



## General Business Administration [GBAD]

### **Cycles included in this report:**

Jun 1, 2020 to May 31, 2021

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

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

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

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

## **Program Name: General Business Administration [GBAD]**

**Reporting Cycle: Jun 1, 2020 to May 31, 2021**

### **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**

The assessment results are analyzed by the assurance of learning committee, department heads, and the dean. In 2009, review sessions were implemented to refresh students on basic business concepts. Since this began we have noticed an increase in MFT scores across disciplines including general business. The average overall MFT score prior to 2009 was 150 (43<sup>rd</sup> percentile), and the 2013-2014 overall MFT score was 158 (87<sup>th</sup> percentile). The average overall MFT score in spring 2015 was 157 (63<sup>rd</sup> percentile). The 2015-2016 overall average MFT score for general business administration majors was 152 (53<sup>th</sup> percentile), exceeding the target MFT score of 140. The 2016-2017 overall average MFT score for general business administration majors was 152 (56<sup>th</sup> percentile), exceeding the target MFT score of 140.

2017-2018:

2018-2019:

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

### **4 Program Highlights from the Reporting Year**

Our general business degree offers students an inclusive education of all areas of business. Seventeen students received degrees in general business administration during the academic year of 2015, 35 in 2016, and 36 in 2017. An average of five general business administration majors had internships during the years 2015-2017.

2017-2018:

2018-2019:

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

### **5 Program Mission**

The Bachelor of Science in General Business Administration serves residents of southwest Louisiana seeking a college degree as well as both public and private employers in the regions. The curriculum is specifically designed to meet the needs of regional economic development and prepares students for leadership in the global economy.

### **6 Institutional Mission Reference**

### **7 Assessment and Benchmark** MGMT 481 Written Communication Assessment

**Assessment:** For written communication assessment, general business administration students' papers are sampled from MGMT 481 - Strategic Management and analyzed by a team of reviewers from across disciplines.

**Benchmark:** 70% of students sampled will score a "Pass" (average or greater) on the assessment rubric.

Prior to fall 2016, the benchmark was 60% of students sampled will score a "Pass" (average or greater) on the assessment rubric.

#### Outcome Links

##### Communication [Program]

General business administration graduates will formulate and express ideas effectively through oral, written, and /or technological communication in academic and professional environments.

## 7.1 Data

Term	Students with a score of "Pass"		Benchmark Met?
	#	%	
Fall 2013	—	60%	Yes
Fall 2014	—	80%	Yes
Fall 2015	—	100%	Yes
Fall 2016	—	60%	No
Fall 2017			
Fall 2018			
Fall 2019			
Fall 2020			

#### Outcome Links

##### Communication [Program]

General business administration graduates will formulate and express ideas effectively through oral, written, and /or technological communication in academic and professional environments.

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

2015-2016:

No data is available for the spring terms because written communication is only assessed in the fall semester. However, because the benchmark was consistently met in fall 2013, fall 2014, and fall 2015, it was increased for the fall 2016 term to 70% of students will score a "Pass" (average or greater) on the assessment rubric.

2016-2017:

This target was not met in fall 2016. The College will create and disseminate a common writing format and assessment standard within the College of Business, create assignments for students to enhance communication skills, and create a method to deliver feedback from oral presentation assessment to professors and students.

2017-2018:

2018-2019:

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

#### Outcome Links

**Communication [Program]**

General business administration graduates will formulate and express ideas effectively through oral, written, and/or technological communication in academic and professional environments.

**8 Assessment and Benchmark** MGMT 481 Critical Thinking Paper

Assessment: Student papers are analyzed by a team of reviewers from across disciplines. They apply a rubric measuring five characteristics that show evidence of critical thinking skills.

Benchmark: 75% of students sampled will score a "Pass" (average or greater) on the assessment rubric.

Prior to fall 2016 the benchmark was 60% of students sampled will score a "Pass" (average or greater) on the assessment rubric.

