CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY NEBRASKA

College of Education
Annual Report
Teacher Education
Academic Year 2010-2011

Teaching … Leading … Learning

Ron Bork, Ed.D.
Dean, College of Education
Concordia University, Nebraska

The Purpose Statement of Concordia University College of Education

The College of Education strives to prepare candidates who exemplify Christ-like leaders and who will serve as educators in Lutheran, parochial, private, and public school classrooms and parish education programs of our church and our world.

We will equip our candidates

- to be effective in ministry in schools and congregations
- to integrate the Christian faith and values into their own lives and into their classrooms and parish ministries in appropriate and effective ways
- to see themselves as leaders and influencers and to provide them with a basic set of skills to carry out their ministry
- to grow spiritually, academically, socially, emotionally, physically, and relationally

We do this by providing an environment that encourages and emphasizes

- spiritual, intellectual, social, emotional, and physical growth in an atmosphere of openness and respect,
- excellence in academics and integrity demonstrated in high standards in both areas,
- a high standard of excellence in personal spiritual life as demonstrated in commitment to Word and Sacrament and to each other as brothers and sisters in Christ,
- the importance of commitment to others in all that we do demonstrated in a willingness to place the needs of others as a high priority in our lives,
- partnership with candidates as they learn and grow, with schools and churches in the training and growth of the candidates, and with Lutheran, public, private, and parochial schools in recruiting, placing, and retaining dedicated servant-leaders, and
- a sense of collegiality and mutual respect and responsibility in our candidates during their time at Concordia and as they take their place in the schools and churches of the world.

The Need for Teachers in our Church and World

- The education of our children is one of the most important responsibilities of a society. That need is even more prevalent in our church as leaders look not only at the academic education of their children but also the spiritual upbringing. Lutheran schools have long been one of the most effective ways of developing strong spiritual values in our children and young people. The challenge in today's world is to continue to provide quality, Christ-centered education to students when the cost of education continues to rise and when schools are closing because of the economy.
- As we prepare teachers for public schools we realize that instilling strong values in the students is important. We strive to be effective in preparing our teacher education candidates to be positive role models for the students.
- In our synodical schools we currently have 243,212 students enrolled in 2,382 programs from child care through twelfth grade.

Courses Taught in the Professional Education Core

The following chart shows professional education core courses taught during the 2010-2011 academic year.

	course/hrs	professor	position	enrollment fall	enrollment spring	cr. hrs. gen. fall	cr. hrs. gen. spring
Courses in the Teacher Education Core	Ed101 (1)	Juergensen	FT CoE	17 21	21	17 21	21
	Ed101(1)	Kromminga	FT CoE	23	22	23	22
	Ed101(1)	Tonjes	FT CoE	18	25	18	25
	Ed201 (3)	Opfer	Adj CoE	27 28	28 27 22	81 84	84 81 66
	EDPS210(2)	Tonjes	FT CoE	24 19 17	25 26 27	48 38 34	50 52 54
	Psy324 (3)	Geidel	FT CoE	30 27	30 31	90 81	90 93
	Ed 424 (2)	Geidel	FT CoE	30 24	21 28	60 48	42 56
	Theo241 (3)	Holtorf	FT A/S		23		69
	Theo251 (3)	Blanco	FT A/S	27 27		81 81	
	Theo252 (3)	Blanco	FT A/S		22		66
	Theo361 (3)	Groth	FT A/S	21		63	
	Theo361 (3)	Reek	FT A/S	27	8 25	81	24 75
	Theo362 (3)	Groth	FT A/S	24	28 17	72	84 51
	Theo362 (3)	Reek	FT A/S	20		60	
	Theo381(2)	Moulds Bork IS	FT CoE	29 29 1	40	58 58 2	80
			Hours Generated			1199	1185
	Total enroll	Fall 510 Spring 496	Hours Taught			48	48
	Sections	Fall 21 Spring 20	Average Class Size			24.3	24.8

Education courses taught during the 2010-2011 academic year:

	course/hrs	professor	position	enrollment fall	enrollment spring	cr. hrs. gen. fall	cr. hrs. gen. spring
Courses in all Teacher Education Programs **ECE** **Elem.** **Middle Level** **Secondary** **ELL** **(some classes have non-teacher education students in them)**	Art 301 (2)	Robson	FT A/S	25	26	50	52
	Ed 211 (1)	Pester	Adj CoE	9		9	
	Ed 315 (3)	Geidel / Epstein	FT CoE	1	24	3	72
	Ed 316 (3)	Geidel	FT CoE		25		75
	Ed 330 (3)	Oliver	FT CoE		15		45
	Ed 331 (3)	Small	Adj CoE	13		36	
	Ed 333 (3)	Spotanski	Adj CoE		17		51
	Ed 362 (2)	Kromminga	FT CoE	20	27	40	54
	Ed 425A (3)	Mickle	FT CoE	30	19	90	57
	Ed 425B (3)	McNulty	Adj CoE	2	7	6	21
	CTA 333(3)	Gernant Numella-Hanel	FT A/S Adj A/S	14	 5	42	 15
	Ed 430 (2)	Kromminga	FT CoE	27		54	
	Ed 461 (6)	Kamprath	Adj CoE	31	23	186	138
	Ed 470 (3)	Uffelman	FT CoE	29	19 15	87	57 45
	Eng 391 (3)	Serck	Emeriti	20	1	60	3
	Math 301(3)	Bork	FT CoE	25	25	75	75
	Psy 211 (2)	Warren	FT CoE	29 15	22	58 30	44
	Psy 212 (1)	Oliver	FT CoE	12	9	12	9
	Psy 421 (2)	Moulds	FT CoE	35	32 23	70	64 46
	Psy 422 (1)	Pester	Adj CoE	12	5	12	5
			Hours Generated			920	928
	Total enroll	Fall – 349 Spring – 339	Hours Taught			42	51
	Sections	Fall – 17 Spring – 19	Average Class Size			20.5	17.8

