

Annual Reporting Measures (CAEP Component 5.4   A.5.4)	
Impact Measures-CAEP Standard 4	Outcome Measures
1. Impact on P-12 learning and development (Component 4.1)	5. Graduation Rates (initial & advanced levels)
2. Indicators of teaching effectiveness (Component 4.2)	6. Ability of completers to meet licensing (certification) and any additional state requirements
3. Satisfaction of employers and employment milestones (Component 4.3)	7. Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they have prepared
4. Satisfaction of completers (Component 4.4)	8. Student loan default rates and other consumer information

### Hope College Education Department

2017-18

1. Impact measures and teaching effectiveness –To determine our impact on student learning we compiled a case study (N=24) with graduates that are employed in our local intermediate school district (OAISD). The education department meets monthly with curriculum directors from the districts and through their work with assessments wanted to see if their effectiveness rating at the end of the year would be an indication of learning impact. We also looked at the growth data of the candidates in the study which makes up 25% of the overall effectiveness rating. After our statistical analysis of the data, we determined that there was no significant difference among the districts in how they rated our graduates, nor was there any significant difference between the growth data score and their effectiveness rating. Taking that conclusion one step further, we then examined the effectiveness ratings that MDE provides all EPP’s as related to our EPI index, a yearly indicator of strength of program. This three year study showed that 97% of our graduates were given a highly effective or effective rating by their administrator. Since growth data and effectiveness ratings are significantly tied together (as proven by our case study), we determined that our graduates are making a strong impact on the learning within their classrooms.

#### Graduate Survey Overview

- The purpose of the graduate survey was to determine Hope college education department graduates’ (from the past three years) perceived level of preparedness and the degree to which they felt the content was important to the profession.
- We looked at four content domains related to InTASC standards: 1) Learner and Learning, 2) Content, 3) Instructional Practice, 4) Professional Responsibility
- On a four point scale, we used 3.2 (80%) as our passing cut rate for all domain scores.
- Scores are reported as follows: 1) overall means for the entire sample by perceived importance and preparedness, 2) disaggregated means by program level (i.e. elementary and secondary). We initially disaggregated by content area (i.e. major and minor); however, our sample size was too small to run an analysis due to the size of our overall program. This analysis violates statistical assumption requirements.

- We looked at two cycles of data (i.e. 2015-2016 and 2016-2017). The third cycle of data will be available for analysis in the spring of 2018.
- Lawshe’s test of validity will be reported in the spring of 2018.
- Cronbach’s Alpha, an indicator of reliability, is strong (2016-2017 = .87, 2015-2016 = .81)

### Results for 2017-2018

#### Overall means for the entire sample by perceived importance and preparedness

- The overall sample was comprised of 54 graduates
- The table below compares means of importance Rating (I) & preparedness rating (P) by the four InTASC domains.

Mean	MEAN	N	Std. Dev	95% Confidence Int.		t	df	Sig
Domain1_Learner and Learning I Domain1_Learner and Learning P	3.74 3.08	54	.04 .08	.49823	.82687	8.087	53	.000
Domain2_Content I Domain2_Content P	3.40 3.31	54	.07 .09	-.10769	.29288	.927	53	.358
Domain3_Instructional Practice I Domain3_Instructional Practice P	3.63 3.25	54	.05 .07	.23789	.52230	5.361	53	.000
Domain4_Prof Responsibility I Domain4_Prof Responsibility P	3.52 3.29	54	.06 .08	.08649	.38018	3.187	53	.002

- Importance: All means met the 3.2 (80%) threshold.
- Preparedness: Using 80% success rate as a guide (3.2), Hope students did not feel adequately prepared in the following area: Domains 1(Learner and Learning). This is also the largest gap between the importance vs. prepared rating.
- In three of the four domains (i.e. Learner and Learning, Instructional Practice, and Professional Responsibility), Hope graduates rated the importance of being prepared significantly higher ( $p < .05$ ) than the degree to which they felt prepared. There was no significant difference in the scores between Important and Prepared in the InTASC domain that focuses on Content.

- The standard for which we need to improve the most in regard to the preparedness score is Domain 1 (Learner and Learning).

### Results for 2016-2017

#### Overall means for the entire sample by perceived importance and preparedness

- The overall sample was comprised of 57 graduates
- The table below compares means of importance Rating (I) & preparedness rating (P) by the four InTASC domains.

	Mean	N	Std. Dev	95% Confidence Int.		t	df	Sig
Domain Learner and Learning I	3.7208	57	.34057					
Domain Learner and Learning P	3.0269	57	.62520	.53910	.84862	8.981	56	.000
Domain Content I	3.6429	56	.41247					
Domain Content P	3.3125	56	.57653	.16433	.49638	3.988	55	.000
Domain Instructional Practice I	3.6803	57	.31344					
Domain Instructional Practice P	3.2407	57	.59672	.28780	.59134	5.802	56	.000
Domain Prof Responsibility I	3.6520	57	.33412					
Domain Prof Responsibility P	3.1871	57	.60057	.29892	.63090	5.611	56	.000

- Importance: All means met the 3.2 (80%) threshold.
- Preparedness: Using 80% success rate as a guide (3.2), Hope students did not feel adequately prepared in the following area: Domains 1(Learner and Learning) and 4 (Professional Responsibility).
- In every Domain, Hope graduates rated the importance of being prepared significantly higher ( $p < .05$ ) than the degree to which they felt prepared.
- The standard for which we need to improve the most in regard to the preparedness score is Domain 1 (Learner and Learning).

