	3.92	1.04	88
report research findings	25	4.00	0.91	92
apply current theories/best practices to your profession	25	4.36	0.57	100
communicate effectively (written)	25	4.36	0.64	100
communicate effectively (oral)	24	4.33	0.64	100
use relevant technology in professional practice	24	4.04	1.00	92
create a positive environment for learning/development	25	4.32	0.48	100
plan/implement appropriate programs to enhance learning and development	25	4.12	0.67	100
assess and analyze learning and development	23	4.22	0.60	100
utilize outcome data for program improvement	23	4.00	0.80	96
relate effectively with individuals of diverse population	25	4.16	0.69	100
relate effectively with individuals with special needs and disabilities	23	3.65	0.93	91
apply fair practices in your profession	25	4.40	0.58	100
value service to society at large	25	4.24	0.78	96
believe that all individuals can learn	25	4.32	0.63	100
grow spiritually	25	3.76	1.13	84
understand your profession from a Christian perspective	25	4.12	0.93	92
integrate your worldview with your profession	25	4.12	1.17	92
deepen your faith commitment	24	3.83	1.24	94

^aScales based on 5-Excellent, 4-Very well, 3-Satisfactory, 2-Somewhat, 1-Not at all.

^bPercent responding "Satisfactory" to "Excellent" or "Adequate" to "Significantly."

Alumni were asked to provide employer contact information so SED Employer Surveys could be sent to all their employers. Of the 15 employer surveys solicited, 8 responded, giving a response rate of 53.33%. Employers mean ratings were consistently higher (sometimes a full point) than the graduates' self-ratings on the same indicators, with the exception of 3 items related to using research and data. Indicators with the highest mean ratings were "practices the professional and ethical standards of the profession" (4.88) and "plans and implements appropriate programs to enhance learning and development" (4.86). Indicators with the lowest mean ratings were "collects data in a systematic way for professional use" (3.86) and "reports research findings" (3.86). Table 20 displays employer survey data (2014-2015).

Table 20. SED Employer Survey Results, 2014-2015

Please rate your employee, a graduate of Andrews University, on the following qualities:	<i>n</i>	Mean ^a	SD	% ^b
has the necessary content knowledge	8	4.75	0.46	100
has the necessary skills of the profession	8	4.63	0.52	100
effectively applies his/her skills in professional responsibilities	8	4.75	0.46	100
practices professional/ethical standards of profession	8	4.88	0.35	100
understands and interprets research in the profession	7	4.00	0.58	100
uses research findings for decision making	7	4.29	0.76	100
collects data in a systematic way for professional use	7	3.86	0.90	100
reports research findings	7	3.86	0.69	100
applies the profession's current theories/best practices	8	4.63	0.52	100
communicates effectively (written)	8	4.75	0.46	100
communicates effectively (oral)	8	4.63	0.52	100
uses relevant technology in professional practice	8	4.50	0.53	100
creates a positive environment for learning/development	8	4.63	0.52	100
plans/implements appropriate programs to enhance learning/development	7	4.86	0.38	100
assesses and analyzes learning and development	8	4.75	0.46	100
utilizes outcome data for program improvement	8	4.50	0.53	100
relates effectively with individuals from diverse population	8	4.63	0.74	100
relates effectively with individuals with special needs or disabilities	6	4.67	0.82	100
applies fair practices in the profession	8	4.75	0.46	100
values service to society at large	8	4.63	0.52	100
believes that all individuals can learn	7	4.71	0.49	100

^aScales based on 5-Excellent, 4-Very well, 3-Satisfactory, 2-Somewhat, 1-Not at all.

^bPercent responding "Satisfactory" to "Excellent."

