



Agricultural Sciences [AGSC]

Cycles included in this report:

Jun 1, 2020 to May 31, 2021

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

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

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

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

Program Name: Agricultural Sciences [AGSC]

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

1 Is this program offered via Distance Learning?

100% Traditional or less than 50% Distance/Traditional

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

No

2.1 If yes to previous, provide addresses for each location where 50% or more of program credits may be earned.

3 Example of Program Improvement

2016-2017:

Met with Director of Institutional Research & Effectiveness to evaluate master plan assessments and SLOs.

2017-2018:

Based on input from faculty and industry, we have incorporated learning activities that help develop communication skills both written and oral. We continue to see improvement in students completing assignments in the capstone course AGRI 441. We will continue to assess these skills and look for additional competencies that need to be addressed.

2018-2019:

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

4 Program Highlights from the Reporting Year

2016-2017:

Students continue to meet established benchmarks on assessments.

2017-2018:

The number of students that have applied and received industry internships have increased. This is due to increased efforts by faculty to make students aware of opportunities in their field of study. Additionally, we have brought in more industry representatives to speak with students about opportunities. We have worked to prepared students for job interviews and resume building.

2018-2019:

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

This year, our students were more successful (7/10) in gaining admission to veterinary school than the previous year. Students participated in internships, student jobs, and experiences that helped students achieve this success. Our students participated in multiple community service events over the year including providing food for hurricane victims and supplies for area livestock producers. We continue to build a strong internship program that has resulted in a pipeline for graduates to gain entry level positions in industry. Our students are competing on a National level for these positions. During the summer of 2020 many of our students were not able to participate in internships due to COVID restrictions.

5 Program Mission

The Bachelor of Science in Agricultural Sciences program will provide education and training in all aspects of agricultural education while focusing specifically on the following criteria: a) preparing

students for careers in agriculture, b) preparing students for graduate or professional school, c) introducing students to the role of research and biotechnology through agriculture, d) contribute to the intellectual development of students, and d) enable students to effectively participate in and make significant contributions to contemporary society.

6 Institutional Mission Reference

The B.S. in Agricultural Sciences supports McNeese State University's fundamental mission to provide successful education of the undergraduate students and services to the employers and communities in its region. The Agricultural Science program is a McNeese special feature program with opportunities for experiential learning at three working farms and the Center for Advancement of Meat Processing and Production (CAMPP).

7 Assessment and Benchmark AGRI 101 & ANSC 101 Final Exams

Assessment: AGRI 101 & ANSC 101 Final Exams.

Benchmark: Appropriate benchmarks will be set after three years of data collection. This is a new assessment for a new student learning outcome.

7.1 Data

2017-2018:

Record and analyze data from first-time freshmen completing the courses versus upper class students.

2018-2019:

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

7.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

N/A.

2018-2019:

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

8 Assessment and Benchmark AGECE 201 Term Paper

Assessment: AGECE 201 Term Paper.

Benchmark: 70% of students will earn a C or higher on the AGECE 201 - Introduction to Agricultural Economics term paper.

Prior to 2017-2018, the benchmark was 90% of the students completing the course will be at the C level or higher (term paper is 30% of final grade).

8.1 Data

Academic Year	# of students that completed the course	Students that received a C or better	
		#	%
2013-2014	108	93	86%
2014-2015	106	98	92%
2015-2016	105	93	89%
2016-2017	92	83	90%
2017-2018	111	102	92%

2018-2019			
2019-2020	106	89	84%
2020-2021	111	79	72%

8.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

After review of this assessment, a new benchmark was created to state: 70% of students will earn a C or higher on the AGECE 201 - Introduction to Agricultural Economics term paper.

2017-2018:

Still collecting data.

2018-2019:

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

This class is taught only in the fall semester. We experienced two hurricanes during the semester that forced us to miss extended periods of time and move to an online/virtual platform. We met the benchmark of 70% passing with a 'C' or better but we had multiple (10) students withdraw and seventeen (17) not complete the course on time. During a typical year term papers would be submitted as a hard copy draft and then a final hard copy. Because of the lack of classroom and office space only an electronic copy was graded.

9 Assessment and Benchmark AGRI 401 Research Project

Assessment: Students are required to design and conduct an experiment and apply acceptable statistical methods to evaluate this research project. This project is worth 25% of the final grade. Time allocation for this project (teaching, research, application, writing and presenting) requires ~40% of the students' time.

Benchmark: 80% of students will pass this assignment with a minimum score of 75% or higher.

The SLO was changed for 2014-2015; this was first year of data collection.

9.1 Data

Academic Year	# of students that completed the course	Students that received a C or better	
		#	%
2014-2015	59	–	83%
2015-2016	56	–	89%
2016-2017	59	–	73%
2017-2018	55	–	73%
2018-2019			
2019-2020	65	54	83%
2020-2021	76	57	75%

9.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

All students have met the benchmark for two years. Continue to track and determine if the benchmark should be raised if this trend continues.

2017-2018:

73% of students enrolled in the course completed the experiment with report with a score of 75% or greater. This is close to what we expect and acceptable for our students. This exercise incorporates analytical, technical and communication skills and serves as a comprehensive evaluation of the students content knowledge.