Methods courses taught:

	course/hrs	professor / sections	position	enrollment fall	enrollment spring	cr. hrs. gen. fall	cr. hrs. gen. spring
Methods Courses Taught	Ed 301 (2)	Juergensen / 1	FT CoE	22	20	44	40
	Ed 363 (6) (0.5 for KK, 1.5 for others)	Kromminga - Gen	FT CoE	20	15	10	7.5
		Rees – music	Adj CoE	20	15	30	22.5
		Opfer – soc st	Adj CoE	20	15	30	22.5
		Petersen – sci	Adj CoE	20	15	30	22.5
		Kromminga - mth	Adj CoE	20	15	30	22.5
	Ed 364 (3) 1 cr hr each	Pester / 1	Adj CoE	13		13	
		Opfer / 1	Adj CoE	13		13	
		Metzger / 1	Adj CoE	13		13	
	Ed 367 (2)	A. Royuk / 1	Adj CoE	-	3		6
	Ed 368 (2)	Sylwester / 1	FT A/S	-	1		2
	Ed 369 (2)	Widler	Adj CoE	2		4	
	Ed 371 (2)	R. Reese	Adj A/S	4	10	8	20
	Ed 372 (2)	Miller, Moody / 1	Adj A/S	7	12	14	24
	Ed 373 (2)	Royuk / 1	FT A/S	4	5	8	10
	Ed 374 (2)	Banzhaf / 1	Adj A/S	2	6	4	12
	Ed 375 (2)	von Kampen / 1	FT A/S	13		26	
	Ed 376 (2)	Goldgrabe / 1	FT A/S	2	3	4	6
	Ed 377 (2)	Robson / 1	FT A/S	-	6		12
	Ed 378 (2)	Reese / 1	Adj A/S	9	3	18	6
	Ed 379 (2)	Kohlwey / 1	Adj A/S	6		12	
	HHP 364(1)	Goldgrabe / 1	FT A/S	20	18	20	18
	HHP 363(1)	Boye / 1	FT A/S	19	18	19	18
	Ed 332 (3)	Oliver	FT CoE	16		48	
	Ed 452 (3)	Oliver / 1	FT CoE	15		45	
			Hours Generated			443	271.5
	Total enroll	Fall – 280 Spring – 180	Hours Taught			37.5	28.5
	Sections	Fall – 22 Spring - 17	Average Class Size			12.7	10.6

Program Productivity

- In the fall of 2010 we had 29 student teachers completing their second experience. These candidates finished their requirements in schools in Alaska, Arizona, Missouri, Nebraska, Texas, Wisconsin, and In Shanghai, China. We had 62 candidates who student taught second semester in Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Florida, Illinois, Iowa, Maryland, Michigan, Missouri Nebraska, Nevada, Texas, Wisconsin and Shanghai, China. During the 2011-2012 academic year we are expecting 116 student teachers, an increase of 27% over the previous year. Included in that group are 19 students who have special education as one of their endorsement areas.
- The total number of declared teacher education candidates on campus in the fall of 2010 was tentatively listed at 460. This included freshmen who have indicated an interest in teacher education. This number is up 13.9% from the previous year.

Course/Instructor Evaluation Information

The Course/Instructor Evaluation form was in its same format for the fourth year in a row. This provides consistent comparisons over that time which can result in seeing trends in evaluation scores. Students rank professors on a 1-5 scale (strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, strongly agree) in 16 different areas. The form will provide longitudinal data on instructor effectiveness as evaluated by the students. Data generated can also be used as part of the faculty professional development process.

Aggregate data for Fall 10 and Spring 11 is included below:

Course Instructor Evaluation Summary

	Fall 10 sections		Spr 11	
	overall average	overall rank	overall average	overall rank
Instructor is accessible	4.512	4	4.579	4
Instructor is prepared	4.576	3	4.689	3
Productive use of time	4.349	13	4.465	12
Feedback is timely, helpful	4.411	8	4.522	7
Students treated fairly	4.678	2	4.748	2
Expectations are clear	4.405	9	4.545	6
Instructor motivates me	4.394	10	4.453	14
Critical thinking is stimulated	4.418	6	4.499	8
Instructor is knowledgeable	4.783	1	4.816	1
Valid assessment is used	4.282	14	4.463	13
Assignments are helpful	4.377	12	4.388	16
Grading practices are clear	4.275	15	4.493	9
Workload is appropriate	4.239	16	4.471	11
My grade reflects my learning	4.449	5	4.578	5
I learned a great deal in class	4.390	11	4.426	15
Overall average of scores	4.345		4.538	

The strengths indicated in the evaluations continue to be the knowledge level of the instructor, the fairness with which students are treated, the preparation of the instructor, and the instructor's accessibility. It is interesting that one of the consistently lower evaluations by students is in the area of valid assessments being used by the instructor and yet the students consistently indicate that their grade reflects their learning.

An analysis has been done over the past four semesters indicating the number of scores given by students to instructors at different score levels. The goal of instructor evaluations is to have all averages at or above 4.0 indicating agreement with the statements. Summaries of Fall 10 and Spring 11 are listed on the next page.

Course Instructor Evaluation Summary - Fall 2010			967 total evaluations			
courses	54		Number of individual instructor scores			
	overall average	overall rank	< 4.0	4.0 to <4.5	4.5 or >	4.8 or >
Instructor is accessible	4.512	4	6	15	33	12
Instructor is prepared	4.576	3	4	13	37	23
Productive use of time	4.349	13	11	12	31	11
Feedback is timely, helpful	4.411	8	7	15	32	9
Students treated fairly	4.678	2	4	2	48	27
Expectations are clear	4.405	9	8	10	36	13
Instructor motivates me	4.394	10	8	17	39	7
Critical thinking is stimulated	4.418	6	8	14	32	7
Instructor is knowledgeable	4.783	1	1	5	38	35
Discussions are helpful	4.416	7	7	17	30	13
Valid assessment is used	4.282	14	10	22	22	3
Assignments are helpful	4.377	12	7	20	27	6
Grading practices are clear	4.275	15	12	18	24	5
Workload is appropriate	4.239	16	10	16	28	5
My grade reflects my learning	4.449	5	7	19	28	8
I learned a great deal	4.390	11	8	15	31	10
# of evaluations at level			118	230	516	194
Overall average of scores	4.345					

Course Instructor Evaluation Summary - Spring 2011			857 total evaluations			
sections	46		Number of individual instructor scores			
	overall average	overall rank	< 4.0	4.0 to <4.5	4.5 or >	4.8 or >
Instructor is accessible	4.579	4	3	10	33	12
Instructor is prepared	4.689	3	2	7	37	26
Productive use of time	4.465	12	5	9	32	10
Feedback is timely, helpful	4.522	7	5	9	32	12
Students treated fairly	4.748	2	3	3	40	28
Expectations are clear	4.545	6	5	7	34	17
Instructor motivates me	4.453	14	4	14	28	14
Critical thinking is stimulated	4.499	8	6	5	35	14
Instructor is knowledgeable	4.816	1	1	3	42	33
Discussions are helpful	4.477	10	5	9	32	14
Valid assessment is used	4.463	13	4	13	29	8
Assignments are helpful	4.388	16	7	12	27	9
Grading practices are clear	4.493	9	5	11	30	11
Workload is appropriate	4.471	11	7	7	32	14
My grade reflects my learning	4.578	5	4	8	34	11
I learned a great deal	4.426	15	8	7	31	16
# of evaluations at level			74	134	528	249
Overall average of scores	4.538					

