MCNEESE. STATE UNIVERSITY

History [HIST]

Cycles included in this report:
Jun 1, 2018 to May 31, 2019

Program Name: History [HIST]

Reporting Cycle: Jun 1, 2018 to May 31, 2019

1 Is this program offered via Distance Learning? [Approved]

100% Distance and Traditional

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

No

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

2016-2017:
Nine of 11 history graduates rated the department 3.00 or higher on instructors' use of technology in the department's exit interview (spring 2017). The department has been working to ensure that all of our classrooms have usable technology resources in order to hopefully bring our scores and student satisfaction in this area up even more.

2017-2018:
Due to students struggling to meet the benchmark regarding presenting their work in a professional setting, the capstone course was schedule for fall only for the coming academic year, in order to facilitate them presenting their completed research in the spring at the annual meeting of the Louisiana Historical Association.

2018-2019:
Two history students presented papers in the spring at the annual meeting of the Louisiana Historical Association, based on their research from the history capstone course in the fall. After this benchmark was missed last year, moving the capstone course to the fall meant that students from that course had papers ready to present at the conference. This supports the QEP initiative's emphasis on student professional development.

4 Program Highlights from the Reporting Year

2016-2017:
Department faculty members published two books and were awarded three grants/fellowships in 2016. The number of students inducted into the Phi Alpha Theta history honor society (seven) was again strong.

2017-2018:
The department succeeded in gaining state approval for a new online concentration of the General History BA program, to begin in the 2018-2019 academic year.

2018-2019:
The online history BA also went into effect, and the History BA with concentration in Social Studies Education was thoroughly redesigned, with the new student teaching year in particular intended to better prepare graduates for the classroom.

Department faculty published 11 tier-2 publications (articles or book chapters) and presented 12 conference papers, so scholarly output was very strong.

5 Program Mission

The purpose of the Bachelor of Arts in History is to provide our graduates with knowledge of significant past events and values, to train them in historical methodologies, to encourage critical thinking, and to give them practice in research and writing. The knowledge and skills our graduates learn will enable them to become informed, responsible citizens.

6 Institutional Mission Reference

McNeese State University is primarily a teaching institution whose mission is successful education of the undergraduate students and services to the employers and communities in its region. McNeese uses a traditional admission process based on courses completed, GPA, and standardized test scores.

The purpose of the Bachelor of Arts in History is to provide our graduates with knowledge of significant past events and values, to train them in historical methodologies, to encourage critical thinking, and to give them practice in research and writing, and to enable them to become informed and responsible citizens.

7 Assessment and Benchmark Gen Ed Critical Thinking Assignment

Assessment: Assignments administered in HIST 101, 102, 201, and 202.

Benchmark: At least 70% of students in survey courses will achieve a score of 70% or better on embedded critical thinking assignments.

Prior to 2017-2018, the benchmark was students in general education survey courses will on average score 70% or better on a critical thinking assignment in order to demonstrate proficiency in that skill.

Prior to 2015-2016, scores for pre-test and post-test were assessed, with a benchmark of 10% improvement.

Course Links

HIST101 [European History to 1648 (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

HIST102 [European History since 1648 (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

HIST201 [American History to 1877 (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

HIST202 [American History since 1877 (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

Outcome Links

Critical Thinking [Program]
Graduates will think critically about the people and events of the past.

Historical Changes and Trends [Program]
Graduates will analyze significant historical changes and trends over time to make sound judgments in academic and professional environments.

7.1 Data

Course	2013-2014			2014-2015		
	Pre- and post-test averages	% improvement	Benchmark met?	Pre- and post-test averages	% improvement	Benchmark met?
HIST 101	83 to 85	2%	No	83.8 to 86	2.2%	No
HIST 102	71 to 81	10%	Yes	71 to 76	5%	No
HIST 201	75 to 80	5%	No	66.7 to 71.9	5.2%	No
HIST 202	77 to 82	5%	No	73.5 to 79.7	6.2%	No

Course	2015-2016		2016-2017		2017-2018	
	# of sections	Benchmark met?	# of sections	Benchmark met?	# of sections	Benchmark met?
HIST 101	3/3	Yes	6/6	Yes	6/6	Yes
HIST 102	2/2	Yes	4/4	Yes	4/4	Yes
HIST 201	10/12	No	22/23	No	22/24	No
HIST 202	13/13	Yes	18/21	No	22/22	Yes

2018-2019:

Course	Face-to-Face Sections			Online Sections		
	# of sections	%	Benchmark met?	# of sections	%	Benchmark met?
HIST 101	4/4	100%	Yes	2/2	100%	Yes
HIST 102	5/5	100%	Yes	1/1	100%	Yes
HIST 201	24/24	100%	Yes	6/6	100%	Yes
HIST 202	19/20	95%	No	5/5	100%	Yes

2019-2020:

Course	Students scoring 70% or higher					
	Face-to-Face Sections			Online Sections		
	# of students	% of students	Benchmark met?	# of students	% of students	Benchmark met?
HIST 101						
HIST 102						
HIST 201						
HIST 202						

Course Links

HIST101 [European History to 1648 (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

HIST102 [European History since 1648 (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

HIST201 [American History to 1877 (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

HIST202 [American History since 1877 (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

Outcome Links

Critical Thinking [Program]
Graduates will think critically about the people and events of the past.

Historical Changes and Trends [Program]
Graduates will analyze significant historical changes and trends over time to make sound judgments in academic and professional environments.

7.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:
The department head changed in 2015; therefore, assessment data was reported for that year, but a newly modified assessment and benchmark were created effective 2015-2016.

2016-2017:
Though not every section met the benchmark, overall the results in almost every section well exceeded the 70% threshold, and the few that missed did so by small margins.

Because this recent assessment did not provide specific-enough information about student achievement, average scores in these sections will be reported and the benchmark will be revised to state, "At least 70% of students in survey courses will achieve a score of 70% or better on embedded critical thinking assignments". Also, information was not previously disaggregated by major, but will be moving forward.

2017-2018:
Four of these sections were distance learning/CALL program courses, all of which met the benchmark.

Only two sections of HIST 201, with the same instructor, did not meet the benchmark (and only

narrowly, with averages of 66 and 69 in those two sections). Will meet with that instructor to discuss strategies for improving student performances.

2018-2019:
The data is now disaggregated by online and face-to-face sections. Online history courses performed as well or better than their in-person counterparts.

Data is not available to measure the results of this assessment by student rather than by course section. Also this is the last year history general education courses will assess critical thinking as a student learning outcome, so changing this assessment this year is not likely to lead to significant program improvement.