**Outcome Links****Critical Thinking [Program]**

General business administration graduates will apply critical thinking in academic and professional environments.

**8.1 Data**

Term	Students with a score of "Pass"		Benchmark Met?
	#	%	
Fall 2013	80%	Yes	
Fall 2014	—	80%	Yes
Fall 2015	—	100%	Yes
Fall 2016	—	60%	No
Fall 2017			
Fall 2018			
Fall 2019			
Fall 2020			

**Outcome Links****Critical Thinking [Program]**

General business administration graduates will apply critical thinking in academic and professional environments.

**8.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement**

2015-2016:

No data is available for the spring terms because critical thinking is only assessed via a critical thinking rubric in the fall semester. However, because the benchmark was consistently met in fall 2013, fall 2014, and fall 2015, it was increased for the fall 2016 term to 75% of students will score a "Pass" (average or greater) on the assessment rubric.

2016-2017:

This was not met in fall 2016.

2017-2018:

2018-2019:

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

**Outcome Links**

**Critical Thinking [Program]**

General business administration graduates will apply critical thinking in academic and professional environments.

**9 Assessment and Benchmark Major Area Test**

Assessment: A Major Area Test (MAT) has been given to graduating seniors in the fall and spring semesters to assess the following learning goals:

- Demonstrate an understanding of fundamental business concepts across the business disciplines of accounting, economics, finance, management, and marketing.
- Demonstrate the ability to identify and discern the impact of internal and external factors of the business environment.
- Demonstrate the ability to utilize financial information and documents to evaluate business concerns.

The MAT is based on a 20-question multiple-choice test written by faculty which has been given to graduating seniors in the fall and spring semesters.

Benchmark: 70% of general business administration majors will achieve a score of 60% or higher on the MAT.

Prior to fall 2016, the benchmark was 70% of general business administration majors will achieve a score of 50% or higher on the MAT.

**Outcome Links****Business Administration Concepts [Program]**

General business administration graduates will demonstrate knowledge of and ability to apply general business concepts.

**9.1 Data**

Term	Students with 60% or higher		Benchmark Met?
	#	%	
Spring 2014	—	63%	Yes
Fall 2014	—	75%	Yes
Spring 2015	—	78%	Yes
Fall 2015	—	40%	No
Spring 2016	—	17%	No
Fall 2016	—	71%	Yes
Spring 2017			
Fall 2017			
Spring 2018			
Fall 2018			
Spring 2019			
Fall 2019			
Spring 2020			
Fall 2020			
Spring 2021			

**Outcome Links****Business Administration Concepts [Program]**

General business administration graduates will demonstrate knowledge of and ability to apply general business concepts.

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

2015-2016:

Students failed to meet the benchmark in both fall 2015 and spring 2016 with the percentage of students meeting the benchmark decreasing drastically in fall 2015 and again in spring 2016. Beginning fall 2016, we will disaggregate the test results by topic to discern the problem area(s).

2016-2017:

2017-2018:

2018-2019:

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

**Outcome Links**

**Business Administration Concepts [Program]**

General business administration graduates will demonstrate knowledge of and ability to apply general business concepts.

## 10 Assessment and Benchmark Bachelor

Assessment: The *ETS*<sup>®</sup> Major Field Test for the Bachelor's Degree in Business contains 120 multiple-choice questions designed to measure a student's subject knowledge and the ability to apply facts, concepts, theories and analytical methods. Some questions are grouped in sets and based on diagrams, charts and data tables. The questions represent a wide range of difficulty and cover depth and breadth in assessing students' achievement levels.

- Benchmark 1: Students will score a mean overall score of 145 or higher on the Major Field Test.
  - Prior to 2016-2017, the benchmark was a mean overall score of 140.
- Benchmark 2: Students will score at or above the 55th percentile in each content area of the MFT.
  - Prior to fall 2015, the benchmark was that students will score at or above the 50th percentile in each content area of the MFT.
- Benchmark 3: Students will score at or above the 70th percentile on the International Issues content area of the MFT.
  - Prior to 2016-2017, the benchmark was that students will score at or above the 55th percentile on the International Issues content area of the MFT.

