

CAEP Standard 4

McNeese State University
Spring 2020
CAEP Update Presentation

InTASC Standards

★ **The Learner and Learning**

★ Standard 1-

Learner Development

★ Standard 2-

Learning Differences

★ Standard 3-

Learning Environments

★ **Content Knowledge**

★ Standard 4-

Content Knowledge

★ Standard 5-

Application of Content

★ **Instructional Practice**

★ Standard 6-

Assessment

★ Standard 7-

Planning for Instruction

★ Standard 8-

Instructional Strategies

★ **Professional Responsibility**

★ Standard 9-

Professional Learning and Ethical Practice

★ Standard 10-

Leadership and Collaboration

Standard 4



The provider demonstrates the impact of its completers on P-12 student learning and development, classroom instruction, and schools, and the satisfaction of its completers with the relevance and effectiveness of their preparation.

8 Annual Reporting Measure



Program Impact:

- ★ P-12 student learning/development
- ★ Observations of teaching effectiveness
- ★ Employer satisfaction
- ★ Completer persistence




Program Outcome and Consumer Information:

- ★ Completer or graduation rates
- ★ Licensure rate
- ★ Employment rate
- ★ Consumer information, including students loan default rate

Louisiana Department of Education Expectations

 Highly Effective:
4.0-3.5

 Effective: Proficient:
3.49-2.5

 Effective: Emerging:
2.49-1.5

 Ineffective:
1.49-1.0

Impact of P-12 learning and development (CAEP 4.1)

Louisiana Board of Regents statement: "Due to discrepancies found in data used to calculate Growth in Student Learning Scores and Compass Teacher Evaluation Scores for new teachers completing individual teacher preparation programs, it was not possible to release 2019 Teacher Preparation Data Dashboards or create a 2019 Teacher Preparation Fact Book. Please go to the USDE Title 2 website at <https://Title2.ed.gov> to locate information about teacher preparation programs pertaining to: listing of programs, number of enrolled candidates, race and gender of enrolled candidates, number of completers, GPA of completers, Praxis passage rates, and other relevant information."

Indicators of teaching effectiveness (CAEP 4.2)

Louisiana Board of Regents statement: "Due to discrepancies found in data used to calculate Growth in Student Learning Scores and Compass Teacher Evaluation Scores for new teachers completing individual teacher preparation programs, it was not possible to release 2019 Teacher Preparation Data Dashboards or create a 2019 Teacher Preparation Fact Book. Please go to the USDE Title 2 website at <https://Title2.ed.gov> to locate information about teacher preparation programs pertaining to: listing of programs, number of enrolled candidates, race and gender of enrolled candidates, number of completers, GPA of completers, Praxis passage rates, and other relevant information."



2018 Louisiana Fact Book and Data Dash Boards: *Undergraduate*

Year	Mean Number	Ineffective	Effective: Emerging	Effective: Proficient	Highly Effective
<i>Compass Student Growth (SLT/VAM) (CAEP 4.1)</i>					
2016	3.4 (n=446)	3%	7%	28%	63%
2017	3.4 (n=422)	1%	10%	23%	66%
2018	3.4 (n=360)	1%	10%	19%	70%
<i>Compass Professional Practice (Observation Evaluations) (CAEP 4.2)</i>					
2016	3.2 (n=446)	1%	8%	62%	30%
2017	3.2 (n=422)	1%	7%	55%	37%
2018	3.3 (n=360)	1%	6%	48%	45%
<i>Compass Final Evaluation (Average of two categories)</i>					
2016	3.3 (n=446)	3%	6%	51%	41%
2017	3.4 (n=422)	2%	7%	45%	46%
2018	3.4 (n=360)	1%	7%	38%	54%



2018 Louisiana Fact Book and Data Dash Boards: *Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT)*

Year	Mean Number	Ineffective	Effective: Emerging	Effective: Proficient	Highly Effective
<i>Compass Student Growth (SLT/VAM) (CAEP 4.1)</i>					
2016	3.4 (n=179)	3%	6%	27%	64%
2017	3.5 (n=120)	1%	6%	22%	72%
2018	3.6 (n=78)	1%	8%	15%	76%
<i>Compass Professional Practice (Observation Evaluations) (CAEP 4.2)</i>					
2016	3.3 (n=179)	0%	7%	51%	42%
2017	3.2 (n=120)	0%	8%	44%	48%
2018	3.4 (n=78)	0%	6%	37%	56%
<i>Compass Final Evaluation (Average of two categories)</i>					
2016	3.4 (n=179)	3%	3%	49%	45%
2017	3.5 (n=120)	1%	3%	43%	53%
2018	3.6 (n=78)	1%	3%	35%	62%



