

# **Education Professions**

Department of Education Professions

## Introduction

The Department of Education Professions and Graduate Education Programs seeks to meet the educational needs of educator candidates who are interested in becoming teachers, administrators, supervisors, and technology facilitators. The Department's mission includes providing learning opportunities, and enhancing intellectual, civic, and cultural diversity. In all of these areas, the Department of Education Professions and Graduate Education Programs is committed to excellence with a personal touch.

The unit advises and assists students with scheduling, evaluating degree plans, updating degree plans, prescription plans, and career choices. Seminars are provided twice each semester to assist students with the completion of applications to the Teacher Education Program and to discuss field experience requirements and expectations. Students are also provided a list of resources available on campus to meet individual needs.

For distance education students, support is provided through the website, e-mail communications, Moodle, Big Blue Button, and Tegrity.

Major	Summer				Fall				Spring			

	S	J	Sr	T	CMP	S	J	Sr	T	CMP	S	J	Sr	T	CMP
ECHD					0					12					16
ELEM					0					18					12
<b>Grand Total</b>					<b>0</b>					<b>30</b>					<b>28</b>

Percentage Change between 2017-2018:

Major	Fall	Total	% Change	Spring	Total	% Change
ECHD	2017			2017		
	2018			2018		
ELEM	2017			2017		
	2018			2018		
<b>Total</b>	<b>2017</b>			<b>2017</b>		
	<b>2018</b>			<b>2018</b>		

### 1.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

The benchmark was not met.

In the fall 2017, DEP faculty had several new initiatives to recruit candidates to the baccalaureate programs. Geaux Teach was held in the spring of 2018 which brought over 40 local high school students to campus to learn about McNeese and the education programs offered. DEP was represented at the Sulphur High School Career Fair in the spring 2018. Sisters of STEAM was also held in the spring of 2018 that targeted minority students and provided mentorship to potential STEAM and MSU students. The Recruitment Committee was also established in the fall of 2017 to organize opportunities for recruitment.

In the upcoming year, the recruitment committee will once again host Geaux Teach (plan to invite a larger number of students this year), attend Sulphur High School Career Day and attend at least one more similar opportunity at other area high schools, and we have requested that the Department of Education Professions be represented on billboards promoting the teaching profession.

2018-2019:

## 2 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: Increase enrollment by 5% each year, overall and in each initial, alternate teacher certification program offered by the department.

Prior to 2018-2019, the benchmark was to increase enrollment by 7% each year from fall 2017 to fall 2021 to coincide with the MSU Strategic Plan goal concerning enrollment and recruitment:

MAT - Master of Arts in Teaching

- EEDU - Elementary Education Grades 1-5, MAT
- SEDU - Secondary Education Grades 6-12, MAT (effective 201940)
  - SEAG - Agriculture (inactive effective 201940)
  - SEBI - Biology (inactive effective 201940)
  - SEBU - Business (inactive effective 201940)
  - SECH - Chemistry (inactive effective 201940)
  - SECI - Chinese (inactive effective 201940)
  - SEEG - English (inactive effective 201940)
  - SEEV - Environmental Science (inactive effective 201940)
  - SEFR - French (inactive effective 201940)
  - SELA - Latin (inactive effective 201940)
  - SEMA - Mathematics (inactive effective 201940)
  - SESS - Social Studies (inactive effective 201940)
  - SESP - Spanish (inactive effective 201940)

[illegible]

		SELA									
		SEMA									
		SESS									
		SESP									
		<b>Total</b>									
		<b>Total</b>									
PBC	IAAR	–									
	IAHP	–									
	IAMI	–									
	IAMV	–									
	IECH	–									
	IEED	–									
	IMMA	–									
	IMSC	–									
	ISAG	–									
	ISBI	–									
	ISBU	–									
	ISCH	–									
	ISEG	–									
	ISEV	–									
	ISFR	–									
	ISGS	–									
	ISMA	–									
	ISSS	–									
	ISSP	–									
	PTEE	–									
	PTBI	–									
	PTCH	–									
	PTEG	–									
	PTFR	–									
	PTGS	–									
	PTMA	–									
	PTPH	–									
	PTSS	–									
	PTSP	–									
	PTMM	–									
	PTMS	–									
	<b>Total</b>										
<b>Grand Total</b>											