**Outcome Links**

**Basic Business Concepts [Program]**

General business administration graduates will demonstrate knowledge of basic business concepts.

**Global Community [Program]**

General business administration graduates will analyze the global community to make sound judgements in academic and professional environments.

### 10.1 Data Overall MFT Score

Academic Year	Mean Overall Score	Benchmark Met?
2013-2014	159	Yes
2014-2015	154	Yes
2015-2016	152	Yes
2016-2017	152	Yes

2017-2018		
2018-2019		
2019-2020		
2020-2021		

#### Outcome Links

##### Basic Business Concepts [Program]

General business administration graduates will demonstrate knowledge of basic business concepts.

#### 10.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement Overall MFT Score

2015-2016:

This benchmark has been consistently met for the past three years; thus, it will be increased for the 2016-2017 academic year to a mean overall score of 145. Also, beginning in fall 2016, scores will be disaggregated by term to allow for better analysis.

2016-2017:

2017-2018:

2018-2019:

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

#### Outcome Links

##### Basic Business Concepts [Program]

General business administration graduates will demonstrate knowledge of basic business concepts.

#### 10.2 Data Average Content Area Scores of MFT

Content Area	2013-2014	2014-2015
Accounting	78th	79th
Economics	96th	90th
Finance	73rd	31st
Information Systems	69th	81st
International Issues	82nd	84th
Legal/Social Environment	81st	67th
Management	84th	79th
Marketing	76th	43rd
Quantitative Business Analysis	95th	75th

Content Area	Fall 2015*	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
Accounting	7th	7th	58th			
Economics	87th	73rd	42nd			
Finance	51st	14th	17th			
Information						

Systems	34th	22nd	76th			
International Issues	85th	76th	24th			
Legal/Social Environment	99th	25th	10th			
Management	98th	26th	96th			
Marketing	98th	17th	25th			
Quantitative Business Analysis	73rd	65th	1st			

\*Beginning in Fall 2015, the data was disaggregated by term to allow for better analysis.

Content Area	Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
Accounting						
Economics						
Finance						
Information Systems						
International Issues						
Legal/Social Environment						
Management						
Marketing						
Quantitative Business Analysis						

**Outcome Links**

**Basic Business Concepts [Program]**

General business administration graduates will demonstrate knowledge of basic business concepts.

**10.2.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement** Average Content Area Scores of MFT

2015-2016:

In fall 2015, students failed to meet the benchmark in the Accounting, Finance, and Information Systems content areas. In spring 2016, students failed to meet the benchmark in the Accounting, Finance, Information Systems, Legal/Social Environment, Management, and Marketing content areas. The drastically significant score decreases in spring 2016 are certainly worrisome. We would like to monitor for one more year to see if any of these scores below the benchmark increase; if scores do not increase, we will thoroughly review the curriculum and add more assessments throughout the program to notify us of problem areas before students reach MGMT 481. The College will continue to develop and add to review modules provided via Moodle for all students enrolled in MGMT 481 lab, create practice questions for students, and add in-person reviews in the MGMT 481 lab with an emphasis on information systems.

2016-2017:

2017-2018:

2018-2019:

2019-2020:



2020-2021:

[Outcome Links](#)

**Basic Business Concepts [Program]**

General business administration graduates will demonstrate knowledge of basic business concepts.

**10.3 Data International Issues Content Area of MFT**

Academic Year	Mean Correct Score	Benchmark Met?
2013-2014	82nd	Yes
2014-2015	84th	Yes

Term	Mean Correct Score	Benchmark Met?
Fall 2015*	85th	Yes
Spring 2016	76th	Yes
2016-2017	40th	No
Fall 2017		
Spring 2018		
Fall 2018		
Spring 2019		
Fall 2019		
Spring 2020		
Fall 2020		
Spring 2021		

\*Beginning in Fall 2015 (with the exception of 2016-2017), the data was disaggregated by term to allow for better analysis.

