
Secondary Education Grades 6-12 [MAT] [SE**]

Cycles included in report:
Cycle #5 Jun 1, 2018 to May 31, 2019

Cycle: #5 Jun 1, 2018 to May 31, 2019

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?

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:

In analyzing the data throughout our assessments, it was determined that our students performed well in assessments based on candidate performance; whereas, assessments focusing on candidate's ability to lesson plan or apply student data/knowledge to drive instruction candidates scored lower, often falling below the proficiency benchmark set by the department. Since the candidates' performance scores are consistently high in performance assessments, it is possible that the high scores may indicate that evaluators are not critical enough for our candidates. Due to this observation, more training on critical feedback, inter-rater reliability spot checks, and a candidate evaluation on the effectiveness of the feedback was implemented throughout the College of Education in May 2016. Professional development will continue that focuses on different components of the observation process.

Many of the assessments that have indicated consistently low scores across programs have been revised in order to provide clearer, more precise expectations in both rubrics and instructional templates. Assessments that have undergone revisions are the Lesson Planning assessment and the Teacher Candidate Work Sample assessment. These revisions are currently being piloted within specific courses to collect data prior to final faculty revisions and departmental implementation. (see Lesson Plan and TCWS data for evidence).

2017-2018:

The course assessments were outlined in the scope and sequence. This semester, course assessments were laid out so that data can be collected, analyzed and used for program improvements.

2018-2019:

We are maintaining/increasing enrollment within our MAT program overall (N=26 to N=31). The Teacher Candidate Work Sample has been revised and is now called the Teaching Cycle.

4 Program Highlights from the Reporting Year

2016-2017:

We implemented a Co-teaching model and professional development for MAT teacher candidates in conjunction with the local P-12 school system. Teacher candidates, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors work together to build a co-teaching relationship for the teacher candidate's student teaching or intern experience. During multiple professional development opportunities, each member of the triad (teacher candidate, cooperating teacher, and university supervisor) receives information on co-teaching and how to make it successful for all involved in the process as well as participates in relationship building activities. The goal of the Co-teaching model and professional development is to improve the student teaching or internship experience in order to further the success of our students during their final semester.

We created a MAT Teacher Residency Program, which will be implemented Fall 2017.

Within the past reporting year, the Department of Education Professions has not only submitted several program assessments for program specific accreditation, but has also aligned all assessments and data to CAEP InTASC standards for national accreditation. Additionally, the department has submitted a self-study report for CAEP accreditation in which a visiting team of accreditors will come on campus during November 2017 to complete their assessment of our Education programs.

2017-2018:

67% of MAT teacher candidates are graduating within two years of official acceptance into the program.

2018-2019:

Candidates continue to excel when taking the PLT.

5 Program Mission

The purpose of the Secondary MAT Education program is to provide a curriculum leading to the Master of Arts in Teaching Secondary degree and meet the needs of candidates preparing to become professional teachers in the multicultural community of Southwest Louisiana and the global community. This program provides candidates with the necessary competencies to be certified to teach grades 6-12 based upon unit and state requirements for specific content areas. The Secondary Education Program enhances the teaching profession through a focus on: critical thinking, communication, reflection, collaboration, diversity, professionalism, and service to the community.

The purpose of the MAT in Secondary Education is to prepare teacher education candidates for successful entry into secondary education as middle or high school teachers, by providing opportunities for developing critical thinking (SL01), communicating effectively through oral, written, and technological communication skills (SL02), and by encouraging sound decision making in the education environment and in the Grades 6-12 classroom setting (SL03).

6 Institutional Mission Reference

At McNeese State University, a member of the University of Louisiana System, students cultivate skills for critical thinking (SL01), effective expression (SL02), and gain an understanding of the global community (SL03). The purpose of the Secondary Education Program reflects the department's focus as it relates to fulfilling state, professional, and national standards. The program purpose is consistent with the university's purpose/mission to "stimulate students to maximum intellectual growth and love of learning, to cultivate the skills necessary for critical thinking and effective expression, to foster understanding of the multicultural world community, and to develop a sense of ethical responsibility."

7 Assessment and Benchmark Enrollment, Completion, Retention, and Recruitment

Assessment: Enrollment and Completer Numbers.

Going beyond traditional approaches of recruitment and partnering with the Office of Admission and Recruiting, the EPP will actively recruit within the community at least two times each academic year.

CAEP Standard 3

Assessment: Graduation Matriculation Rates.

7.1 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.

7.2 Benchmark: Create and monitor candidate progress throughout the program. A minimum of 90% of candidates should complete the MAT program in Secondary Education within 2 years of being accepted into the program (599 packet).

External Outcomes Links

7.1 Data

Enrollment and Completer Data:

All MAT Secondary Education Programs:

Academic Year	# of students officially enrolled in program with an EDUC 599 packet	# of completers fall semester	# of completers spring semester	Total # of completers
2013-2014	28			11
2014-2015	20			9
2015-2016	29	1	5	6
2016-2017	43	4	9	13
2017-2018	26	4	6	10
2018-2019	31	2	7	9
2019-2020				

Secondary Education Grades 6-12, Agriculture MAT:

Academic Year	# of students officially enrolled in program with an EDUC 599 packet	# of completers fall semester	# of completers spring semester	Total # of completers
2017-2018	0	0	0	0
2018-2019	0	0	0	0
2019-2020				

Secondary Education Grades 6-12, Biology MAT:

Academic Year	# of students officially enrolled in program with an EDUC 599 packet	# of completers fall semester	# of completers spring semester	Total # of completers
2013-2014	8			3
2014-2015	5			4
2015-2016	5	1	2	3
2016-2017	2	0	1	1
2017-2018	7	2	0	2
2018-2019	8	1	3	4
2019-2020				

Secondary Education Grades 6-12, Business MAT:

Academic Year	# of students officially enrolled in program with an EDUC 599 packet	# of completers fall semester	# of completers spring semester	Total # of completers
2013-2014	3			1
2014-2015	0	0	0	0
2015-2016	1	0	0	0
2016-2017	3	0	0	0
2017-2018	0	0	0	0
2018-2019	1	0	0	0
2019-2020				

Secondary Education Grades 6-12, Chemistry MAT:

Academic Year	# of students officially enrolled in program with an EDUC 599 packet	# of completers fall semester	# of completers spring semester	Total # of completers
2013-2014	2			1
2014-2015	0	0	0	0

2015-2016	1	0	0	0
2016-2017	1	0	0	0
2017-2018	0	0	0	0
2018-2019	0	0	0	0
2019-2020				

Secondary Education Grades 6-12, Chinese MAT:

Academic Year	# of students officially enrolled in program with an EDUC 599 packet	# of completers fall semester	# of completers spring semester	Total # of completers
2017-2018	1	0	0	0
2018-2019	0	0	0	0
2019-2020				

Secondary Education Grades 6-12, English MAT:

Academic Year	# of students officially enrolled in program with an EDUC 599 packet	# of completers fall semester	# of completers spring semester	Total # of completers
2013-2014	8			2
2014-2015	8			5
2015-2016	6	0	0	0
2016-2017	14	1	3	4
2017-2018	7	0	3	3
2018-2019	9	0	0	0
2019-2020				

Secondary Education Grades 6-12, Environmental Science MAT:

Academic Year	# of students officially enrolled in program with an EDUC 599 packet	# of completers fall semester	# of completers spring semester	Total # of completers
2013-2014	1			1
2014-2015	0	0	0	0
2015-2016	0	0	0	0
2016-2017	0	0	0	0
2017-2018	0	0	0	0
2018-2019	0	0	0	0
2019-2020				

Secondary Education Grades 6-12, French MAT:

Academic Year	# of students officially enrolled in program with an EDUC 599 packet	# of completers fall semester	# of completers spring semester	Total # of completers
2013-2014	1			1
2014-2015	0	0	0	0
2015-2016	0	0	0	0
2016-2017	1	0	0	0
2017-2018	1	0	0	0
2018-2019	1	0	0	0
2019-2020				

Secondary Education Grades 6-12, Latin MAT:

Academic Year	# of students officially enrolled in program with an EDUC 599 packet	# of completers fall semester	# of completers spring semester	Total # of completers
2017-2018	0	0	0	0
2018-2019	0	0	0	0
2019-2020				

MAT SEC Family and Consumer Science Program*	2013-2014	1	N=1 100%							
MAT SEC Content	2013-2014	2					N=1 50%		N=1 50%	
	2014-2015	1	N=1 100%							
	2015-2016									

*No longer offered

**Area undetermined

7.2.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data:

This benchmark was met by students in all secondary content areas, with the exception of mathematics, business, and undetermined content areas. Business students dropped from the university and did not graduate. Similarly, teacher candidates, who did not identify a content area, either dropped from the university (50%) or earned a different degree (50%). Teacher candidates in secondary mathematics did graduate; however, 50% took four years to do so.

