

Health and Physical Education Grades K-12 [HEDU]

Cycles included in this report:

Jun 1, 2022 to May 31, 2023

This PDF document includes any files attached to fields in this report.

To view the attachments you should view this file in Adobe Acrobat XI or higher, or another PDF viewer that supports viewing file attachments.

The default PDF viewer for your device or web browser may not support viewing file attachments embedded in a PDF.

If the attachments are in formats other than PDF you will need any necessary file viewers installed.

Xitracs Program Report Page 2 of 35

Program Name: Health and Physical Education Grades K-12 [HEDU]

Reporting Cycle: Jun 1, 2022 to May 31, 2023

1 Is this program offered via Distance Learning?

100% Traditional or less than 50% Distance/Traditional

2 Is this program offered at an off-site location?

Nο

2.1 If yes to previous, provide addresses for each location where 50% or more of program credits may be earned.

3 Example of Program Improvement

2018-2019:

First time pass rate for HPE content was much lower in the spring semester when compared to previous terms (see data analysis). We are evaluating and redesigning content which is found on the exam to be taught earlier in the degree plan for the new program redesign.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

Though the number of students completing the HHP 200 packet did decrease by one student from the last recorded numbers, the loss of only one student given the hurricane and COVID issues shows a success in recruiting.

2021-2022:

2022-2023:

4 Program Highlights from the Reporting Year

2018-2019:

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

100% of students who are pursuing a career in the educational field were successfully placed in a teaching position upon completion of the program.

2021-2022:

2022-2023:

Laboratory classes have been created and approved for Fall 2023 academic year to help with Praxis learning content.

5 Program Mission

The mission of the teacher education program in the Department of Health and Human Performance is to prepare effective teachers of health and physical education in K-12 schools, the provision of leadership in school-based and community activities, and exposure of students to professional activities.

6 Institutional Mission Reference

The program supports the university's mission of: 1) providing a baccalaureate curriculum distinguished by academic excellence; 2) promoting student success; 3) promoting university-community linkages; 4) cultivating skills necessary for critical thinking and effective expression; 5) gaining an understanding of the multicultural global community; and, 6) developing a sense of ethical and civic responsibility along with specific knowledge of the chosen discipline.

Xitracs Program Report Page 3 of 35

7 Assessment and Benchmark HHP 103 Developmentally Diverse Lesson Plan

Assessment: Students will select and implement developmentally appropriate instruction that is sensitive to the multiple needs, learning styles, and experiences of learners utilizing lesson plans in a teaching environment.

Benchmark: 75% of students will pass with a grade of 80% or better, on their first attempt, on their lesson plans involving developmentally appropriate instruction in a teaching environment.

Prior to 2017-2018, the benchmark was 70% of students will score 70% or better on their lesson plans involving developmentally appropriate instruction in a teaching environment. Prior to 2016-2017, the benchmark was percentage of students scoring 90% or better.

Files: See list of attachments to view. (Requires Adobe Reader or compatible viewer).

HHP 103 Developmentally Diverse Lesson Plan Rubric

Outcome Links

Communication [Program]

All-level teacher candidates formulate and express ideas effectively through written and/or technological communications in academic and professional environments.

Content Knowledge [Program]

Students will demonstrate achievement of content knowledge of Health and Physical Education.

Instructional Planning and Delivery [Program]

All-level teacher candidates plan effectively for instruction in classes to include effective instructional delivery, appropriate content, opportunities for student involvement in the learning process, and assessments for student process in K-12 Education.

Other Certification Area Competencies [External]

All Levels K-12 Education

The standards in which the following certification competences are defined: Art Education, Dance Education, English as a Second Language Education, Foreign Languages Education, Health and Physical Education, Music Education, and Theater Education.

Ε

Health and Physical Education: Society of Health and Physical Educators (SHAPE) America Initial Health Education Teacher Education Standards and Initial Physical Education Teacher Education Standards

2008 American Association for Health Education [External]

Standard I: Content Knowledge

Candidates demonstrate the knowledge and skills of a health literate educator.

Standard III: Planning

Candidates plan effective comprehensive school health education curricula and programs.

2017 National Standards For Initial Physical Education Teacher Education [External]

Standard 2 Skillfulness/Health-R Fitness

Skillfulness and Health-Related Fitness(2). Physical education candidates are physically literate individuals who can demonstrate skillful performance(3) in physical education content areas and health-enhancing levels of fitness. (2)To assist individuals with special needs achieve the intent of Standard 2, physical education teacher education programs are allowed and encouraged to use a variety of accommodations and/or modifications to help candidates demonstrate skillful performance (e.g., modified or adapted equipment, augmented communication devices, multimedia devices) and fitness (e.g., weight programs, exercise logs). (3)Skillful performance: A person's effective employment of techniques, tactics, strategies, rules and etiquette in the context of the activity.

Standard 3 Planning and Implementation

Planning and Implementation. Physical education candidates apply content and foundational knowledge to plan and implement developmentally appropriate learning experiences aligned with local, state and/or SHAPE America's National Standards and Grade-Level Outcomes for K-12 Physical Education through the effective use of resources, accommodations and/or modifications, technology and metacognitive strategies to address the diverse needs of all students.

Xitracs Program Report Page 4 of 35

7.1 Data

Semester	scored 80%	nts that % or higher attempt		
	#	%		
Fall 2017	_	85%		
Spring 2018	_	95%		
Fall 2018	18/20	90%		
Spring 2019	12/13	92%		
Fall 2019	_	_		
Spring 2020	_	_		
Fall 2020	_	_		
Spring 2021	_	_		
Fall 2021	_	_		
Spring 2022	8/9	89%		
Fall 2022	_	_		
Spring 2023	10/12	83.3%		

7.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2018-2019:

Scores continue to maintain. The instructor and program coordinator are working to develop a newer scoring instrument that will be a bit more rigorous.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

The instructor was unable to complete this assignment with the students this academic year due to the complication presented by COVID 19, the hurricanes that struck Lake Charles, and the freeze that caused the cancelation of school. With the return of face-to-face courses this assignment will be continued as a regular part of this course.

2021-2022:

Benchmark was successful. Instructor is developing more in-depth assessment of lesson plan for next cycle.

2022-2023:

Benchmark was met. Benchmark will be increased to 75% pf students will pass with a grade of 85% or better on their first attempt.

Xitracs Program Report Page 5 of 35

8 Assessment and Benchmark HHP 104 Physical Activity Lesson Plan

Assessment: Students will apply disciplinary concepts and principles to skillful movement and physical activity, utilizing lesson plans in a teaching environment.

Benchmark: 75% of students will pass with a grade of 80% or better, on their first attempt, on their lesson plans involving developmentally appropriate instruction in a teaching environment.

Prior to 2017-2018, the benchmark was 70% of students will score 70% or better on their lesson plans involving skillful movement and physical activity in a teaching environment.

Files: See list of attachments to view. (Requires Adobe Reader or compatible viewer).

HHP 104 Physical Activity Lesson Plan Rubric

Outcome Links

Communication [Program]

All-level teacher candidates formulate and express ideas effectively through written and/or technological communications in academic and professional environments.

Content Knowledge [Program]

Students will demonstrate achievement of content knowledge of Health and Physical Education.