APPENDIX A.
Assessment Documents
for Teaching, Learning,
and Curriculum
Programs

EDTE 228 Clinical Observation/Interaction Matrix (Old Rubric)									
2016-2017									
	Exceptional (5 pts)	Proficient (4 pts)	Satisfactory (3 pts)	Emerging (2 pts)	Unsatisfactory (1 pt)	Mean	Mode	Stdev	
Heading & details: dates, times, locations, settings, schools visited included in journal and grid (sig, sheet).	14	0	0	0	0	5.00	5	0.000	
Use of appropriate language and sensitive approach relative to exceptionality including person first language and/or culture/race	14	0	0	0	0	5.00	5	0.000	
Observations & interactive activities are presented w/ descriptions of students relative to special education, disability labels, and descriptions of programs viewed. (Objective details) 3-4 pages	14	0	0	0	0	5.00	5	0.000	
Overall Summary - Summarize your first impressions of the children observed as to their general abilities and the type of interactions you saw in each of the various settings. (composite) 1 to 2 pages	14	0	0	0	0	5.00	5	0.000	
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?) Shows evidence of disabilities through content knowledge (Subjective analysis)	14	0	0	0	0	5.00	5	0.000	
Thought and effort demonstrated through editing/revision of writing. (correct mechanics observed) Typewritten product is neatly formatted, clear, and easy to understand.	7	6	1	0	0	4.43	5	0.623	
20 hours documented (signatures)	14	0	0	0	0	5.00	5	0.000	
Observations include Blossomland Learning Center (2 hours + tour) plus two other settings for required 20 hours.	14	0	0	0	0	5.00	5	0.000	
Total Assessments	105	6	1	0	0				
Percent	94%	5%	1%	0%	0%				
N=14					Avg Mean	4.93			
									(June 2017)

EDTE 408 Micro Teaching Assessment 2016-2017									
	Exceptional (5 pts)	Proficient (4 pts)	Satisfactory (3 pts)	Emerging (2 pts)	Unsatisfactory (1 pt)	Mean	Mode	Stdev	
Writing...	2	4	0	0	0	4.33	4	0.471	
Scope...	4	2	0	0	0	4.67	5	0.471	
Scope...	1	5	0	0	0	4.17	4	0.373	
Substance...	3	3	0	0	0	4.50	5	0.500	
Substance...	2	2	2	0	0	4.00	5	0.816	
Delivery...	3	2	1	0	0	4.33	5	0.745	
Reflection...	5	1	0	0	0	4.83	5	0.373	
Total Assessments	20	19	3	0	0				
Percent	48%	45%	7%	0%	0%				
N=6						Avg Mean	4.40		

(June 2017)

EDTE 408 Portfolio Element 2: Human Growth & Change 2016-2017								
	Exceptional (5 pts)	Proficient (4 pts)	Satisfactory (3 pts)	Emerging (2 pts)	Unsatisfactory (1 pt)	Mean	Mode	Stdev
Outcome II.A Describe developmentally appropriate educational practices....	3	6	1	0	0	4.20	4	0.600
Outcome II.B Implement developmentally appropriate ed practices....	4	5	1	0	0	4.30	4	0.640
Depth of Coverage...	3	5	2	0	0	4.10	4	0.700
Personalization...	5	5	0	0	0	4.50	5	0.500
Artifact Guidelines...	5	3	2	0	0	4.30	5	0.781
Total Assessments	20	24	6	0	0			
Percent	40%	48%	12%	0%	0%			
N=10						Avg Mean	4.28	

(June 2017)

EDTE 408 Portfolio Introduction & Closing 2015-2017									
	Exceptional (5 pts)	Proficient (4 pts)	Satisfactory (3 pts)	Emerging (2 pts)	Unsatisfactory (1 pt)	Mean	Mode	Stdev	
Cover Page...	7	2	0	1	0	4.50	5	0.922	
Title Page...	6	3	1	0	0	4.50	5	0.671	
Resume...	5	4	0	1	0	4.30	5	0.900	
Autobiographical Essay...	8	1	0	1	0	4.60	5	0.917	
Reflective Conclusion...	4	2	1	0	3	3.40	5	1.685	
	Total Assessments	30	12	2	3	3			
	Percent	60%	24%	4%	6%	6%			
N=10						Avg Mean	4.26		

(June 2017)

**EDTE 420 Literacy Intervention Strategies
2016-2017**

	Exceptional (5 pts)	Proficient (4 pts)	Satisfactory (3 pts)	Emerging (2 pts)	Unsatisfactory (1 pt)	Mean	Mode	Stdev
Provided details of all components of unit in a 1-2 page outline; submitted on time....	6	0	0	0	0	5.00	5	0.000
Lesson plans use language appropriate to church standards and to culture or ethnic group chosen for focus of mini-unit....	6	0	0	0	0	5.00	5	0.000
Lesson plans integrate content selection, timeline and organizational structures; objectives aligned with content standards and benchmarks. Formative and summative assessments completed....	6	0	0	0	0	5.00	5	0.000
A total of ten mini-unit lessons completed on time, unit shows field experience and meets all performance (no absences or late arrivals) criteria....	4	0	2	0	0	4.33	5	0.943
Mini-unit culminating activity presentation. Teacher/tutor presents mini-unit to class through power point demonstration, with student work included. Presentation is between 5 and 10 minutes in length....	6	0	0	0	0	5.00	5	0.000
Final Reflection - summary of initial/final assessments of student's reading skills. Four components + four recommendations. 2-3 page document; on time....	6	0	0	0	0	5.00	5	0.000
Total Assessments	34	0	2	0	0			
Percent	94%	0%	6%	0%	0%			
N=6					Avg Mean	4.89		
							(June 2017)	