All sections except one in-person 202 course met the benchmark. That section scored a 68%, so missed the benchmark by 2%. That instructor will be encouraged to improve results.

Course Links

HIST101 [European History to 1648 (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

HIST102 [European History since 1648 (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

HIST201 [American History to 1877 (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

HIST202 [American History since 1877 (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

Outcome Links

Critical Thinking [Program]
Graduates will think critically about the people and events of the past.

Historical Changes and Trends [Program]
Graduates will analyze significant historical changes and trends over time to make sound judgments in academic and professional environments.

8 Assessment and Benchmark Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI)

Assessment: Student Evaluation of Instruction.

Benchmark: The mean average of students completing the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) in history courses, where the scale is 1.00 to 5.00 and 5.00 is "excellent," will rate their instructor at 4.50 or above on Item #7, which reads: "The instructor requires students to think critically about the people and events of the past."

Prior to 2016-2017, the benchmark was an average score of 4.00 or higher.

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

Department of History SEI

Outcome Links

Critical Thinking [Program]
Graduates will think critically about the people and events of the past.

Historical Changes and Trends [Program]
Graduates will analyze significant historical changes and trends over time to make sound judgments in academic and professional environments.

8.1 Data

Item #7:

Academic Year	Average	Benchmark met?
2014-2015	4.57	Yes
2015-2016	4.52	Yes
2016-2017	4.57	Yes
2017-2018	4.58	Yes

2018-2019	4.55	Yes

Outcome Links

Critical Thinking [Program]
Graduates will think critically about the people and events of the past.

8.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:
This assessment was added in 2014-2015; however, because the benchmark of a 4.00 average has been consistently met, the department will increase the benchmark to 4.50.

2016-2017:
The new, higher benchmark was met and exceeded.

2017-2018.:
The newer benchmark was again met and exceeded, with very slightly improved results.

2018-2019:
The higher benchmark was again met. The department's general education courses are in the process of being redesigned, with new student learning objectives and assessments, which it is hoped will have a beneficial result on outcomes.

Outcome Links

Critical Thinking [Program]
Graduates will think critically about the people and events of the past.

9 Assessment and Benchmark History Department Exit Survey

Assessment: History Department Exit Survey.

Benchmark: 75% of history graduates on the History Department Exit Survey, where the scale is 1.00 to 4.00 and 4.00 is "Excellent," will rate the department at a 3.00 or higher on the question which asks if they gained an appreciation for elements of diversity within the world and within societies.

Outcome Links

Historical Changes and Trends [Program]
Graduates will analyze significant historical changes and trends over time to make sound judgments in academic and professional environments.

9.1 Data

Academic Year	Average	Benchmark met?
2014-2015	100%	Yes
2015-2016	87.5%	Yes
2016-2017	100%	Yes
2017-2018	100%	Yes

Academic Year	Students rating 3.00 or higher		Benchmark met?
	#	%	
2018-2019	13/13	100%	Yes
2019-2020			

Outcome Links

Historical Changes and Trends [Program]

Graduates will analyze significant historical changes and trends over time to make sound judgments in academic and professional environments.

9.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:
Maintain benchmark until summer 2017 when the department will have three continuous years of data on this new assessment and determine how to modify.

2016-2017:
The benchmark was met again, and seems appropriate to maintain. Continue to track.

2017-2018:
The benchmark was again met and program graduates express strong satisfaction with the program in this area.

2018-2019:
Benchmark met. The department this year added a new faculty member who is a specialist in Asian history and created four new upper-level courses on Asian history. It is intended that this updated curriculum will increase students' appreciation for diversity and understanding of global issues.

Outcome Links

Historical Changes and Trends [Program]
Graduates will analyze significant historical changes and trends over time to make sound judgments in academic and professional environments.

10 Assessment and Benchmark HIST 300 Research Project/Presentation

Assessment: HIST 300 research project and presentation.

Benchmark 1: 70% of students in HIST 300 will successfully complete a research exercise in which they cite historical sources and critically analyze historical documents.

Benchmark 2: 70% of students in HIST 300 will earn a grade of C or better on an oral presentation of their research project to the class.

Course Links

HIST300 [Introduction to Research and Writing (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

Outcome Links

Historical Changes and Trends [Program]
Graduates will analyze significant historical changes and trends over time to make sound judgments in academic and professional environments.

Historical Research [Program]
Graduates will conduct historical research, which includes familiarity with scholarly secondary source literature and analysis of primary sources, placing them within the larger historical and historiographic contexts.

10.1 Data

Semester	Pass Rate		Benchmark met?
	#	%	
Spring 2016	—	75%	Yes
Spring 2017	—	100%	Yes
Fall 2017	9/10	90%	Yes
Spring 2018	5/7	71%	Yes
Fall 2018	8/8	100%	Yes
Spring 2019	13/13	100%	Yes

Semester	Pass Rate					
	Face-to-Face Sections			Online Sections		
	# of students	% of students	Benchmark met?	# of students	% of students	Benchmark met?
Fall 2019						
Spring 2020						

Course Links

HIST300 [Introduction to Research and Writing (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

Outcome Links

Historical Changes and Trends [Program]
Graduates will analyze significant historical changes and trends over time to make sound judgments in academic and professional environments.

10.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:
This assignment was moved to HIST 300 in 2015-2016, so the department will maintain the benchmark until three years of data have been gathered and determine how to modify the benchmark at that time.

2016-2017:
New course instructor assigned to HIST 300 for 2017-2018, and rotation of faculty teaching the course is now planned to best serve students in the major. Also, information was not previously disaggregated by major, but will be moving forward.

2017-2018:
History majors in HIST 300 met the benchmark, which it seems appropriate to maintain.

2018-2019:
The benchmark was met, History majors continue to perform well on this metric, a key assessment regarding their professional development.
At the departmental faculty meeting in the fall the instructors for HIST 300 and 410 discussed how best to coordinate the departmental methods courses and how to best assess these outcomes going forward. Scheduling and faculty rotation of the methods courses were also discussed.
Though the online History BA is now in effect, none of the online majors have reached the midpoint stage in the program, so their data is not yet available for this assessment, but in the future will be disaggregated.

Course Links

HIST300 [Introduction to Research and Writing (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

Outcome Links

Historical Changes and Trends [Program]
Graduates will analyze significant historical changes and trends over time to make sound judgments in academic and professional environments.