2018 Louisiana Fact Book and Data Dash Boards: *Alternative Certification (PBC)*

Year	Mean Number	Ineffective	Effective: Emerging	Effective: Proficient	Highly Effective
<i>Compass Student Growth (SLT/VAM) (CAEP 4.1)</i>					
2016	3.4 (n=105)	1%	10%	26%	64%
2017	3.5 (n=84)	0%	6%	29%	66%
2018	3.6 (n=80)	0%	4%	25%	71%
<i>Compass Professional Practice (Observation Evaluations) (CAEP 4.2)</i>					
2016	3.3 (n=105)	0%	6%	50%	45%
2017	3.3 (n=84)	0%	4%	49%	48%
2018	3.4 (n=80)	0%	3%	45%	53%
<i>Compass Final Evaluation (Average of two categories)</i>					
2016	3.4 (n=105)	1%	5%	45%	50%
2017	3.5 (n=84)	0%	5%	42%	54%
2018	3.6 (n=80)	0%	3%	38%	60%

Program Comparison



2018 Factbook and Data Dashboard

Compass Final Evaluation

(combined CAEP 4.1 and 4.2)

Program	Mean number	Ineffective	Effective: Emerging	Effective: Proficient	Highly Effective
Undergraduate	3.4 (n=360)	1%	7%	38%	54%
MAT	3.6 (n=78)	1%	3%	35%	62%
PBC	3.6 (n=80)	0%	3%	38%	60%

Completer Data Conclusions from 2018 (combined CAEP 4.1 and 4.2)

-  Undergraduate, MAT, and PBC completers teaching in their first or second year in the 2015-2016 academic year had mean scores of Effective Proficient to Highly Effective ($m=3.4-3.6$) in all three categories of Student Growth, Professional Practice, and Final Evaluations.
-  When combining all 4.1 and 4.2 data found within the LBoR Factbook and Data Dashboards and then comparing all three initial-certification program types, the PBC program has the highest percentage of completers scoring at the Effective: Proficient and Highly Effective range at 97%, followed by MAT program at 96%, and undergraduate program at 92%.

Program Comparison

2018 Factbook and Data Dashboard

Compass Student Growth (SLT/VAM)

CAEP 4.1

Program	Mean number	Ineffective	Effective: Emerging	Effective: Proficient	Highly Effective
Undergraduate	3.4 (n=360)	1%	10%	19%	70%
MAT	3.6 (n=78)	1%	8%	15%	76%
PBC	3.6 (n=80)	0%	4%	25%	71%

Student Growth (VAM)

Disaggregation by Content Area: *Undergraduate*

Year	number	Ineffective	Effective: Emerging	Effective: Proficient	Highly Effective
<i>Math</i>					
2016	37	41%	35%	19%	5%
2017	11	64%	18%	0%	18%
2018	14	50%	29%	7%	14%
<i>Science</i>					
2016	27	15%	48%	33%	4%
2017	19	21%	21%	47%	11%
2018	17	12%	47%	29%	12%
<i>Social Studies</i>					
2016	35	9%	51%	29%	11%
2017	--	--	--	--	--
2018	--	--	--	--	--
<i>English Language Arts</i>					
2016	45	27%	42%	27%	4%
2017	11	21%	26%	32%	21%
2018	22	18%	32%	32%	18%

Student Growth (VAM)

Disaggregation by Content Area:




Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT)

Year	number	Ineffective	Effective: Emerging	Effective: Proficient	Highly Effective
<i>Math</i>					
2016	34	12%	53%	21%	15%
2017	--	--	--	--	--
2018	--	--	--	--	--
<i>Science</i>					
2016	29	14%	59%	14%	14%
2017	12	0%	75%	0%	25%
2018	10	10%	80%	0%	10%
<i>English Language Arts</i>					
2016	28	21%	43%	25%	11%
2017	--	--	--	--	--
2018	11	0%	46%	36%	18%