Overall, the MAT Secondary Content Areas graduated 67% of teacher candidates graduated within 1 to 2 years of starting their program. This fell below our departmental benchmark of 80%.

All content areas, with the exception of business, mathematics, and undetermined content areas, graduated teacher candidates within 1-2 years of starting their program (N=9, 100%). Business students dropped from the university and did not graduate; therefore, reporting 0% of students graduating from the program (N=2, 0%). Similarly, teacher candidates, who did not identify a content area, either dropped from the university (N=1, 50%) or earned a different degree (N=1, 50%). Teacher candidates in secondary mathematics did graduate within the department's goal of 1 to 2 years (N=1, 50%); however, 50% of these teacher candidates took 4 years to do so (N=1).

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The goal for 2018-2019 is to identify reasons students are dropping from the university or earning a different degree and determine intervention activities.

Recommendations to Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement: The most beneficial action the department can take is to develop a survey for students who wish to drop from the university or change degrees. The survey information gathered on these students, in addition to reviewing teacher candidate credentials upon admission, can aid in providing additional resources or support to these students in the future.

2018-2019:

The recommendations from the previous year were not met as no action was taken to develop a survey to identify reasons students drop from the university.

The benchmark was not met. The benchmark states a minimum of 90% of candidates should complete the MAT program within 2 years. Only 59% of completers finished the program within the two year benchmark date.

The goal of 2019-2020 is to have a mid-term meeting to check the progress of students within the program.

8 Assessment and Benchmark Curriculum Development

Assessment: Curriculum Development

All program faculty will meet at least twice an academic year to discuss curriculum changes/implementation, assessment data, and progress monitoring of action plans.

Curriculum alignment includes:

- InTASC standards
- Program standards
- Year-long residency
- Louisiana Components of Effective Teaching
- Louisiana Teacher Preparation Competencies
- Louisiana Student Standards

CAEP Standard 2

Benchmark: All program faculty will meet at least twice an academic year to discuss curriculum changes/implementations, assessment data, and progress monitoring of action plans.

External Outcomes Links

8.1 Data

2015-2016:

K-12 Secondary Advisory Council

November 13, 2015 1:00 pm

- 1) Updated information was presented about the secondary methods courses (402-405).
- 2) EDUC 205 concerns
- 3) A list of S16, pre-service teacher seminar meetings was distributed.
- 4) Social studies (math and chemistry) voiced concerns about scheduling conflicts for their courses.
- 5) Data practices, needs, and concerns relative to SPA/CAEP reports.
- 6) Idea for creating a brown-bag meeting sponsored by the K-12 Secondary Advisory Council to help support students in networking together.
- 7) QEP will target innovations and improvements in advising.

February 5, 2016 1:00 pm

Worked on SPA assessments and reports. Discussed data collection, analysis, and future actions.

2016-2017:

Meeting #1: December 7, 2016

Topic: Alignment of course major assessments across programs
 Instructors present: Wallace, Williams, Anthony, Duhon, Fontenot
 Discussion: Creation of scope and sequence of major assessments including but not limited to FEE, Lesson Planning, TCWS, Case Study, and Praxis Data.

Meeting #2: May 16, 2017
 Topic: Alignment of Louisiana Teacher Preparation Competencies across program
 Instructors present: Wallace, Williams, Anthony, Duhon, Fontenot
 Discussion: Discussion of Louisiana Teacher Preparation Competencies across programs within each course.

2017-2018:
 Data table is attached.

2018-2019:
 Data table is attached.

Artifacts

[MAT_Secondary_Curriculum_Development_17-18](#) [PDF 98 KB SEP 21, 2018]

[Secondary Education Curriculum Development](#) [PDF 84 KB MAR 9, 2020]

8.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:
 Program faculty will continue to meet throughout the year to review student progress, curricular offerings, and appropriate professional contacts and opportunities.

2016-2017:
 Action/Outcome of meeting #1: Scope and Sequence was created for the MAT Secondary program that aligned all major assessments throughout program for implementation, collection, and data analysis.
 Action/Outcome of meeting #2: Working draft of Louisiana Competencies implementation throughout program coursework.

2017-2018:
 Analysis of Data: One of the outcomes was met and our overall benchmark of meeting twice an academic year to discuss curriculum changes/implementations, assessment data, and progress monitoring of action plans was accomplished.
 The MAT program faculty met January 9th, 2018 to outline major assessments throughout the MAT Secondary Program. The program assessments were outlined on a chart in order to visualize the scope and sequence of our assessments. Additionally, the MAT faculty met February 28, 2018 to discuss assessment data and to obtain curriculum redesign information.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The goal for 2018-2019 will be to implement curriculum changes to the MAT Secondary program.

Recommendations to Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement: The redesign of the MAT Secondary curriculum will be adopted for the 2019-2020 academic year.

2018-2019:
 There were a number of meeting held throughout the 18-19 AY to finalize the MAT program course sequence and curriculum. The MAT program will be going 100% online. In the upcoming semesters, faculty will be working to ensure that standards and outcomes are covered throughout the progression of the five-semester coursework.

9 Assessment and Benchmark PRAXIS II Content

Assessment: Praxis Content Exam.
 Content Knowledge: InTASC Standard 4.
 The candidate applies the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches. These tests must be taken and passed prior to the candidate being officially admitted into the program.

9.1 Benchmark: A minimum of 80% of graduates will pass the Praxis content exam on the first attempt.

9.2 Benchmark: A mean score of 70% for percentage of questions answered correctly in each sub-category will be achieved on the Praxis II Content Exam.

Program Outcomes Links

LTGC B

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.

External Outcomes Links

9.1 Data

MAT Secondary Education - Praxis Content Exam:

All MAT Secondary Content		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
Combined	Number	1	5	4	9	4	6
	% Pass 1st attempt	100%	100%	75%	100%	75%	83%

All MAT Secondary Content		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
	Number	2	7				

Combined	% Pass 1st attempt	100%	57%				
----------	--------------------	------	-----	--	--	--	--

Biology		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
#5235 overall	Number	1	2	0	1	2	0
	Mean	165	172		154	151.5	
	Range	165	164-179		154	150-153	
	% correct					49%	
	% Pass 1st attempt	100%	100%		100%	100%	
#5235 breakdown:	Number	1	0	0	0	2	0
Nature of Science: Scientific Inquiry, Methodology, Techniques, and History	Mean	13				10	
	Range	13				10	
	% correct (17)					59%	
Molecular and Cellular Biology	Mean	17				7	
	Range	17				7	
	% correct (24)					29%	
Genetics and Evolution	Mean	15				12.5	
	Range	15				11-14	
	% correct (24)					52%	
Diversity of Life and Organismal Biology	Mean	14				11	
	Range	14				9-13	
	% correct (24)					46%	
Ecology: Organisms and Environments	Mean	10				11	
	Range	10				10-12	
	% correct (19)					58%	
Science, Technology, and Social Perspectives	Mean	11				7.5	
	Range	11				6-9	
	% correct (12)					63%	

Biology		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
#5235 overall	Number	1	3				
	Mean	189	158				
	Range	189	153-165				
	% correct						
	% Pass 1st attempt	100%	33%				
#5235 breakdown:	Number	1	3				
Nature of Science: Scientific Inquiry, Methodology, Techniques, and History	Mean	16	12				
	Range	16	10-13				
	% correct (17)	94%	69%				
Molecular and Cellular Biology	Mean	21	13				
	Range	21	13-14				
	% correct (24)	88%	56%				
Genetics and Evolution	Mean	22	13				
	Range	22	11-16				
	% correct						

	(24-25)	88%	56%				
Diversity of Life and Organismal Biology	Mean	22	13				
	Range	22	10-17				
	% correct (24)	92%	53%				
Ecology: Organisms and Environments	Mean	15	12				
	Range	15	9-13				
	% correct (19)	79%	61%				
Science, Technology, and Social Perspectives	Mean	11	7				
	Range	11	6-8				
	% correct (12)	92%	61%				

Math		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
#5062/5161 overall	Number	0	1	0	1	1	1
	Mean		171		141	141	167
	Range		171		141	141	167
	% correct						
	% Pass 1st attempt		100%		100%	100%	100%
#5161 breakdown:	Number	0	1	0	0	0	0
Number and Quantity, Algebra, Functions, and Calculus	Mean		26				
	Range		26				
	% correct						
Geometry, Probability and Statistics, and Discrete Mathematics	Mean		12				
	Range		12				
	% correct						

