



CAEP Annual Reporting Measures (Component 5.4 I A.5.4) 2017/2018

Impact Measures (CAEP Standard 4)	Outcome Measures
1. Impact on P-12 learning and development (Component 4.1)	5. Graduation Rates (initial & advanced levels)
2. Indicators of teaching effectiveness (Component 4.2)	6. Ability of completers to meet licensing (certification) and any additional state requirements; Title II (initial & advanced levels)
3. Satisfaction of employers and employment milestones (Components 4.3 A.4.1)	7. Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they have prepared (initial & advanced levels)
4. Satisfaction of completers (Components 4.4 A.4.2)	8. Student loan default rates and other consumer information (initial & advanced levels)

Impact Measures (CAEP Standard 4)

1. Impact on P-12 learning and development

The EPP demonstrates through multiple measures that completers contribute to expected levels of student learning growth. The initial set of names of completers and associated employers was gathered from the Teaching, Learning and Curriculum Department at Andrews University. Additionally, in collaboration with the Office of Education at the North American Division of Seventh-day Adventists, further details were gathered regarding completer's employment during the following school years: 2016-2017. Specifically, the data obtained were names of completers, years taught, schools of employment, and subjects taught during those years. These names with their associated components were checked against university records as a reliability check and confirmed.

Multiple measures using available ITBS scores in various subject areas (i.e., composite scores and subject areas in Science, Mathematics, Language Arts, and Social Studies) ([Link to Evidence](#))

4.1a, 4.1b, 4.1c, 4.1d, 4.1e) were collected across multiple locations and school years to measure whether completers contributed to their students expected academic growth. Scores were available for schools in the Adventist school system in the United States, where most of our completers are employed. The ITBS test scores for students were analyzed in connection to their teachers (the completers) in order to measure whether students were progressing at expected levels of growth.

We collected available pre- and post- ITBS scores for students taught by our completers and had ITBS scores available for the 2016-17 school year.

In our analysis, we set as a baseline expectation that students would demonstrate knowledge within ± 1 SD of the national normal curve equivalent (NCE) mean on the ITBS, which equates to national percentile rank (NPR) medians between 20 and 80. Additionally, in order to measure expected levels of student learning, we compared students' NCE before the completer taught the student to the student's NCE subsequent to instruction by the completer. If the NCE post-score was not statistically significantly different from the NCE pre-score, then the assumption was that the student demonstrated, the expected level of student-learning under the completer's instruction.

Multiple measures collected including composite scores and subject areas in Science, Mathematics, Language Arts, and Social Studies. The *Ns* are the number of students who had scores for the specific measures in two consecutive years. The mean and median scores show the central tendency of outcome from the student population analyzed, and the Cohen's *D* shows the effect size of the difference between the students' pre- and post-scores.

In general, differences in NCE scores observed from one year to another are within the margin of error and might be attributed to random error and minor fluctuation in scores. The findings from this collection indicate that students are therefore progressing and learning as expected under the teaching of our completers and their NPRs were within the baseline expectation (i.e., within ± 1 SD of the national NCE mean on the ITBS with all students' NPR medians between 20 and 80).

Specifically, the data show no significant negative or positive differences from comparative years in 2014-15, 2015-16, and 2016-17 in composite, Mathematics, Language Arts, or Social Studies scores, which indicates expected student-learning growth during these years in these subjects. The single exception is in Science during 2014-15, when there was a positive effect evident in significantly higher post-scores on NCEs after instruction by our completers (Cohen's $D = 0.43$), which indicates greater-than-expected student-learning growth during the 2014-15 academic year in Science.

Interpretation

Given the above findings, we conclude that the students of our completers who teach in either the SDA education system or Michigan public school system are performing at expected levels or higher.

