Mission: Our Christ-centered mission is to develop and empower professional educators committed to student learning in a global society.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals/Claims</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Related Measures</th>
<th>Achievement Targets</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Action Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Spring Arbor University Model for Teacher Education guides our programs.</td>
<td>The Model (or its graphical representation), also known as our Conceptual Framework, is present in every syllabus, along with an explanation of how the content of that class addresses the Model.</td>
<td>Course syllabi</td>
<td>100% of EDU, SED, RDG, ECE syllabi.</td>
<td>Verified by SOE Secretary and Off-site Secretary</td>
<td>Lead faculty are notified if any syllabi do not have the Model included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Model forms a basis and framework for our student assessments.</td>
<td>Professional Skills and Dispositions, Pedagogical Dispositions, Student Teacher Evaluation, Employer and Alumni Survey</td>
<td>100% of assessments.</td>
<td>Target met: Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Model (or its graphical representation) is identified in public and</td>
<td>Undergraduate catalog, web site, SOE handbooks, MDE program folios, program</td>
<td>100% of public documents.</td>
<td>Verified collectively and individually by SOE Dean Team: Reuben Rubio, Donna Bergman, Rashell Johnson, Dale Linton, Kathy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals/Claims</td>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>Related Measures</td>
<td>Achievement Targets</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>Action Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| private documents as the conceptual or guiding framework for the School of Education. | At the end of each course, candidates can describe how they believe that class related to the conceptual framework | advertising, office signage                  | Target in development – at this point, we are still evaluating the data and its ramifications. Students are asked to rate coverage of each domain in program as “strong,” “covered,” and “not covered.” | Measured from N=1,038 students in 2013-14:  
  • Content Knowledge rated Strong by 67.0% of students (71.4% in ’12-13)  
  • Professional Skills & Dispositions – 62.9% (50.8%)  
  • Pedagogy – 61.37% (79.5%)  
  • Management & Organization – 57.1% (61.9%)  
  • Assessment – 56.9% (62.1%)  
  • Leadership & Scholarship – 52.8% (33.1%)  
  • Interactions with Stakeholders – 52.2% (50.0%)  
  • Diversity – 50.7% (58.3%)  
  • Integration of Faith & Learning – 50.1% (47.9%)  
  • Technology – 49.9% (55.4%)  
  • Global Perspective – 38.4% (29.5%) | There were many more students in ’13-14 who completed the survey than in ’12-13. There is some regression to the mean that can be seen in comparing the two years. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals/Claims</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Related Measures</th>
<th>Achievement Targets</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Action Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Pedagogy rated highest in methods courses, 100-level courses, and courses taught by part-time instructors (100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Interactions with Stakeholders rated highest in 300-level courses (80.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Diversity rated highest in 300-level courses (73.5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Content knowledge rated highest in methods courses and courses taught by part-time instructors (100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Assessment rated highest in 300-level courses (91.7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Management &amp; Organization rated highest in 100-level courses and courses taught by part-time instructors (100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Professional Skills &amp; Dispositions rated highest in methods courses (92.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Technology rated highest in secondary education courses (89.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Global Perspectives rated highest in courses taught by adjunct instructors (58.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Leadership &amp; Scholarship rated highest in 100-level courses (100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Integration of Faith &amp;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals/Claims</td>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>Related Measures</td>