Math		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
#5062/5161 overall	Number	0	2				
	Mean		160				
	Range		160				
	% correct						
	% Pass 1st attempt		50%				
#5161 breakdown:	Number		1				
Number and Quantity, Algebra, Functions, and Calculus	Mean		22				
	Range		22				
	% correct (34)		65%				
Geometry, Probability and Statistics, and Discrete Mathematics	Mean		10				
	Range		10				
	% correct (16)		63%				

English		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
#5041/5039 overall	Number	0	0	1	3	0	3
#5041 overall	Number	0	0	1	3	0	0
	Mean			171	175		
	Range			171	168-181		
	% Pass 1st attempt			100%	100%		

#5041 breakdown:	Number				2		
	Range				172		
	Mean				168-176		
Literature & Understanding Text	Mean				48		
	Range				45-50		
Language & Linguistics	Mean				13		
	Range				13		
Composition & Rhetoric	Mean				28		
	Range				27-28		
#5039 overall	Number	0	0	0	1	0	3
	Mean				181		180.33
	Range				181		175-186
	% Pass 1st attempt						67%
#5039 breakdown:	Number	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Mean						175
	Range						175
	% correct (122)						75%
Reading	Mean				40		30
	Range				40		30
	% correct (41)						73%
Language Use and Vocabulary	Mean				28		24
	Range				28		24
	% correct (28)						86%
Writing, Speaking, Listening	Mean				32		31
	Range				32		31
	% correct (41)						76%
Constructed Response	Mean						7
	Range						7
	% correct (12)						58%

English		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
#5041/5039 overall	Number	0	0				
#5041 overall	Number						
	Mean						
	Range						
	% Pass 1st attempt						
#5041 breakdown:	Number						
	Range						
	Mean						
Literature & Understanding Text	Mean						
	Range						
Language & Linguistics	Mean						
	Range						
Composition & Rhetoric	Mean						
	Range						
	Number						

#5039 overall	Mean						
	Range						
	% Pass 1st attempt						
#5039 breakdown:	Number						
	Mean						
	Range						
Reading	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct						
Language Use and Vocabulary	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct						
Writing, Speaking, Listening	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct						
Constructed Response	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct						

Social Studies		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
#5086 overall	Number	0	1	3	4	0	0
	Mean		161	169.3	168		
	Range		161	167-172	161-177		
	% Pass 1st attempt		100%	75%	100%		
#5086 breakdown:	Number			2	4		
United States History	Mean			12	13		
	Range			11-12	10-15		
World History	Mean			15	13		
	Range			12-15	12-15		
Government/ Civics	Mean			10	14		
	Range			9-11	13-16		
Economics	Mean			10	10		
	Range			8-11	8-11		
Geography	Mean			8	8		
	Range			7-8	4-10		
Behavioral Sciences	Mean			12	6		
	Range			10-14	5-8		

Social Studies		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
#5086 overall	Number	1	1				
	Mean	178	167				
	Range	178	167				
	% Pass 1st attempt	100%	100%				
#5086 breakdown:	Number						
United States History	Mean						
	Range						
World History	Mean						
	Range						

Government/ Civics	Mean						
	Range						
Economics	Mean						
	Range						
Geography	Mean						
	Range						
Behavioral Sciences	Mean						
	Range						

Spanish		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
#5195 overall	Number	0	1	0	0	1	2
	Mean		172			159	189.5
	Range		172			157	185-194
	% Pass 1st attempt		100%			0%	100%
#5195 breakdown:	Number						1
Interpretive Mode: Listening	Mean						23
	Range						23
	% correct (25)						92%
Interpretive Mode: Reading	Mean						22
	Range						22
	% correct (24)						92%
Cultural Knowledge	Mean						11
	Range						11
	% correct (11)						100%
Interpersonal and Presentational Writing	Mean						16
	Range						16
	% correct (18)						89%
Presentational and Interpersonal Speaking	Mean						15
	Range						15
	% correct (18)						83%

Spanish		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
#5195 overall	Number	0	1				
	Mean		195				
	Range		195				
	% Pass 1st attempt		100%				
#5195 breakdown:	Number		1				
Interpretive Mode: Listening	Mean		23				
	Range		23				
	% correct (25)		92%				
Interpretive Mode: Reading	Mean		24				
	Range		24				
	% correct (24-25)		96%				
	Mean		11				

Cultural Knowledge	Range		11				
	% correct (11-12)		92%				
Interpersonal and Presentational Writing	Mean		14				
	Range		14				
	% correct (18)		78%				
Presentational and Interpersonal Speaking	Mean		18				
	Range		18				
	% correct (18)		100%				

9.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:

The mean average for Biology MAT students on their Praxis content area exam rose from 165 in the fall to 172 in the spring. Only one candidate completed in both Math MAT and Social Studies MAT for fall 2015 and spring 2016. Both candidates passed the exam on their first attempt. This is a new assessment as of 2015-2016. A benchmark will be set after three years of data collection.

2016-2017:

In MAT Secondary programs, Fall 16 yielded the lowest Praxis Content pass rates; whereas, Fall 15, Spring 16, and Spring 17 indicated 100% pass rate on the first attempt. Within the MAT Secondary programs, Social Studies indicated a 75% pass rate in Fall 16 which fell below the department benchmark of 80% pass rate. Additionally, this was the only program to not receive 100% pass rate on the 1st attempt at taking this exam. Since the Social Studies scores were low in this one semester, the Department looked at these scores in tandem with the BS Secondary Social Studies pass rates. Analyzing both sets of data, Social Studies pass rates are consistently below the department benchmark of 80%, with BS Social Studies yielding a pass rate of 20% in Fall 15, 50% in Fall 16, and 50% in Spring 17.

Due to the consistently low scores on this Content exam. The department is sending a History and Education professor to take this Praxis Content exam. The result of this will be changes to the course content and assessments in order to help students succeed on this exam.

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: During the spring 2018 semester, the MAT Secondary Content areas exceeded benchmark at 83%. Overall, the passing rate of students taking the Praxis Content exam increased in every content area, yielding an 8% increase from fall 2017 to spring 2018. During the spring 2018 semester, the MAT Secondary Content areas exceeded benchmark at 83%. The English content area was the only program that reported below our benchmark. This is the first semester this has occurred within our data analysis. It is noteworthy that no Social Studies teacher candidates took the Praxis Content exam this semester.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The goal for 2018-2019 should be for candidates to achieve at least 80% or higher passage rate on Praxis first attempt.

Recommendations to Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement: It is recommended that the department select two faculty members to complete the History Praxis Exam, as previously recommended in 2016-2017. Selected faculty will then outline content on the exam in order to ensure alignment during curriculum redesign.

2018-2019:

The benchmark was not met due to 78% of students passing the Praxis on the first attempt in the fall and spring semesters combined. The goal of 2019-2020 is to have 80% of students pass the Praxis on the first attempt. The recommendation is that Praxis Workshops are promoted throughout the department and on social media. Other Praxis workshops will be created and offered to students, such as Biology, English and Math.

9.2 Data

MAT Secondary Education - Praxis Content Exam:

All MAT Secondary Content		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
Combined	Number	1	5	4	9	4	6
	% Pass 1st attempt	100%	100%	75%	100%	75%	83%

All MAT Secondary Content		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
Combined	Number	2	7				
	% Pass 1st attempt	100%	57%				

Biology		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
#5235 overall	Number	1	2	0	1	2	0
	Mean	165	172		154	151.5	
	Range	165	164-179		154	150-153	
	% correct					49%	
	% Pass 1st						

	attempt	100%	100%		100%	100%	
#5235 breakdown:	Number	1	0	0	0	2	0
Nature of Science: Scientific Inquiry, Methodology, Techniques, and History	Mean	13				10	
	Range	13				10	
	% correct (17)					59%	
Molecular and Cellular Biology	Mean	17				7	
	Range	17				7	
	% correct (24)					29%	
Genetics and Evolution	Mean	15				12.5	
	Range	15				11-14	
	% correct (24)					52%	
Diversity of Life and Organismal Biology	Mean	14				11	
	Range	14				9-13	
	% correct (24)					46%	
Ecology: Organisms and Environments	Mean	10				11	
	Range	10				10-12	
	% correct (19)					58%	
Science, Technology, and Social Perspectives	Mean	11				7.5	
	Range	11				6-9	
	% correct (12)					63%	

Biology		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
#5235 overall	Number	1	3				
	Mean	189	158				
	Range	189	153-165				
	% correct						
	% Pass 1st attempt	100%	33%				
#5235 breakdown:	Number	1	3				
Nature of Science: Scientific Inquiry, Methodology, Techniques, and History	Mean	16	12				
	Range	16	10-13				
	% correct (17)	94%	69%				
Molecular and Cellular Biology	Mean	21	13				
	Range	21	13-14				
	% correct (24)	88%	56%				
Genetics and Evolution	Mean	22	13				
	Range	22	11-16				
	% correct (24-25)	88%	56%				
Diversity of Life and Organismal Biology	Mean	22	13				
	Range	22	10-17				
	% correct (24)	92%	53%				
Ecology: Organisms and Environments	Mean	15	12				
	Range	15	9-13				
	% correct (19)	79%	61%				
	Mean	11	7				