**EDTE 424 Philosophy of Assessment
2016-2017**

	Exceptional (5 pts)	Proficient (4 pts)	Satisfactory (3 pts)	Emerging (2 pts)	Unsatisfactory (1 pts)	Mean	Mode	Stdev
Scope	8	0	0	0	0	5.00	5	0.000
Scope	6	1	0	1	0	4.50	5	1.000
Substance	2	3	3	0	0	3.88	4	0.781
Substance	3	0	5	0	0	3.75	3	0.968
Substance	5	1	1	1	0	4.25	5	1.090
Writing	6	1	0	1	0	4.50	5	1.000
Writing	6	1	0	1	0	4.50	5	1.000
Writing	5	2	1	0	0	4.50	5	0.707
Total Assessments	41	9	10	4	0			
Percent	64%	14%	16%	6%	0%			
N=8						Avg Mean	4.36	

(June 2017)

**EDTE 447 Lesson Observation
2016-2017**

	Exceptional (5 pts)	Proficient (4 pts)	Satisfactory (3 pts)	Emerging (2 pts)	Unsatisfactory (1 pts)	Mean	Mode	Stdev
A. Learner Development and Learning	0	2	0	0	0	4.00	4	0.000
A. Learner Development and Learning	0	2	1	0	0	3.67	4	0.471
B. Knowledge of Learners	0	2	0	0	0	4.00	4	0.000
B. Knowledge of Learners	0	2	1	0	0	3.67	4	0.471
C. Differentiated Instruction	0	0	2	1	0	2.67	3	0.471
C. Differentiated Instruction	0	0	2	1	0	2.67	3	0.471
C. Differentiated Instruction	0	0	2	1	0	2.67	3	0.471
D. Motivation and Learning	0	1	2	0	0	3.33	3	0.471
D. Motivation and Learning	0	1	2	0	0	3.33	3	0.471
D. Motivation and Learning	0	1	2	0	0	3.33	3	0.471
G. Content Pedagogy	0	1	1	0	0	3.50	3	0.500
G. Content Pedagogy	0	0	1	1	0	2.50	3	0.500
G. Content Pedagogy	0	1	1	0	0	3.50	3	0.500
G. Content Pedagogy	0	1	1	0	0	3.50	3	0.500
H. Resources	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	3	0.000

EDTE 447 Lesson Observation 2016-2017 (cont'd)								
	Exceptional (5 pts)	Proficient (4 pts)	Satisfactory (3 pts)	Emerging (2 pts)	Unsatisfactory (1 pts)	Mean	Mode	Stdev
I. Procedures:								
Instructional Strategies for Critical Thinking	0	1	2	0	0	3.33	3	0.471
J. Communication	0	3	0	0	0	4.00	4	0.000
K. Assessment	0	1	1	0	0	3.50	3	0.500
K. Assessment	0	1	1	0	0	3.50	3	0.500
L. Instructional Planning	0	2	1	0	0	3.67	4	0.471
L. Instructional Planning	0	2	1	0	0	3.67	4	0.471
M. Procedures:								
Introductory Activities	0	0	2	1	0	2.67	3	0.471
N. Procedures:								
Closing/Concluding Activities	0	2	1	0	0	3.67	4	0.471
N. Procedures:								
Closing/Concluding Activities	0	2	1	0	0	3.67	4	0.471
N. Procedures:								
Closing/Concluding Activities	0	2	1	0	0	3.67	4	0.471
P. Collaboration	0	3	0	0	0	4.00	4	0.000
P. Collaboration	0	3	0	0	0	4.00	4	0.000
P. Collaboration	0	3	0	0	0	4.00	4	0.000
Total Assessments	0	39	30	5	0			
Percent	0%	53%	41%	7%	0%			
N=3						Avg Mean	3.45	
							(June 2017)	