10.2 Data

Semester	Pass Rate		Benchmark met?
	#	%	
Spring 2016	—	100%	Yes
Spring 2017	—	100%	Yes
Fall 2017	9/10	90%	Yes

Spring 2018	6/7	86%	Yes
Fall 2018	7/8	87.5%	Yes
Spring 2019	12/13	92.3%	Yes

Semester	Pass Rate					
	Face-to-Face Sections			Online Sections		
	# of students	% of students	Benchmark met?	# of students	% of students	Benchmark met?
Fall 2019						
Spring 2020						

Course Links

HIST300 [Introduction to Research and Writing (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

Outcome Links

Historical Research [Program]
Graduates will conduct historical research, which includes familiarity with scholarly secondary source literature and analysis of primary sources, placing them within the larger historical and historiographic contexts.

10.2.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:
Benchmark met. Success rate is high, but this is traditionally a rigorous course with comparatively high attrition, so it makes sense that the students who remain and complete the course successfully would do well on the assignment.

2016-2017:
New course instructor assigned to HIST 300 for 2017-2018, and rotation of faculty teaching the course is now planned to best serve students in the major. Also, information was not previously disaggregated by major, but will be moving forward.

2017-2018:
History majors in HIST 300 met the benchmark for the oral presentation assignment. It seems appropriate to maintain the benchmark at the current level.

2018-2019:
History majors met the benchmark for the oral presentation assessment, a key element in their professional development. In the future once students in the online BA meet the mid-point of the program and have data available for this assessment, it will be disaggregated.

Course Links

HIST300 [Introduction to Research and Writing (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

Outcome Links

Historical Research [Program]
Graduates will conduct historical research, which includes familiarity with scholarly secondary source literature and analysis of primary sources, placing them within the larger historical and historiographic contexts.

11 Assessment and Benchmark HIST 410 Research Project/Presentation

Assessment: HIST 410 research project and presentation for General History Concentration students.

Benchmark 1: 75% of students in HIST 410, where students must write a lengthy history research paper, will earn a grade of C or better.

Benchmark 2: 75% of students in HIST 410, where students must present their findings orally, will earn a grade of C or better.

Prior to 2018-2019, the benchmarks were 70% of students.

HIST410 [Research Seminar in History (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

Historical Research [Program]
Graduates will conduct historical research, which includes familiarity with scholarly secondary source literature and analysis of primary sources, placing them within the larger historical and historiographic contexts.

11.1 Data

Academic Year	Pass Rate #	Pass Rate %	Benchmark met?
2014-2015	8/10	80%	Yes
2015-2016	3/3	100%	Yes
2016-2017	10/10	100%	Yes
2017-2018	2/2	100%	Yes
2018-2019	13/13	100%	Yes

Semester	Pass Rate					
	Face-to-Face Sections			Online Sections		
	# of students	% of students	Benchmark met?	# of students	% of students	Benchmark met?
Fall 2019						
Spring 2020						

HIST410 [Research Seminar in History (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

Historical Research [Program]
Graduates will conduct historical research, which includes familiarity with scholarly secondary source literature and analysis of primary sources, placing them within the larger historical and historiographic contexts.

11.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:
Benchmark met. The department is considering starting in 2017-2018, only offering the capstone once per year to ensure a larger cohort and better scheduling efficiency. Also, information was not previously disaggregated by major, but will be moving forward.

2017-2018:
General History majors in HIST 410 met and exceeded the benchmark. Department faculty have agreed to raise the benchmark to 75% for future semesters.

2018-2019:
History majors met the higher benchmark. In the future once data is available for students in the online BA for this metric, it will be disaggregated.

At the departmental faculty meeting in the fall the instructors for HIST 300 and 410 discussed

how best to coordinate the departmental methods courses and how to best assess these outcomes going forward.

HIST410 [Research Seminar in History (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

Historical Research [Program]
Graduates will conduct historical research, which includes familiarity with scholarly secondary source literature and analysis of primary sources, placing them within the larger historical and historiographic contexts.

11.2 Data

Academic Year	Pass Rate		Benchmark met?
	#	%	
2014-2015	7/10	70%	Yes
2015-2016	3/3	100%	Yes
2016-2017	10/10	100%	Yes
2017-2018	2/2	100%	Yes
2018-2019	13/13	100%	Yes

Semester	Pass Rate					
	Face-to-Face Sections			Online Sections		
	# of students	% of students	Benchmark met?	# of students	% of students	Benchmark met?
Fall 2019						
Spring 2020						

HIST410 [Research Seminar in History (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

Historical Research [Program]
Graduates will conduct historical research, which includes familiarity with scholarly secondary source literature and analysis of primary sources, placing them within the larger historical and historiographic contexts.

11.2.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:
Benchmark met. The department is considering starting in 2017-2018 only offering the capstone once per year to ensure a larger cohort and better scheduling efficiency. Also, information was not previously disaggregated by major, but will be moving forward.

2017-2018:
General History majors in HIST 410 met and exceeded the benchmark. Department faculty agreed to raise the benchmark to 75% for future semesters.

2018-2019:
The higher benchmark was met. In the future when data is available students in the new online history BA program, none of whom have yet reached the capstone course, their data will be disaggregated.

HIST410 [Research Seminar in History (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

Historical Research [Program]
Graduates will conduct historical research, which includes familiarity with scholarly secondary source
literature and analysis of primary sources, placing them within the larger historical and historiographic
contexts.

12 Assessment and Benchmark Enrollment and Completers

Assessment: Enrollment numbers are based on candidates currently enrolled in the program who
have submitted an EDUC 200 packet.

Benchmark: The EPP has set a goal to increase enrollment by 7% across programs each year
from fall 2017 to fall 2021 to coincide with the MSU Strategic Plan goal concerning enrollment and
recruitment.

EDUC200 [Entrance into Teacher Education (Cr. 0)]

12.1 Data

Social Studies 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
2013-2014	20	—	—	7
2014-2015	23	—	—	6
2015-2016	17	—	—	5
2016-2017	23	—	—	2
2017-2018	11	2	1	3
2018-2019	17	3	2	5

EDUC200 [Entrance into Teacher Education (Cr. 0)]

12.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:
Enrollment dropped in 2014-2015, then exceeded the benchmark in 2015-2016. Overall
program enrollment dropped slightly in 2016-2017, but number of completers continued to
rise.

2017-2018:
Analysis of Data: Enrollment numbers continue to drop. The 2017-2018 numbers have
decreased by 50% from the previous year.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The Department of Education Professions has created a
Recruitment Committee to assist all programs in achieving the enrollment goals set. Geaux
Teach is also a recruiting effort that brings high school students onto campus and provides
information about the education programs.