Student Growth (VAM) Disaggregation by Content Area: *Alternative Certification (PBC)*

Year	number	Ineffective	Effective: Emerging	Effective: Proficient	Highly Effective
<i><u>English Language Arts</u></i>					
2016	25	28%	36%	24%	12%
2017	--	--	--	--	--
2018	10	30%	50%	10%	10%

P-12 Learning and Development Conclusions from 2018 (CAEP 4.1)

-  Undergraduate, MAT, and PBC completers teaching in their first or second year in 2015-2016 academic year had mean scores of Effective Proficient to Highly Effective ($m=3.4-3.6$) in Student Growth when SLTs and VAM scores are combined.
-  Disaggregated VAM scores by grade level and content area for undergraduate completers, indicate math as an area of challenge.
-  ELA in undergraduate and MAT has our highest scoring content area percentages ranked at 3rd and 4th, respectively, in the state.

P-12 Learning and Development Next Steps (CAEP 4.1)

-  Teaching Cycle in all methods courses
-  Assessment course redesign
-  Deans for Impact Collaborative implementation of four-semester math content and methods redesign
-  Addition of Tier 1 curriculum
-  Domain 5 aligning to Louisiana Preparation Teacher Competencies

Program Comparison


2018 Factbook and Data Dashboard

Compass Professional Practice






(Observation Evaluations; CAEP 4.2)

Program	Mean number	Ineffective	Effective: Emerging	Effective: Proficient	Highly Effective
Undergraduate	3.3 (n=360)	1%	6%	48%	45%
MAT	3.3 (n=78)	0%	6%	37%	56%
PBC	3.7 (n=80)	0%	3%	45%	53%

Observations of Teaching Effectiveness Conclusions from 2018 (CAEP 4.2)

 Data across the three programs (undergraduate, MAT, and PBC) indicate that completers are consistently scored within the Emerging Proficient (2.5-3.49) and Highly Effective (3.5-4.0) range when being evaluated by their administration.

Observations of Teaching Effectiveness Next Steps (CAEP 4.2)

-  Move from Field Experience Evaluation instrument to Louisiana Department of Education Compass instrument.
-  Norm the new instrument with university supervisors, faculty, and mentor teachers.
-  Each year have stakeholders will complete inter-rater reliability training
-  Mentor Teacher Training
-  Implementation of the POP cycle (pre-observation; observation; post-observation) within methodology courses



Enrollment and Completer Numbers

Undergraduate




Year	Enrolled	Completers	Total
2013-14	206	102	308
2014-15	204	81	285
2015-16	214	85	299

Alternative Certification

Year	Enrolled	Completers	Total
2013-14	58	37	95
2014-15	72	40	112
2015-16	67	38	105

Enrollment and Completer Numbers

Next Steps

-  EdRising initiative for traditional programs
-  Addition of a Minor in Education
-  Hubspot for supporting electronic recruiting efforts for alternative certification programs

Persistence Data

Completers teaching in public schools in Louisiana

Undergraduate







Alternative Certification

Completion Year	Number	Percentage after 5 years
2013-14	105	72% (n=76)
2014-15	108	69% (n=74)
2015-16	104	69% (n=72)

Completion Year	Number	Percentage after 5 years
2013-14	70	70% (n=49)
2014-15	90	69% (n=62)
2015-16	85	66% (n=56)

Persistence Data

Next Steps

-  All redesigned initial-certification programs are now available
-  US PREP Coalition Member with a site coordinator to support two-semester residency experience
-  Inclusion of Tier 1 curriculum
-  Inclusion of a Motivation and Engagement course along with Classroom Management
-  Additional special education coursework
-  Embedded texts for supporting social-emotional learning

MSU Created Surveys

Section 1: Curriculum Design and Implementation

1.1 Implement a variety of instructional strategies during lesson planning, which addresses students' common misunderstandings as well as typical ways students learn the content (i.e. instructional strategies) <i>InTASC 1, TLL</i>	4	3	2	1
1.2 Incorporate students' diverse cultures as well as real-world interests and experiences into instructional content to make learning relevant. <i>InTASC 4, CK</i>	4	3	2	1
1.3 Implement strategies to help students understand the interconnectedness of different content areas. <i>InTASC 5, CK</i>	4	3	2	1
Additional comments about program strengths and weaknesses pertaining to this section:				