2018-2019:

2019-2020:

83% of students enrolled in the course completed the experiment with report with a score of 75% or greater. This data includes the spring semester that went virtual due to COVID. The final paper was submitted online.

2020-2021:

75% of students enrolled in the course completed the experiment with report with a score of 75% or greater. This year was impacted by hurricanes Laura and Delta and COVID. All classes in the Fall went to a virtual format due to hurricanes. The spring semester was back to traditional in classroom.

10 Assessment and Benchmark AGRI 441 Final Presentation

Assessment: Students are required to research a relevant topic, write an abstract, and present the abstract at the conclusion of the course.

Benchmark: 70% of students will earn a C or higher on the AGRI 441 - Seminar final presentation.

Prior to 2017-2018, the benchmark was that there will be a 70% increase in students completing their final presentation with a C or better.

10.1 Data

Academic Year	# of students that completed AGRI 441	Students that improved their grade from initial presentation		Students that completed AGRI 441 with a C or better	
		#	%	#	%
2013-2014	54	N/A	N/A	52	96%
2014-2015	61	56	92%	61	100%
2015-2016	69	60	87%	65	94%
2016-2017	63	60	95%	63	100%
2017-2018	52	50	96%	52	100%
2018-2019					
2019-2020	58	50	86%	58	100%
2020-2021	69	60	87%	60	87%

10.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

After review of this assessment a new benchmark was created to state: 70% of students will earn a C or higher on the AGRI 441 - Seminar final presentation.

2017-2018:

Benchmark was met, will continue to monitor.

2018-2019:

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

Benchmark was met, will continue to monitor. We have started to look at success rate in junior seminar AGRI 340 to determine success in senior seminar. Even though we met the

benchmark we had 7 students that did not complete the course either with withdrawals or incomplete grades. One semester (Fall 2020), seminars were completed virtually due to hurricanes Laura and Delta.

11 Assessment and Benchmark AGRI 441 Case Studies

Assessment: Students will be evaluated on their knowledge of the scientific method during the senior year in AGRI 441 through case studies.

Benchmark: 80% of students will demonstrate a command of the scientific method by scoring an average of 75% or higher on these case studies.

11.1 Data

2017-2018:

No data was collected; a new method for assessing competency will be decided and piloted in the fall and spring of 2018-2019.

2018-2019:

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

11.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

This is a new assessment and benchmark, and data collection will begin in 2017-2018.

2017-2018:

An alternative method of evaluating competency of scientific method is being discussed. The case study approach was not successful. The new instrument will be discussed prior to the fall 2018 semester and piloted in fall and spring semesters.

2018-2019:

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

12 Assessment and Benchmark Senior Exit Exam

Assessment: Senior Exit Exam administered in AGRI 441.

Benchmark: 80% of graduating students will be able to identify the scientific method as an appropriate mechanism of problem solving.

This assessment was implemented in 2014-2015.

12.1 Data

Academic Year	Students that identified the scientific method as appropriate	
	#	%
2014-2015	44/52	85%
2015-2016	59/74	80%
2016-2017	54/63	85%
2017-2018	42/50	85%
2018-2019		
2019-2020		
2020-2021		

12.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

All students have met the benchmark for two years. Continue to track and determine if the benchmark should be raised if this trend continues.

2017-2018:

Students have met the benchmark. Will continue to reinforce the scientific method throughout the academic program.

2018-2019:

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

13 Assessment and Benchmark Enrollment and Completers

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

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

13.1 Data

BS Agriculture Education, Grades 6-12 - Enrollment and Completer Data:

Academic Year	# of students officially enrolled in program with an EDUC 200 packet	# of completers in fall semester	# of completers in spring semester	Total # of completers
2013-2014	6	-	-	4
2014-2015	3	-	-	1
2015-2016	3	-	-	1
2016-2017	-	-	-	0
2017-2018	5	1	0	1
2018-2019	7	1	0	1
2019-2020				
2020-2021	6	0	3	3

Outcome Links

2013 CAEP Standards [External]

3.1

The provider presents plans and goals to recruit and support completion of high-quality candidates from a broad range of backgrounds and diverse populations to accomplish their mission. The admitted pool of candidates reflects the diversity of America's P-12 students. The provider demonstrates efforts to know and address community, state, national, regional, or local needs for hard-to-staff schools and shortage fields, currently, STEM, English-language learning, and students with disabilities.

3. Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity

The provider demonstrates that the quality of candidates is a continuing and purposeful part of its responsibility from recruitment, at admission, through the progression of courses and clinical experiences, and to decisions that completers are prepared to teach effectively and are recommended for certification. The provider demonstrates that development of candidate quality is the goal of educator preparation in all phases of the program. This process is ultimately determined by a program's meeting of Standard 4.

13.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

After a drop in 2014-2015, enrollment was consistent but did not increase in 2015-2016. Therefore, the benchmark of 7% was not met.

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: The benchmark was met. The enrollment for candidates officially admitted into the Agriculture Education program with an EDUC 200 packet increased by 66% from 2015-2016 to the 2017-2018.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

The goal for 2018-2019 will be 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.

Secondary education faculty along with agriculture education faculty, through participation in the Noel Levitz Recruiting Initiative, will contact students who have inquired or applied to McNeese to enroll in education or who are undecided about a major.