Table 1a

Number of Participants per Institution and Year for Composite ITBS Score Calculations

School Name	Years			
	2014	2015	2016	2017
Alpine Christian	0	7	2	0
First Flint Elementary	4	6	7	4
Indianapolis Jr. Academy	10	15	0	0
Ithaca Elementary	2	3	6	2
Kalamazoo Jr. Academy	3	3	0	0
Miami Gardens WAKJA	15	19	0	0
Oakhurst	7	7	6	1
Milwaukee SDA School	0	0	36	42
Pittsford Elementary	0	3	3	3
Roseburg Jr Academy	0	0	10	7
Tri City Jr Academy	0	6	5	0
Warren Elementary	0	13	11	14
Total	41	82	86	73

Table 1b

Number of Participants per Institution and Year for Science ITBS Score Calculations

School Name	Years			
	2014	2015	2016	2017
ACA Raleigh	0	0	6	10
Alpine Christian	0	7	2	0
First Flint Elementary	4	6	7	4
Indianapolis Jr. Academy	10	15	0	0
Ithaca Elementary	2	3	6	2
Kalamazoo Jr. Academy	3	3	0	0
Miami Gardens WAKJA	15	19	0	0
Oakhurst	7	7	6	1
Milwaukee SDA School	0	0	36	42
Pittsford Elementary	0	3	3	3
Roseburg Jr Academy	0	0	10	7
Tri City Jr Academy	0	6	5	0
Berrien Springs	0	34	53	42
Warren Elementary	0	0	11	14
Total	41	103	145	125

Table 1c

Number of Participants per Institution and Year for Language Arts ITBS Score Calculations

School Name	Years			
	2014	2015	2016	2017
ACA Raleigh	0	0	1	4
Alpine Christian	0	7	2	0
First Flint Elementary	4	6	7	4
Indianapolis Jr. Academy	10	15	0	0
Ithaca Elementary	2	3	6	2
Kalamazoo Jr. Academy	3	3	0	0
Miami Gardens WAKJA	15	19	0	0
Oakhurst	7	7	6	1
Milwaukee SDA School	0	0	36	42
Pittsford Elementary	0	3	3	3
Roseburg Jr Academy	0	0	10	7
Tri City Jr Academy	0	6	5	0
Berrien Springs	0	14	31	17
Warren Elementary	0	0	11	14
Total	41	83	118	94

Table 1d

Number of Participants per Institution and Year for Mathematics ITBS Score Calculations

School Name	Years			
	2014	2015	2016	2017
ACA Raleigh	0	0	1	4
Alpine Christian	0	7	2	0
Battle Creek Academy	8	15	8	0
First Flint Elementary	4	6	7	4
Indianapolis Jr. Academy	10	15	0	0
Ithaca Elementary	2	3	6	2
Kalamazoo Jr. Academy	3	3	0	0
Miami Gardens WAKJA	15	19	0	0
Oakhurst	7	7	6	1
Midland Adventist Academy	0	0	11	11
Milwaukee SDA School	0	0	36	42
Pittsford Elementary	0	3	3	3
Roseburg Jr Academy	0	0	10	7
Tri City Jr Academy	0	6	5	0
Berrien Springs	0	14	31	17
Warren Elementary	0	0	11	14
Total	49	98	137	105

Table 1e

Number of Participants per Institution and Year for Social Studies ITBS Score Calculations

School Name	Years			
	2014	2015	2016	2017
ACA Raleigh	0	0	6	10
Alpine Christian	0	7	2	0
First Flint Elementary	4	6	7	4
Indianapolis Jr. Academy	10	15	0	0
Ithaca Elementary	2	3	6	2
Kalamazoo Jr. Academy	3	3	0	0
Miami Gardens WAKJA	15	19	0	0
Oakhurst	7	7	6	1
Milwaukee SDA School	0	0	36	42
Pittsford Elementary	0	3	3	3
Roseburg Jr Academy	0	0	10	7
Tri City Jr Academy	0	6	5	0
Roseburg Jr Academy	0	0	10	7
Tri City Jr Academy	0	6	5	0
Warren Elementary	0	0	11	14
Total	41	69	92	83

Table 2

Change in students of completers score in ITBS measure as NCE Mean and NP Median for years between 2014 and 2017 by Composite, Science, Language-arts, and Mathematics.

Outcome	Comparison's years	N	NCE with computation Mean	Cohen's D	NP Rank with computation Median
Composite	2014-2015	33	40.67 – 42.03	0.18	34.00 – 35.00
	2015-2016	21	39.62 – 38.19	0.16	45.00 – 28.00
	2016-2017	51	45.08 – 45.75	0.09	43.00 – 40.00
Science	2014-2015	33	42.45 – 48.76	0.43*	39.00 – 49.00
	2015-2016	36	51.36 – 53.08	0.14	53.00 – 48.00
	2016-2017	89	51.24 – 50.73	0.04	49.00 – 45.00
Language-Arts	2014-2015	33	43.06 – 40.94	0.21	37.00 – 25.00
	2015-2016	23	48.09 – 45.04	0.29	50.00 - 46.00
	2016-2017	65	51.31 – 52.08	0.08	53.00 – 57.00

