

KSDE & CAEP ANNUAL REPORTING MEASURES

KSDE (Kansas State Department of Education) and CAEP (Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation) have eight annual reporting measures that are used to provide information to the public on Haskell's Elementary Teacher Education Program's (ETEP) outcome and program impact.

The eight reporting measures for our School of Education undergraduate program and the links to data tables are below. The tables provide supporting evidence for each measure:

Annual Report Section 4—Display of Annual Reporting Measures

1. Impact on P-12 learning and development (Component 4.1)

For 2018-2019: The EPP sent requests to 28 completers for their student achievement data or, if that was not available, the completion of a case study to evaluate student learning on academic content areas such as English language arts, math, science or social studies. There were 4 completers that returned their data resulting in a 14.3% return rate. Three sent data using the case study method and results for 2 of the completers' classes showed a positive growth for students in each of the content areas provided. The third completers' results were inconclusive because there was no pre-test for comparison. One completer was able to send state achievement test scores with students' names redacted and results indicated that 16 out of the 18 students passed the state standards. After the EPP and its SOE Advisory Board analyzed the 4 completers' submissions, it was found that there was a low (less than 20%) return rate and inconsistent format and process. Therefore, the EPP is working on a different method to obtain relevant data.

For 2019-2020: The EPP was unable to obtain results from any completers due to COVID 19 and the impact on completers' school sites.

2. Indicators of teaching effectiveness (Component 4.2)

For 2018-2019:

The EPP was able to obtain employer email addresses from 6 graduates. The EPP created Principal Survey was set up in SurveyMonkey and an email was sent to the 6 employers.

The EPP received 5 survey responses and below is an analysis of the data:

The completers are from more recent cohorts as the Principals indicate they have supervised the completers from August, 2019 through 4 years. We interpret this to mean these are completers who have been in Cohorts 24 through Cohort 21.

As we discuss our analysis, we are aware that we have a challenge with a small number (*n*) of survey responses.

All areas of the survey regarding InTASC/KSDE standards are at the On Target (what we expect for a new teacher) to Accomplished (what we expect for a graduate in the 3rd year and higher in teaching) with the exception of the following:

Question 5: one Principal indicated that the teacher under their supervision was at the Developing (what we would expect from a Senior in the EPP) level in using technology to enhance student learning (InTASC/KSDE 3). Because the other 4 Principals responded that their employees are all at the Accomplished (highest) level, it would be helpful to have anecdotal information to identify the specific areas of technology use to improve the program. Regardless, we will continue to document our expectations for teacher candidates on learning expectations about using technology to teach; how we assess their learning; and how we analyze and use the data for improvement in the program.

Question 9: one Principal indicated that their teacher was Developing in InTASC/KSDE Standard 6 – providing multiple opportunities for students to engage in self-assessment. There were more Principals who rated their teachers at the On Target level and only 1 Principal rated their teacher at the Accomplished level. This would be useful for the program to consider enhancing the delivery of curriculum and practice of assessing student learning in the 2 Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment courses during the Junior year.

Question 12: One Principal indicated their teacher was at the Developing level for implementing instructional strategies that promote the development of higher-order thinking. The remaining Principals provided even (2 and 2) ratings of On Target and Accomplished. With the small response (small *n*) it is difficult to statistically identify if this is a true place for improvement. The SOE will, however, teach more strategies and provide more opportunities for candidates to use the instructional strategies designed to develop higher-order thinking.

Question 15: one Principal indicated their teacher was Developing in displaying appropriate leadership qualities (dispositions) for teaching children. Three others indicate their teachers are On Target and only one indicates their teacher is Accomplished. As these are teachers who have been in the schools from 3 months to 4 years, they seem to be still growing in their dispositions. We will enhance Leadership Qualities (dispositions) throughout the program, especially in the year-long residency to provide multiple opportunities to practice.

3. Satisfaction of employers and employment milestones (Component 4.3)

In the 2018-2019 academic year, the EPP was only able to obtain employer satisfaction results in Fall 2019. The EPP was not able to obtain employer satisfaction results in the 2019-2020 due to COVID 19 issues and we are not able to show results to ensure privacy because we had only 1 Completer in 2019-2020.

For 2018-2019:

The EPP was able to obtain employer email addresses from 6 graduates. The EPP created Principal Survey was set up in SurveyMonkey and an email was sent to the 6 employers.

The EPP received 5 survey responses and below is an analysis of the data:

As we discuss our analysis, we are aware that we have a challenge with a small number (*n*) of survey responses.

Question 15: The Haskell graduate's display of appropriate leadership qualities (dispositions) for teaching children is...: 1 Principal indicated their teacher was Developing, 3 Principals indicated their teacher was on Target and 1 Principal indicated their teacher was Accomplished. Because most are On Target or Above, we believe Principals are satisfied with the dispositions of our graduates.

Question 16: The Haskell graduate's personal representation as an American Indian/Alaska Native educator is done in a manner that promotes Indigenous heritage is: 2 Principals indicate their teacher is On Target and 2 principals indicate their teachers are Accomplished and this indicates to us that Principals are satisfied with how our graduate represents their Indigenous heritage.