[Outcome Links](#)

**Global Community [Program]**

General business administration graduates will analyze the global community to make sound judgements in academic and professional environments.

**10.3.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement International Issues Content Area of MFT**

2015-2016:

Although the benchmark was increased from a score at or above the 50th percentile to a score at above the 55th percentile for 2015-2016, the new benchmark has been consistently met for the past three years; the combined fall 2015 and spring 2016 score for students is 92nd percentile on 'international issues'. Therefore, it will be increased for the 2016-2017 academic year to a score at or above the 70th percentile.

2016-2017:

2017-2018:

2018-2019:

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

[Outcome Links](#)

**Global Community [Program]**

General business administration graduates will analyze the global community to make sound judgements in academic and professional environments.

**11 Assessment and Benchmark Business Administration Praxis**

Assessment: Praxis Business Content Exam

Program: Business Traditional; Exam #: 5101

Benchmark: 90% of the candidates will pass the Praxis Business Content Exam on the first attempt.

**11.1 Data**

			Fall 2015	Spring 2016
Overall score information			Mean 175	Mean —
			Range 167-182	Range —
Passes on first attempt			100%	—
Passed prior to student teaching/intern			100%	—
Sub-component	Standard Alignment		Fall 2015 N=2	Spring 2016 N=0
Accounting & Finance		Mean	12	
		Range	11-12	
		% Correct (18)		
Communication & Career Development		Mean	16	
		Range	14-18	
		% Correct (18)		
Economics		Mean	8	
		Range	7-8	
		% Correct (12)		
Entrepreneurship		Mean	11	
		Range	10-11	
		% Correct (12)		
Information Technology		Mean	15	
		Range	13-17	
		% Correct (18)		
Law & International Business		Mean	11	
		Range	9-12	
		% Correct (18)		
Marketing &		Mean	9	
		Range	8-9	

Management		% Correct (12)		
Professional Business Education		Mean	10	
		Range	10	
		% Correct (12)		

2017-2018:

There were no completers in the Business Education program and, therefore, no new data to report.

2018-2019:

Data not reported.

2019-2020:

Data not reported.

			Fall 2020	Spring 2021
Overall score information			Mean 166	Mean 163
			Range 166	Range 163
Passes on first attempt			100%	100%
Passed prior to student teaching/intern			100%	100%
Sub-component	Standard Alignment		Fall 2020 N=1	Spring 2021 N=1
Accounting & Finance		Mean	12	14
		Range	12	14
		% Correct (18)	67%	78%
Communication & Career Development		Mean	13	15
		Range	13	15
		% Correct (18)	72%	83%
Economics		Mean	7	6
		Range	7	6
		% Correct (12)	58%	50%
Entrepreneurship		Mean	10	10
		Range	10	10
		% Correct (12)	83%	83%
Information Technology		Mean	16	10
		Range	16	10
		% Correct (18)	89%	56%
Law & International Business		Mean	13	11
		Range	13	11
		% Correct		

		(18)	72%	61%
Marketing & Management		Mean	8	5
		Range	8	5
		% Correct (12)	67%	42%
Professional Business Education		Mean	8	8
		Range	8	8
		% Correct (12)	67%	67%

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

2016-2017:

100% of students passed the exam before student teaching and also passed it on the first attempt. This benchmark has been met.

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: There were no completers in the Business Education program and therefore, no new data to analyze.

2018-2019:

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

The benchmark was met for the 2020-2021 academic year with 100% of candidates passing the exam on the first attempt. Therefore, a closer look at sub-category data will be addressed for continuous improvement.

The percentage correct for the fall 2020 sub-categories ranged from 58% to 89%, with Economics having the lowest percentage score. The spring 2021 data for percentage correct ranged from 42% to 83%. Those two lowest scoring categories included *Marketing and Management (42%)* and *Economics (50%)*. For both semesters, *Economics* had the lowest scores.

