Secondary Education Grades 6-12 [PBC] [IS**]

Cycles included in report: Cycle #7 Jun 1, 2020 to May 31, 2021

Cycle: #7 Jun 1, 2020 to May 31, 2021

1 Is this program offered via Distance Learning?

50-99% Distance/Traditional

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

Νc

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

2015-2016:

To help strengthen our candidate's lesson planning, data analysis of student achievement, and content knowledge, we have revamped the instructions and rubrics for these assessments including more rigorous expectations within the directions and/or more thorough, clear, and descriptive components with the rubric elements.

2016-2017:

Assessment to improve instruction: Program involvement in required licensure exams and ongoing curriculum review of the PBS Secondary 6-12 program ensures that candidates are adequately prepared in the area of content knowledge. Assessment data analysis of course grades and the PRAXIS II Content Knowledge exam reveal that candidates are acquiring the necessary knowledge to integrate theories and research with respect to each content area (Reading/Language Arts, Mathematics, Social Studies, and Science). PRAXIS II Content scores and course grades indicate that candidates possess knowledge in the content areas and have an understanding of the central concepts and structures as they relate to PBC Secondary 6-12 classrooms. Assessment data collected from the FEE instrument which is utilized to assess candidate lesson planning and evaluation throughout the Program through to the student teacher experience, shows solid evidence that our candidates are able to demonstrate preparedness in the content areas.

Pedagogical and Professional Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions: Data from the Field Experience Evaluation-form (FEE) assessment used to evaluate candidates in program courses and student teaching are reviewed regularly by program faculty, university supervisors, and staff within the Office of Student Teaching and Professional Education Services. Collaboration with the area school district E3 initiative provides pre-service teachers the opportunity to develop technology skills as they relate to teaching and learning. This collaborative project equips candidates with skills necessary to integrate the use of instructional technology (e.g. Promethean Interactive whiteboard technology boards) into daily lessons.

Student Learning: During student teaching, candidates must complete the PBC Secondary 6-12 Teacher Candidate Work Sample by selecting a unit of instruction, administering a pre/post assessment on that unit of instruction, and analyzing the student performance results. This analysis requires candidates to compare the pre/post results and calculate the difference in student performance. Candidates further use the data for re-teaching purposes within their assigned classrooms. Information from this assessment is used by program faculty to develop student teaching seminars and course-embedded workshops to support candidates in the creation of future work samples.

2017-2018:

Domains 3 and 5 exhibit areas of weakness. These areas are being addressed in the program redesign.

2018-2019:

The Praxis Content and PLT exams both had 100% pass rate on the first attempt. FEE scores have improved in the past year.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

The EPP created a minor for secondary education content areas to feed into the PBC program to boost enrollment. EPAC faculty were updated on the minor opportunities and encouraged to promote minors in content areas within their colleges.

4 Program Highlights from the Reporting Year

2015-2016:

All PBC secondary candidates work with one advisory that is able to support their program requirements, build relationships with candidates and strengthen support and program clarity. Some PBC candidates are interested in obtaining a Practitioner License (PL2) and this advisor is able to direct this multi-year process with DEP licensure specialist.

2016-2017

The Department of Education Professions PBC Secondary 6-12 Program continues to enhance course development with the alignment of required elements, as well as implement new and enhanced learning experiences for the candidates. For example, the department implemented a Co-teaching model and professional development for PBC Secondary 6-12 teacher candidates in conjunction with the local school system. Teacher candidates, cooperating teachers, university professors (the pool of which has been strengthened in the Department of Education professions), and university supervisor's work together to build a co-teaching relationship for the teacher candidate's student teaching experience. The goal of the Co-teaching model and professional development is to improve the student teaching experience in order to further the success of our students during their final semester. McNeese faculty and CPSB teachers come together to provide professional development and serve as mentors for student teacher candidates in the Believe and Prepare Collaboration. This collaboration instills the Co-Teaching Model.

2017-2018:

67% of PBC/Practitioner teacher candidates are graduating within two years.

2018-2019:

Overall, PBC Secondary candidates are performing well in our program, meeting or exceeding benchmark in the FEE, TCWS, Praxis, and PLT. This would be great information to use to promote the program.

2019-2020:

2020-2021

There are currently four candidates enrolled in a secondary education minor who could potentially feed into the PBC Secondary program to complete and earn certification after graduation.

5 Program Mission

The purpose of the Post Baccalaureate Secondary certificates in 6-12 is to prepare candidates for successful entry into education as school teachers by providing opportunities for developing expertise in content knowledge, teaching methods and strategies, communication skills, behavior management, and the professional dispositions that will enable completers of the program to succeed as teachers within 6-12 grade levels.

6 Institutional Mission Reference

The PBC in Secondary Education supports McNeese State University's fundamental mission to provide successful education of students and services to the employers and communities in its region. The PBC in Secondary Education program prepares students to fulfill their roles in the teaching profession in grades 6-12 and contribute to the cultural and intellectual advancement of the citizens of Louisiana.

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

Assessment: Enrollment, Completion, Recruitment, and Retention

Track levels of student enrollment, retention, and completion. Active recruitment efforts within the community specific to your program.

CAEP Standard 3

Assessment: Completer 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 PBC program in Secondary Education within two years of being accepted into the program (499 packet).

External Outcomes Links

7.1 Data Enrollment and Completers

Enrollment and Completer Data:

All PBC Secondary Education Programs:

Academic Year	Program	# of students officially enrolled in program with an EDUC 499 packet	# of completers fall semester	# of completers spring semester	Total # of completers
2015-2016		17			9
2016-2017		5	1	2	3
2017-2018	PBC	5	1	2	3
2017-2016	Practitioner	2	0	2	2
2018-2019	PBC	6	0	3	3
2019-2020	PBC		2	0	2
2020-2021	PBC	1	0	0	0

Secondary Education Grades 6-12, Agriculture PBC:

Academic Year	# of students officially enrolled in program with an EDUC 599 packet	# of completers fall semester	# of completers spring semester	Total # of completers
2015-2016	0	0	0	0
2016-2017	0	0	0	0
2017-2018	1	0	0	0
2018-2019	0	0	0	0
2019-2020		0	0	0
2020-2021	0	0	0	0

Secondary Education Grades 6-12, Biology PBC/Practitioner:

Academic Year	# of students officially enrolled in program with an EDUC 599 packet	# of completers fall semester	# of completers spring semester	Total # of completers
2015-2016	4			3
2016-2017	2			1
2017-2018	0	0	0	0
2018-2019	0	0	0	0
2019-2020		0	0	0
2020-2021	0	0	0	0

Secondary Education Grades 6-12, Business PBC:

Academic Year	# of students officially enrolled in program with an EDUC 599 packet	# of completers fall semester	# of completers spring semester	Total # of completers
2015-2016	3			2
2016-2017	0	0	0	0
2017-2018	1	0	1	1

2018-2019	1	0	0	0
2019-2020		1	0	1
2020-2021	0	0	0	0

Secondary Education Grades 6-12, Chemistry PBC/Practitioner:

Academic Year	# of students officially enrolled in program with an EDUC 599 packet	# of completers fall semester	# of completers spring semester	Total # of completers
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		0	0	0
2020-2021	0	0	0	0

Secondary Education Grades 6-12, Chinese PBC:

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

Secondary Education Grades 6-12, English PBC/Practitioner:

Academic Year	Program	# of students officially enrolled in program with an EDUC 599 packet	# of completers fall semester	# of completers spring semester	Total # of completers
2015-2016		2			0
2016-2017		1			1
2017-2018	PBC	2	0	1	1
2017-2016	Practitioner	1	0	1	1
2018-2019	PBC	4	0	2	2
2019-2020	PBC		1	0	1
2020-2021	PBC	0	0	0	0

Secondary Education Grades 6-12, Environmental Science PBC:

Academic Year	# of students officially enrolled in program with an EDUC 599 packet	# of completers fall semester	# of completers spring semester	Total # of completers
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		0	0	0
2020-2021	0	0	0	0

Secondary Education Grades 6-12, French PBC/Practitioner:

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

Secondary Education Grades 6-12, General Science PBC/Practitioner:

Academic Year	# of students officially enrolled in program with an EDUC 599 packet	# of completers fall semester	# of completers spring semester	Total # of completers
2015-2016	2			1
2016-2017	0	0	0	0
2017-2018	0	0	0	0
2018-2019	0	0	0	0
2019-2020		0	0	0
2020-2021	0	0	0	0

Secondary Education, Grades 6-12, Mathematics PBC/Practitioner:

Academic Year	# of students officially enrolled in program with an EDUC 599 packet	# of completers fall semester	# of completers spring semester	Total # of completers
2015-2016	2			2
2016-2017	0	0	0	0
2017-2018	0	0	0	0
2018-2019	1	0	1	1
2019-2020		0	0	0
2020-2021	0	0	0	0

Secondary Education Grades 6-12, Physics Practitioner:

Academic Year	# of students officially enrolled in program with an EDUC 599 packet	# of completers fall semester	# of completers spring semester	Total # of completers
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	0	0	0	0
2020-2021	0	0	0	0

Secondary Education Grades 6-12, Social Studies PBC/Practitioner:

Academic Year	# of students officially enrolled in program with an EDUC 599 packet	# of completers fall semester	# of completers spring semester	Total # of completers
2015-2016	4			1
2016-2017	2			2
2017-2018	1	1	0	0
2018-2019	0	0	0	0
2019-2020		0	0	0
2020-2021	1	0	0	0

Secondary Education Grades 6-12, Spanish PBC/Practitioner:

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

7.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016

Enrollment has been maintained at the same level for three years. Continue to maintain enrollments through current recruitment efforts.

Xitracs Program Report
Page 6 of 46

2016-2017:

Enrollment increased from 2014 to 2016, then decreased again in 2017. The amount of completers followed a similar pattern. A recruitment committee has been formed to assess this data and review the five year recruitment plan. Also, the Pinnacle Award was Granted to support a 'Geaux Teach' Day in which local high school students are invited to McNeese's campus to participate in teaching sessions. The goal of this event is to encourage high school student enrollment into the Department of Education Professions is currently setting up a Facebook page in order to have a social media presence to encourage.

PBC Secondary 6-12 faculty schedule regular meetings to discuss CAEP requirements and plan recruitment activities in fall 2017 and spring 2018. Regular meetings stimulate ideas about recruitment programs designed to pique interest in, and instill confidence in, the EPP at McNeese. The individual programs housed in the content colleges launch, and participate in, recruitment activities as well throughout the year that include parents/families of candidates – i.e. Cowboy Q&A day/McNeese Preview Day.

2017-2018

Analysis of Data: The benchmark was not met. There has been a decline in completers since 2015-2016 data cycle. Total numbers of completers has declined since 2015-2016 data cycle (N=9); however, has averaged since then at 4.5 completers.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The goal of 2018-2019 is to collaborate with General Studies faculty to contact graduating senior about the PBC opportunities as well as to collaborate with McNeese State University Office of Admissions to contact 100% of applicants indicating interest in the PBC program.

Recommendations to Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement: A recommendation is that the Recruitment Committee document two in-service and job fairs attended with information on the PBC programs. It is also recommended that a goal of 10 potential PBC students' information be collected on sign-in sheets at these events.

2018-2019:

Analysis of Data:

There was a 14% decrease in enrollment from 2017-2018 to 2018-2019.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

The goal for 2019-2020 is to promote the PBC program via social media and recruiting events.