Science, Technology, and Social Perspectives	Range	11	6-8				
	% correct (12)	92%	61%				

Math		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
#5062/5161 overall	Number	0	1	0	1	1	1
	Mean		171		141	141	167
	Range		171		141	141	167
	% correct						
	% Pass 1st attempt		100%		100%	100%	100%
#5161 breakdown:	Number	0	1	0	0	0	0
Number and Quantity, Algebra, Functions, and Calculus	Mean		26				
	Range		26				
	% correct						
Geometry, Probability and Statistics, and Discrete Mathematics	Mean		12				
	Range		12				
	% correct						

Math		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
#5062/5161 overall	Number	0	2				
	Mean		160				
	Range		160				
	% correct						
	% Pass 1st attempt		50%				
#5161 breakdown:	Number		1				
Number and Quantity, Algebra, Functions, and Calculus	Mean		22				
	Range		22				
	% correct (34)		65%				
Geometry, Probability and Statistics, and Discrete Mathematics	Mean		10				
	Range		10				
	% correct (16)		63%				

English		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
#5041/5039 overall	Number	0	0	1	3	0	3
#5041 overall	Number	0	0	1	3	0	0
	Mean			171	175		
	Range			171	168-181		
	% Pass 1st attempt			100%	100%		
#5041 breakdown:	Number				2		
	Range				172		
	Mean				168-176		
Literature & Understanding Text	Mean				48		
	Range				45-50		
Language & Linguistics	Mean				13		
	Range				13		
Composition & Rhetoric	Mean				28		
	Range				27-28		

#5039 overall	Number	0	0	0	1	0	3
	Mean				181		180.33
	Range				181		175-186
	% Pass 1st attempt						67%
#5039 breakdown:	Number	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Mean						175
	Range						175
	% correct (122)						75%
Reading	Mean				40		30
	Range				40		30
	% correct (41)						73%
Language Use and Vocabulary	Mean				28		24
	Range				28		24
	% correct (28)						86%
Writing, Speaking, Listening	Mean				32		31
	Range				32		31
	% correct (41)						76%
Constructed Response	Mean						7
	Range						7
	% correct (12)						58%

English		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
#5041/5039 overall	Number	0	0				
#5041 overall	Number						
	Mean						
	Range						
	% Pass 1st attempt						
#5041 breakdown:	Number						
	Range						
	Mean						
Literature & Understanding Text	Mean						
	Range						
Language & Linguistics	Mean						
	Range						
Composition & Rhetoric	Mean						
	Range						
#5039 overall	Number						
	Mean						
	Range						
	% Pass 1st attempt						
#5039 breakdown:	Number						
	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct						
	Mean						

Reading	Range						
	% correct						
Language Use and Vocabulary	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct						
Writing, Speaking, Listening	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct						
Constructed Response	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct						

Social Studies		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
#5086 overall	Number	0	1	3	4	0	0
	Mean		161	169.3	168		
	Range		161	167-172	161-177		
	% Pass 1st attempt		100%	75%	100%		
#5086 breakdown:	Number			2	4		
United States History	Mean			12	13		
	Range			11-12	10-15		
World History	Mean			15	13		
	Range			12-15	12-15		
Government/ Civics	Mean			10	14		
	Range			9-11	13-16		
Economics	Mean			10	10		
	Range			8-11	8-11		
Geography	Mean			8	8		
	Range			7-8	4-10		
Behavioral Sciences	Mean			12	6		
	Range			10-14	5-8		

Social Studies		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
#5086 overall	Number	1	1				
	Mean	178	167				
	Range	178	167				
	% Pass 1st attempt	100%	100%				
#5086 breakdown:	Number						
United States History	Mean						
	Range						
World History	Mean						
	Range						
Government/ Civics	Mean						
	Range						
Economics	Mean						
	Range						
Geography	Mean						
	Range						
Behavioral Sciences	Mean						
	Range						

Spanish		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
#5195 overall	Number	0	1	0	0	1	2
	Mean		172			159	189.5
	Range		172			157	185-194
	% Pass 1st attempt		100%			0%	100%
#5195 breakdown:	Number						1
Interpretive Mode: Listening	Mean						23
	Range						23
	% correct (25)						92%
Interpretive Mode: Reading	Mean						22
	Range						22
	% correct (24)						92%
Cultural Knowledge	Mean						11
	Range						11
	% correct (11)						100%
Interpersonal and Presentational Writing	Mean						16
	Range						16
	% correct (18)						89%
Presentational and Interpersonal Speaking	Mean						15
	Range						15
	% correct (18)						83%

Spanish		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
#5195 overall	Number	0	1				
	Mean		195				
	Range		195				
	% Pass 1st attempt		100%				
#5195 breakdown:	Number		1				
Interpretive Mode: Listening	Mean		23				
	Range		23				
	% correct (25)		92%				
Interpretive Mode: Reading	Mean		24				
	Range		24				
	% correct (24-25)		96%				
Cultural Knowledge	Mean		11				
	Range		11				
	% correct (11-12)		92%				
Interpersonal and Presentational Writing	Mean		14				
	Range		14				
	% correct (18)		78%				
Presentational and Interpersonal Speaking	Mean		18				
	Range		18				
	% correct						

(18)

100%

9.2.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: All content areas met the departmental benchmark of correctly answering 70% of exam sub-category questions correctly, with the expectation of Biology and English. Biology fell below our benchmark in the following sub-category questions: Nature of Science: Scientific Inquiry, Methodology, Techniques, and History (59%); Molecular and Cellular Biology (29%); Genetics and Evolution (52%); Diversity of Life and Organismal Biology (46%); Ecology: Organisms and Environments (58%); and Science, Technology, and Social Perspectives (63%). The English sub-category question that did not meet the department benchmark was: Constructive Response (58%).

It is noteworthy to mention, that even though these subcategories fall below our departmental benchmarks, all teacher candidates passed this content exam even though they had a low percentage of questions answered correctly on the exam. The English Praxis Content exam also had a sub-category question that did not meet the department benchmark. This sub-category was Constructive Response (58%).

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The goal for 2018-2019 should be to elevate the sub-category scores within the Biology Praxis Content exam to 70%.

Recommendations to Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement: An in depth analysis of student data needs to be completed. It is recommended that an analysis on the following areas be completed in order to understand the low success rate on Praxis Content questions: course completion/success, Praxis subcategory scoring, and biology courses taken during program. Conclusions from this analysis can validate curriculum redesign changes.

2018-2019:

The benchmark was not met due to Math and Biology sub-category scores falling below the 70% proficiency benchmark.

The goal of 2019-2020 is to have students score 70% proficiency in all sub-categories.

The recommendation is to flag lower sub-category areas in Biology and Math in order to address these lower performing areas in the Praxis Workshops. All sub-categories within the Biology Praxis fell below the benchmark of 70% proficiency (Nature of Science, Molecular and Cellular Biology, Genetics and Evolution, Diversity of Life and Organismal Biology, Ecology, Science, Technology, and Social Perspectives). Math also fell below benchmark in all sub-categories (Number and Quantity, Algebra, Functions, and Calculus; and Geometry, Probability, and Statistics, and Discrete Mathematics).

10 Assessment and Benchmark Lesson Planning

Assessment: Lesson Plan.

Knowledge:

Learner Development: InTASC Standard 1.

The candidate determines how learners grow and develop, recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas

Learning Differences: InTASC Standard 2.

The candidate identifies individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards

Content Knowledge: InTASC Standard 4.

The candidate applies the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches

Application of Content: InTASC Standard 5.

The candidate decides how to connect concepts and use differing perspectives to engage learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local and global issues

Planning for Instruction: InTASC Standard 7.

The candidate draws upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and the community context to plan instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals

Skills:

Instructional Strategies: InTASC Standard 8.

The candidate implements a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways

CAEP Standard 1

Benchmark: A minimum of 80% of the candidates will score at the Proficiency level (3) or higher in each category assessed on the lesson plan.

Program Outcomes Links

LTGC F

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

LTGC G

The teacher candidate develops and applies instructional supports and plans for an Individualized Education Plan (IEP) or Individualized Accommodation Plan (IAP) to allow a student with exceptionalities developmentally appropriate access to age- or grade-level instruction, individually and in collaboration with colleagues.

External Outcomes Links

10.1 Data

2017-2018:

Data tables are attached.

2018-2019:

Data tables are attached.