A business content faculty member should sit for the Praxis Content exam during the 2021-2022 academic year. This will provide insight into the e types of questioning on the current exam and provide a glimpse into what topics need to be further addressed within the program. It is critical that candidates are not only introduced to the knowledge, but that it is also reviewed and reinforced throughout the program to ensure in depth understanding that can be transferred to their own students when serving as a teacher of record.

## 12 Assessment and Benchmark FEE Content

Assessment: Field Experience Evaluation Domain 5.

Benchmark: 100% of candidates will score a 3.00 or better on each element of the Field Experience Evaluation Domain 5 rubric.

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

### 12.1 Data

Business	Fall 2015			Spring 2016			Fall 2016			Spring 2017		
Component	#	Mean	Range	#	Mean	Range	#	Mean	Range	#	Mean	Range
5.1	2	4.00	4.00				4	3.88	3.75-4.00	1	3.83	3.83
			3.75-						3.63-			

5.2	2	3.82	3.88				4	3.69	3.75	1	3.75	3.75
5.3	2	3.88	3.88				4	3.79	3.50-4.00	1	3.38	3.38
5.4	2	3.88	3.88				4	3.69	3.13-3.88	1	3.50	3.50
5.5	2	4.00	4.00				4	3.88	3.75-4.00	1	3.63	3.63
5.6	1	3.00	3.00				2	3.63	3.25-4.00	1	3.63	3.63
5.7	2	4.00	4.00				4	3.74	3.25-3.88	1	3.50	3.50
5.8	2	3.50	3.00-4.00				4	3.54	3.00-4.00	1	3.00	3.00
5.9	2	4.00	4.00				4	3.64	3.50-4.00	1	3.75	3.75
5.1	2	3.88	3.88				4	3.72	3.38-4.00	1	3.25	3.25

2017-2018:

There were no completers in the Business Education program and therefore, no new data to report.

2018-2019:

Data not reported.

2019-2020:

Data not reported.

Business Component	Fall 2020			Spring 2021			Fall 2021			Spring 2022		
	#	Mean	Range	#	Mean	Range	#	Mean	Range	#	Mean	Range
5.1	0			1	4.00	4.00						
5.2				1	3.33	3.33						
5.3				1	3.58	3.58						
5.4				1	3.00	3.00						
5.5				1	3.08	3.08						
5.6												
5.7												
5.8												
5.9												
5.10				1	4.00	4.00						
TECH 1				1	4.00	4.00						
TECH 2				1	4.00	4.00						
TECH 3				1	4.00	4.00						

**12.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement**

2016-2017:

This benchmark has been met or exceeded.

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: There were no completers in the Business Education program and therefore, no new data to analyze.

2018-2019:

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

The benchmark was met for the Domain 5 elements and the three added TECH components. There were no domain 5 scores reported for the fall 2020 semester partially due to COVID-19 restrictions and issues arising from hurricanes Laura and Delta.

During the summer 2021 semester, EPP faculty will meet with content faculty to update the domain 5 rubric components so that it is aligned to the correct and current standards.

### 13 Assessment and Benchmark inTASC Standards - Lesson Planning

Assessment: Lesson Planning Rubric

Benchmark: 80% of candidates will score 3.00 or better on each element of the lesson plan rubric.

#### 13.1 Data

Business:

Rubric Element	InTASC Standard		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017
Essential Questions		Number	1	1	4	1
		Mean	1.00	3.00	1.75	2.00
		Range	1.00	3.00	1.00-3.00	2.00
		% Proficient or Higher	0%	100%	25%	0%
Content Standards		Number	1	1	4	1
		Mean	2.00	3.00	1.75	2.00
		Range	2.00	3.00	1.00-3.00	2.00
		% Proficient or Higher	0%	100%	25%	0%
Student Outcomes	4n	Number	1	1	4	1
		Mean	3.00	2.00	2.00	1.00
		Range	3.00	2.00	1.00-3.00	1.00
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	0%	25%	0%
Technology	5l	Number	1	1	4	1
		Mean	4.00	4.00	2.50	2.00
		Range	4.00	4.00	1.00-4.00	2.00
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%	50%	0%
Educational Materials		Number	1	1	4	1
		Mean	3.00	3.00	2.50	2.00
		Range	3.00	3.00	1.00-4.00	2.00
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%	50%	0%
		Number	1	1	4	1