Seeing an increase in first time students majoring in agriculture education will assess the goal. The number of contacts with potential students will be tracked along with successful recruitment numbers.

2018-2019:

From 2017-2018 to 2018-2019, there was a 40% increase in students officially enrolled in the agriculture education program. Therefore, the benchmark of increasing enrollment from the previous year by 7% was met.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

The goal for 2019-2020 will be to again achieve at least a 7% increase in the number of candidates enrolled in the agriculture education program.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- 1) Education faculty will visit at least two high schools with diverse populations to recruit candidates for the program
- 2) Agriculture education faculty will be invited to Geaux Teach- Unlock Education event in January to provide information to potential high school candidates.
- 3) Faculty will continue to work with Noel Levitz and contact candidates who have inquired about McNeese or could potentially be interested in Agriculture Education

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

The goal to increase enrollment in the Agricultural Sciences, Secondary Education concentration by 7% each academic year was not met. There was a decrease in total enrollment from the previous years. A positive note from the data was that there were 3 completers in the spring 2021 semester, which is the highest number of completers in an academic year since 2014-2015.

During the 2020-2021 academic year, the EPP hosted the Unlock Education virtual conference for high school students (03.26.2021). Dr. Ogea also traveled to local high schools to recruit for BCOE and to promote the Ed Rising program as a partnership between local high schools and MSU.

The EPP will continue to work to increase enrollment in all education programs. Schools from outside of the 5-parish region will be invited to participate in the Unlock Education/Ed Rising Conference each spring. The EPP will also implement the "Call Me Mister" program beginning in fall 2021 as an opportunity for recruitment and support for candidates.

14 Assessment and Benchmark Agriculture Praxis

Assessment: Agriculture Praxis Content Exam.

The Agriculture Education, Grades 6-12 Praxis Content Exam is #5701. This exam must be passed prior to student teaching. The passing score required by the state for 2017-2018 is 147.

Benchmark: 100% of Agriculture Education majors will achieve a passing score on the Praxis Agriculture Education Exam (#5701) on the first attempt. Passing score set by the state is 147.

Prior to 2018-2019, the benchmark was 90% of Agriculture Education majors will achieve a passing score on the Praxis Agriculture Education Exam (#5701) on the first attempt.

Prior to 2017-2018, the benchmark was 100% of the candidates will pass the Agriculture Praxis Content Exam on the first attempt.

14.1 Data

Agriculture Education, Grades 6-12 - Praxis Content #5701:

		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
#5701 overall	Number	0	1	0	0	1	0
	Mean		157			152	
	Range		157			152	
	% Pass 1st attempt		100%			100%	
#5701 breakdown:	Number	0	1	0	0	1	0
Agribusiness Systems	Mean		7			4	
	Range		7			4	
	% correct (13)		54%			31%	
Animal Systems	Mean		13			10	
	Range		13			10	
	% correct (18)		72%			56%	
Food Science and Biotechnology Systems	Mean		8			4	
	Range		8			4	
	% correct (13)		62%			31%	
Environmental and National Resource Systems	Mean		12			12	
	Range		12			12	
	% correct (15)		80%			80%	
Plant Systems	Mean		14			9	
	Range		14			9	
	% correct (17)		82%			53%	
Power; Structural; Technical Systems	Mean		6			10	
	Range		6			10	
	% correct (15)		40%			67%	
Leadership and Career Development	Mean		11			13	
	Range		11			13	
	% correct (17)		65%			76%	

		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
#5701 overall	Number	1	0			0	3
	Mean	169					157
	Range	169					150-166
	% Pass 1st attempt	100%					100%
#5701 breakdown:	Number	1					3
Agribusiness Systems	Mean	6					5
	Range	6					5
	% correct (13)	46%					38%
Animal Systems	Mean	15					12.33
	Range	15					11-15
	% correct (18)	83%					69%
Food Science and Biotechnology Systems	Mean	11					7
	Range	11					7
	% correct (12)	92%					58%
Environmental and National Resource Systems	Mean	12					10
	Range	12					8-14
	% correct (16)	75%					63%
Plant Systems	Mean	13					13
	Range	13					11-14
	% correct (17)	76%					76%
Power; Structural; Technical Systems	Mean	12					9
	Range	12					7-10
	% correct (16)	75%					56%
Leadership and Career Development	Mean	11					12.67
	Range	11					12-13
	% correct (16-17)	65%					79%

14.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: The benchmark was met. There was one candidate who completed the program in 2017-2018. The first time percentage pass rate was 100%.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

The goal for 2018-2019 will be to achieve an 100% first attempt pass rate on the Praxis Agriculture Content Knowledge Exam.

In order to achieve the goal, as the agriculture professors redesign the agriculture education program to meet state residency requirements, they will also revisit the topics covered on the

content Praxis exam to ensure the appropriate courses are a part of the program. Professors will also evaluate and include in the course sequence the time in the sequence where students would be most prepared to complete the Praxis content exam successfully. Agriculture faculty will look at Agribusiness Systems area which was a consistently low score for the last two completers.

2018-2019:

The benchmark was met with 100% of the candidates (n=1) passing the Agriculture Praxis Content exam on the first attempt. For the past three years, all three candidates passed the Praxis Content exam for Agriculture Education on the first attempt, however, a consistently low area for percentage of questions correct for all three tests is Agribusiness (S16- 54%, F17- 31%, and F18- 46%).