An 8-semester comparison of course instructor evaluation scores indicates that students in spring semesters tend to rank the course and the instructor higher than the fall students. A consistent trend has emerged with scores of 4.8 or above gradually increasing over the respective semesters the last three years. Caution should be taken with any inferences made given the different courses offered and instructors of those courses over that time frame.

	overall average	overall rank	< 4.0	4.0 to <4.5	4.5 or >	4.8 or >
Fall 2007						
Total evals at level			28	131	141	17
Overall average of scores	4.370131	%	9.3%	43.7%	47%	5.7%
Spring 2008						
Total evals at level			48	180	267	74
Overall average of scores	4.408051	%	9.7%	36.4%	53.9%	14.9%
Fall 2008						
Total evals at level			111	115	204	82
Overall average of scores	4.338712	%	21.7%	22.5%	39.8%	16.0%
Spring 2009						
Total evals at level			45	144	419	152
Overall average of scores	4.514846	%	7.4%	23.7%	68.9%	25.0%

Fall 2009						
Total evals at level			101	212	455	168
Overall average of scores	4.447821	%	13.2%	27.6%	59.2%	21.9%
Spring 2010						
Total evals at level			65	141	482	193
Overall average of scores	4.544494	%	9.5%	20.5%	70.1%	28.1%
Fall 2010						
Total evals at level			118	230	516	194
Overall average of scores	4.434636	%	13.7%	26.6%	59.7%	22.5%
Spring 2011						
Total evals at level			74	134	528	249
Overall average of scores	4.538188	%	10.1%	18.2%	71.7%	33.8%

Strengths, Highlights, and Changes in the Teacher Education Program

- The teacher education program continues to be the flagship program at Concordia University, Nebraska. While we hope that we have reached the low point in graduation numbers and that in the coming years we will see a gradual increase in the number of students enrolled in and completing the teacher education program at all levels we realize that there will be a continuing challenge in enrolling students in the teacher education program.

- The next scheduled program review by the Nebraska Department of Education will be in the summer of 2012 and the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education will receive a written report in the fall of 2012 with an onsite visit in the spring of 2013.

- In recent years we have experienced more non-LCMS students choosing Concordia University, Nebraska to continue their education with the goal of becoming a teacher. Many of these students have indicated a desire to teach in Christian schools. We believe that a solid preparation in Biblical basics will be beneficial to these students. The College of Education approved the addition of a Christian Teacher Diploma program in the spring of 2011. This program received Board of Regents approval in July 2011. The Christian Teacher Diploma is granted to students who have met all requirements for the teacher education program, have a teaching degree, and are eligible for a teaching license in the State of Nebraska. Students seeking this diploma have indicated an interest in serving as teachers in Christian schools that are not associated with the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod. Students wishing to receive the CTD must apply to the program and complete its requirements as a part of the baccalaureate degree. All students receiving the Christian Teachers Diploma are required to take a minimum of six hours of upper-level (300 or 400 level) theology or philosophy courses on campus.

Christian Teacher Diploma

Choose 9 hours from the following courses:

Theo-241 or 242 or 251 or 252 Biblical Interpretation course (choose only one)	3
Phil-301 Concepts in Philosophy	3
Theo-375 Christian Denominations, Movements, and Contemporary Cults	3
Theo-390 World Religions: The Gospel in a Pluralistic World	3
Theo-450 Understanding and Teaching the Bible	3
(Biblical Interpretation is a pre-requisite for Theo-450)	
Theo-465 Christian Ethics	3
Theo-482 Nurturing Faith through Family, School and Congregation	3
Theo-489 Ministry in a Changing World	3

Progress Made on Program Goals

- The undergraduate faculty in the College of Education currently numbers eight full-time faculty and two "super adjuncts" who serve nearly full-time in the program. We also have three full-time members who serve in the Director of Christian Education program and regularly meet with the College of Education. Changes were made in administrative responsibilities during the year. Beginning in the fall of 2010 Professor Beth Pester took on the responsibility of student teaching I placement. Dr. Bernie Tonjes continued in his role as field experiences director and also expanded his role as director of the Dual Credit program with high schools.

- Adjustments were made in course instructor assignments for the coming semester. The realignment provided greater consistency between sections of a course and allowed faculty to teach to their strengths.

- Teacher Education Data (TED) continues to be gathered and the College of Education is at the point where trends can be seen over time.

- The Special Education endorsement was implemented in the fall of 2010. 19 students will complete their student teaching in the 2011-2012 academic year.

Program Size 2007-2010

Based on Admission to Teacher Education status as of May of each year

(ECE and SpEd candidates are only counted once)

	Early childhood	Elementary	Special Education	Middle Level	Secondary	K-12	Total
2007	31	42	5	26	56	17	177
2008	26	39	2	25	50	24	166
2009	35	54	2	29	58	27	205
2010	32	54	3	24	55	21	189
2011	33	53	21	19	74	23	223

PROGRAM REPORTS:

Early Childhood Education

2011 graduates of the program: (15)

Sara Braatz	Elaine Feilmeier	Alicia Fulton
Emily Gierse	Cassandra Havelka	Amber Hopkins
Brett Jagels	Donna McCray	Rachel Miller
Michelle Myslinski	Alexa Oelke	Amanda Rosse
Andrea Schmiege	Kelsey Smith	Amy Woodman

Early Childhood Endorsement	30 hours
HHP-182 First Aid and CPR	2
Psy-212 Child Development & Psychology/EC	1
Educ-330 Early Childhood Educ. Foundations & Programs	3
Educ-331 Infants & Toddlers: Development, Curriculum & Teaching	3
Educ-333 Primary Education and Literacy Development	3
+Educ-430 School, Community, and Parent Involvement	2
Professional Semester (ECE requires two professional semesters):	
+Educ-332 Early Childhood Curriculum & Methodology	3
+Educ-452 Early Childhood Prog. Organization & Mgmt.	3
+Educ-380 Student Teaching in Pre-Primary	10

Annette Oliver
Director of Early Childhood Education

Elementary Education

2011 graduates of the program: (19)

Christine Bailey	Katelin Daletas	Katherine Deterding
Debra Erickson	Angela Fick	Doris Galarza
Sarah Hinckfoot	Elizabeth Inman	Julie Klinge
Heidi Kohn	Katherine Krause	Sarah Kreiger
Chelsi Mahalek	Molly Millard	Erika Mock
Danae Otten	Tyler Schardt	Sally Schwarz
Falon Tardiff		

