Early Childhood Education Grades PK-3 [BS] [ECHD]

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?

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:
Use of Assessment to Improve Instruction:
1) Content Knowledge: The Department of Teacher Education is involved in ongoing curriculum review of the Early Childhood Education program in order to ensure that candidates are well prepared in the area of content knowledge. In particular, performance measured by course grades and the PRAXIS II Elementary Content Knowledge exam (5018) prior to Sept. 1, 2017 and now (5001) are used to inform recommendations regarding course and programmatic changes. As stated in section IV, course grades along with the passing rate on PRAXIS II (first attempt average pass rate of 73.25%), provides evidence 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). Content knowledge is also assessed by the cooperating teachers and university supervisors during the student teaching semester. Five of the seven NAEYC Standards are measured on the Field Experience Evaluation form (FEE) for early childhood. As stated in Section IV, data show positive findings and trends. By incorporating the results of this data with PRAXIS II Elementary Content scores and course grades, it is evident that candidates possess knowledge in the content areas and have an understanding of the central concepts and structures as they relate to the early childhood classroom. A lesson plan format was adopted to correlate with the Louisiana Edition of Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching. The FEE instrument directly correlates to the Danielson framework. Faculty and student teacher candidates are experiencing ongoing training utilizing the above stated instruments for planning and evaluation. Candidates also provide input on the effectiveness of feedback from evaluations through end of semester surveys. These sources of information can then be used to make adjustments to the planning and evaluation instruments. Although the data shows solid evidence that our candidates are able to demonstrate preparedness in the content areas, it does not fully reflect the range of content knowledge our program provides through course work and field experiences. For example, the Early Childhood candidates complete 280 hours of field experiences throughout the early childhood degree plan before the student teaching semester. Through lesson planning, teaching, collaboration, and reflection in each course, all NAEYC Standards are consistently integrated.

2) Pedagogical and Professional Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions: Data from the Field Experience Evaluation-form (FEE) assessment used to evaluate candidates in the above stated courses and the student teaching semester are reviewed regularly by program faculty, university supervisors, and staff within the Office of Student Teaching and Professional Education Services. With increased use of technology in methodology courses, collaboration continues with area school district in order to provide pre-service teachers the opportunity to further develop technology skills as they relate to teaching and learning. Teacher candidates are required to attend technology seminars prior to and during the student teaching semester. Through this collaborative project candidates are better equipped with the skills necessary to integrate the use of instructional technology (e.g. Promethean Interactive whiteboard technology boards) into daily lessons. Early Childhood candidates are required to use technology in every evaluated lesson in the practicum and student teaching semesters. Use of technology to enhance learning, teaching, and the ability to make appropriate accommodations has had positive results reflected in the data. The addition of these performance-based evaluation elements has provided faculty the ability to assess mastery of teaching and of content. In addition, through coursework and seminars, the Burton College of Education encourages candidates to become involved with professional teaching organizations which provide a variety of professional development opportunities in their specialty areas. Candidates are encouraged to attend and present at national, regional, and state conferences. At present, the assessments described in this report do not provide clear evidence of candidate experience with these organizations and online resources as addressed in NAEYC Standard 6: Becoming a Professional. Candidates are required throughout the program's coursework to read and summarize journal articles pertaining to methodology issues in early childhood; however, at this time, data is not being collected to reflect this.

3) Student Learning: The semester prior to student teaching, the early childhood candidates complete a portfolio/child case study. The data from this assessment reflects the candidate's ability to interpret the impact of observing and documenting student growth and the tool assists candidates in parent-teacher conferencing. Program faculty uses the portfolio/child case study for data collection to assess student learning in place of the P-12 Learning Analysis. During student teaching, the candidates must complete the P-12 Learning Analysis by selecting a unit of instruction, administering a pre/post assessment on that unit of instruction, and analyzing the student performance results. That analysis requires the candidates to compare the pre/post results and calculate the difference in student performance. 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. Early childhood candidates do complete the P-12 Learning Analysis assignment; and data collection began spring 2017. Throughout the degree program, there are many opportunities for candidates to engage in lesson planning and activities that impact student achievement.

The minimum 80% passage rate on the first attempt on the PRAXIS PLT, 0621, was not met in fall 2015 at 60%; however, it was met in spring 2016 at 86%. It was not met in fall 2016 at 67%, however it was met in spring 2017 at 80%. The sub-score is being used to address specific areas of need which at this time is Assessment.

Due to changes in the school district's collection of student assessment in the pre-kindergarten classroom, the portfolio assessment tool in the McNeese practicum course has been revised. New data will follow.

2017-2018:
Faculty have worked together to clarify instructions and expectations on the lesson plan template used by candidates. As a result, lesson plan scores have improved in 2017-2018.

2018-2019:
Candidates showed improvement in the area of planning for differentiation on the lesson plan.
Redesigned courses and the realignment of EDUC 192 and EDUC 202 should increase the preparation of candidates for the PLT.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
Candidates in degree plans with student teaching are completing the program and candidates in the revised programs with teacher residency are progressing through the program. EDUC 192 and EDUC 202 have been merged to cover pertinent material. EDUC 203 and EDUC 204 have been redesigned to offer anti-bias and culturally responsive classroom lessons, of which they can opt to earn micro-credentials. As a form of recruitment, EdRising was implemented into two high schools in the area.

4 Program Highlights from the Reporting Year

2016-2017:
We implemented a Co-teaching model and professional development for MAT teacher candidates in conjunction with the local P-12 school system. Teacher candidates, cooperating teachers, and university supervisor's work together to build a co-teaching relationship for the teacher candidate's student teaching or intern experience. During multiple professional development opportunities, each member of the triad (teacher candidate, cooperating teacher, and university supervisor) receives information on co-teaching and how to make it successful for all involved in the process, as well as participates in relationship building activities. The goal of the Co-teaching model and professional development is to improve the student teaching or internship experience in order to further the success of our students during their final semester.

A select group of 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.

Selected Early Childhood Candidates participate in the Teacher Residency - Pilot Program, which will be implemented fall 2017.

2017-2018:
- Matriculation rates are at 94%.
- Developed a Diversity committee to address cultural relevance.
- Addressed recruitment with "Geaux Teach" workshop for local high school students.
- Making strides to establish inter-rater reliability for all faculty, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors on the FEE assessment tool.

2018-2019:
- The number of completers (28) for the 18-19 AY is the highest it has been in the past 6 years.
- Enrollment remained consistent from the previous year, after decreasing for the past two years.
- The redesigned ECHD program will provide specific field experiences for candidates in all grade levels in which they will be certified to teach.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
Piloted a teacher residency for several early childhood candidates during the 2020-2021 academic year. The implementation of site coordinators and mentor teachers produced positive feedback from all involved. Full implementation should show improvement in completer preparation for the first year of employment.

5 Program Mission

The Bachelor of Science Degree in Early Childhood Education is designed to prepare teacher education candidates for entry into teaching as an Early Childhood Education teacher in Grades PK-3. Additionally, the purpose is to prepare professional educators and life-long learners who will contribute to the cultural and intellectual advancement of the citizens of Louisiana and instill professionalism, collaboration, reflection, and a respect for diversity.

6 Institutional Mission Reference

The Bachelor of Science in Early Childhood Education supports McNeese State University's fundamental mission to provide successful education of undergraduate students and services to the employers and communities in its region. The Early Childhood Education program prepares students to fulfill their roles in the teaching profession in grades PK-3 and contribute to the cultural and intellectual advancement of the citizens of Louisiana.

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

Assessment: Enrollment, Completion, Retention, and Recruitment.
CAEP Standard 3
Going beyond traditional approaches of recruitment and partnering with the Office of Admission and Recruiting, the EPP will actively recruit within the community at least two times each academic year.

Benchmark 1: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.

Benchmark 2: Create and monitor candidate progress throughout the program. A minimum of 90% of candidates should complete the baccalaureate program in Early Childhood within three years of being accepted into the program.

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.

7.1 Data

Early Childhood Education - Enrollment and Completers:

Academic Year	# of students officially enrolled in program with an EDUC 200 packet	# of completers fall semester	# of completers spring semester	Total # of completers
2013-2014	73	6	14	20
2014-2015	53	12	11	23
2015-2016	109	10	14	24
2016-2017	89	9	14	23
2017-2018	78	11	12	23
2018-2019	78	12	16	28
2019-2020	54	4	19	23
2020-2021	45	9	8	17

External Outcomes Links

7.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:
Enrollment from 2014-15 increased 51% by 2015-2016. Enrollment dropped 18% from the 2015-2016 year to the year of 2016-2017 which does not meet the enrollment increase goal of 7%.
Early childhood faculty will be present at future Spring Flings and Cowboy Q&A Days. Will have photos and or brochure emphasizing the Early Childhood Program.

2017-2018:
Early Childhood faculty attended Cowboy Q&A Day on October 21st and Spring preview Day on February 24th. A tri-fold with photos and program descriptions was posted on the table.
The benchmark was not met. Enrollment dropped 18% from 2016-2017 to 2017-2018 even though the implementation of strategies were fulfilled.

Early Childhood faculty will contact students who have inquired or applied to McNeese State University to enroll in education or who are undecided about a major. Faculty will participate in the Ruffalo Noel Lebitz recruiting initiative.

Achievement of the above goal will be measured by increasing the number of first time students majoring in Early Childhood Education. Through the recruiting initiative, the Early Childhood faculty will require names and contacts for potential students. This first year will be used to set a benchmark for future recruitment efforts.

2018-2019:
The benchmark was not met. The officially enrolled number of candidates remained at 78. However, the number of completers increased by 5 from the previous year. This is the highest number of completers in the last 6 years for this program.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:
The goal for the 2019-2020 academic year will be to increase student enrollment by 7% (a minimum of 83 candidates).

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:
1) Advise candidates to submit EDUC 200 packets for official admission into program in a timely manner by following the recommendations for course sequences and test taking.
2) Participate in the Education Professions Advising Session after the 14th day of each semester to make connections with candidates and provide guidance for official acceptance into the program.
3) Faculty will attend recruitment events such as recruitment fairs, the Sulphur Career Fair, Geaux Teach- Unlock Education, and will visit at least two local high schools with the purpose of recruiting for education programs.
4) Promote Ed Rising in the local school districts to recruit to the education profession. Complete process to give credit for two education courses within the program for participation and completion of assessments in the Ed Rising High School Program.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
The benchmark was not met as there has been a continued downward trend in ECHD official enrollment. From 2018-2019 to 2019-2020 there was a 31% decline and from 2019-2020 to 2020-2021 there was another 17% decline. During the 2020-2021 academic year, EPP faculty attended the Cowboy Q&A Day and Unlock Education. Faculty participate and post to social media what is happening in the college and on campus. The EPP is also partnering with local high schools to implement Ed Rising as a way to encourage high school students to learn more about the education profession while earning micro-credentials.

Faculty will continue to use community events to promote the Burton College of Education as well as involve themselves in area P-12 schools as permitted with COVID-19 regulations. Faculty will engage with candidates on Social Media highlighting current events. EdRising will add two more high schools in the upcoming educational year. Faculty will participate in community events such as "Out of the Darkness" suicide prevention awareness walk. Faculty will be in the district P-12 schools on a weekly basis, working with our candidates and other stakeholders in the field.

7.2 Data

Completer Matriculation Rates:

Program Type	Cohort Academic Year	Accepted into program	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	Earned an Assoc. Degree
BACH	2011	68	N=54 79%	N=8 12%			N=5 7%	N=1 2%			
BACH	2012	102	N=57 59%	N=29 28%	N=8 6%		N=5 4%		N=3 3%		
BACH	2013	78	N=65 84%	N=1 1%			N=4 5%		N=6 8%	N=2 2%	
BACH	2013-2014	42	N=19 45%	N=16 38%	N=2 5%		N=1 2%		N=4 10%		
BACH	2014-2015	35	N=17 49%	N=7 20%	N=1 3%		N=6 17%		N=4 11%		
BACH	2015-2016	35	N=20 57%	N=3 9%			N=3 9%		N=8 23%		N=1 4%
BACH	2016-2017	42	N=26 62%	N=2 5%	N=0 0%		N=2 5%		N=12 29%		

External Outcomes Links

7.2.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:
Previous data was reported as a department. This will be the first time that data is reported by individual programs. The information is needed for CAEP. This benchmark has been set for the Early Childhood Program as evidence for SPA and CAEP reports.

83% (N=35) of the candidates who entered the 2013-2014 academic cohort year completed the program within three years. 5% (N=2) candidates completed in four years, 2% of the candidates (N=1) dropped from the University, and 10% (N=4) earned degrees in different programs from McNeese State University.

Early Childhood Faculty will utilize qualitative/quantitative data analysis to develop and implement retention intervention activities. Early Childhood Faculty will follow up with candidates who are eligible to continue but do not continue in the program to learn reasons for departure.

The benchmark was not met, however, the faculty have focused on ensuring that they are advising accurately, evaluating course data, and sequencing the order of courses combined with advising candidates to take Praxis exams after relevant course work.

2018-2019:
The benchmark of a minimum of 90% of candidates completing the baccalaureate program in Early Childhood within 3 years of being accepted into the program was not met.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

The data reported is from the past 5 years. Since data has been reported since 2011, and recommendations and changes have been made, we would anticipate that retention numbers would increase as our efforts have. The goal for 2019-2020 will be to continue to strive for a minimum of 90% of candidates completing the baccalaureate program in Early Childhood within three years of official acceptance into the program.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:
1) Since Praxis tests seem to be one of the roadblocks that candidates face during the program, advisors will promote the Core Academic Skills Praxis Workshop on campus opportunities. The Elementary Education Mathematics Praxis Workshop is also being offered (this is the exam that ECHD takes as well). The Elementary Social Studies Workshop is currently being created and the Elementary Science Workshop is expected to be offered summer 2019.
2) The redesigned program sequence will be used by advisers to assist candidates in selecting coursework and taking Praxis exams to enable them to graduate within three years of acceptance into the program.
3) Early Childhood faculty will attend the Education Professions Advising Meetings each semester to connect with candidates who are moving into the college from Basic Studies and stress the importance of following the course sequence for the program.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
100% of the candidates who entered the program as part of the 2016-2017 cohort and completed in ECHD did so within the 3-year benchmark. However, 29% of the candidates who were in the cohort earned a different degree and 5% dropped from the university. Therefore, the benchmark was not met.