Recommendations for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- The department will have the presence of faculty or staff members at the TNT conference and Calcasieu Job Fair
- The programs will be promoted via departmental social media sites.
- Faculty will visit with graduates from other disciplines at Grad Fest to encourage them to enter a PBC program for teacher education.
- Minors are being created in education that will feed into the PBC programs.

Accepted

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

The benchmark was not met. Since the 2015-2016 academic year, enrollment in the PBC Secondary Education programs has substantially decreased through the years. The largest enrollment number of candidates since 2015-2016 has been 17 and the lowest enrollment was during the 2020-2021 academic year with only one candidate enrolled in the program with an EDUC 499 packet. The PBC will have an increase in enrollment for the 2021-2022 academic year as a result of recruitment efforts by the education faculty throughout the year. Moving forward, the EPP faculty will document attending at least two recruitment events/opportunities for the PBC Secondary Education programs. This may include events such as the TNT Conference, Lake Charles Job Fair, and grad fest. Advisors will also continue to promote the minor programs and encourage candidates to complete the PBC program immediately after completing their baccalaureate programs.

7.2 Data Completer Matriculation Rates

Completer Matriculation Rates:

Program Type	Cohort Academic Year	into program with 599 Packet	1-2 Years to Grad	3 Years to Grad	4 Years to Grad	5 Years to Grad	Dropped from university	State Completer	Earned Different Degree	Still Enrolled
	2013-2014	6	N=4 67%				N=2 33%			
PBC SEC ALL	2014-2015	4	N=2 50%				N=1 25%		N=1 25%	
	2015-2016									
	2016-2017	6	N=3 50%	N=1 17%			N=2 33%			
	2013-2014	_								
PBC SEC	2014-2015	_								
Agriculture	2015-2016									
-	2016-2017	1	N=1 100%							
	2013-2014	2	N=2 100%							
PBC SEC Biology	2014-2015	1	N=1 100%							
	2015-2016									
	2016-2017	_								
	2013-2014	1	N=1 100%							
PBC SEC	2014-2015	_								
Business	2015-2016									

	2016-2017	_						
	2013-2014	1	N=1 100%					
PBC SEC	2014-2015	_				Î		
Chemistry	2015-2016							
	2016-2017	_	ĺ					1
	2013-2014	_						
DDC CCC English	2014-2015	1					N=1 100%	
PBC SEC English	2015-2016							
	2016-2017	3	N=1 33%	N=1 33%		N=1 33%		
	2013-2014	_						
PBC SEC Environmental	2014-2015	_						
Science	2015-2016							
	2016-2017	_						
	2013-2014	_						
PBC SEC	2014-2015	_						
General Science	2015-2016							
	2016-2017	_						
	2013-2014	_						
PBC SEC	2014-2015	_						
Mathematics	2015-2016							
	2016-2017	_						
	2013-2014	_						
PBC SEC Physics	2014-2015	_						
PBC SEC PHYSICS	2015-2016							
	2016-2017	_						
	2013-2014	2				N=2 100%		
PBC SEC Social	2014-2015	2	N=1 50%			N=1 50%		
Studies	2015-2016							
	2016-2017	1	N=1 100%					

7.2.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: The benchmark was met by students in all secondary content areas with the exception of PBC Sec Social Studies. All PBC Sec Social Studies students dropped from the university (N=2); whereas, all PBC Biology, Business, and Chemistry students met the departmental benchmark and completed their programs within 1-2 years (N=4).

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The goal for 2018-2019 is to identify reasons students are dropping from the University 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. 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:

Analysis of Data

The benchmark was not met. Only 50% of the candidates (n=4) completed the program within two years of official admission into the program (EDUC 499).

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

The goal of 2019-2020 is to have a mid-term meeting to check the progress of students within the program to identify candidates in need of additional academic support and resources to complete the program.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- PBC Secondary faculty and advisors will meet at midterm each semester to voice any concerns with the candidates in the program.
- Faculty and advisors will follow up with candidates determined to be "at risk" and will provide additional academic support and resources for success.

2019-2020:

Xitracs Program Report
Page 8 of 46

2020-2021:

The benchmark was not met since 50% of the candidates accepted into the program in the 2016-2017 cohort either took longer than two years to complete the program or dropped from the university before completing the program. As was done in 2020-2021, the EPP faculty will continue to meet at midterm to discuss any at risk candidates that need specific attention and additional academic support to complete the program. PBC faculty will also advise candidates to follow the course sequence for a more equitable distribution of coursework to increase chances of success for candidates. EPP faculty will also work to better understand the reason candidates are dropping from the program in order to deter candidates from dropping and increase completion rates.

8 Assessment and Benchmark Curriculum Development

Assessment: Curriculum Development

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

Spring 2015:

- February 20, 2015 CLASS consulting with CPSB
- May 11, 2015 DEP Faculty Meeting Master Plan 10:30-12:30
- May 13, 2015 Master Plan 10:30-12:00

Fall 2015:

- August 18, 2015 BCOE Meeting 1:00
- August 19, 2015 DEP Meeting 9:00-10:00
- October 8, 2015 Turnitin Plagiarism 3:00-4:00

Spring 2016:

- January 12, 2016 QEP with Dr. John Gardner 9:30-5:00
- January 13, 2016 QEP 9:45-12:00
 - DEP Faculty meeting (General Information) 2:00-4:30
- January 29, 2016 DEP Faculty Meeting (CAEP) 10:00-12:30
- February 17, 2016 QEP Focus Group 12:30-2:00
 - CAEP Meeting 3:00-4:00
- February 18, 2016 CPSB Believe and Prepare
- February 19, 2016 CPSB Believe and Prepare
- March 17, 2016 CAEP Meeting
- March 21, 2016 CPSB Believe and Prepare (Presenters)
- April 18, 2016 CAEP Meeting
- May 16, 2016 DEP Workshop/SPA
- May 17, 2016 DEP workshop/SPA
- May 26, 2016 CAEP Webinar 3:00

2016-2017:

Meeting #1: December 2016

Topic: Alignment of course major assessments across programs.

Instructors present: King, Ogea, Fetter, Broussard, Williams, White, Scott-McLemore, SeSalem, Garner, Fontenot, Chaumont, Wallace, Anthony, Duhon, Zhang 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, 2017

Topic: Alignment of Louisiana Teacher Preparation Competencies across program

Instructors present: King, Ogea, Fetter, Broussard, Williams, White, Scott-McLemore, SeSalem, Garner, Fontenot, Chaumont, Wallace, Anthony, Duhon, Zhang Discussion: discussion of Louisiana Teacher Preparation Competencies across program within each course.

2017-2018:

Data table is attached.

2018-2019:

Data table is attached.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

June 24, 2020: 8:00am-12:00pm DEP Faculty

Major assessments for all programs

Xitracs Program Report Page 9 of 46

August 4, 2020: 9:00am-11:30am DEP Faculty Class Measures Rubric

August 6, 2020: 8:30am-11:00am DEP Faculty POP Cycle with Quality Feedback

August 13, 2020: 9:00-11:00 am DEP Faculty Field Experiences, Internship, Practicum Expectations

January 25, 2021: 4:00-5:30pm Mentor Teachers, University Supervisors, DEP Faculty Expectation of Student Teaching/Residency and Evaluations

Artifacts

PBC_Secondary_Curriculum Development_17-18 [PDF 97 KB SEP 23, 2018]
Secondary Education Curriculum Development [PDF 84 KB MAR 9, 2020]

8.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2010

Department of Education Professions is up for CAEP site visit in spring 2017; therefore, faculty have been meeting in preparation.

Program faculty meets at regular intervals throughout the year to discuss advising methods and program implementation.

Program Faculty will continue to collaborate with local districts to strengthen our program and prepare our teacher candidates to fully meet district needs.

2016-2017:

Action/Outcome of meeting #1: Working draft of Louisiana Competencies implementation throughout program coursework:

PBC General Competencies Outlined as follows:

- 1. FEE: EDUC 204, 316, 409, 410, 420
- 2. Content Information: Student Teaching; Want to add the content page to the FEEs used in observations

C.1 EDUC 216: SEED Questions; EDUC 416: Lesson Plan; EDUC 316: Assessment Analysis; EDUC 410: TCWS- Assessment Piece; SPED 443

C.2 EDUC 316: Assessment Analysis; EDUC 416: Informal Assessments (Pre-Mid-Post); EDUC 336; SPED 452

C.3 EDUC 316: Peer Observation, Mentor Teacher Observation, MSU Observatio

D. EDUC 204: Community Map; SPED 424; EDUC 204: In Class Group Activity: Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act; EDUC 202: Test Questions

EDUC 203

EDUC 204: FEE

EDUC 409: Teacher Candidate Work Sample

EDUC 410: Teacher Candidate Work Sample

EDUC 419: Learning Centers

SPED 424

G. SPED 443; EDUC 316: Lesson Plan (2); EDUC 409: Lesson Plan; EDUC 410: Lesson Plan (2); EDUC 420: Lesson Plan; EDUC 204: Lesson Plan

EDUC 410: Teacher Candidate Work Sample- Prove an alignment to standards

Student Teaching

EDUC 336

SPED 424

SPED 452

Action/Outcome of meeting #2: Scope and Sequence was created for the PBC Secondary 6-12 program that aligned all major assessments throughout program for implementation, collection, and data analysis.

Professors complete chart for each course taught that is within PBC initial certification program. Course charts uploaded in Moodle, in BCoE.

Professors enter GPA data digitally on the template provided in Google Drive. Demonstration follows on how to find the means of the data and discuss trends and information that can be obtained from the data.

2017-2018

Analysis of Data: The departmental benchmark of meeting twice an academic year to discuss curriculum changes/implementations, assessment data, and progress monitoring of action plans was accomplished.

The PBC program faculty met January 9th, 2018 to outline major assessments throughout the program. The program assessments were outlined on a chart in order to visualize the scope and sequence of our assessments. Additionally, the 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 PBC Secondary program.

Recommendations to Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement: Curriculum redesign for the PBC Secondary Programs adopted for the 2019-20 academic year.

2018-2019

Secondary education and content faculty met multiple times throughout the 18-19 AY to solidify the course sequences and curriculum for the PBC Secondary programs. EPAC meetings and other secondary meetings included both undergraduate and PBC coursework redesign. All PBC Secondary programs will be moving completely online in the upcoming year.

2019-2020:

2020-2021

The benchmark was met as there were multiple opportunities for professional development and program/coursework improvement discussions. EPP faculty attended virtual DEP meetings throughout the fall 2020 and spring 2021 semesters to discuss ongoing matters including those related to curricula and assessment. Additionally, virtual professional development opportunities provided insight to improving instructional practices in coursework. Due to the circumstances of the hurricanes and COVID, some meetings covered field observations and student teaching opportunities for candidates. For the 2021-2022 academic year, PBC Elementary faculty will continue to attend professional development opportunities and at least two meetings per year to discuss curriculum, assessment data, and the status of action plans.

9 Assessment and Benchmark Praxis Content Exam

Assessment: Praxis Content Exam.

Louisiana Teacher General Competency 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. InTASC standards included: 4

- 9.1 Benchmark: A minimum of 80% of graduates will pass the Praxis content exam on the first attempt.9.2 Benchmark: Candidates will scores a minimum of 70% correct in each sub-category on the Praxis Content exam specific to their subject area.