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

The three candidates in the past three years have all passed the exam on the first attempt, therefore, Agriculture Education faculty will make decisions on modifying course content, giving additional study materials, or covering topics related to Agribusiness.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- 1) A faculty member in the Agriculture Education content area will take the Praxis content exam to determine appropriate topics of focus particularly in the area of Agribusiness.
- 2) Agriculture faculty members will examine the coursework in the Agriculture Education Program to determine where the above determined topics are taught in the program.
- 3) Based on courses above, Agriculture faculty will determine the best time for candidates to take the Praxis Content exam and include it in the advising process.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

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

The spring 2021 completer sub-category scores ranged from 38% to 79% correct. The sub-category in which candidates scored the lowest was *Agribusiness Systems* (38% or 5/13 correct).

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

15 Assessment and Benchmark FEE Content

Assessment: The Field Experience Evaluation Domain 5 measures the Content Specific Components related to teaching observations.

The FEE Scoring Scale is as follows: 1- Ineffective; 2- Effective: Emerging; 3- Effective: Proficient; 4- Highly Effective

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

15.1 Data

Agriculture Education Content specific components on FEE III:

Component	Fall 2015			Spring 2016			Fall 2016			Spring 2017		
	#	Mean	Range	#	Mean	Range	#	Mean	Range	#	Mean	Range
5.1	0			1	3.50	3.50	0			0		

5.2				1	3.33	3.33						
5.3				0								
5.4				1	4.00	4.00						
5.5				0								
5.6				0								
5.7				1	4.00	4.00						
5.8				1	3.63	3.63						
5.9				1	3.63	3.63						

	Fall 2017			Spring 2018			Fall 2018			Spring 2019		
Component	#	Mean	Range	#	Mean	Range	#	Mean	Range	#	Mean	Range
5.1	1	3.25	3.25	0			1	2.75	2.75			
5.2	0						0					
5.3	0						0					
5.4	0						0					
5.5	1	3.50	3.50				0					
5.6	1	3.50	3.50				0					
5.7	0						0					
5.8	1	3.67	3.67				1	3.25	3.25			
5.9	1	3.83	3.83				1	3.25	3.25			

	Fall 2019			Spring 2020			Fall 2020			Spring 2021				
Component	#	Mean	Range	#	Mean	Range	#	Mean	Range	% Prof.	#	Mean	Range	% Prof.
5.1	1						0							
5.2	0													
5.3	0													
5.4	0													
5.5	1										1	4.00	4.00	100%
5.6	1										1	4.00	4.00	100%
5.7	0										1	4.00	4.00	100%
5.8	1										2	3.67	3.33-4.00	100%
5.9	1													
TECH 1											3	3.46	2.88-3.75	67%
TECH 2											3	3.05	2.63-3.38	67%
TECH 3											3	2.71	1.75-3.25	67%

15.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

This benchmark was met or exceeded.

2017-2018:

The benchmark was met. 100% of the candidates scored 3.50 or above in the areas scored in Domain 5 of the FEE rubric.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

Several of the Domain 5 elements were not scored. The EPP will encourage mentor teachers and university supervisors to look for opportunities to assess all components in the rubric.

2018-2019:

Of the three elements that were scored in domain 5 for one candidate, two of the three were above benchmark (3.25). Element 5.1 fell below benchmark at 2.75.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

Mentors and University Supervisors will be encouraged to look for opportunities to score candidates on Domain 5 of the FEE rubric. In addition, Secondary Education faculty and Agriculture Education faculty should revisit and revise (if needed) the elements of Domain 5 to ensure that they are aligned to appropriate content standards.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

Secondary Education faculty and Agriculture 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.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

The benchmark was met for the Domain 5 elements. However, in the last academic year, three technology components were also added. It was for each of the three technology components where there were 67% of the candidates who achieved proficiency.

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

16 Assessment and Benchmark InTASC Standards - Lesson Planning

Assessment: InTASC standards are aligned to the components of the lesson plan rubric.

Lesson Plan Rubric scoring scale: 1- Ineffective; 2- Effective: Emerging; 3- Effective: Proficient; 4- Highly Effective

Benchmark: 100% of the candidates will score a 3.00 or higher on each element of the Lesson Plan Rubric.

16.1 Data

Agriculture Education - Lesson Plan Data from EDUC 333:

Rubric Element	Standard	InTASC Standard		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
Essential Questions			Number	0	1	0	0	1	0
			Mean		2.00				
			Range		2.00				
			% Proficient or Higher		0%				
Content Standards			Number						
			Mean		3.00				
			Range		3.00				
			% Proficient		100%				

			or Higher					
Student Outcomes		4n	Number					
			Mean	3.00			4.00	
			Range	3.00			4.00	
			% Proficient or Higher	100%			100%	
Technology		5l	Number					
			Mean	3.00			4.00	
			Range	3.00			4.00	
			% Proficient or Higher	100%			100%	
Educational Materials			Number					
			Mean	2.00				
			Range	2.00				
			% Proficient or Higher	0%				
Procedures		3k	Number					
			Mean	3.00			4.00	
			Range	3.00			4.00	
			% Proficient or Higher	100%			100%	
Lesson "Hook"		8j	Number					
			Mean	2.00			3.00	
			Range	2.00			3.00	
			% Proficient or Higher	50%			100%	
Pre-Planned (Seed) Questions		8i	Number					
			Mean	3.00			3.00	
			Range	3.00			3.00	
			% Proficient or Higher	100%			100%	
Modeled, Guided, Collab, & Ind. Practice		7k	Number					
			Mean	3.00			4.00	
			Range	3.00			4.00	
			% Proficient or Higher	100%			100%	
Closure			Number					
			Mean	2.00				
			Range	2.00				
			%					