Mathematics	2014-2015	39	39.92 – 39.77	0.01	34.00 – 35.00
	2015-2016	30	46.10 – 45.87	0.03	43.50 – 42.50
	2016-2017	75	43.57 – 44.64	0.12	38.00 – 39.00
Social Studies	2014-2015	33	47.09 – 45.36	0.13	40.00 – 33.00
	2015-2016	15	39.07 – 44.60	0.30	30.00 – 38.00
	2016-2017	55	46.91 – 49.07	0.16	42.0 – 47.00

*T-test value sig <.05

2. Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness (4.2)

We chose to utilize observational measures to assess completers' effectiveness. Employers, who had implemented observational instruments, completed a survey documenting their professional observations of completers' knowledge, skills, and dispositions. Four employer surveys were returned completed. Of the six items in the survey, questions 1, 2, and 3 address Standard 4.2 and questions 4, 5, and 6 address Standard 4.3. This section reports employers' responses on completers' effective application of professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions in the field.

From the four employer surveys that were sent out for 2016-17 (Artifact 4.2c), three responded, representing 75% which meets our target of 60%. The employers were asked to rate completers on three qualities: knowledge, skills and dispositions.

Findings

The survey used a 5-point Likert scale (Not at all = 1 to Excellent = 5). Principal component EFA was used to evaluate the construct validity of this instrument, finding one factor with 89% of the variance and item loadings between .707 and .970. Thus, a very strong reliability was achieved (Cronbach's alpha = .971). The following three paragraphs outline the findings in each of the three areas important for Standard 4.2.

Knowledge: The data demonstrate that the completers have effectively applied the expected professional knowledge as classroom teachers. Four employers responded with mean scores of 5 and a standard deviation of 0 in 2014-15; mean scores of 4 with a standard deviation of 1.73 in 2015-16; and mean scores of 4.67 with a standard deviation of 0.58 in 2016-17.

Skills: The data demonstrate that the completers have effectively applied the expected professional skills as classroom teachers. Three employers responded with mean scores of 4.75 and a standard deviation of 0.5 in 2014-15; mean scores of 3.67 with a standard deviation of 1.53 in 2015-16; and mean scores of 4.67 with a standard deviation of 0.58 in 2016-17.

Dispositions: The data demonstrate that the completers have effectively applied the expected professional dispositions as classroom teachers. Three employers responded with mean scores of

4.75 and a standard deviation of 0.5 in 2014-15; mean scores of 3.67 with a standard deviation of 1.53 in 2015-16; mean scores of 4.67 with a standard deviation of 0.58 in 2016-17.

The Employer Survey shows the means and standard deviations of employers' ratings of completers' knowledge, skills, and dispositions based on employers' observations. The results indicate that our completers *probably* (4) or *definitely* (5) demonstrated the knowledge, skills, and dispositions per documented professional observations by employers.

3. Satisfaction of Employers and Employment Milestones (4.3/A 4.1)

Employer Survey were used to measure employers' satisfaction with the completers' preparation for their assigned responsibilities. The survey that was sent out in 2016-17 (Artifact 4.3c), three employers responded, which represents 75%.

Findings:

Promotion: The data demonstrate that the completers have the potential to be promoted within this profession. In 2016-17, three employers responded with a mean score of 4 and standard deviation of 1. Overall, 90% of the responses from the employers expressed the potential for completers' promotion.

Retention: The data demonstrate the completers have the potential to continue working within this profession. In 2016-17, 3 employers responded with mean scores of 5 and a standard deviation of 0. Overall, 100% of the employers expressed the desire for completer's retention. Employers overwhelmingly expressed the desire to retain the employed completers.

Satisfaction: The data demonstrate employers are satisfied with the preparation of completers. Mean scores of 3.33 with a standard deviation of 2.08 in 2015-16; mean scores of 4.67 with a standard deviation of 5.8 in 2016-17. Overall, 9 out of 10 responses from the employers indicated probable or definite satisfaction with the completer.