<td>Achievement Targets</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>Action Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|              | At the end of their program, candidates can write how they believe the program related to the conceptual framework | Program analysis of learning paper | Target in development – at this point, we are just evaluating the data and its ramifications. Students are asked to rate coverage of each domain in each course as “strong,” “covered,” and “not covered.” | Measured for most student teachers (N=68):  
  - Management & Organization rated Strong (“4”) by 77.6% of students, avg = 3.75/4.0 (prior year 80.7%)  
  - Assessment – 77.9%, 3.76 (81.5%)  
  - Pedagogy – 80.9%, 3.79 (92.9%)  
  - Interactions with Stakeholders – 65.7%, 3.63 (75.5%)  
  - Content Knowledge – 68.7%, 3.66 (76.0%)  
  - Diversity – 67.7%, 3.65 | Comments and phrasing from the survey data suggest that students saw this as a course analysis of learning, rather than one for the whole program. There was a form developed for the program analysis of learning that was not used. The EDU 450 instructors have been asked to correct this for the 2015-16 year. |
|              |            |                  |                     | Learning rated highest in 100-level courses (100%)  
Top three areas not addressed:  
  - Global Perspective (34.1%)  
  - Leadership & Scholarship (14.3%)  
  - Interactions with Stakeholders (11.5%) |          |            | Records available on G: Drive under te: SOE Reports – SOE Assessment Report |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals/Claims</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Related Measures</th>
<th>Achievement Targets</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Action Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Our program completers demonstrate competence in each | Average cumulative yearly pass rate for all “claimed” program | Michigan Department of Education’s annual Teacher Preparation | 90% of “claimed” MTTC subject area test takers pass the test over the course of an academic year. | (56.6%) • Technology – 60.3%, 3.51 (46.9%) • Integration of Faith & Learning – 41.2%, 3.29 (31.3%) • Professional Skills & Dispositions – 82.4%, 3.82 (30.6%) • Global Perspective – 47.1%, 3.29 (20.0%) • Leadership& Scholarship – 67.7%, 3.62 (17.6%) Top three areas that were least addressed (% of students who rated with score of “2” or “1”): • Global Perspective, 17.65% • Integrating Faith and Learning, 10.29% • Technology, 7.35% Target met: NR Records available on G: Drive under te_.SOE Reports – SOE Assessment Report | The overall pass rate was about five points lower than in 2012-13. Perhaps the main reason for
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals/Claims</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Related Measures</th>
<th>Achievement Targets</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Action Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| domain/element of the Model. | completers exceeds minimum criterion. | Institute (TPI) report | • History 100% (N=2)  
• Biology 60% (N=5)  
• Chemistry 0% (N=1)  
• Math Secondary 80% (N=5)  
• Spanish 100% (N=3)  
• Physical Ed 50% (N=2)  
• Guidance Couns. 100% (N=4)  
• Learning Disabilities 80% (N=10)  
• “old” Elementary Ed 100% (N=2)  
• Social Studies Secondary 100% (N=4)  
• English as Second Lang 100% (N=3)  
• Math Elementary 100% (N=1)  
• Language Arts 80% (N=5)  
• Reading Specialist 50% (N=2)  
• Integrated Science 100% (N=3)  
• Visual Arts 100% (N=1)  
• Music 100% (N=3)  
• “new” Elementary Ed 77.3% (N=22)  
• Social Studies Elementary 100% (N=2)  
• Early Childhood 50% (N=8)  
Target met: N | • this is that in 2013-14, the MDE made the Elementary Education test harder than it used to be, so that the test went from an area of strength to an area of weakness.  