To assist with matriculation, the EPP planned campus Praxis Workshops which began in the spring 2020 semester. These were disrupted due to COVID-19 restrictions and two hurricanes causing major damage to our buildings. Praxis exams often effect matriculation since not passing an exam can prevent a candidate to move on to the coursework in the next portal. Additionally, the 8-semester course sequence will be given to all advisees and advisors are responsible for helping candidates plan coursework to progress through the program efficiently.

In the 2021-2022 academic year, the EPP plans to again begin to offer Praxis workshops. Additionally, Praxis study materials and resources will be administered in EDUC 110, EDUC 200, and by advisors. Advisors will also encourage candidates to take their Praxis exams when indicated during the program. EPP faculty will also evaluate and discuss coursework relatable to all programs and make improvements so that candidates will have a more cohesive learning experience in the Burton College of Education.

8 Assessment and Benchmark Curriculum Development

Assessment: Curriculum Development.
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/implementation, assessment data, and progress monitoring of action plans.

Prior to 2016-2017, the benchmark was program faculty meets three times per academic year to review student progress, curricular offerings, and appropriate professional contacts and opportunities.

8.1 Data

2014-2015:
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

2015-2016:
Fall 2015:
- August 18, 2015 - BCOE Meeting 1:00
- August 19, 2015 - DEP Meeting 9:00-10:00
             - ECE small group meeting 12:20-1:30
- 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
- Feb 1-4, 2016 - Tara Chaumont and Laura Fontenot CLASS re-certification
- 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 14, 2016 - ECE advising meeting
- 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:
DEP Meetings:
- 01/12/2016 - Quality Enhancement Program (QEP) Campus wide discussion on advising strategies

- 01/13/2016 - DEP meeting 2:00-4:30 - Lesson planning and rubric revisions, 2.5 hours
- 01/29/2016 - ECE Faculty meeting 10:00-12:30, 5 hours
- 03/14/2016 - ECE Advising meeting 1:00-2:15, 15 hours
- 04/06/2016 - DEP Faculty meeting 12:20-2:00, 40 hours
- 05/16/2016 - Assessment for specific curriculum
- 08/08/2016 - Collaboration Partners with a Purpose, 10:00-2:00, 4 hours
- 08/15/2016 - DEP meeting 9:00-12:30, (SPA)1:00-4:30, 7 hours
- 10/26/2016 - DEP Faculty meeting, 3:00-5:00, 2 hours
- 11/07/2016 - InTASC Student Learning Targets 11:00-1:00, 2 hours
- 11/08/2016 - InTASC Student Learning Targets 11:00-3:00, 4 hours
- 12/07/2016 - DEP ECE data 9:00-12:00, 1-4:30, 5 hours
- 12/08/2016 - DEP 9:15-12:00, ECE/PBC data 1:00-4:30, 15 hours

2017-2018:
Data table is attached.

2018-2019:
Data table is attached

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
Date of Meeting: Aug 3, 2020
Meeting Location and Duration: *Zoom Meeting*
Attendees: *BCOE faculty*
Topic and brief description, results of meeting, next steps, etc.: *Professional Development with US Prep; High Leverage Practices*

Date of Meeting: Aug. 13, 2020
Meeting Location and Duration: Zoom meeting (9:00 – 11:00)
Attendees: DEP faculty
Topic and brief description, results of meeting, next steps, etc.: Field Experience

Date of Meeting: August 21. 2020
Meeting Location and Duration: zoom meeting 9:00 – 12:00
Attendees: BCOE
Topic and brief description, results of meeting, next steps, etc.: Assessment Plan Data

Artifacts

BS_ECHD_Curriculum Development [PDF 99 KB SEP 4, 2018]

Early Childhood Education Curriculum Development [PDF 83 KB MAR 8, 2020]

External Outcomes Links

8.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:
Department of Education Professions is up for CAEP site visit in the spring of 2017; therefore, faculty have been meeting in preparation.

Early Childhood Faculty recertified in "CLASS", which is a Classroom Assessment Scoring System, utilized in Head-Start and Pre-Kindergarten classrooms. Certification enables faculty to work directly with district cohorts.

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:
01/29/2016; SPA and CAEP data to be collected by ECE Faculty
03/14/2016; ECE faculty addressed advising policies/procedures
12/07-08/2016; Gathering, analyzing, and loading data from fall 2016 semester for Master Plans, SPAS, and CAEP.
- During the QEP meeting, faculty discussed advisement strategies and procedures to enhance student retention and graduation rates.
- Faculty discussed lesson plan template and decided to use a more universal format in professional education courses.
- Rubrics for specific assessments were evaluated and changed to align with CEC standards.
- Assignments were evaluated to identify strengths and weaknesses and changed to reflect rigor of the course.

2017-2018:
The recommendations for the Early Childhood Faulty were to collaborate with local school districts to strengthen the program and prepare teacher candidates to fully meet district needs.

The benchmark was met and exceeded with Early Childhood Education faculty participating in professional development and recruitment meetings. Early Childhood Education faculty also collaborated with district cooperating teachers where candidates were placed for field experiences throughout the year.

In 2018-2019, the Early Childhood Education faculty will convene meetings with faculty from other content areas to enhance the curriculum and instruction for Early Childhood Education candidates. Early Childhood Education Faculty will participate in professional development for technology in curriculum development. Early Childhood Education faculty will participate in and require candidates to participate in community partnerships.

The recommendations to support the success of the set goal will be assessed through the number of documented meetings and the enhancements for the Early Childhood Education curriculum and instruction. Documentation of the community partnership events that faculty and candidates attend will also support achievement of the goal.

2018-2019:
The recommendations for the Early Childhood Education program were to meet with faculty from other content areas to enhance curriculum and development for ECHD candidates. ECHD faculty will participate in PD for technology in curriculum development. ECHD faculty will also participate in community partnerships.

During the 2018-2019 academic year, Early Childhood and methods course faculty were part of the Dean's for Impact Collaborative which focused on the mathematics course sequence for the early childhood and elementary education candidates. Additionally, ECHD faculty collaborated with CPSB and the surrounding districts to redesign the program sequence to create an innovative model with a one-year teacher residency. EDTC 245 course content was also revised to contain information relevant to the current PK-12 classroom.

The benchmark was met as ECHD faculty participated in professional development, recruitment activities, community activities, and revision of coursework.

The recommendations for the 2019-2020 academic year would be to assess coursework in relation to standards and outcomes in order to continuously improve candidate performance. ECHD faculty will meet to discuss the progression of standards and outcomes as candidates move through coursework. Faculty will also review assessment tools to determine if the items assessed are in line with the intended outcomes.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
The benchmark of having all program faculty meet at least twice an academic year to discuss curriculum changes/implementations, assessment data, and process monitoring of action plans was met for the 2020-2021 academic year. Faculty participated in professional development led by US PREP and in weekly faculty meetings to discuss curriculum and programs. Most meetings were held via ZOOM due to faculty being off campus because of COVID-19 restrictions and the aftermath of hurricanes Laura and Delta.

The benchmark will remain the same with many opportunities to collaborate as courses continue to evolve and new faculty members are hired for the 2021-2022 academic year. Faculty will meet during the summer 2021 semester to ensure alignment of assessments to current standards and cohesiveness across degree certifications. Faculty will also collaborate on materials, tools, and technologies appropriate for the P-12 and/or higher education classrooms.

9 Assessment and Benchmark PRAXIS II Content

NAEYC Standard 5
Assessment: ECHD SPA Assessment 1, Praxis II
Praxis II exam (0014) & Praxis II exam became all computer based (5014)
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.
NAEYC 1a: Knowing and understanding young children's characteristics and needs.
NAEYC 1b: Knowing and understanding multiple influences on development and learning.
NAEYC 1c: Using developmental knowledge to create healthy, respectful, supportive and challenging learning environments.
NAEYC 3a: Understanding the goals benefits and uses of assessment
NAEYC 4b: Knowing, understanding, and using effective approaches, strategies, and tools for early education.
NAEYC 4d: Using own knowledge and other resources to design, implement, and evaluate meaningful, challenging curriculum to promote positive outcomes.
InTASC standards included: 4
Knowledge:
Content Knowledge: InTASC Standard 4 - The candidate applies the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches.
Candidate will pass their Praxis content area exam before entering their student teaching/intern semester.
CAEP Standard 1

Benchmark: A minimum of 80% of graduate candidates will have passed the Praxis Content Exam (5014/5018 or 5001(5002, 5003, 5004, 5005)) 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.

External Outcomes Links

9.1 Data

BS Early Childhood Education - Praxis Content Exam (Elementary Content) #5014/5018/5001(5002, 5003, 5004, 5005):

All BS Early Childhood Education Content	Fall 2013	Spring 2014	Fall 2014	Spring 2015	Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
% Pass 1st attempt	78%	78%	78%	N/A	80%	86%	78%	64%	86%	73%

All BS Early Childhood Education Content	Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021	Fall 2021	Spring 2022	Fall 2022	Spring 2023
% Pass 1st attempt	58%	52%	*31%	79%	77%	69%				

* One candidate took content exam 26 times (#5002- 3 attempts; #5003- 3 attempts; #5004- 7 attempts; and #5005- 13 attempts).

Early Childhood Education		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
Combined	Number	10	14	9	14	14	30
	% Pass 1st attempt	80%	86%	78%	64%	86%	73%
	Number	10	14	7	8	2	0

#0014/5014 overall	Mean	162	172	157	168	167	
	Range	156-175	161-185	150-180	157-177	151-183	
	% Pass 1st attempt	80%	86%	71%	75%	100%	
#0014/5914 breakdown:	Number	8	10	5	8	1	
Reading	Mean	24	22	23	26	26	
	Range	14-28	19-27	21-26	21-28	26	
Mathematics	Mean	19	21	21	21	26	
	Range	14-28	14-28	19-24	17-26	26	
Social Studies	Mean	19	17	18	19	21	
	Range	14-25	12-20	14-23	16-24	21	
Science	Mean	20	21	18	22	29	
	Range	16-25	13-27	14-22	19-25	29	
#5018 overall	Number			2	6	8	6
	Mean			169	171	171	171
	Range			163-175	166-180	164-180	160-179
	% Pass 1st attempt			100%	50%	100%	67%
#5018 breakdown:	Number			2	6	8	6
Reading	Mean			33	31	32	29
	Range			30-35	25-34	28-35	26-32
Mathematics	Mean			26	27	28	27
	Range			23-29	21-28	21-34	24-29
Social Studies	Mean			15	13	13	12
	Range			14-16	10-18	9-16	9-16
Science	Mean			13	14	14	14
	Range			11-15	12-17	11-18	11-18
#5001 Multiple Subjects	Number					1	24
	% Pass 1st attempt					0%	33%
#5002 Reading overall	Number					1	6
	Mean					158	169
	Range					158	160-186
	% Pass 1st attempt					100%	83%
#5002 breakdown:	Number					1	6
Reading	Mean					31	22
	Range					31	19-25
Writing, Speaking, Listening	Mean					33	24
	Range					33	
#5003 Math overall	Number					1	6
	Mean					157	172
	Range					157	157-184
	% Pass 1st attempt					100%	100%
#5003 breakdown:	Number					1	6
Numbers and Operations	Mean					12	13
	Range					12	11-16
Algebraic Thinking	Mean					8	8
	Range					8	5-10
Geometry and Measurement; Data; Statistics; Probability	Mean					6	8
	Range					6	7-9

	Number					1	6
#5004 Social Studies overall	Mean					158	166
	Range					158	157-178
	% Pass 1st attempt					0%	67%
#5004 breakdown:	Number					1	6
United States History; Government; Citizenship	Mean					15	18
	Range					15	16-20
Geography; Anthropology; Sociology	Mean					10	10
	Range					10	7-13
World History and Economics	Mean					11	9
	Range					11	7-10
	Number					1	6
	Mean					164	167
#5005 Science overall	Range					164	159-184
	% Pass 1st attempt					0%	50%
#5005 breakdown:	Number					1	6
Earth Science	Mean					9	10
	Range					9	7-13
Life Science	Mean					14	13
	Range					14	10-17
Physical Science	Mean					12	12
	Range					12	10-15

Early Childhood Education		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
Combined	Number	36	52	13	76	36	32
	% Pass 1st attempt	58%	52%	31%	67%	N=20 77%	N=22 69%
	Number						
#0014/5014 overall	Mean						
	Range						
	% Pass 1st attempt						
#0014/5014 breakdown:	Number						
Reading	Mean						
	Range						
Mathematics	Mean						
	Range						
Social Studies	Mean						
	Range						
Science	Mean						
	Range						
	Number	4	4	1			
	Mean	171	174	184			
#5018 overall	Range	163-177	166-183	184			
	% Pass 1st attempt	75%	50%	100%			
#5018 breakdown:	Number	4	4	N/A			
Reading	Mean	30	30				
	Range	26-34	25-33				
Mathematics	Mean	29	32				
	Range	24-33	29-35				