Instructional Planning and Delivery [Program]

All-level teacher candidates plan effectively for instruction in classes to include effective instructional delivery, appropriate content, opportunities for student involvement in the learning process, and assessments for student process in K-12 Education.

Other Certification Area Competencies [External]

All Levels K-12 Education

The standards in which the following certification competences are defined: Art Education, Dance Education, English as a Second Language Education, Foreign Languages Education, Health and Physical Education, Music Education, and Theater Education.

Ε

Health and Physical Education: Society of Health and Physical Educators (SHAPE) America Initial Health Education Teacher Education Standards and Initial Physical Education Teacher Education Standards

2008 American Association for Health Education [External]

Standard I: Content Knowledge

Candidates demonstrate the knowledge and skills of a health literate educator.

Standard III: Planning

Candidates plan effective comprehensive school health education curricula and programs.

2017 National Standards For Initial Physical Education Teacher Education [External]

Standard 2 Skillfulness/Health-R Fitness

Skillfulness and Health-Related Fitness(2). Physical education candidates are physically literate individuals who can demonstrate skillful performance(3) in physical education content areas and health-enhancing levels of fitness. (2)To assist individuals with special needs achieve the intent of Standard 2, physical education teacher education programs are allowed and encouraged to use a variety of accommodations and/or modifications to help candidates demonstrate skillful performance (e.g., modified or adapted equipment, augmented communication devices, multimedia devices) and fitness (e.g., weight programs, exercise logs). (3)Skillful performance: A person's effective employment of techniques, tactics, strategies, rules and etiquette in the context of the activity.

Standard 3 Planning and Implementation

Planning and Implementation. Physical education candidates apply content and foundational knowledge to plan and implement developmentally appropriate learning experiences aligned with local, state and/or SHAPE America's National Standards and Grade-Level Outcomes for K-12 Physical Education through the effective use of resources, accommodations and/or modifications, technology and metacognitive strategies to address the diverse needs of all students.

Xitracs Program Report Page 6 of 35

8.1 Data

Students that scored 80% or higher on first attempt					
#	%				
_	95%				
_	90%				
8/9	89%				
14/16	88%				
_	_				
_	_				
_	_				
_	_				
_	_				
5/6	83%				
_					
12/13	92.3%				
	scored 80% on first #				

8.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2018-2019:

Scores continue to maintain. The instructor and program coordinator are working to develop a newer scoring instrument which will be a bit more rigorous.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

The instructor was unable to complete this assignment with the students this academic year due to the complication presented by COVID 19, the hurricanes that struck Lake Charles, and the freeze that caused the cancelation of school. With the return of face-to-face courses this assignment will be continued as a regular part of this course.

2021-2022

Benchmark successful. Continued work on rigorous instrument for scoring this assignment.

2022-2023:

Benchmark was met. Increase benchmark to 75% of students will pass with a grade of 85% or better on their first attempt.

Xitracs Program Report Page 7 of 35

9 Assessment and Benchmark HHP 331 Human Movement Report

Assessment: Students will be able to demonstrate ability to anatomically analyze human movement and identify the muscles producing the action.

Benchmark: 70% of students will score 80% or higher on a written report graded by the mechanical analysis rubric in HHP 331.

Files: See list of attachments to view. (Requires Adobe Reader or compatible viewer).

Mechanical Analysis Rubric

Outcome Links

Content Knowledge [Program]

Students will demonstrate achievement of content knowledge of Health and Physical Education.

Critical Thinking [Program]

All teacher candidates apply critical thinking in academic and professional environments.

2008 American Association for Health Education [External]

Standard I: Content Knowledge

Candidates demonstrate the knowledge and skills of a health literate educator.

2017 National Standards For Initial Physical Education Teacher Education [External]

Standard 1 Content and Foundational Know

Content and Foundational Knowledge. Physical education candidates(1) demonstrate an understanding of common and specialized content, and scientific and theoretical foundations for the delivery of an effective preK-12 physical education program. (1)Throughout this document, the term candidate refers to an individual in a preparation program, and the term student refers to a preK-12 pupil or learner

9.1 Data

Academic Year	Fall Enrollment	Spring Enrollment	Summer Enrollment	Students that scored 80% or better		
	Enrollment	Enrollment	Enrollment	#	%	
2013-2014	6	8	1	15/15	100%	
2014-2015	5	7	3	15/15	100%	
2015-2016	6	4	2	12/12	100%	
2016-2017	6	5	3	14/14	100%	
2017-2018	4	5	2	11/11	100%	
2018-2019	2	8	3	11/13	85%	
2019-2020		_	_	_	_	
2020-2021	3	6	0	1/9	11%	
2021-2022		_	_	_	_	
2022-2023	3	2	0	5/5	100%	

Xitracs Program Report Page 8 of 35

9.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2018-2019

The expected level of achievement will remain at 80%. In the upcoming academic year, there is a new instructor for one of the 331 sections. He will utilize the same grading instrument for the mechanical analysis.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

Due to the complications created by COVID 19, the two hurricanes that struck Lake Charles, and the freezing conditions that resulted in cancelation of school, students were not able to participate in key laboratory exercises that would have aided with the analyzation of human movement. The return to face-to-face instruction will allow for the hands-on activities that were unavailable this academic year, it is believed that this lack of tactile learning contributed to the inability of the student population to reach the benchmark in this course. Measurements that focused on theory rather than application remained constant with the online only courses while students struggled with application knowledge through out the course.

2021-2022:

Data not reported by instructor.

2022-2023:

Benchmark was met. Benchmark will remain the same for next reporting year. If numbers remain high, the benchmark will be reassessed.

10 Assessment and Benchmark HHP 345 Physical Performance Tests Lab Report

Assessment: Students will be able to perform and evaluate physical performance tests.

Benchmark: 90% of students score 80% of better on all physical performance tests in lab report(s).

Outcome Links

Content Knowledge [Program]

Students will demonstrate achievement of content knowledge of Health and Physical Education.

2008 American Association for Health Education [External]

Standard I: Content Knowledge

Candidates demonstrate the knowledge and skills of a health literate educator.

2017 National Standards For Initial Physical Education Teacher Education [External]

Standard 1 Content and Foundational Know

Content and Foundational Knowledge. Physical education candidates(1) demonstrate an understanding of common and specialized content, and scientific and theoretical foundations for the delivery of an effective preK-12 physical education program. (1)Throughout this document, the term candidate refers to an individual in a preparation program, and the term student refers to a preK-12 pupil or learner

Standard 2 Skillfulness/Health-R Fitness

Skillfulness and Health-Related Fitness(2). Physical education candidates are physically literate individuals who can demonstrate skillful performance(3) in physical education content areas and health-enhancing levels of fitness. (2)To assist individuals with special needs achieve the intent of Standard 2, physical education teacher education programs are allowed and encouraged to use a variety of accommodations and/or modifications to help candidates demonstrate skillful performance (e.g., modified or adapted equipment, augmented communication devices, multimedia devices) and fitness (e.g., weight programs, exercise logs). (3)Skillful performance: A person's effective employment of techniques, tactics, strategies, rules and etiquette in the context of the activity.