Section 2: Classroom Environment and Management

2.1 Implement routines and rules for the classroom that enables all students to focus on learning. <i>InTASC 3, TLL</i>	4	3	2	1
2.2 Demonstrate appropriate use of communication and interventions to manage behavior in the classroom taking into account student diversity. <i>InTASC 3, TLL</i>	4	3	2	1
2.3 Implement efficient transitions between classroom activities. <i>InTASC 3, TLL</i>	4	3	2	1
2.4 Implement and support diverse inclusiveness with structured student-led discussion, curricula, and instructional experiences. <i>InTASC 2, TLL</i>	4	3	2	1
Additional comments about program strengths and weaknesses pertaining to this section:				

Section 3: Quality of Instructional Practices

3.1 Demonstrate instructional strategies that emphasize critical thinking and deepen students' understanding by including Bloom's Taxonomy of analysis, synthesis, and/or evaluation or Webb's Depth of Knowledge of strategic thinking (DOK 3) and/or extended thinking (DOK 4). <i>InTASC 8, IP</i>	4	3	2	1
3.2 Demonstrate the ability to provide academic support (e.g. scaffolding, models and approaches, instructional strategies, theories of learning) to meet particular learning differences or needs. <i>InTASC 2, TLL</i>	4	3	2	1
3.3 Implement interactive and engaging technology within instructional lessons. <i>InTASC 5, CK</i>	4	3	2	1
Additional comments about program strengths and weaknesses pertaining to this section:				

Section 4: Student Assessment and Monitoring

4.1 Demonstrate various ways to give feedback on student work that is descriptive, specific, relevant, timely, and constructive. <i>InTASC 6, IP</i>	4	3	2	1
4.2 Analyze formal and informal assessment results against student goals and utilize the data to guide instruction. <i>InTASC 7, IP</i>	4	3	2	1
4.3 Demonstrate how to help students assess their own ability and set goals which leads to successful outcomes (formative self-assessments such as checklist and rubrics, student goal setting, etc.). <i>InTASC 6, IP</i>	4	3	2	1
4.4 Analyze formative and summative assessment data to identify students' areas of weakness and create an instructional plan for academic improvement, especially with regards to Response to Intervention (RTI). <i>InTASC 9, PR</i>	4	3	2	1
Additional comments about program strengths and weaknesses pertaining to this section:				

Section 5: Professional Dispositions

5.1 Demonstrate thoughtful and critical reflection on his/her own effectiveness as a teacher in order to improve planning and practice. <i>InTASC 9, PR</i>	4	3	2	1
5.2 Collaborate with learners and their families through technology and other forms of communication to establish mutual expectations and ongoing communication to support learner development and achievement. <i>InTASC 10, PR</i>	4	3	2	1
5.3 Collaborate with educational colleagues both within Professional Learning Committees (PLCs) and individually to meet the needs of all students (e.g. special education teachers, school counselors, school librarians, curriculum, etc.) <i>InTASC 7, IP</i>	4	3	2	1
Additional comments about program strengths and weaknesses pertaining to this section:				

Candidate Follow-up Survey Prompt:

What were the three (3) toughest transitions for you moving from your college experience to a P-12 classroom?

Employer Satisfaction Survey Prompt:

What are two (2) recommendations you have for improving **THIS** candidate's development and readiness for the P-12 classroom?

MSU Created Survey: Employer Satisfaction (ESS) *By the Numbers*



Undergraduate

Overall return rates:

Spring 2018
Completers: 4%

Fall 2018
Completers: 26%

- ★ InTASC standards and cross-cutting themes (technology/diversity) had mean range scores of 3.75 and 3.61, respectively, scoring at the 'well-prepared' level.
- ★ The lowest score earned by the undergraduate completers by their employers was a mean score of 3.5 for InTASC standard 2.



PBC

- ★ InTASC standards and cross-cutting themes (technology/diversity) had means range scores of 4.0, 'well-prepared' level.

MSU Created Survey: Employer Satisfaction

In their own words...