			Proficient or Higher		0%			
Formative /Summative Assessment		6j	Number					
			Mean		2.00			4.00
			Range		2.00			4.00
			% Proficient or Higher		50%			100%
Relevance & Rationale		2j	Number					
			Mean		3.00			4.00
			Range		3.00			4.00
			% Proficient or Higher		100%			100%
Exploration, Extension, Supplemental		1e	Number					
			Mean		2.00			4.00
			Range		2.00			4.00
			% Proficient or Higher		0%			100%
Differentiation		7j	Number					
			Mean		2.00			4.00
			Range		2.00			4.00
			% Proficient or Higher		0%			100%

Rubric Element	Standard	InTASC Standard		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020
Essential Questions			Number		0		
			Mean				
			Range				
			% Proficient or Higher				
Content Standards			Number	1			
			Mean	4.00			
			Range	4.00			
			% Proficient or Higher	100%			
Student Outcomes		4n	Number	1			
			Mean	3.00			
			Range	3.00			
			% Proficient or Higher	100%			
Technology		5l	Number	1			
			Mean	1.00			
			Range	1.00			

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

			or Higher	100%			
Differentiation		7j	Number	1			
			Mean	4.00			
			Range	4.00			
			% Proficient or Higher	100%			
Interdisciplinary Connections			Number	1			
			Mean	4.00			
			Range	4.00			
			% Proficient or Higher	100%			
Modeled, Guided Practice (Whole Group)			Number	1			
			Mean	3.00			
			Range	3.00			
			% Proficient or Higher	100%			
Collaborative Practice (Small Group or Paired)			Number	1			
			Mean	3.00			
			Range	3.00			
			% Proficient or Higher	100%			
Independent Practice (Individual)			Number	1			
			Mean	4.00			
			Range	4.00			
			% Proficient or Higher	100%			
Content Connection to Assigned Strategy			Number	1			
			Mean	4.00			
			Range	4.00			
			% Proficient or Higher	100%			

2020-2021:

See attached file for 2020-2021 data.

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

AGED_ Lesson Plan Data_20-21

16.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

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

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: The benchmark was met. The completer in 2017-2018 scored at or above the benchmark in all areas of the lesson plan assessment.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

The candidate scored a 4.00 on 8/10 categories scored on the lesson plan. The candidate scored at benchmark (3.00) in only two categories (Lesson "Hook" and Pre-Planned SEED Questions). These two categories typically yield lower scores for candidates across program.

Education faculty is working to strengthen instruction and opportunities for practice in these areas.

2018-2019:

The benchmark was not met. The candidate in the 2018-2019 AY scored below benchmark in both Technology and Pre-planned Seed Questions.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

Pre-planned Seed Questions has been a category that yields lower results over the past few semesters. However, additional instruction and attention has been paid to this area (among others) in methods coursework and we expect candidates to reach benchmark in this element on the rubric.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- Agriculture education faculty and secondary education faculty, along with University Supervisors and mentors will meet to discuss methods for implementing technology into the agriculture education classroom.
- Seed Questions will be assessed on the lesson plan and will be a continued focus area.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

The benchmark was not met for the 2020-2021 academic year. Half of the categories (11/22) had at least one candidate who did not score at the proficiency level.

Future completers will be in the redesigned program with the one year residency. Candidates in this program are required to enroll in the *EDUC 318: Planning and Instruction for Literacy in the Content Area* course early on in their program (Term 4:Spring). This course is designed to teach candidates the importance of planning for instruction taking into consideration the students within the P-12 courses and the objectives and content that needs to be covered. This course will provide a foundation for understanding the components of the plan utilized in methods coursework.

Additionally, future data will include a progression of lesson plan data from the initial work in EDUC 318 to the teacher residency semester.

17 Assessment and Benchmark FEE - Specific inTASC Standards

Assessment: The Field Experience Evaluation (FEE) measures the following elements: Domain 1: Planning and Preparation; Domain 2: Classroom Environment; Domain 3: Instruction, and Domain 4: Professionalism.

The following scoring scale is used: 1- Ineffective; 2- Effective: Emerging; 3- Effective: Proficient; 4- Highly Effective.

Benchmark: 90% of candidates will score a 3.50 or higher on each element in the Field Experience Evaluation (FEE) Rubric for Domains 1-4.

Prior to 2018-2019, the benchmark was 90% of candidates will score a 3.00 or higher on each element in the Field Experience Evaluation (FEE) Rubric for Domains 1-4.