SOE faculty member Tovah Sheldon was identified and compensated with load credit to work with students for Elementary Education MTTC test preparation in 2014-15.  

This year we saw our first Reading and Reading Specialist examinees.  

On the three-year report (2011-14), our overall pass rate was 90%, a small increase from 2010-13.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals/Claims</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Related Measures</th>
<th>Achievement Targets</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Action Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The minimum grade point average of all program completers for all majors and minors (including elementary planned program) is 2.7.</td>
<td>Content area GPA</td>
<td>100% of program completers have a GPA of at least 2.7.</td>
<td>Verified by School of Education Executive Team: Reuben Rubio, David Hopper, Rashell Johnson, Dale Linton, Tovah Sheldon, Julie Zeller</td>
<td>Target met: Y</td>
<td>Records available on G: Drive under te: SOE Reports – MTTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The minimum grade point average of all program completers for the professional education sequence is 2.7.</td>
<td>Education course GPA</td>
<td>100% of program completers have a GPA of at least 2.7.</td>
<td>Verified by School of Education Executive Team</td>
<td>Target met: Y</td>
<td>Records available on G: Drive under te:A MINUTES – E TEAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All candidates approved for student teaching have an acceptable record of professional skills and dispositions or pedagogical dispositions</td>
<td>Professional Skills and Dispositions Instrument; Pedagogical Dispositions Instrument</td>
<td>100% of candidates approved by SOE Executive Team after audit for acceptable record of dispositions.</td>
<td>Verified by School of Education Executive Team</td>
<td>Target met: Y</td>
<td>Records available on G: Drive under te:A MINUTES – E TEAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item related to lesson/unit</td>
<td>In development</td>
<td>In development</td>
<td>Awaiting meeting of all methods faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td>Still on hold, but the SOE is moving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals/Claims</td>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>Related Measures</td>
<td>Achievement Targets</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>Action Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>ahead with plans to redo the rubrics used for methods and student teaching, to turn it into one rubric that is used in both situations. We have been meeting during Spring 2015 to do this, and hope to enact the new rubric by Fall 2015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students taught by teacher candidates during student teaching demonstrate an acceptable level of learning.</td>
<td>K-12 student achievement data within EDU 430 work sample</td>
<td>All Edu 430 students score at least 85% (out of max possible 19 points) on the assessment.</td>
<td>The average score on the assessment (N=49, main campus, Lansing, Petoskey sites) was 15.8/16, or 99.0%. 47/49 or 95.9% scored at the target or above. There was 1 Gaylord student in the group. Elem: 31/31 met target (100%; avg score 16.0/16) Sec: 16/18 met target (88.9%; avg 15.6) Main: 38/39 met target (97.4%; avg 15.9) Lansing: 2/3 met target (66.7%; avg 14.7) Gaylord: 1/1 met target (100%; avg score 16.0/16) Petoskey: 6/6 met target (100%; avg score 16.0/16) Male: 10/11 met target (90.9%; avg score 15.6/16)</td>
<td>All students/site/sections included in 2013-14. Trajectory for the work sample: ’12-13 – 98.1% (N=65) ’11-12 – 93.4% (N=34) ’10-11 – 75.8% (N=33)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals/Claims</td>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>Related Measures</td>
<td>Achievement Targets</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>Action Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH PERCENTAGE OF ALL STUDENT TEACHERS EXHIBIT TARGET PROFICIENCY IN EACH DOMAIN OF THE EFFECTIVE TEACHING MODEL</td>
<td>STUDENT TEACHER EVALUATION BY COOPERATING TEACHER, OLD SET OF RATINGS INCLUDE “3” (TARGET PROFICIENCY MOST OF THE TIME), “2” (TARGET PROFICIENCY SOME OF THE TIME), AND “1” (NOT TARGET PROFICIENCY); NEW SET OF RATINGS INCLUDE “4” (STRONGLY AGREE PROFICIENCY OBSERVED), “3” (AGREE PROFICIENCY OBSERVED), “2” (DISAGREE PROFICIENCY OBSERVED), AND “1” (STRONGLY DISAGREE PROFICIENCY OBSERVED);</td>
<td>95% OF ALL NOVICE TEACHERS DEMONSTRATE PROFICIENCY IN EACH DOMAIN OF THE EFFECTIVE TEACHING MODEL AS RATED BY COOPERATING TEACHERS WHERE THE PERCENTAGE OF “2” AND “3” RATINGS IS AT LEAST 80% (OLD) AND PERCENTAGE OF “3” AND “4” RATINGS IS AT LEAST 80% (NEW). 95% OF NOVICE TEACHER CANDIDATE PLACEMENTS ARE SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETED DURING AN ACADEMIC YEAR (RECOMMENDED OR RECOMMENDED WITH RESERVATIONS).</td>
<td>100.0% (64) OF 64 PLACEMENTS WERE EACH RATED ABOVE 80%. NORMALIZING TO 4.0 SCALE, THE WEIGHTED AVERAGES FOR EACH DOMAIN WERE: • INTEGRATION OF FAITH/LEARNING, 3.87 • PROF SKILLS/DISP, 3.70 • TECHNOLOGY, 3.68 • MANAGEMENT/Org, 3.60 • PEDAGOGY, 3.58 • ASSESSMENT, 3.58 • CONTENT KNOWLEDGE, 3.56 • INTERACTIONS W/ STAKEHOLDERS, 3.53 • DIVERSITY, 3.53 • LEADERSHIP/SCHOLARSHIP, 3.49 • GLOBAL PERSPECTIVE, 3.37 100.0% COMPLETED SUCCESSFULLY (N=64 PLACEMENTS, 64 RECOMMENDED, 0 RECOMMENDED WITH RESERVATIONS).</td>