Two recommendations for this completers:



Spring 2018 Completers:

- ★ Classroom Environment and Management (40%)
- ★ Curriculum Design and Implementation (20%)
- ★ Student Assessment and Monitoring (13%)
- ★ Quality of Instructional Practices (13%)
- ★ Professional Dispositions (13%)



Fall 2018 Completers:

- ★ Student Assessment (50%)
- ★ Curriculum Design and Implementation (25%)
- ★ Classroom Environment and Management (25%)

Quotes from 2018 Employer Satisfaction Surveys



Demonstrates a high level of creativity for motivating her students (ECHD PBC)



Very resourceful and shows willingness to incorporate more strategies as she progresses (ELEM BS)






I have no recommendations for this candidate at this time. I just did her first Compass observation and I was very pleased with her performance (ECHD BS)







Her strength is in communicating with her English team in order to better her practices in the classroom (ENGL BA)

Employer Satisfaction Survey Conclusions

-  InTASC standards 1-10 show candidates scored at 'sufficiently prepared' for both semesters and undergraduate and alternative certification programs with mean scores of 3.5-4.0.
-  Secondary English (n=1) showed consistent scoring at the 'not sufficiently prepared' level for multiple InTASC standards.
-  For both Spring and Fall 2018, employers listed Curriculum Design and Implementation in the top two recommendations at 20% and 25%, respectively

Employer Satisfaction Next Steps

-  The assessment course has been rewritten and aligned with the Senior Year Residency Performance Portfolio.
-  The Teaching Cycle which includes analysis of student summative data and student work samples is required for all methods courses.
-  A curriculum design/lesson planning course has been added to all initial certification programs
-  Repeatedly low participation has led the EPP to partner with Skyfactor to support creating and sending a survey using more modern technology applications. The EPP hopes that this will engage more participants and will also help with data collection and analysis of findings.

MSU Created Survey: Completer Follow-up (CFS) *By the Numbers*



Undergraduate and PBC

Overall return rates:

Spring 2018
completers: 9%

Fall 2018
Completers: 22%

- ★ InTASC standards 1-10 had range scores of 3.0-4.0 for both semesters meaning all completers (n=10) scored at ‘sufficiently prepared’ or ‘well prepared’.
- ★ The lowest mean score of 2.5 was noted for the Social Studies undergraduate program (n=2) for InTASC Standard 1.

MSU Created Survey: Completer Follow-up

In their own words...

What are your toughest transitions from college to the classroom?

Spring 2018 Completers:

- ★ Classroom Environment and Management (44%)
- ★ Professional Dispositions (33%)
- ★ Curriculum and Design and Implementation (22%)

Fall 2018 Completers:

- ★ Classroom Environment and Management (44%)
- ★ Curriculum Design and Implementation (17%)
- ★ Student Assessment and Monitoring (17%)
- ★ Professional Dispositions (17%)
- ★ Quality of Instructional Practices (6%)

Quotes from 2018 Completer Follow-up Surveys





Classroom management has been something I have been struggling with, but I don't think it was because I was not sufficiently prepared. I came in during the middle of the school year after several other subs had already been filtering through before me as well. I think all of this contributes some of the chaos that happens in my classroom and why the students are harder to manage. (BS Business)



I believe most of a teacher candidate experience comes from within the classroom. I have learned majority of my knowledge, techniques, management, etc from being in the classroom and working with both students and colleagues. Seeing how a classroom functions and is managed helped me to become a better teacher. Being able to observe and monitor in different schools and classrooms, I was able to see different levels of learning and how to monitor different assessments. (BS Early Childhood)

Completer Follow-up Survey Conclusions and Next Steps

-  CFS data indicates no trends can be established as each survey iteration shows strengths and challenges within the individual programs offered by the EPP (undergraduate, MAT, PBC).
-  Repeatedly low participation has led the EPP to partner with Skyfactor to support creating and sending a survey using more modern technology applications. The EPP hopes that this will engage more participants and will also help with data collection and analysis of findings.

Employer Satisfaction Survey and Completer Follow-up Survey Comparison

InTASC	Completer Follow-up	Employer Satisfaction	Difference
Baccalaureate	3.56	3.68	.12
Alternative Certification	3.82	4.0	.18



Combined results for both CFS and ESS administered for spring and fall 2018 indicated that employers rated completer abilities higher than our graduates by .12 for baccalaureate program completers and .18 for alternative certification program completers.