Social Studies	Mean	14	15				
	Range	11-18	14-17				
Science	Mean	14	16				
	Range	11-18	15-17				
#5001 Multiple Subjects	Number	8	12	3	19	9	8
	% Pass all four portions on the 1st attempt	25%	0%	0%	N=8 42%	N=1 11%	N=2 25%
#5002 Reading overall	Number	8	12	3	19	9	8
	Mean	172	168	163	170	166	170
	Range	164-186	157-181	157-166	158-184	157-171	159-188
	% Pass 1st attempt	63%	67%	33%	79%	44%	75%
#5002 breakdown:	Number	8	12	3	19	9	7
Reading	Mean	23	21	19	22	21	23
	Range	21-27	18-24	18-20	19-27	16-23	19-28
Writing, Speaking, Listening	Mean	24	24	24	25	23	24
	Range	22-29	18-29	23-25	19-29	19-27	20-28
#5003 Math overall	Number	8	12	3	19	9	8
	Mean	167	177	173	175	170	176
	Range	158-188	158-198	169-176	157-200	157-198	157-195
	% Pass 1st attempt	75%	75%	67%	79%	78%	100%
#5003 breakdown:	Number	7	11	3	19	9	7
Numbers and Operations	Mean	12	12	11	13	13	13
	Range	9-15	10-14	9-13	8-16	10-16	11-15
Algebraic Thinking	Mean	8	8	8	9	8	9
	Range	7-9	6-12	6-11	6-12	5-11	7-10
Geometry and Measurement; Data; Statistics; Probability	Mean	7	9	10	8	7	8
	Range	6-9	7-11	9-10	6-10	4-9	5-10
#5004 Social Studies overall	Number	8	12	3	19	9	8
	Mean	161	163	160	168	163	165
	Range	155-175	155-175	159-161	155-187	157-170	156-178
	% Pass 1st attempt	25%	25%	0%	47%	44%	50%
#5004 breakdown:	Number	8	12	3	19	9	7
United States History; Government; Citizenship	Mean	16	17	16	17	17	18
	Range	13-19	13-22	14-18	12-21	15-20	15-20
Geography; Anthropology; Sociology	Mean	10	11	11	12	11	11
	Range	8-12	9-14	10-12	9-14	9-14	9-13
World History and Economics	Mean	9	8	8	9	8	9
	Range	7-12	5-11	7-8	7-11	5-12	6-11
#5005 Science overall	Number	8	12	3	19	9	8
	Mean	166	164	172	169	168	172
	Range	161-173	159-174	163-182	159-184	159-183	159-190
	% Pass 1st attempt	63%	42%	0%	63%	56%	50%
#5005 breakdown:	Number	7	12	3	19	9	7
Earth Science	Mean	9	9	11	10	10	11
	Range	6-13	7-11	10-12	7-15	8-15	10-15
Life Science	Mean	12	12	14	13	13	13
	Range	11-14	10-14	13-15	11-17	9-16	11-15
	Mean	11	12	11	12	12	13

Physical Science	Range	9-13	9-16	9-14	9-15	9-15	11-14

9.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:
Benchmark met. In 2015-2016, students who took the Praxis II achieved higher scores than the past two years.

2016-2017:
As of fall 2017 the Praxis content Exam will change format again as a multiple content area exam or individual content area exams.
It actually did not change format again. 5018 will no longer be offered; however 5001 (which is all of the following: 5002/ELA, 5003/MATH, 5004/SOC STUDIES, 5005/SCIENCE)
On the Praxis test 0014/5014 the content area of social studies is consistently lower than other content areas with the area of reading having the highest scores.
At the point of this test, most candidates would not have taken the Social Studies methods course while they would have been exposed to one or two reading courses.

2017-2018:
The benchmark for the combined fall 2017 and spring 2018 semester was not met as there was a 55% first time pass rate. Data reflect that social studies and science content areas on the exams, no matter which content exam was taken, were consistently lower that math and reading content areas. The benchmark for 2018-2019: 80% or higher of candidates will pass the Praxis Content Exam on the first attempt.

Early Childhood Education faculty will analyze 5002-5005 Praxis data, since this is the current exam being administered for certification purposes, from previous Early Childhood Education candidates to identify factors (when the exam is taken during the program, course content addressing testing topics, candidate GPA, etc.) affecting score performance. Content areas for social studies and science will be prioritized in the analysis.

Faculty will create Praxis study resources and review the resources with candidates. Early Childhood Education Faculty will compare content course learning outcomes with Praxis content area study materials to determine if appropriate content is covered; if necessary, Early Childhood Education faculty will meet with course content faculty to request learning outcome revisions in content courses.

2018-2019:
The benchmark was not met. Twenty-five percent of the candidates passed the Praxis Content exam on the first attempt. This includes 5/8 (63%) candidates passing 5018 on the first attempt and 2/20 (10%) candidates passing 5001 on the first attempt (all portions included- 5002, 5003, 5004, and 5005).

Plan for Continuous Improvement:
The goal for 2019-2020 will be to have a minimum of 80% of candidates passing the Praxis Content Exam on the first attempt.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:
1. Praxis workshops will be offered for Elementary Education: Mathematics (5003) during the fall 2019 and spring 2020 semesters. Elementary Social Studies and Elementary Science Praxis workshops are currently being created and are expected to be offered by summer 2020.
2. EDUC 334: Math Methods I will take a pretest aligned to the types of questions found on Praxis 5003. The instructor will then use this information for reinforcement opportunities throughout the semester.
3. In the redesign of the Early Childhood Education program, a new course will be dedicated to Social Studies Methods and supplemented with topics and materials found on the Praxis 5004.
4. Faculty will advise candidates to not take all four content areas on one day, but instead to focus on and prepare for each content area individually using recommended materials and workshops.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
The benchmark was not met as 17% of completers form the 2020-2021 academic year passed all four subtests of the Praxis Elementary Content Exam (5001) in one attempt. The low first-time pass rate has been a trend over the past three years. One notable highlight was the significant improvement in the Math subtest (5003) with 100% pass rate on the first attempt for spring 2021 completers. Revisions to the math content and methods coursework to align the courses with best practices and reenforce material from the content exam were implemented two years ago. This seems to have made a significantly positive impact and improvement in candidate results on the Mathematics subtest. Additionally, there is a course dedicated to Social Studies methods that is being supplemented with topics and materials found on the Praxis 5004 exam.

ECHD faculty will identify content area courses directly related to the Praxis exam and add the information to the 8-semester course sequence as a recommendation of when to take the content subtests. This will be shared with students during advising sessions and in EDUC 110. Candidates will also be advised to take one subtest at a time to ensure that appropriate time for preparation of each test using suggested workshops and materials have been achieved.

10 Assessment and Benchmark EDUC 420 Comprehensive Unit Plan

ECHD SPA Assessment 3 Planning
Assessment: EDUC 420: Early Childhood Practicum II
Comprehensive Unit Plan is assessed during the kindergarten practicum via a rubric that is based on a lesson plan template that is aligned with Common Core State Standards and utilized by the Department of Education Professions.
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
Knowledge:
Learner Development: InTASC Standard 1 - The candidate determines how learners grow and develop, recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas
Learning Differences: InTASC Standard 2 - The candidate identifies individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards
Content Knowledge: InTASC Standard 4 - The candidate applies the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches
Application of Content: InTASC Standard 5 - The candidate decides how to connect concepts and use differing perspectives to engage learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local and global issues
Planning for Instruction: InTASC Standard 7 - The candidate draws upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and the community context to plan instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals
Skills:
Instructional Strategies: InTASC Standard 8 - The candidate implements a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways.
NAEYC Standard 1
NAEYC 1a: Knowing and understanding young children's characteristics and needs.
NAEYC 1b: Knowing and understanding multiple influences on development and learning.
NAEYC 1c: Using developmental knowledge to create healthy, respectful, supportive and challenging learning environments.
NAEYC 3a: Understanding the goals benefits and uses of assessment
NAEYC 4b: Knowing, understanding, and using effective approaches, strategies, and tools for early education.
NAEYC 4d: Using own knowledge and other resources to design, implement, and evaluate meaningful, challenging curriculum to promote positive outcomes.

CAEP Standard 1

Benchmark: Candidates will have a minimum score of 3 (Proficient) in each criterion from the Comprehensive Unit Plan rubric administered in EDUC 420: Early Childhood Assessment and Practicum II.

Program Outcomes Links

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

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

External Outcomes Links

10.1 Data

Comprehensive Unit Plan		Fall 2015 N=15				
Standard	Criteria on Rubric	Ineffective 0 points	Emerging 1 point	Proficient 3 points	Highly Effective 5 points	# of students with passing score
4b	Integrations of Technology	0	1	2	12	14
		0%	6%	14%	80%	94%
4b	Introductory Activities	0	0	1	14	15
		0%	0%	6%	94%	100%
4b	Learning Activities	0	1	0	14	14
		0%	6%	0%	94%	94%
4b	Seed Questions	0	2	2	11	13
		0%	13%	13%	74%	87%
4d	How Special Needs will be met	0	0	0	15	15
		0%	0%	0%	100%	100%
4d	Accommodations/ Modifications	0	0	0	15	15
		0%	0%	0%	100%	100%

Comprehensive Unit Plan		Spring 2016 N=6				
Standard	Criteria on Rubric	Ineffective 0 points	Emerging 1 point	Proficient 3 points	Highly Effective 5 points	# of students with passing score
4b	Integrations of Technology	0	0	0	6	6
		0%	0%	0%	100%	100%
4b	Introductory Activities	0	0	1	5	6
		0%	0%	16%	84%	100%
4b	Learning Activities	0	0	2	4	6
		0%	0%	33%	66%	100%
4b	Seed Questions	0	0	1	5	6
		0%	0%	16%	84%	100%
4d	How Special Needs will be met	0	0	0	6	6
		0%	0%	0%	100%	100%
4d	Accommodations/ Modifications	0	0	0	6	6
		0%	0%	0%	100%	100%

Comprehensive Unit Plan		Fall 2017				
						# of

Standard	Criteria on Rubric	#	Ineffective 0 points	Emerging 1 point	Proficient 3 points	Highly Effective 5 points	students with passing score
4b	Integrations of Technology	11	0	0	0	11	11
			0%	0%	0%	100%	100%
4b	Introductory Activities	11	0	0	0	11	11
			0%	0%	0%	100%	100%
4b	Learning Activities	11	0	1	2	8	10
			0%	9%	18%	73%	91%
4b	Seed Questions	11	1	0	3	7	10
			9%	0%	27%	64%	91%
4d	How Special Needs will be met	11	0	0	2	9	11
			0%	0%	18%	82%	100%
4d	Accommodations/ Modifications	11	0	0	0	11	11
			0%	0%	0%	100%	100%

Comprehensive Unit Plan			Spring 2018				
Standard	Criteria on Rubric	#	Ineffective 0 points	Emerging 1 point	Proficient 3 points	Highly Effective 5 points	# of students with passing score
4b	Technology	12	0	0	0	12	12
			0%	0%	0%	100%	100%
4b	Method: Modeled	12	0	0	0	12	12
			0%	0%	0%	100%	100%
4b	Method: Collaborative Practice	12	0	0	1	11	12
			0%	0%	8%	92%	100%
4b	Method: Independent Practice	12	0	0	0	12	12
			0%	0%	0%	100%	100%
4b 4d	Pre-planned SEED Questions	12	0	0	10	2	12
			0%	0%	83%	17%	100%
4d	Narrative Explanation of how Special Needs will be met	12	0	0	0	12	12
			0%	0%	0%	100%	100%
4d	Differentiation by Content, Product, Process	12	0	0	2	10	12
			0%	0%	17%	83%	100%

Comprehensive Unit Plan			Fall 2018				
Standard	Criteria on Rubric	#	Ineffective 0 points	Emerging 1 point	Proficient 3 points	Highly Effective 5 points	# of students with passing score
4b 4d	Technology	12	0	0	0	12	12
			0%	0%	0%	100%	100%
4b	Method: Modeled	12	0	0	0	12	12
			0%	0%	0%	100%	100%
4b	Method: Collaborative	12	1	0	1	10	11

Standard	Criteria on Rubric	#	Ineffective	Emerging	Proficient	Highly Effective	# of students with passing score
	Practice		8%	0%	8%	84%	92%
4b	Method: Independent Practice	12	0	0	0	12	12
			0%	0%	0%	100%	100%
4b 4d	Pre-planned SEED Questions	12	0	2	7	3	10
			0%	17%	58%	25%	83%
4d	Narrative Explanation of how Special Needs will be met	12	0	0	2	10	12
			0%	0%	17%	83%	100%
4d	Differentiation by Content, Product, Process	12	0	0	0	12	12
			0%	0%	0%	100%	100%

Comprehensive Unit Plan			Spring 2019				
Standard	Criteria on Rubric	#	Ineffective 0 points	Emerging 1 point	Proficient 3 points	Highly Effective 5 points	# of students with passing score
4b 4d	Technology	12	0	0	0	16	16
			0%	0%	0%	100%	100%
4b	Method: Modeled	12	0	0	0	16	16
			0%	0%	0%	100%	100%
4b	Method: Collaborative Practice	12	0	0	1	15	16
			0%	0%	7%	93%	100%
4b	Method: Independent Practice	12	0	0	0	16	16
			0%	0%	0%	100%	100%
4b 4d	Pre-planned SEED Questions	12	0	2	10	4	14
			0%	12%	63%	25%	88%
4d	Narrative Explanation of how Special Needs will be met	12	0	0	0	16	16
			0%	0%	0%	100%	100%
4d	Differentiation by Content, Product, Process	12	0	0	1	15	16
			0%	0%	7%	93%	100%

Comprehensive Unit Plan			Fall 2019				
Standard	Criteria on Rubric	#	Ineffective	Emerging	Proficient	Highly Effective	# of students with passing score
4b 4d	Technology	4	0	0	0	4	4
			0%	0%	0%	100%	100%
4b	Method: Modeled	4	0	0	0	4	4
			0%	0%		100%	100%
4b	Method: Collaborative Practice	4	0	0	0	4	4
			0%	0%	0%	100%	100%
4b	Method: Independent	4	0	0	1	3	4

Standard	Criteria on Rubric	#	Ineffective 0 points	Emerging 1 point	Proficient 3 points	Highly Effective 5 points	# of students with passing score
	Practice		0%	0%	25%	75%	100%
4b 4d	Pre-planned SEED Questions	4	0	0	4	0	4
			0%	0%	100%	0%	100%
4d	Narrative Explanation of how Special Needs will be met	4	0	0	0	4	4
			0%	0%	0%	100%	100%
4d	Differentiation by Content, Product, Process		0	0	0	4	4
			0%	0%	0%	100%	100%

Comprehensive Unit Plan			Spring 2020				
Standard	Criteria on Rubric	#	Ineffective 0 points	Emerging 1 point	Proficient 3 points	Highly Effective 5 points	# of students with passing score
4b 4d	Technology	19	1	0	2	16	18
			5%	0%	11%	84%	95%
4b	Method: Modeled		0	1	0	18	18
			0%	5%	0%	95%	95%
4b	Method: Collaborative Practice		0	1	1	17	18
			0%	5%	5%	90%	95%
4b	Method: Independent Practice		0	0	4	15	19
			0%	0%	21%	79%	100%
4b 4d	Pre-planned SEED Questions		5	10	3	1	4
			26%	53%	16%	5%	21%
4d	Narrative Explanation of how Special Needs will be met		0	0	1	18	19
			0%	0%	5%	95%	100%
4d	Differentiation by Content, Product, Process		0	0	0	19	19
			0%	0%	0%	100%	100%

Comprehensive Unit Plan			Fall 2020				
Standard	Criteria on Rubric	#	Ineffective 0 points	Emerging 1 point	Proficient 3 points	Highly Effective 5 points	# of students with passing score
4b 4d	Technology	9	0	0	0	9	9
			0%	0%	0%	100%	100%
4b	Method: Modeled	9	0	1	0	8	8
			0%	11%	0%	89%	89%
4b	Method: Collaborative Practice	9	0	0	0	9	9
			0%	0%	0%	100%	100%
4b	Method: Independent Practice	9	0	0	0	9	9
			0%	0%	0%	100%	100%
	Pre-planned		1	6	0	2	2

Standard	Criteria	#					
4b 4d	SEED Questions	9	11%	67%	0%	22%	22%
4d	Narrative Explanation of how Special Needs will be met	9	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	9 100%	9 100%
4d	Differentiation by Content, Product, Process	9	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	9 100%	9 100%

** CUP data not available for spring 2021 completers who enrolled in EDUC 420 in fall 2020 (COVID and hurricanes semester).