17.1 Data

Agriculture Education -FEE with InTASC Standards
FEE pulled from Student Teaching Semester:

Element	InTASC Standard	Fall 2015 N=0		Spring 2016 N=1		Fall 2016 N=0		Spring 2017 N=0	
		Mean	Range	Mean	Range	Mean	Range	Mean	Range
Domain 1: Planning and Preparation				3.46	3.35- 3.65				

Component 1.1				3.46	3.35-3.65				
1.1.1	4n			3.35	3.35				
1.1.2	6r			3.35	3.35				
1.1.3	2g			3.50	3.50				
1.1.4	1b			3.65	3.65				
Domain 2: The Classroom Environment				3.50	3.30-3.70				
Component 2.1				3.54	3.30-3.70				
2.1.1	3j			3.70	3.70				
2.1.2	3d			3.50	3.50				
2.1.3	3d			3.65	3.65				
2.1.4	3d			3.30	3.30				
Component 2.2				3.45	3.30-3.60				
2.2.1	3c			3.30	3.30				
2.2.2	3f			3.45	3.45				
2.2.3	3f			3.60	3.60				
Domain 3: Instruction				3.52	3.30-3.70				
Component 3.1				3.45	3.35-3.50				
3.1.1	8f			3.35	3.35				
3.1.2	4c			3.50	3.50				
3.1.3	5e			3.50	3.50				
Component 3.2				3.56	3.40-3.70				
3.2.1	7a			3.40	3.40				
3.2.2	3j			3.50	3.50				
3.2.3	4f			3.65	3.65				
3.2.4	3d			3.70	3.70				
Component 3.3				3.53	3.30-3.65				
3.3.1	6d			3.30	3.30				
3.3.2	6a			3.50	3.50				
3.3.3	6d			3.65	3.65				
3.3.4	8b			3.65	3.65				
Domain 4: Professionalism				3.72	3.65-3.75				
Component 4.1				3.72	3.65-3.75				
4.1.1	9o			3.75	3.75				
4.1.2	9l			3.65	3.65				
4.1.3	9o			3.75	3.75				

Element	InTASC Standard	Fall 2017 N=1			Spring 2018 N=		
		Mean	Range	%*	Mean	Range	%
Domain 1: Planning and Preparation		3.66	3.50-3.75	100%			
Component 1.1		3.66	3.50-3.75	100%			
1.1.1	4n	3.63	3.63	100%			
1.1.2	6r	3.50	3.50	100%			
1.1.3	2g	3.75	3.75	100%			
1.1.4	1b	3.75	3.75	100%			
Domain 2: The Classroom Environment		3.59	3.25-3.75	100%			
Component 2.1		3.57	3.25-3.75	100%			
2.1.1	3j	3.25	3.25	100%			
2.1.2	3d	3.63	3.63	100%			
2.1.3	3d	3.63	3.63	100%			
2.1.4	3d	3.75	3.75	100%			
Component 2.2		3.63	3.38-3.75	100%			
2.2.1	3c	3.75	3.75	100%			
2.2.2	3f	3.38	3.38	100%			
2.2.3	3f	3.75	3.75	100%			
Domain 3: Instruction		3.51	3.38-3.63	100%			
Component 3.1		3.50	3.38-3.63	100%			
3.1.1	8f	3.50	3.50	100%			
3.1.2	4c	3.63	3.63	100%			
3.1.3	5e	3.38	3.38	100%			
Component 3.2		3.50	3.38-3.63	100%			
3.2.1	7a	3.38	3.38	100%			
3.2.2	3j	3.50	3.50	100%			
3.2.3	4f	3.50	3.50	100%			
3.2.4	3d	3.63	3.63	100%			
Component 3.3		3.54	3.38-3.63	100%			
3.3.1	6d	3.63	3.63	100%			
3.3.2	6a	3.50	3.50	100%			
3.3.3	6d	3.63	3.63	100%			
3.3.4	8b	3.38	3.38	100%			
Domain 4:			3.88-				

Professionalism		3.96	4.00	100%			
Component 4.1		3.96	3.88-4.00	100%			
4.1.1	9o	3.88	3.88	100%			
4.1.2	9l	4.00	4.00	100%			
4.1.3	9o	4.00	4.00	100%			

*% Proficient or higher.

Element	InTASC Standard	Fall 2018 N=1		Spring 2019 N=0		Fall 2019 N=		Spring 2020 N=	
		Mean	Range	Mean	Range	Mean	Range	Mean	Range
Domain 1: Planning and Preparation		3.16	2.88-3.38						
Component 1.1		3.16	2.88-3.38						
1.1.1	4n	3.13	3.13						
1.1.2	6r	2.88	2.88						
1.1.3	2g	3.38	3.38						
1.1.4	1b	3.25	3.25						
Domain 2: The Classroom Environment		3.16	3.00-3.38						
Component 2.1		3.16	3.00-3.38						
2.1.1	3j	3.00	3.00						
2.1.2	3d	3.13	3.13						
2.1.3	3d	3.25	3.25						
2.1.4	3d	3.00	3.00						
Component 2.2		3.25	3.13-3.38						
2.2.1	3c	3.13	3.13						
2.2.2	3f	3.25	3.25						
2.2.3	3f	3.38	3.38						
Domain 3: Instruction		3.00	2.75-3.63						
Component 3.1		2.79	2.75-2.88						
3.1.1	8f	2.88	2.88						
3.1.2	4c	2.75	2.75						
3.1.3	5e	2.75	2.75						
Component 3.2		3.03	3.00-3.13						
3.2.1	7a	3.00	3.00						
3.2.2	3j	3.13	3.13						
3.2.3	4f	3.00	3.00						
3.2.4	3d	3.00	3.00						