Percentage Change between 2017-2018:

Degree	Major	Fall	Total	% Change	Spring	Total	% Change

MAT	EEDU	2017			2017		
		2018			2018		
	SEDU	2017			2017		
		2018			2018		
PBC	IAAR	2017			2017		
		2018			2018		
	IAHP	2017			2017		
		2018			2018		
	IAMI	2017			2017		
		2018			2018		
	IAMV	2017			2017		
		2018			2018		
	IECH	2017			2017		
		2018			2018		
	IEED	2017			2017		
		2018			2018		
	IMMA	2017			2017		
		2018			2018		
	IMSC	2017			2017		
		2018			2018		
	ISAG	2017			2017		
		2018			2018		
	ISBI	2017			2017		
		2018			2018		
	ISBU	2017			2017		
		2018			2018		
	ISCH	2017			2017		
		2018			2018		
	ISEG	2017			2017		
		2018			2018		
	ISEV	2017			2017		
		2018			2018		
	ISFR	2017			2017		
		2018			2018		
	ISGS	2017			2017		
		2018			2018		
	ISMA	2017			2017		
		2018			2018		
	ISSS	2017			2017		
		2018			2018		
	ISSP	2017			2017		
		2018			2018		

PTEE	2017			2017		
	2018			2018		
PTBI	2017			2017		
	2018			2018		
PTCH	2017			2017		
	2018			2018		
PTEG	2017			2017		
	2018			2018		
PTFR	2017			2017		
	2018			2018		
PTGS	2017			2017		
	2018			2018		
PTMA	2017			2017		
	2018			2018		
PTPH	2017			2017		
	2018			2018		
PTSS	2017			2017		
	2018			2018		
PTSP	2017			2017		
	2018			2018		
PTMM	2017			2017		
	2018			2018		
PTMS	2017			2017		
	2018			2018		
<b>Total</b>	<b>2017</b>			<b>2017</b>		
	<b>2018</b>			<b>2018</b>		

### 2.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

The benchmark was not met. Overall, the graduate education program enrollment has decreased. Faculty will be promoting programs through brochures and meetings with principals and teachers in the five-parish area. Each year a booth is set up at the Teaching 'N Technology Fair to recruit for advanced level programs. Each graduate faculty member will promote graduate level programs to current teachers and mentors and will provide documentation of at least one recruitment initiative for a graduate level program.

2018-2019:

## 3 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: Increase enrollment by 5% each year, overall and in each advanced program offered by the department.

Prior to 2018-2019, the benchmark was to increase enrollment by 7% each year from fall 2017 to fall 2021 to coincide with the MSU Strategic Plan goal concerning enrollment and recruitment.

EdS - Education Specialist

- EDLO - Educational Leadership [Online]
  - EDLR - Educational Leadership Concentration
  - EDTC - Educational Technology Concentration

GC - Graduate Certificate



- CUIN - Curriculum and Instruction
  - AGFT - Academically Gifted Education Concentration
  - ECHE - Early Childhood Education Concentration (inactive effective 201840)
  - ELED - Elementary Education Concentration (inactive effective 201940)
  - IMME - Immersion Education Concentration (inactive effective 201840)
  - READ - Reading Concentration
  - SCED - Secondary Education Concentration
  - SPCE - Special Education Concentration
- EDLE - Educational Leadership
- EDTL - Educational Technology Leadership
- SCHC - School Counseling

- INTC - Instructional Technology
- INTO - Instructional Technology [Online]

- AASL - School Librarian
- ASEE - Special Education Mild/Moderate for Elementary Education Grades 1-5
- ASES - Special Education Mild/Moderate for Secondary Education Grades 6-12 (inactive effective 201740)

[illegible]

PBC	ASEE	—								
	ASES	—								
	Total									
Grand Total										

Percentage Change between 2017-2018:

Degree	Major	Fall	Total	% Change	Spring	Total	% Change
EdS	EDLO	2017			2017		
		2018			2018		
GC	AGFT	2017			2017		
		2018			2018		
	AEDG	2017			2017		
		2018			2018		
MEd	CUIN	2017			2017		
		2018			2018		
	EDLE	2017			2017		
		2018			2018		
	EDTL	2017			2017		
		2018			2018		
	SCHC	2017			2017		
		2018			2018		
MS	INTC	2017			2017		
		2018			2018		
PBC	AASL	2017			2017		
		2018			2018		
	ASEE	2017			2017		
		2018			2018		
	ASES	2017			2017		
		2018			2018		
Total		2017			2017		
		2018			2018		

### 3.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

Enrollment data was not available for previous years, so enrollment numbers could not be compared. However, completer numbers did decrease.

In the upcoming year, the Department of Education Professions has entered into a partnership with Lake Charles College Prep and Teach for Calcasieu to assist non-certified teachers in acquiring initial certification. It is expected that the enrollment for the next academic year will show an increase due to the involvement with these partnerships.

2018-2019:

## 4 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: The EPP will maintain or exceed 2013-2014 levels of retention for all graduate education programs.

Program Type	Major	Cohort Academic Year	Accepted into program with 599 Packet	Years to Graduation				Dropped from university	State completer	Earned different degree	Still enrolled in program
				1-2	3	4	5				
MAT	ELEM	2013-2014	7	N=5 71%	N=1 14%			N=1 14%			
MAT	SEC ALL	2013-2014	15	N=10 67%		N=1 7%		N=3 20%		N=1 7%	

Program Type	Major	Cohort Academic Year	Accepted into program with 499 Packet	Years to Graduation				Dropped from university	State completer	Earned different degree	Still enrolled in program
				1-2	3	4	5				

PBC	IA**	2013-2014	7	N=4 57%				N=3 43%			
PBC	IECH	2013-2014	4	N=3 75%				N=1 25%			
PBC	IEED	2013-2014	8	N=4 50%				N=4 50%			
PBC	IS**	2013-2014	4	N=4 100%							
PBC	IM**	2013-2014	2	N=1 50%							N=1 50%

### 5.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

Data reported by IRE shows that none of the post-baccalaureate programs have maintained or exceeded their retention rates over the past three years. The average retention percentage rates were calculated as follows: AASL: 23.12%; ASEE: 61.11%; IECH: 19.75%; IEED: 38.72%; IM\*\*: 18.75%; IS\*\*: 31.46%; and IA\*\*: 50.27%.

DEP data represents the matriculation of candidates in the 2013-2014 cohort of candidates submitting the EDUC 499 packet for official enrollment into the above indicated programs. The following percentages indicate the candidates completing the program in which they were officially enrolled: IA\*\*: 57%; IECH: 75%; IEED: 50%; IS\*\*: 100%; IA\*\*: 50%.

Advisors and professors for the PBC programs need to increase contact with the candidates to ensure that they are being advised correctly and are aware of the testing requirements to progress through the program. Faculty will also assist those in danger of dropping out of the program to provide remediation, encouragement, and support to be successful.

2018-2019:

## 6 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmarks:

- A persistence rate (retained students from fall Y1 to spring Y1) of 85%.
- A retention rate of 70% from Y1 to Y2.
- A retention rate of 55% from Y1 to Y3.
- A retention rate of 45% from Y1 to Y4.
- A 4-year graduation rate of 35%.
- A 5-year graduation rate of 40%.
- A 6-year graduation rate of 45%.

Major:

- ECHD - Bachelor of Science in Early Childhood Education Grades PK-3
- ELEM - Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education Grades 1-5
- SECC - Bachelor of Science in Secondary Education and Teaching
- SECP - Bachelor of Science in Secondary Education and Teaching
- SECB - Bachelor of Science in Secondary Education and Teaching

### 6.1 Data

2012:

Major	Cohort Size*	Same Major?	Persistence Rate		Retention Rate						Graduation Rate					
					Y1 to Y2		Y1 to Y3		Y1 to Y4		4-Year		5-Year		6-Year	
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
ECHD	33*	Same	25	75.8	19	57.6	14	42.4	15	45.5	10	30.3	12	36.4	13	39.4
		Changed	5	15.2	5	15.2	8	24.2	8	24.2	7	21.2	8	24.2	8	24.2
		<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>90.9</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>72.7</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>66.7</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>69.7</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>51.5</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>60.6</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>63.6</b>
		Same	26	74.3	15	42.9	13	37.1	11	31.4	7	20.0	10	28.6	10	28.6

\*\*5 students were previously undeclared before declaring ELEM.