Elementary Education Endorsement	35 hours
Psy-211 Child Development and Psychology	2
+Art-301 Methods in Art Education	1
+Math-301 Concepts of Mathematics II	3
+Educ-461 Literacy Instruction, Assessment & Intervention	6
*Educ-362 Teaching the Christian Faith	2
+Educ-425A Foreign Language Instruction, Curriculum, Assessment	3
+HHP-363 Health Methods in the Elementary School	1
+HHP-364 PE Methods in the Elementary School	1
Professional Semester :	
+Educ-363 Teacher Laboratory-Elementary Methods	6
+Educ-381-384 Elementary Student Teaching	10

Kevin Kromminga, M.A.
Director of Elementary Education

Middle Level Education

2011 graduates of the program: (10)

Andy Banahan	Celeste Brutus	Carolyn Chrzan
Caleb Egger	Laura Elmshauser	Laura Henke
Luann Jacobitz	Anna Kreis	Joshua Menke
Karen Piel		

Middle Level Endorsement	37 hours
Educ-211 Middle Level Seminar I	1
+Educ-311 Middle Level Seminar II	1
*Educ-362 Teaching the Christian Faith	2
+Eng-392 Reading Interests of Adolescents	or
+Eng-491 Issues in Literature for Children and Youth	3
+Educ-401 Middle Level Instruction	3
+Psy-421 Psychology of Adolescence	2
+Educ-470 Content Area Literacy	3

+Educ-425A ESL Foreign Language Instruction, Curriculum, Assessment 3
+Educ-364 Teacher Lab Components for Middle Level (math, soc. st., science) 3
+Psy-422 Psychology & Development of the Young Adolescent 1

Professional Semester

+Educ-402 Middle Level Program & Curriculum 1
+Educ-37x Secondary Methods in Content Teaching. Area I 2
+Educ-37x Secondary Methods in Content Teaching. Area II 2
+Educ-396a/b Middle Level Student Teaching 10

Beth Pester
Interim Director of Middle Level Education

Secondary Education

2011 graduates of the program: (37)

Katherine Bailey	Nicole Baker	Lindsay Bartling
Austin Beckman	Nicholas Bloch	Keegan Bloomfield
Roger Cattle	Charles Chaveriat	Scott Dinslage
Teagan Dinslage	Clarissa Eloge	Kole Ficken
Caledonia Gerth	Justin Groth	Ann Henny
Ellen Hente	Elizabeth Hinkle	Wade Houchin
Andrew Houghton	Chelsey Igo	Rebecca Kaaz
Abby Klein	Micah Korb	Antoine Love
Melanie Maxson	Zachary McGargill	Curtis Miller
Lauren Onions	Kate Phillips	Bradley Ramp
Andrew Rathe	James Refenes	Jonathan Rempfer
Kyle Schmidt	Amber Sims	Paul von Kampen
Kelsey Wagner		

Secondary Education Sequence 19-23 hours

+Psy-421 Psychology of Adolescence 2
+Educ-470 Content Area Literacy 3

Professional Semester

+Educ-301 Principles of Secondary Education 2
+Educ-367-379 Secondary Methods Courses 2-4
+Educ-385 Secondary Student Teaching 10

James D. Juergensen, Ed.D.
Director of Secondary Education

Special Education

During the year the need became evident for an expanded and revised endorsement program in special education. Hence a special education endorsement was added at the elementary level, middle level, and secondary level. It includes 22 hours of coursework that will be offered along with the 10 weeks of student teaching required for endorsement. Courses in the revised program include:

PSY 324	Psychology of Exceptionality (3 hours)
EDUC 424	Teaching Diverse Learners (2 hours)
ECTA 170	American Sign Language (3 hours)
HHP 471	Adaptive Physical Education (3 hours)
EDUC 314	Assessment, Evaluation, and IEP (3 hours)
EDUC 315	Behavior Disorders and Intervention (3 hours)
EDUC 316	Teaching Students with Mental Retardation (3 hours)
EDUC 317	Teaching Students with Learning Disabilities (3 hours)

Amanda Geidel, M. A.
Director of Special Education

Appendix A

Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod School Statistics 2006 through 2011

Appendix B

Teacher Vacancy Areas – State of Nebraska

Appendix C

LTD / Public Graduation Numbers

Appendix D
Teacher Education Admissions History

Appendix E
Teacher Education Data (T.E.D.)
Initial Information

Appendix F
Departmental Assessment 2010-2011

Appendix G
Financial Reports 2007-2011 (unaudited)

Appendix A

Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod School Statistics 2006 through 2011

	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011
Total Lutheran Schools	2488	2485	2500	2444	2382
% change	-1.46%	-0.1%	+0.6%	-2.2%	-2.5%
ECE Centers	1368	1406	1406	1400	1393
% change	-2.1%	+2.8%	0.0%	-0.4%	-0.5%
Enrollment Childcare / Pre-K	131,225	133,225	131,361	129,351	128,351
% change	+0.5%	+1.5%	-1.4%	-1.5%	-0.8%
Elementary Schools	1018	976	986	945	899
% change	-0.8%	-4.1%	+1.0%	-4.2%	-4.9%
Enrollment K-8	130,395	121,424	120,684	107,370	98,213
% change	-7.5%	-6.9%	-0.6%	-11.0%	-8.5%
High Schools	102	103	108	99	90
% change	0.0%	+1.0%	+4.9%	-8.3%	-9.1%
Enrollment 9-12	18,806	19,254	18,867	18,455	16,648
% change	-0.6%	+2.4%	-2.0%	-2.2%	-9.8%
Total Enrollment	280,426	273,903	270,912	255,176	243,212
% change	-3.5%	-2.3%	-1.1%	-5.8%	-4.7%
Average Starting Salary					
Average Starting Salary	$26,794	$27,635	$29,125	$29,954	$28,877
Candidate Placement - total for Concordia University System					
ECE	15	19	23	7	16
Elementary	226	231	216	170	164
Secondary	47	50	41	30	37

Appendix B

Teacher Vacancy Areas – State of Nebraska

2003-2004	Sciences	Special Education
	Foreign Languages	English
	Math	Speech Language Pathology
	Media Specialist	Guidance Counselor
2004-2005	Sciences	Special Education
	Foreign Languages	English
	Industrial Tech	Speech Language Pathology
2005-2006	Foreign Languages	Special Education
	Music	Speech Language Pathology
	Sciences	
2006-2007	Special Education	Math
	Sciences	English
	Industrial Tech.	Foreign Languages
	Music	Speech Language Pathology
2007-2008	Special Education	Sciences
	Foreign Languages	English
	Music	Speech Language Pathology
	Media Specialist	Industrial Tech.
	Math	
2008-2009	Special Education	Foreign Languages
	English	Speech Language Pathology
	Sciences	Agriculture
	Art	Industrial Technology
	Math	Music
	Guidance Counselor	
2009-2010	Special Education	Foreign Languages / ESL/ELL
	Language Arts/English	Speech Language Pathology
	Sciences	Art
	Mathematics	Music
	Agriculture	Industrial Technology
	Guidance Counselor	
2010-2011	Agriculture	Sciences
	Language Arts	Special Education
	Mathematics	Speech Language Pathology
	School Librarian	World Language - Spanish