Artifacts

[MAT SEC Lesson Plan Data_18-19](#) [DOCX 234 KB MAR 9, 2020]

[MAT_SEC_Lesson Plan_17-18](#) [PDF 99 KB SEP 21, 2018]

[MAT_SEC_Lesson Plan_17-18.2](#) [PDF 144 KB SEP 21, 2018]

10.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:

As opposed to the FEE which is graded by university supervisors in the field, the lesson planning rubric is graded by course instructors and is more in tuned with the lesson plan as a whole and not simply the outcomes of the lesson.

Because the numbers within individual content areas are so low, the three content areas have been combined to form one data set in order to give more a more accurate representation of candidate abilities when planning a lesson.

Examination of Spring 2016 data chart will be used for this analysis because it has the most number of candidates (4) to use as a better data comparison than one candidate.

When examining this collection of data, candidates (as a mean) scored below minimum competency on the closure (3.0) element of planning.

This information is vital as we have revamped our lesson planning rubric recently to add more rigor to candidate planning. Descriptive words were included within each rubric component to delineate expectations among scoring components.

After looking at the data, it was decided that our program must do a better job of preparing candidates to the new level of expectations. In doing so, candidates will have lesson planning covered in multiple coursework as opposed to only one. Lesson planning will now be included in EDUC 647, 523, and 525.

This is a new assessment as of 2015-2016. A benchmark will be set after three years of data collection.

2016-2017:

In all MAT Secondary programs, students yielded means below benchmark on the following rubric components: Essential questions, Student outcomes, Technology, Procedures, Lesson Hook, Seed Questions, Model, Guided, Collab & Ind. Practice, Closure, Relevance and Rational, Explorations, Extensions, and Supplemental; and Differentiation. Due to the consistently low scores, the department had a speaker at the previous Student Teaching Seminar in Spring 17. This speaker outlined the expectations for this assessment.

Additionally, the department is piloting a new lesson plan rubric and template. The template has clearer, more concise directions for students. The rubric is also more detailed and aligns with the template instructions. After collecting the piloted data and departmental feedback, the new lesson plan will be implemented to help ensure student success (projected in Spring 17).

The current McNeese State University Lesson Plan Template Rubric was developed by a team, which comprised of faculty members from Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary programs as well as from Special Education, Field Supervisors, and P-12 partners. This team examined the previous rubric requirements and corresponding student performance data, before analyzing additional program preparation needs that were not previously addressed. Once the Lesson Plan Template Rubric was updated, a rough draft was sent to all staff for feedback, edits, and verification of alignment to InTASC standards. The team collected feedback and made the appropriate revisions to the document before it was disseminated to the certification programs for further alignment to their individual program standards. This InTASC-aligned lesson planning rubric is used to guide the candidate's planning and instruction.

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: Benchmark was met in all Secondary Content Areas, with the exception of Spanish. All other content areas exceeded our benchmark of 80%.

Within the Secondary MAT program, Spanish was the only content area that fell below the departmental benchmark. In the following areas, only 50% of teacher candidates (N=2) within the Spanish program received a proficiency score within the lesson plan assessment: Procedures; Lesson Hook; Modeled, Guided, Collaborative, and Independent Practice; and Formative/Summative Assessment.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The goal for 2018-2019 will be to continue to exceed or maintain the departmental benchmark for this assessment and to implement the new Lesson Plan rubric during the next academic year.

Recommendations to Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement: Develop and implement a systematic process to track student performance data from the new Lesson Plan rubric in order to more accurately identify areas of weakness on the Lesson Plan assessment.

2018-2019:

The benchmark was met in all components of the lesson plan with the exception of Relevance and Rationale.

The goal of 2019-2020 will be to implement and utilize the updated Lesson Plan in order to better identify student weaknesses.

Faculty will meet to complete inner rater reliability on the new Lesson Plan. The new lesson plan will also have two rubric rows to identify if students struggle with relevance or/and rationale, which will help highlight the area students struggle in.

11 Assessment and Benchmark Field Experience Evaluation

Assessment: Field Experience Evaluation, Domains 1-4 and Domain 5.

Knowledge:

Learning Differences: InTASC Standard 2.

The candidate identifies individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards.

Content Knowledge: InTASC Standard 4.

The candidate applies the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches.

Skills:

Learner Development: InTASC Standard 1.

The candidate designs and implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences.

Learning Environments: InTASC Standard 3.

The candidate works with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, and that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

Content Knowledge: InTASC Standard 4.

The candidate creates learning experiences that make aspects of the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assure mastery of the content.

Application of Content: InTASC Standard 5.

The candidate engages learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local and global issues by connecting concepts and using differing perspectives.

Assessment: InTASC Standard 6.

The candidate uses multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, and to guide the teacher's and learners' decision making.

Planning for Instruction: InTASC Standard 7.

The candidate plans instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and the community context.

Instructional Strategies: InTASC 8.

The candidate implements a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways.

Dispositions:

Professional Learning and Ethical Practice: InTASC 9.

The candidate engages in ongoing professional learning and uses evidence to continually evaluate his/her practice, particularly the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (learners, families, other professionals, and the community), and adapts practice to meet the needs of each learner

Candidates will score at benchmark (score of 2) or higher on their FEE evaluation at the end of their internship or student teaching semester.

CAEP Standard 1

11.1 Benchmark: Candidates will score a 3.00 or higher on each component in the FEE rubric for Domains 1-4 of the FEE rubric.

11.2 Benchmark: Candidates will score 3.00 or higher on each InTASC standard assessed in the FEE rubric.

11.3 Benchmark: Candidates will score a 3.00 or higher on each element assessed in Domain 5 of the FEE rubric.

11.4 Benchmark: Candidates will score a 3.00 or higher on each component of the FEE rubric for Domains 1-4 in each of the secondary content areas.

11.5 Benchmark: Candidates will score a 3.00 or higher on each element assessed in Domain 5 of the FEE rubric for each content area.

*Program Outcomes Links***LTGC A**

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

LTGC C2

The teacher candidate gathers, synthesizes, and analyzes a variety of data from a variety of sources to adapt instructional practices and other professional behaviors to better meet students'™ needs.

*External Outcomes Links***11.1 Data**

2017-2018:
Data table is attached.

2018-2019:
Data table is attached.

Artifacts

[MAT SEC FEE from ST_18-19](#) [DOCX 231 KB MAR 9, 2020]

[MAT_Secondary_FEE Combined_17-18](#) [PDF 129 KB SEP 21, 2018]

11.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:

All five candidates scored at above proficient on each of the four elements of planning on the FEE form. Because of this, as stated in program improvements above, the field supervisors will go through inter-relater reliability and professional development training to ensure valid and reliable results are being reported.

This is a new assessment as of 2015-2016. A benchmark will be set after three years of data.

2016-2017:

In all programs, student data indicate students met or exceeded the benchmark of 3 or higher on each FEE component. All FEE Data is pulled from candidates' final semesters in our program. In the future, data will be triangulated from the beginning, middle, and end of the program to identify any weaknesses within instruction or student abilities.

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: Benchmark was met in all components on the FEE, with the exception of Domain 1: Component 3.1 in both fall and spring semesters. Teacher candidates fell below benchmark in every element under Domain 3: Component 3.1 in both fall and spring semesters. Component 3.1 encompasses the following elements: 3.1.1 Quality of Questions, 3.1.2 Discussion techniques, and 3.1.3 Student Participation. Within 3.1.1 Quality of Questions, teacher candidates' yielded a mean score of 2.75 (N=4) in fall 2017 and 2.91 (N=6) in the spring 2018 semester. In 3.1.2 Discussion techniques, a mean score of 2.88 (N=4) was reported in fall 2017 and 2.98 (N=6) in spring 2018. Lastly, in the element 3.1.3 Student Participation, teacher candidates' yielded a mean score of 2.75 in fall 2017 and met benchmark in spring 2018 with a mean score of 3.07. It is evident that student scores are improving from fall 2017 to spring 2018; however, two elements still do not meet the departmental benchmark.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The goal for 2018-2019 is to share this data finding with the faculty of the MAT program so that they can reinforce expectations and provide examples to MAT students on Component 3.1.

Recommendations to Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement: Verify the reinforcement of teaching Component 3.1 throughout the scope and sequence of the MAT curriculum, specifically in the curriculum redesign and corresponding meetings.

2018-2019:

The benchmark was met on all components of the FEE with the exception of Component 3.2.2. All components had a mean score of 3.00 or higher with the exception of Component 3.2.2 which had a mean score of 2.98.

The goal of 2019-2020 is to incorporate the proficiency percentage as part of the benchmark.

A recommendation would be to incorporate in the benchmark the proficiency percentage as well as the mean. This would allow for a more holistic view of student success in each component of the FEE rubric.

11.2 Data

2017-2018:
Data table is attached.