**EDTE 476 Final Exam
2016-2017**

	Exceptional (5 pts)	Proficient (4 pts)	Satisfactory (3 pts)	Emerging (2 pts)	Unsatisfactory (1 pt)	Mean	Mode	Stdev
Technology Requested	9	0	0	0	0	5.00	5	0.000
Networking/Internet	8	2	0	0	0	4.80	5	0.400
Rational	8	2	0	0	0	4.80	5	0.400
Formatting of Letter	7	2	1	0	0	4.60	5	0.663
Philosophy Ideal plan for use of Internet at grade level and relationship to NETS	9	0	1	0	0	4.80	5	0.600
Safety in use of technology	8	2	0	0	0	4.80	5	0.400
Safety in use of technology	9	0	1	0	0	4.80	5	0.600
Equity issues Types of technology activities for both students and teachers	8	1	0	1	0	4.60	5	0.917
Future of the Internet and technology.	6	4	0	0	0	4.60	5	0.490
	6	3	1	0	0	4.50	5	0.671
Total Assessments	78	16	4	1	0			
Percent	79%	16%	4%	1%	0%			

N=10

Avg Mean 4.73

(June 2017)

APPENDIX B.
Assessment Documents
for Foundations Courses

EDFN 500 Personal and Professional Synthesis (All Candidates) 2016-2017								
	Exceptional (5 pts)	Proficient (4 pts)	Satisfactory (3 pts)	Emerging (2 pts)	Unsatisfactory (1 pts)	Mean	Mode	Stdev
SED Element I.A: Explain worldviews & trace their historical development ...	12	9	3	1	0	4.28	5	0.826
SED Element I.B: Critique worldviews from a Christian perspective ...	13	7	4	1	0	4.28	5	0.873
SED Element I.B: Critique worldviews from a Christian perspective ...	7	10	7	1	0	3.92	4	0.845
Element VI.A. Demonstrate continuing professional development ...	6	6	8	5	0	3.52	3	1.063
SED Element I.C: Integrate principles of a Christian worldview into their chosen field of study...	10	9	5	1	0	4.12	5	0.863
SED Element III.B: Relate effectively with various cultural, racial & special interest groups...	8	11	1	4	1	3.84	4	1.155
SED Element IV.A: Communicate effectively in written, (verbal & nonverbal form[s])...	2	7	12	3	1	3.24	3	0.907
SED Element IV.A: Communicate effectively in written, (verbal & nonverbal form[s])...	3	10	3	3	2	3.429	4	1.178
	Total Assessments		61	69	43	19	4	
	Percent		32%	36%	22%	10%	2%	
N=25						Avg Mean	3.83	
								(June 2017)

**EDFN 500 Personal and Professional Synthesis (Online Candidates)
2016-2017**

	Exceptional (5 pts)	Proficient (4 pts)	Satisfactory (3 pts)	Emerging (2 pts)	Unsatisfactory (1 pts)	Mean	Mode	Stdev
SED Element I.A: Explain worldviews & trace their historical development ...	9	4	0	0	0	4.69	5	0.462
SED Element I.B: Critique worldviews from a Christian perspective ...	8	5	0	0	0	4.62	5	0.487
SED Element I.B: Critique worldviews from a Christian perspective ...	7	5	1	0	0	4.46	5	0.634
Element VI.A. Demonstrate continuing professional development ...	8	5	0	0	0	4.62	5	0.487
SED Element I.C: Integrate principles of a Christian worldview into their chosen field of study...	9	4	0	0	0	4.69	5	0.462
SED Element III.B: Relate effectively with various cultural, racial & special interest groups...	9	4	0	0	0	4.69	5	0.462
SED Element IV.A: Communicate effectively in written, (verbal & nonverbal form[s])...	4	7	2	0	0	4.15	4	0.662
SED Element IV.A: Communicate effectively in written, (verbal & nonverbal form[s])...	1	7	0	4	1	3.23	4	1.187
Total Assessments	55	41	3	4	1			
Percent	53%	40%	3%	4%	1%			

N=13

Avg Mean 4.39

(June 2017)

EDRM 505 Final Exam Article Evaluation 2016-2017									
	Exceptional (5 pts)	Proficient (4 pts)	Satisfactory (3 pts)	Emerging (2 pts)	Unsatisfactory (1 pt)	Mean	Mode	Stddev	
Research Objectives...	7	1	0	0	0	4.88	5	0.331	
Sample frame and sampling procedures...	7	1	0	0	0	4.88	5	0.331	
Data collection and non- response rate...	7	1	0	0	0	4.88	5	0.331	
Major findings and limitations of the study...	7	1	0	0	0	4.88	5	0.331	
Discussion of results...	7	1	0	0	0	4.88	5	0.331	
Total Assessments	35	5	0	0	0				
Percent	88%	13%	0%	0%	0%				
N=8						Avg Mean	4.88		