Comprehensive Unit Plan			Spring 2021				
Standard	Criteria on Rubric	#	Ineffective 0 points	Emerging 1 point	Proficient 3 points	Highly Effective 5 points	# of students with passing score
4b 4d	Technology						
4b	Method: Modeled						
4b	Method: Collaborative Practice						
4b	Method: Independent Practice						
4b 4d	Pre-planned SEED Questions						
4d	Narrative Explanation of how Special Needs will be met						
4d	Differentiation by Content, Product, Process						

Rubric Element	InTASC Standard		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017
Essential Questions		Number	10	14	9	14
		Mean	1.1	1.00	2.11	1.86
		Range	1.00-2.00	1.00	1.00-3.00	1.00-4.00
		% Proficient or Higher	0%	0%	33%	36%
Content Standards		Number	10	14	9	14
		Mean	2.7	2.93	2.78	4.00
		Range	2.00-4.00	2.00-3.00	2.00-3.00	4.00
		% Proficient or Higher	60%	93%	78%	100%
Student Outcomes		Number	10	14	9	14
		Mean	2.6	2.86	2.22	3.71
		Range	2.00-4.00	2.00-3.00	2.00-3.00	2.00-4.00

	% Proficient or Higher	50%	79%	82%	93%
Technology	Number	10	14	9	14
	Mean	2.00	2.7	3.00	2.64
	Range	2.00	2.00-3.00	2.00-4.00	2.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	0%	57%	89%	57%
Education Materials	Number	10	14	9	14
	Mean	3.4	3.29	3.22	3.86
	Range	2.00-4.00	2.00-4.00	2.00-4.00	3.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	90%	79%	89%	100%
Procedures	Number	10	14	9	14
	Mean	2.9	3.14	2.89	3.79
	Range	2.00-4.00	1.00-4.00	2.00-4.00	3.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	70%	64%	67%	100%
Lesson "Hook"	Number	10	14	9	14
	Mean	2.9	3.57	3.00	3.79
	Range	1.00-4.00	1.00-4.00	2.00-4.00	3.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	70%	93%	67%	100%
Pre-Planned (Seed) Questions	Number	10	14	9	14
	Mean	2.7	3.21	2.78	3.43
	Range	1.00-4.00	2.00-4.00	2.00-4.00	2.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	50%	93%	56%	88%
Modeled, Guided, Collab. & Ind. Practice	Number	10	14	9	14
	Mean	2.7	3.21	3.00	3.79
	Range	2.00-4.00	1.00-4.00	2.00-4.00	2.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	60%	86%	78%	93%
Closure	Number	10	14	9	14
	Mean	2.6	3.00	2.44	3.5
	Range	1.00-3.00	1.00-4.00	1.00-4.00	2.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	80%	71%	84%	88%
Formative/Summative Assessment	Number	10	14	9	14
	Mean	3.2	2.71	2.89	4.00
	Range	2.00-4.00	1.00-3.00	1.00-4.00	4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	90%	79%	67%	100%
Relevance & Rationale	Number	10	14	9	14
	Mean	2.5	2.43	2.78	3.00
	Range	2.00-4.00	2.00-3.00	2.00-4.00	2.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	40%	71%	56%	71%
	Number	10	14	9	14
	Mean	2.3	2.43	3.11	2.83

Exploration, Extension, Supplemental						
		Range	1.00-3.00	1.00-4.00	2.00-4.00	1.00-4.00
		% Proficient or Higher	40%	50%	78	88%
Differentiation		Number	10	14	9	14
		Mean	1.3	1.93	2.67	3.86
		Range	1.00-3.00	1.00-2.00	1.00-4.00	3.00-4.00
		% Proficient or Higher	10%	0%	67	100%

Rubric Element	InTASC Standard		Fall 2017	Spring 2018	Fall 2018	Spring 2019
Professional Writing		Number	10	11	12	16
		Mean	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
		Range	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%	100%	100%
Content Standards		Number	10	11	12	16
		Mean	4.00	3.75	4.00	4.00
		Range	4.00	1.00-4.00	4.00	4.00
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	92%	100%	100%
Student Outcomes		Number	10	11	12	16
		Mean	3.80	4.00	3.92	3.56
		Range	3.00-4.00	4.00	3.00-4.00	3.00-4.00
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%	100%	100%
Technology		Number			12	16
		Mean			4.00	3.94
		Range			4.00	3.00-4.00
		% Proficient or Higher			100%	100%
Education Materials		Number				
		Mean				
		Range				
		% Proficient or Higher				
Procedures		Number	10	11	12	16
		Mean	3.80	3.50	3.75	4.00
		Range	3.00-4.00	2.00-4.00	2.00-4.00	4.00
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	92%	92%	100%
Lesson "Hook"		Number	10	11	12	16
		Mean	3.60	3.83	3.75	3.69
		Range	2.00-4.00	3.00-4.00	3.00-4.00	2.00-4.00
		% Proficient or Higher	90%	100%	100%	94%
Pre-Planned (Seed) Questions		Number				
		Mean				
		Range				

		% Proficient or Higher				
Modeled, Guided, Collab. & Ind. Practice		Number	10	11	12	16
		Mean	3.50	3.67	3.75	4.00
		Range	3.00-4.00	2.00-4.00	2.00-4.00	4.00
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	92%	92%	100%
Closure		Number	10	11	12	16
		Mean	4.00	3.83	3.75	4.00
		Range	4.00	3.00-4.00	1.00-4.00	4.00
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%	92%	100%
Formative/Summative Assessment		Number	10	11	12	16
		Mean	3.60	3.92	3.92	4.00
		Range	2.00-4.00	3.00-4.00	3.00-4.00	4.00
		% Proficient or Higher	90%	100%	100%	100%
Relevance & Rationale		Number				
		Mean				
		Range				
		% Proficient or Higher				
Exploration, Extension, Supplemental		Number				
		Mean				
		Range				
		% Proficient or Higher				
Differentiation		Number	10	11	12	16
		Mean	3.90	2.83	3.33	4.00
		Range	3.00-4.00	1.00-4.00	1.00-4.00	4.00
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	67%	75%	100%

Rubric Element	InTASC Standard		Fall 2019	Spring 2020
Guiding Questions		Number	4	19
		Mean	4.00	3.74
		Range	4.00	1.00-4.00
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	95%
Pre-Post Test		Number	4	19
		Mean	3.75	3.26
		Range	3.00-4.00	1.00-4.00
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	84%
Narrative explanation of how special needs will be met.		Number	4	19
		Mean	4.00	3.95
		Range	4.00	3.00-4.00
		% Proficient		

		or Higher	100%	100%
Communication		Number	4	19
		Mean	4.00	3.74
		Range	4.00	1.00-4.00
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	89%
Unit Plan		Number	4	19
		Mean	4.00	3.95
		Range	4.00	3.00-4.00
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%
Technology		Number	4	4
		Mean	4.00	3.74
		Range	4.00	1.00-4.00
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	95%
Interdisciplinary Connections		Number	4	19
		Mean	4.00	3.63
		Range	4.00	1.00-4.00
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	95%
(a) Method: Modeled (Whole Group)		Number	4	19
		Mean	4.00	3.89
		Range	4.00	2.00-4.00
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	95%
(b) Method: Collaborative Practice (Small group or paired)		Number	4	19
		Mean	4.00	3.84
		Range	4.00	2.00-4.00
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	95%
(c) Method: Independent Practice (Individual)		Number	4	19
		Mean	3.75	3.79
		Range	3.00-4.00	3.00-4.00
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%
Closure		Number	4	19
		Mean	4.00	3.89
		Range	4.00	3.00-4.00
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%
Seed Questions		Number	4	19
		Mean	3.00	2.00
		Range	3.00	1.00-4.00
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	21%
		Number	3	18
		Mean	4.00	4.00

			Fall 2020	Spring 2021
Materials		Range	4.00	4.00
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%
Relevance		Number	4	19
		Mean	3.75	3.95
		Range	3.00-4.00	3.00-4.00
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%
Informal		Number	4	19
		Mean	4.00	3.95
		Range	4.00	3.00-4.00
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%
Formal		Number	4	19
		Mean	4.00	3.89
		Range	4.00	3.00-4.00
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%
Differentiation		Number	4	19
		Mean	4.00	4.00
		Range	4.00	4.00
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%
Reproducibles		Number	3	18
		Mean	4.00	3.83
		Range	4.00	2.00-4.00
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	94%

CUP Assignment was not completed in EDUC 420 for the Spring 2021 semester.

Rubric Element	InTASC Standard		Fall 2020	Spring 2021
Guiding Questions	NAEYC 4b	Number	9	
		Mean	4.00	
		Range	4.00	
		% Proficient	100%	
Pre- Post Test		Number	9	
		Mean	3.89	
		Range	3-4	
		% Proficient	100%	
Narrative Explanation of Meeting Special Needs	NAEYC 4d	Number	9	
		Mean	4.00	
		Range	4.00	
		% Proficient	100%	
Communication	NAEYC 3d	Number	9	
		Mean	4.00	
		Range	4.00	
		% Proficient	100%	
Unit Plan	NAEYC 4c	Number	9	
		Mean	4.00	
		Range	4.00	

		% Proficient	100%	
Content Standards and Outcomes	InTASC 7g	Number	9	
		Mean	4.00	
		Range	4.00	
		% Proficient	100%	
Teacher's Use of Technology	InTASC 5l ISTE Ed 6	Number	9	
		Mean	3.67	
		Range	1-4	
		% Proficient	89%	
Student Use of Technology	InTASC 8n ISTE Students 6 NAEYC 4b, 4d	Number	9	
		Mean	4.00	
		Range	4.00	
		% Proficient	100%	
Cross-Disciplinary Connections with Content	InTASC 7h NAEYC 4c	Number	9	
		Mean	4.00	
		Range	4.00	
		% Proficient	100%	
Student Outcomes and Assessment	InTASC 6b	Number	9	
		Mean	3.78	
		Range	2-4	
		% Proficient	89%	
Lesson Progression	InTASC 7c	Number	9	
		Mean	4.00	
		Range	4.00	
		% Proficient	100%	
Learning Environment	In TASC 3k	Number	9	
		Mean	4.00	
		Range	4.00	
		% Proficient	100%	
Lesson Introduction	InTASC 4d	Number	9	
		Mean	3.78	
		Range	3-4	
		% Proficient	100%	
Whole Group/Guided Instruction	InTASC 8 NAEYC 4b	Number	9	
		Mean	3.78	
		Range	2-4	
		% Proficient	89%	
Small Group/Paired Instruction	InTASC 8h NAEYC 4b	Number	9	
		Mean	4.00	
		Range	4.00	
		% Proficient	100%	
Pre-Planned Seed Questions	InTASC 8i NAEYC 4b, 4d	Number	9	
		Mean	2.33	
		Range	1-4	
		% Proficient	22%	
Independent Practice	InTASC 8e	Number	9	
		Mean	4.00	
		Range	4.00	
		% Proficient	100%	
Closure	InTASC 2d	Number	9	
		Mean	4.00	
		Range	4.00	

		% Proficient	100%	
Instructional Resources/Materials	inTASC 4f NAEYC 4d	Number	9	
		Mean	4.00	
		Range	4.00	
		% Proficient	100%	
Assessments	InTASC 6k	Number	9	
		Mean	4.00	
		Range	4.00	
		% Proficient	100%	
Relevance and Rationale	InTASC 2j NAEYC 4b	Number	9	
		Mean	3.89	
		Range	3-4	
		% Proficient	100%	
Differentiation by Content, Product, Process	InTASC 1d	Number	9	
		Mean	4.00	
		Range	4.00	
		% Proficient	100%	
Differentiation by Learner	InTASC 2g	Number	9	
		Mean	4.00	
		Range	4.00	
		% Proficient	100%	
Exploration, Extension, and Supplemental	InTASC 1e	Number	9	
		Mean	4.00	
		Range	4.00	
		% Proficient	100%	
Reproducible Materials		Number	9	
		Mean	3.78	
		Range	2-4	
		% Proficient	89%	
Reflection of Instructional Strategies	InTASC 7k	Number	9	
		Mean	4.00	
		Range	4.00	
		% Proficient	100%	

10.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:
Rubric implemented in 2015-2016 academic year. Program faculty revised rubric so that data reflects disaggregation by standard and element, as well as percentages for competency level. Faculty pulled fall 2015 and spring 2016 candidate rubrics and re-graded content for verification of data. A competency score of 3 (proficient) was set by faculty as a minimum score for candidates to effectively demonstrate understanding of each element assessed. After reviewing spring 2016 data, faculty determined there was a lack of correlation with learning activities to stated outcomes and given assessments along with corresponding seed questions. Program faculty will address each area of need in the learning activities section of the lesson plan during classroom instruction or as candidates express a need.