Procedures	3k	Mean	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.00
		Range	3.00	3.00	1.00-3.00	2.00
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%	25%	0%
Lesson "Hook"	8j	Number	1	1	4	1
		Mean	2.00	2.00	1.50	2.00
		Range	2.00	2.00	1.00-3.00	2.00
		% Proficient or Higher	0%	0%	25%	0%
Pre-Planned (Seed) Questions	8i	Number	1	1	4	1
		Mean	1.00	1.00	2.00	2.00
		Range	1.00	1.00	1.00-3.00	2.00
		% Proficient or Higher	0%	0%	25%	0%
Modeled, Guided, Collab, & Ind. Practice	7k	Number	1	1	4	1
		Mean	2.00	3.00	1.75	2.00
		Range	2.00	3.00	1.00-2.00	2.00
		% Proficient or Higher	0%	100%	0%	0%
Closure		Number	1	1	4	1
		Mean	3.00	2.00	1.75	2.00
		Range	3.00	2.00	1.00-3.00	2.00
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	0%	25%	0%
Formative/Summative Assessment	6j	Number	1	1	4	1
		Mean	3.00	3.00	2.00	3.00
		Range	3.00	3.00	1.00-3.00	3.00
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%	50%	100%
Relevance & Rationale	2j	Number	1	1	4	1
		Mean	4.00	4.00	2.25	1.00
		Range	4.00	4.00	1.00-3.00	1.00
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%	50%	0%
Exploration, Extension, Supplemental	1e	Number	1	1	4	1
		Mean	2.00	3.00	1.25	2.00
		Range	2.00	3.00	1.00-3.00	2.00
		% Proficient or Higher	0%	100%	25%	0%
		Number	1	1	4	1

Differentiation	7j	Mean	1.00	1.00	1.25	2.00
		Range	1.00	1.00	1.00-2.00	2.00
		% Proficient or Higher	0%	0%	0%	0%

2017-2018:

There were no completers in the Business Education program and therefore, no new data to report.

2018-2019:

Data not reported.

2019-2020:

Data not reported.

2020-2021:

Data table attached.

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

SEC BUS\_Lesson Plan \_20-21

### 13.1.1 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 were no completers in the Business Education program and therefore, no new data to analyze.

2018-2019:

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

The benchmark was not met for the 2020-2021 academic year. 72% (16/22) of the categories had less than 80% proficiency. It is important to note the low n value (N=2). Completers of the redesigned one-year residency programs are required to enroll in *EDUC 318: Planning and Instruction for Literacy in the Content Area* course early on in the program (Term 4, spring). This course is designed to teach candidates the importance of planning for instruction, taking into consideration the students within the P-12 courses and the objectives and content that needs to be covered. This course will provide a foundation for understanding the components of the plan utilized in methods coursework. Additionally, future data will include a progression of lesson plan data from the initial work in EDUC 318 to the teacher residency semester

## 14 Assessment and Benchmark FEE - Specific inTASC Standards

Assessment: Field Experience Evaluation Domains 1-4

Benchmark: 100% of candidates will score a 3.00 or better on each element of the Field Experience Evaluation Domains 1-4 rubric.