Component 3.3		3.13	2.88-3.63					
3.3.1	6d	2.88	2.88					
3.3.2	6a	3.13	3.13					
3.3.3	6d	3.63	3.63					
3.3.4	8b	2.88	2.88					
Domain 4: Professionalism		3.84	3.75-3.88					
Component 4.1		3.84	3.75-3.88					
4.1.1	9o	3.88	3.88					
4.1.2	9l	3.75	3.75					
4.1.3	9o	3.75	3.75					

Element	InTASC Standard	Fall 2020 N=0			Spring 2021 N=3		
		Mean	Range	% Proficient	Mean	Range	% Proficient
Domain 1: Planning and Preparation					3.78	3.63-4.00	100%
Component 1.1					3.78	3.63-4.00	100%
1.1.1	4n				3.75	3.63-3.88	100%
1.1.2	6r				3.79	3.63-4.00	100%
1.1.3	2g				3.75	3.63-3.88	100%
1.1.4	1b				3.84	3.75-3.88	100%
Domain 2: The Classroom Environment					3.15	2.63-3.38	76%
Component 2.1					3.13	2.75-3.38	75%
2.1.1	3j				3.29	3.25-3.38	100%
2.1.2	3d				2.88	2.75-3.00	33%
2.1.3	3d				3.13	2.75-3.00	67%
2.1.4	3d				3.21	3.00-3.38	100%
Component 2.2					3.18	2.63-3.50	78%
2.2.1	3c				3.05	2.63-3.38	67%
2.2.2	3f				3.13	2.88-3.38	67%

2.2.3	3f				3.38	3.25-3.50	100%
Domain 3: Instruction					3.23	2.75-3.75	88%
Component 3.1					3.06	2.75-3.38	78%
3.1.1	8f				2.92	2.75-3.13	33%
3.1.2	4c				3.04	3.00-3.13	100%
3.1.3	5e				3.21	3.00-3.38	100%
Component 3.2					3.35	3.00-3.75	100%
3.2.1	7a				3.46	3.38-3.63	100%
3.2.2	3j				3.13	3.00-3.25	100%
3.2.3	4f				3.42	3.25-3.75	100%
3.2.4	3d				3.38	3.13-3.63	100%
Component 3.3					3.25	2.75-3.38	83%
3.3.1	6d				2.92	2.75-3.13	33%
3.3.2	6a				3.42	3.13-3.63	100%
3.3.3	6d				3.63	3.38-3.75	100%
3.3.4	8b				3.04	3.00-3.13	100%
Domain 4: Professionalism					3.99	3.88-4.00	100%
Component 4.1					3.99	3.88-4.00	100%
4.1.1	9o				4.00	4.00	100%
4.1.2	9l				3.96	3.88-4.00	100%
4.1.3	9o				4.00	4.00	100%

17.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

This benchmark was met or exceeded.

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: The candidate scored at benchmark or above for each element on the FEE rubric in Domains 1-4.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

All domain scores were above 3.50. The benchmark will be raised from 3.00 to 3.50 in 2018-2019.

2018-2019:

The benchmark was not met. The benchmark for the assessment plan was moved up to 3.50. However, in reporting to CAEP for accreditation, the benchmark remains a 3.00. In either case, the benchmark was not met.

The following elements were below a 3.00 mean: 1.1.2 (=2.88); Domain 3: 3.1.1 (=2.88); 3.1.2 (=2.75); 3.1.3 (=2.75); 3.3.1 (=2.88); and 3.3.4 (=2.88).

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

Domain 3 covers instruction. Component 3.1 as a whole, as well as each individual component, fell below 3.00. These elements focused on the Quality of questions, discussion techniques, and student participation. This coincides with lesson plan data falling below benchmark in pre-planned seed questions.

Component 3.3.1 and 3.3.4 include assessment criteria and student self-assessment and monitoring of progress.

Both areas indicated as areas for improvement above include a need for additional student awareness and participation on a higher cognitive level.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- Methods courses will emphasize a shift to student-led discussions
- Agriculture faculty and secondary faculty will determine appropriate strategies for assessing learning and fostering deeper discussions.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

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

The FEE rubric data for 2020-2021 indicated that candidates scored a mean of 3.00 or higher for Domain 1: Planning and Preparation (3.78), Domain 2: The Classroom Environment (3.15), Domain 3: Instruction (3.23) and Domain 4: Professionalism (3.99). There were several components however, where less than 90% of candidates scored at the proficiency or above and the mean score for the component fell below 3.00: 2.1.2- *Management of Transitions* (=2.88, 33% proficient); 3.1.1- *Quality of Questions* (=2.92, 33% proficient); and 3.3.1- *Assessment Criteria* (=2.92, 33% proficient).