Major	Cohort Size	Same Major?	Persistence Rate		Retention Rate						Graduation Rate					
					Y1 to Y2		Y1 to Y3		Y1 to Y4		4-Year		5-Year		6-Year	
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
ECHD	38*	Same	33	86.8%	24	63.2	15	39.5	11	28.9						
		Changed	3	7.9	8	21.1	12	31.6	11	28.9						
		<b>Total</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>94.7</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>84.2</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>71.1</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>57.9</b>						
ELEM	24**	Same	18	75.0	9	37.5	6	25.0	4	16.7						
		Changed	6	25.0	9	37.5	10	41.7	9	37.5						
		<b>Total</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>75.0</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>66.7</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>54.2</b>						
SECB	1	Same	1	100	1	100	1	100	1	100						
		Changed	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0						
		<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100</b>						
<b>Total</b>	63	Same	52	82.5	34	54.0	22	34.9	16	25.4						
		Changed	9	14.3	17	27.0	22	34.9	20	31.7						
		<b>Total</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>96.8</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>81.0</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>69.8</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>57.1</b>						

\*\*1 student was previously undeclared before declaring ELEM.

[illegible]

Major	Cohort Size	Same Major?	Persistence Rate		Retention Rate						Graduation Rate					
					Y1 to Y2		Y1 to Y3		Y1 to Y4		4-Year		5-Year		6-Year	
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
ECHD	24	Same	18	75.0	15	62.5	13	54.2	11	45.8						
		Changed	3	12.5	3	12.5	3	12.5	3	12.5						
		<b>Total</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>87.5</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>75.0</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>66.7</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>58.3</b>						
ELEM	17	Same	8	47.1	8	47.1	9	52.9	8	47.1						
		Changed	5	29.4	4	23.5	3	17.6	4	23.5						
		<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>76.5</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>70.6</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>70.6</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>70.6</b>						
<b>Total</b>	41	Same	26	63.4	23	56.1	22	53.7	19	46.3						
		Changed	8	19.5	7	17.1	6	14.6	7	17.1						
		<b>Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>82.9</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>73.2</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>68.3</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>68.3</b>						

Major	Cohort Size	Same Major?	Persistence Rate		Retention Rate						Graduation Rate					
					Y1 to Y2		Y1 to Y3		Y1 to Y4		4-Year		5-Year		6-Year	
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
ECHD	29	Same	25	86.2	21	72.4	17	58.6								
		Changed	2	6.9	2	6.9	2	6.9								
		<b>Total</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>93.1</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>79.3</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>65.5</b>								
ELEM	18	Same	12	66.7	9	50.0	7	38.9								
		Changed	3	16.7	5	27.8	6	33.3								
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>83.3</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>77.8</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>72.2</b>								
<b>Total</b>	47	Same	37	78.7	30	63.8	24	51.1								
		Changed	5	10.6	7	14.9	8	17.0								
		<b>Total</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>89.4</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>78.7</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>68.1</b>								

[illegible]

2018:

Major	Cohort Size	Same Major?	Persistence Rate		Retention Rate						Graduation Rate					
					Y1 to Y2		Y1 to Y3		Y1 to Y4		4-Year		5-Year		6-Year	
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
ECHD	33	Same	27	81.8												
		Changed	3	9.1												
		<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>9.9</b>												
ELEM	20	Same	16	80.0												
		Changed	2	10.0												
		<b>Total</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>90.0</b>												
<b>Total</b>	53	Same	43	81.1												
		Changed	5	9.4												
		<b>Total</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>90.6</b>												

2019:

Major	Cohort Size	Same Major?	Persistence Rate		Retention Rate						Graduation Rate					
					Y1 to Y2		Y1 to Y3		Y1 to Y4		4-Year		5-Year		6-Year	
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
ECHD		Same														
		Changed														
		<b>Total</b>														
ELEM		Same														
		Changed														
		<b>Total</b>														
<b>Total</b>		Same														
		Changed														
		<b>Total</b>														

### 6.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2018-2019:

**Performance Objective 2 Provide a comprehensive curriculum that reflects disciplinary foundations and remains responsive to contemporary developments, student and workforce demand, and university needs and aspirations.**

#### 1 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: Program faculty will meet at least three times per academic year to review student progress, curricular offerings, and appropriate professional contacts and opportunities.

##### 1.1 Data

2016-2017:

Spring 2015:

Date	Meetings
February 20	CLASS consulting with CPSB
May 11	DEP Faculty Meeting - Master Plan 10:30-12:30
May 13	Master Plan 10:30-12:00

Fall 2015:

Date	Meetings
August 18	BCOE Meeting 1:00
August 19	DEP Meeting 9:00-10:00 ECE small group meeting 12:20-1:30
October 8	Turnitin Plagiarism 3:00-4:00

Spring 2016:

Date	Meetings
January 12	QEP with Dr. John Gardner 9:30-5:00
January 13	QEP 9:45-12:00 DEP Faculty meeting (General Information) 2:00-4:30
January 29	DEP Faculty Meeting (CAEP) 10:00-12:30
Feb 1, 2, 3, 4	Tara Chaumont and Laura Fontenot CLASS recertification
February 17	QEP Focus Group 12:30-2:00 CAEP Meeting 3:00-4:00
February 18	CPSB - Believe and Prepare
February 19	CPSB - Believe and Prepare
March 14	ECE advising meeting
March 17	CAEP Meeting
March 21	CPSB - Believe and Prepare (Presenters)
April 18	CAEP Meeting
May 16	DEP workshop /SPA
May 17	DEP workshop /SPA
May 26	CAEP Webinar 3:00

2017-2018:

See attached file.

2018-2019:

[DEP-GEP Assessment Plan PO2](#) [PDF 108 KB 1/28/19]

### 1.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

- Department of Education Professions is up for CAEP site visit in the Spring of 2017; therefore, faculty have been meeting in preparation.
- Early Childhood Faculty recertified in "CLASS", which is a Classroom Assessment Scoring System, utilized in Head-Start and Pre-Kindergarten classrooms. Certification enables faculty to work directly with district cohorts.
- Program faculty meets at regular intervals throughout the year to discuss advising methods and program implementation.
- Program Faculty will continue to collaborate with local districts to strengthen our program and prepare our teacher candidates to fully meet district needs.



2017-2018:

The benchmark was met for the baccalaureate, post-baccalaureate, and MAT programs.

There was a heavy emphasis on the undergraduate programs because of the redesign requirements from the state. In the fall 2018, the Master of Arts in Teaching programs will be revised to address the state requirements of teacher residency. In addition, graduate faculty will meet at least three times to revisit the content, sequences, and competencies in the programs to meet CAEP advanced standard program requirements. Graduate faculty will also need to meet to increase research within their graduate courses.

2018-2019:

### **Performance Objective 3 Faculty will engage in campus, community, and scholarly activities on behalf of the University.**

#### **1 Assessment and Benchmark**

Benchmark: At least 53% of the Department of Education Professions and Graduate Education Programs full-time faculty will be active in the research and development of grants to procure monies for educational, cultural, or technological endeavors.

##### **1.1 Data**

Academic Year	DEP faculty members that were active in grant writing	
	%	#
2013-2014	56%	
2014-2015	53%	
2015-2016	33%	
2016-2017	50%	8/16
2017-2018	56%	9/16
2018-2019		

[DEP-GEP Assessment Plan PO3](#) [PDF 47 KB 1/28/19]

##### **1.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement**

2015-2016:

Goal was not met. There was a decrease in the number of faculty members participating in grant writing last year, from 53% to 33%. Grant opportunities will be promoted more prominently and encouraged as we move forward. Due to a loss of five faculty members for 2015-2016 and hiring only one replacement, professors' course loads and professional responsibilities have increased which may have had an effect on the amount of time available for grant writing activities.