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

All PBC Secondary Content		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
	Number	3	2	1	3	1	4
Combined	% Pass 1st attempt	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	75%
		<u> </u>					
All PBC Secondary Content		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Sprin 202
	Number	0	3			0	0
Combined	% Pass 1st attempt		100%				
		Fall.	Consists	Fall.	Carias	Fall.	C
Agriculture		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Sprir 201
	Number				1		
	Mean				158		
#5704 averall	Range				158		
#5701 overall	% Pass 1st attempt				100%		
	% Pass prior to ST/intern				100%		
#5701 breakdown:	Number				1		
Agriculture	Mean				7		
Systems	Range				7		
Animal Systems	Mean				15		
Animai Gystems	Range				15		
Food Science	Mean				4		
1 dod ddichide	Range				4		
Environmental &	Mean				12		
Natural Resources	Range				12		
Plant Systems	Mean				11		
r iditi Oystems	Range				11		
Power &	Mean				13		
Technical Systems	Range				13		
Leadership	Mean				10		
Loudoioiiip	Range				10		
Agriculture		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Sprii 202
	Number	0	0			0	0
	Mean						
	Range						
	% Pass 1st						

#5701 overall	attempt			
	% Pass prior to ST/intern			
#5701 breakdown:	Number			
Agriculture	Mean			
Systems	Range			
Animal Cuatama	Mean			
Animal Systems	Range			
Food Science	Mean			
Food Science	Range			
Environmental &	Mean			
Natural Resources	Range			
Diant Customs	Mean			
Plant Systems	Range			
Power &	Mean			
Technical Systems	Range			
Loodorobin	Mean			
Leadership	Range			

Biology		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
	Number	1	2	1	0	0	0
	Mean	163	154	153			
	Range	163	154	153			
#5235 overall	% correct (120)	100%	100%	100%			
	% Pass 1st attempt						
#5235 breakdown:	Number						
Nature of Science:	Mean						
Scientific Inquiry,	Range						
Methodology, Techniques, and History	% correct (17)						
	Mean						
Molecular and	Range						
Cellular Biology	% correct (24)						
	Mean						
Genetics and	Range						
Evolution	% correct (24)						
B: " (1.)	Mean						
Diversity of Life and Organismal	Range						
Biology	% correct (24)						
	Mean						
Ecology: Organisms	Range						
and Environments	% correct (19)						
	Mean						
Science, Technology, and Social	Range						
Perspectives	% correct (12)						

Biology		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
	Number	0	0			0	0
	Mean						
	Range						
#5235 overall	% correct (120)						
	% Pass 1st attempt						
#5235 breakdown:	Number						
Nature of Science:	Mean						
Scientific Inquiry,	Range						
Methodology, Techniques, and History	% correct (17)						
	Mean						
Molecular and	Range						
Cellular Biology	% correct (24)						
	Mean						
Genetics and	Range						
Evolution	% correct (24)						
5: " (1)	Mean						
Diversity of Life and Organismal	Range						
Biology	% correct (24)						
	Mean						
Ecology: Organisms	Range						
and Environments	% correct (19)						
	Mean						
Science, Technology, and Social	Range						
Perspectives	% correct (12)						

Business		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
	Number	1	1	2010	2017	2017	1
	Mean	154	620				176
	Range	154	620				176
#5101 overall	% Pass 1st attempt	100%	100%				100%
	% Pass prior to ST/intern	100%					
#5101 breakdown:	Number	1					
Accounting &	Mean	9					
Finance	Range	9					
Communication &	Mean	14					
Career Development	Range	14					
Economics	Mean	6					
ECOHOITIICS	Range	6					
Entropropourabin	Mean	9					
Entrepreneurship	Range	9					
Information	Mean	13					
Technology	Range	13					

Law & International	Mean	8			
Business	Range	8			
Marketing &	Mean	6			
Management	Range	6			
Professional	Mean	8			
Business Education	Range	8			

Business		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
	Number	0	0			0	0
	Mean						
	Range						
#5101 overall	% Pass 1st attempt						
	% Pass prior to ST/intern						
#5101 breakdown:	Number						
Accounting &	Mean						
Finance	Range						
Communication &	Mean						
Career Development	Range						
Economics	Mean						
Loonomics	Range						
Entrepreneurship	Mean						
Entropreneuranip	Range						
Information	Mean						
Technology	Range						
Law & International	Mean						
Business	Range						
Marketing &	Mean						
Management	Range						
Professional	Mean						
Business Education	Range						

English		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
#5041/5039 overall	Number			1			
	Number						
	Mean						
#5041 overall	Range						
	% Pass 1st attempt						
	Number						
#5041 breakdown:	Range						
	Mean						
Literature &	Mean						
Understanding Text	Range						
Language &	Mean						
Linguistics	Range						
Composition &	Mean						
Rhetoric	Range						
	Number			1			2
	Mean			169			180

#5039 overall	Range	169	178-182
	% Pass 1st attempt	100%	50%
	Number	1	1
	Mean	169	178
#5039 breakdown:	Range	169	178
	% correct (122)	100%	74%
	Mean	30	33
Reading	Range	30	33
reduing	% correct (41)		80%
	Mean	23	23
Language Use	Range	23	23
and Vocabulary	% correct (28)		82%
	Mean	26	24
Writing, Speaking,	Range	26	24
Listening	% correct (41)		59%
	Mean		10
Constructed	Range		10
Response	% correct (12)		83%

English		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
#5041/5039 overall	Number	0	2			0	0
	Number		2				
	Mean		174				
#5041 overall	Range		174				
	% Pass 1st attempt		100%				
	Number						
#5041 breakdown:	Range						
	Mean						
Literature &	Mean						
Understanding Text	Range						
Language &	Mean						
Linguistics	Range						
Composition &	Mean						
Rhetoric	Range						
	Number						
	Mean						
#5039 overall	Range						
	% Pass 1st attempt						
	Number		1				
	Mean		174				
#5039 breakdown:	Range		174				
	% correct (122)		75%				
	Mean		35				
Pooding	Range		35				
Reading	% correct						

	(41)	85%		
	Mean	22		
Language Use	Range	22		
and Vocabulary	% correct (28)	79%		
	Mean	27		
Writing, Speaking,	Range	27		
Listening	% correct (41)	68%		
	Mean	8		
Constructed	Range	8		
Response	% correct (12)	67%		

French		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
	Number						1
	Mean						179
#5174 overall	Range						179
	% Pass 1st attempt						100%
#5174 breakdown:	Number						
	Mean						
Interpretive Mode:	Range						
Listening	% correct (30)						
	Mean						
Interpretive Mode:	Range						
Reading	% correct (30)						
	Mean						
Cultural	Range						
Knowledge	% correct (15)						
	Mean						
Interpersonal and Presentational	Range						
Writing	% correct (3)						
5	Mean						
Presentational and Interpersonal	Range						
and Interpersonal Speaking	% correct (3)						

Math*		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
#5062/5161 overall	Number	0	1			0	0
	Mean		174				
	Range		174				
	% correct		100%				
	% Pass 1st attempt		100%				
#5161 breakdown:	Number		1				
Number and Quantity,	Mean		30				
Algebra, Functions,	Range		30				
and Calculus	% correct		88%				
Geometry, Probability	Mean		13				

and Statistics,	Range	13		
and Discrete Mathematics	% correct	81%		

*No data for Fall 2015-Spring 2018.

Social Studies		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
	Number	1			2	1	
	Mean	164			157	187	
#5086 overall	Range	164			153-161	187	
	% Pass 1st attempt	100%			100%	100%	
#5086 breakdown:	Number	1			1		
United States	Mean	13			14		
History	Range	13			14		
147 1111° 4	Mean	9			15		
World History	Range	9			15		
Government/	Mean	14			12		
Civics	Range	14			12		
Economics	Mean	7			9		
Economics	Range	7			9		
Coornenby	Mean	11			8		
Geography	Range	11			8		
Behavioral	Mean	8			6		
Sciences	Range	8			6		
	Number				1		
0083 overall	Mean				153		
	Range				153		

Social Studies		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
	Number	0	0			0	0
	Mean						
#5086 overall	Range						
	% Pass 1st attempt						
#5086 breakdown:	Number						
United States	Mean						
History	Range						
World History	Mean						
vvona History	Range						
Government/	Mean						
Civics	Range						
Economics	Mean						
Economics	Range						
Geography	Mean						
Geography	Range						
Behavioral	Mean						
Sciences	Range						
	Number						
0083 overall	Mean						
	Range						

9.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:

As stated in the first column all candidates must pass the content exam in order to be accepted into the secondary PBC program.

The PBC Biology data table shows that a total of three candidates took the exam in fall 2015 and spring 2016 and all three passed the exam on the first attempt.

There was one PBC Business candidate who took the exam in 2015 (#5101) and they passed it on the first attempt. Likewise, the candidate who took exam #100 in 2016 passed it on the first attempt as well. The testing number changed due to Louisiana Department of Education mandates.

For PBC Social Studies, one candidate passed the exam on the first attempt in fall 2015. No attempts recorded in 2016.

Low numbers in testers for all PBC content areas do not allow for a deeper analysis of data such as mean and range.

ETS only reports subscores for two years.

2016-2017:

This chart shows that all PBC Secondary 6-12 programs from Fall 2015 through to Spring 2017 indicated a 100% pass rate on the first attempt of the Praxis content.

Data reported on this assessment reflect performance of candidates in this program demonstrated knowledge of the content associated with 6-12 programs.

All professors in the content colleges continue to be encouraged to send a representative to take the Praxis exam in order to stay abreast of, and effectively address, components of exam.

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: Overall, the passing rate in the secondary content areas fell below benchmark at 75% pass rate on the first Praxis attempt. Business and French had a 100% first time pass rate; however, the English PBC students fell below benchmark at 50% passing rate on first Praxis attempt. The English PBC teacher candidate pass rate on the Praxis first attempt brought the overall pass rate of PCB content areas below benchmark to 75%.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The goal for 2018-2019 is to set one meeting with content area faculty across campus in order to share Praxis data and facilitate discussion of learning outcomes within coursework as related to the Praxis content area exams.

Recommendations to Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement: It is recommended that the department hold one meeting with content area faculty that specifically address Praxis reporting and areas of improvement in order to identify if course contents adequately address Praxis material. It is also recommended that the department review the areas of weakness within the Praxis content exam during curriculum redesign meetings as well as during syllabi objective revisions.

2018-2019:

Analysis of Data:

The benchmark for proficiency was met. 100% of students in the PBC program passed the Praxis on their first attempt.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

The goal will remain as having 80% of graduates passing the Praxis content exam on the first attempt.

Recommendations for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- The Burton College of Education will offer Praxis workshops and have study guide materials available for candidates preparing to sit for the exam in content areas.
- All content areas will be asked to create a Praxis content workshop to be offered at least once each semester.

Spring

Fall

Spring

Spring

2019-2020

2020-2021:

All DDC Secondary Content

There were no completers in the 2020-2021 academic year and therefore no new data to report. The goal will remain as having 80% of completers passing the Praxis content exam on the first attempt. The EPP will provide a written list of Praxis resources for all candidates during their first advising session. Additionally, faculty in the content colleges have been offered the opportunity to be reimbursed to take the Praxis content exam and also receive compensation to create and administer content workshops for candidates. COVID 19 and hurricanes Delta and Laura interrupted these plans, but there will be a push to get these workshops in place during the 2021-2022 academic year.