Question 17: What are the strengths of the Haskell graduate: Principals wrote the following: the teacher is really improving as a leader in the PLC of our district; the teacher is very good at communicating with administration and support and seeks out ways to help her struggling learners; she is well-prepare, incorporates technology, works well with all learners, communicates effectively with students colleagues, parents, and engages in continuous learning; the teachers uses culturally relevant pedagogy; the teacher is very well prepared for the classroom, and has done a great job of building relationships with the students and the stakeholders in the community.

Question 19: one Principal recommended that our graduates be exposed to the new Kansas Education Systems Accreditation (KESA). This is the continuous improvement model for school districts within the State of Kansas. Exposure to this system can be provided during the Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment courses. This is one of the areas in which we will improve in our degree program.

4. Satisfaction of completers (Component 4.4)

In the 2018-2019 academic year, the EPP was only able to obtain completer satisfaction results in (via the Alumni Survey) Fall 2019. The EPP was not able to obtain completer satisfaction results in the 2019-2020 due to COVID 19 issues.

Below are the results of the 2018-2019 Alumni Survey where we received 22 responses:

Question 4: Based on your teaching experiences, HINU prepared you to teach your academic subject and grade level: 1 (4.55%) responded Strongly Disagree; 2 (9.09%) responded Disagree; 4 (18.18%) responded Agree, and 15 (68.18%) responded Strongly Agree. From these responses, a large majority (19 out of 22) agreed HINU prepared them to teach their academic subject and grade level.

Question 5: Based on your experiences and interactions with others, how well do you believe HINU prepared you to be a teacher: 2 (9.09%) responded Moderately Prepared; 14 (63.64%) responded Adequately Prepared and 5 (22.27%) responded Overly Prepared. With these responses, the majority of completers feel HINU prepared them to be a teacher.

Question 6. Each of the 10 InTASC/KSDE and Haskell standards was listed, and respondents had to indicate if they were Ineffective, Developing, On Target, or Accomplished for each of the standards. Below is a summary:

InTASC/KSDE 1: 1-Developing, 8-On Target, 13-Accomplished

InTASC/KSDE 2: 1-Ineffective, 2-Developing, 5-On Target, 14-Accomplished

InTASC/KSDE 3 (Technology): 2-Ineffective, 1-Developing, 8-On-Target, 11-Accomplished

InTASC/KSDE 3: 1-Developing, 7-On Target, 14-Accomplished

InTASC/KSDE 4: 1-Ineffective, 7-On-Target, 14-Accomplished

InTASC/KSDE 5: 1-Developing, 9-On-Target, 12-Accomplished

InTASC/KSDE 6: (Student Self-Assessment of Learning) 1-Ineffective, 2-Developing, 10-On Target, 9-Accomplished

InTASC/KSDE 6: 2-Developing, 6-On-Target, 14-Accomplished

InTASC/KSDE 7: 1-Developing, 6-On-Target, 15-Accomplished

InTASC/KSDE 8: 1-Ineffective, 8-On-Target, 13-Accomplished

InTASC/KSDE 9: 3-Developing, 5-On-Target, 14-Accomplished

InTASC/KSDE 10: 1-Developing, 8-On-Target, 13-Accomplished

Haskell 11 Dispositions for Teaching Children: 5-On-Target, 17-Accomplished

Haskell 12 Representing Native Americans in a manner that promotes indigenous heritage: 3-On-Target, 19-Accomplished

Based on these results, the EPP has a majority of completers who believe they are prepared for implementing the InTASC/KSDE and Haskell standards. There is a continued focus on incorporating more learning experiences for Standard 5 on critical thinking, Standard 6 for completers to be able to help their students do self-assessment.

The remainder of the survey allows for written responses to the following questions:

Question 7: What are the strengths of the HUNU Elementary Teacher Education Program, as evidenced by your performance as a teacher? Some basic responses were: student/teacher ratio,

time spent in elementary classrooms, close-knit comradery-cohort, open communication, differentiated instruction and learning, in-depth lesson planning and modeling, interpreting state standards, leadership qualities.

Question 8: What areas associated with teaching do you feel you need more training/courses on? Some basic responses: classroom management, teaching students with multiple disabilities, social-emotional learning, using technology in classroom, meeting needs of ELL students, using data to plan for instruction.

Question 9: Are there any comments you would like to add that will help the Elementary Teacher Education program at HINU better prepare teachers? Some basic answers: Continue incorporating technology, keep allowing students to experience a classroom for an entire year, mentorship between juniors and seniors.

5. Graduation Rates (Component 5.4)

NOTE: For 2019-2020 we are unable to report for Section 5 due to there being only 1 Completer in the program and we feel it is our duty to protect that student’s confidentiality.

The following tables provide data for the ETEP educator program preparation program by cohort. The ETEP cohort is defined as the year that the candidate is accepted into the ETEP program as a Junior. Data include active status, contextual information on candidates and graduation rates.