2018-2019:
Analysis of Data:
There was a 55% increase in enrollment from 2017-2018 and a 66% increase in the number
of completers. Official enrollment is still 26% down from the highest enrollment (n=23) over
the past five years.
Plan for Continuous Improvement:
The goal for 2019-2020 will be to again achieve a minimum of 7% increase in the number of
candidates enrolled in the social studies education program.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:
1) Education faculty will visit at least two high schools with diverse populations to recruit candidates for the program.
2) Social Studies education faculty will attend Geaux Teach: Unlock Education event in January 2020 to provide information to potential high school candidates as part of recruiting efforts.
3) Faculty will participate in calling potential candidates who are interested in McNeese but have not yet registered to encourage them to complete the application process.
4) Advisors will encourage candidates to follow the redesigned program sequence, take Praxis exams in a timely manner, and apply for official admission into the prior to the third semester of the program.

Secondary education faculty, along with social studies education faculty, through participation in the Noel Levitz Recruiting Initiative, will contact students who have inquired or applied to McNeese to enroll in education or who are undecided about a major as an attempt to bring in more candidates.
Enrollment numbers are up from the previous year. The Social Studies Education program was redesigned this year, now with a year-long student teaching component, and a new eight-semester education course sequence, which it is hoped will result in more program candidates and completers.

Course Links

EDUC200 [Entrance into Teacher Education (Cr. 0)]

13 **Assessment and Benchmark** History Praxis

Assessment: Social Studies Praxis Content Exam.
The Social Studies Education, Grades 6-12 Praxis Content Exam is #5086. This exam must be passed prior to student teaching. The passing score required by the state for 2017-2018 is 160.

Benchmark: 80% of Social Studies Education majors will achieve a passing score on the Praxis Social Studies Education Exam (#5086) on the first attempt.

Prior to 2017-2018, the benchmark was 100% of students will pass the Social Studies content and interpretation Praxis prior to student teaching.

13.1 **Data**

Social Studies Education - Praxis Content #5086:

		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
#5086 overall	Number	5	1	2	2	2	1
	Mean	167	162	163	166	164.5	161
	Range	160-175	162	160-166	160-172	162-167	161
	% Pass 1st attempt	20%	100%	50%	50%	0%	0%
#5086 breakdown:	Number	4	1	2	2	2	1
United States History	Mean	13	11	11	14	12	13
	Range	8-15	11	10-11	14	12	13
	% correct (18)	72%	61%	61%	78%	67%	72%
World History	Mean	13	14	15	13	13.5	15
	Range	11-16	14	15	13	13-14	15
	% correct (18)	72%	78%	83%	72%	75%	83%

		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
Government/Civics	Mean	13	13	12	14	12.5	14
	Range	11-14	13	10-14	11-16	12-13	14
	% correct (18)	72%	72%	67%	78%	69%	78%
Economics	Mean					10	6
	Range					9-11	6
	% correct (13)					77%	46%
Geography	Mean	9	12	8	9	10	11
	Range	8-10	12	8	7-10	10	11
	% correct (13)	69%	92%	62%	69%	77%	85%
Behavioral Sciences	Mean	6	7	7	5	7	5
	Range	5-8	7	5-9	4-6	6-8	5
	% correct (10)	60%	70%	70%	50%	70%	50%
Short Content Essays	Mean					9	8
	Range					8-10	8
	% correct (18)					50%	44%

		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
#5086 overall	Number	3	2				
	Mean	161	169.5				
	Range	161-162	167-172				
	% Pass 1st attempt	0%	50%				
#5086 breakdown:	Number	3	2				
United States History	Mean	13	15				
	Range	12-14	15				
	% correct (18)	72%	83%				
World History	Mean	12.7	13				
	Range	11-14	12-14				
	% correct (18)	70%	72%				
Government/Civics	Mean	13.3	13				
	Range	12-15	12-14				
	% correct (18)	74%	72%				
Economics	Mean	8.7	8.5				
	Range	8-10	7-10				
	% correct (13)	67%	65%				
Geography	Mean	9.3	10				
	Range	9-10	10				
	% correct (13)	72%	77%				
Behavioral Sciences	Mean	4.7	8.5				
	Range	2-7	8-9				

	% correct (10)	47%	85%				
Short Content Essays	Mean	10.7	11.5				
	Range	9-13	10-13				
	% correct (18)	59%	64%				

13.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:
Although 100% of students passed prior to student teaching, only 50% passed on the first attempt in 2016-2017. Course content will be re-aligned to Praxis content requirements.

2017-2018:
Analysis of Data: 0% of the completers in 2017-2018 achieved a passing score on the Praxis Social Studies Content Exam. Over the past three years, 4/13 of the candidates passed the Praxis Content exam on the first attempt.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: Social Studies faculty have been invited to take the Praxis Content exam in order to better understand the topics of the exam and the type of questioning that is used on the Praxis.

2018-2019:
Analysis of Data:
The benchmark was not met. 20% of the candidates passed the Social Studies Praxis Content & Interpretation exam on the first attempt.
Plan for Continuous Improvement:
80% of the Social Studies Education completers will achieve a passing score on the Praxis Social Content and Interpretation Exam on the first attempt.
Recommendations for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:
1) History faculty member Philippe Girard took the Praxis exam and created a Praxis workshop to help prepare candidates for the exam. The Praxis workshop will be administered beginning in the spring 2020 semester.
2) BESE voted to lower the acceptable passing score for the Social Studies Praxis exam in Louisiana from 160 to 153 based on the scores required by other states for the same exam. The new passing score can be applied retroactively to previous attempts taken since January 1, 2019. It is expected that the change in score will have a significant beneficial result for the program's first-time pass rate.
3) The redesigned program took into account the content areas that are addressed in the Praxis exam. History faculty will monitor test results to determine if adjustments in programs need to be made to better meet the needs of the candidates.

14 Assessment and Benchmark FEE Content

Assessment: Field Experience Evaluation, Domain 5.
The FEE Scoring Scale is as follows: 1- Ineffective; 2- Effective: Emerging; 3- Effective: Proficient; 4- Highly Effective

Benchmark: 90% of candidates will meet or exceed the benchmark score of 3.00 or higher on each element of Domain 5 (Content Specific Components) on the Field Experience Evaluation (FEE) Rubric.

Prior to 2017-2018, the benchmark was 100% of students will meet or exceed the benchmark of 2.00, which is set by the State of Louisiana.