#### 2016-2017 Disaggregated means by program level (i.e. elementary and secondary)

- The sample was comprised of 21 elementary and 35 secondary graduates
- There is no significant difference between Secondary and Elementary test scores in rating of importance or perceived level of preparation ( $p = .218$ ). The results happened by chance. Thus, the same trends for overall means prevail.

### Results for 2015-2016

#### Overall means for the entire sample by perceived importance and preparedness

- The overall sample was comprised of 102 graduates
- The table below compares means of importance Rating (I) & preparedness rating (P) by the four InTASC domains.

Paired Samples Statistics					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	
	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Lower	Upper				
Pair 1	Domain_1_Learner_and_Learning_I	3.7056	102	.33066	.03274					
	Domain_1_Learner_and_Learning_P	3.1356	102	.60555	.05996	.44655	.69332	9.163	101	.000
Pair 2	Domain_2_Content_I	3.5196	102	.51666	.05116					
	Domain_2_Content_P	3.4069	102	.48098	.04762	-.01079	.23628	1.810	101	.073
Pair 3	Domain_3_InstructionandPractice_I	3.6560	102	.34681	.03434					
	Domain_3_InstructionandPractice_P	3.3701	102	.47915	.04744	.19019	.38171	5.923	101	.000
Pair 4	Domain_4_ProfResponsibility_I	3.5732	99	.43404	.04362					
	Domain_4_ProfResponsibility_P	3.2870	99	.54088	.05436	.18059	.39180	5.378	98	.000

- Importance: All means met the 3.2 (30%) threshold.
- Preparedness: All but one of the the scores met the 3.2 (80%) threshold. The domain 1 (learner and learning) score related to the graduates perception of preparedness fell below the threshold with a mean of 3.14 ( $SD = .61$ ). Within Domain 1 (learner and learning) the individual items that had means below the 3.2 threshold related to diversity (i.e. SES, race and ethnicity). However, the items related to teaching exceptional learners (special education) did not fall below the 3.2 threshold.
- In three out of the four domains, Hope graduates rated perceived importance significantly higher ( $p < .05$ ) than the degree to which they felt prepared. Domain 2 (Content) was not rated significantly different.

### 2015-2016 Disaggregated means by program level (i.e. elementary and secondary)

- The sample was comprised of 47 elementary and 52 secondary graduates
- There is no significant difference between Secondary and Elementary test scores in rating of importance or perceived level of preparation ( $p = .554$ ). The results happened by chance. Thus, the same trends for overall means prevail.

### Principal Survey Overview

- The purpose of the principal survey was to determine Hope college education department graduates' (from the past three years) performance in the field as measured by principals. This is likened to the "preparedness" scores from the Graduate Survey.
- We looked at 20 items related to InTASC domains: 1) Learner and Learning, 2) Content, 3) Instructional Practice, 4) Professional Responsibility
- On a four point scale, we used 3.2 (80%) as our passing cut rate for all domain scores.
- Scores are reported as follows as overall means for the entire sample. The principals did not identify our graduates program level (i.e. elementary/secondary).
- We looked at two cycles of data (i.e. 2015-2016 and 2016-2017). The third cycle of data will be available for analysis in the spring of 2018.
- Lawshe's test of validity: We looked at 13% of our sample population ( $n = 9$ ) which requires a 78% CVI pass rate according to Lawshe. Our overall CVI was 79.48 which meets the passing criteria for content validity.
- Cronbach's Alpha, an indicator of reliability, is strong (2016-2017 = .92, 2015-2016 = .93)

**Results for 2016-2017**

**Overall means for the entire sample by domain as determined by the principal**

- The sample was comprised of 25 Michigan principals who evaluated our graduates
- The table below compares means by the four InTASC domains.

Domains	Mean	Std. Deviation	N	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	3.6860	.34627	25	3	.320	1.908	.133
2	3.7333	.41944	25	1	1348.318	8028.138	.000
3	3.5084	.48194	25	3	.320	1.908	.133
4	3.7600	.37908	25	96	.168		
Total	3.6719	.41542	100	100			
				99			

- All of the scores met the 3.2 (80%) threshold.
- Principals rated our students the same across all four domains. There was no statistical significance among the domains,  $p = 0.13$ .

**Results for 2015-2016**

**Overall means for the entire sample by domain as determined by the principal**

- The sample was comprised of 42 Michigan principals who evaluated our graduates
- The table below compares means by the four InTASC domains.

Domain	Mean	Std. Deviation	N	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1.0	3.7048	.48235	42	3	.537	2.802	.042
2.0	3.7460	.39516	42	1	2305.597	12032.593	.000
3.0	3.5500	.49645	42	3	.537	2.802	.042
4.0	3.8175	.36219	42	164	.192		
Total	3.7046	.44477	168	168			
				167			

- All of the scores met the 3.2 (80%) threshold.
- Principals rated our students significantly higher in Professional Responsibility (Domain 4) than in Instructional Practice (Domain 3),  $p = 0.04$ . This is understandable for novice teachers in their first three years.

5. The 2016-17 – 4-year graduation rate for Hope College is 70.7%, and the 6-year graduation rate is 77.3%. The 2016-17 – 4-year graduation rate for the Education Department is 71.0%, and the 6-year graduation rate is 96.5%.

6. From the 2016-17 Title 2 report, Hope College had a 91% success rate for passing state licensure tests (with 2 failures). This is down from the previous two years where we had a 100% success rate.

7. The graduating class of 2016-17 had a 100% placement rate, 84% of which were in positions they were prepared to teach. Other examples of placement were classroom aides, instructional aides, etc.

8. The 2016-17 student loan default rate is 1.96%. Other consumer information can be found at <https://hope.edu/admin/consumerinformation/>