Xitracs Program Report Page 9 of 35

10.1 Data

Academic Year	% of students able to perform and evaluate physical performance tests
2013-2014	100%
2014-2015	100%
2015-2016	100%
2016-2017	100%
2018-2019	100%
2019-2020	_
2020-2021	_
2021-2022	
2022-2023	-

Competer	# of atudonta		% scoring 80% or better								
Semester	# of students	Lab 1	Lab 2	Lab 3	Lab 4	Lab 5	Lab 6				
Fall 2017	4	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	N/A				
Spring 2018	2	100%	100%	100%	100%	50%	100%				
Fall 2018	0	_	_	_	_	_	_				
Spring 2019	4	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%				
Fall 2019	_	_	_	_	_	_	_				
Spring 2020	_	_	_	_	_	_	_				
Fall 2020	_	_	_	_	_	_	_				
Spring 2021	_	_	_	_	_	_	_				
Fall 2021	_	_	_	_	_	_	_				
Spring 2022		_	_	_	_	_	_				
Fall 2022											
Spring 2023	_	_	_	_	_	_	_				

Xitracs Program Report Page 10 of 35

10.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2018-2019:

The data submitted is incomplete. The HHP department hired a new faculty member who taught a fall, spring, and summer section of this course which had a total of 11 HEDU students. The teacher did not include labs in the course so data was not collected. The plan for the 2019-2020 academic year is to restrict the lab course to specific majors including HEDU. The other option being considered is to create a new course.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

The only instructor of this course does not include laboratory exercises of any type. The program coordinator will be consulted about the viability of changing this assessment completely.

2021-2022:

The only instructor of this course does not include laboratory exercises of any type.

2022-2023:

The instructor of this course does not include laboratory exercise of any type. The instructor responsible for it is no longer at the University. Based on new professor for the course, assessment may be changed.

11 Assessment and Benchmark HHP 468 Final Field Experience Evaluation III

Assessment: All-level teacher candidates plan effectively for instruction in classes to include effective instructional delivery, appropriate content, opportunities for student involvement in the learning process, and assessments for student progress in K-12 education.

Benchmark: Mean score of 3.00.

Outcome Links

Content Knowledge [Program]

Students will demonstrate achievement of content knowledge of Health and Physical Education.

Instructional Planning and Delivery [Program]

All-level teacher candidates plan effectively for instruction in classes to include effective instructional delivery, appropriate content, opportunities for student involvement in the learning process, and assessments for student process in K-12 Education.

Instructional Tools [Program]

All level teacher candidates create instructional tools for use in a peer teaching environment.

Other Certification Area Competencies [External]

All Levels K-12 Education

The standards in which the following certification competences are defined: Art Education, Dance Education, English as a Second Language Education, Foreign Languages Education, Health and Physical Education, Music Education, and Theater Education.

Ε

Health and Physical Education: Society of Health and Physical Educators (SHAPE) America Initial Health Education Teacher Education Standards and Initial Physical Education Teacher Education Standards

2008 American Association for Health Education [External]

Standard I: Content Knowledge

Candidates demonstrate the knowledge and skills of a health literate educator.

Standard II: Needs Assessment

Candidates assess needs to determine priorities for school health education.

Standard III: Planning

Candidates plan effective comprehensive school health education curricula and programs.

Standard IV: Implementation

Candidates implement health education instruction

Standard V: Assessment

Candidates assess student learning.

Xitracs Program Report Page 11 of 35

Standard VI: Administration&Coordination

Candidates plan and coordinate a school health education program.

Standard VII: Being a Resource

Candidates serve as a resource person in health education.

Standard VIII: Communication & Advocacy

Candidates communicate and advocate for health and school health education.

2017 National Standards For Initial Physical Education Teacher Education [External]

Standard 1 Content and Foundational Know

Content and Foundational Knowledge. Physical education candidates(1) demonstrate an understanding of common and specialized content, and scientific and theoretical foundations for the delivery of an effective preK-12 physical education program. (1)Throughout this document, the term candidate refers to an individual in a preparation program, and the term student refers to a preK-12 pupil or learner

Standard 3 Planning and Implementation

Planning and Implementation. Physical education candidates apply content and foundational knowledge to plan and implement developmentally appropriate learning experiences aligned with local, state and/or SHAPE America's National Standards and Grade-Level Outcomes for K-12 Physical Education through the effective use of resources, accommodations and/or modifications, technology and metacognitive strategies to address the diverse needs of all students.

Standard 4 Instructional Delivery & Mgmt

Instructional Delivery and Management. Physical education candidates engage students in meaningful learning experiences through effective use of pedagogical skills. They use communication, feedback, technology, and instructional and managerial skills to enhance student learning.

Standard 5 Assessment of Student Learn

Assessment of Student Learning. Physical education candidates select and implement appropriate assessments to monitor students' progress and guide decision making related to instruction and learning.

Standard 6 Professional Responsibility

Professional Responsibility. Physical education candidates demonstrate behaviors essential to becoming effective professionals. They exhibit professional ethics and culturally competent practices; seek opportunities for continued professional development; and demonstrate knowledge of promotion/advocacy strategies for physical education and expanded physical activity opportunities that support the development of physically literate individuals.

11.1 Data

HHP 468 Final Field Experience Evaluation III:

HHP		Fall 2	017		Spring	2018		Fall 2	018		Spring	2019
Component	#	Mean	Range	#	Mean	Range	#	Mean	Range	#	Mean	Range
5.1	3	3.38	3.00- 3.63	3	3.19	3.63- 3.75	1	3.25	3.25	8	3.44	3.13- 3.88
5.2	3	3.46	3.38-3.5	3	3.23	3.75- 3.88	1	3.38	3.38	8	3.43	2.88- 3.88
5.3	3	3.84	3.75- 3.88	3	3.42	3.88- 4.00	1	4.00	4.00	8	3.92	3.75- 4.00
5.4	3	3.83	3.75- 4.00	3	3.42	4.00	1	4.00	4.00	8	3.77	3.38- 4.00
5.5	3	3.92	3.75- 4.00	3	3.46	4.00	1	4.00	4.00	8	3.92	3.50- 4.00
5.6	3	3.96	3.88- 4.00	3	3.48	3.88- 4.00	1	4.00	4.00	8	3.88	3.50- 4.00
5.7												

Xitracs Program Report Page 12 of 35

HHP		Fall 2	2019		Spring	2020		F	all 2020			Sp	ring 202	1
Component	#	Mean	Range	#	Mean	Range	#	Mean	Range	% Prof.	#	Mean	Range	% Prof.
5.1							5	4.00	4.00	100%	5	3.48	3.00- 3.75	100%
5.2							5	3.73	3,00- 4.00	100%	5	3.30	2.63- 3.75	80%
5.3							5	3.93	3.67- 4.00	100%	5	3.45	3.00- 3.75	100%
5.4							5	4.00	4.00	100%	5	3.65	3.38- 4.00	100%
5.5							5	4.00	4.00	100%	5	3.73	3.38- 4.00	100%
5.6							5	4.00	4.00	100%	5	3.70	3.25- 4.00	100%
5.7														
TECH 1											5	2.78	1.75- 3.88	40%
TECH 2											5	2.53	1.63- 3.13	60%
TECH 3											5	2.30	1.38- 3.38	20%