2016-2017:

The benchmark of 40% was met and surpassed by 10%. There was an increase in the number of faculty members participating in grant writing in 2016-2017 by 27%. With the hiring of three new professors for 2017-2018, the expectation is to exceed 53%.

2017-2018:

There has been a consistent increase over the last three years in grant funding. The department will continue to seek opportunities for additional revenues to support programs, recruitment, and research outside of the university. The department would like to see at least one submitted grant for a non-university funded grant. In addition, those who have not previously sought grant funding will collaborate with those who have in an effort to increase revenue.

2018-2019:

#### **2 Assessment and Benchmark**

Benchmark: At least 70% of Department of Education Professions and Graduate Education Programs full-time faculty will work collaboratively with local/regional school districts, community agencies, and university entities.

##### **2.1 Data**

Academic Year	DEP faculty members were involved in collaborative activities with local/ regional K-12 schools, community agencies, and/or university entities	
	%	#
2013-2014	88%	
2014-2015	94%	
2015-2016	84%	
2016-2017	75%	12/16
2017-2018	88%	14/16
2018-2019		

### 2.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:

Faculty members decreased their collaborative presence in the community from 94% to 84%. This is still above the goal of 70%. Due to a loss of five faculty members for 2015-2016, and hiring only one replacement, professors' course loads and professional responsibilities have increased which may have had an effect on the number of professors available to reach out to the community.

2016-2017:

Faculty members decreased their collaborative presence in the community from 79% to 75% from the previous year. This is still above the benchmark of 70%. With the added responsibilities for some faculty, graduate assistants helped with classroom observations/evaluations. With the addition of three new faculty members the percentage will increase. All new professors will be required to be involved in collaborative activities with the schools and community agencies.

2017-2018:

Because this benchmark has been consistently met, in the fall 2018 the department of education professions faculty will meet twice to share their collaborative experiences with the intended outcome of course enrichment and awareness. By knowing the types and purposes of collaborations in each other's courses, collaborations can be expanded, extended, and/or revised. The benchmark will be raised to 80% for 2018-2019.

2018-2019:

## 3 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: At least 75% of the Department of Education Professions and Graduate Education Programs full-time faculty members are expected to make presentations at local, state and/or national conferences to promote awareness of the programs and University.

### 3.1 Data

Academic Year	DEP full-time faculty presented at local, state and/or national conferences	
	%	#
2013-2014	75%	
2014-2015	71%	
2015-2016	75%	
2016-2017	67%	10/15
2017-2018	88%	14/16
2018-2019		

### 3.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:

The goal of 75% was met. Professors will continue to be encouraged to seek out opportunities to present at conferences and workshops.

2016-2017:

Not met. The goal of 75% was not met; down 8%.

During 2016-2017, many faculty were involved in chairing and serving on committees for CAEP & SPA reviews. With the resignation of the Assessment Coordinator at the beginning of the fall 2016 semester, several faculty had to begin the arduous task of compiling and verifying data for a spring CAEP Self-Study.

Professors will continue to be encouraged to seek out opportunities to present at conferences and workshops.

2017-2018:

There was an increase in the number of faculty involved in presentations over the past year with a number of the presentations being at the local level. In the upcoming year, the benchmark will be strengthened by an additional goal to have 10% or more of the presentations at the state level or beyond. Faculty members are encouraged to collaborate on projects to create opportunities to present for larger audiences.

2018-2019:

#### 4 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: At least 40% of the Department of Education Professions and Graduate Education Programs full-time faculty will submit articles to nationally recognized journals and/or textbooks.

##### 4.1 Data

Academic Year	% of faculty members successful in submitting publications to nationally recognized journals and/or textbooks
2013-2014	38%
2014-2015	38%
2015-2016	42%
2016-2017	47%
2017-2018	44%
2018-2019	

##### 4.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:

Goal was met, faculty will continue to be encouraged to work independently, as well as collaboratively, in joint research and publications.

2016-2017:

Faculty will continue to be encouraged to work independently, as well as collaboratively, in joint research and publications.