<td>NEW RATING FORM AND SCALE WAS IMPLEMENTED STARTING IN 2011-12 TO ACCOMMODATE THE NEW CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK COINCIDENT WITH EDU 140 STUDENTS. FOR SEVERAL YEARS, THERE HAVE BEEN TWO VERSIONS OF THIS FORM, ONE FOR THE “OLD” FRAMEWORK AND ONE FOR THE “NEW” ONE. THE SCALES ARE COMBINED INTO ONE, SO THAT THERE IS ONE REPORTED RESULT. THIS DUAL REPORTING BEGAN IN 2011-12. IN 2013-14, ONLY 7 STUDENTS WERE RATED WITH THE OLD FORM. THERE WAS A DECLINE ACROSS THE BOARD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals/Claims</td>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>Related Measures</td>
<td>Achievement Targets</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>Action Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>recommendations also include recommended, recommended with reservations, or not recommended, and forms the basis for certification decision.</td>
<td></td>
<td>reservations, 0 not recommended, 0 students no recommendation decision entered; percentages of 100.0%, 0.0%, 0%, and 0%.</td>
<td>from last year. There was a possibility in last year’s results that the switch to a broader scale might have brought the numbers down from 2011-12. But the trend continues this year. Integration of Faith and Learning was atop the list again, and Global Perspective at the bottom again. This trend was brought to the attention of faculty in an email Apr 2015 with discussion at faculty meeting of May 2015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High percentage of SAU student teachers and their student teaching supervisors agree or strongly agree that the candidate possesses the skills related in eight survey areas. These areas holistically correspond to the Michigan Department of Education’s annual Teacher Preparation Institute (TPI) report, survey of student teacher efficacy. The MDE changed the survey this year to be consistent with Change: 80% of SAU student teachers thoroughly agree or mostly agree that they possess each of the skills delineated.</td>
<td></td>
<td>All areas are above 80%. (N=49). Data also shows the avg rating on the four point scale for each category.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Designing High Quality Learning Experience: 100.0%, 3.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Critical Thinking: 93.0%, 3.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Connect Content Knowledge to Real World Problems and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The MDE changed the survey this year to be consistent with the recent change in teacher preparation standards to InTASC; while there is overlap in survey items from before, the broad categories and questions are different. This will make longitudinal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals/Claims</td>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>Related Measures</td>
<td>Achievement Targets</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>Action Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conceptual framework.</td>
<td>the recent change in teacher preparation standards to InTASC; while there is overlap in survey items from before, the broad categories and questions are different. This will make longitudinal comparison difficult. The responses were also changed, so that students were asked to agree with whether their EPI prepared them in a certain area: 4 = “thoroughly agree,” 3 = “mostly agree,” 2 = “slightly agree,” and 1 = “not at all agree.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High percentage of employers of alumni (school principals) believe that their employees</td>
<td>Employee Survey of Alumni, ratings include “4” (strongly agree), “3” (agree), “2”</td>
<td>80% of employers of alumni rate their employees’ skills as a “3” or “4” on groups of survey items related to domains of Conceptual Framework.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Due to personnel shortage, this survey has been delayed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals/Claims</td>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>Related Measures</td>
<td>Achievement Targets</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>Action Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>possess appropriate knowledge and skills for teaching after 2 years of service.</td>
<td>(disagree), “1” (strongly disagree), or “NB” (no basis for observation)</td>
<td>80% of alumni rate their skills as a “3” or “4” on groups of survey items related to domains of Conceptual Framework.</td>
<td>Administered June 2011, included in 2010-11 assessment results. Next administration planned for 2015</td>
<td>Target met? NR</td>
<td>Due to personnel shortage, this survey has been delayed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High percentage of alumni believe that they possess knowledge and skills appropriate to teaching.</td>
<td>Alumni Survey, ratings include “4” (strongly agree), “3” (agree), “2” (disagree), or “1” (strongly disagree), or “NB” (no basis for observation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Goals/Claims
Our assessment processes are reasonable and consistent, and our data is used to inform decisions.