MSU Institutional Research Office

Graduation/Matriculation Rates

Graduation-Matriculation Rates

TAGS: CAEP standards 3.4, 5.3 and Standard 4: CAEP 8 Annual Reporting Measures: Graduation Rates




Graduation-Matriculation Rates for 2015, 2016, and 2017 initial certification program cohorts

Program Type	Cohort Academic Year	Accepted into program	1-2 Years to Grad	3 Years to Grad	4 Years to Grad	5 Years to Grad	Dropped from University	State Completer	Earned Different Degree	Still Enrolled In Program
BACH	2014-2015	112	N= 74 66%	N=5 4%	N=2 2%	N=1 1%	N=16 14%		N=14 13%	
BACH	2015-2016	110	N=66 60%	N=5 5%			N=11 10%		N=23 21%	
BACH	2016-2017	110	N=76 69%	N=7 6%			N=8 7%		N=18 16%	N=1 1%
PBC	2014-2015	25	N=19 76%		N=1 4%		N=4 16%	N=1 4%		
PBC	2015-2016	27	N=15 56%				N=11 41%	N=1 4%		
PBC	2016-2017	20	N=11 55%				N=5 25%	N=2 10%		N=2 10%
MAT	2014-2015	30	N=22 73%	N=1 3%	N=1 3%		N=6 20%			
MAT	2015-2016	25	N=20 80%	N=1 4%			N=4 16%			
MAT	2016-2017	21	N=14 67%	N=2 9%			N=5 23%			

Graduation/Matriculation Rates

Initial-certification Programs

Next Steps

-  During summer 2019, all PBC and MAT coursework will be redesigned to become online programs. Many of our candidates are working as classroom teachers and travel from long distances to attend face-to-face classes. This should alleviate the time constraints of working a full-time job and attending night classes several times a week.
-  We have added pre-selected videos as part of the field experience requirements that are aligned to course assignments and standards to support candidates having less time away from their full-time teaching assignments.
-  We have also added Praxis workshops, created by faculty who are experts in the content. This extra support is for those candidates that cannot progress in the program without passage of Praxis I or II.

Teach Louisiana: Licensure and Employment Rates (Initial Certification Programs)

Undergraduate

Year	Number of graduates	Percentage that began teaching year immediately	Percentage that was granted state license
2014-15	81	82% (n=66)	99% (n=80)
2015-16	85	79% (n=67)	97% (n=82)
2016-17	87	56% (n=49)	97% (n=84)



Alternative Certification

Year	Number of graduates	Percentage that began teaching year immediately	Percentage that was granted state license
2014-15	40	78% (n=31)	100%
2015-16	38	76% (n=29)	97% (n=37)
2016-17	39	82% (n=32)	97% (n=38)

Teach Louisiana: Graduation and Licensure Rates Advanced Programs

Degree	Program	Semester/Year	# of Completers	Concentration	Added to Certificate	Eligible to Add to Certificate	Attempted and Passed Exam
Master of Education	Educational Leadership	Fall 2018	5			1	n=3 67%
		Spring 2019	1		1		n=1 100%
Master of Education	Curriculum and Instruction	Fall 2018	2	Academically Gifted		2	
		Spring 2019	1	Secondary		1	
Education Specialist	Educational Leadership	Fall 2018	1		1		n=1 100%
		Spring 2019	1				n=0
Master of Education	School Counseling	Fall 2018	4		1	2	n=4 100%

Graduation and Licensure Rates Advanced Programs Next Steps

-  Newly redesigned Master of Education in Curriculum and Instruction programs in place for 2020-2021
-  Continue the Mentor Teacher Training pathways for 2020-2021:
 - ★ Professional Development
 - ★ Embedded in the Master of Education programs

United States Department of Education: MSU Loan Default Rates

Fiscal Year	2016	2015	2014	2013
Default rate	13.6%	9.9%	11%	12.4%
# in default	227	178	195	224
# in repayment	1,662	1,795	1,758	1,805
National cohort default rate	10.1%	10.8%		

Questions??

 Contact Dr. Angel Ogea, Dean of the Burton College of Education

 aogea@mcneese.edu