2017-2018:

The department has met the benchmark for the past three years. For the 2018-2019 academic year, the benchmark will be increased to meet or exceed 47%.

2018-2019:

#### Performance Objective 4 Demonstrate excellence in professional responsibilities to include teaching and advising.

##### 1 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: 100% of the Department of Education Professions and Graduate Education Programs full-time faculty members

are expected to demonstrate excellence in teaching by scoring above the university average on the combined spring/fall Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) report (all questions).

### 1.1 Data

Academic Year	DEP full-time faculty rated higher than the university average on the combined SEI "all questions" report		University average	DEP faculty average
	%	#		
2013-2014	56%		4.53	4.50
2014-2015	82%		4.52	4.49
2015-2016	75%		4.50	4.58
2016-2017	63%	10/16	4.46	4.48
2017-2018	76%	13/17	4.47	4.61
2018-2019				

#### 1.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:

Goal not met. Although there was a 7% decrease in the number of DEP full-time faculty members that rated higher than the university average on the SEI report, the departmental average was above the university average score. Of the five continuing faculty members who were below the university average in 2014-2015, four of those professors rose above the university average in 2015-2016. Professors will continue to be counseled and made aware of ways to improve in upcoming semesters.

2016-2017:

Not met. For the second consecutive year the DEP faculty has not met the benchmark. There was a 12% decrease from the 2016 calendar year.

As a department, 12 of the 16 professors were at or above the university average of 4.46. Data also shows the six professors below the university average were all within 0.42 and on professor increase scores from previous calendar year by 0.24. Two professors had significant drops in scores from the 2015 calendar year. The two professors with significant decreases will be counseled at the beginning of the fall semester and made aware of ways to improve in upcoming semesters, including a personal plan to raise their SEI scores.

Another interesting fact from reviewing the data was that only two of the 16 teaching faculty actually increased their SEI average, 14 of 16 decreased from previous calendar year. The reason for this could be the workload of the faculty.

2017-2018:

76% of the faculty rated higher than the University average on the SEI. The Departmental combined average increased by .15 for the 2017 year. Overall, eight of 13 professors increased their SEI scores (average increase was .17, range .02 to .71). Five of the 13 professors had a decrease in score (average decrease was .13, range -2.6 to -.02). Overall the departmental combined average remained constant (.01 increase) from the previous year. For the two professors who had significant decreases from 2015-2016, one of them increased SEIs for 2017 by .25 and the other was not a part of the faculty for 2017-2018.

The DEP will discuss the outcome of these scores at the first faculty meeting and will brain storm ways to improve teaching in the classroom that will reflect on the SEI scores. The department chair will also discuss SEIs with each faculty member during their checkout at the end of the year to determine future plans of action and support for those in need.

2018-2019:

## 2 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: The Department of Education Professions and Graduate Education Programs full-time faculty are expected to

have a 4.0 average advising score on the 5-point scale on their Annual Performance Review (APR).

## 2.1 Data

Academic Year	Average department score on advising
2013-2014	4.06
2014-2015	4.12
2015-2016	4.16
2016-2017	3.67
2017-2018	4.25
2018-2019	

### 2.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:

There was a .04 increase from the previous year. Faculty members will continue to be accountable for their advisees and the dissemination of the correct information given to them. Individual and group meetings will continue to assist with advising.

2016-2017:

Not met. There was a 0.49 decrease from the previous year and the benchmark of 4.0 was not met.

At the beginning of the 2017-2018 academic year, the faculty will review and discuss criteria for evaluating advising. Faculty members will continue to be accountable for their advisees and the dissemination of the correct information given to them. Individual program faculty meetings will continue specifically related to advising to assist with dissemination of accurate information. The expectation of excellence in advising will be stressed.

As a department the faculty is required to be on campus a minimum of four days a week with two consecutive hours a day for office hours.

2017-2018:

In January of 2018, a faculty meeting was held discussing the advising component of APR. This will be addressed again in the fall of 2018 with particular emphasis on how the advising number is determined.

2018-2019:

## 3 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: The Department of Education Professions and Graduate Education Programs will participate in technology training and collaborations, as well as integrate technology into classroom instruction and assignments.