14.1 Data

Social Studies Education - Content specific components on FEE III:

Component	Fall 2015			Spring 2016			Fall 2016			Spring 2017		
	#	Mean	Range	#	Mean	Range	#	Mean	Range	#	Mean	Range
5.1	5	3.68	3.75-4.00	1	4.00	4.00	2	3.66	3.56-3.75	2	4.00	4.00
5.2	5	3.71	3.42-4.00	1	4.00	4.00	2	3.61	3.38-3.83	2	4.00	4.00

5.3	5	3.73	3.63-4.00	1	4.00	4.00	2	3.66	3.56-3.75	2	3.81	3.63-4.00
5.4	5	3.83	3.63-4.00	1	3.75	3.75	2	3.50	3.50	2	4.00	4.00
5.5	5	3.65	3.13-4.00	1	4.00	4.00	2	3.47	3.38-3.56	2	4.00	4.00
5.6	5	3.72	3.00-4.00	1	4.00	4.00	2	3.38	3.25-3.50	2	4.00	4.00
5.7	5	3.53	3.00-4.00	1	3.75	3.75	2	3.53	3.38-3.67	2	4.00	4.00
5.8	5	3.65	3.25-4.00	1	4.00	4.00	1	3.25	3.25	2	4.00	4.00
5.9	5	3.69	3.00-4.00	1	4.00	4.00	2	3.53	3.38-3.67	2	4.00	4.00
5.10	5	3.74	3.33-4.00	1	3.83	3.83	1	4.00	4.00	2	4.00	4.00

| | | Fall 2017 | | | Spring 2018 | | | Fall 2018 | | | Spring 2019 | |
Component	#	Mean	Range	#	Mean	Range	#	Mean	Range	#	Mean	Range
5.1	2	3.88	3.75-4.00	1	3.71	3.71	2	3.94	3.88-4.00	2	3.82	3.63-4.00
5.2	2	3.69	3.50-3.88	1	3.38	3.38	1	3.75	3.75	2	4.00	4.00
5.3	2	3.82	3.63-4.00	1	3.00	3.00	1	4.00	4.00	2	3.88	3.75-4.00
5.4	2	3.69	3.63-3.75	1	3.50	3.50	1	3.58	3.58	2	3.92	3.83-4.00
5.5	2	3.63	3.50-3.75	1	3.88	3.88	1	4.00	4.00	2	3.71	3.67-3.75
5.6	2	3.82	3.75-3.88	1	3.88	3.88	1	4.00	4.00	2	3.92	3.83-4.00
5.7	2	3.79	3.75-3.83	1	4.00	4.00	1	3.88	3.88	1	4.00	4.00
5.8	2	3.88	3.75-4.00	1	4.00	4.00	1	4.00	4.00	1	3.88	3.88
5.9	2	3.67	3.50-3.83	1	3.33	3.33	1	3.63	3.63	2	3.66	3.63-3.69
5.10	2	3.88	3.75-4.00	1	3.88	3.88	1	4.00	4.00	2	4.00	4.00

14.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:
100% of students exceeded the benchmark of 2.00.

2017-2018:
The benchmark was raised to 3.00 for 2017-2018.
Analysis of Data: 100% of the candidates met the benchmark of 3.00.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The FEE content items will be analyzed to determine if additional components should be added to specifically address knowledge of the content and best practices for instruction.

2018-2019:
Analysis of Data:
100% of the candidates who received scores for Domain 5 scored at the level of proficiency or above. Not all components were scored for all candidates. The lowest recorded score was 3.58, which is well above the 3.00 benchmark.
Plan for Continuous Improvement:
Mentors and University Supervisors will be encouraged to look for opportunities to score candidates on Domain 5 of the FEE rubric. In addition, secondary education faculty and Social Studies faculty should revisit and revise (if needed) the elements of Domain 5 to ensure that they are aligned to appropriate content standards.
Recommendations for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:
- Secondary education faculty and Social Studies education faculty will meet to review and revise (if necessary) the elements of Domain 5 to ensure alignment to current content standards.

15 Assessment and Benchmark inTASC Standards - Lesson Planning

Assessment: InTASC standards are aligned to the components of the lesson plan rubric.
Lesson Plan Rubric scoring scale: 1- Ineffective; 2- Effective: Emerging; 3- Effective: Proficient; 4-

Highly Effective

Benchmark: 80% of the candidates will score a 3.00 or higher on each element of the Lesson Plan Rubric.

15.1 Data

Social Studies Education - Lesson Plan Data from EDUC 412:

Rubric Element	InTASC Standard		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
Essential Questions		Number	5	1	2	2	2	1
		Mean	2.40	2.00	2.00	1.00		
		Range	2.00-3.00	2.00	1.00-3.00	1.00		
		% Proficient or Higher	40%	0%	50%	0%		
Content Standards		Number						
		Mean	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.50		
		Range	3.00	3.00	2.00-4.00	3.00-4.00		
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%	50%	100%		
Student Outcomes	4n	Number						
		Mean	3.00	3.00	2.50	3.00	4.00	4.00
		Range	3.00	3.00	2.00-3.00	2.00-4.00	4.00	4.00
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%	50%	50%	100%	100%
Technology	5l	Number						
		Mean	2.60	3.00	1.00	4.00	4.00	2.00
		Range	2.00-3.00	3.00	1.00	4.00	4.00	2.00
		% Proficient or Higher	60%	100%	0%	100%	100%	0%
Educational Materials		Number						
		Mean	3.00	3.00	2.00	4.00		
		Range	3.00	3.00	1.00-3.00	4.00		
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%	50%	100%		
Procedures	3k	Number						
		Mean	3.00	3.00	1.50	3.00	3.50	2.00
		Range	3.00	3.00	1.00-2.00	3.00	3.00-4.00	2.00
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%	0%	100%	100%	0%
Lesson "Hook"	8j	Number						
		Mean	2.40	3.00	1.00	3.00	4.00	1.00
		Range	2.00-3.00	3.00	1.00	2.00-4.00	4.00	1.00
		%						