2018-2019:
Data table is attached.

Artifacts

[MAT SEC FEE from ST_18-19](#) [DOCX 231 KB MAR 9, 2020]

[MAT_Secondary_FEE Combined_17-18](#) [PDF 129 KB SEP 21, 2018]

11.2.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: Benchmark was met in all components on the FEE, with the exception of Domain 1: Component 3.1 in both fall and spring semesters.

Teacher candidates fell below benchmark in every element under Domain 3: Component 3.1 in both fall and spring semesters. Component 3.1 encompasses the following elements: 3.1.1 Quality of Questions, 3.1.2 Discussion techniques, and 3.1.3 Student Participation. Within 3.1.1 Quality of Questions, teacher candidates' yielded a mean score of 2.75 (N=4) in fall 2017 and 2.91 (N=6) in the spring 2018 semester. In 3.1.2 Discussion techniques, a mean score of 2.88 (N=4) was reported in fall 2017 and 2.98 (N=6) in spring 2018. Lastly, in the element 3.1.3 Student Participation, teacher candidates' yielded a mean score of 2.75 in fall 2017 and met benchmark in spring 2018 with a mean score of 3.07. It is evident that student scores are improving from fall 2017 to spring 2018; however, two elements still do not meet the departmental benchmark.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The goal for 2018-2019 is to share this data finding with the faculty of the MAT program so that they can reinforce expectations and provide examples to MAT students on Component 3.1.

Recommendations to Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement: Verify the reinforcement of teaching Component 3.1 throughout the scope and sequence of the MAT curriculum, specifically in the curriculum redesign and corresponding meetings.

2018-2019:
The benchmark was met on all components of the FEE that were aligned with InTASC with the exception of Component 3.2.2. All components had a mean score of 3.00 or higher with the exception of Component 3.2.2 which had a mean score of 2.98.
The goal of 2019-2020 is to incorporate the proficiency percentage as part of the benchmark.
A recommendation would be to incorporate in the benchmark the proficiency percentage as well as the mean. This would allow for a more holistic view of student success in each component of the FEE rubric.

11.3 Data

2017-2018:
Data table is attached.

2018-2019:
Data table is attached.

Artifacts

[MAT SEC FEE from ST_18-19](#) [DOCX 231 KB MAR 9, 2020]

[MAT_Secondary_FEE Combined_17-18](#) [PDF 129 KB SEP 21, 2018]

11.3.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:
Analysis of Data: Benchmark was met in all areas of Domain 5 on the FEE rubric.
All elements listed in the data chart for fall 2017 and spring 2018 exceed the departmental benchmark of 80% proficiency. The lowest percentage of proficiency is 83% within element 5.4 and 5.5 in the spring 2018 semester.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The recommended goal for 2018-2019 is to maintain the exceptional scores within this Domain.

Recommendations to Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement: A recommendation would be to continue to analyze the data for trends as well as document any correlation between Domain 5 and grades in students' content area course work.

2018-2019:
The benchmark was met on all components of Domain 5 of the FEE with the exception of Component 5.11 and 5.13. All components had a mean score of 3.00 or higher with the exception of Component 5.11 (M =2.75) and 5.13 (M= 2.75).
The goal of 2019-2020 is to share data from Domain 5 with EPAC.
The recommendation is to share the data from Domain 5 with EPAC. EPAC could help evaluate where these subject specific components could be revised, updated, etc. within content courses.

11.4 Data

2017-2018:
Data table is attached.

2018-2019:
Data table is attached.

Artifacts

[MAT SEC FEE by Content Area_18-19](#) [DOCX 350 KB MAR 9, 2020]

[MAT_SEC_FEE_17-18](#) [PDF 491 KB SEP 21, 2018]

11.4.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:
Analysis of Data: Benchmark was met by MAT Mathematic candidates in all areas. The following Secondary Areas fell below benchmark within Component 3.1 (3.1.1 Quality of Questions, 3.1.2 Discussion techniques, and 3.1.3 Student Participation) in both fall and spring semesters: Biology, English, and Spanish. Math fell below benchmark in this component in the fall 2017 semester, but met our benchmark in spring 2018
Component 3.1 encompasses the following elements: 3.1.1 Quality of Questions, 3.1.2 Discussion techniques, and 3.1.3 Student Participation. Within Component 3.1, biology teacher candidates had a mean score of 2.73 in fall 2017. Within this semester, biology teacher candidates' lowest element within Component 3.1 was 3.1.1 Quality of Questions (m= 2.63, n=2) with no students achieving proficiency on this component.
Similarly, English teacher candidates within the MAT program had a mean score of and 2.80 in spring 2018 within Component 3.1. Students struggled equally in all three elements listed under Component 3.1.
Mathematics teacher candidates within the MAT program fell below benchmark for only the fall 2017 semester in Component 3.1. These students' struggled with element 3.1.3 Student Participation or 3.1.2 Discussion Techniques in this semester with no students receiving a proficiency level on this element. However, Mathematics teacher candidates exceeded benchmark in all areas the following spring semester.
Spanish MAT teacher candidates had a mean score of 2.9 in fall 2017 and 2.91 in spring 2018 within Component 3.1. Students struggled equally in all three elements listed under Component 3.1; however, consistently yielded a 0% proficiency scoring on 3.1.2 Discussion techniques in both fall and spring semesters.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The goal for 2018-2019 is to share this data finding with the faculty of the MAT program so that they can reinforce expectations and provide examples to MAT students on Component 3.1.

Recommendations to Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement: Verify the reinforcement of teaching Component 3.1 throughout the scope and sequence of the MAT curriculum, specifically in the curriculum redesign and corresponding meetings.

2018-2019:
The benchmark was not met. Students in Mathematics struggled in Domains 2 and 3 scoring below benchmark in the following areas: 2.1.3, 2.2.1, 2.2.2, 3.1.1, 3.1.3, 3.2.2, 3.3.1. Additionally, the student in Social Studies fell below benchmark in Domain 1, 2, and 3 in the following areas: 1.1.3, 1.1.4, 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 3.1.3, 3.1, 3.2.2, 3.3.1, 3.3.4. Lastly, Spanish fell below benchmark in Domain 3 in the following area: 3.2.2.
The goal for 2019-2020 will be to implement the FEE, which will be assessed by the professor, in all methods courses within the MAT program.
The recommendation is that the FEE will be implemented in all methods courses and evaluated by the professors (using swivl if needed) in order to offer students consistent and meaningful feedback for growth and to identify areas of weakness within their teaching earlier on in the program. The data will be collected from the MAT methods courses on the FEE rubric.

11.5 Data

2017-2018:

Data table is attached.

2018-2019:
Data table is attached.

Artifacts

[MAT SEC FEE by Content Area_18-19](#) [DOCX 350 KB MAR 9, 2020]

[MAT_SEC_FEE_17-18](#) [PDF 491 KB SEP 21, 2018]

11.5.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: All secondary content areas received a mean score of 3 or higher within Domain 5; however, English teacher candidates fell below our departmental benchmark of 80% proficiency scoring. In domain 5.4 and 5.5, English teacher candidates yielded a mean score of 3; however, reported 67% of students received proficiency scoring or higher in both domains for the spring 2018 semester.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The goal for 2018-2019 is to share data findings with English content faculty as well as faculty within the Department of Education in order to identify problematic content application and make program changes during the curriculum redesign.

Recommendations to Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement: Revise learning objectives, or course content, during the curriculum redesign to ensure English MAT candidates meet departmental benchmark within their content knowledge.

2018-2019:

The benchmark was met by all content areas, with the exception of Mathematics in Domain 5.11. This domain fell below benchmark.

The goal for 2019-2020 would be to share data in Domain 5 with EPAC.

The recommendation is to share the data from Domain 5 with EPAC. EPAC could help evaluate where these subject specific components could be revised, updated, etc. within content courses.

12 Assessment and Benchmark Teacher Candidate Work Sample

Assessment: InTASC Standard 6.

The candidate uses multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, and to guide the teacher's and learner's decision making.

CAEP Standard 1

P-12 teachers are required to create a Teacher Candidate Work Sample (TCWS) during their internship/student teaching semester. The TCWS involves writing a unit lesson plan covering at least 5 days of learning as well as student learning outcomes that justify with data whether the P-12 students made progress for learning the content within the teacher candidate's lessons.

Program Outcomes Links

LTGC C1

The teacher candidate observes and reflects on students' responses to instruction to identify areas of need and make adjustments to practice.

LTGC H

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.