2016-2017:
For the Essential Question element, early childhood candidates were not required to pose a question. Candidates are mainly teaching baseline skills. Candidates scored at 36% out of 100% in spring 2017. This element will not be required of early childhood candidates.
Other elements such as content standards, student outcomes, lesson hook, procedures, and educational materials, candidates have scored very well (67% to 100%) due to consistency of instruction and rigor required of instructors.
Instructors will plan and implement additional strategies to improve scores for formative/summative assessment which is currently at 67% and seed questions which is at 56%
Faculty will utilize new lesson plan template with specific content criteria to facilitate lesson planning instruction.

2017-2018:
Benchmark was met with 97% of the candidates scoring at proficiency or above on all elements in the Comprehensive Unit Plan Rubric.
Two areas on the rubric that were of concern from 2016-2017 were SEED questions and Formative/Summative assessments. For 2017-2018, on the SEED questions element, 91% of the candidates scored at the proficiency level or higher in fall 2017 and 100% in spring 2018.

Early Childhood Education faculty will revise the Comprehensive Unit Plan rubric for fall 2018 in compliance with the DEP lesson plan rubric and NAEYC standards. Learning outcomes in EDUC 420 will prioritize emphasis in the areas of developmentally appropriate seed questions, formative, and summative assessment.

2018-2019:
The benchmark of three (Proficient) was not met in all measured areas. 83% of the candidates in fall 2018 and 88% of the candidates in spring 19 scored a three or above in the Pre-Planned Seed Question component. All other areas 92-100% of candidates scored at three or above.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:
The goal for the 2019-2020 AY will for 100% of candidates to score a 3.00 or above in all components of the CUP Rubric.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:
1. Faculty will practice with students using specific questioning techniques in order to develop thinking skills in your students as well as elicit more in-depth information through conversation.
2. Faculty will purposefully model pre-planned SEED questioning in their own teaching practices.
3. Faculty will review lesson plans when mentoring candidates in the field, addressing specific areas of higher order thinking, differentiation, and formative assessments. Recommendations and plans of action will be documented in pre and post conference meeting materials.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
It should be noted that spring 2021 completers were in EDUC 420 during the fall 2020 semester. The comprehensive unit plan was not completed during this semester due to COVID-19 restrictions and the two hurricanes hitting Lake Charles and the surrounding areas. The benchmark was not met. Candidates have become successful in lesson planning due to high leverage practices in content courses. Candidates met benchmark in all areas except pre-planned seed questions. As a result, questioning and discussion of subject matter should still be a priority for lesson delivery.
In EDUC 420, faculty have prioritized developmentally appropriate seed questions by requiring candidates to use specific questioning techniques to develop thinking skills to elicit in-depth information through classwork conversations. EDUC 420 is not a course in the redesigned Early Childhood program and therefore, CUP data will need to be pulled from other courses. In the summer of 2021, early childhood faculty will revise the rainbow chart to ensure that there is progression throughout the program, content is being addressed, and from which courses major assessment data will be pulled. POP Cycle data will be documented concerning components of lesson plans. ECHD faculty will also purposefully practice higher order questioning and discuss in delivery of course content.

11 Assessment and Benchmark Field Experience Evaluation

Assessment: 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
NAEYC 1a: Knowing and understanding young children's characteristics and needs.
NAEYC 1b: Knowing and understanding multiple influences on development and learning.
NAEYC 1c: Using developmental knowledge to create healthy, respectful, supportive and challenging learning environments.
NAEYC 3a: Understanding the goals benefits and uses of assessment
NAEYC 4b: Knowing, understanding, and using effective approaches, strategies, and tools for early education.
NAEYC 4d: Using own knowledge and other resources to design, implement, and evaluate meaningful, challenging curriculum to promote positive outcomes.
InTASC standards included: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9
Knowledge:
Learning Differences: InTASC Standard 2 - The candidate identifies individual difference s and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards.
Content Knowledge: InTASC Standard 4 - The candidate applies the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches.
Skills:
Learner Development: InTASC Standard 1 - The candidate designs and implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experienced.
Learning Environments: InTASC Standard 3 - The candidate works with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, and that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.
Content Knowledge: InTASC Standard 4 - The candidate creates learning experiences that make aspects of the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assure mastery of the content.
Application of Content: InTASC Standard 5 - The candidate engages learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local and global issues by connecting concepts and using differing perspectives.
Assessment: InTASC Standard 6 - The candidate uses multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, and to guide the teacher's and learners' decision making.
Planning for Instruction: InTASC Standard 7 - The candidate plans instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and the community context.
Instructional Strategies: InTASC 8 - The candidate implements a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways.
Dispositions:
Professional Learning and Ethical Practice: InTASC 9 - The candidate engages in ongoing professional learning and uses evidence to continually evaluate his/her practice, particularly the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (learners, families, other professionals, and the community), and adapts practice to meet the needs of each learner
CAEP Standard 1

Benchmark 1: Minimum of 3.00 mean score out of 4.00 on indicators of the final Field Experience Evaluation (FEE) that measure each of the following domains: Planning and Preparation, The Classroom Environment, Instruction, and Professionalism.

Benchmark 2: Minimum average mean score of 3.00 out of 4.00 on content specific indicators on the Field Experience Evaluation III.

Program Outcomes Links

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

LTGC C2
The teacher candidate gathers, synthesizes, and analyzes a variety of data from a variety of sources to adapt instructional practices and other professional behaviors to better meet students' needs.

External Outcomes Links

11.1 Data

Previous Data:

Domain	NAEYC Standards	Fall 2013	Spring 2014	Fall 2014	Spring 2015	Fall 2015	Spring 2016
		N=N/A	N=N/A	N=N/A	N=N/A	N=10	N=14
Planning and Preparation	5a, 5b, 5c	3.7	3.5	3.5	3.3	3.6	3.7
Classroom Environment: Managing Student Behavior	4a	3.5	3.6	3.4	3.4	3.2	3.6
Instruction:		3.5	3.5	3.5	3.4		

Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques	5b					3.1	3.4
Engaging Students in Learning	1c					3.3	3.7
Using Assessment in Instruction	3a, 3b, 3c	3.6	3.4	3.5	3.3	3.3	3.5
Professionalism	6a, 6b, 6c	3.8	3.6	3.5	3.7	3.9	3.9

	InTASC	Fall 2015 N=10		Spring 2016 N=14		Fall 2016 N=9		Spring 2017 N=14	
Component	Standard	Mean	Range	Mean	Range	Mean	Range	Mean	Range
1.1.1	4n	3.61	2.88-4	3.75	3.5-4	3.67	3.5-3.88	3.84	3.25-4
1.1.2	6r	3.7	3.2-4	3.79	3.5-4	3.68	3.25-4	3.86	3.50-4
1.1.3	2g	3.52	2.88-4	3.66	3.25-4	3.67	3.5-4	3.82	3.25-4
1.1.4	1b	3.64	2.88-4	3.78	3.5-4	3.65	3.5-3.88	3.86	3.38-4
2.1.1	3j	3.29	2.63-4	3.62	2.88-3.88	3.34	2.88-3.88	3.66	3-4
2.1.2	3d	3.14	2.5-4	4.52	3.25-3.88	3.29	3.13-3.75	3.45	2.88-3.88
2.1.3	3d	3.33	2.25-4	3.64	3.25-4	3.49	3.13-4	3.53	2.75-4
2.1.4	3d	3.41	2.5-4	3.63	3.13-3.88	3.3	2.88-3.63	3.67	3.13-3.88
2.2.1	3c	3.3	2.75-3.88	3.69	3.25-3.88	3.41	3-3.63	3.74	3.13-4
2.2.2	3f	3.01	2.5-3.75	3.48	2.88-3.88	3.14	2.75-3.75	3.31	2.63-3.88
2.2.3	3f	3.26	2.63-4	3.7	3.38-4	3.45	2.88-3.75	3.65	2.88-4
3.1.1	8f	3.1	2.63-3.75	3.42	2.88-3.75	3.17	2.75-3.5	3.42	3-4
3.1.2	4c	3.14	2.13-3.88	3.38	2.63-3.63	3.17	2.88-3.38	3.3	2.75-3.63
3.1.3	5e	3.08	2.25-3.75	3.42	2.88-3.8	3.18	2.88-3.75	3.42	2.88-3.88
3.2.1	7a	3.35	2.88-4	3.61	3.25-4	3.24	2.75-3.63	3.57	3.13-3.88
3.2.2	3j	3.37	2.75-3.88	3.56	3.25-3.88	3.32	2.88-4	3.33	3-3.63
3.2.3	4f	3.38	2.88-4	3.48	3.13-3.88	3.4	3.25-3.75	3.46	2.88-3.88
3.2.4	3d	3.31	2.5-4	3.71	3.13-4	3.43	3-4	3.74	3.38-4
3.3.1	6d	3.13	2.63-4	3.47	3-3.75	3.28	2.63-4	3.5	3-4
3.3.2	6a	3.52	2.75-4	3.81	3.63-4	3.57	3.25-3.88	3.78	2.75-4
3.3.3	6d	3.46	2.88-4	3.78	3.38-4	3.67	3.13-4	3.84	3.25-4
3.3.4	8b	3.12	2.25-3.88	3.48	3.13-3.88	3.14	2.38-4	3.46	2.75-4
4.1.1	9o	3.9	3.13-4	3.98	3.88-4	3.88	3.38-4	3.97	3.75-4
4.1.2	9l	3.9	3.38-4	3.97	3.75-4	3.83	3.5-4	3.99	3.88-4
4.1.3	9o	3.84	2.88-4	3.94	3.5-4	3.8	3.25-4	3.97	3.88-4

2017-2018:
Data table is attached.

2018-2019:
Data table is attached.

2019-2020:
Data table is attached.

2020-2021:
Data table is attached.

Artifacts

BS_ECHD_FEE_17-18 [PDF 85 KB SEP 15, 2018]

BS_ECHD_FEE_18-19 [PDF 93 KB SEP 11, 2019]

BS_ECHD_FEE_19-20 [PDF 114 KB AUG 16, 2020]

BS_ECHD_FEE_20-21 [PDF 119 KB JUN 1, 2021]

11.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:
According to the data, the benchmark was met in all areas with a score of 3 or above during fall 2017 and spring 2018.

Training occurred during the semesters of fall 2017, spring 2018, and summer 2018 to establish inter-rater reliability as data was being gathered. According to the data, candidates met the benchmark of 3 on the FEE criteria. Data for fall 2018 and spring 2019 results should be more consistent due to established inter-rater reliability.

The goal for 2018-2019 will be to achieve inter-rater reliability on FEE critical feedback to candidates across four domains. 100% of the candidates will achieve a reliable score of 3.0 or higher.

Early Childhood Education faculty will create a systematic process to analyze candidates' FEE scores (including scripted observations). Areas indicating need for improvement will be identified and curriculum changes made in appropriate courses.

2018-2019:

The mean score for all elements of the rubric for both the fall 2018 and 2019 semester were at or above the benchmark of 3.00. In Domain 2: The Classroom Environment and Domain 3: Instruction, there were several elements in which particular candidates scored below benchmark, but the overall mean scores were well above the 3.00 benchmark.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:
In the 2018-2019 AY, ECHD faculty scripted observations and held post conferences with candidates. All components not scoring in the proficient range were addressed with suggestions for improvement.
To ensure that candidates continue to meet his benchmark, ECHD faculty will pull lesson plans for discussion and group work on differentiating assessments and small group activities in lower level courses in preparation for the student teaching semester. In the case of seed questions, ECHD faculty will instruct candidates to identify the DOK level of their seed questions to strive to plan questions in level three and four.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:
1. Faculty, Mentors, and University Supervisors will participate in inter-rater reliability workshops to ensure scoring is consistent.
2. Pre and post conference conversations with candidates will follow POP Cycle protocol to provide candidates with the proper resources to overcome obstacles in the planning and delivery of lessons
3. DEP faculty will discuss the process of moving from the FEE to the Compass evaluation tool in order to capitalize on training materials available for evaluators and a more consistent form of evaluation between the University and the Districts.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
The benchmark was not met as candidates did not score at the proficiency level (a mean score of 3.00) on indicators in the final Field Experience Evaluation in all four domains. Candidates scored at the proficiency level or above in Domain 1: Planning and Preparation and Domain 4: Professionalism. Domain 2: The Classroom Environment had 95% and 96% proficient for fall 2020 and spring 2021 respectively, and Domain 3: Instruction had 91% and 86% respectively. Trend data indicates similarities in that over the past two academic years, Domains 2 and 3 have had similar low proficiency rate than Domains 1 and 4.

The FEE rubric will continue to be utilized to assess candidate teaching in the field. Inter-rater reliability will be established for all faculty and mentor teachers utilizing the tool. Early childhood faculty will meet in summer 2021 to determine where various components of the FEE are intentionally and specifically addressed for candidates to know how they will be scored, what should be evident in their teaching, and how to achieve success in the delivery of content to P-12 students. Pre and post conferences will also be help with candidates in EDUC 419 and EDUC 421 to pin-point strategies being utilized, questioning, and assessment.