		Proficient or Higher	40%	100%	0%	50%	100%	0%
Pre-Planned (Seed) Questions	8i	Number						
		Mean	3.00	3.00	2.50	2.50	3.50	2.00
		Range	3.00	3.00	2.00-3.00	1.00-4.00	3.00-4.00	2.00
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%	50%	50%	100%	0%
Modeled, Guided, Collab, & Ind. Practice	7k	Number						
		Mean	2.40	2.00	1.50	3.00	3.50	2.00
		Range	2.00-3.00	2.00	1.00-2.00	3.00	3.00-4.00	2.00
		% Proficient or Higher	40%	0%	0%	100%	100%	0%
Closure		Number						
		Mean	2.20	2.00	1.00	2.50		
		Range	2.00-3.00	2.00	1.00	1.00-4.00		
		% Proficient or Higher	20%	0%	0%	50%		
Formative/Summative Assessment	6j	Number						
		Mean	3.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	3.00
		Range	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.00-4.00	4.00	3.00
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%	0%	50%	100%	100%
Relevance & Rationale	2j	Number						
		Mean	3.00	3.00	2.50	2.00	4.00	2.00
		Range	3.00	3.00	2.00-3.00	1.00-3.00	4.00	2.00
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%	50%	50%	100%	0%
Exploration, Extension, Supplemental	1e	Number						
		Mean	2.00	2.00	1.50	2.50	4.00	3.00
		Range	2.00	2.00	1.00-2.00	2.00-3.00	4.00	3.00
		% Proficient or Higher	0%	0%	0%	50%	100%	100%
Differentiation	7j	Number						
		Mean	2.00	2.00	1.00	1.50	3.50	1.00
		Range	2.00	2.00	1.00	1.00-2.00	3.00-4.00	1.00
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%

Social Studies Education - Lesson Plan Data from EDUC 412:

Rubric Element	InTASC Standard		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021

			1	2				
Essential Questions		Number						
		Mean						
		Range						
		% Proficient or Higher						
Content Standards		Number	1	2				
		Mean	4.00	4.00				
		Range	4.00	4.00				
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%				
Student Outcomes	4n	Number	1	2				
		Mean	3.00	2.50				
		Range	3.00	2.00-3.00				
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	50%				
Technology	5l	Number	1	2				
		Mean	4.00	4.00				
		Range	4.00	4.00				
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%				
Educational Materials		Number	1	2				
		Mean	4.00	4.00				
		Range	4.00	4.00				
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%				
Procedures	3k	Number	1	2				
		Mean	2.00	3.00				
		Range	2.00	2.00-4.00				
		% Proficient or Higher	0%	50%				
Lesson "Hook"	8j	Number	1	2				
		Mean	3.00	3.00				
		Range	3.00	2.00-4.00				
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	50%				
Pre-Planned (Seed) Questions	8i	Number	1	2				
		Mean	3.00	3.00				
		Range	3.00	2.00-4.00				
		% Proficient	100%	50%				

		or Higher							
Modeled, Guided, Collab, & Ind. Practice	7k	Number							
		Mean							
		Range							
		% Proficient or Higher							
Closure		Number	1	2					
		Mean	4.00	4.00					
		Range	4.00	4.00					
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%					
Formative/Summative Assessment	6j	Number							
		Mean							
		Range							
		% Proficient or Higher							
Relevance & Rationale	2j	Number	1	2					
		Mean	1.00	3.50					
		Range	1.00	3.00-4.00					
		% Proficient or Higher	0%	100%					
Exploration, Extension, Supplemental	1e	Number	1	2					
		Mean	3.00	3.00					
		Range	3.00	2.00-4.00					
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	50%					
Differentiation	7j	Number	1	1					
		Mean	2.00	2.00					
		Range	2.00	2.00					
		% Proficient or Higher	0%	0%					
Interdisciplinary Connections		Number	1	2					
		Mean	1.00	3.00					
		Range	1.00	2.00-4.00					
		% Proficient or Higher	0%	50%					
Whole Group Methods		Number	1	2					
		Mean	2.00	3.50					
		Range	2.00	3.00-4.00					
		%							

		Proficient or Higher	0%	100%					
Collaborative Practice Methods		Number	1	2					
		Mean	2.00	3.00					
		Range	2.00	2.00-4.00					
		% Proficient or Higher	0%	50%					
Independent Practice Methods		Number	1	2					
		Mean	2.00	3.00					
		Range	2.00	2.00-4.00					
		% Proficient or Higher	0%	50%					
Informal Assessment		Number	1	2					
		Mean	2.00	3.50					
		Range	2.00	3.00-4.0					
		% Proficient or Higher	0%	100%					
Formal Assessment		Number	1	2					
		Mean	4.00	3.50					
		Range	4.00	3.00-4.00					
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%					
Student Use of Technology		Number		1					
		Mean		4.00					
		Range		4.00					
		% Proficient or Higher		100%					
Teacher Use of Technology		Number		1					
		Mean		4.00					
		Range		4.00					
		% Proficient or Higher		100%					
Differentiation by Content		Number		1					
		Mean		4.00					
		Range		4.00					
		% Proficient or Higher		100%					
		Number		1					
		Mean		4.00					

Differentiation by Learning Environment		Range		4.00				
		% Proficient Higher		100%				
Post-Lesson Reflection		Number		1				
		Mean		4.00				
		Range		4.00				
		% Proficient or Higher		100%				

15.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:
Essential Questions will be removed from the lesson plan rubric because they do not align to P-12 classroom instruction of completers.
Categories below benchmark are being addressed through the revision and clarification of the lesson plan instructions.

2017-2018:
Analysis of Data: There are several areas in which the benchmark was not met: Technology- 67%; Procedures- 67%; Lesson Hook- 67%; SEED Questions- 67%; Modeled, Guided, Collaborative, and Independent Practice- 67%; Relevance and Rationale- 67%; and Differentiation- 67%.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: A revised lesson plan rubric has been piloted and will be used in 2018-2019. The revised lesson plan provides clearer instructions and line elements to assess.

2018-2019:
Analysis of Data:
The data reported indicates several areas in which the benchmark was not met. There were several elements that had candidates score below benchmark. These categories are listed below and show the percentage of candidates that scored at benchmark and above: For F18 (n=1), Procedures (0%); Relevance and Rationale (0%); Differentiation (0%); Interdisciplinary Connections (0%); Whole Group Methods (0%); Collaborative Practice Methods (0%); Independent Practice Methods (0%); and Informal Assessment (0%). For S19 (n=2), Student Outcomes (50%); Procedures (50%); Lesson Hook (50%); Pre-Planned (Seed) Questions (50%); Exploration, Extension, Supplemental (50%); Differentiation (0%); Interdisciplinary Connections (50%); Collaborative Practice Methods (50%); and Independent Practice Methods (50%).
Looking at the two semester combined, the benchmark in was not met in the following areas, with the percentage passing indicated: Student Outcomes, Lesson Hook, Pre-Planned Questions, Relevance & Rationale, Informal Assessment, Whole Group Methods, Exploration Extension Supplemental all at 67%; Procedures, Independent Practice Methods, Collaborative Practice Methods, Interdisciplinary Connections all at 33%; and Differentiation at 0%.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:
Candidates will score at the level of proficiency (3.00) or above on all elements of the Lesson Plan Rubric.