9.2 Data

PBC Secondary Education - Praxis Content Exam:

All PBC Secondary Content		2015	2016	2016	2017	2017	2018
	Number	3	2	1	3	1	4
Combined	% Pass 1st attempt	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	75%
All PBC Secondary Content		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
	Number	0	3			0	0
Combined	% Pass 1st attempt		100%				
							•
Agriculture		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
	Number				1		
	Mean				158		
	Range				158		
#5701 overall	% Pass 1st attempt				100%		
	% Pass prior to ST/intern				100%		
#5701 breakdown:	Number				1		
Agriculture	Mean				7		
Agriculture							

Fall

Systems	Range		7	
Animal Systems	Mean		15	
Animai Systems	Range		15	
Food Science	Mean		4	
Food Science	Range		4	
Environmental &	Mean		12	
Natural Resources	Range		12	
Plant Systems	Mean		11	
Fiant Systems	Range		11	
Power &	Mean		13	
Technical Systems	Range		13	
Leadership	Mean		10	
LeaderSnip	Range		10	

Agriculture		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
	Number	0	0			0	0
	Mean						
	Range						
#5701 overall	% Pass 1st attempt						
	% Pass prior to ST/intern						
#5701 breakdown:	Number						
Agriculture	Mean						
Systems	Range						
Animal Systems	Mean						
Animal Systems	Range						
Food Science	Mean						
Food Science	Range						
Environmental &	Mean						
Natural Resources	Range						
Diant Cyatama	Mean						
Plant Systems	Range						
Power &	Mean						
Technical Systems	Range						
Leadership	Mean						
LeauerSnip	Range						

Biology		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
	Number	1	2	1	0	0	0
	Mean	163	154	153			
	Range	163	154	153			
#5235 overall	% correct (120)	100%	100%	100%			
	% Pass 1st attempt						
#5235 breakdown:	Number						
Nature of Science:	Mean						
Scientific Inquiry,	Range						
Methodology, Techniques, and History	% correct (17)						
	Mean						

Molecular and	Range						l
Cellular Biology	% correct (24)						
	Mean						
Genetics and	Range						
Evolution	% correct (24)						
5: " (1.4	Mean						
Diversity of Life and Organismal	Range						
Biology	% correct (24)						
Ecology: Organisms and Environments	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct (19)						
O: T. I.	Mean						
Science, Technology, and Social	Range						
Perspectives	% correct (12)						
Biology		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
	Number	0	0			0	0
	Mean						
# 5005 !!	Range						
#5235 overall	% correct						

Biology		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
	Number	0	0			0	0
	Mean						
	Range						
#5235 overall	% correct (120)						
	% Pass 1st attempt						
#5235 breakdown:	Number						
Nature of Science:	Mean						
Scientific Inquiry,	Range						
Methodology, Techniques, and History	% correct (17)						
Molecular and Cellular Biology	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct (24)						
	Mean						
Genetics and	Range						
Evolution	% correct (24)						
D: " (1)"	Mean						
Diversity of Life and Organismal	Range						
Biology	% correct (24)						
	Mean						
Ecology: Organisms	Range						
and Environments	% correct (19)						
	Mean						
Science, Technology, and Social	Range						
Perspectives	% correct (12)						

Business 2015 2016 2016 2017 2017 2017
--

	Number	1	1		1
	Mean	154	620		176
	Range	154	620		176
#5101 overall	% Pass 1st attempt	100%	100%		100%
	% Pass prior to ST/intern	100%			
#5101 breakdown:	Number	1			
Accounting & Finance	Mean	9			
	Range	9			
Communication &	Mean	14			
Career Development	Range	14			
Economics	Mean	6			
	Range	6			
Fatarana a constitu	Mean	9			
Entrepreneurship	Range	9			
Information	Mean	13			
Technology	Range	13			
Law & International	Mean	8			
Business	Range	8			
Marketing &	Mean	6			
Management	Range	6			
Professional	Mean	8			ĺ
Business Education	Range	8			1

Business		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
	Number	0	0			0	0
	Mean						
	Range						
#5101 overall	% Pass 1st attempt						
	% Pass prior to ST/intern						
#5101 breakdown:	Number						
Accounting &	Mean						
Finance	Range						
Communication &	Mean						
Career Development	Range						
Economics	Mean						
Economics	Range						
Entrepreneurship	Mean						
Entropronoutship	Range						
Information	Mean						
Technology	Range						
Law & International	Mean						
Business	Range						
Marketing &	Mean						
Management	Range						
Professional	Mean						
Business Education	Range						

English	Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018

#5041/5039 overall	Number	 	1		
	Number				
	Mean				
#5041 overall	Range				
	% Pass 1st attempt				
	Number				
#5041 breakdown:	Range				
	Mean				
Literature &	Mean				
Understanding Text	Range				
Language &	Mean				
Linguistics	Range				
Composition &	Mean				
Rhetoric	Range				
	Number		1		2
	Mean		169		18
#5039 overall	Range		169		178-
	% Pass 1st attempt		100%		50°
	Number	i	1		1
	Mean	İ	169		17
#5039 breakdown:	Range	i	169		17
Linguistics Composition & Rhetoric #5039 overall E5039 breakdown: Reading Language Use	% correct (122)		100%		74
	Mean		30		33
Peading	Range		30		33
Literature & Understanding Text Language & Linguistics Composition & Rhetoric #5039 overall #5039 breakdown: Reading Language Use and Vocabulary	% correct (41)				809
	Mean		23		23
Language Use	Range		23		23
and Vocabulary	% correct (28)				829
	Mean		26		24
Writing, Speaking,	Range		26		24
	% correct (41)				59°
	Mean	 			10
Constructed	Range				10
Constructed Response	% correct				83

English		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
#5041/5039 overall	Number	0	2			0	0
	Number						
#5041 overall	Mean						
	Range						
	% Pass 1st attempt						
	Number						
#5041 breakdown:	Range						
	Mean						
Literature & Understanding	Mean						

Text	Range	<u> </u>	igsquare		ļ		<u> </u>
Language &	Mean		igsquare				lacksquare
Linguistics	Range						L
Composition &	Mean						L
Rhetoric	Range						
	Number		2				
	Mean		174				П
#5039 overall	Range		174				П
	% Pass 1st attempt		100%				
	Number		1				Т
	Mean		174				П
#5039 breakdown:	Range		174				
	% correct (122)		85%		Fall Spring Fall 2016 2017		
	Mean	<u> </u>	35				Т
D "	Range		35				⇈
Reading	% correct (41)	2					
	Mean		22				Н
Language Use	Range	 					┢
and Vocabulary	% correct	 					十
	(28)		igwdown				L
	Mean		_				╙
Writing, Speaking, Listening	Range		27				Ļ
Listering	% correct (41)		68%				
	Mean		8				
Constructed	Range		8				
Response	% correct (12)		67%				
							_
French			Spring 2016		Spring 2017		S 2
	Number						
	Mean						L
#5174 overall	Range						
	% Pass 1st attempt						1
#5174 breakdown:	Number						
	Mean						
Interpretive Mode:	Range						
Listening	% correct (30)						Γ
	Mean	Ì					Π
Interpretive Mode:	Range						Т
Reading	% correct (30)						Γ
	Mean		$\vdash \vdash \vdash$				十
Cultural	Range		$\vdash \vdash \vdash$				十
Knowledge	% correct (15)						T
	Mean		\vdash				┢
Interpersonal and	Range	 					\vdash
D							₩
Presentational Writing	% correct						ı

Presentational and Interpersonal	Mean			
	Range			
Speaking	% correct (3)			

Math*		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
	Number	0	1			0	0
	Mean		174				
#5062/5161 overall	Range		174				
#3302/3101 Gvetaii	% correct		100%				
	% Pass 1st attempt		100%				
#5161 breakdown:	Number		1				
Number and Quantity,	Mean		30				
Algebra, Functions,	Range		30				
and Calculus	% correct		88%				
Geometry, Probability	Mean		13				
and Statistics, and Discrete	Range		13				
Mathematics	% correct		81%				

*No data for Fall 2015-Spring 2018.

Social Studies		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
	Number	1			2	1	
	Mean	164			157	187	
#5086 overall	Range	164			153-161	187	
	% Pass 1st attempt	100%			100%	100%	
#5086 breakdown:	Number	1			1		
United States	Mean	13			14		
History	Range	13			14		
Morld History	Mean	9			15		
World History	Range	9			15		
Government/	Mean	14			12		
Civics	Range	14			12		
Economics	Mean	7			9		
Economics	Range	7			9		
Coography	Mean	11			8		
Geography	Range	11			8		
Behavioral	Mean	8			6		
Sciences	Range	8			6		
	Number				1		
0083 overall	Mean				153		
	Range				153		

Social Studies		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
	Number	0	0			0	0
	Mean						
#5086 overall	Range						
	% Pass 1st attempt						
#5086 breakdown:	Number						
United States	Mean						

History	Range			
World History	Mean			
World History	Range			
Government/	Mean			
Civics	Range			
Economics	Mean			
Economics	Range			
Geography	Mean			
Geography	Range			
Behavioral	Mean			
Sciences	Range			
	Number			
0083 overall	Mean			
	Range			

9.2.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: Benchmark was met in all sub-categories on the Praxis content areas, with the exception of the English Praxis sub-category: Writing, Speaking, and Listening.

All Praxis content area sub-category scoring met or exceeded the departmental benchmark of 70% or higher, with the exception of the English Praxis sub-category: Writing, Speaking, and Listening (59%).

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The goal for 2018-2019 is to collect and analyze sub-category area data for all teacher candidates that report their Praxis scores.

Recommendations to Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement: It is recommended that sub-category scores are collected from all students that report/submit their Praxis scores with their 599 Packet for the next academic year.

2018-2019:

Analysis of Data:

The benchmark for proficiency was met in all areas except for the English Praxis sub-categories of Writing, Speaking, Listening (67%) and Constructed Response (68%).

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

The goal is to have all candidates score at the 70% proficiency in all sub-categories.

Recommendations for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

The lower sub-category areas in English will be flagged in order to address these lower performing areas in the Praxis workshops.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

There were no completers in the PBC Secondary Education programs during the 2020-2021 academic year, therefore, there is no new data to report. Based on previous data and recommendations for improvement, the EPP will provide a written list of Praxis resources for all candidates during their first advising session. Additionally, faculty in the content colleges have been offered the opportunity to be reimbursed to take the Praxis content exam and also receive compensation to create and administer content workshops for candidates. COVID 19 and hurricanes Delta and Laura interrupted these plans, but there will be a push to get these workshops in place during the 2021-2022 academic year.

10 Assessment and Benchmark Field Experience Evaluation by Subject Area

Assessment: Field Experience Evaluation by Subject Area.

Louisiana Teacher General Competency 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. InTASC standards included: 4, 5

- 10.1 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.
- 10.2 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 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

10.1 Data

2017-2018:

Data table is attached.

2018-2019:

Data table is attached.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

There were no completers for the PBC Secondary Education program during the 2020-2021 academic year and therefore, no new data to report.

Artifacts

PBC_Secondary_FEE by Content Area_17-18 [PDF 550 KB SEP 23, 2018]

PBC_Secondary_FEE by Content Area_18-19 [PDF 715 KB OCT 15, 2019]

10.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:

Nearly all components meet the benchmark. Track for several more years to determine if the benchmark is appropriate.