HHP		F	all 2021		Spring 2022				
Component	#	Mean	Range	% Prof.	#	Mean	Range	% Prof.	
5.1	3	3.59	3.50- 3.63	100%	6	3.54	3.25- 4.00	100%	
5.2	3	3.63	3.50- 3.75	100%	6	3.42	3.25- 3.50	100%	
5.3	3	3.67	3.50- 3.88	100%	6	3.29	3.08- 3.75	100%	
5.4	3	3.63	3.50- 3.75	100%	6	3.65	3.63- 3.75	100%	
5.5	3	3.67	3.50- 3.88	100%	6	3.71	3.63- 3.88	100%	
5.6	3	3.67	3.50- 3.75	100%	6	3.59	3.50- 3.75	100%	
5.7									
TECH 1	3	2.79	2.38- 3.50	33%	6	2.25	1.50- 3.00	17%	
TECH 2	3	2.88	2.38- 3.75	33%	6	2.27	1.50- 3.00	17%	
TECH 3	3	2.88	2.38- 3.50	33%	6	2.05	1.17- 3.00	17%	

Xitracs Program Report Page 13 of 35

HHP		F	all 2022		Spring 2023				
Component	#	Mean	Range	% Prof.	#	Mean	Range	% Prof.	
5.1									
5.2									
5.3									
5.4									
5.5									
5.6									
5.7									
TECH 1									
TECH 2									
TECH 3									

11.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2018-2019:

The benchmark score of 3.00 has maintained for all students teachers. In the upcoming academic year, there is a strong possibility that there will be new field supervisors for the student teachers in HPE. It will be critical that the new supervisors go through the appropriate instrument training.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

All students met the benchmark for the FEE Domain 5. Scores for the fall 2020 semester were based off less evaluations due to the hurricanes and restricted learning environment due to COVID. The spring 2021 students had a larger range in scores which reflects a more accurate evaluation.

2021-2022:

All students met the benchmark for the FEE Domain 5 elements 1-6 that were scored in the fall 2021 and spring 2022 semesters. Candidates did not reach benchmark on any of the technology items for either semester.

EPAC representatives from the Department of Health and Human Performance will ensure that the content portion of domain 5 aligns to the appropriate standards and will assist in the evaluation of content knowledge of candidates during the residency semester evaluations.

2022-2023:

12 Assessment and Benchmark Praxis II

Program: H&HP Traditional Assessment #1: Praxis Content

Exam #: 5857

Benchmark: 90% of teacher candidates will pass the Praxis Content exam on the first attempt.

Outcome Links

Content Knowledge [Program]

Students will demonstrate achievement of content knowledge of Health and Physical Education.

12.1 Data

Xitracs Program Report Page 14 of 35

HHP Education - Praxis Content #5857:

		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
	Number	1	8			5	5
	Mean	164	167			167	168.4
	Range	164	160-175			160-177	161-177
#5857 overall	Pass 1st attempt	100%	38%			40%	40%
	Pass prior to teaching /intern	100%	100%			100%	100%
#5857 breakdown:	Number	1	8			5	5
	Mean	17	16.4			15.4	17
Health Ed as a Discipline/	Range	17	12-21			13-17	14-19
Health Instruction	Percentage Correct (22)	77%	74%			70%	77%
	Mean	17	19			20.2	18.8
Health Ed Content/	Range	17	15-22			17-24	14-23
Physical Education	Percentage Correct (28)	61%	68%			72%	67%
2	Mean	11	12.3			12	12.6
Content Knowledge and Student Growth and	Range	11	10-16			6-14	10-15
Development	Percentage Correct (18)	61%	68%			67%	70%
	Mean	19	19.3			20	19.8
Management, Motivation,	Range	19	14-24			17-22	15-23
& Communication/ Collaboration, Reflection, & Technology	Possible points/ questions (25)	76%	77%			80%	79%
	Mean	12	13.1			12	14.2
	Range	12	10-16			8-15	14-15
Planning, Instruction, and Student Assessment	Possible points/ questions (17)	71%	77%			71%	84%

Xitracs Program Report Page 15 of 35

		Fall 2021	Spring 2022	Fall 2022	Spring 2023	Fall 2023	Spring 2024
	Number	3	6	0	1		
	Mean	165	169		174		
	Range	161-170	161-179		174		
#5857 overall	Pass 1st attempt	33%	67%		0%		
	Pass prior to teaching /intern	100%	100%		100%		
#5857 breakdown:	Number	3	6		1		
	Mean	15	17		16		
Health Ed as a Discipline/	Range	13-18	14-18		16		
Health Instruction	Percentage Correct (22)	70%	75%		73%		
	Mean	19	21		20		
Health Ed Content/	Range	17-22	19-22		20		
Physical Education	Percentage Correct (28)	69%	73%		71%		
	Mean	12	13		14		
Content Knowledge and	Range	11-13	10-15		14		
Student Growth and Development	Percentage Correct (17- 18)	71%	72%		78%		
	Mean	18	18		21		
Management, Motivation,	Range	17-19	14-21		21		
& Communication/ Collaboration, Reflection, & Technology	Possible points/ questions (25)	72%	73%		84%		
	Mean	13	13		14		
	Range	12-15	9-15		14		
Planning, Instruction, and Student Assessment	Possible points/ questions (17)	76%	74%		82%		

Xitracs Program Report Page 16 of 35

12.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2018-2019:

First time pass rates were lower than in previous semesters. The primary reason for this is that we are encouraging our students to take the exam earlier in the degree plan. The newest curriculum change will require our students to take this exam late sophomore/early jr year. We are trying to evaluate when/where HPE Praxis content should be taught to meet the needs of earlier test takers.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

The first-time pass rate for this exam is not meeting program benchmarks. The program coordinator and assistant coordinator are reviewing all portions of the exam. Specific courses will be identified to include more in depth material to better prepare for the exam.

2021-2022:

5 of the 9 candidates in the 2021-2022 academic year passed the content exam on the first attempt (56%). This does not meet benchmark.

The EPAC representative will ensure that the curriculum is aligned to the Praxis content exam and should add this information to the course syllabi to ensure that new instructors understand the importance of the material to the success of the candidates in completing the content exam and in becoming a successful educator.

2022-2023:

13 Assessment and Benchmark in TASC Standards - Lesson Planning

Assessment: The teacher candidate differentiates instruction, behavior management techniques, and the learning environment in response to individual student differences in cognitive, socioemotional, language, and physical development.

Benchmark: 80% of students will score at least a 3.00 on each component of this assessment.