At the advanced level, approximately 91% (11 of 12) candidates who graduated from 2016 through 2018, are currently employed as school psychologists. Most likely this is because many completers are retained for employment after internship. For Educational Leadership (EDAL) MA graduates, 100% (n=8) were employed as administrators in Adventist schools. Reasons for high employment rates include applicant characteristics (already working as administrators, recommended by employers to be future administrators, personal choice to be in administration) and EDAL's partnerships with future employers.

4. Satisfaction of Completers (4.4 / A.4.2)

Alumni survey. Alumni surveys provided both quantitative and qualitative data for programs at the initial level. Items were scaled along a 5-point scale (1-strongly disagree to 5-strongly agree or 1-Poor to 5-Excellent). The overall mean for Effective Preparation is 3.91 with average rating for each item ranging from 3.50 to 4.42 indicating high levels of completer satisfaction. For job responsibilities, the overall mean was 3.72 with ratings for each item ranging from 3.41 to 4.11 indicating high levels of preparation for job responsibilities.

Written responses had a pattern of positive feedback and fell into four categories: (1) Professors and Modeling, (2) Procedural Skills and Training, (3) Knowledge, and (4) field experience. With professors and modeling, one-third of the students reported personal relationships and rapport developed between professors and students as a strength. However, three areas of weaknesses were cited in the comments: (1) Knowledge, (2) Class Instruction, and (3) Field Experience. Four students commented on the need for stronger expert inputs during field experiences. Completers rated their preparation for technology at 3.89 (on a scale of 1-5), indicating high quality preparation. In terms of satisfaction with their ability to work fairly and effectively with diverse students and those with special needs and their belief that all individuals can learn regardless of background or experience, completers rated their preparation at 3.95 which, indicates high satisfaction with diversity preparation.

At the advanced level (SP), a total of 12 surveys were sent out and 8 responses were obtained (67% response rate). Surveys contained 20 items that were relevant to addressing completers' satisfaction; 8 items were related to the effectiveness of the preparation and 12 items were related to relevance of the preparation to their job responsibilities. Items were ranked on a 5-point Likert scale from 1- Strongly Disagree to 5- Strongly Agree. For the sample of 8 respondents, the mean ratings for the 8 items related to Effective Preparation ranged from 3.25 to 3.63 indicating better than "neutral" but below "agree." The mean ratings for the 12 items related to Job Responsibilities ranged from 3.13 to 3.88 indicating better than "neutral" but below "agree."

Alumni survey were sent to EDAL program completers. Results of the analysis of the data from the 9 completers in the EDAL program are as follows: Knowledge and Skills (overall Mean=4. 3); Spirituality and ethics (overall mean=4. 3); research (overall mean=3. 9); communication and technology (overall mean=4. 1); and diversity (overall mean=4. 2). Details of these summary statistics are reported in the EDAL Alumni Survey Descriptive Analysis artifact (see Advance Standard 4). The strength of the EDAL program in the SED at AU is that 96% of our completers perceive the program as relevant and are satisfied with it. (See Advanced Standard 4).

As noted by the data, when it comes to the knowledge and skills, our EDAL completers perceive their preparation as relevant to the responsibilities they confront on the job and believe the program was effective because they have the necessary content knowledge as school leaders and are able to integrate their worldview into their practice. They perceive that they attained the necessary skills to effectively apply their skills into their profession. Completers felt the preparation they received in the EDAL program enabled them to create positive school environments that foster learning and development in school settings (Composite 2015-2018 mean 4. 3).

Outcome Measures

5. Graduation Rates (initial and advanced levels-5.4 /A.5.4)

Initial Teacher Preparation Programs Graduation Rate. The Andrews University Teacher Preparation Program (TPP) Graduation Rate for 2017-18 is 93.3%. This rate was based on the Intake Cohort expected to graduate by 2017-18. That Intake Cohort includes BA/BS students

accepted into the TPP during 2013-14 and MAT students accepted into the TPP during 2012-13. Since the number of candidates in our programs is small, we report graduation rates by aggregating data across elementary and secondary certification programs and across BA/BS and MAT degrees to protect the privacy of our candidates.