2016-2017:

Benchmark was met on all elements of the Content FEE rubric. The benchmark was set at 3.00 to indicate student level of proficiency on a rigorous rubric. All content colleges will continue to work with the Education Department to closely align their content FEE with specific standards for accreditation and student success purposes. Additionally, a co-teaching model is now being incorporated in an attempt to improve the teaching skills and knowledge of candidates, especially within the planning aspect of teaching. The latest rubric is now also more rigorous.

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: Benchmark was met in the majority of components listed on the FEE assessment. However, the following components fell below benchmark during fall 2017: all components under domain 1 and 3, Components 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.2.1, 2.2.2, and 2.2.3. In spring 2018, the following components fell below benchmark: 2.1.1, 2.2.2, 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.1.3, 3.2.2, 3.3.4.

During the fall 2017 semester, all components that did not meet benchmark specifically fell below benchmark with candidates in the Social Studies PBC program. During the spring 2018 semester, teacher candidates in the French, English, and Business PBC/Practitioner programs fell below benchmark in FEE components 2.1.1, 2.2.2, 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.1.3, 3.2.2, 3.3.4.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The goal for 2018-2019 is to share data findings with the faculty of the PBC and Practitioner programs during curriculum redesign so that they can reinforce expectations and provide examples to PBC/Practitioner students on weak domains 2 and 3.

Recommendations to Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement: Identified FEE Domains 2 and 3 weaknesses discussed with PBC and Practitioner program faculty during curriculum redesign meetings during 2018-2019 academic year. Implementation and teaching of the revised FEE domains throughout the scope and sequence of Education coursework in the curriculum redesign.

2018-2019:

Analysis of Data:

The benchmark was met. The PBC Secondary candidates met or exceeded the benchmark of 3.00 in all areas of the FEE.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

The goal for 2019-2020 is to implement the FEE, which will be assessed by the professor, in all methods courses within the PBC program.

Recommendations for Successful Implementation of the Plan for Improvement:

- 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 for improvement within their teaching at earlier points within the program.
- Methods instructors will meet once per year to view a sample video, evaluate the teaching video using the FEE, and discuss high quality academic feedback that would be provided.

2019-2020:

2020-2021

There were no completers in the 2020-2021 academic year in the PBC Secondary Education programs. Therefore, there was no new data to report. The POP Cycle will be implemented for the two observations in each of the internship/residency semesters. Data driven professional development sessions for the candidates will be delivered each week. Additionally, the EPP faculty will ensure all elements are aligned to InTASC and CAEP standards during the summer 2021 semester.

10.2 Data

2017-2018:

Data table is attached.

2018-2019:

Data table is attached.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

There were no completers in the 2020-2021 academic year and therefore no new data to report.

Artifacts

PBC_Secondary_FEE by Content Area_17-18 [PDF 550 KB SEP 23, 2018]

PBC_Secondary_FEE by Content Area_18-19 [PDF 715 KB OCT 15, 2019]

10.2.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017

For all PBC secondary certification areas (Business, Biology, and Social Studies), the overall average for each element met the standard of 3.00.

In order to ensure university supervisors are evaluating candidates with the same level of rigor, the Field Experience office implemented inter-rater reliability workshops as well as professional development for the university supervisors in May 2016.

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: Proficiency was met in all components within Domain 5 with the exception of 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4 for spring 2018.

All candidates met or exceeded all components under domain 5 with the exception of the teacher candidate within the PBC program. The Business PBC student did not meet benchmark in the following domain 5 components: 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The goal for 2018-2019 is to share data findings/analysis with the faculty of the PBC and Practitioner programs during curriculum redesign so that they can reinforce expectations and provide examples to PBC/Practitioner students on weak domains of 5.2, 5.3 and 5.4 which are content area specific.

Recommendations to Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement: Identified FEE Domains 5.2, 5.3, 5.4 weaknesses discussed with PBC and Practitioner program faculty during curriculum redesign meetings during 2018-2019 academic year. Implementation and teaching of the revised FEE domains throughout the scope and sequence of Education coursework in the curriculum redesign.

2018-2019:

Analysis of Data:

The benchmark was met. The PBC candidates met or exceeded the benchmark on each element in Domain 5 of the FEE.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

The Secondary faculty will share the domain 5 scores with the EPAC committee to address any needs that are noted.

Recommendations for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- PBC Secondary faculty will meet to review and revise (if necessary) the elements of Domain 5 to ensure that elements are aligned to current content standards.
- EPAC members will assist in identifying additional coursework, resources, or tutoring sessions that would assist candidates in improving content knowledge.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

There were no completers in the PBC Secondary Education programs during the 2020-2021 academic year and therefore no new data to report. The domain 5 elements will be aligned to current program standards for each content area during the summer 2021 semester to be implemented in fall 2021. Norming and inter-rater reliability will be established for domain 5 elements.

11 Assessment and Benchmark Lesson Planning

Assessment:

Louisiana Teacher General Competency 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.

Louisiana Teacher General Competency G:

The teacher candidate develops and applies instructional supports and plans for an Individual 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.

InTASC standards included: 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8.

Benchmark: A minimum of 80% of candidates will score at the Proficiency level (3.00) 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

11.1 Data

2017-2018:

Data tables are attached.

2018-2019:

Data tables are attached.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

There were no completers in the 2020-2021 academic year and therefore no new data to report.

Artifacts

PBC_Secondary_Lesson Plan_17-18 [PDF 108 KB SEP 23, 2018]

PBC_Secondary_Lesson Plan_17-18.2 [PDF 105 KB SEP 23, 2018]

PBC_Secondary_Lesson Plan_18-19.1 [PDF 131 KB OCT 15, 2019]

PBC_Secondary_Lesson Plan_18-19.2 [PDF 155 KB OCT 15, 2019]

PBC_Secondary_Lesson Plan_Previous Data [PDF 631 KB SEP 23, 2018]

11.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

Xitracs Program Report Page 27 of 46

2015-2016:

For PBC Business and Social Studies the sample number is low and the data set is relative to a single student. Therefore, this analysis uses the largest sample, which is PBC Biology, spring 2016 with three candidates. This is not the most accurate analysis but given the low numbers we believe this can provide insight about how to make some improvements.

For PBC Biology the mean data for Spring 2016 indicates candidates are lowest in the areas of "Essential Question" (2), "Student Outcomes" (1.33), "Content Standards" (2.67), "Technology" (2), "Educational Materials" (2.33), "Hook" (2), "Model, Guided..." (2.67), and "Formative/Summative Assessment" (2.67). The above indicators are areas that require improvement and will be addressed in secondary methods courses and the candidates' student teaching. Strengthening lesson planning earlier is important and there is a one hour course that focuses on lesson planning fundamentals. This course is not part of the degree plan for the PBC candidates: however, elements of this course should be examined and woven into other courses with PBC candidates, for examples, 402-405 and 412. Also, the lesson planning expectations should be revisited with university supervisors and partner school faculty to ensure inter-rater reliability.

2016-2017:

Candidate scores consistently did not reach the benchmark of 2.50 for the lesson planning elements - Essential questions, Procedures, Lesson Hook, Pre-Planned Questions, Closure, Relevance and Rationale, Explorations/Extensions, and Differentiation. It is recommended these vital areas be emphasized more in the Assessment class and in the Methods courses that candidates take, and candidates should have exposure earlier in the Program to specific elements of the Lesson Plan and more often.

Faculty will utilize new lesson plan template with specific content criteria to facilitate lesson planning instruction. Instructors will plan and implement additional strategies to improve scores on all elements with these post-baccalaureate candidates.

2017-2018

Analysis of Data: Benchmark was met in every component of the Lesson Plan rubric with the exception of Technology; Exploration, Extension, Supplemental; and Accommodations/Differentiation for our English Practitioner teacher candidate and Student Outcomes and Closure for our Business PCB teacher candidate.

The only components on the Lesson Plan rubric that fell below benchmark within our English Practitioner program was Technology (N=1, M=2); Exploration, Supplemental (N=1, M=2); and Accommodations/Differentiation (N=1, M=1). In our Business PBC program, the following components fell below benchmark: Student Outcomes (N=1, M=2) and Closure (N=1, M=2).

Plan for Continuous Improvement: Adopt the new Lesson Plan rubric in PBC and Practitioner programs 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:

Analysis of Data:

The benchmark was met. The PBC candidates averaged a 3.00 or higher on all components of the lesson plan.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

The goal for 2019-2020 will be to implement and utilize the revised Lesson Plan in order to better identify student weakness.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of the Plan for Improvement:

Faculty will meet to complete inter-rater reliability on the new lesson plan. The new lesson plan will also have two rubric rows to identify if students struggle with relevance and/or rationale, which will help highlight the area(s) candidates struggle with.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

There were no completers during the 2020-2021 academic year and therefore no new data to report. EDUC 318 was added as a requirement to the PBC Secondary Education programs to provide candidates with a foundation to implement lesson planning throughout their methods coursework. Faculty will continue to evaluate lesson plan data within their courses at the end of each semester. Each summer semester, faculty make recommendations for edits to the Lesson Plan Template and Rubric based on the analysis of data collected. The plan is revised and an updated version is put in to place for the following fall semester.

12 Assessment and Benchmark Field Experience Evaluation

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

Louisiana Teacher General Competency 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.

Louisiana Teacher General Competency 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. InTASC standards included: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9.

- 12.1 Benchmark: Candidates will score a 3.00 or higher on each component in the FEE rubric for Domains 1-4 of the FEE rubric.
- 12.2 Benchmark: Candidates will score 3.00 or higher on each InTASC standard assessed in the FEE rubric.
- 12.3 Benchmark: Candidates will score a 3.00 or higher on each element assessed in Domain 5 of the FEE rubric.

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 C

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

12.1 Data

2017-2018:

Data tables are attached.

2018-2019:

Data table is attached.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

There were no completers in the 2020-2021 academic year and therefore no new data to report.

Artifacts

PBC_Secondary_FEE Domains 1-4_17-18 [PDF 95 KB SEP 23, 2018]
PBC_Secondary_FEE Domains 1-4_18-19 [PDF 94 KB OCT 15, 2019]
PBC_Secondary_FEE_Previous Data [PDF 582 KB SEP 23, 2018]

12.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016

Continue to monitor for three years to determine if the benchmark is appropriate. Nearly all areas and components meet the benchmark.

2016-2017:

It is apparent that the candidates had a strong grasp of the content knowledge and demonstrated this during the clinical experience. All FEE Data is pulled from candidates' final semesters in our program. The mean score of the FEE content knowledge assessment shows evidence that this was a strong point regarding candidate preparation and background in the subject matter content.

Overall these Post-Baccalaureate candidates were successful in planning a cohesive lesson plan, planning for behavior management, providing for quality of questions, and planning for assessment. Faculty will continue to spend time mentoring these students with this instrument and understanding of the process as a whole.

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: Benchmark was met in the majority of components listed on the FEE assessment. However, the following components fell below benchmark during fall 2017: all components under domain 1 and 3, Components 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.2.1, 2.2.2, and 2.2.3. In spring 2018, the following components fell below benchmark: 2.1.1, 2.2.2, 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.1.3, 3.2.2, 3.3.4.