### Objectives
Use of PSL validated

### Related Measures
PSL

### Achievement Targets
Positive report on validity of PSL – this was first done through Sally Ingles’ dissertation. Now we wish to set a new objective and target

### Findings
Verified by School of Education Executive Team

N=100 students in Edu 140; as of May 1, 2015:
- Avg. ACT composite 22.7
- 85.0% got an A/A-
- 80.0% passed PSL
- 51.0% passed or waived PRE as of 5/1/15
- 38.0% of those admitted to SOE as of 5/1/15
- 0.0% of those admitted to SOE as of 5/1/15 are nonwhite
- Avg. ACT composite of admitted students is 26.2

Target met: Y

Records available on G: Drive under te: SOE
Reports: SOE Assessment Reports

### Action Plans
Need to set a new objective and target for desired performance and outcome of students in Edu 140 and PSL. We have results for each year of Edu 140 students going back to 2009, when it was first implemented.

Make sure that all students declare a race to the University; some students who could be nonwhite classified themselves as “unknown/other.”

### MTTC, MDE surveys for student teachers and supervisors validated yearly by MDE

MTTC, MDE surveys for student teachers and supervisors validated yearly by MDE

### MDE annual surveys of student teachers and their supervisors (TPI), MTTC results (TPI)

MDE annual surveys of student teachers and their supervisors (TPI), MTTC results (TPI)

### Validated by MDE

Validated by MDE

### Reliability scores reported at .75 and above by MDE

Reliability scores reported at .75 and above by MDE

### Each candidate has received a “C” or higher in Data from graduation audits

Each candidate has received a “C” or higher in Data from graduation audits

### 100% of grades in courses counted for credit towards program completion are “C” or

100% of grades in courses counted for credit towards program completion are “C” or

### Verified by School of Education Executive Team

Verified by School of Education Executive Team

### Action Plans

Need to set a new objective and target for desired performance and outcome of students in Edu 140 and PSL. We have results for each year of Edu 140 students going back to 2009, when it was first implemented.