(June 2017)

**EDRM 505 Literature Review Evaluation
2016-2017**

	Exceptional (5 pts)	Proficient (4 pts)	Satisfactory (3 pts)	Emerging (2 pts)	Unsatisfactory (1 pt)	Mean	Mode	Stdev
Indicate the Purpose...	6	1	1	0	0	4.63	5	0.696
Defined criteria for selection of sources....	5	2	1	0	0	4.50	5	0.707
Literature are relevant to the problem/topic...	8	0	0	0	0	5.00	5	0
Primary Literature emphasized...	5	2	1	0	0	4.50	5	0.707
Quotation format/references...	2	5	1	0	0	4.13	4	0.599
Complete bibliographic data....	6	2	0	0	0	4.75	5	0.433
Logical Organization of the content...	8	0	0	0	0	5.00	5	0
Comparison and contrast of studies...	5	2	0	1	0	4.38	5	0.992
Major studies discussed in detail....	4	2	1	1	0	4.13	5	1.053
Interpretation and understanding of prior research....	6	0	1	1	0	4.38	5	1.111
Methodological analyses appropriate for sustain a design...	3	2	1	2	0	3.75	5	1.199
Establish the importance and significance of the study....	7	1	0	0	0	4.88	5	0.331
Total Assessments	65	19	7	5	0			
Percent	68%	20%	7%	5%	0%			

N=8

Avg Mean 4.50

(June 2017)

EDRM 505 Proposal Evaluation 2016-2017								
	Exceptional (5 pts)	Proficient (4 pts)	Satisfactory (3 pts)	Emerging (2 pts)	Unsatisfactory (1 pt)	Mean	Mode	Stdev
Statement of the Problem. Research Question ...	5	1	1	0	0	4.57	5	0.728
Significance of the study...	4	2	1	0	0	4.43	5	0.728
Literature Review...	6	0	1	0	0	4.71	5	0.700
Research design...	5	2	0	0	0	4.71	5	0.452
Sampling...	5	2	0	0	0	4.71	5	0.452
Definition of variables...	5	2	0	0	0	4.71	5	0.452
Instrumentation...	4	2	1	0	0	4.43	5	0.728
Data Collection...	3	4	0	0	0	4.43	4	0.495
Data Analysis...	5	0	1	1	0	4.29	5	1.161
Overall Quality of the Proposal...	4	3	0	0	0	4.57	5	0.495
Total Assessments	46	18	5	1	0			
Percent	66%	26%	7%	1%	0%			
N=7						Avg Mean	4.56	

(June 2017)

EDRM 505 Essay on Research (Ethical Issues) 2016-2017										
	Exceptional (5 pts)	Proficient (4 pts)	Satisfactory (3 pts)	Emerging (2 pts)	Unsatisfactory (1 pt)	Mean	Mode	Stdev		
Information about professional importance of ethics on research	8	0	0	0	0	5.00	5	0		
Understanding of research ethical issues in his/her profession	8	0	0	0	0	5.00	5	0		
Understands importance and benefits of ethics in research in the profession.	8	0	0	0	0	5.00	5	0		
Value ethics in research as professional practice	8	0	0	0	0	5.00	5	0		
Committed to ethics on research in his/her profession	8	0	0	0	0	5.00	5	0		
Total Assessments	40	0	0	0	0					
Percent	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%					
N=8						Avg Mean	5.00			
									(June 2017)	

**EDRM 505 Chapter 1, Introduction
2016-2017**

	Exceptional (5 pts)	Proficient (4 pts)	Satisfactory (3 pts)	Emerging (2 pts)	Unsatisfactory (1 pt)	Mean	Mode	Stdev
Topic relevance	4	4	0	0	0	4.50	4	0.500
Problem context	4	4	0	0	0	4.50	4	0.500
Research purpose	6	2	0	0	0	4.75	5	0.433
Research problem	6	2	0	0	0	4.75	5	0.433
Research problem	6	2	0	0	0	4.75	5	0.433
Significance and importance	4	4	0	0	0	4.50	4	0.500
Theoretical framework	4	4	0	0	0	4.50	4	0.500
Delimitations and limitations	4	4	0	0	0	4.50	4	0.500
Terms definitions	4	4	0	0	0	4.50	4	0.500
Overall quality	6	2	0	0	0	4.75	5	0.433