The following components fell below benchmark during fall 2017: all components under domain 1 and 3 (N= 1, 0% Proficiency), Components 2.1.1 (N=1, M=2.5), 2.1.2 (N=1, M=2.5), 2.2.1 (N=1, M,=1.75), 2.2.2 (N=1, M=2.13), and 2.2.3 (N=1, M=2). In spring 2018, the following components fell below benchmark: 2.1.1 (N=4, M=3.54), 2.2.2 (N=4, M=3.03), 3.1.1 (N=4, M=3.03), 3.1.3 (N=4, M=3.03), 3.2.2 (N=4, M=3.04).

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The goal for 2018-2019 is to share FEE Domains 1-4 data findings/analysis with the faculty of the PBC and Practitioner programs during curriculum redesign so that they can reinforce expectations and provide examples to PBC/Practitioner students on weak domains.

Recommendations to Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement: Identified FEE Domains 1-4 weaknesses discussed with PBC and Practitioner program faculty during curriculum redesign meetings during 2018-2019. Implementation and teaching of the revised FEE domains throughout the scope and sequence of Education coursework in the curriculum redesign.

2018-2019:

Analysis of Data:

The benchmark was met. The mean score met or exceeded the departmental benchmark on all components of the FEE rubric.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

The goal in 2019-2020 will be to incorporate the proficiency percentage as part of the benchmark.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

Incorporate the proficiency percentage into the benchmark as well as the mean score. This will allow for a more holistic view of student success in each component of the FEE rubric.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

There were no completers in the 2020-2021 academic year in the PBC Secondary Education programs. Therefore, there was no new data to report. The POP Cycle will be implemented for the two observations in each of the internship/residency semesters. Data driven professional development sessions for the candidates will be delivered each week. Additionally, the EPP faculty will ensure all elements are aligned to InTASC and CAEP standards during the summer 2021 semester.

12.2 Data

2017-2018:

Data tables are attached.

2018-2019:

Data table is attached.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

There were no completers in the 2020-2021 academic year and therefore no new data to report.

Artifacts

PBC_Secondary_FEE Domains 1-4_17-18 [PDF 95 KB SEP 23, 2018]
PBC_Secondary_FEE Domains 1-4_18-19 [PDF 94 KB OCT 15, 2019]

PBC_Secondary_FEE InTASC_Previous Data [PDF 57 KB SEP 23, 2018]

12.2.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:

All four PBC Biology candidates scored above the 3.00 benchmark on all Domain 1: Planning and Preparation elements. The lowest scored area is in the area of "value, sequence, and alignment." This area also has the lowest score as indicated in the range metric. This cohort of candidates was likely not beneficiaries of improvements made to the lesson planning process as changes were made when they were near the end of their program.

There were two PBC Business candidates. The fall 2015 candidate received highest marks as she scored 4.00 on each indicator. The spring 2016 candidate did better than the 3.00 benchmark and reported a 3.50 on each indicator. Both candidates reached proficient with all elements.

The PBC Social Studies candidate scored above the required 3.00 threshold. This candidate's lowest score was a 3.50 in areas "value, seguence and alignment" and "balance."

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: Proficiency was met in the majority of components listed on the FEE assessment. However, the following components fell below benchmark during fall 2017: all components under domain 1 and 3, Components 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.2.1, 2.2.2, and 2.2.3. In spring 2018, the following components fell below benchmark: 2.1.1, 2.2.2, 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.1.3, 3.2.2, 3.3.4.

The following components fell below benchmark during fall 2017: all components under domain 1 and 3 (N= 1, 0% Proficiency), Components 2.1.1 (N=1, M= 2.5), 2.1.2 (N=1, M=2.5), 2.2.1 (N=1, M,=1.75), 2.2.2 (N=1, M=2.13), and 2.2.3 (N=1, M=2). In spring 2018, the following components fell below benchmark: 2.1.1 (N=4, M=3.54), 2.2.2 (N=4, M=3.35), 3.1.1 (N=4, M=3.03), 3.1.3 (N=4, M=3.03), 3.2.2 (N=4, M=3.47), and 3.3.4 (N=4, M=3.04).

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The goal for 2018-2019 is to share data findings/analysis with the faculty of the PBC and Practitioner programs during curriculum redesign so that they can reinforce expectations and provide examples to PBC/Practitioner students on weak domains 1-3.

Recommendations to Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement: Identified FEE Domains 1-3 weaknesses discussed with PBC and Practitioner program faculty during curriculum redesign meetings during 2018-2019 academic year. Implementation and teaching of the revised FEE domains throughout the scope and sequence of Education coursework in the curriculum redesign.

2018-2019:

Analysis of Data:

The benchmark was met. All InTASC components on the FEE had a mean score of 3.00 or above.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

The EPP will host professional development opportunities for University Supervisors, University Professors, Administrators and Mentor Teachers to participate in inter-rater reliability and norming sessions.

Recommendations for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

Host at least one opportunity per year for those scoring the FEE to participate in inter-rater reliability and norming sessions.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

There were no completers in the 2020-2021 academic year and therefore no new data to report. The POP Cycle will be implemented for the two observations in each of the internship/teacher residency semesters. Data driven professional development sessions for the candidates will be delivered each week. Additionally, the EPP faculty will review the alignment of the elements to the InTASC standards during summer 2021.

12.3 Data

2017-2018:

Data tables are attached.

2018-2019:

Data table is attached.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

There were no completers in the 2020-2021 academic year and therefore no new data to report.

Artifacts

PBC_Secondary_FEE Domain 5_18-19 [PDF 83 KB OCT 15, 2019]

PBC_Secondary_FEE Domain 5_Previous Data [PDF 291 KB SEP 23, 2018]

PBC_Secondary_FEE_Domain 5_17-18 [PDF 76 KB SEP 23, 2018]

12.3.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018

Analysis of Data: Benchmark was met in all components within Domain 5 with the exception of 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4 for spring 2018.

Benchmark was not met in spring 2018 in the following domain 5 components: 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4. All components listed had a 75% of teacher candidates scoring proficiency.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The goal for 2018-2019 is to share data findings with the faculty of the PBC and Practitioner programs during curriculum redesign so that they can reinforce expectations and provide examples to PBC/Practitioner students on weak domains of 5.2, 5.3 and 5.4.

Recommendations to Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement: Identified FEE Domain 5.2, 5.3, 5.4 weaknesses discussed with PBC and Practitioner program faculty during curriculum redesign meetings during 2018-2019 academic year. Implementation and teaching of the revised FEE domains throughout the scope and sequence of Education coursework in the curriculum redesign.

2018-2019:

Analysis of Data:

The candidate's (n=1) mean scores on Domain 5 of the FEE rubric ranged from 3.63-4.00 on elements 5.1 through 5.1 to 5.8.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

Mentors, University Supervisors, and Administrators scoring with the FEE instrument will be encouraged to look for opportunities to score candidates on Domain 5 of the FEE rubric.

Recommendations for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

• Secondary Education faculty will meet to review and revise (if necessary) the elements of Domain 5 to ensure that the elements are aligned to current content standards.

• Domain 5 of the rubric will be attached to the FEE when given to supervisors for scoring.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

There were no completers in the PBC Secondary Education programs during the 2020-2021 academic year and therefore no new data to report. The domain 5 elements will be aligned to current content standards for each subject area during the summer of 2021 to be implemented in fall 2021. Norming and inter-rater reliability will be established for domain 5 elements.

13 Assessment and Benchmark Teacher Candidate Work Sample

Assessment: Teacher Candidate Work Sample.

Louisiana Teacher General Competency 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.

Louisiana Teacher General Competency C1:

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

InTASC standards included: 6

Benchmark: Candidates will score a 3.00 or above on each of the elements of the Teacher Candidate Work Sample rubric.

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

13.1 Data

PBC Secondary Education All Content Areas - Teacher Candidate Work Sample Data:

Criteria		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
	Number	9	6	0	8	0	3
	Mean	2.9	2.38		3.75		4.00
Choice of Assessment	Range	1.00-4.00	1.00-4.00		3.00-4.00		4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	78%	33%		100%		100%
	Number	9	6		8		3
	Mean	2.23	2.13		3.75		3.33
Pre-assessment	Range	2.00-3.00	1.00-3.00		3.00-4.00		2.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	22%	33%		100%		67%
	Number	9	6		8		3
	Mean	2.67	2.5		3.5		3.00
Post-assessment	Range	2.00-3.00	2.00-3.00		2.00-4.00		1.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	78%	50%		88%		67%
	Number	9	6		8		3
	Mean	2.3	2.25		3.63		3.67
Alignment of Lesson Evidence	Range	2.00-3.00	2.00-3.00		3.00-4.00		3.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	33%	33%		100%		100%
	Number	9	6		8		3
Otrada at Lavarla f Mastana 9	Mean	2.77	3.25		3.75		3.33
Student Level of Mastery & Evaluation of Factors	Range	2.00-3.00	3.00-4.00		3.00-4.00		2.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	67%	100%		100%		67%
	Number	9	6		8		3
	Mean	2.43	3.00		3.75		3.33
Data to Determine Patterns & Gaps	Range	2.00-3.00	2.00-4.00		3.00-4.00		2.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	67%	100%		100%		67%

Response to Interventions	Number	9	6	8	3
	Mean	1.2	1.38	3.63	3.67
	Range	1.00-2.00	1.00-4.00	3.00-4.00	3.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	0%	17%	100%	100%

	<u> </u>	F-"	1 1	F-"	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , 	F-"	
Criteria		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
	Number	0	3			0	0
	Mean		3.33				
Choice of Assessment	Range		3.00-4.00				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%				
	Number		3				
	Mean		3.33				
Pre-assessment	Range		3.00-4.00				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%				
	Number		3				
Post-assessment	Mean		3.33				
	Range		3.00-4.00				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%				
	Number		3				
	Mean		3.33				
Alignment of Lesson Evidence	Range		3.00-4.00				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%				
	Number		3				
Ctudent Level of Meetens 9	Mean		3.33				
Student Level of Mastery & Evaluation of Factors	Range		3.00-4.00				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%				
	Number		3				
	Mean		3.33				
Data to Determine Patterns & Gaps	Range		3.00-4.00				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%				
	Number		3				
	Mean		3.33				
Response to Interventions	Range		3.00-4.00				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%				

PBC Secondary Education Agriculture - Teacher Candidate Work Sample Data:

Criteria		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017
	Number		1		1
Choice of Assessment	Mean		2.00		4.00
Choice of Assessment	Range		2.00		4.00
	% Proficient or Higher		0%		100%
	Number		1		1
Pre-assessment	Mean		2.00		4.00
Fie-assessment	Range		2.00		4.00
	% Proficient or Higher		0%		100%

	Number	1 1	1 1
Alignment of Lesson Evidence tudent Level of Mastery & Evaluation of Factors Data to Determine Patterns & Gaps	Mean	2.00	4.00
	Range	2.00	4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	0%	100%
	Number	1	1
Alignment of Lagran Thirdens	Mean	2.00	4.00
Alignment of Lesson Evidence	Range	2.00	4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	0%	100%
	Number	1	1
Student Level of Mastery & Evaluation	Mean	4.00	4.00
	Range	4.00	4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%
	Number	1	1
Data to Datarmina Battarna 9 Cana	Mean	4.00	4.00
Data to Determine Patterns & Gaps	Range	4.00	4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%
	Number	1	1
Decrease to Interventions	Mean	1.00	4.00
Response to Interventions	Range	1.00	4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	0%	100%