Appendix C

LTD / Public Graduation Numbers

Graduation Year	Early Childhood		Special Education		Elementary		Middle Level		Secondary		Total
	LTD	Pub	LTD	Pub	LTD	Pub	LTD	Pub	LTD	Pub	
02-03	13	0	2	0	28	2	11	0	42	0	100
											96% LTD
03-04	7	4	5	0	35	3	4	0	30	4	92
											88% LTD
04-05	11	0	5	1	27	3	7	1	45	4	104
											91% LTD
05-06	24	1	6	1	30	1	11	0	31	4	109
											94% LTD
06-07	8	1	5	0	20	2	7	2	38	3	83
											90% LTD
07-08	11	3	2	0	25	1	10	0	27	2	81
											93% LTD
08-09	12	5	1	1	15	3	13	2	32	6	90
											81% LTD
09-10	9	3	-	-	26	1	6	2	27	3	77
											88% LTD
10-11	14	1	-	-	16	3	8	2	29	8	81
											83% LTD
11-12 projected	8	3	10	2	23	7	6	1	40	9	109
											80% LTD
12-13 projected	11	3	8	2	21	4	10	3	39	9	110
											81% LTD

Appendix D
Teacher Education Admissions History

The total number is the number of individuals admitted into teacher education at that point in time. In the middle level column the number in ( ) indicates those in a stand-alone program. All other middle level candidates are also included as either elementary or secondary students. ECE candidates are also receiving an elementary degree but they are double listed as elementary. Hence adding the numbers up in the columns may not result in the number listed under "total".

Semester/ Year	Total	Secondary	Middle Level stand-alone since 06-07	Elementary	Early childhood (also listed in elementary)	Special Education (listed with endorsement)
Dec 11	196	92	16	88	21	26
May 11	211	94	19	98	33	-
Dec 10	176	80	19	77	28	-
May 10	188	75	24	89	33	-
Dec 09	164	75	18	71	28	-
May 09	205	85	29	91	35	2
Dec 08	175	71	26	78	32	2
May 08	217	91	33	93	35	4
Dec 07	176	74	26	76	33	4
May 07	175	73	26	77	32	9
Dec 06	190	76	22 – all stand alone	52	40	9
May 06	239	86	31 (30 – stand alone)	76	47	9
Dec 05	248	97	29 (26 – s.a.)	77	48	9
May 05	265	104	25 (19 – s.a.)	91	51	7
Dec 04	274	117	27 (16 – s.a.)	94	47	7

Appendix E
Teacher Education Data (T.E.D.)
Initial Information

On the pages that follow is information from the data analysis using information entered in the Teacher Education Data (T.E.D.) system of Banner. Averages for cohorts consisting of teacher education candidates who entered the program in years 2005 through 2010 are included. The teacher performance areas included are:

Teaching Knowledge
T-K1: Student Development – INTASC2

Teaching skills
T-S1: Multiple Instructional Strategies – INTASC4
T-S2: Planning – INTASC7
T-S3: Assessment – INTASC8
T-S4: Motivation and Management – INTASC5

Teaching dispositions
T-D1: Passion for Teaching
T-D2: Personal Characteristics

Leading knowledge
LD-K1: Content Pedagogy - INTASC1

Leading skills
LD-S1: School and Community Involvement – INTASC10
LD-S2: Diverse Learners – INTASC3
LD-S3: Communication and Technology – INTASC6

Leading dispositions
LD-D1: Character / Faith Development

Learning knowledge
LR-K1: Depth of Knowledge in Endorsement Area

Learning skills
LR-S1: Reflective Practice: Professional Growth – INTASC9

Learning dispositions
LR-D1: Lifelong Learning

Appendix F
Departmental Assessment 2010-2011

Concordia University
Department of Education: Assessment Program for 2010-2011

Identification of one departmental learning outcome that will be assessed by the department during the 2010-2011 academic year.

See Conceptual Framework, LD-S3 "Communication and Technology: The teacher candidate uses knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom."

Method of Assessment

A. Full-time education faculty and selected adjuncts will be asked to select a technology integration goal for the academic year that will result in an improvement in their ability to integrate technology into their teaching.
B. As part of the goal setting process, participating faculty will put their technology goal in writing at the beginning of the academic year. In addition to the written goal, each will compose a brief list of steps that will be taken to accomplish the goal and quality indicators to be expected if the goal is successfully completed.
C. Based on these written plans, faculty will self-assess their performance before the end of the academic year with adequate time to allow for the student evaluation process described in "D".
D. The faculty assessment portion of the technology survey used in 2009-2010 will be used again to provide a basis of comparison to the prior year.
E. As part of the course/instructor evaluation process, faculty will add additional questions to the assessment instrument to allow students to evaluate and comment on the instructor's performance on the designated goal. Questions should include both controlled-response items, (e.g. Likert-type items) and open-response items.
F. Data for LD-S3 from TED (Teacher Education Data) assessment package will be monitored for consistency with results from other aspects of the assessment process

Full-time faculty and selected adjuncts will be asked to specify a technology goal for themselves for the coming year. Emphasis will be made on keeping the number of goals low (one per faculty member would be ideal) and on developing goals that can be evaluated in an outcomes-based manner.

Assessment of the goal will include a self-evaluation by the faculty member and an evaluation by students. The student evaluation will make use of the course and instructor evaluation process and also an administration of the technology assessment used in 2009-2010 to the extent that it fits with the goals selected for this year.

TED data represents an evaluation of students based on a combination of assessments by CUNE faculty, cooperating field experience teachers and student self evaluation on the subject of Communication and Technology as demonstrated during the pre-service practical experiences undertaken by our students. Assuming that there is an improvement in faculty integration of technology, TED scores may also show an improvement in this area.

The faculty self-assessment and student evaluation will utilize the 5 item rubric developed for the TED assessment. Having the self-assessment of faculty and student evaluations supported by TED data should give us a well-rounded picture of the changes that come with the goal setting and evaluation process. Faculty members will have up-to-date, anonymous feedback about their performance on their technology integration goal to be able to compare to their self-assessment.

Schedule for Assessment

August & September, 2010: Faculty members choose technology goal, outline steps to accomplish the goal and specify quality indicators of successful goal completion.

August, 2010 to February, 2011: Faculty members implement steps to accomplish technology goal for the year.