Total Assessments

48

32

0

0

0

Percent

60%

40%

0%

0%

0%

N=8

Avg Mean

4.60

(June 2017)

**EDRM 505 Chapter 3, Methodology
2016-2017**

	Exceptional (5 pts)	Proficient (4 pts)	Satisfactory (3 pts)	Emerging (2 pts)	Unsatisfactory (1 pt)	Mean	Mode	Stdev
Introduction	5	3	0	0	0	4.63	5	0.484
Type of research	8	0	0	0	0	5.00	5	0.000
Population and sampling	5	3	0	0	0	4.63	5	0.484
Hypotheses	5	3	0	0	0	4.63	5	0.484
Variables definitions	8	0	0	0	0	5.00	5	0.000
Instrumentation	5	3	0	0	0	4.63	5	0.484
Data collection procedures	5	3	0	0	0	4.63	5	0.484
Data analysis procedures	5	3	0	0	0	4.63	5	0.484
Schedule and budget	5	3	0	0	0	4.63	5	0.484
Overall quality of the document	5	3	0	0	0	4.63	5	0.484

Total Assessments

56

24

0

0

0

Percent

70%

30%

0%

0%

0%

N=8

Avg Mean

4.70

(June 2017)

APPENDIX C.
Assessment Documents
for Graduate Psychology
and Counseling
Programs

**GPC School Psychology Portfolio Evaluation
2016-2017**

	Exceptional (5 pts)	Proficient (4 pts)	Satisfactory (3 pts)	Emerging (2 pts)	Unsatisfactory (1 pt)	Mean	Mode	Stdev
Overall General: Graded on appearance, writing conventions, aesthetic appeal, individualized	3	5	0	0	0	4.38	4	0.484
Data-Based Decision Making and Accountability	3	5	0	0	0	4.38	4	0.484
Consultation and Collaboration Interventions and Instructional Support to Develop Academic Skills	3	5	0	0	0	4.38	4	0.484
Interventions and Mental Health Services to Develop Social and Life Skills	2	6	0	0	0	4.25	4	0.433
School-Wide Practices to Promote Learning	2	6	0	0	0	4.25	4	0.433
Preventive and Responsive Services	2	6	0	0	0	4.25	4	0.433
Family-School Collaboration Services	2	6	0	0	0	4.25	4	0.433
Diversity in Development and Learning	2	6	0	0	0	4.25	4	0.433
Research and Program Evaluation	2	6	0	0	0	4.25	4	0.433
Legal, Ethical, and Profession Practice	2	6	0	0	0	4.25	4	0.433
Total Assessments	25	63	0	0				
Percent	28%	72%	0%	0%				
N=8						Avg Mean	4.28	

(June 2017)

**School Psychology Counseling Evaluation
2016-2017**

	Exceptional (5 pts)	Proficient (4 pts)	Satisfactory (3 pts)	Emerging (2 pts)	Unsatisfactory (1 pt)	Not Observed	Mean	Mode	Stdev
1. Knows the principles, models, and documentation formats of biopsychosocial case conceptualization and treatment planning.	1	0	2	0	0	0	3.67	3	0.943
2. Uses the principles and practices of diagnosis, treatment, referral, and prevention of mental and emotional disorders to initiate, maintain, and terminate counseling.	1	1	1	0	0	0	4.00	5	0.816
3. Applies multicultural competencies through case conceptualization, diagnosis, treatment, referral, and prevention of mental and emotional disorders.	1	1	1	0	0	0	4.00	5	0.816
4. Applies effective strategies to promote client understanding of and access to a variety of community resources.	1	0	1	0	0	1	2.67	0	2.055
5. Demonstrates the ability to use procedures for assessing and managing suicide risk.	1	0	1	0	0	1	2.67	0	2.055
6. Applies current record-keeping standards.	1	1	1	0	0	0	4.00	5	0.816
7. Provides appropriate strategies when working with clients with addiction and co-occurring disorders.	0	2	1	0	0	0	3.67	4	0.471
8. Demonstrates the ability to recognize his or her own limitations and seek supervision or refer clients when appropriate.	1	1	1	0	0	0	4.00	5	0.816
9. Demonstrates the ability to modify counseling systems, theories, techniques, and interventions to make them culturally appropriate for diverse populations.	0	1	2	0	0	0	3.33	3	0.471