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

	Mean			
Response to Interventions	Range			
	% Proficient or Higher			

PBC Secondary Education Biology - Teacher Candidate Work Sample Data:

Criteria		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017
	Number				1
Chains of Assessment	Mean				4.00
Choice of Assessment	Range				4.00
	% Proficient or Higher				100%
	Number				1
Dro googgement	Mean				4.00
Pre-assessment	Range				4.00
	% Proficient or Higher				100%
	Number				1
Doot conserved	Mean				4.00
Post-assessment	Range				4.00
	% Proficient or Higher				100%
	Number				1
Alignment of Leasen Evidence	Mean				4.00
Alignment of Lesson Evidence	Range				4.00
	% Proficient or Higher				100%
	Number				1
Student Level of Mastery & Evaluation	Mean				4.00
of Factors	Range				4.00
	% Proficient or Higher				100%
	Number				1
Data to Datarmina Battarna & Cana	Mean				4.00
Data to Determine Patterns & Gaps	Range				4.00
	% Proficient or Higher				100%
	Number				1
Response to Interventions	Mean				4.00
Response to interventions	Range				4.00
	% Proficient or Higher				100%

Criteria		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
	Number	0	0			0	0
	Mean						
Choice of Assessment	Range						
	% Proficient or Higher						
	Number						
	Mean						
Pre-assessment	Range						
	% Proficient or Higher						
	Number						
	Mean						
Post-assessment	Range						
	% Proficient or Higher						

1	Number				
Alignment of Lesson Evidence	Mean				
	Range				
	% Proficient or Higher				
	Number				
Student Level of Meeters ?	Mean				
Student Level of Mastery & Evaluation of Factors	Range				
	% Proficient or Higher				
	Number				
	Mean				
Data to Determine Patterns & Gaps	Range				
	% Proficient or Higher				
	Number				
	Mean				
Response to Interventions	Range				
	% Proficient or Higher				

PBC Secondary Education Business - Teacher Candidate Work Sample Data:

Criteria		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017
	Number	2		4	1
Choice of Assessment	Mean	3.00		3.50	4.00
Choice of Assessment	Range	2.00-4.00		2.00-4.00	4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	50%		75%	100%
	Number	2		4	1
Dra accessment	Mean	2.50		3.50	4.00
Pre-assessment	Range	2.00-3.00		2.00-4.00	4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	50%		75%	100%
	Number	2		4	1
Doct coccessed	Mean	3.00		3.50	4.00
Post-assessment	Range	3.00		2.00-4.00	4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	100%		75%	100%
Alimon and of Lances Friday	Number	2		4	1
	Mean	2.50		3.50	3.00
Alignment of Lesson Evidence	Range	2.00-3.00		2.00-4.00	3.00
	% Proficient or Higher	50%		75%	
	Number	2		4	1
Student Level of Mastery & Evaluation	Mean	3.00		3.50	4.00
of Factors	Range	3.00		2.00-4.00	4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	100%		75%	100%
	Number	2		4	1
Data to Datarmina Pattarna & Cana	Mean	2.50		3.50	4.00
Data to Determine Patterns & Gaps	Range	2.00-3.00		2.00-4.00	4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	100%		75%	100%
	Number	2		4	1
Despense to Interventions	Mean	1.00		3.50	3.00
Response to Interventions	Range	1.00		2.00-4.00	3.00
	% Proficient or Higher	0%		75%	100%

	Fall	Fall	Fall	

Criteria		2018	Spring 2019	2019	Spring 2020	2020	Spring 2021
	Number	0	0			0	0
	Mean						
Choice of Assessment	Range						
	% Proficient or Higher						
	Number						
	Mean						
Pre-assessment	Range						
	% Proficient or Higher						
	Number						
	Mean						
Post-assessment	Range						
	% Proficient or Higher						
	Number						
	Mean						
Alignment of Lesson Evidence	Range						
	% Proficient or Higher						
	Number						
Charles I aval of Masters 9	Mean						
Student Level of Mastery & Evaluation of Factors	Range						
	% Proficient or Higher						
	Number						
	Mean						
Data to Determine Patterns & Gaps	Range						
	% Proficient or Higher						
	Number						
	Mean						
Response to Interventions	Range						
	% Proficient or Higher						

PBC Secondary Education Chemistry - Teacher Candidate Work Sample Data:

Criteria		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017
	Number			1	
Choice of Assessment	Mean			4.00	
Choice of Assessment	Range			4.00	
	% Proficient or Higher			100%	
	Number			1	
Dro googgement	Mean			4.00	
Pre-assessment	Range			4.00	
	% Proficient or Higher			100%	
	Number			1	
Post-assessment	Mean			4.00	
FOSI-dSSESSITIETII	Range			4.00	
	% Proficient or Higher			100%	
	Number			1	
Alignment of Lesson Evidence	Mean			4.00	
Alignment of Lesson Evidence	Range			4.00	

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

Criteria		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
	Number	0	0			0	0
	Mean						
Choice of Assessment	Range						
	% Proficient or Higher						
	Number						
	Mean						
Pre-assessment	Range						
	% Proficient or Higher						
	Number						
	Mean						
Post-assessment	Range						
	% Proficient or Higher						
	Number						
	Mean						
Alignment of Lesson Evidence	Range						
	% Proficient or Higher						
	Number						
Ctudent Level of Meeten (9	Mean						
Student Level of Mastery & Evaluation of Factors	Range						
	% Proficient or Higher						
	Number						
	Mean						
Data to Determine Patterns & Gaps	Range						
	% Proficient or Higher						
	Number						
	Mean						
Response to Interventions	Range						
	% Proficient or Higher						

PBC Secondary Education English - Teacher Candidate Work Sample Data:

Critorio	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	2018
Criteria	2015	2016	2016	2017	2017	PBC	Pract.

I	Number	2	2	3	2	0	1	1
[Mean	2.5	3.00	4.00	4.00		4.00	4.00
Choice of Assessment	Range	1.00-3.00	2.00-4.00	4.00	4.00		4.00	4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	50%	50%	100%	100%		100%	100%
	Number	2	2	3	2		1	1
Pre-assessment	Mean	2.00	2.5	4.00	4.00		4.00	2.00
	Range	2.00	2.00-3.00	4.00	4.00		4.00	2.00
	% Proficient or Higher	0%	50%	100%	100%		100%	0%
	Number	2	2	3	2		1	1
ſ	Mean	2.00	3.00	4.00	3.50		4.00	1.00
Post-assessment	Range	2.00	3.00	4.00	3.00-4.00		4.00	1.00
	% Proficient or Higher	0%	100%	100%	100%		100%	0%
	Number	2	2	3	2		1	1
ľ	Mean	2.00	3.00	4.00	3.50		4.00	3.00
Alignment of Lesson Evidence	Range	2.00	3.00	4.00	3.00-4.00		4.00	3.00
	% Proficient or Higher	0%	100%	100%	100%		100%	100%
	Number	2	2	3	2		1	1
Chudant Laval of Mastery 9	Mean	2.50	3.00	4.00	4.00		4.00	2.00
Student Level of Mastery & Evaluation of Factors	Range	2.00-3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00		4.00	2.00
	% Proficient or Higher	50%	100%	100%	100%		100%	0%
	Number	2	2	3	2		1	1
ľ	Mean	2.00	3.00	4.00	3.50		4.00	2.00
Data to Determine Patterns & Gaps	Range	2.00	3.00	4.00	3.00-4.00		4.00	2.00
	% Proficient or Higher	0%	100%	100%	100%		100%	0%
	Number	2	2	3	2		1	1
ľ	Mean	1.00	2.50	4.00	4.00		4.00	3.00
Response to Interventions	Range	1.00	1.00-4.00	4.00	4.00		4.00	3.00
	% Proficient or Higher	0%	50%	100%	100%		100%	100%

Criteria		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
	Number	0	2			0	0
	Mean		3.00				
Choice of Assessment	Range		3.00				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%				
	Number		2				
	Mean		3.00				
Post-assessment	Range		3.00				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%				
	Number		2				
	Mean		3.00				
Alignment of Lesson Evidence	Range		3.00				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%				
	Number		2				
	Mean		3.00				
Student Level of Mastery &		Ì					

Evaluation of Factors	Range	3.00		
	% Proficient or Higher	100%		
	Number	2		
	Mean	3.00		
Data to Determine Patterns & Gaps	Range	3.00		
	% Proficient or Higher	100%		
	Number	2		
	Mean	3.00		
Response to Interventions	Range	3.00		
	% Proficient or Higher	100%		

PBC Secondary Education Math - Teacher Candidate Work Sample Data:

Criteria		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017
	Number	0	2	1	2
Choice of Assessment	Mean		2.50	4.00	4.00
Choice of Assessment	Range		1.00-4.00	4.00	4.00
	% Proficient or Higher		50%	100%	100%
	Number		2	1	2
Pre-assessment	Mean		2.00	4.00	3.50
Fie-assessment	Range		1.00-3.00	4.00	3.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher		50%	100%	100%
	Number		2	1	2
Doot googgement	Mean		2.00	4.00	3.50
Post-assessment	Range		2.00	4.00	3.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher		0%	100%	100%
	Number		2	1	2
Alignment of Losson Evidence	Mean		2.00	4.00	3.50
Alignment of Lesson Evidence	Range		2.00	4.00	3.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher		0%	100%	100%
	Number		2	1	2
Student Level of Mastery & Evaluation	Mean		3.00	4.00	3.50
of Factors	Range		3.00	4.00	3.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher		100%	100%	100%
	Number		2	1	2
Data to Datarmina Dattarna 9 Cana	Mean		3.00	4.00	3.50
Data to Determine Patterns & Gaps	Range		3.00	4.00	3.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher		100%	100%	100%
	Number		2	1	2
Pagnanga ta Interventiona	Mean		1.00	4.00	3.50
Response to Interventions	Range		1.00	4.00	3.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher		0%	100%	100%

Criteria		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
	Number	0	1			0	0
	Mean		4.00				
Choice of Assessment	Range		4.00				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%				
	Number		1				

Dra accessment	Mean	4.00		
Pre-assessment	Range	4.00		
	% Proficient or Higher	100%		
	Number	1		
	Mean	4.00		
Post-assessment	Range	4.00		
	% Proficient or Higher	100%		
	Number	1		
	Mean	4.00		
Alignment of Lesson Evidence	Range	4.00		
	% Proficient or Higher	100%		
	Number	1		
Student Level of Mastery &	Mean	4.00		
Evaluation of Factors	Range	4.00		
	% Proficient or Higher	100%		
	Number	1		
	Mean	4.00		
Data to Determine Patterns & Gaps	Range	4.00		
	% Proficient or Higher	100%		
	Number	1		
	Mean	4.00		
Response to Interventions	Range	4.00		
	% Proficient or Higher	100%		

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

Criteria		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017
	Number	5	1	2	2
Choice of Assessment	Mean	3.2	2.00	3.00	3.00
Choice of Assessment	Range	3.00-4.00	2.00	2.00-4.00	3.00
	% Proficient or Higher	100%	0%	50%	100%
	Number	5	1	2	2
Dra accessment	Mean	2.2	2.00	3.00	3.50
Pre-assessment	Range	2.00-3.00	2.00	2.00-4.00	3.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	20%	0%	50%	100%
	Number	5	1	2	2
Doot googgement	Mean	3.00	3.00	2.50	3.00
Post-assessment	Range	3.00	3.00	1.00-4.00	2.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%	50%	50%
	Number	5	1	2	2
Alignment of Lesson Evidence	Mean	2.4	2.00	2.50	4.00
Alignment of Lesson Evidence	Range	2.00-3.00	2.00	1.00-4.00	4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	40%	0%	50%	100%
	Number	5	1	2	2
Student Level of Mastery & Evaluation	Mean	2.8	3.00	3.00	3.50
of Factors	Range	2.00-3.00	3.00	2.00-4.00	3.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	80%	100%	50%	100%
	Number	5	1	2	2

Data to Determine Patterns & Gaps	Mean	2.8	2.00	3.00	4.00
	Range	2.00-3.00	3.00	2.00-4.00	4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	80%	100%	50%	100%
	Number	5	1	2	2
Pagagon to Interventions	Mean	1.6	1.00	3.00	3.50
Response to Interventions	Range	1.00-2.00	1.00	2.00-4.00	3.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	0%	0%	50%	100%

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

13.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016

After three years of data is obtained for a concentration determine an appropriate benchmark.