March, 2011: Faculty members conduct a self-evaluation of their progress towards their individual technology goal.

April, 2011: Students are surveyed during the course and instructor evaluation process at the end of Semester 2.

May, 2011: Technology integration goals and their impact on classroom experiences will be discussed at the end of the year meeting of the education faculty.

Evaluation Results:
Names have been removed to ensure anonymity.

Professor A
I will attempt to use technology and internet sources in [my classes].

Sem 1: I chose not to have my … class evaluate my technology goal since I only used one instance during the entire semester. I considered that to be less than my original goal and wasn't sure the students would even remember it unless I reminded them that I did it. I'm still going to try to implement the clicker activity with chapter reviews next semester. I need to get the software loaded on my computer and learn how to use the software and hardware. That's still my goal for the coming semester.

Sem 2: I failed in my goal. Time and other tasks became more important. When I found out that I wasn't going to be teaching [this class] next fall I lost interest in spending time learning something that I wouldn't have the opportunity to use in class.

Professor B
Access and use "Films on Demand".
Put gradebook on spreadsheet and make available to students.

Sem 1: Decided to abandon spreadsheet task as to time consuming at this time.

Students unanimous in their assessment that using videos helped students in their understanding of the lives of people with disabilities.

Sem 2: Once again, students agreed that use of videos was helpful. Comments primarily emphasized that the movies contributed to a better understanding of the situation and abilities of the handicapped. Comments also indicated that the videos broadened the view of the students related to students with disabilities.

Considerable survey data available in accompanying spreadsheet.

Professor C
Use MOBI tablets and clickers for my [class].

Sem 1: My goal was to use the Mobi tablet and clickers for my [class]. However, after thinking more about it I decided that it wouldn't be a more effective teaching strategy than what I was already using. On top of that there were some glitches with the tablet when others tried to use it and it didn't work as it was supposed to, so I really didn't want to mess with it. It was a poor goal to set from the beginning.

Sem 2: I successfully switched over from old school video tapes to electronic links for my…class, but not until after the… course was done…I also used SKYPE on several occasions for job related conversations, but that didn't have any impact on my classes or students.

Professor D
I would like to learn how to use and be able to model the use of a MOBI tablet and clickers in the classroom.

Sem 2: My goal was not accomplished mostly because of the equipment not working properly. I have not been able to sync the tablet down in [Room] 005. It works on my computer in my office but for some reason when I get it down in the classroom it does not respond. I did call tech support and they said it was the pen. After I received the new pen I tried it and still had no luck. Thus—frustration and I wasn't willing to spend any more time with it over the semester.

Professor E
Develop a student-created Wiki.

Sem 1: Evaluation. Asked students 3 questions about Wiki use and development. Scores used a 5-point Likert scale: 5=Strongly agree, 3= Neither Agree nor Disagree and 1= Strongly Disagree.

Results:
Q1 Wiki use was helpful? 2.8 (Slightly towards the "disagree" side.)
Q2 I would use a Wiki again? 2.75 (Slightly towards "disagree" side.)
Q3 Learning to develop Wikis resulted in professional bnefit for me? 3.2 (Slight agreement.)

Comments indicated that while students could see possibilities, it was presented in a way which did not clearly demonstrate advantages for use.

Sem 2: Learn to use Skype effectively.

Skyping was wonderful and well received by the students. They were very attentive, but not very interactive. For some of the topics, I had students generate questions to provide the speaker before hand, others I suggested the questions. I had one technology glitch and two scheduling conflicts. Of the six

presenters, only 3 actually took place. I would highly recommend using this form of … guest lecturers. They certainly brought in a level of expertise and experience which was current. I will likely do it again.

Professor F
Use SKYPE to have live conversations with Middle Level instructors and experts/professionals in adolescence in each of my classes. (And maybe even talk with a few… students.)

Sem 1: Overwhelmingly the feedback was positive. I don't have quantitative data, but the qualitative data was very positive. My students loved it. Of the 13 in one class and 12 in another at least seven of them asked that we do it more frequently. They felt it added a considerable amount the learning the course to hear from professionals in the field about the different topics discussed. One student asked that we get better equipment to make the video stream less hesitant, but I'm quite sure that was a problem on the other end, not ours. Not one said it was a poor experience - NOT ONE

Sem 2: I was very successful in Skyping presenters in. I loved it. My students loved it. It was a "real" person in a real classroom telling them all the same things I tell them, but they listed more carefully because "real" people have more clout.

In the future I want to bring more than one presenter in per class. (Not more than two, but certainly two.) And I want to bring a class of [grade-level] kids into a couple of my courses so they can have a chance to interact with a classroom full of kids through Skype. I also want to bring more than educators in as presenters - perhaps DCEs, psychologists, pastors - just brainstorming possibilities.

It has been a benefit both in the viability of content in my courses, and also in demonstrating the value of using Skype in an educational and interactive way. I hope in the near future Skype becomes accepted by our computing services department.

Professor G
My goal is to go as "paperless" as I can in my… classes.

Sem 1 & 2: Extensive evaluative data included in associated spreadsheet file. In summary, students were strongly positive (4.0 or higher on 5 point Likert scale: Agree to Strongly agree") . Substantial changes included taking the objective portion of the mid-term and final in the computer lab, submitting journals and most other written via "dropboxes" on Blackboard, and publishing "handouts" on Blackboard without printing them on paper.

I found it sometimes took exceptionally long to fix a quick mistake, or if an element of the course was not set up properly, trying to go to a quick fix (e.g. emailing journals instead of using a dropbox) caused numerous hours of frustration. But in the end, there was what seemed tobe a net gain in efficiency and is something I will continue to do in the future.

Professor H
Secure a FLIP camera and learn how to use it.
Read resources indicating how to use the camera.
Incorporate the use of the FLIP camera within [my class] in an educationally sound and productive manner.

I achieved the technology goals stated [above]. I used the Flip camera extensively.
I video-taped my students as they did micro-teaching and then sent each segment to them privately for

analysis. They discovered many mannerisms of which they were not aware. Some of the clips were posted on the [College of Education] webpage.

Professor J
Engage online with other news readers in dialog on Internet news articles.

I was able to engage in conversations on-line surrounding current news events. What I learned is that most people do not want to engage in honest dialog working towards better understanding, but seemed to like to read their own rants and move on. I call these "drive by posts". They will make an extreme comment or post a reaction to my comments based upon shallow assumptions and not come back again.

I had some students attempt to engage in on-line discussions based upon a particular news article by posting comments at the end of the article. They did receive some interactions from others which led to some faith sharing.

I learned that many people will not take the time or make the effort for honest dialog. It takes quite a bit of time for students to post comments, return to the news article to sift through the hundreds of other comments and see which ones were actually responding to them.