11.2 Data

Domain 5 indicators on the Field Experience Evaluation (FEE) from Student Teaching:

Element	NAEYC Standard	Fall 2015 N=2		Spring 2016 N=1		Fall 2016 N=0		Spring 2017 N=0	
		Mean	Range	Mean	Range	Mean	Range	Mean	Range
5.1	1a	3.50	3.50	2.67	2.67				
5.2	1b	3.50	3.50	2.67	2.67				
5.3	1c	3.25	3.00-3.50	2.00	2.00				
5.4	2a	3.50	3.50	3.00	3.00				
5.5	2b	3.35	3.20-3.50	3.00	3.00				
5.6	2c	3.53	3.30-3.75	3.00	3.00				
5.7	3a	3.75	3.50-4.00	3.00	3.00				
5.8	3b	3.75	3.50-4.00	3.00	3.00				
5.9	3c	3.75	3.50-4.00	3.00	3.00				
5.10	3d	3.75	3.50-4.00	3.00	3.00				
5.11	4a	3.50	3.50	3.00	3.00				
5.12	4b	3.50	3.50	2.33	2.33				
5.13	4c	3.38	3.25-3.50	2.33	2.33				
5.14	5a	3.50	3.50	3.00	3.00				

Domain 5 indicators on the Field Experience Evaluation (FEE) from Student Teaching:

Element	NAEYC Standard	Fall 2017 N=2		Spring 2018 N=1		Fall 2018			Spring 2019		
		Mean	Range	Mean	Range	Number	Mean	Range	Number	Mean	Range

5.1	1a	3.78	3.50-4.00	3.71	3.00-4.00	10	3.89	3.50-4.00	14	3.72	3.13-4.00
5.2	1b	3.75	3.50-4.00	3.73	3.13-4.00	10	3.89	3.50-4.00	14	3.69	3.13-4.00
5.3	1c	3.74	3.13-4.00	3.65	2.75-4.00	10	3.94	3.50-4.00	14	3.73	3.38-4.00
5.4	2a	3.55	2.00-4.00	3.76	3.13-4.00	8	3.85	4.50-4.00	14	3.70	3.13-4.00
5.5	2b	3.93	3.75-4.00	3.79	3.00-4.00	6	3.78	3.00-4.00	14	3.72	3.13-4.00
5.6	2c	3.91	3.67-4.00	3.77	3.00-4.00	6	3.68	3.00-4.00	13	3.80	3.50-4.00
5.7	3a	3.78	3.50-4.00	3.68	2.92-4.00	10	3.91	3.50-4.00	14	3.73	3.38-4.00
5.8	3b	3.79	3.42-4.00	3.60	2.75-4.00	10	3.88	3.50-4.00	14	3.70	3.13-4.00
5.9	3c	3.71	3.50-4.00	3.62	2.92-4.00	10	3.88	3.25-4.00	14	3.72	3.38-4.00
5.10	3d	3.74	3.38-4.00	3.63	3.00-4.00	10	3.83	3.25-4.00	14	3.73	3.50-3.00
5.11	4a	3.88	3.63-4.00	3.74	3.25-4.00	10	3.91	3.50-4.00	14	3.72	3.38-4.00
5.12	4b	3.72	3.25-4.00	3.70	3.25-4.00	10	3.90	3.50-4.00	14	3.66	3.33-4.00
5.13	4c	3.74	3.25-4.00	3.68	2.92-4.00	10	3.86	3.25-4.00	14	3.69	3.38-4.00
5.14	5a	3.88	3.50-4.00	3.69	2.92-4.00	10	3.90	3.50-4.00	14	3.65	3.25-4.00

Element	NAEYC Standard	Fall 2019				Spring 2020			
		Number	Mean	Range	% Proficient	Number	Mean	Range	% Proficient
5.1	1a	4	3.72	3.38-4.00	100%	15	3.70	3.00-4.00	100%
5.2	1b	4	3.69	3.38-4.00	100%	15	3.72	3.00-4.00	100%
5.3	1c	4	3.72	3.38-4.00	100%	15	3.73	3.00-4.00	100%
5.4	2a	4	3.64	3.25-4.00	100%	13	3.79	3.50-4.00	100%
5.5	2b	3	3.57	3.17-4.00	100%	8	3.78	3.00-4.00	100%
5.6	2c	3	3.42	3.13-4.00	100%	10	3.68	3.00-4.00	100%
5.7	3a	4	3.66	3.25-4.00	100%	15	3.63	3.00-4.00	100%
5.8	3b	4	3.63	3.25-3.75	100%	15	3.57	2.50-4.00	93%
5.9	3c	4	3.63	3.25-3.75	100%	15	3.53	3.00-4.00	100%
5.10	3d	4	3.56	3.25-3.75	100%	15	3.74	3.00-4.00	100%
5.11	4a	4	3.79	3.38-4.00	100%	15	3.85	3.50-4.00	100%
5.12	4b	4	3.69	3.38-4.00	100%	15	3.79	3.00-4.00	100%
5.13	4c	4	3.69	3.38-4.00	100%	15	3.80	3.50-4.00	100%
5.14	5a	4	3.63	3.38-4.00	100%	15	3.81	3.50-4.00	100%

	NAEYC	Fall 2020		Spring 2021	

Element	Standard	Number	Mean	Range	% Proficient	Number	Mean	Range	% Proficient
5.1	1a	7	3.93	3.50-4.00	100%	8	3.69	3.38-4.00	100%
5.2	1b	7	3.93	3.50-4.00	100%	8	3.66	3.38-3.88	100%
5.3	1c	7	3.93	3.50-4.00	100%	8	3.71	3.38-4.00	100%
5.4	2a	5	4.00	4.00	100%	7	3.63	3.00-3.88	100%
5.5	2b	4	4.00	4.00	100%				
5.6	2c	3	4.00	4.00	100%				
5.7	3a	7	3.79	3.00-4.00	100%	8	3.64	3.25-3.88	100%
5.8	3b	5	4.00	4.00	100%	8	3.64	3.25-3.88	100%
5.9	3c	7	3.86	3.50-4.00	100%	8	3.63	3.25-3.88	100%
5.10	3d	7	3.79	3.00-4.00	100%	8	3.64	3.25-3.88	100%
5.11	4a	7	3.93	3.50-4.00	100%	8	3.67	3.25-4.00	100%
5.12	4b	7	3.93	3.50-4.00	100%	8	3.66	3.25-4.00	100%
5.13	4c	7	3.93	3.50-4.00	100%	8	3.61	3.25-3.88	100%
5.14	5a	7	3.93	3.50-4.00	100%	8	3.60	3.25-3.88	100%
TECH 1						8	3.81	3.50-4.00	100%
TECH 2						8	3.54	3.13-4.00	100%
TECH 3						8	3.06	2.63-3.50	63%

11.2.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:
Analyze data after three years of data collection to determine benchmark.

2017-2018:
Candidates scored above the proficiency rater of 3.00 on all indicators for fall 2017 and spring 2018.
In fall 2017, '5.4. Knowing about diverse family and community characteristics' was the lowest scoring indicator of 3.55. For spring 2018, indicator '5.8. Partnerships with families and with professional colleagues' scored a 3.60 which is still above the proficiency rating of 3.00.

McNeese faculty, district cooperating teachers, and university supervisors will score formal Field Experience Evaluations (FEE) for student teacher candidates. The FEE will include
Early Childhood Education content standards (Domain 5). For 2018-2019, 100% of the candidates will score a 3.00 (Proficient) or above.

Early Childhood Education faculty will analyze the FEE practicum and student teaching scores to identify areas of strength and areas for improvement. Based on analysis, Early Childhood Education course learning outcomes relative to Domain 5 content standards as determined by NAEYC will be revised.

2018-2019:
The benchmark was met with 100% of the candidates scoring a 3.00 or better on each element of Domain 5.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:
Although all candidates in the 2018-2019 AY scored above a 3.00 in each element of Domain 5, ECHD faculty recognize the need for additional guidance in understanding young children's needs, understanding the multiple influences on development, supporting and engaging families through reciprocal relationships, and knowing about assessment with families and other individuals.

In the 2019-2020 AY, faculty will implement these topics in courses throughout the program to instill a deeper understanding and plan for completing these processes to a higher degree.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:
1. Faculty will include a specific unit covering the current influences on the development of young children in schools today.
2. Faculty will work with school districts to provide opportunities for teacher candidates to engage with families and young children including Dr. Seuss's birthday party held at MSU and Math night in our school districts. At least one opportunities will be made available each semester.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
The benchmark was met as the mean scores for all candidates met the proficiency level or above for each element in Domain 5+Technology. Average mean scores ranged from 3.60-4.00 on the Domain 5 elements. Two of the three technology indicators had lower average mean scores concerning technology strategies utilized (3.54) and candidates including students in the use of technology (3.06).

In EDUC 409, current influences on the development of young children in schools today are addressed. Faculty also planned to work with district schools to include opportunities for engagement with schools and families through the use of programs such as the Dr. Seuss Birthday Party and Math nights. COVID-19 restrictions and damage from the two hurricanes limited these opportunities during the 2020-2021 academic year.

In order to strengthen the technology implementation skills for candidates in the P-12 classroom, professional development within the Department of Education Professions dealing with technologies will enhance the candidate's knowledge of available technologies and meaningful and purposeful P-12 student inclusion in the use of technology in the classroom. As a continued support for candidates, instructors of classroom management courses in the Department of Education Professions will meet in the summer 2021 to redesign courses for more cohesiveness across degree programs.

12 Assessment and Benchmark EDUC 419 Case Study/Portfolio

Assessment 1: Case Study
NAEYC Standards 2, 3, and 5
ECE SPA Assessment 5: Portfolio
EDUC 419: Early Childhood Practicum I
Early childhood candidates complete a child case-study in a pre-kindergarten classroom utilizing an assessment chart with detailed outcomes/goals aligned to the "Head Start Child Development and Early Learning Framework". Candidates reflect on the process of portfolio assessment and it's purpose as a necessary tool, strengths and weaknesses of their portfolio assessment, how the data collection can be utilized when conferencing with parents, and in planning developmentally appropriate activities that meet the needs of their students.

Assessment 2: Portfolio
NAEYC Standard 3
ECHD SPA Assessment 5
EDUC 419: Early Childhood Practicum I
Student Portfolio assessed during the students' pre-K practicum via an instructor-created rubric.

Early Childhood Teacher Competencies: B2 The teacher candidate provides emotional and behavioral support to children as indicated by exhibiting an awareness and sensitivity to children's emotional and learning needs.
Early Childhood Teacher Competencies: E4 The teacher candidate uses assessment to guide planning and understands children's levels of growth and development as indicated by making decisions based on the progress of children's development with reliability.
NAEYC: 1a Knowing and understanding young children's characteristics and needs
NAEYC: 1b Knowing and understanding the multiple influences on development and learning.
NAEYC: 1c Using developmental knowledge to create healthy, respectful, supportive, and challenging learning environments.
NAEYC: 2c Involving families and communities in their children's learning and development
NAEYC: 3d Knowing about assessment partnerships with families and other professionals
NAEYC: 4b Candidates know and understand and use a wide array of effective approaches, strategies, and tools, to positively influence young children's development and learning.
InTASC standards included: 1d The teacher candidate understands how learning occurs, how learners construct knowledge, acquire skills, and develop disciplined thinking processes and knows how to use instructional strategies that promote student learning.
InTASC standards included: 2g The teacher candidate understands and identifies differences in approaches to learning and performance and knows how to design instruction that uses each learners strengths to promote growth.
InTASC standards included: 7h The teacher candidate understands how integrating cross-disciplinary skills in instruction engages learners purposefully in applying content knowledge

Benchmark 1: A competency score of 4.00 out 5.00 will be the minimum mean score on all elements related to this assessment tool (EDUC 419 Case Study).

Benchmark 2: 100% of the candidates to achieve an 8 out of 10 proficiency score on the rubric.

Prior to 2018-2019, the benchmark was a minimum mean score of 7.00 (out of 10.00) on each criteria assessment in the Portfolio/Case Study.

Program Outcomes Links

LTGC C1
The teacher candidate observes and reflects on students' responses to instruction to identify areas of need and make adjustments to practice.

LTGC H
The teacher candidate applies knowledge of various types of assessments and their purposes, strengths, and limitations to select, adapt, and modify assessments to accommodate the abilities and needs of students with exceptionalities.

External Outcomes Links

12.1 Data

Previous Data:

NAEYC Standards	Portfolio Item	Fall 2013	Spring 2014	Fall 2014	Spring 2015
1.a	1	4.87	4.77	4.77	5
3.a, 4.b	2	4.87	3.66	5	4.63
3.d, 5.c	3	4.87	3.66	4.77	4.27
3.a. 3.c	5	5	5	4.77	5
5.d	6	4.6	4.55	5	4.63
2.c, 4.a, 5.b, 5.c	7	4.5	4.55	5	4.81
1.a	8	4.56	4.55	5	4.81

NAEYC Standards	Portfolio Narrative Items	Fall 2015 N=12		Spring 2016 N=8		Fall 2016 N=17		Spring 2017 N=11	
		Min	Max	Min	Max	Min	Max	Min	Max

		Mean	Score	Score	Mean	Score	Score	Mean	Score	Score	Mean	Score	Score
3a, 3b	1	5	5	5	5	5	5	4.12	0	5	5	5	5
3a,3c	2	5	5	5	4.75	3	5	4.35	0	5	5	5	5
3d	3	5	3	5	5	5	5	4.35	0	5	5	5	5

EDUC 419 Case Study:

Portfolio Narrative Items	NAEYC Standards	Fall 2017 N=11		Spring 2018 N=12		Fall 2018 N=12		Spring 2019 N=16	
		Mean	Range	Mean	Range	Mean	Range	Mean	Range
Portfolio Summary and Reflection	3a, 3b	5.00	5.00	4.86	3.00-5.00	4.83	3.00-5.00	5.00	5.00
	3a,3c	5.00	5.00	4.86	3.00-5.00	4.83	3.00-5.00	4.63	3.00-5.00
	3d	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.75	3.00-5.00
	Combined	5.00	5.00	4.90	3.00-5.00	4.89	3.00-5.00	4.79	3.00-5.00

EDUC 419 Case Study:

Portfolio Narrative Items	NAEYC Standards	Fall 2019 N=4		Spring 2020 N=17		Fall 2020 N=9			Spring 2021 N=8		
		Mean	Range	Mean	Range	Mean	Range	% Proficient	Mean	Range	% Proficient
Portfolio Summary and Reflection	3a, 3b	4.00	4.00	3.88	2.00-4.00	3.78	2.00-4.00	89%	4.00	4.00	100%
	3a,3c	4.00	4.00	3.82	2.00-4.00	3.33	2.00-4.00	67%	4.00	4.00	100%
	3d	4.00	4.00	3.82	2.00-4.00	3.11	2.00-4.00	56%	4.00	4.00	100%
	Combined	4.00	4.00	3.76	3.00-4.00	3.41	2.00-4.00	67%	4.00	4.00	100%

Artifacts

BS_ECHD_Case Study_17-18 [PDF 61 KB SEP 15, 2018]

12.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:
Benchmark met. The data collected for this assessment changed in the 2015-2016 master plan.