2016-2017

It is apparent that these candidates developed a much stronger grasp of of the TCWS elements by fall 2016 and spring 2017 than the previous two semesters reported. Previous actions and decisions regarding candidate preparation and background in the subject matter content were obviously successfully employed. Instructors will continue to instruct post-baccalaureate candidates on the importance of TCWS assessment elements, as well as adhere to the EPP implementation of 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.

Two-thirds of Post-Baccalaureate candidates were successful in planning a cohesive lesson plan, planning for behavior management, providing for quality of questions, and planning for assessment. Faculty will continue to spend time mentoring these students with this instrument and understanding of the process as a whole.

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: Half of the components on the TCWS met departmental benchmarks. Components that fell below benchmark include: Pre-assessment, Post-assessment, Student Level of Mastery & Evaluation of Factors, and Data to Determine Patterns & Gaps.

All of the following components had 67% of teacher candidates score proficient (N=3): Pre-assessment, Post-assessment, Student Level of Mastery & Evaluation of Factors, and Data to Determine Patterns & Gaps. The student who did not receive a proficiency rating in these components was in the English PBC program.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The goal for 2018-2019 is to share data findings/analysis with the faculty of the PBC and Practitioner programs during curriculum redesign so that they can reinforce expectations and provide examples to PBC/Practitioner students on weak TCWS components, Pre-assessment, Post-assessment, Student Level of Mastery & Evaluation of Factors, and Data to Determine Patterns & Gaps.

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:

Analysis of Data:

All students met or exceeded the benchmark of 3.00 on each element of the Teacher Candidate Work Sample.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

The Teacher Candidate Work Sample will be replaced with the Teaching Cycle which provides specific expectations and increased rigor with scaffolded support to improve candidate abilities to evaluate student learning and plan for instructions.

Recommendations for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

The Teaching Cycle will be scaffolded throughout the program and the Senior Residency Portfolio will include the Teaching Cycle. During the Senior Residency Portfolio course, candidates will be assigned a mentor professor to assist them, answer questions, and guide them through the full process.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

There were no completers for this program in the 2020-2021 academic year and therefore no new data to report. The Teacher Candidate Work Sample has been revised and is now the Teaching Cycle Assessment. Tis assessment was piloted in the 2018-2019 academic year and was fully implemented into all programs and methods courses in the 2019-2020 academic year. This tool is used to provide useful data for diagnosing the strengths and areas for improvement in the practices of our candidates. The rainbow chart will be reviewed and revised summer 2021 so that the Teaching Cycle components are strategically and sequentially addressed throughout the program.

14 Assessment and Benchmark PRAXIS PLT

Assessment: Praxis Principles of Learning and Teaching.

Louisiana Teacher General Competency 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.

Louisiana Teacher General Competency E:

The teacher candidate applies knowledge of state and federal laws related to students' 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 1706, and Bulletin 1903).

Interpretation of the professionals in making instructional decisions and communicating with colleagues and families (e.g., laws and policies governing student privacy, special education, including but not limited to Bulletin 1508, Bulletin 1706, and Bulletin 1903).

Benchmark: 80% or more of the candidates will pass the Praxis PLT 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 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 students' 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, including but not limited to Bulletin 1508, Bulletin 1508, Bulletin 1706, and Bulletin 1903).

LTGC E

The teacher candidate applies knowledge of state and federal laws related to students' 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, including but not limited to Bulletin 1508, Bulletin 1508, Bulletin 1706, and Bulletin 1903).

External Outcomes Links

14.1 Data

All Secondary Programs		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017
	Number	3	3	2	3
	Mean	168	178.25	183.5	171
Overall Score	Range	160-174	184-172	182-185	165-175
Information	% Pass 1st attempt	67%	67%	100%	100%
	% Pass prior to ST/Intern	100%	100%	100%	100%
Subcomponent	Number	1	2	2	2
	Mean	17	19	17	16.5
I					

Students as Learners	Range	17	19	15-19	16-17
Instructional Process	Mean	9	15	18	15
	Range	9	13-18	18	15
Accomment	Mean	9	13	11	10.5
Assessment	Range	9	12-14	11	10-11
Professional Development	Mean	7	10.5	10.5	9.5
Leadership and Community	Range	7	10-11	10-11	9-10
Analysis of Instructional Scenarios	Mean	8	11.5	12	9.5
	Range	8	11-12	11-13	9-10

Agriculture		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017
	Number	0	0	0	1
	Mean				172
	Range				172
Overall	% Pass 1st attempt				100%
	% Pass prior to ST/Intern				100%
Breakdown:	Number	0	0	0	1
Students as Learners	Mean				16
Students as Learners	Range				16
Instructional Process	Mean				15
Instructional Process	Range				15
Assessment	Mean				10
Assessment	Range				10
Professional Development	Mean				10
Leadership and Community	Range				10
Analysis of Instructional	Mean				9
Scenarios	Range				9

Biology		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017
	Number	1	2	1	0
	Mean	174	184.5	185	
	Range	174	184-185	185	
Overall	% Pass 1st attempt	100%	100%	100%	
	% Pass prior to ST/Intern	100%	100%	100%	
Breakdown:	Number	0	2	1	0
Students as Learners	Mean		19	19	
Students as Learners	Range		19	19	
Instructional Process	Mean		15	18	
Ilistructional Process	Range		13-18	13	
Assessment	Mean		13	11	
Assessment	Range		12-14	11	
Professional Development	Mean		10.5	11	
Leadership and Community	Range		10-11	11	
Analysis of Instructional	Mean		11.5	11	
Scenarios	Range	11-12	11		

Business		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017
	Number	1	1	0	0

1			·		
	Mean	160	172		
	Range	160	172		
Overall	% Pass 1st attempt	0%	0%		
	% Pass prior to ST/Intern	100%	100%		
Breakdown:	Number	1	0	0	0
Students as Learners	Mean	17			
Students as Learners	Range	17			
Instructional Process	Mean	9			
instructional Process	Range	9			
Assessment	Mean	9			
Assessment	Range	9			
Professional Development	Mean	7			
Leadership and Community	Range	7			
Analysis of Instructional	Mean	8			
Scenarios	Range	8			

Chemistry		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017
	Number	1	1	0	0
	Mean	160	172		
	Range	160	172		
Overall	% Pass 1st attempt	0%	0%		
	% Pass prior to ST/Intern	100%	100%		
Breakdown:	Number	1	0	0	0
Students as Learners	Mean	17			
Students as Learners	Range	17			
Instructional Process	Mean	9			
Ilistructional Process	Range	9			
Assessment	Mean	9			
Assessment	Range	9			
Professional Development	Mean	7			
Leadership and Community	Range	7			
Analysis of Instructional	Mean	8			
Scenarios	Range	8			

English		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017
Overall	Number	0	0	1	0
	Mean			182	
	Range			182	
	% Pass 1st attempt			100%	
	% Pass prior to ST/Intern			100%	
Breakdown:	Number	0	0	1	0
Students as Learners	Mean			15	
	Range			15	
Instructional Process	Mean			18	
	Range			18	
	Mean			11	
Assessment					

	Range		11	
Professional Development Leadership and Community	Mean		10	
	Range		10	
Analysis of Instructional Scenarios	Mean		13	
	Range		13	

Social Studies		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017
Overall	Number	1	0	0	2
	Mean	169			170
	Range	169			165-175
	% Pass 1st attempt	100%			100%
	% Pass prior to ST/Intern	100%			100%
Breakdown:	Number				1
Students as Learners	Mean				17
	Range				17
Instructional Process	Mean				15
	Range				15
Assessment	Mean				11
	Range				11
Professional Development Leadership and Community	Mean				9
	Range				9
Analysis of Instructional Scenarios	Mean				10
	Range				10

2017-2018:

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

2018-2019:

Data table is attached.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

There were no PBC Secondary Education completers in the 2020-2021 academic year and therefore no new data to report.

Artifact

PBC_Secondary_Praxis_PLT_17-18 [PDF 80 KB SEP 23, 2018]

PBC_Secondary_Praxis_PLT_18-19 [PDF 34 KB OCT 15, 2019]

14.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:

As stated in the first column all candidates must pass the content exam in order to be accepted into the secondary PBC program.

The PBC Biology data table shows that a total of three candidates took the exam in fall 2015 and spring 2016 and all three passed the exam on the first attempt.

There was one PBC Business candidate who took the exam in 2015 (#5101) and they passed it on the first attempt. Likewise, the candidate who took exam #100 in 2016 passed it on the first attempt as well. The testing number changed due to Louisiana Department of Education mandates.

For PBC Social Studies, one candidate passed the exam on the first attempt in fall 2015. No attempts recorded in 2016.

Low numbers in testers for all PBC content areas do not allow for a deeper analysis of data such as mean and range.

2016-2017

PBC Secondary 6-12 candidates scored within the range of 160-175 on the PLT. Passing score is 157. Instructors will continue to stress the importance of not taking the PLT exam until after the completion of EDUC 203 - Theories and Principles of Learning and Teaching: A practical application of research based on learning theory. This course provides an overview of teaching in today's society and strategies of effective teaching, and has an educational psychology focus.

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data:

There was one completer who took and passed the Praxis PLT on the first attempt.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: Candidates will pass the PLT with 80% proficiency on their first attempt.

Recommendations to Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement: It is also recommended that the department review the Praxis score data to identify areas of weakness within the PLT exam; data analysis will be discussed during curriculum redesign meetings and curriculum or course revisions adopted as necessary.

2018-2019:

Analysis of Data:

100% of the candidates (n=3) passed the Praxis PLT on the first attempt. Only two of the five sub-categories were passed with 80% proficiency or above: Instructional Process (82.5%) and Assessment (80.95%).

Plan of Continuous Improvement:

The EPP will focus on coursework related to the Praxis PLT within the PBC Secondary program to ensure that it supports the sub-categories within the exam.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- 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.
- Review PLT exam scores to ensure that redesigned programs incorporate the necessary topics needed for candidates to pass the Praxis PLT exam.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

There were no completers in the 2020-2021 academic year and therefore no new data to report. The EPP will continue to focus on coursework that covers the topics and information relative to the principles of learning and teaching. Currently, candidates are advised to complete the Praxis PLT after completing EDUC 203. Advisors will continue to encourage candidates to take this exam in a timely manner. EPP faculty will also compile a list of Praxis resources that will be given to candidates at their first advising session.

End of report