Faculty and University Supervisors have begin to conduct pre and post conferences (POP Cycles) with candidates to discuss expectations for the lesson being taught and to evaluate the success of the lesson afterward. In preparation for the fall 2021 semester and to work toward meeting benchmark in all components, EPP Secondary faculty will distribute and implement components of the POP Cycle within their courses. This will assist in increasing understanding, usefulness, and implementation expectations to prepare candidates to achieve higher scores on the assessment during teacher residency. The EPP will provide training and opportunities to establish inter-rater reliability and norming of the FEE rubric.

18 Assessment and Benchmark Outcomes - Teaching Cycle (Formerly TCWS)

Assessment: Teaching Cycle (formerly Teacher Candidate Work Sample).

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

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

18.1 Data

Agriculture Education Teacher Candidate Work Sample (data from EDUC 412, EDUC 440):

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

Criteria		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
	Number	1	0			0	3
	Mean	4.00					4.00

Choice of Assessment	Range	4.00					4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	100%					100%
Pre-assessment	Number	1					3
	Mean	4.00					4.00
	Range	4.00					4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	100%					100%
Post-assessment	Number	1					3
	Mean	4.00					3.33
	Range	4.00					2.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	100%					67%
Alignment of Lesson Evidence	Number	1					3
	Mean	4.00					3.00
	Range	4.00					2.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	100%					67%
Student Level of Mastery & Evaluation of Factors	Number	1					3
	Mean	4.00					4.00
	Range	4.00					4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	100%					100%
Data to Determine Patterns & Gaps	Number	1					3
	Mean	4.00					4.00
	Range	4.00					4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	100%					100%
Response to Interventions	Number	1					3
	Mean	4.00					4.00
	Range	4.00					4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	100%					100%

18.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

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

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: The benchmark was met. The candidate scored at benchmark or above in all areas assessed in the Teacher Candidate Work Sample.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

As secondary programs are redesigned, faculty will ensure that the components evaluated in the Teacher Candidate Work Sample are scaffolded throughout the program to ensure continued success of candidates.

2018-2019:

The benchmark was met. The candidate scored 4.00 on all elements of the rubric.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

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

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- The Teaching Cycle will be scaffolded throughout the program and the Senior Residency Portfolio will include the entire 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:

The benchmark was not met as there were two criteria in which there were not 80% of candidates scoring at the proficiency level or above: *Post-Assessment (67%)* and *Alignment of Lesson Evidence (67%)*.

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

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

19 Assessment and Benchmark Agriculture Praxis PLT

Assessment: Agriculture Education candidates must pass the Praxis PLT#5624 before student teaching. The Louisiana qualifying score is 157.

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

19.1 Data

Agriculture Education - Praxis PLT #5624:

		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
#5624 overall	Number	0	1	0	0	1	0
	Mean		172			173	
	Range		172			173	
	% Pass 1st attempt		100%			100%	
#5624 breakdown:	Number	0	1	0	0	1	0
Students as Learners	Mean		16			14	
	Range		16			14	
	% correct (20)		80%			70%	
Instructional Process	Mean		15			18	
	Range		15			18	
	% correct						

	(21)		71%			86%	
Assessment	Mean		10			10	
	Range		10			10	
	% correct (14)		71%			71%	
Professional Development Leadership and Community	Mean		10			9	
	Range		10			9	
	% correct (13)		77%			69%	
Analysis of Instructional Scenarios	Mean		9			8	
	Range		9			8	
	% correct (16)		56%			50%	

		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
#5624 overall	Number	1	0			0	3
	Mean	184					169.33
	Range	184					162-174
	% Pass 1st attempt	100%					100%
#5624 breakdown:	Number	1					3
Students as Learners	Mean	19					13.67
	Range	19					13-14
	% correct (21)	90%					68%
Instructional Process	Mean	17					13.67
	Range	17					11-16
	% correct (21)	81%					68%
Assessment	Mean	13					9
	Range	13					8-11
	% correct (14)	93%					64%
Professional Development Leadership and Community	Mean	7					8.67
	Range	7					8-9
	% correct (13)	54%					62%
Analysis of Instructional Scenarios	Mean	13					12.33
	Range	13					12-13
	% correct (16)	81%					77%

19.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

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

2017-2018:

The benchmark was met. The candidate who completed the program in 2017-2018 passed the Principles of Learning and Teaching Praxis Exam on the first attempt. This resulted in a 100% first time pass rate percentage.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

Although the benchmark was met, the area of "Analysis of Instructional Strategies" was the lowest percentage correct (56% and 50%) in the last two completers sitting for the exam. Secondary education faculty will need to analyze course progression and ensure that this is covered appropriately in the program.

2018-2019:**Data Analysis:**

The benchmark was met. 100% (n=1) of the candidates passed the Praxis PLT on the first attempt and prior to student teaching.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

With the redesign of the new program, courses are aligned to ensure that candidates receive appropriate knowledge to continue to perform well on the exam and exceed the benchmark.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- Advisors and course faculty will encourage candidates to take the PLT exam after the appropriate coursework is successfully completed
- Secondary education faculty will monitor pass rates of candidates in order to ensure alignment and proper sequence.

2019-2020:**2020-2021:**

The benchmark was met, 100% of candidates passed the Praxis Principles of Learning and Teaching exam on the first attempt. The range of sub-category scores ranged from 62% correct to 77% correct.

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

End of report