Recommendations for Successful Implementation of the Plan for Improvement:
- Faculty and University Supervisors will participate in US Prep training related to differentiation.
- Lesson plan elements concerning differentiation will be further broken down to types
- Differentiation will be addressed throughout the program for candidates to have a clearer understanding of expectations.

16 Assessment and Benchmark FEE - Specific inTASC Standards

Assessment: The Field Experience Evaluation (FEE) measures the following elements: Domain 1: Planning and Preparation; Domain 2: Classroom Environment; Domain 3: Instruction, and Domain 4: Professionalism.
The following scoring scale is used: 1- Ineffective; 2- Effective: Emerging; 3- Effective: Proficient; 4- Highly Effective.

Benchmark: 90% of candidates will score a 3.00 or higher on each element in the Field Experience Evaluation (FEE) Rubric for Domains 1-4.

Prior to 2017-2018, the benchmark was 100% of students will meet or exceed the benchmark of 2.00, which is set by the State of Louisiana.

16.1 Data

2017-2018:
Data table is attached.

2018-2019:
Data table is attached.

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

Social Studies Education_FEE_17-18
Social Studies Education_FEE_18-19

16.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:
This benchmark has been met or exceeded.

2017-2018:
Analysis of Data: Only 45% of the scores for Domain 3 met the benchmark score in spring 2018, Component 3.1 had no elements above the benchmark.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: Methods courses will be analyzed to determine areas of improvement that would assist candidates in improving their instructional strategies in the classroom.

2018-2019:
Analysis of Data:
The benchmark was not met for all domains.
For fall 2018:
Component 2.2 was below benchmark with 78% scoring at or above benchmark. Although 2.2.1 and 2.2.3 had 100% of the candidates (n=3) at the proficiency level or above, element 2.2.2 had only 33% at proficiency level or above (=2.92).
Domain 3: Instruction fell below benchmark at 82% proficiency or above. Component 3.1 (56%) and each element within fell below benchmark: 3.1.1 (67%), 3.1.2 (67%) and 3.1.3 (33%). Component 3.3 (83%) also fell benchmark, with elements 3.3.1 (67%) and 3.3.4 (67%) below benchmark as well. All other domains, components, and elements met benchmark.
For spring 2019:
Domain 3: Instruction fell below benchmark with 82% scoring at the proficiency level or above. Component 3.1 (50%) fell below benchmark along with elements 3.1.2 (50%) and 3.1.3 (0%). Component 3.3 also feel below benchmark (88%) with element 3.3.4 (50%). All other domains, components, and elements met benchmark.
Plan for Continuous Improvement:
Domain 3 covers instruction. Component 3.1 as a whole, as well as each individual component in the F18 semester and two of the elements in the S19 semester, did not meet benchmark. These elements focused on the quality of questions, discussion techniques, and student participation. Components 3.3.1 and 3.3.4 include assessment criteria and student self-assessment and monitoring of progress. All components indicated as areas for improvement above include a need for additional student awareness and participation on a higher cognitive level.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation for Plan for Improvement:
- Methods courses will emphasize a shift to student-led discussions
- Secondary faculty will determine appropriate strategies for assessing learning and fostering deeper discussions.

17 Assessment and Benchmark Outcomes - TCWS

Assessment: Teacher Candidate Work Sample.
The scoring scale for the Teacher Candidate Work Sample is: 1- Ineffective; 2- Effective: Emerging; 3- Effective: Proficient; 4- Highly Effective.

Benchmark: 80% of candidates will score a 3.00 or above on each of the elements on the Teacher Candidate Work Sample Rubric.

17.1 Data

Social Studies Education - Teacher Candidate Work Sample (data from EDUC 412):

Criteria		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
Choice of Assessment	Number	5	1	2	2	2	1
	Mean	3.20	2.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	4.00
	Range	3.00-4.00	2.00	2.00-.4.00	3.00	1.00-3.00	4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	100%	0%	50%	100%	50%	100%
Pre-assessment	Number						
	Mean	2.20	2.00	3.00	3.50	2.00	3.00
	Range	2.00-3.00	2.00	2.00-4.00	3.00-4.00	1.00-3.00	3.00
	% Proficient or Higher	20%	0%	50%	100%	50%	100%
Post-assessment	Number						
	Mean	3.00	3.00	2.50	3.00	3.00	2.00
	Range	3.00	3.00	1.00-4.00	2.00-4.00	2.00-4.00	2.00
	% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%	50%	100%	50%	0%
Alignment of Lesson Evidence	Number						
	Mean	2.40	2.00	2.50	4.00	2.00	2.00
	Range	2.00-3.00	2.00	1.00-4.00	4.00	2.00	2.00
	% Proficient or Higher	40%	0%	50%	100%	0%	0%
Student Level of Mastery & Evaluation of Factors	Number						
	Mean	2.80	3.00	3.00	3.50	2.50	3.00
	Range	2.00-3.00	3.00	2.00-4.00	3.00-4.00	2.00-3.00	3.00
	% Proficient or Higher	80%	100%	50%	100%	50%	100%
Data to Determine Patterns & Gaps	Number						
	Mean	2.80	2.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	3.00
	Range	2.00-3.00	2.00	2.00-4.00	4.00	2.00-4.00	3.00

	% Proficient or Higher	80%	0%	50%	100%	50%	100%
Response to Interventions	Number						
	Mean	1.60	1.00	3.00	3.50	2.50	1.00
	Range	1.00-2.00	1.00	2.00-4.00	3.00-4.00	1.00-4.00	1.00
	% Proficient or Higher	0%	0%	50%	100%	50%	0%

Social Studies Education - Teacher Candidate Work Sample (data from EDUC 412):

Criteria		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
Choice of Assessment	Number	2	1				
	Mean	2.00	3.00				
	Range	2.00	3.00				
	% Proficient or Higher	0%	100%				
Pre-assessment	Number	2	1				
	Mean	2.50	2.00				
	Range	2.00-3.00	2.00				
	% Proficient or Higher	50%	0%				
Post-assessment	Number	2	1				
	Mean	2.50	2.00				
	Range	2.00-3.00	2.00				
	% Proficient or Higher	50%	0%				
Alignment of Lesson Evidence	Number	2	2				
	Mean	3.00	2.00				
	Range	3.00	2.00				
	% Proficient or Higher	100%	0%				
Student Level of Mastery & Evaluation of Factors	Number	2	1				
	Mean	3.50	2.00				
	Range	3.00-4.00	2.00				
	% Proficient or Higher	100%	0%				
Data to Determine Patterns & Gaps	Number	2	1				
	Mean	4.00	2.00				
	Range	4.00	2.00				
	% Proficient or Higher	100%	0%				
Response to Interventions	Number	2	2				
	Mean	3.50	3.00				
	Range	3.00-4.00	2.00-4.00				
	% Proficient						