Early childhood students have been introduced to the 'Teaching Strategies Gold' assessment tool. Strategies were adopted for use in fall 2015 and correlated to NAEYC standards and portfolio items. 100% of candidates met minimum expectations of a 4.00 or better on all selected narrative items .

2016-2017:
Student teacher candidates scored well on these elements due to becoming accomplished at analyzing student work samples.

Students are called to reflect on the process of utilizing portfolio assessment with pre-kindergarten students. They are to use content standards and assess these children in a real-world setting and then make professional judgments as to determine the children's skill levels. Candidates further create a prescription page for individual children as to their strengths, and where there are areas of need.

Instructors need to take a closer look at the rubric and see if a change is needed in either the rubric or how the activity is graded.

2017-2018:
The benchmark was met. On 'Standard 3, portfolio summary and reflection', candidates scored a 5.00 for fall 2017 and a 4.90 in the spring 2018 semester which is above benchmark.

The goal for 2018-2019 will be to ensure that Early Childhood Education curriculum meets NAEYC standard 3 by requiring candidates to score 4.00 out of 5.00 on the case study rubric in EDUC 419. Early Childhood Education faculty will analyze student achievement on the case study in EDUC 419. The results will be used to address emerging deficiencies in course content/rubric alignment. The rubric will also be assessed to ensure alignment to NAEYC Standard 3.

2018-2019
The benchmark was met with candidates ending with a 4.89 mean score in fall 2018 and a 4.79 mean score in spring 2019.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:
In the 2018-2019 AY, faculty reviewed NAEYC standard 3 to ensure that the reflection met the requirements of the standard. Moving forward, faculty will continue to tweak the assignment to ensure that the assignment is best aligned to standard 3.

Also, as of February 2020, CAEP will no longer require a SPA for NAEYC standards. ECHD faculty will continue to monitor the CAEP guidelines to ensure that assignment are aligned to the most updated standards.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:
1. Faculty will implement a set of questions for candidates to reflect upon to ensure the alignment to standard three.
2. ECHD faculty will stay up to date on current expectations and standards and will make revisions as needed.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
The benchmark was met. Fall 2020 candidates average means scores for each element ranged from 3.11-4.00. However, individual mean scores did have some candidates scoring below proficiency level with scores ranging from 2.00-4.00. Spring 2021 candidate scores were all 4.00. It is important to note that the rubric was adjusted during the fall 2020 semester (which is when the spring 2021 candidates would have been enrolled in this course) due to hurricanes and placement restrictions in the district schools. Candidates did not completer all activities. For example, candidates were given documentation from former case studies to complete the assignment instead of obtaining the data from their own work with P-12 students.

Faculty will continue to utilize the assessment as a measurement of the preparation of candidates for the early childhood profession. ECHD faculty will revise the rubric to adequately prepare candidates for this type of assessment in the field while being mindful of field placements. ECHD faculty implemented questions for candidates to reflect on along with their assessment observations to ensure alignment with CAEP Standard 3. Faculty will review the assessment to ensure CAEP Standard 3 alignment and provide the necessary observation tools and reflection prompts aligned to CAEP Standard 3.

12.2 Data

Portfolio Items	NAEYC Standards	Fall 2017 N=11		Spring 2018 N=12		Fall 2018 N=12		Spring 2019 N=16	
		Mean	Range	Mean	Range	Mean	Range	Mean	Range
Student Prescription	5a, 5b	10.00	10.00	9.71	6.00-10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00
	5c	10.00	10.00	9.71	6.00-10.00	9.67	6.00-10.00	9.75	6.00-10.00
	Combined	10.00	10.00	9.71	6.00-10.00	9.83	6.00-10.00	9.88	6.00-10.00
Standard 2	2a, 2b, 2c	6.72	4.00-10.00	4.29	0.00-10.00	9.17	0.00-10.00	9.63	4.00-10.00

Portfolio Items	NAEYC Standards	Fall 2019 N=4			Spring 2020 N=17			Fall 2020 N=9			Spring 2021 N=8		
		Mean	Range	% Proficient	Mean	Range	% Proficient	Mean	Range	% Proficient	Mean	Range	% Proficient
Student Prescription	5a, 5b	4.00	4.00	100%	3.73	3.00-4.00	4.00	4.00	100%	4.00	4.00	100%	
	5c	4.00	4.00	100%	3.80	3.00-4.00	3.78	3.00-4.00	100%	4.00	4.00	100%	
	Combined	4.00	4.00	100%	3.77	3.00-4.00	3.89	3.00-4.00	100%	4.00	4.00	100%	
Standard 2	2a, 2b, 2c	3.25	1.00-4.00	75%	3.80	3.00-4.00	—	—	—	—	—	—	

12.2.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:
This was the first year of this assessment.

Due to comments received on the SPA submission report, NAEYC Standard 2, the Portfolio/Child Case Study has been redesigned to meet only one standard/element per section. In addition, new criteria have been added to this assessment piece, to also address NAEYC Standards 2 and 5.

The benchmark was met for fall 2017 with candidates scoring 6.27 out of 10 on indicators measuring standard 2 and candidates scoring 10 out of 10 on indicators measuring standard 5. For spring 2018, standard 2 did not meet proficiency with candidates scoring 4.29 out of 10. In regards to standard 5, candidates met the benchmark with a 9.71 out of 10.

For standard 2, candidates have a mean score of 6.72 out of 10 for fall 2017 and a mean score of 4.29 in spring 2018, which measured the home/school activities. On standard 5, analyzing work samples of students, candidates scored a mean of 10 out of 10 for fall 2017 and 9.71 for spring 2018. The benchmark of 80% which was the measure for success on the updated rubric was accomplished.

The goal for 2018-2019 will be for 100% of the candidates to achieve an 8 out of 10 proficiency score on the rubric, which aligns with NAEYC standards 2 and 5.
Candidates will be required to complete the Family Feedback Form and utilize the information to create the student's prescription plan and home/school recommendations (NAEYC Standard 2). Early Childhood Education faculty will assess the rubric to ensure alignment to NAEYC Standards 2 and 5 and will make revisions if necessary. Candidate data for NAEYC Standard 5 will be available in fall 2018.

2018-2019:
The benchmark for this assessment was not met for all components in the assessment. In the Student Prescription item, 5a and 5b met the benchmark with all candidates scoring a 10/10. The mean score for all candidates was 9.67 in fall 2018 with a range from 6.00-10.00 and 9.75 in spring 2019 with a range of 6.00-10.00. The benchmark was also not met for Standard 2 with mean scores of 9.17 for fall 2018 and 9.63 for spring 2019, but with ranges of 0.00-10.00 and 4.00-10.00 respectively.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:
In looking at the results of the assessment, some family surveys and activity response cards were not returned and candidates did not reflect on the causes or make an attempt to gain responses from their case-study child. In the upcoming year, candidates will be required to complete the Family Feedback Form and utilize the information to create the student's prescription plan and home/school recommendations as part of the requirements in NAEYC Standard 2.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:
- Faculty will work with candidates to determine alternative measures for making connections with families, thus reinforcing the goal and home and school working hand in hand to educate students
- Candidates will discuss interests with students and create activities to work on at home or at school in small groups.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

2020-2021 completers met the benchmark of achieving a score of 3.00 out of 4.00 on all elements of the rubric. Candidates were required to have the Family Feedback form completed and utilized the information to create students' prescription plans for home and school activities. Candidates discussed interests with students to differentiate activities related to content needs. During the 2020-2021 academic year, the assessment was modified to accommodate for COVID-19 restrictions and challenges resulting from hurricanes Laura and Delta. Early Childhood faculty will rework the rubric expectations to adequately prepare candidates for this type of assessment with young children while being mindful of field placement and COVID-19 restrictions. Faculty will reinstate the Family Information Form so that candidates can differentiate assessment types to align with student interest and content needs for fall 2021.

13 Assessment and Benchmark PRAXIS II Principles of Learning and Teaching

ECHD SPA Assessment 6 Licensure: Early Childhood Praxis II
Assessment: PRAXIS PLT 0621
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).
NAEYC Standard 1, 2, 3, 4, 5
NAEYC 1a: Knowing and understanding young children's characteristics and needs.
NAEYC 1b: Knowing and understanding multiple influences on development and learning.
NAEYC 1c: Using developmental knowledge to create healthy, respectful, supportive and challenging learning environments.
NAEYC 2c: Involving families and communities in their children's learning and development.
NAEYC Standard 3: Observing, documenting, and Assessing to Support Young Children and Families
NAEYC Standard 4c: Understanding content knowledge in early education
NAEYC Standard 4d: Building meaningful curriculum
InTASC standards included: 10
Dispositions:
Leadership and Collaboration: InTASC 10 - The candidate seeks appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to take responsibility for student learning, to collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, other school professionals, and community members to ensure leaner growth, and to advance the profession.

Benchmark: At least 80% of graduates pass Praxis Principals of Learning and Teaching (#5621) on the first attempt. Candidates should also score a minimum of 70% on sub component scores with Praxis PLT (#5621).

Program Outcomes Links

LTGC B
The teacher candidate demonstrates mastery of the content knowledge and skills and content pedagogy needed to teach the current academic standards as defined in BESE policy.

LTGC E
The teacher candidate applies knowledge of state and federal laws related to 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 1530, Bulletin 1706, and Bulletin 1903).

External Outcomes Links

13.1 Data

	Fall 2013	Spring 2014	Fall 2014	Spring 2015	Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
Praxis PLT #5621 % pass 1st attempt	82%	85%	82%	88%	60%	86%	67%	80%	82%	83%

	Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021	Fall 2021	Spring 2022	Fall 2022	Spring 2023
Praxis PLT #5621 % pass 1st attempt	58%	81%	75%	100%	56%	100%				

#5621			Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
Overall Score Information		Number	10	14	9	14	11	12
		Mean	165	172	164.4	168	171	170
		Range	157-179	161-185	157-179	158-185	159-179	162-179
		% Pass 1st attempt	60%	86%	67%	80%	82%	83%
		% Pass prior to ST/Intern	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Subcomponent		Number	9	12	9	14	10	12
Students as Learners		Mean	14	16	14	14	16	15
		Range	12-16	13-19	12-17	10-18	13-20	10-18

Instructional Process	Mean	14	15	14	14	16	15
	Range	12-17	12-19	14-17	7-17	13-18	12-17
Assessment	Mean	9	9	9	10	10	10
	Range	7-11	7-12	6-10	7-13	6-13	8-12
Professional Development Leadership and Community	Mean	10	10	9	11	10	10
	Range	6-14	9-13	6-10	8-14	7-14	6-14
Analysis of Instructional Scenarios	Mean	11	12	11	10	11	11
	Range	5-15	10-16	9-14	6-15	10-14	8-14

#5621		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
Overall Score Information	Number	12	16	4	19	9	8
	Mean	165	166	168	168	167	170
	Range	159-172	157-177	157-183	158-181	159-182	160-179
	% Pass 1st attempt	58%	81%	75%	100%	56%	100%
	% Pass prior to ST/Intern	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Subcomponent	Number	8	14	3	17	9	7
Students as Learners (21)	Mean	14	14	14	13	14	15
	Range	11-20	9-18	11-16	11-17	10-19	13-18
	% Correct	67%	67%	67%	62%	67%	71%
Instructional Process (20)	Mean	14	14	15	15	14	14
	Range	10-17	12-17	13-18	9-18	13-18	11-18
	% Correct	67%	70%	75%	75%	70%	70%
Assessment (14)	Mean	10	9	11	9	9	11
	Range	9-11	6-11	9-12	6-13	4-12	8-13
	% Correct	67%	64%	79%	64%	64%	79%
Professional Development Leadership and Community (13)	Mean	11	10	11	10	10	9
	Range	9-14	7-13	10-12	8-13	8-13	6-11
	% Correct	67%	77%	85%	77%	77%	69%
Analysis of Instructional Scenarios (16)	Mean	10	11	12	11	10	13
	Range	8-13	8-14	9-14	6-15	4-14	8-16
	% Correct	67%	69%	75%	69%	63%	81%

13.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:
This level of achievement was not met in fall 2015; however, in spring 2016, teacher candidates exceeded the minimum competency score by 6%.

2016-2017:
Data ranges for percentage of passage on first attempt are 60%-86%. In fall 2015, competency scores were lacking by 20% and in fall 2016 by 23%. Students performed better in spring 2016 and spring 2017 with scores of 86% and 80%. Faculty is unsure why students' achievement is higher on first attempt for the PLT in the spring semesters.

100% of students passed the PLT prior to student teaching and/or internship semester. The Office of Student Teaching and Professional Education Services utilizes passage of all Praxis parts as a stop gate before the final semester as a way to ensure certification of all graduating candidates.

The mean score for the sub-component Assessment was lowest of all sub-components, with a mean score of 9. Assessment has been challenging for teacher candidates and is being addressed specifically in the methods courses such as, EDUC 419 and 420.

2017-2018:
83% of the candidates passed the Praxis Principles of Learning and Teaching Exam, meeting benchmark for 2017-2018.

While candidates exceeded the benchmark of 80% on the Praxis PLT, there were sub-score areas that remained the same or slightly regressed. In the area of 'students as learners', candidates scored 76% correct in the fall 2017 and 71% correct in the spring 2018. In the area of 'Instructional Processes', candidates scored 80% correct in fall 2017 and 75% correct in spring 2018. Areas of 'Assessment and Professional Development' revealed that candidates scored 71% correct for both the fall 2017 and spring 2018 semesters. Candidates scored 68% for both the fall 2017 and spring 2018 semesters in the area of 'Analysis'.

For 2018-2019, 80% of candidates will pass the PLT on the first attempt. In addition, candidates will average 70% or higher for percentage of questions answered correct on each sub-score area.

EDUC 202 will prioritize content relevant to case study activities to strengthen knowledge of the assessment and analysis of scenarios sub-components within the Praxis PLT. Praxis PLT sub-scores will continue to be analyzed each year to determine areas for improvement.

2018-2019:

The benchmark was not met for the 2018-2019 AY. 58% of the candidates passed on the first attempt in the fall 2018 semester and 81% passed on the first attempt in the spring 2019 semester. This is a 71% for the 2018-2019 AY.

The mean score of the following sub-components fell below the 70% benchmark: Students as learners F18 (67%) and S19 (67%); Assessment S19 (64%); and Analysis of Scenarios F18 (63% and S19 (69%).

Plan for Continuous Improvement:
The ECHD program requirements and course sequence has been redesigned beginning with the 2018-2019 AY. Faculty will ensure that materials taught in EDUC 192 and EDUC 202 are aligned with appropriate Praxis requirements and NAEYC or other appropriate standards.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:
1. Redesign of the ECHD program will shift the focus of course content in EDUC 192 and EDUC 202 to ECHD philosophers and cognitive content for early learners.
2. The courses in the current program will be revisited to ensure that the most relevant topics are being taught to the candidates
3. EDUC 202 will address developmental stages for children birth to five, cognitive development for pre-k and kindergarteners, and grades 1-3.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
The benchmark was not met as only 56% of fall 2020 completers passed the Praxis PLT on the first attempt, while 100% of completers in the spring 2021 semester passed on the first attempt. There has been an overall trend over the last three years of a significantly higher first time pass rate percentage for spring completers than fall completers. ECHD faculty will research when candidates are taking the PLT in relation to designated courses to try to determine the significant difference in fall and spring first time pass rates.

When analyzing the subcomponents of the PLT, each section had at least one of the two semesters where the mean score fell below benchmark (70%) except for Instructional Process which was at benchmark (70%) for both semesters.

During the past year, EDUC 202 and EDUC 203 in the traditional BS ECHD program were revisited to ensure pertinent topics for early childhood were being presented. EDUC 192 and EDUC 202 were combined for a more cohesive delivery of developmental stages, so now EDUC 202 addressed developmental stages for childbirth to five, cognitive development for PK, K, and grades 1-3.

The benchmark will remain the same. The redesigned program has a recommended timeline for candidates to take all Praxis exams. Advisors will strongly suggest that the PLT be taken immediately after completion of EDUC 202, PSYC 260, and EDUC 203.

14 Assessment and Benchmark Lesson Planning

Assessment: Lesson Plan rubric administered in EDUC 409: Early Classroom Management and Field Experience.

Benchmark: Candidates will have a minimum score of 3 (Proficient) in each criterion from the Lesson Plan rubric administered in EDUC 409: Early Classroom Management and Field Experience.

14.1 Data
2017-2018:
Data table is attached.

2018-2019:
Data table is attached.

2019-2020:
Data table is attached.

2020-2021:
Data table is attached.

Artifacts

BS Early Childhood_LP_17-18 [PDF 139 KB SEP 15, 2018]

BS Early Childhood_LP_18-19 [PDF 149 KB SEP 11, 2019]

BS Early Childhood_LP_19-20 [PDF 185 KB AUG 16, 2020]

BS Early Childhood_LP_20-21 [PDF 209 KB JUN 1, 2021]

14.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement
2017-2018:
Proficiency was met by all candidates in all areas except differentiation. One candidate failed to include differentiation in her lesson plan, which lowered the percentage to 68%.

Candidates demonstrated proficiency in writing an effective lesson plan for the grade level they were assigned.

Early Childhood Education faculty will require candidates to write a complete lesson plan and score at the level of 80% proficiency or higher in each of the areas.

Data analysis indicates that candidates' scores in the area of differentiation in the lesson plan are below 80%. Instructional methods in EDUC 409 will be revised to address lesson plan differentiation learning objectives. Candidates will complete additional practice on differentiation lessons.

2018-2019:
The benchmark was not met. In the fall 2018 semester, the following categories had candidates score below the proficient level (3.00): Procedures (8%; Seed Questions (16%); Modeling, Guided, Independent Practice (8%); Closure (8%) and Differentiation (25%).

In the spring 2019 semester, the following categories had candidates score below the proficient level (3.00): Lesson Hook (6%) and Seed Questions (19%)

Plan for Continuous Improvement:
Differentiation was an area that received a great deal of focus in conversations with faculty over the past two years. There was an significant increase in improvement in this area from F18-S19. Faculty will continue to determine ways to address issues in particular areas and develop instructional techniques to help students strategically think through each element of the lesson plan in preparation for delivery.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:
- ECHD faculty will pull lesson plans for discuss and group work on differentiating assessments and small group activities
1. ECHD faculty will have candidates identify DOK levels for the seed questions in an effort to plan for level 3 and 4 in depth thinking.
2. Faculty will address technology use for scoring purposes. Proficient scores will only be obtained if PK-3 students are engaged in the use of technology.
3. Faculty will continue to revise the CUP rubric to mirror the DEP updated lesson plan rubric.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
The benchmark was not met due to there being one candidate each semester that did not meet benchmark on one of the criteria of the rubric. In the fall 2020 semester, that category was Pre-planned Seed Questions and in the fall 2020 the category was Student Outcomes. Although the benchmark was not met, it is important to note that the overwhelming majority of students did meet proficiency in all categories both semesters.

During the 2020-2021 academic year, faculty had candidates identify the DOK level for the higher order thinking questions for level 3 and 4 thinking. Faculty used data to identify areas of need through analysis. In the next year, faculty will continue to track areas of need in lesson planning. Candidates will also participate in POP Cycles, pre and post conferences, for lessons being formally evaluated with a FEE. At the pre-conference, lesson plans will be reviewed, discussed, and candidates will be provided specific feedback that will be documented by faculty.

15 Assessment and Benchmark Course Content GPA

Assessment: Course content GPA to meet NAEYC Standards:
NAEYC Standard 1: EDUC 192. EDUC 202, and EDUC 319
NAEYC Standard 1c: EDUC409
NAEYC Standard 2: EDUC 419
NAEYC Standard 3: SPED 452 and SPED 453
NAEYC Standard 4: EDUC 420
NAEYC Standard 5: EDUC 468P

Benchmark: Candidates will make a minimum score of 3.00 in each of the courses listed for the Early Childhood content area. Early Childhood Education curriculum content will be up-to-date and meet state and national standards. The 3.00 score correlates to a "B" average.

Prior to 2016-2017, the benchmark was 2.00, since all candidates must have a "C" or better to apply the grade to the degree program.

15.1 Data
2017-2018:
Data table is attached.

2018-2019:
Data table is attached.

2019-2020:
Data table is attached.

2020-2021:
Data table is attached.

Artifacts

BS_ECHD_Course Content GPA_17-18 [PDF 75 KB SEP 15, 2018]

BS_ECHD_Course Content GPA_18-19 [PDF 70 KB SEP 11, 2019]

BS_ECHD_Course Content GPA_19-20 [PDF 71 KB AUG 16, 2020]

BS_ECHD_Course Content GPA_20-21 [PDF 65 KB JUN 18, 2021]

15.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement
2017-2018:
The benchmark was raised from a 2.00 to a 3.00 in order to sustain improvement. The benchmark was met in all course content areas with the one exception of EDUC 319 in fall 2017.

The goal for 2018-2019 will be to have 100% of the candidates achieve a minimum score of 3.00 in each of the courses listed in the Early Childhood Education content area. This correlates to a "B" average.

Early Childhood Education faculty will analyze student achievement in content area courses to determine scores achieved. Course content will be assessed to verify that material is up-to-date and meets state and national standards. Course content grades will also be triangulated with praxis scores to determine any relationships.

2018-2019:
The benchmark was not met. Data for the fall 2018 semester is as follows: EDUC 192: =2.92 with 83% of candidates scoring 3.00; EDUC 202: =3.42 with 83% of candidates scoring 3.00; and EDUC 319: =2.67 with 58% of the candidates scoring 3.00. All other courses had 100% of the candidates scoring 3.00.

Data for the spring 2019 semester is as follows: EDUC 192: =3.06 with 75% of the candidates scoring 3.00; EDUC 319: =3.25 with 81% of the candidates scoring 3.00. All other courses had 100% of the candidates scoring 3.00.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:
As the ECHD courses are redesigned, attention will be focused on early childhood curriculum in EDUC 192 and 202. EDUC 319 is no longer offered as part of the ECHD program

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

1. ECHD 192 will be revised and faculty will revisit the consideration of merging EDUC 202 with EDUC 192 which will provide three credit hours free to possibly include EDUC 203. By merging ECHD 192 and 202, enrollment for the course would be restricted to ECHD majors for an increased focus on ECHD curriculum and issues.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
The average mean score met benchmark for all coursework assessed in the course content GPA benchmark. However, there were six courses in the fall 2020 (67%) and one course in the spring 2021 semester (11%) where at least one student did not meet the proficiency benchmark of a 3.00 or higher.

Early childhood faculty will align program coursework to current program standards by the fall 2021 semester. Faculty will continue to look for field work opportunities and course content will be updated with the most current teaching practices to meet student needs. Through advising and campus activities, faculty will build rapport with candidates to validate their needs and concerns as they move through the early childhood program.

16 Assessment and Benchmark Field Experience Data

Assessment: Data is collected from field experience data entered on the STPES web site.

Benchmark: 100% of candidates will observe and practice in the three groups within Early Childhood Education (PK, K, and grades 1-3) and participate in working relationships with families and communities with child care centers, Head Start program, and local public schools (PK-3), and their faculty. This benchmark will assist in preparing candidates for teaching positions in any grade level, PK-3.

16.1 Data
2017-2018:
Data table is attached.

2018-2019:
Data table is attached.

2019-2020:
Data table is attached.

2020-2021:
Data table is attached.

Artifacts

BS_ECHD_Field Experience Data_17-18 [PDF 108 KB SEP 15, 2018]

BS_ECHD_Field Experience Data_18-19 [PDF 128 KB SEP 11, 2019]

BS_ECHD_Field Experience Data_19-20 [PDF 135 KB AUG 16, 2020]

BS_ECHD_Field Experience Data_20-21 [PDF 149 KB JUN 1, 2021]

16.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement
2017-2018:
Data was added to the assessment plan in 2017-2018. Due to the state mandates and SPA standards, the Field Experience Coordinator will analyze this data to ensure that candidate experiences are diverse in grade levels, ethnicities of PK-3 students, and classroom environments.

For 2018-2019, the goal will be for 100% of the Early Childhood Education candidates to observe and practice in the three grade levels (PK, K, and grades 1-3) in order to experience the working relationship among families and communities with child care centers, Head Start programs, and local public schools and their faculty.

The field experience coordinator will analyze the data from the Field Experience Data System to verify student placement in the three early childhood age groups, in a variety of community settings. Student placement information is reported to the Office of Student Teaching.

2018-2019:
The benchmark was met. F18: 14.24% of candidate observations were in PK classrooms; 13.90% were in Kindergarten classrooms; 19.32% were in 1st grade classrooms; 17.97% were in 2nd grade classrooms; and 13.90% were in 3rd grade classrooms. Additional observation hours were spent in birth to three years, 4th grade, 5th grade, and other classrooms.

S19: 15.21% of candidate observations were in PK classrooms; 17.50% were in Kindergarten classrooms; 18.33% were in 1st grade classrooms; 15.83% were in 2nd grade classrooms; and 12.29% were in 3rd grade classrooms. Additional observation hours were spent in birth to three years, 4th grade, 5th grade, and other classrooms.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:
Candidates will gain experiences in all areas of the ECHD certification area: Pre-Kindergarten, Kindergarten, and Grades 1-3.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:
1. When assigning candidates field experience opportunities throughout the program, faculty will be specific in identifying the age group these activities should be completed with in order to ensure that candidates gain experiences with all age groups at different points throughout the program.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
Data shows that candidates have experience in a variety of grade levels and schools during their education program. Data for 2020-2021 completers indicates that 23-27% of field experiences are occurring in grade levels outside of the initial certification area for early childhood candidates. This trend will be discussed as field experiences are discussed and entered into the rainbow chart for documentation of activities, assignments, and placements for education courses. ECHD faculty will pay particular attention to the grade level expectations for observations within the coursework.

Candidates gained experiences in all areas of ECHD certification by being assigned specific activities per grade/age range in EDUC 202. EDUC 419 has students specifically working in head start and pre-k classrooms. EDUC 420 had students working at the kindergarten level and will continue to do so in the new course EDUC 421, while content courses have candidates working in Pre-K through 3rd grade levels.

The redesigned program will allow faculty to assign candidates to specific sites and age groups within the ECHD degree plan. Activities implemented will accommodate a variety of age groups throughout the course sequence. Office of Student Teaching with the assistance of administrative help will be assigning candidates to specific sites for field work. Faculty will convey needs of age/grade levels to meet the standards for courses and activities utilized in course content. Documentation of sites, grades levels, and experiences will be documented in the rainbow chart.

End of report