13.1 Data

HHP Education - Lesson Plan Data:

Rubric Element	InTASC Standard		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020
		Number	1	8		
		Mean	4.00	3.00		
Student Outcomes	4n	Range	4.00	2.00- 4.00		
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	63%		
		Number	0	0		
	3k	Mean				
Procedures		Range				
		% Proficient or Higher				
		Number	1	8		
		Mean	3.00	3.00		
Lesson "Hook"	8j	Range	3.00	2.00- 4.00		
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	63%		

Xitracs Program Report Page 17 of 35

		Number	1	8	
		Mean	3.00	2.63	
Pre-Planned SEED Questions	8i	Range	3.00	1.00- 4.00	
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	75%	
		Number	0	2	
Madalad Cuidad		Mean		3.00	
Modeled, Guided, Collaborative, & Independent Practice	7k	Range		2.00- 4.00	
		% Proficient or Higher		50%	
		Number	0	0	
		Mean			
Technology	51	Range			
		% Proficient or Higher			
		Number		1	
F		Mean		2.00	
Formative / Summative Assessments	6j	Range		2.00	
7656531116116		% Proficient or Higher		0%	
		Number	1	8	
		Mean	2.00	3.00	
Relevance and Rationale	2 j	Range	2.00	2.00- 4.00	
		% Proficient or Higher	0%	63%	
		Number	1	6	
		Mean	4.00	3.17	
Exploration, Extension, Supplemental	1e	Range	4.00	2.00- 4.00	
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	83%	
		Number	0	0	
Accommodation /		Mean			
Differentiation	7 j	Range			
		% Proficient or Higher			
		Number	1	5	
		Mean	4.00	3.40	
Interdisciplinary Connections		Range	4.00	3.00- 4.00	
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%	
		Number	0	1	
		Mean		4.00	
		Range		4.00	

Xitracs Program Report Page 18 of 35

Additional Standards and CD Connections with ELA	% Proficient or Higher		100%	
	Number	0	1	
Additional Standards and	Mean		4.00	
CD Connections with	Range		4.00	
Content	% Proficient or Higher		100%	
	Number	0	1	
	Mean		4.00	
Student Misconceptions	Range		4.00	
	% Proficient or Higher		100%	
	Number	1	8	
	Mean	3.00	2.88	
Lesson Progression	Range	3.00	2.00- 3.00	
	% Proficient or Higher	100%	88%	
	Number	0	1	
	Mean		2.00	
Learning Environment	Range		2.00	
	% Proficient or Higher		0%	
	Number	1	6	
	Mean	4.00	2.33	
Whole-Group	Range	4.00	2.00- 4.00	
	% Proficient or Higher	100%	17%	
	Number	1	6	
	Mean	4.00	2.83	
Collaborative / Small Group	Range	4.00	2.00- 4.00	
	% Proficient or Higher	100%	67%	
	Number	1	6	
	Mean	4.00	3.00	
Independent Practice	Range	4.00	2.00- 4.00	
	% Proficient or Higher	100%	67%	
	Number	1	8	
	Mean	4.00	3.75	
Resource / Material	Range	4.00	3.00- 4.000	
	% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%	
	Number	1	8	
	Mean	4.00	3.75	

Xitracs Program Report Page 19 of 35

Teacher Use of Technology	Range	4.00	2.00- 4.00	
	% Proficient or Higher	100%	88%	
	Number	1	8	
	Mean	4.00	3.38	
Student Use of Technology	Range	4.00	1.00- 4.00	
	% Proficient or Higher	100%	75%	
	Number	1	7	
	Mean	4.00	3.86	
Formal Assessment	Range	4.00	3.00- 4.00	
	% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%	
	Number	1	7	
	Mean	4.00	3.86	
Informal Assessment	Range	4.00	3.00- 4.00	
	% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%	
	Number	1	8	
	Mean	4.00	3.00	
Differentiation by CCP	Range	4.00	1.00- 4.00	
	% Proficient or Higher	100%	75%	
	Number	1	8	
	Mean	4.00	3.38	
Differentiation by Learner	Range	4.00	2.00- 4.00	
	% Proficient or Higher	100%	88%	
	Number	0	1	
	Mean		4.00	
Response to Intervention	Range		4.00	
	% Proficient or Higher		100%	
	Number	1	6	
	Mean	1.00	2.67	
Reflection	Range	1.00	1.00- 4.00	
	% Proficient or Higher	0%	67%	
	Number	1	8	
	Mean	4.00	3.25	
	Range	4.00	2.00- 4.00	

Xitracs Program Report Page 20 of 35

Content Standards	% Proficient or Higher	100%	75%	
	Number	1	6	
	Mean	4.00	2.67	
Closure	Range	4.00	1.00- 4.00	
	% Proficient or Higher	100%	50%	

2020-2021:

Data table is attached.

2021-2022:

Data table is attached.

2022-2023:

Files: See list of attachments to view. (Requires Adobe Reader or compatible viewer).

HPE_ Lesson Plan Data_20-21 HPE_ Lesson Plan Data_21-22 Xitracs Program Report Page 21 of 35

13.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2018-2019:

There are some categories that do not have any data and/or different n values due to the use of the evolving lesson plan templates being used. Each category has its own n value. The preservice teachers for the following academic year will have a little more training on this version of the lesson plan but the template has been revised since they have taken lesson planning courses. 300 level method courses are spending more time in the weaker areas.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

The benchmark was not fully met due to restricted activities from COVID and hurricane complications. Going forward, pre-service teachers are required to take a lesson planning course prior to going into the schools. This course should have our students better prepared and comfortable with the lesson plan document.

2021-2022:

The benchmark was for at least 80% of the candidates to score at least a 3.00 on the assessment. The benchmark was not met in the majority of elements in either semester: Fall 2021: Additional Standards including 6 ELA and Cross-Disciplinary, Explanation for Inclusion of Cross-Disciplinary content and 6 ELA standards, Relevance, Rationale, Student Misconceptions, Teacher's Use of Technology, Student Use of Technology, Assessments, Differentiation by Content, Differentiation by Learner, Post-Instruction RTI, and Reflection of Instructional Strategies.

Spring 2022: Content Standards and Outcomes, Student Outcomes and Assessments, Additional Standards including 6 ELA and Cross-Disciplinary, Explanation for Inclusion of Cross-Disciplinary content and 6 ELA standards, Relevance, Rationale, Student Misconceptions, Pre-Planned SEED Questions, Closure, Instructional Resources/Materials, Teacher's Use of Technology, Student Use of Technology, Assessments, Differentiation by Content, Differentiation by Learner, Post-Instruction RTI, and Reflection of Instructional Strategies.

All major assessments, including the lesson plan, are being realigned to the 2022 Danielson Framework for Teaching Model in preparation for the Fall 2024 CAEP accreditation visit therefore a new assessment will be implemented in Fall 2022.

2022-2023:

14 Assessment and Benchmark FEE - Specific inTASC Standards

Assessment: The teacher candidate demonstrates, at an effective level, the Louisiana Components of Effective Teaching as defined in Bulletin 130 and the Compass Teacher Rubric.

Benchmark: 80% of candidates will score at least a 3.0 in all areas of this assessment.

Prior to 2021-2022, the benchmark was 100% of students will score at least 2.00 in all areas of this assessment. The state of Louisiana sets this benchmark according to Bulletin 746.