While a good experience and theoretically worth while, it is very cumbersome, I have virtually no control over other people's level of engagement and it is time consuming. I'd like to fine tune this by limiting the dialogs to some higher quality news sites with a greater population of readers who genuinely want to discuss faith related issues.

Professor K
Use my CU laptop to show video clips in class. Find a way to increase volume so everyone can hear.

I talked with [another professor] about what she does, and did my homework. I found an "extra" set of comparable speakers in my boys' "stuff" [at home], brought them to school, plugged them in and they WORKED! I used them several times through the semester.

Professor L

(Each goal was assessed through an informal focus group method asking open ended question to each class that was impacted by the goal.)

1. Further develop the use of black board in classes in particular find a way to manage grades through blackboard so they can be posted for individual students.

I started using Blackboard in all classes. I struggled with the Grade book feature. I found it to not be as flexible as I would like and being a bit cumbersome in recording grades. I will continue to learn and find better ways to utilize this means of real time grades for students. Students indicated a desire for this to be a part of my courses.

2. Integrate the use of smart boards into at least one class.

I was able to utilize the use of Smart boards in three classes. A total usage of ten class sessions was attempted. Twice I found it difficult to get up and running and it was a distraction to the class. The remaining eight sessions I found the use to be increasingly easier to use and at times a benefit in explaining concepts in a more graphical context. I am still learning to be more proficient on the use of white boards and am working on finding useful pedagogical functions in its use in my courses. This is a

neat tool that I need more work on using in a helpful way. Students enjoyed using the smart boards but were somewhat critical in seeing them as more of a fun option of delivery and saw the distraction as often a distracter to their over all learning.

3. Utilize clickers in the instruction of one class second semester.

I found this to be a very helpful tool with courses where confidentiality in responses is limiting to the discussion. A very helpful tool! The setup is a bit cumbersome in integration but given the benefit in anonymity of responses in some courses well worth it. Student response was very positive. The use of clickers or other similar tools will be incorporated into future course delivery.

Summary:
In evaluating the outcomes of the technology related changes, it is helpful to divide the faculty into groups regarding the complexity of the goals chosen. "Simple" goals were those that involved the adoption and integration of a single application or technology. "Moderate" goals involved adoption of more than one application or technology. "Complex" goals involved the use of several different applications and technology.

For the professors that chose simple goals (A, E,F,H and K) three (F, H and K) felt that they successfully integrated the changes suggested and that the new technologies had been an enhancement to the class. The changes that they made (e.g., adding Skype, using online videos in class, or making use of a Flip camera) were changes that were well-supported by expertise and experience of other staff members or the students in the classes.

One professor (A) selected a goal that was quite indefinite ("use the internet in class") and felt unsuccessful in the accomplishment of the goal due to a lack of time for exploration and for revising teaching strategies to make use of new material. This goal was different from all others in its lack of specificity. Being less specific, it called for considerably more research from the professor to find, study and then use new technology. This likely contributed to the lack of a successful outcome.

Another professor (E) expended considerable effort in attempting to make use of Wikis in class only to find that students felt it was not well integrated into the class. The use of Wikis is not particularly common amongst faculty in their teaching and the professor reported that the good-faith effort was not based in a solid understanding of the use of Wikis. Considering the lack of success with Wikis in first semester, Professor E revised the goal and was successful in integrating Skype into classroom use. The choice of Skype was made in part because of the success of other professors during the first semester. Peer support was an integral component of the successful completion of the goal.

There were 4 professors (B,C,D and J) that elected to designate more complex goals for their classrooms this year. While all reported that they learned a great deal, only one (Professor B) reported clear success, and that was on the simpler (using videos) of the two goals. Professor B also attempted to make use of a spreadsheet for grading that could be made available to students but soon abandoned that goal because of it's complexity. Not only did it require learning some of the mathematical functions of a spreadsheet, it also involved finding a way to make it available to students, a complex task in itself. This goal was quickly abandoned.

One professor reported what can be considered "mixed" success. The professor wanted to find websites where students could interact with others online regarding topics of importance to the class. The professor successfully found websites for direct interaction and had some success in fostering student interaction with the general public on these sites. While the technology part (finding and using web sites) was successful, the professor reported disappointment in the quality of the interaction that came from the

sites. Many of the interactions were simply online wisecracks, characterized by the professor as "drive-by posts" which were not intended for discussion, rather to merely entertain, shock or offend. While there are lessons that can be learned from this kind and quality of interaction, it did not result in the high-quality discussion that was hoped for.

Two professors (C and D) elected to integrate Mobi tablets and clickers into their teaching. Both felt that their efforts were not successful. Professor C had considerable difficulty in getting the devices to operate successfully in the classroom and eventually decided that the time spent in trying to get it to work was not worth the potential payoff. Professor D abandoned the goal after deciding that the changes offered by the technology would not result in better teaching. So, in spite of a donation of a Mobi tablet and a set of clickers, neither has found use in class at this time.

Two professors (G and L) chose somewhat more complex goals and reported more complex results. Some of the hoped for innovations did not pan out at all. Others worked well and represented an enhancement to the class. Students in both classes were very positive about the results achieved. Professor G reports spending a great deal of time in setting up the changes and then in spending additional hours in trying to un-do unsuccessful innovations. Professor L combined several technologies (clickers, Smart Board and Blackboard) and found varying levels of success with all of these. As with Professor G, many of the new additions took more time than expected, but with practice, became easier to use over time.

As is expected in an exercise of this sort, there are common lessons that apply to innovation of any kind, not just to that which comes from a computer. First of all, those that had the most success found that peer support and advice was extremely helpful in making the desired changes. Second, in one form or another, almost all professors mentioned the greater-than-expected amount of time required to study, practice and successfully integrate these changes. Finally, as is usually the case, those that established clear and simple, specific goals had the greatest chances of success.

As we move forward in our teaching and the technology around us continues to change it seems advisable to stick together and help each other, choose clear and specific goals and expect that any technology integration is going to take a commitment of time to make it come to fruition.

Identification of one General Education learning outcome that will be assessed by the department during the 2010-2011 academic year.

Our assessment for 2010-2011 will once again focus on financial literacy, especially those issues and concepts unique to teaching and especially those encountered by students who enter professional church work. Considering the lack of knowledge indicated by last year's assessment, we will implement changes designed to improve students' knowledge in this area and then assess the effectiveness of the changes.

Method of Assessment

A. Students will be asked to complete a pre-test and a post-test covering significant personal finance issues.
   The pre-test assessment will be conducted at the end of Student Teaching I. There will be no preliminary input so that the assessment will give us a picture of student's knowledge of significant financial issues.