Make sure that all students declare a race to the University; some students who could be nonwhite classified themselves as “unknown/other.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals/Claims</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Related Measures</th>
<th>Achievement Targets</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Action Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>each course that is counted towards completion of the program</td>
<td>higher</td>
<td>Target met: Y Audits maintained by Registrar’s Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals/Claims</td>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>Related Measures</td>
<td>Achievement Targets</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>Action Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All SOE curriculum, policies and procedures are the same or equivalent at each external site.</td>
<td>Data from Compliance officer</td>
<td>Compliance officer meets once per term with site personnel and communicates once per year with lead faculty; compliance officer regularly attends meetings of SOE Dean Team and Executive Team and is a voting member of each</td>
<td>Verified by Compliance Officer, Rashell Johnson</td>
<td>Target met: Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification officer performs a final audit of all candidates to make sure that they have met all requirements for certification before being recommended to the MDE.</td>
<td>Data from Candidate folder</td>
<td>100% of program completers meet all requirements for certification prior to being recommended</td>
<td>Verified by Certification Officer, Julie Zeller</td>
<td>Target met: Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual assessment reports (TPI, Title II, WEAVE, AACTE/NCATE, SOE, other) presented to admin, faculty</td>
<td>Minutes of Meetings, Reports</td>
<td>Meeting minutes show that Director of Accreditation and Assessment presents reports annually or other appropriate period to SOE Faculty or Dean Team; 100% of assessment reports available to all SOE Faculty on shared network drive or Blackboard Community Shell</td>
<td>Verified by Interim Dean of Education, Reuben Rubio</td>
<td>Target met: Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty evaluations are used to evaluate and inform faculty performance for SAU Course Evaluation, SAU Faculty evaluation</td>
<td>100% of SOE faculty receive course evaluations that are within the range of most recent benchmark; Dean meets with 100% of SOE faculty annually (non-tenured) or biannually</td>
<td>Verified by Interim Dean of Education, Reuben Rubio</td>
<td>Target met: Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals/Claims</td>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>Related Measures</td>
<td>Achievement Targets</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>Action Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improving practice.</td>
<td>(tenured) to evaluate teaching.</td>
<td>Reuben Rubio</td>
<td>Course analysis of learning data disaggregated by course type (elem/sec/both), methods (Y/N), instructor (FT SOE/PT SOE/Adj SOE), and level (100/200/300/400)</td>
<td>Due to low numbers of students of color or males, the data check will be periodic rather than annual.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All data checked for bias (gender, race, specialty area, site)</td>
<td>In development</td>
<td>In development</td>
<td>Work sample data disaggregated by degree level (elem/sec), site (main/Lansing/Petoskey) and gender (male/female). Target met: Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The School of Education intentionally monitors student and program outcomes and collaborates to make improvements.</td>
<td>Faculty will integrate faith and learning in their practice.</td>
<td>Minutes of Meetings</td>
<td>100% of regularly scheduled SOE meetings (Dean Team, Executive Team, SOE Faculty) begin with prayer; SOE Faculty meetings include a devotion</td>
<td>Verified by meeting agendas and minutes for the named groups. Target met: Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Records available on G: Drive under te:A MINUTES – E TEAM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All candidates who are admitted to the School of Education demonstrate basic professional dispositions and skills.</td>
<td>Data from Professional Skills Lab</td>
<td>100% of students who are admitted to the School of Education pass the Professional Skills Lab.</td>
<td>Verified by School of Education Executive Team Target met: Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Records available on G: Drive under te:A MINUTES – E TEAM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals/Claims</td>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>Related Measures</td>
<td>Achievement Targets</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>Action Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOE Faculty meet regularly to discuss and/or approve candidate admissions, academic or character issues, petitions, applications to student teach, and problems during student teaching</td>
<td>Minutes of Meetings</td>
<td>The SOE Executive Team meets 9-10 times a year to accomplish this.</td>
<td>Verified by School of Education Executive Team</td>
<td>Target met: Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All candidates who are admitted to the School of Education must first meet all admissions criteria</td>
<td>Audits, Minutes of Meetings</td>
<td>100% of students admitted to the School of Education are approved by a vote of the SOE Executive Team.</td>
<td>Verified by School of Education Executive Team</td>
<td>Target met: Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All candidates who are approved to student teach must first meet all criteria for student teaching</td>
<td>Audits, Meetings</td>
<td>100% of students approved to student teach are approved by a vote of the SOE Executive Team.</td>
<td>Verified by School of Education Executive Team</td>
<td>Target met: Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All candidates who student teach are supervised by a certified or retired teacher,</td>
<td>Data from Directors and Supervisors</td>
<td>100% of SOE faculty and staff involved in student teaching are certified or retired teachers; 100% of cooperating teachers are tenured and certified appropriately</td>
<td>Verified by Director of Field Placement, Dale Linton</td>
<td>Target met: Y</td>
<td>Starting in 2014-15, each full-time education faculty member who is also a methods instructor is assigned at least</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals/Claims</td>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>Related Measures</td>
<td>Achievement Targets</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>Action Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and overseen by a Director of Field Placement at the site who is a certified or retired teacher; all placements are made in classrooms taught by a tenured cooperating teacher who is certified at the grade level and endorsement of the candidate.</td>
<td>Candidates are successful in completing the program.</td>
<td>Michigan Department of Education’s annual Teacher Preparation Institute (TPI) report, Six-Year Yield</td>
<td>90% of students who enter the education program complete it within six years.</td>
<td>Not tabulated due to personnel shortage.</td>
<td>This piece of data is no longer required by the State of Michigan for the annual EPI ranking. Due to personnel shortage, we are suspending the tabulation of this data indefinitely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics for program completers exceeds minimum criterion to show institutional responsiveness to State needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The new PRE exam is taking a special toll on our candidate pool of incoming students of color; this is actually a statewide phenomenon that has provoked</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