**School Psychology Counseling Evaluation
2016-2017 (Cont'd)**

	Exceptional (5 pts)	Proficient (4 pts)	Satisfactory (3 pts)	Emerging (2 pts)	Unsatisfactory (1 pt)	Not Observed	Mean	Mode	Stdev
10. Demonstrates skill in conducting an intake interview, a mental status evaluation, a biopsychosocial history, a mental health history, and a psychological assessment for treatment planning and caseload management.	1	2	0	0	0	0	4.33	4	0.471
11. Applies relevant research findings to inform practice.	0	2	1	0	0	0	3.67	4	0.471
12. Develops measurable outcomes in programs, interventions, and treatments.	1	2	0	0	0	0	4.33	4	0.471
13. Analyzes and uses data to increase the effectiveness of interventions and programs.	0	3	0	0	0	0	4.00	4	0
14. Demonstrates appropriate use of diagnostic tools, including the current edition of the DSM, to describe the symptoms and clinical presentation of clients with mental and emotional impairments.	1	1	1	0	0	0	4.00	5	0.816
15. Conceptualizes an accurate multi-axial diagnosis of disorders presented by a client and discuss the differential diagnosis with collaborating professionals.	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	0	2.16
16. Differentiates between diagnosis and developmentally appropriate reactions during crises, disasters, and other trauma-causing events.	1	2	0	0	0	0	4.33	4	0.471
17. Makes appropriate referrals to school and/or community resources.	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	0	2.16
18. Starts and ends sessions on time.	3	0	0	0	0	0	5.00	5	0
19. Maintains confidentiality at all times.	3	0	0	0	0	0	5.00	5	0

**School Psychology Counseling Evaluation
2016-2017 (Cont'd)**

	Exceptional (5 pts)	Proficient (4 pts)	Satisfactory (3 pts)	Emerging (2 pts)	Unsatisfactory (1 pt)	Not Observed	Mean	Mode	Stdev
20. Dresses in a professionally appropriate manner and is neatly groomed.	3	0	0	0	0	0	5.00	5	0
21. Demonstrates ethical behavior.	3	0	0	0	0	0	5.00	5	0
22. Responds with genuineness, accurate empathy, and positive regard.	3	0	0	0	0	0	5.00	5	0
23. Follows approved format for writing intake reports, progress notes, and termination/transfer summaries.	3	0	0	0	0	0	5.00	5	0
24. Writes intake reports and progress notes as soon as possible for each session.	3	0	0	0	0	0	5.00	5	0
25. Videotapes or records every session and reviews important segments in supervision.	2	1	0	0	0	0	4.67	5	0.471
26. Accepts responsibility in supervision for self-evaluation.	3	0	0	0	0	0	5.00	5	0
27. Applies new insights and interventions resulting from supervision.	2	1	0	0	0	0	4.67	5	0.471
Total Assessments	41	23	13	0	0				
Percent	53%	30%	17%	0%	0%				
N=3						Avg Mean	4.15		
									(Nov 2016)

Counseling Psychology Practicum Supervisor Evaluation, 2016-2017

	Excellent (4 pts)	Above Average (3 pts)	Average (2 pts)	Needs to Improve (1 pt)	Mean	Mode	Stddev
1. Supervision helped me gain insight into client dynamics.	11	1	1	0	3.77	4	0.576
2. Supervision helped me gain insight into my own dynamics.	9	3	1	0	3.62	4	0.625
3. Supervision helped me to improve my treatment planning skills.	8	2	0	0	3.80	4	0.400
4. Supervision encouraged/increased my awareness and use of professional literature, research, and/or other media	7	5	1	0	3.46	4	0.634
5. Supervision encouraged/increased my awareness and use of video and/or observational appraisals of my/other's therapy skills.	3	2	1	0	3.33	4	0.745
6. Supervision increased my competency in report writing.	9	3	0	0	3.75	4	0.433
7. Supervision helped me develop proficiency in the use of DSM and diagnosis in client assessment.	9	3	0	0	3.75	4	0.433
8. Supervision helped me improve my ability to establish therapeutic relationships with clients.	8	4	0	0	3.67	4	0.471
9. Supervision provided a positive learning environment that balanced support and confrontation.	12	0	1	0	3.85	4	0.533
10. Supervision helped me to develop more effective intervention skills.	9	2	1	0	3.67	4	0.624
11. Supervision increased my multi-cultural sensitivity and skills.	7	5	1	0	3.46	4	0.634
12. Supervision provided opportunities for developing general strategies and for exploring alternative therapy responses.	10	2	1	0	3.69	4	0.606
13. My supervisor was empathic.	11	2	0	0	3.85	4	0.361
14. My supervisor acknowledged my competencies.	11	2	0	0	3.85	4	0.361
15. My supervisor encouraged independent thinking and action.	12	0	1	0	3.85	4	0.533
Total Assessments	136	36	9	0			
Percent	75%	20%	5%	0%			