14.1 Data

HHP Education - FEE Specific inTASC Standards:

HHP	InTASC		Fall 2017			Spring	2018		Fall 2	018		Spring	2019
Component	Standards	#	Mean	Range	#	Mean	Range	#	Mean	Range	#	Mean	Range
Domain 1								1	3.69	3.50- 3.88	8	3.58	3.13- 3.88
1.1								1	3.69	3.50- 3.88	8	3.58	3.13- 3.88

Xitracs Program Report Page 22 of 35

1.1.1	4n	3	3.53	3.50- 3.75	3	3.50	3.25- 3.75	1	3.63	3.63	8	3.61	3.25- 3.88
1.1.2	6r	3	3.50	3.25- 3.75	3	3.71	3.63- 3.75	1	3.50	3.50	8	3.63	3.25- 3.88
1.1.3	2g	3	3.44	3.25- 3.63	3	3.54	3.38- 3.75	1	3.88	3.88	8	3.47	3.25- 3.63
1.1.4	1b	3	3.34	3.25- 3.38	3	3.71	3.63- 3.75	1	3.75	3.75	8	3.61	3.38- 3.75
Domain 2								1	3.52	3.25- 4.00	8	3.47	2.88- 4.00
2.1								1	3.50	3.38- 3.75	8	3.50	2.88- 3.88
2.1.1	3j	3	3.33	3.00- 3.75	3	3.63	3.50- 3.75	1	3.38	3.38	8	3.52	3.25- 3.75
2.1.2	3d	3	3.33	3.25- 3.50	3	3.21	2.88- 3.50	1	3.50	3.50	8	3.33	2.88- 3.75
2.1.3	3d	3	3.29	3.00- 3.63	3	3.09	2.88- 3.25	1	3.75	3.75	8	3.53	3.38- 3.75
2.1.4	3d	3	3.04	3.00- 3.13	3	3.17	3.00- 3.25	1	3.38	3.38	8	3.63	3.38- 3.88
2.2								1	3.54	3.25- 4.00	8	3.43	3.00- 4.00
2.2.1	3c	3	3.33	3.25- 3.50	3	3.34	3.25- 3.88	1	3.25	3.25	8	3.27	3.00- 3.63
2.2.2	3f	3	3.30	3.13- 3.38	3	3.33	3.00- 3.75	1	4.00	4.00	8	3.36	3.13- 3.75
2.2.3	3f	3	3.55	3.38- 3.63	3	3.67	3.50- 3.75	1	3.38	3.38	8	&3. 66	3.38- 4.00
Domain 3								1	3.50	3.00- 4.00	8	3.33	2.50- 4.00
3.1								1	3.21	3.13- 3.25	8	3.01	2.50- 3.38
3.1.1	8f	3	2.96	2.88- 3.00	3	2.96	2.88- 3.13	1	3.25	3.25	8	2.92	2.50- 3.13
3.1.2	4c	3	2.88	2.63- 3.13	3	3.13	3.00- 3.25	1	3.13	3.13	8	2.97	2.50- 3.25
3.1.3	5e	3	2.92	2.00- 3.00	3	3.17	3.00- 3.38	1	3.25	3.25	8	3.13	2.88- 3.38
3.2								1	3.63	3.25- 4.00	8	3.51	3.00- 4.00
3.2.1	7a	3	3.17	3.00- 3.38	3	3.50	3.38- 3.63	1	3.25	3.25	8	3.38	3.00- 3.63
3.2.2	3j	3	3.38	3.00- 3.63	3	3.46	3.25- 3.75	1	4.00	4.00	8	3.60	3.13- 4.00
3.2.3	4f	3	3.29	3.00- 3.63	3	3.29	3.00- 3.50	1	3.25	3.25	8	3.38	3.13- 3.63
3.2.4	3d	3	3.50	3.25- 3.75	3	3.79	3.63- 4.00	1	4.00	4.00	8	3.71	3.38- 4.00
3.3								1	3.60	3.00- 4.00	8	3.38	2.88- 3.88

Xitracs Program Report Page 23 of 35

3.3.1	6d	3	3.21	3.00- 3.38	3	3.38	3.13- 3.50	1	3.00	3.00	8	3.33 /td>	3.13- 3.75
3.3.2	6a	3	3.58	3.50- 3.75	3	3.50	3.00- 3.75	1	3.88	3.88	8	3.53	3.13- 3.88
3.3.3	6d	3	3.63	3.38- 3.75	3	3.63	3.38- 3.88	1	4.00	4.00	8	3.55	3.25- 3.88
3.3.4	8b	3	3.13	3.00- 3.25	3	3.08	3.00- 3.25	1	3.50	3.50	8	3.11	2.88- 3.63
Domain 4								1	4.00	4.00	8	3.92	3.63- 4.00
4.1								1	4.00	4.00	8	3.92	3.63- 4.00
4.1.1	90	3	3.96	3.88- 4.00	3	3.92	3.88- 4.00	1	4.00	4.00	8	3.94	3.63- 4.00
4.1.2	9i	3	3.88	3.75- 4.00	3	3.96	3.88- 4.00	1	4.00	4.00	8	3.92	3.63- 4.00
4.1.3	90	3	3.96	3.00- 4.00	3	4.00	4.00	1	4.00	4.00	8	3.91	3.75- 4.00

HHP	InTASC		F	all 2020			Sp	oring 202	1
Component	Standards	#	Mean	Range	% Prof.	#	Mean	Range	% Prof.
Domain 1		6	3.13	2-4	88%	5	3.15	2.63-4	70%
Component 1.1		6	3.13	2-4	88%	5	3.15	2.63-4	70%
1.1.1		6	3.17	3-4	100%	5	3.30	3-4	100%
1.1.2		6	3.17	2.5-4	83%	5	3.13	2.63- 3.63	60%
1.1.3		6	2.97	2-3.5	83%	5	2.95	2.63- 3.38	40%
1.1.4		6	3.22	2.5-3.67	83%	5	3.23	2.63- 3.63	80%
Domain 2		6	3.27	2-4	95%	5	3.17	2.75- 3.63	74%
Component 2.1		6	3.16	2-4	96%	5	3.18	2.75- 3.63	75%
2.1.1		6	3.28	2-4	100%	5	3.13	2.75- 3.63	60%
2.1.2		6	2.89	2-3.33	83%	5	3.13	2.75- 3.63	60%
2.1.3		6	3.11	3-3.67	100%	5	3.25	3-3.5	100%
2.1.4		6	3.36	3-4	100%	5	3.18	2.75-3.5	80%
Component 2.2		6	3.41	2.67-4	94%	5	3.14	2.75-3.5	73%
2.2.1		6	3.31	3-3.67	100%	5	3.08	2.88- 3.38	80%
2.2.2		6	3.22	3-4	100%	5	3.15	2.75-3.5	60%
2.2.3		6	3.70	2.67-4	83%	5	3.20	2,88- 3.50	80%
Domain 3		6	3.10	2-4	80%	5	3.01	2.12-4	56%
Component 3.1		6	2.87	2-3.50	61%	5	2.71	2.12- 3.38	27%

Xitracs Program Report Page 24 of 35

3.1.1	6	ŝ	2.81	2.5-3	50%	5	2.80	2.12- 3.38	40%
3.1.2	6	ŝ	2.83	2.33- 3.50	50%	5	2.68	2.38-3	20%
3.1.3	6	ŝ	2.97	2-3.50	83%	5	2.65	2.38- 3.13	20%
Component 3.2	6	6	3.18	2.5-4	88%	5	3.20	2.75-3.5	85%
3.2.1	(ŝ	3.22	2.5-3.67	83%	5	3.20	2.88- 3.38	80%
3.2.2	6	ŝ	2.92	2.5-3	83%	5	3.23	3.13- 3.38	100%
3.2.3	6	ŝ	3.00	2.5-3.5	83%	5	3.15	3.00- 3.38	100%
3.2.4	6	6	3.58	3-4	100%	5	3.20	2.75-3.5	60%
Component 3.3	6	6	3.19	2-4	88%	5	3.06	2.25-4	50%
3.3.1	6	ŝ	2.89	2-3.33	83%	5	2.85	2.63- 3.13	20%
3.3.2	6	ŝ	3.36	3-4	100%	5	3.38	2.88- 4.00	60%
3.3.3	6	ŝ	3.31	2-4	83%	5	3.28	2.88- 4.00	80%
3.3.4	6	ŝ	3.19	2.5-4	83%	5	2.78	2.25- 3.25	40%
Domain 4	6	6	3.98	3.67-4	100%	5	3.64	3-4	100%
Component 4.1	- (6	3.98	3.67-4	100%	5	3.64	3-4	100%
4.1.1	(ŝ	3.95	3.67-4	100%	5	3.48	3-4	100%
4.1.2	(6	4.00	4	100%	5	3.80	3.38-4	100%
4.1.3	(ŝ	4.00	4	100%	5	3.65	3.13- 4.00	100%