1.1.1	4n		4.00	4.00		3.88	3.88					
1.1.2	6r		4.00	4.00		3.88	3.88					
1.1.3	2g		4.00	4.00		3.88	3.88					
1.1.4	1b		4.00	4.00		3.63	3.63					
2.1.1	3j		3.67	3.67		3.25	3.25					
2.1.2	3d		4.00	4.00		3.38	3.38					
2.1.3	3d		3.67	3.67		3.75	3.75					
2.1.4	3d		4.00	4.00		3.50	3.50					
2.2.1	3c		3.67	3.67		3.63	3.63					
2.2.2	3f		4.00	4.00		2.88	2.88					
2.2.3	3f		3.67	3.67		3.13	3.13					
3.1.1	8f		4.00	4.00		2.50	2.50					
3.1.2	4c		4.00	4.00		2.88	2.88					
3.1.3	5e		4.00	4.00		2.75	2.75					
3.2.1	7a		4.00	4.00		3.13	3.13					
3.2.2	3j		4.00	4.00		3.25	3.25					
3.2.3	4f		4.00	4.00		3.50	3.50					
3.2.4	3d		4.00	4.00		2.50	2.50					
3.3.1	6d		3.33	3.33		3.13	3.13					
3.3.2	6a		4.00	4.00		3.25	3.25					
3.3.3	6d		4.00	4.00		3.38	3.38					
3.3.4	8b		3.67	3.67		2.50	2.50					
4.1.1	9o		4.00	4.00		3.38	3.38					
4.1.2	9l		4.00	4.00		4.00	4.00					
4.1.3	9o		4.00	4.00		4.00	4.00					

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

2016-2017:

This benchmark has been met or exceeded.

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: There were no completers in the Business Education program and therefore, no new data to analyze.

2018-2019:

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

The benchmark was not met for the 2020-2021 academic year on each component for domains 1-4 of the FEE. It is important to consider the data may reflect the challenges of the candidates' student teaching experience which was impacted by the extraordinary circumstances of COVID-19 and continued recovery from the fall 2020 hurricanes.

The FEE data from the fall 2020 semester did meet benchmark. All Domain scores and sub scores were above 3.00. However, in the spring 2021 semester, the following sub-categories were below 3.00: 2.2.2, 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.1.3, 3.2.4, and 3.3.4. Faculty and University Supervisors have begun to conduct pre- and post-conferences (POP Cycles) with candidates to discuss expectations for the lesson being taught and to evaluate the success of the lesson afterward. IN preparation for the fall 2021 semester and to work toward meeting benchmark

in all components, EPP secondary faculty will distribute and implement components of the POP Cycle within their courses. This will assist in increasing understanding, usefulness, and implementation expectations to prepare candidates to achieve higher scores on the assessment during teacher residency. The EPP will provide training and opportunities to establish inter-rater reliability and norming of the FEE rubric.

## 15 Assessment and Benchmark Outcomes - TCWS

Assessment: Teacher Candidate Work Sample

Benchmark: 80% or more of the candidates will score a 3.00 or better on each element assessed in the Teacher Candidate Work Sample Rubric.

### 15.1 Data

Business:

Criteria		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017
Choice of Assessment	Number	2		4	1
	Mean	3.00		3.50	4.00
	Range	2.00-4.00		2.00-4.00	4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	50%		75%	100%
Pre-assessment	Number	2		4	1
	Mean	2.50		3.50	4.00
	Range	2.00-3.00		2.00-4.00	4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	50%		75%	100%
Post-assessment	Number	2		4	1
	Mean	3.00		3.50	4.00
	Range	3.00		2.00-4.00	4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	100%		75%	100%
Alignment of Lesson Evidence	Number	2		4	1
	Mean	2.50		3.50	3.00
	Range	2.00-3.00		2.00-4.00	3.00
	% Proficient or Higher	50%		75%	100%
Student Level of Mastery & Evaluation of Factors	Number	2		4	1
	Mean	3.00		3.50	4.00
	Range	3.00		2.00-4.00	4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	100%		75%	100%
	Number	2		4	1

Data to Determine Patterns & Gaps	Mean	2.50		3.50	4.00
	Range	2.00-3.00		2.00-4.00	4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	100%		75%	100%
Response to Interventions	Number	2		4	1
	Mean	1.00		3.50	3.00
	Range	1.00		2.00-4.00	3.00
	% Proficient or Higher	0%		75%	100%

2017-2018:

There were no completers in the Business Education program and, therefore, no new data to report.