B. In consultation with the CUNE Director of Investments and Student Administrative Services, and others in the church and in the Seward community with specific expertise in the area of financial literacy, we will develop an extensive financial literacy presentation to be used with exiting student teachers during the last week of each semester. The presentation will focus directly on financial issues for ordained and commissioned ministers but will also have alternative components to allow for full participation by students in the public education program. The presentation will be included in required activities for student teachers at the close of Student Teaching 2. Students from other professional church work programs will be invited to participate at their option. Participation will be *required* of students in the education program.
C. After the presentation at the close of Student Teaching 2, students will repeat the pre-test assessment given at the end of Student Teaching I. We will also use a series of open-ended questions to allow students to comment on particular aspects of the presentation and to make suggestions for improvement. Comparing data from both assessments will be used as an indicator of the effectiveness of the presentation.

Schedule for Assessment

August-September 2010: Create an outline of topics to be covered, presenters, and develop a pre-test/post-test instrument.

October, 2010: Administer pre-test instrument to student teachers at the end of Student Teaching 1.

December, 2010: Student teachers participate in financial literacy workshops at the conclusion of Student Teaching 2 and complete the post-test assessment.

January, 2011: Preliminary data from first semester used to make modifications to the program if they are indicated.

March, 2011: Administer pre-test instrument to student teachers at the end of Student Teaching 1.

April, 2011: Student teachers participate in financial literacy workshops at the conclusion of Student Teaching 2 and complete the post-test assessment.

May, 2011: Summary results and discussion at Education Department meeting. Program revision if indicated.

Summary and Results:

This year we completed a full slate of "financial literacy" workshops at the end of Student Teaching 2. This represents the first delivery of the completed plan developed from last year's assessment program.

Presenters:
Curt Sherman- General Financial Literacy & Student Loan Information (All students)
Ryan Burger, CPA: Housing Allowance & Social Security for Ministers (LTD only).
Eustolio Gomez: Concordia Plans (St. Louis) LTD only.
Rev. Gene Gerike: Church Extension Fund Options (LTD Only)

Comments about the presentations were all positive. No gain was shown in pre-test/post-test of financial literacy items, but conversations with presenters raised serious questions about the validity of the items used. Significant gains were shown in scores of LTD students on 5 items related to church worker issues related to social security and housing allowance.

Incidentally, and unrelated to our assessment efforts, LCMS now requires (Res. 4-17) all colleges in CUS to make sure that additional instruction is given church-work students regarding ministry-specific financial issues. Our workshops should place us in full compliance with the resolution.

The workshops will be continued at the end of the Spring Semester following the same basic format. Evaluation for semester 2 will no longer included test/retest format.

In the Spring Semester, anecdotal comments from students involved in the workshop were entirely complimentary and enthusiastic regarding the content of the presentations and the fact that the workshops were differentially targeted at students in the public education program and those in the Lutheran Teaching Diploma program. The only negative comments voiced regarded the decision to have all four hours of presentations on a single day. Consideration is being given to revising the schedule with the possibility of dividing the presentations into a two-day schedule.

All of this is being done in the context of greater attention of general financial literacy on the part of students at Concordia. The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod passed Resolution 4-17 requiring all of the Concordia Universities to take steps to ensure increased financial literacy on the part of students going into church work vocations. In response, the College of Education has also added a one hour presentation on student loans to the list of topics included in EDUC101: Teaching as a Profession, the introductory class taken by students before they are apply for admission to the program. In addition to the steps taken by the College of Education, the General Education requirement for all students now includes additional online coursework by freshmen. This will be followed up by additional instruction prior to graduation.

The goals of the proposed assessment seem to have been met. The program developed will continue with periodic evaluations regard

Appendix G
Financial Reports 2007-2011 (unaudited)

2007-2008 - Final Accounting

	#		Budget	Actual	%	Projected	%	
Dean	93001		8950	8743.24	97.68983	8743.24	97.68983	206.76
College of Ed	93011		36525	36312.8	99.41903	36312.8	99.41903	212.20
ST General	93031		77995	68936.33	88.38558	68936.33	88.38558	9058.67
ST Room/Board	93032		55000	52532.01	95.51275	52532.01	95.51275	2467.99
Pre-Professional	93051		22035	16418.84	74.51255	16418.84	74.51255	5616.16
Ed 101	93052		9500	4556	47.95789	4556	47.95789	4944.00
DCE	93071		36505	29817.17	81.67969	29817.17	81.67969	6687.83
								Under budget
		totals	246510	217316.4	88.15723	217316.4	88.15723	29193.61

2008-2009 with adjustments to BoR approved amounts

	#		Budget	Actual	%	Projected	%	
Dean	93001		8150	7490.74	91.91092	7490.74	91.91092	659.26
College of Ed	93011		39592	33559.57	84.76351	33559.57	84.76351	6032.43
ST General	93031		73315	73877.32	100.767	73877.32	100.767	-562.32
ST Room/Board	93032		63900	58243.15	91.14734	58243.15	91.14734	5656.85
Pre-Professional	93051		20385	17772.14	87.18244	17772.14	87.18244	2612.86
Ed 101	93052		4950	7623.75	154.0152	7623.75	154.0152	-2673.75
DCE	93071		38899	21699.62	55.78452	21699.62	55.78452	17199.38
								Under budget
		totals	249191	220266.3	88.39255	220266.3	88.39255	28924.71

2009-2010 Undergrad Programs – through April 83.33%

	#		Budget	Actual	%	Projected	%	
Dean	93001		8150	7918	97.15337	7918	97.15337	232
College of Ed	93011		34237.7	35977	105.0801	35995	105.1326	-1757.3
ST General	93031		70522.27	51987	73.71714	64727	91.78235	5795.27
ST Room/Board	93032		62999.97	53209	84.45877	53209	84.45877	9790.97
Pre-Professional	93051		18550.07	17747	95.6708	16947	91.35815	1603.07
Ed 101	93052		1100	273	24.81818	273	24.81818	827
DCE	93071		35984.74	8957	24.89111	28107	78.10811	7877.74
								Under budget
		totals	231544.8	176068	76.04059	207176	89.47558	24368.75

2010-2011 Undergrad Programs

through May				91.67%			
	#	Budget	Actual	%	Projected	%	
Dean	93001	7918	7700	97.24678	7700	97.24678	
College of Ed	93011	38923	43178	110.9318	43476	111.6975	
ST General	93031	81049	86695	106.9662	90895	112.1482	
ST Room/Board	93032	55000	51839	94.25273	51839	94.25273	
Pre-Professional	93051	6719	5081	75.62137	5631	83.80711	
DCE	93071	27808	26215	94.27143	27965	100.5646	
	totals	217417	220708	101.5137	227506	104.6404	over 10089