		100%	50%					
	or Higher							
Content Standards	Number		1					
	Mean		4.00					
	Range		4.00					
	% Proficient or Higher		100%					
Strength: Data to Determine	Number		1					
	Mean		4.00					
	Range		4.00					
	% Proficient or Higher		100%					
Weakness: Data to Determine	Number		1					
	Mean		4.00					
	Range		4.00					
	% Proficient or Higher		100%					
Analysis	Number		1					
	Mean		4.00					
	Range		4.00					
	% Proficient or Higher		100%					
Application	Number		1					
	Mean		4.00					
	Range		4.00					
	% Proficient or Higher		100%					

17.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:
Assessment is a weakness. We are revamping the lesson plan template and rubric, and we are rewriting the education assessment course.

2017-2018:
Analysis of Data: 0% of the candidates scored above the benchmark in the "Alignment of Lesson Evidence" category. This category has had 50% or below benchmark in five of the six previous semesters. The Post Assessment category had 67% scoring below benchmark.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The assessment course has been revised to better address the candidates' use of assessments. In addition, secondary education faculty will review the scope and sequence to determine ways to better provide instruction for the "Alignment of Lesson Evidence".

2018-2019:
Analysis of Data:
The benchmark was not met. There were a number of elements in which the % Proficient or Higher fell below 80%, including: Choice of Assessment (F18-0%); Pre-assessment (F18-50%, S19-0%); Post-assessment (F18-50%, S19-0%); Alignment of Lesson Evidence (S19-0%); Student Level of Mastery and Evaluation of Factors (S19-0%); Data to Determine Patterns and Gaps (S19-0%); and Response to Intervention (S19-50%).
Plan for Continuous Improvements:
The Teacher Candidate Work Sample is being replaced by the Teaching Cycle which provides specific expectations and increased rigor with scaffolded support to improve

candidate abilities to evaluate student learning and plan for instruction.
Recommendations for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:
The Teaching Cycle will be scaffolded throughout the program and the Senior Residency
Portfolio will include the complete Teaching Cycle. During the Senior Residency Portfolio
course, candidates will be assigned a mentor professor to assist them, answer questions, and
guide them through the full process.

18 Assessment and Benchmark History Praxis PLT

Social Studies Education candidates must pass the Praxis PLT#5624 prior to student teaching.
The Louisiana qualifying score is 157.

Benchmark: 80% of candidates will pass the Principles of Learning and Teaching Praxis exam on
the first attempt.

Prior to 2017-2018, the benchmark was 100% of students will pass the Praxis exam on the
principles of learning and teaching (PLT) before student teaching.

18.1 Data

Social Studies Education - Praxis PLT #5624:

		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
#5624 overall	Number	5	1	2	2	2	1
	Mean	172	177	176	174	178	169
	Range	168-178	177	176	170-178	177-179	169
	% Pass 1st attempt	60%	100%	100%	50%	100%	100%
#5624 breakdown:	Number	3	1	2	2	2	1
Students as Learners	Mean	15	19	16.5	18	14	16
	Range	14-16	19	16-17	17-19	13-15	16
	% correct (21)	71%	90%	79%	86%	67%	76%
Instructional Process	Mean	15	12	15.5	14.5	16	18
	Range	13-17	12	14-17	12-17	15-17	18
	% correct (20)	75%	60%	78%	73%	80%	90%
Assessment	Mean	10	12	10.5	10	11.5	10
	Range	8-13	12	9-12	7-13	11-12	10
	% correct (14)	71%	86%	75%	71%	82%	71%
Professional Development Leadership and Community	Mean	10.5	12	11	12	10	8
	Range	10-11	12	11	12	10	8
	% correct (12)	88%	100%	92%	100%	83%	67%
Analysis of Instructional Scenarios	Mean	10	12	9.5	8.5	11.5	8
	Range	9-11	12	7-12	8-9	11-12	8
	% correct (16)	63%	75%	59%	53%	72%	50%

Social Studies Education - Praxis PLT #5624:

		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021

#5624 overall	Number	3	2					
	Mean	165	181.5					
	Range	157-170	179-184					
	% Pass 1st attempt	100%	100%					
#5624 breakdown:	Number	3	2					
Students as Learners	Mean	13.3	17					
	Range	12-15	17					
	% correct (21)	63%	81%					
Instructional Process	Mean	15	16					
	Range	14-16	15-17					
	% correct (21)	71%	80%					
Assessment	Mean	9	11.5					
	Range	8-10	11-12					
	% correct (14)	64%	82%					
Professional Development Leadership and Community	Mean	9	9.5					
	Range	9	9-10					
	% correct (12)	64%	79%					
Analysis of Instructional Scenarios	Mean	8.7	13.5					
	Range	6-11	13-14					
	% correct (16)	54%	84%					

18.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:
Although 100% of students passed prior to student teaching, only 50% passed on the first attempt.

2017-2018:
Analysis of Data: 100% of candidates passed the Praxis PLT on the first attempt. 10/13 (77%) of the candidates in the past three years have passed the PLT on the first attempt.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The "Analysis of Instructional Scenarios" category exhibits the lowest scores. Secondary Education faculty will need to review the scope and sequence to determine how to strengthen instruction in this area.

2018-2019:
Analysis of Data:
100% of the candidates (n=5) from the 2018-2019 AY passed the Praxis PLT on the first attempt. The mean score of the spring 2019 candidates was 16.5 points higher than the fall 2018 candidates' mean score.
For the F18 semester, candidates averaged 71% or below correct in each of the five sub-categories. For the S19 semester, only one sub-category fell below 80%: Professional Development Leadership and Community (79%).

Plan for Continuous Improvement:
With the redesign of the new program, courses are aligned to ensure that the appropriate content is covered for candidates to perform well on the exam and continue to exceed the benchmark.

Recommendations for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:
- Advisors and course faculty will encourage candidates to take the PLT exam after the appropriate coursework is successfully completed

- Secondary education faculty will monitor pass rates of candidates in order to ensure alignment and proper sequence.

- Secondary education faculty will monitor pass rates of candidates in order to ensure alignment and proper sequence.

End of report