HHP	InTASC		F	all 2021			Sp	ring 202	2
Component	Standards	#	Mean	Range	% Prof.	#	Mean	Range	% Prof.
Domain 1		3	3.51	3.25- 3.75	100%	6	2.96	2.63- 3.38	54%
Component 1.1		3	3.51	3.25- 3.75	100%	6	2.96	2.63- 3.38	54%
1.1.1		3	3.54	3.38- 3.75	100%	6	3.00	2.75- 3.25	50%
1.1.2		3	3.42	3.25- 3.75	100%	6	2.88	2.63- 3.38	33%
1.1.3		3	3.54	3.38- 3.75	100%	6	2.96	2.75- 3.13	67%
1.1.4		3	3.54	3.50- 3.63	100%	6	3.00	2.88- 3.13	67%
Domain 2		3	3.41	2.88- 3.75	95%	6	3.16	2.50- 3.75	76%
Component 2.1		3	3.50	3.13- 3.75	100%	6	3.18	2.50- 3.50	79%
2.1.1		3	3.42	3.13- 3.63	100%	6	3.32	3.13- 3.50	100%

Xitracs Program Report Page 25 of 35

2.1.2	3	3.38	3.13- 3.75	100%	6	3.02	2.50- 3.50	50%
2.1.3	3	3.63	3.50- 3.75	100%	6	3.15	2.75- 3.25	83%
2.1.4	3	3.58	3.50- 3.75	100%	6	3.23	2.88- 3.50	83%
Component 2.2	3	3.28	2.88- 3.50	89%	6	3.13	2.50- 3.75	72%
2.2.1	3	3.20	3.25- 3.88	100%	6	3.13	2.63- 3.50	83%
2.2.2	3	3.09	2.88- 3.25	67%	6	3.05	2.50- 3.38	50%
2.2.3	3	3.46	3.38- 3.50	100%	6	3.21	2.75- 3.75	83%
Domain 3	3	3.26	2.75- 3.63	85%	6	3.00	2.25- 3.50	64%
Component 3.1	3	3.08	2.75- 3.38	67%	6	2.77	2.25- 3.38	28%
3.1.1	3	3.08	2.75- 3.25	67%	6	2.77	2.50- 3.38	17%
3.1.2	3	3.13	2.75- 3.38	67%	6	2.82	2.25- 3.38	33%
3.1.3	3	3.04	2.88- 3.25	67%	6	2.71	2.38- 3.38	33%
Component 3.2	3	3.39	3.13- 3.63	100%	6	3.23	2.88- 3.50	96%
3.2.1	3	3.29	3.25- 3.88	100%	6	3.31	3.00- 3.50	100%
3.2.2	3	3.34	3.25- 3.88	100%	6	3.15	2.88- 3.50	83%
3.2.3	3	3.54	3.50- 3.63	100%	6	3.27	3.00- 3.50	100%
3.2.4	3	3.38	3.13- 3.63	100%	6	3.19	3.00- 3.38	100%
Component 3.3	3	3.25	2.88- 3.63	83%	6	2.96	2.38- 3.38	58%
3.3.1	3	3.00	2.88- 3.25	33%	6	2.82	2.38- 3.25	33%
3.3.2	3	3.30	3.13- 3.63	100%	6	3.02	2.88- 3.13	83%
3.3.3	3	3.46	3.25- 3.63	100%	6	3.13	2.88- 3.38	83%
3.3.4	3	3.25	3.13- 3.38	100%	6	2.86	2.63- 3.13	33%
Domain 4	3	3.88	3.63- 4.00	100%	6	3.66	3.38- 4.00	100%
Component 4.1	3	3.88	3.63- 4.00	100%	6	3.66	3.38- 4.00	100%
4.1.1	3	3.88	3.75- 4.00	100%	6	3.59	3.38- 3.75	100%

Xitracs Program Report Page 26 of 35

4.1.2	3	3.79	3.63- 4.00	100%	6	3.73	3.63- 4.00	100%
4.1.3	3	3.96	3.88- 4.00	100%	6	3.67	3.50- 3.88	100%

HHP	InTASC	Fall 2022			Spring 2023				
Component	Standards	#	Mean	Range	% Prof.	#	Mean		% Prof.
Domain 1	Otaridardo	"	Wiodii	riango	70 1 101.		Wiodii	riango	70 1 101.
Component 1.1									
1.1.1									
1.1.2									
1.1.3									
1.1.4									
Domain 2									
Component 2.1									
2.1.1									
2.1.1									
2.1.3									
2.1.3									
Component 2.2									
2.2.1									
2.2.2									
2.2.3									
Domain 3									
Component 3.1									
3.1.1									
3.1.2									
3.1.3									
Component 3.2									
3.2.1									
3.2.2									
3.2.3									
3.2.4									
Component 3.3									
3.3.1									
3.3.2									
3.3.3									
3.3.4									
Domain 4									
Component 4.1									
4.1.1									
4.1.2									
4.1.3	_								

Xitracs Program Report Page 27 of 35

14.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2018-2019:

The benchmark score of 3.00 has been met for all students teachers. In the upcoming academic year, there is a strong possiblility that there will be new field suspervisors for the student teachers in HPE. It will be critical that the new supervisors go through the appropriate FEE instrument training.

2019-2020:

2020-2021

Mean sources for this benchmark have been met. The ranges are varied which indicates that the students did show growth after the multiple evaluations. Improvement plans will be created after this next academic year. We will begin phasing out degree candidates and will be assessing students in the 2-semester residency program.

2021-2022:

Domain 3 contained the only elements in which less than 80% of candidates scored below a 3.00 during the fall 2021 semester, however, there were elements in Domain 1, Domain 2 and Domain 3 that did not meet benchmark.

All major assessments, including the field experience evaluation, are being realigned to the 2022 Danielson Framework for Teaching Model in preparation for the Fall 2024 CAEP accreditation visit therefore a new assessment will be implemented in Fall 2022.

2022-2023:

15 Assessment and Benchmark Outcomes - TCWS

Assessment: The teacher candidate applies knowledge of various types of assessments and their purposes, strengths, and limitations to select, adapt, and modify assessments to accommodate the abilities and needs of students with exceptionalities.

Benchmark: 80% of students will earn at least 3.00 on all areas of this assessment.