Graduation Rate Definition. In the Andrews University Teacher Preparation Program (TPP), we have created a definition of Graduation Rate in alignment with Title II reporting procedures. We calculate Graduation Rates based on Intake Cohort years. An Intake Cohort is a group of candidates admitted to the Andrews TPP in one academic cycle/year. Based on advising materials and sample course plans, elementary education and secondary education candidates at the Bachelor’s degree level need approximately three (3) years after TPP acceptance to complete their Programs. MAT students generally need four (4) years to complete their programs. We then apply the same principle prescribed by the federal government in calculating the general graduation rate reported by the university at large, that is, 150% of a program’s length for completion. First, we calculated 150% of the expected program time for both BA/BS and MAT degrees. For Bachelor’s degrees, 150% of 3 years is 4.5 years. As our current record keeping system is not set up to parse by half-years, we have rounded the calculation up to 5 years. For MAT students, 150% of 4 years is 6 years.

2017-2018 Andrews University Teacher Preparation Graduation Rate					
Intake Cohort	Tracking of Enrollment by Academic Year				
2012-13 MAT/ 2013-14 BA/BS (N=15)	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	Graduation Target 2017-18
Number Graduated	2	4	6	1	1
Cumulative Graduation Rate (Expressed as %)	13.3	40	80	86.7	93.3
Number Continuing	13	8	2	1	0
Internal Transfer Out of TPP	0	1	0	0	0
Transfer Out of Andrews University	0	0	0	0	0

School Psychology Graduation Rate. Candidates in the EdS School Psychology program are able to complete all requirements in three years. This consists of two years of coursework and practicum and a one year 1200 hour internship. The majority of candidates complete the program within the three-year timeframe, but as a graduate level degree, we do accept candidates who are non-traditional and may need to take an additional year to complete coursework.

As indicated on the table below, cohort sizes range from 3-5 candidates year. If the candidate is completing the program within the three years, then they would be reflected as a completer in the

summer of their 3rd year. A Fall 2013 cohort would graduate in Summer 2016 and show in the 2015-2016 column below. There have been several candidates throughout the prior five years who have taken a longer than average time, but the program recognizes that situations occur which may delay graduation of a valuable candidate.

2017-2018 Andrews University Graduation Rate for School Psychology-Advanced Program					
	Academic year a candidate was first enrolled				
	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15	2013-14
First Time enrollment. The number of candidates who enrolled for the first time, during a specified academic year.					
Number of candidates who were enrolled for the first time leading to advanced certification or licensure	3	3	5	4	5
Number of candidates who were recommended for advanced certification	4	1	7	3	6
Number of candidates continuing the program	3	3	3	1	0
Been counseled out of a program	0	0	0	0	0
Withdrew from the program	0	0	2	0	0

2017-2018 Andrews University Graduation Rate for Educational Leadership-Advanced Program						
		Academic year a candidate was first enrolled				
		2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15	2013-14
First Time enrollment. The number of candidates who enrolled for the first time, during a specified academic year.						
Number of candidates who were enrolled for the first time leading to advanced certification or licensure	EdS	1	0	1	0	0
	MA	12	1	1	1	1
	GRCEDL	3	1	3	1	0
Number of candidates who were recommended for advanced certification	EdS	0	1	0	0	0
	MA	0	3	2	0	0
	GRCEDL	0	1	1	0	0
Number of candidates continuing the program	EdS	1	1	0	0	0
	MA	12	1	1	1	1
	GRCEDL	2	1	1	0	0
Been counseled out of a program	All	0	0	0	0	0
Withdrew from the program	MA	0	1	0	0	1
	GRCEDL	0	0	0	0	1

6. Ability of completers to meet licensing (certification) and any additional state requirements; Title II (initial & advanced levels)

The Andrews University TPP Licensure Rate for 2017-18 is 100%. The rate was based on the 14 graduates from the 2012-13 MAT and 2013-1014 BA/BS Intake Cohort. For this Intake Cohort, no candidates needed extra time after graduation to acquire their licenses.

Licensure Rate Definition. In the Andrews University Teacher Preparation Program (TPP), we calculate Licensure Rates for the initial teacher preparation programs based on Intake Cohorts, as we do for graduation rates. However, instead of calculating rates based on everyone accepted into an Intake Cohort, we calculate Licensure Rates based on the total number of graduates from an Intake Cohort. While all candidates are required to apply for Michigan Teaching Certificates, not all actually complete the process by paying the final fee to secure the license. We expect our graduates to receive their teaching certificates/licenses within one year of degree completion. This provide time for those who have yet to pass the required MTTC Content Area Exam(s) or those who are waiting to earn some money to pay for the exam(s) and/or the certificate itself.