46.8% of initial certificate endorsements among completers from 2013-14 academic year were in a high needs area - math, science, special education, and world language (including TESOL). | | | | | |

6.4% of program completers from 2013-2014 academic year were students of color (3/47). | | | | | |

Linton | | | | | |

one student teacher to supervise. This is done to insure that methods instructors are current with practices in K-12 classrooms. | | | | | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals/Claims</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Related Measures</th>
<th>Achievement Targets</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Action Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Content Areas</td>
<td>high needs area.</td>
<td></td>
<td>discussion between EPIs. The state chapter of AACTE, known as MACTE (of which the Interim Dean of the SOE is a board member through Summer 2015) is preparing a submission to discussion to the State Board and Superintendent on this matter in Fall 2015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOE Administrators meet regularly to discuss and propose changes</td>
<td>Minutes of Meetings</td>
<td>The SOE Dean Team meets 9-10 times a year to accomplish this.</td>
<td>Verified by SOE Dean Team Target met: N</td>
<td>The Dean Team now meets regularly once a month.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- Target met: N, Y
- Records available on G: Drive under te SOE Reports – AACTE Reports
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals/Claims</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Related Measures</th>
<th>Achievement Targets</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Action Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>in program, curriculum, policy, and procedure, and to review assessment data</td>
<td>SOE Faculty meet regularly to approve changes in program, curriculum, policy, and procedure, and to review assessment data</td>
<td>Minutes of Meetings</td>
<td>The SOE Faculty meets 9-10 times a year to accomplish this.</td>
<td>Drive under te:A MINUTES – DEAN’STEAM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The School and University infrastructures adequately support the preparation of teacher candidates.</td>
<td>Administrative head of School of Education has a Dean-level appointment</td>
<td>SAU Organizational chart</td>
<td>Administrative head of School of Education at Dean level.</td>
<td>Verified by Interim Dean Reuben Rubio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative structure of School of Education shows faculty and staff as described in the 2010-11 TEAC Inquiry Brief.</td>
<td>SOE Organizational chart</td>
<td>Organization of SOE shows all positions described.</td>
<td>Verified by Interim Dean Reuben Rubio. The Interim Dean is currently filling the roles of Undergraduate Director, Graduate MAE Director, and Director of Accreditation and Assessment.</td>
<td>A plan was in place in the spring of 2014 to appoint a Graduate MAE Director and a faculty member to take the role of Director of Accreditation. Sally Ingles left the University prior to assuming the role of grad director. Tovah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals/Claims</td>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>Related Measures</td>
<td>Achievement Targets</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>Action Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The School of Education is adequately funded by the University</td>
<td>AACTE Budget Report, Fall Enrollment Report</td>
<td>Instructional funding is proportional to SOE enrollment</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Sheldon is receiving some load credit to offset accreditation work. Budget shortages have precluded plans to fill the remaining roles. When both the former Dean and the former Certification Officer left to assume new roles within the University, the SOE was not allowed to hire a replacement for either. We shifted responsibilities to cover certification, but a personnel shortage remains.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2013-14, 8.79% of all instructional expenses were credit to the SOE. In Fall 2013, the SOE accounted for 12.8% of all enrolled students. In 2012-13, the percentages were 9.34% and 14.9%, respectively.