GRADUATION RATES

Elementary Education K-6

Academic Year – Acceptance Into Program as a Junior	Graduate Rate	Active	Contextual Information
2015-2016 – 6	83%		1 student withdrew from University
2016-2017 - 7	86%		1 student withdrew from University

2017-2018 - 6	50%	1 student still in program	1 student changed majors, 1 student transferred out of University
2018-2019 – 6	83%		1 student changed majors
2019-2020			

6. Ability of completers to meet licensing requirements and additional state requirements (Component 5.4)

NOTE: For 2019-2020 we are unable to report for Section 5 due to there being only 1 Completer in the program and we feel it is our duty to protect that student’s confidentiality.

Educator preparation program (EPP) pass rates allow students considering a career as a teacher to compare the performance of educator candidates from Haskell’s educator preparation program to Kansas and national pass rate averages on the tests required for licensure as a teacher in Kansas.

What the Pass Rates Indicate

The pass rate indicates the percentage of candidates from a college or university that took and passed the examinations. Note that some candidates may take these examinations before they complete the educational program at the college or university, which could affect the pass rate. Data is extracted from Educational Testing Service (ETS) Data Manager. N represents examinees who took the indicated exam during the specific testing period and self-reported that they attended Haskell Indian Nations University’s School of Education

Pass Rate Data are Just One Factor When Choosing a University EPP

Please note that the test data was not collected nor is it intended to be used for the purpose of evaluating individual teacher preparation programs; many factors affect test score data. The data are provided as a service to interested individuals and represent only one of many sources of information that should be carefully considered when making college application decisions. Additionally, other criteria should be considered when applying to an institution of higher education, such as financial resources expended by the institution, curriculum offered, and the experience and number of advanced degrees held by the faculty, just to name a few. Parents and students should consider a variety of factors when making application decisions.

Haskell School of Education *

Elementary Teacher Education Program: Elementary Education

Licensure Exam Pass Rates for Program Completers for Combined Three Years
(2017-2018, 2018-2019, 2019-2020*)

Praxis Tests	Minimum Passing Score	Total Test Takers	Passing %	HINU Average Score	Range of Cut Scores
Elementary Education: Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment (5017) or ^Content Knowledge Test CKT- Reading and Language Arts Subtest (7812), CKT - Math Subtest (7813), CKT- Science Subtest (7814), CKT Social Studies Subtest (7815)	(5017) is 153 or (7812) is 159, (7813) is 147, (7814) is 150, (7815) is 157	10	100%	165.78	153-182
Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grades K-6 (5622)	(5622) is 160	9	100%	167.67	160-178

*(In 2019-2020, only one completer and unable to take PLT exam due to pandemic closure at all testing sites and unable to administer a home test.)

^ (Starting in 2019-2020, the Praxis Test (5017) is discontinued and replaced with the Content Knowledge Test – CKT requiring four separate subtest scores for Reading and Language Arts, Mathematics, Science and Social Studies. This new test is adopted by the Kansas State Department of Education and the Kansas Institutions of Higher Education including Haskell Indian Nations University.)

Haskell School of Education

Elementary Teacher Education Program: Elementary Education

Average GPAs of Program Completers for a Combined Three Years

(2017-2018, 2018-2019, 2019-2020*), n=10

Combined Academic School Years	Cumulative GPA Average
Three Academic School Years (2017-2018, 2018-2019, 2019-2020)	3.6085

**Haskell has chosen to report data for 3 academic years (2017-2018, 2018-2019, 2019-2020) due to having only 1 completer in the 2019-2020 academic year. This is done to protect the confidentiality of the 1 completer.*

7. Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they have prepared (Component 5.4)

NOTE: For 2019-2020 we are unable to report for Section 5 due to there being only 1 Completer in the program and we feel it is our duty to protect that student's confidentiality.

Based on the Alumni Survey, 20 of the 22 respondents indicated they were employed. Four respondents indicated they had not been employed as a teacher. Three (13.64%) indicated they had been employed as a teacher for 1-2 years and 15 (68.18%) indicated they had been employed as a teacher for 3 plus years.

Of these respondents: 2 (9.09%) have been employed as Pre-K teachers; 10 (45.45%) indicate they have been employed as Kindergarten teachers; 3 (13.64%) have been employed as 1st grade teachers; 1 (4.55%) has been employed as a 2nd grade teacher; 3 respondents (13.64%) have been employed as a 3rd grade teacher; 4 respondents (18.18%) have been employed as a 4th grade teacher; 4 (18.18%) have been employed as a 5th grade teacher, 1 (4.55%) has been employed as 6th grade teacher and 3 (13.64%) have indicated they've been employed in Other types of positions.

This indicates the majority of our completers are employed as teachers and that the majority have been employed as K-6 grade teachers for which they were prepared in our Bachelor of Science Elementary Education K-6 degree program.

8. Student loan default rates and other consumer information (Component 5.4)

The U.S. Department of Education releases office default rates once per year. A cohort default rate is the percentage of an institution's borrowers who enter repayment on certain Federal Family Education Loan (FFEL) Program or William D. Ford Federal Direct Loan (Direct Loan) Program loans during a particular federal fiscal year, October 1 to September 30, and default or meet other specified conditions prior to the end of the second following fiscal year. **Haskell Indian Nations University does not participate in any student loan program.**