15.1 Data

Xitracs Program Report Page 28 of 35

HHP Education - Teacher Candidate Work Sample:

Criteria		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020
Content Standards	Number	1	8		
	Mean	3	3.38		
	Range	3	2-4		
	% Scored Proficient or Higher	100	75		
	Number	1	8		
	Mean	4	3.88		
Strength: Data to	Range	4	3-4		
Determine	% Scored Proficient or Higher	100	100		
	Number	1	8		
	Mean	4	3.75		
Weakness: Data to	Range	4	3-4		
Determine	% Scored Proficient or Higher	100	100		
	Number	1	8		
	Mean	3	3		
Analysis	Range	3	2-4		
Allalysis	% Scored Proficient or Higher	100	75		
	Number	1	8		
	Mean	2	2.75		
Alignment	Range	2	2-4		
Allgrifficht	% Scored Proficient or Higher	0	100		
Application	Number	1	8		
	Mean	4	3.63		
	Range	4	2-4		
	% Scored Proficient or Higher	100	88		
Response to Interventions	Number	1	8		
	Mean	4	2.38		
	Range	4	1-4		
	% Scored Proficient or Higher	100	38		

2021-2022:

Data not available. The candidates were enrolled in the coursework that normally collects this data during the semesters impacted by COVID-19 and the hurricanes.

Xitracs Program Report Page 29 of 35

Criteria		Fall 2020	Spring 2021	Fall 2022	Spring 2023	Fall 2023	Spring 2024
Choice of Assessment	Number	6	5				
	Mean	3.17	3.20				
	Range	3-4	2-4				
	% Scored Proficient or Higher	100%	80%				
	Number	6	5				
	Mean	3.00	3.20				
Pre-assessment	Range	2-4	3-4				
1 16-4556551116111	% Scored Proficient or Higher	83%	100%				
	Number	6	5				
	Mean	3.33	3.20				
Post-assessment	Range	3-4	3-4				
T dot dodddinion	% Scored Proficient or Higher	100%	100%				
	Number	6	5				
	Mean	3.33	3.20				
Alignment of	Range	3-4	2-4				
Lesson Evidence	% Scored Proficient or Higher	100%	80%				
	Number	6	5				
Student Level of	Mean	3.83	3.20				
Mastery & Evaluation	Range	3-4	3-4				
of Factors	% Scored Proficient or Higher	100%	100%				
Data to Determine Patterns & Gaps	Number	6	5				
	Mean	3.50	3.60				
	Range	2-4	3-4				
	% Scored Proficient or Higher	83%	100%				
	Number	6	5				
	Mean	3.50	3.00				
Response to	Range	3-4	2-4				
Interventions	% Scored Proficient or Higher	100%	80%				

Xitracs Program Report Page 30 of 35

15.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2018-2019:

Last year data was from 412, but it was not available. In the future, we will pull from 333, 412, and student teaching. This will allow the students more opportunity to master this component.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

The benchmark has been met. Program instructions do plan to spend more time on response to intervention in the upcoming practicum course to improve the range for that element.

2021-2022:

Due to the semesters impacted by COVID and hurricanes, data was not collected for the teaching cycle on some candidates, therefore there was not data to report here.

All major assessments, including the teaching cycle, are being realigned to the 2022 Danielson Framework for Teaching Model in preparation for the Fall 2024 CAEP accreditation visit therefore a new assessment will be implemented in Fall 2022.

2022-2023:

16 Assessment and Benchmark HHP Ed Praxis PLT

Assessment: The teacher candidate demonstrates mastery of the content knowledge and skills and content pedagogy needed to teach the current academic standards as defined in BESE policy.

Benchmark: 90% of students will pass on the first attempt; 100% of students will pass this exam before student teaching.

Xitracs Program Report Page 31 of 35

16.1 Data

HHP Education - Praxis PLT #5624:

		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020
	Number	1	8		
	Mean	178	166		
	Range	178	158-175		
#5624 overall	% Pass 1st attempt	100%	63%		
	% Pass Prior to ST/Intern	100%	100%		
#5624 breakdown:	Number	1	8		
Students as Learners	Mean	16	13.8		
(20-21)	Range	16	10-18		
Instructional Process	Mean	17	13.9		
(21)	Range	17	10-19		
Assessment	Mean	13	8.8		
(14)	Range	13	7-13		
Professional	Mean	9	8.1		
Development Leadership and Community 12-(14)	Range	9	7-10		
Analysis of Instructional	Mean	12	9.3		
Scenarios (16)	Range	12	8-10		

2020-2021:

Data table is attached.

2021-2022:

Data table is attached.

2022-2023:

Files: See list of attachments to view. (Requires Adobe Reader or compatible viewer).

HPE_Praxis PLT_20-21 HPE_Praxis PLT_21-22 Xitracs Program Report Page 32 of 35

16.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2018-2019:

First time pass rates were lower than in previous semesters. The primary reason for this is that we are encouraging our students to take the exam earlier in the degree plan. The newest curriculum change will require our students to take this exam late sophomore/early jr year. We are trying to evaluate when/where PLT Praxis content should be taught to meet the needs of earlier test takers.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

The benchmark was met for k-6 and 5-9 PLT exams. PLT for 7-12 did not pass the first time. The testing environment at this time was disrupted by hurricanes. Additionally, when these students were in upper level method courses when the pandemic hit. There was a lot of missed content during this time period. Moving forward, instructors are better prepared for delivering content online.

2021-2022:

The benchmark was not met when combining those candidates who took either #5624 or #5624 for the PLT requirement, 6/9 or 67% of the candidates passed the exam on the first attempt.

PLT candidates data across secondary and P-12 programs will guide the review of secondary education coursework in preparation for the PLT exam.

2022-2023:

17 Assessment and Benchmark Enrollment, Recruitment, & Retention

Assessment: The Department is aligning with the university goal of increasing enrollment by 7% each year.

Benchmark: Department will increase enrollment by 7% each year.

17.1 Data

BS K-12 Health and Physical Education - Enrollment and Completer Data:

Academic Year	# of students officially enrolled in program with an EDUC 200 packet	# of completers in fall semester	# of completers in spring semester	Total # of completers
2018-2019	28	1	8	9
2019-2020	_	_		_
2020-2021	27	6	5	11
2021-2022	_	3	6	9
2022-2023				

Xitracs Program Report Page 33 of 35

17.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2018-2019:

Enrollment is low for completed EDUC 200 packets. There are expected to be a higher # of graduates in the upcoming academic year. Program coordinators are attending more recruiting events for the university and BCOE.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

Program coordinators are attending more recruiting events for the university and BCOE.

2021-2022:

Completer numbers slightly decreased in 2021-2022 from the previous year.

The Burton College of Education and particularly the Department of Education Professions has made intentional efforts to recruit candidates into teacher-education programs and has focused particular attention on those from diverse backgrounds and within high needs areas. In addition to traditional attendance at parish career fairs and expos, the following are part of the MSU Department of Education Professions (EDPR) Recruitment and Retention Plan: Unlock Education, Call Me MISTER, Educators Rising, and minors.

Although the efforts are strong and we are committed to recruiting candidates from diverse backgrounds, results of these efforts are not immediate as these students are juniors or seniors in high school and the data reported in the Performance Profile for education provider programs is on completers. We will track the data for program admission to monitor new students and make adjustments as needed to attract a diverse group of candidates interested in the field of education.

2022-2023:

Xitracs Program Report Page 34 of 35

Xitracs Program Report Page 35 of 35

End of report