N=13

Avg
Mean 3.69

(Sept 2017)

**Counseling Psychology Internship
2016-2017**

	Exceptional (5 pts)	Proficient (4 pts)	Satisfactory (3 pts)	Emerging (2 pts)	Unsatisfactory (1 pt)	Mean	Mode	Stdev
1. Has professional and appropriate interactions with treatment teams, peers and supervisors; seeks supervisor and peer support as needed.	4	0	0	0	0	5.00	5	0.000
2. Demonstrates positive coping strategies with personal and professional stressors and challenges. Maintains professional functioning and quality client care.	2	2	0	0	0	4.50	5	0.500
3. Responsible for key client care tasks (e.g. phone calls, letters, case management), completes tasks promptly. All client contacts, including scheduled and unscheduled appointments, and phone contacts are well documented.	3	0	0	0	0	5.00	5	0.000
4. Efficient and effective time management. Keeps scheduled appointments and meetings on time. Keeps supervisors aware of whereabouts as needed. Minimizes unplanned leave, whenever possible.	2	2	0	0	0	4.50	5	0.500
5. Effectively evaluates, manages and documents client risk by assessing immediate concerns such as suicidality, homicidality, and safety issues. Collaborates with clients in crisis to make appropriate short-term safety plans, and intensify treatment as needed. Discusses all applicable confidentiality issues openly with clients.	3	1	0	0	0	4.75	5	0.433
6. Demonstrates good knowledge of ethical principles and state law. Consistently applies these appropriately, seeking consultation as needed.	2	2	0	0	0	4.50	5	0.500

**Counseling Psychology Internship
2016-2017 (cont'd)**

	Exceptional (5 pts)	Proficient (4 pts)	Satisfactory (3 pts)	Emerging (2 pts)	Unsatisfactory (1 pt)	Mean	Mode	Stdev
7. Spontaneously raises issues relating to individual differences with clients as appropriate, conveys ease in working with a range of backgrounds, is aware and sensitive to individual differences, and accurately self-monitors own responses to differences.	3	1	0	0	0	4.75	5	0.433
8. Independently monitors and applies knowledge of self as a cultural being in	3	0	1	0	0	4.50	5	0.866
9. Independently monitors and applies knowledge of diversity in others as cultural beings in assessment, treatment, and consultation.	3	1	0	0	0	4.75	5	0.433
10. Demonstrates a thorough working knowledge of psychiatric diagnostic nomenclature and diagnostic nomenclature and DSM classification. Utilizes historical, interview and psychometric data to diagnose accurately.	1	2	1	0	0	4.00	4	0.707
11. Promptly and proficiently administers commonly used tests in his/her area of practice. Appropriately chooses the tests to be administered. Demonstrates competence in administering intelligence and personality tests.	1	2	0	0	0	4.33	4	0.471
12. Interprets the results of psychological tests used in his/her area of practice. Demonstrates competence interpreting intelligence and personality tests.	1	2	0	0	0	4.33	4	0.471
13. Writes a well-organized psychological report. Answers the referral question clearly and provides the referral source with specific recommendations.	1	2	0	0	0	4.33	4	0.471

Counseling Psychology Internship 2016-2017 (cont'd)								
	Exceptional (5 pts)	Proficient (4 pts)	Satisfactory (3 pts)	Emerging (2 pts)	Unsatisfactory (1 pt)	Mean	Mode	Stdev
14. Plans and carries out a feedback interview. Explains the test results in terms the client and/or caregiver can understand, provides suitable recommendations and responds to issues raised by client or caregiver.	1	1	1	0	0	4.00	5	0.816
15. Formulates a useful case conceptualization that draws on theoretical and research knowledge. Collaborates with client to form appropriate treatment goals.	2	2	0	0	0	4.50	5	0.500
16. Interventions are well-timed, effective and consistent with empirically supported treatments.	3	1	0	0	0	4.75	5	0.433
Total Assessments	35	21	3	0	0			
Percent	59%	36%	5%	0%	0%			
N=4						Avg Mean	4.53	

(Sept 2017)