Verified from data provided by Controller Dawn Schnitkey and Institutional Assessment Director Tom

This continues to be a longstanding issue, that the SOE does not receive instructional funding proportional to its enrollment.

Based on the recommendation of the University’s Operational Efficiency Task
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals/Claims</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Related Measures</th>
<th>Achievement Targets</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Action Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Force, the University purchased IBM Cognos to support deeper financial reporting that would provide “revenue &amp; expense” statements to the SOE and other academic departments for the purpose of missional and strategic budgeting. These statements have been made available during 2014-15, but the process is not yet “in production mode.” Academic Affairs has targeted the budget year 2015-16 for these statements to be a stable data point for SOE administrative decisions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The University provides academic oversight of SOE programs

Minutes of Meetings

100% of all new SOE programs, program changes, new courses, and significant course changes are approved by the University’s Academic Senate

Verified by Provost Kimberly Rupert

Target met: Y

Records and meeting minutes available from the Office of Academic Affairs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals/Claims</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Related Measures</th>
<th>Achievement Targets</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Action Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOE Faculty are treated comparably to other faculty within institution</td>
<td>SOE Faculty are treated comparably to other faculty within institution (hiring processes, makeup, promotion, tenure, etc.)</td>
<td>SAU Faculty Handbook</td>
<td>100% of SOE faculty (full-time, affiliate, adjunct) are governed equally by the Faculty Handbook</td>
<td>Verified by Interim Dean Reuben Rubio and Provost Kimberly Rupert</td>
<td>Target met: Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOE Faculty have opportunities for professional development</td>
<td>SOE Faculty have opportunities for professional development</td>
<td>Funding, workshops</td>
<td>% of SOE full-time faculty receive $700/year for professional development; the SOE administration provides one annual professional development opportunity for its faculty</td>
<td>Verified by Interim Dean Reuben Rubio and Provost Kimberly Rupert</td>
<td>Target met: Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOE candidates receive proper academic advising</td>
<td>SOE candidates receive proper academic advising</td>
<td>Graduation plans in Academic planner</td>
<td>100% of SOE Candidates have an approved graduation plan prior to registering for classes each year; 100% of plans are approved by an academic advisor who is an SOE faculty member</td>
<td>Verified by Interim Dean Reuben Rubio</td>
<td>Target met: Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Beginning in 2013-14, all SOE students are advised according to a specific process (for which a flow chart exists) whereby the SOE student advisor, Patti Johnston helps students with course and graduation planning and SOE faculty advise students within a specific content area for career planning.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals/Claims</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Related Measures</th>
<th>Achievement Targets</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Action Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOE and Arts &amp; Sciences faculty work together to make sure that all specialty area programs are approved by the MDE and thus aligned to MDE standards.</td>
<td>% of Folios approved (TPI)</td>
<td>100% of programs approved by MDE</td>
<td>All programs are currently approved.</td>
<td>and other matters that arise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Target met: Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Approved programs are listed <a href="#">here</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional Program Data

Initial certification Program Completers: 77 (previous year 173)
47 Undergrad (88)
0 PBA (12)
24 Endorsements (54)
6 MAC-SC (19)

Spring Arbor University New Teacher Effectiveness Report for 2013-14 (no direct State comparison available at this time):
N = 95 (previous year 111)
Highly Effective: 17.9% (19.8%)
Effective: 76.8% (75.7%)
Minimally Effective: 5.3% (4.5%), all five teachers with this rating in 2013-14 had two years of teaching experience
Ineffective: 0% (0%)
Highly Effective + Effective: 94.7% (95.5%)