2018-2019:

Data not reported.

2019-2020:

Data not reported.

Criteria		Fall 2020	Spring 2021	Fall 2021	Spring 2022	Fall 2022	Spring 2023
Choice of Assessment	Number	0	1				
	Mean		4.00				
	Range		4.00				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%				
Pre-assessment	Number		1				
	Mean		4.00				
	Range		4.00				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%				
Post-assessment	Number		1				
	Mean		3.00				
	Range		3.00				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%				
Alignment of Lesson Evidence	Number		1				
	Mean		2.00				
	Range		2.00				
	% Proficient or Higher		0%				
	Number		1				

Student Level of Mastery & Evaluation of Factors	Mean	4.00				
	Range	4.00				
	% Proficient or Higher	100%				
Data to Determine Patterns & Gaps	Number	1				
	Mean	4.00				
	Range	4.00				
	% Proficient or Higher	100%				
Response to Interventions	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:

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: There were no completers in the Business Education program and therefore, no new data to analyze.

2018-2019:

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

The benchmark was not met as there was one criteria in which 80% of candidates did not score at the proficiency level or above: Alignment of Lesson Evidence (0%).

The data captures the one time collection of Teaching Cycle data in the performance portfolio at the end of the program. Moving forward, at least two points of data will be used to monitor progression in the Teaching Cycle criteria in addition to the proficiency levels.

At the end of each academic year, EPAC faculty will review Teaching Cycle data and areas of concern and in need of improvement. Faculty will work together to address areas for improvement or concern (ex. clarifying directions and expectations, modeling, providing exemplars, etc.)

## 16 Assessment and Benchmark Praxis PLT

Assessment: Praxis Principles of Learning and Teaching

Benchmark: 80% of candidates will achieve a passing score on the Praxis Principles of Learning and Teaching exam on the first attempt.

Prior to 2017-2018, the benchmark was 100% of students will pass this exam before student teaching.

### 16.1 Data

Business/5624:

Overall Score Information		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
	Number	2	0	4	1					1	1
	Mean	170		173.3	161					175	166
	Range	165-175		164-181	161					175	166
	% Pass 1st Attempt	100%		75%	100%					100%	100%
	% Pass Prior to ST /Intern	100%		100%	100%					100%	100%

Subcomponent		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017
Students	Number	1	0	4	1
	Mean	8		14	11
	Range	8		11-17	11
Instruction	Number	1		4	1
	Mean	15		13	12
	Range	15		11-16	12
Assessment	Number	1		4	1
	Mean	10		8.5	12
	Range	10		6-11	12
Professional	Number	1		4	1
	Mean	8		10	10
	Range	8		8-11	10
Analysis	Number	1		4	1
	Mean	11		12	10
	Range	11		10-13	10

2017-2018:

There were no completers in the Business Education program and, therefore, no new data to report.

2018-2019:

Data not reported.

2019-2020:

Data not reported.

Subcomponent		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020 N=1	Spring 2021 N=1
Students (20)	Mean					13	11
	Range					13	11
	% Correct					65%	55%
Instructional	Mean					18	11

Process (20)	Range					18	11
	% Correct					90%	55%
Assessment (14)	Mean					10	12
	Range					10	12
	% Correct					71%	86%
Professional (14)	Mean					10	11
	Range					10	11
	% Correct					71%	79%
Analysis (16)	Mean					11	9
	Range					11	9
	% Correct					69%	56%

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

2016-2017:

100% of students passed the exam before student teaching and also passed it on the first attempt. This benchmark has been met.

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: There were no completers in the Business Education program and therefore, no new data to analyze.

2018-2019:

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

The benchmark was met. 100% of candidates passed the Praxis Principles of Learning and Teaching exam on the first attempt. The range of sub-category scores ranged from 55% to 90% correct.

EPP faculty will look at Praxis PLT across secondary programs to identify trends and areas for improvement. Based on findings, changes in instruction, course content, study materials, etc. will be made.



End of report