2017-2018 Andrews University Teacher Preparation Licensure Rate

Intake Cohort	Tracking by Academic Year				
2012-13 MAT/ 2013-14 BA/BS	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
N=14					
Number Graduated	2	4	6	1	1 ^a
Number of Graduates Receiving MI Teaching License	2	5	6	1	0
MI Licensure Rate (Expressed as a %)	14.3	50	92.9	100	100

^aThis cell may seem to have incorrect data, as one candidate graduated after receiving licensure. However, MAT candidates can complete certification requirements and apply for their initial license on the basis of their Bachelor’s degree. They then have the freedom to finish the MAT degree within the 6-year time limit established by the Graduate School.

Licensure rate. MTTC subject area and Praxis II (SP) exams are required for licensure. 100% of initial candidates scored at or above target levels on MTTC. According to the data provided by MDE, AU ranks second out of 32 institutions for cumulative MTTC passing rates at 94.7%. The program ranks fifth out of 32 institutions initial passing rates with an 84.2%. These benchmarks show our completers are scoring higher than completers at most other EPP's and that our candidates are mastering essential knowledge. These data have led us to reinforce our internal practices of focusing on knowledge and skill level development. We focus on students' academic and professional performance from the time they indicate interests in our teacher education program. Student academic performance is closely monitored throughout the program.

7. Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they have prepared (initial & advanced levels)

The Andrews University TPP Employment Rate for 2017-18 is 100%. The rate was based on the 14 graduates from the 2012-13 MAT and 2013-1014 BA/BS Intake Cohort. For this Intake Cohort, 13 graduates were hired to begin teaching in the academic year immediately following their graduation, while one graduate began a graduate program.

2017-2018 Andrews University Teacher Preparation Employment Rate

Intake Cohort	Tracking by Academic Year				
2012-13 MAT/ 2013-14 BA/BS N=14	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Graduated (n)	2	4	6	1	1 ^a
Employed (n)	2	4	6	0	1
Enrolled in Graduate School (n)	0	0	0	1	0
First Year Employment Rate (%)	100	100	100	100	NA

Employment Rate Definition. In the Andrews University Teacher Preparation Program (TPP), we calculate Employment Rates for the initial teacher preparation programs based on Intake Cohorts, as we do for Graduation Rates. However, instead of calculating rates based on everyone accepted into an Intake Cohort, we calculate Employment Rates based on the total number of graduates from an Intake Cohort. We count employment as any of the following for our

graduates (1) being hired to teach in a K12 position, (2) being hired in a related educational field, or (3) admission to a related graduate program. Because it is difficult to track graduates beyond their first year out of the program, we only report employment rates for the first year after graduation.

Employment Rate. For initial level candidates, we intentionally focus on helping them transition into high quality employment. Our high employment rates (100%) suggest we are preparing candidates to transition well from the university to the workplace. We believe this is connected to the fact they have good clinical experiences (time and quality places). They are prepared consistently to apply course learning to teaching practices. They experience effective student teaching placement and receive individualized mentoring from university and field instructors. Multiple data sources indicate we should continue these strong practices. Part of the candidate employment success may be due to the fact that many of our graduates are qualified to fill high need teaching areas (e. g. STEM, special education, ESL).

Our close partnership with public and Adventist employers, and our reputation as an excellent teacher education program, helps our candidates get multiple job interviews and offers. Completers' employment success motivates us to continue being intentional in advising, maintaining/improving program quality, strengthening partnerships with our stakeholders, and developing/enhancing employability skills. Furthermore, our various academic partners (music, biology, etc.) also place a high emphasis on effective teaching and learning. These trends reinforce our commitment to create a culture of high expectations for candidates' content and professional skill levels.

At the advanced level, approximately 91% (11 of 12) candidates who graduated from 2016 through 2018, are currently employed as school psychologists. Most likely this is because many completers are retained for employment after internship. For Educational Leadership (EDAL) MA graduates, 100% (n=8) were employed as administrators in Adventist schools. Reasons for high employment rates include applicant characteristics (already working as administrators, recommended by employers to be future administrators, personal choice to be in administration) and EDAL's partnerships with future employers.

8. Student loan default rates and other consumer information (initial & advanced levels)

Consumer-based EPI. We are using loan default rates as the indicator for consumer-based EPI. The university loan default rates in 2019 was 4.6. This rate is lower than the national student loan default rate of 10. 8% (2015) and 11. 5% (2014).