External Outcomes Links

12.1 Data

MAT Secondary Education All Content Areas - Teacher Candidate Work Sample Data:
InTASC 6

Criteria		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
Choice of Assessment	Number	1	4	0	0	0	3
	Mean	3.00	3.50				4.00
	Range	3.00	3.00-4.00				4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%				100%
Pre-assessment	Number						
	Mean	1.00	1.00				4.00
	Range	1.00	1.00				4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	0%	0%				100%
Post-assessment	Number						
	Mean	3.00	3.00				4.00
	Range	3.00	3.00				4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%				100%
	Number						

Alignment of Lesson Evidence	Mean	3.00	2.25				4.00
	Range	3.00	2.00-3.00				4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	100%	25%				100%
Student Level of Mastery & Evaluation of Factors	Number						
	Mean	3.00	2.75				4.00
	Range	3.00	2.00-4.00				4.00
Data to Determine Patterns & Gaps	Number						
	Mean	3.00	2.50				4.00
	Range	3.00	2.00-3.00				4.00
Response to Interventions	Number						
	Mean	1.00	1.00				4.00
	Range	1.00	1.00				4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	0%	0%				100%

Criteria		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
Choice of Assessment	Number	2	7				
	Mean	4.00	3.71				
	Range	4.00	2.00-4.00				
	% Proficient or Higher	100%	86%				
Pre-assessment	Number						
	Mean	4.00	3.43				
	Range	4.00	1.00-4.00				
	% Proficient or Higher	100%	86%				
Post-assessment	Number						
	Mean	4.00	3.71				
	Range	4.00	2.00-4.00				
	% Proficient or Higher	100%	86%				
Alignment of Lesson Evidence	Number						
	Mean	4.00	3.86				
	Range	4.00	3.00-4.00				
	% Proficient or Higher	100%	86%				
Student Level of Mastery & Evaluation of Factors	Number						
	Mean	4.00	3.29				
	Range	4.00	1.00-4.00				
	% Proficient or Higher	100%	86%				
	Number						
	Mean	3.50	3.29				

Data to Determine Patterns & Gaps	Range	3.00-4.00	1.00-4.00				
	% Proficient or Higher	100%	86%				
Response to Interventions	Number						
	Mean	4.00	3.29				
	Range	4.00	1.00-4.00				
	% Proficient or Higher	100%	86%				

MAT Secondary Education English - Teacher Candidate Work Sample Data:

Criteria		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
Choice of Assessment	Number	0	0	1	3		2
	Mean			4.00	3.33		4.00
	Range			4.00	2.00-4.00		4.00
	% Proficient or Higher			100%	67%		100%
Pre-assessment	Number						
	Mean			4.00	3.33		4.00
	Range			4.00	2.00-4.00		4.00
	% Proficient or Higher			100%	67%		100%
Post-assessment	Number						
	Mean			4.00	3.00		4.00
	Range			4.00	2.00-4.00		4.00
	% Proficient or Higher			100%	67%		100%
Alignment of Lesson Evidence	Number						
	Mean			4.00	3.33		4.00
	Range			4.00	2.00-4.00		4.00
	% Proficient or Higher			100%	67%		100%
Student Level of Mastery & Evaluation of Factors	Number						
	Mean			4.00	2.67		4.00
	Range			4.00	1.00-4.00		4.00
	% Proficient or Higher			100%	67%		100%
Data to Determine Patterns & Gaps	Number						
	Mean			4.00	3.33		4.00
	Range			4.00	2.00-4.00		4.00
	% Proficient or Higher			100%	67%		100%
Response to Interventions	Number						
	Mean			4.00	2.67		4.00
	Range			4.00	1.00-4.00		4.00
	% Proficient or Higher			100%	67%		100%

Criteria		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
----------	--	-----------	-------------	-----------	-------------	-----------	-------------

Choice of Assessment	Number	0	0				
	Mean						
	Range						
	% Proficient or Higher						
Pre-assessment	Number						
	Mean						
	Range						
	% Proficient or Higher						
Post-assessment	Number						
	Mean						
	Range						
	% Proficient or Higher						
Alignment of Lesson Evidence	Number						
	Mean						
	Range						
	% Proficient or Higher						
Student Level of Mastery & Evaluation of Factors	Number						
	Mean						
	Range						
	% Proficient or Higher						
Data to Determine Patterns & Gaps	Number						
	Mean						
	Range						
	% Proficient or Higher						
Response to Interventions	Number						
	Mean						
	Range						
	% Proficient or Higher						

MAT Secondary Education Spanish - Teacher Candidate Work Sample Data:

Criteria		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
Choice of Assessment	Number	0	1	0	0	0	1
	Mean		3.00				4.00
	Range		3.00				4.00
	% Proficient or Higher		100%				100%
Pre-assessment	Number		1				
	Mean		1.00				4.00
	Range		1.00				4.00
	% Proficient or Higher		0%				100%
Post-assessment	Number		1				
	Mean		3.00				4.00
	Range		3.00				4.00
	% Proficient or Higher		100%				100%
	Number		1				

Alignment of Lesson Evidence	Mean	2.00				4.00
	Range	2.00				4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	0%				100%
Student Level of Mastery & Evaluation of Factors	Number	1				
	Mean	3.00				4.00
	Range	3.00				4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	100%				100%
Data to Determine Patterns & Gaps	Number	1				
	Mean	2.00				4.00
	Range	2.00				4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	0%				100%
Response to Interventions	Number	1				
	Mean	1.00				4.00
	Range	1.00				4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	0%				100%

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

	% Proficient or Higher		100%				
--	------------------------	--	------	--	--	--	--

MAT Secondary Education Math - Teacher Candidate Work Sample Data:

Criteria		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2018	Spring 2019
Choice of Assessment	Number	0	1	0	1	0	2
	Mean		4.00		3.00		4.00
	Range		4.00		3.00		4.00
	% Proficient or Higher		100%		100%		100%
Pre-assessment	Number		1		1		2
	Mean		1.00		4.00		4.00
	Range		1.00		4.00		4.00
	% Proficient or Higher		0%		100%		100%
Post-assessment	Number		1		1		2
	Mean		3.00		4.00		4.00
	Range		3.00		4.00		4.00
	% Proficient or Higher		100%		100%		100%
Alignment of Lesson Evidence	Number		1		1		2
	Mean		2.00		3.00		4.00
	Range		2.00		3.00		4.00
	% Proficient or Higher		0%		100%		100%
Student Level of Mastery & Evaluation of Factors	Number		1		1		2
	Mean		4.00		4.00		4.00
	Range		4.00		4.00		4.00
	% Proficient or Higher		100%		100%		100%
Data to Determine Patterns & Gaps	Number		1		1		2
	Mean		3.00		4.00		4.00
	Range		3.00		4.00		4.00
	% Proficient or Higher		100%		100%		100%
Response to Interventions	Number		1		1		2
	Mean		1.00		4.00		4.00
	Range		1.00		4.00		4.00
	% Proficient or Higher		0%		100%		100%

MAT Secondary Education Social Studies - Teacher Candidate Work Sample Data:

Criteria		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2018	Spring 2019
Choice of Assessment	Number	0	1	3	4	0	1
	Mean		3.00	4.00	3.50		2.00
	Range		3.00	4.00	3.00-4.00		2.00
	% Proficient or Higher		100%	100%	100%		0%
Pre-assessment	Number		1	3	4		1
	Mean		1.00	4.00	4.00		1.00
	Range		1.00	4.00	4.00		1.00
	% Proficient or Higher		0%	100%	100%		0%
	Number		1	3	4		1

Post-assessment	Mean		3.00	4.00	3.75		2.00
	Range		3.00	4.00	3.00-4.00		2.00
	% Proficient or Higher		100%	100%	100%		0%
Alignment of Lesson Evidence	Number		1	3	4		1
	Mean		3.00	4.00	3.25		3.00
	Range		3.00	4.00	2.00-4.00		3.00
	% Proficient or Higher		100%	100%	75%		100%
Student Level of Mastery & Evaluation of Factors	Number		1	3	4		1
	Mean		2.00	4.00	4.00		1.00
	Range		2.00	4.00	4.00		1.00
	% Proficient or Higher		0%	100%	100%		0%
Data to Determine Patterns & Gaps	Number		1	3	4		1
	Mean		3.00	4.00	4.00		1.00
	Range		3.00	4.00	4.00		1.00
	% Proficient or Higher		100%	100%	100%		0%
Response to Interventions	Number		1	3	4		1
	Mean		1.00	4.00	2.50		1.00
	Range		1.00	4.00	1.00-4.00		1.00
	% Proficient or Higher		0%	100%	50%		0%

MAT Secondary Education Biology - Teacher Candidate Work Sample Data:

Criteria		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2018	Spring 2019
Choice of Assessment	Number	1	2	0	1	1	3
	Mean	3.00	3.50		4.00	4.00	4.00
	Range	3.00	3.00-4.00		4.00	4.00	4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%		100%	100%	100%
Pre-assessment	Number	1	2		1	1	3
	Mean	1.00	1.00		4.00	4.00	3.67
	Range	1.00	1.00		4.00	4.00	3.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	0%	0%		100%	100%	100%
Post-assessment	Number	1	2		1	1	3
	Mean	3.00	3.00		4.00	4.00	4.00
	Range	3.00	3.00		4.00	4.00	4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%		100%	100%	100%
Alignment of Lesson Evidence	Number	1	2		1	1	3
	Mean	3.00	2.00		4.00	4.00	4.00
	Range	3.00	2.00		4.00	4.00	4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	100%	0%		100%	100%	100%
Student Level of Mastery & Evaluation of Factors	Number	1	2		1	1	3
	Mean	3.00	2.50		4.00	4.00	3.33
	Range	3.00	2.00-3.00		4.00	4.00	3.00-4.00

	% Proficient or Higher	100%	50%		100%	100%	100%
Data to Determine Patterns & Gaps	Number	1	2		1	1	3
	Mean	3.00	2.00		4.00	4.00	3.33
	Range	3.00	2.00		4.00	4.00	3.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	100%	0%		100%	100%	100%
Response to Interventions	Number	1	2		1	1	3
	Mean	1.00	1.00		4.00	4.00	3.67
	Range	1.00	1.00		4.00	4.00	3.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	0%	0%		100%	100%	100%

12.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:
 Since each element on the TCWS rubric has been aligned to InTASC standards, this artifact shows the average score, range, and percentage passing for each element by semester and is categorized by InTASC Standards. This assessment includes two cycles of data, which was collected and reported for five candidates.
 Because only one candidate was included in fall 2015 data, spring 2016 data will be analyzed.
 Candidates had a mean score at or above the 3.0 proficiency benchmark in Choice of assessment and Post assessment. Students scored lowest in their Pre-assessment choice and Response to Intervention, scoring a mean of 1 in both categories.

Since this raised concern, the department faculty met and revised the instructions on the Teacher Candidate Work Sample fall 2016 in order to further clarify directions and expectations on the assessment. The rubric was also realigned with the revised assessment. Data will be monitored to further identify if the revisions.
 Because the data table shows an abundance of scores falling below the proficient level, the TCWS is now required in EDUC 412 so that the candidates have practice with writing multiple, sequential lesson plans as well as using student data to drive instruction.

This is a new assessment as of 2015-2016. A benchmark will be set after three years of data collection.

2016-2017:
 In the MAT Secondary program, student percentage who scored proficient or higher did not meet the department benchmark of 80% in the rubric components of pre-assessment , post-assessment in Fall 15 and Spring 16. However, both components saw significant increases by Fall 16 and Spring 17, bringing these scores above or close to the department benchmark for proficiency. On the other hand, rubric components: Alignment of Lesson Evidence and Response to Intervention did not meet benchmark Fall 16 and Spring 17.

Recently, the department implemented clearer expectations in courses leading up to student teaching. Previous changes will stay in place to see if continued student success is indicated in the data.

2017-2018:
 Analysis of Data: Benchmark was met and exceeded in all areas of the Teacher Candidate Work Sample rubric. In all components of the TCWS rubric, teacher candidates within the MAT Secondary Content Areas earned a mean score of 4 and 100% of candidates received proficiency or higher.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The goal for 2018-2019 is to collect additional data on the TCWS so that trends may be identified.

Recommendations to Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement: Discuss TCWS data analysis with PBC and Practitioner program faculty in order to ensure TCWS implementation and teachings throughout the scope and sequence of Education coursework is consistently incorporated into the curriculum redesign and adoption.

2018-2019:
 The benchmark was met by all students with the exception of the Social Studies candidate. This candidate fell below benchmark in the follow areas on the assessment: Choice of Assessment, Pre-Assessment, Post-Assessment, Student Level of Mastery and Evaluation of Factors, Data, and RTI.
 The goal of 2019-2020 will be to refer to the Teacher Candidate Work Sample as the Teaching Cycle and adopt the revisions for the Teaching Cycle.
 The recommendation is that the revised Teaching Cycle Assessment is implemented in all appropriate MAT courses and data is collected.

13 Assessment and Benchmark PRAXIS PLT

Assessment: Praxis Principles of Learning and Teaching:

Dispositions:

Leadership and Collaboration: InTASC 10.

The candidate seeks appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to take responsibility for student learning, to collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, other school professionals, and community members to ensure leaner growth, and to advance the profession.

Benchmark: 100% of candidates will pass the Praxis Principles of Learning and Teaching Exam on the first attempt.

Program Outcomes Links

LTGC B

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.

LTGC E

The teacher candidate applies knowledge of state and federal laws related to studentsâ€™ rights and teacher responsibilities for appropriate education for students with and without exceptionalities, parents, teachers, and other professionals in making instructional decisions and communicating with colleagues and families (e.g., laws and policies governing student privacy, special education, and limited English proficient education, including but not limited to Bulletin 1508, Bulletin 1530, Bulletin 1706, and Bulletin 1903).

External Outcomes Links

13.1 Data

Secondary Education - Praxis PLT #5624:

English		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017
#5624 overall	Number	0	0	1	3
	Mean			180	174
	Range			180	170-179
	% Pass 1st attempt			100%	100%
	% Pass prior to ST/Intern			100%	100%
#5624 breakdown:	Number	0	0	1	2
Students as Learners	Mean			16	14
	Range			16	13-15
Instructional Process	Mean			19	16.5
	Range			19	16-17
Assessment	Mean			10	11.5
	Range			10	11-12
Professional Development Leadership and Community	Mean			13	10.5
	Range			13	10-11
Analysis of Instructional Scenarios	Mean			11	11
	Range			11	10-12

Social Studies		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017
#5624 overall	Number	0	1	3	4
	Mean		163	174	174
	Range		163	173-176	166-186
	% Pass 1st attempt		100%	100%	100%
	% Pass prior to ST/Intern		100%	100%	100%
#5624 breakdown:	Number		1	3	4
Students as Learners	Mean		11	15	15
	Range		11	13-16	12-19
Instructional Process	Mean		14	17	15
	Range		14	16-18	13-18
Assessment	Mean		6	10	11
	Range		6	9-12	9-12
Professional Development Leadership and Community	Mean		9	9	10
	Range		9	9-10	7-13
Analysis of Instructional Scenarios	Mean		12	10	11
	Range		12	9-11	10-13

Biology		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017
#5624 overall	Number	1	2	0	1
	Mean	174	179		188
	Range	174	177-180		188
	% Pass 1st attempt	100%	100%		100%
	% Pass prior to ST/Intern	100%	100%		100%
#5624 breakdown:	Number	1	2		1

Students as Learners	Mean	15	16		17
	Range	15	14-18		17
Instructional Process	Mean	17	18		16
	Range	17	18		16
Assessment	Mean	12	12		13
	Range	12	11-13		13
Professional Development Leadership and Community	Mean	8	11		9
	Range	8	10-12		9
Analysis of Instructional Scenarios	Mean	10	10		15
	Range	10	9-11		15

Spanish		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017
#5624 overall	Number	0	1	0	0
	Mean		177		
	Range		177		
	% Pass 1st attempt		100%		
	% Pass prior to ST/Intern		100%		
#5624 breakdown:	Number		1		
Students as Learners	Mean		15		
	Range		15		
Instructional Process	Mean		14		
	Range		14		
Assessment	Mean		10		
	Range		10		
Professional Development Leadership and Community	Mean		12		
	Range		12		
Analysis of Instructional Scenarios	Mean		14		
	Range		14		

The data table for Principles of Learning and Teaching #5624 for Grades 7-12 and 5841 for World Language Pedagogy (Combined Data for MAT Secondary Education Content Areas) is attached.

Artifacts

[MAT SEC Praxis PLT_18-19](#) [DOCX 128 KB MAR 9, 2020]

[MAT_Secundary_Praxis PLT_17-18](#) [PDF 81 KB SEP 21, 2018]

13.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:

100% of students passed the test prior to student teaching and 100% passed the test on the first attempt. This benchmark has been met.

2016-2017:

100% of students pass the PLT prior to student teaching and on the students' first attempt. The Department plans on relaying this data to the Educational Advisory board in order to encourage accurate advising to continue this high student success rate.

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: 100% of candidates passed the PLT on the first attempt.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: 100% of candidates will pass PLT exam on first attempt.

Recommendations to Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement: Determine action plans based on adopted departmental benchmarks.

2018-2019:

Benchmark was determined to be 90% of candidates will pass the PLT on their first attempt.

The goal of 2019-2020 will be for 100% of candidates to pass the PLT on their first attempt.

The recommendation is to advise students to use Mometrix as a study guide prior to taking the PLT and/or develop a PLT Workshop for any students struggling to pass the PLT.

End of report