Previous Benchmark:

1. Encourage faculty participation in technology training.
2. Post-semester faculty survey of technology integration in classroom instruction.
3. Encourage student use of technology in their coursework.
4. Instructors develop assignments that require the integration of the Promethean technology.
5. Develop a way of sharing ideas about integrating technology.

### 3.1 Data

2016-2017:

- In order to encourage faculty participation, technology workshops have been offered during faculty meetings. These workshops include but are not limited to Promethean Board use, digital resource application and access, and ActivTable integration.
- All faculty members incorporate instructor modeling of Promethean Board application within at least, but not limited to, one major project within each course. As a result of instituting this element within the course, each student is required to prepare a Promethean project using the techniques presented during the lesson and/or instructional content. This required project is documented in the syllabus of every instructor's course.
- In addition, a Moodle course was constructed titled, "Adventures in Technology". All faculty members within our

department have access to this Moodle course which acts as a depository of reflections upon Promethean Board project success stories and guiding tips for instruction.

- Instructors have designed and incorporated Technology integrated assignments as evidenced by the syllabus.

2017-2018:

Faculty have been required to document in each course syllabus the use of technology with the teacher candidates. Beginning in the fall of 2018, each faculty member will provide an example of technology use at departmental checkout each semester. Each professor over the course of fall and spring semesters will be assigned to a faculty meeting to present technology they are using in the classroom. With faculty input, a rubric will be created to assess the impact of technology use in the courses which will be available by fall 2019.

2018-2019:

### 3.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

- Our department is blossoming in terms of technology use and heightened access for faculty and students. The courses have moved from roughly 75% instructor participation in 21<sup>st</sup> century instructional presentation methods to a full 100%. Each member of the faculty has added at least one instructor modeled as well as student developed Promethean project to each course and is documented within the instructor's syllabus and documented in the graded material of the student.
- Students have access to Promethean Boards, computers, and Activtable in the Farrar lab. This highly accessible lab gives students a rich environment for creating assigned projects. As a result of this heightened access and rich resource lab, the students can easily begin to build learning communities based upon their individual needs.
- The faculty meetings that are set aside for a protected time for technology workshops have greatly increased the faculty's technology knowledge base in at least three ways. Our faculty has become more knowledgeable in terms of Promethean Board features and use, instructional delivery and application within lessons, and digital resources. Our faculty is becoming a technology learning community as we continue to share our "adventures" when we post to the Moodle course, "Adventures in Technology."

2017-2018:

A rubric will be created to assess the impact of technology use in the courses. This data will be collected beginning in 2019-2020.

2018-2019:

## 4 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: At least 90% of all course sections will be taught by regular full-time Department of Education Professions and Graduate Education Programs faculty.

### 4.1 Data

Academic Year	Total course sections	Course sections taught by FT faculty		Course sections taught by PT/V faculty	
	#	#	%	#	%
2013-2014	259	231	89.20%	28	10.80%
2014-2015	262	234	89.31%	28	10.60%
2015-2016	216	188	87%	28	13%
2016-2017	219	181	83%	38	17%
2017-2018	254	207	82%	47	19%
2018-2019					

### 4.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:

- Goal was not met, the number of course sections taught by full time faculty members decreased which resulted in a lower percentage for the same amount of courses being taught by visiting lecturers.

- Only one full-time professor was hired for the 2015-2016 academic year to replace the five full-time faculty members lost from the Department of Education Professions since the 2014-2015 academic year.

2016-2017:

Not met. The number of course sections taught by full-time faculty members decreased by 4% and course sections increased by 0.9%. For the second year one additional faculty member was replaced; however, two more faculty left the university and a third faculty member took medical leave for the spring of 2017.

2017-2018:

The benchmark was not met. 2017-2018 had the highest percentage of visiting lecturers over the past five years. During 2017-2018, one of our specialty area professors was out on medical leave and an additional 35 course sections were added from the previous year. The department will be adding one full-time instructor for 2018-2019 and the professor out on medical leave will be returning. This should assist in lowering the necessary number of visiting lecturers.

2018-2019: