Elementary Education Grades 1-5 [BS] [ELEM]

Cycles included in this report:
Jun 1, 2020 to May 31, 2021

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

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

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

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

Program Name: Elementary Education Grades 1-5 [BS] [ELEM]

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

1 Is this program offered via Distance Learning?

100% Traditional or less than 50% Distance/Traditional

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

No

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

3 Example of Program Improvement

2015-2016:
1) Content Knowledge: The Department of Teacher Education is involved in ongoing curriculum review of the Elementary 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 (0014/5014) 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 pass rate of 100% for fall 2015 and spring 2016), 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. Four of the five ACEI Standards are measured on the Field Experience Evaluation form (FEE) for elementary education. 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. These sources of information can then be used to make adjustments to the planning and evaluation instruments. Although the data show 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 Elementary Education candidates complete 285 hours of field experiences throughout the elementary teaching degree plan before the student teaching semester. Through lesson planning, teaching, collaboration, and reflection in each course, all ACEI 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 collaboration, 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. Elementary education candidates are required to use technology in every evaluated lesson in 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 ACEI Standard 5: Professional growth , reflection, and evaluation. Candidates are required throughout the program's coursework to read and summarize journal articles pertaining to methodology issues in elementary education; however, at this time, data is not being collected to reflect this.

3) Student Learning: The semester prior to student teaching, the elementary education candidates complete a 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 child case study for data collection to assess student learning. 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. Throughout the degree program there are many opportunities for candidates to engage in lesson planning and activities that impact student achievement.

2016-2017:
In analyzing the data throughout our assessments, it was determined that our candidates performed well in assessments based on candidate performance; whereas, assessments focusing on candidate's ability to lesson plan or apply student data/knowledge to drive instruction candidates scored lower, often falling below the proficiency benchmark set by the department. Since the candidates' performance scores are consistently high in performance assessments, it is possible that the high scores may indicate that evaluators are not critical enough of our candidates. Due to this conclusion, more training on critical feedback, inter-rater reliability spot checks, and a candidate evaluation on the effectiveness of the feedback was implemented throughout the College of Education Professions during the 2016-2017 academic year. Professional development that focuses on different components of the observation process will continue.

Additionally, lower candidate scores associated with lesson planning and application of student data to drive instruction consistently fell at or below the proficiency benchmark. It was concluded that there is a weakness within the program regarding the instruction and application of these components. Since identifying these pattern trends, the department has revised the lesson plan rubric to reflect the expectations and rigor found in the student performance assessments that are also aligned with the state observation evaluation Danielson rubric, ACEI and InTASC standards. Additionally, the department has added a more thorough lesson planning component as well as implemented the revised lesson planning assessments throughout the program.

The EPP has created a scope and sequence of major assessments across the elementary education baccalaureate program to better align candidate knowledge and performance of pedagogical skills and dispositions. Through these improvements, the candidates will experience more diverse field placements. We now have a focus of writing lesson plans and collecting data in each of the content areas to document P-12 student learning outcomes. EDTC 245 candidates are now being exposed early in the program to technology tool including: e-portfolios, assessment, classroom management, collaboration, presentation, and video. In addition, the EPP has provided clearer template instructions, delineated rubric descriptions and performance objectives.

2017-2018:
First attempt pass rates for the Praxis Content Exam have increased in mathematics, social studies, science, and overall. A Praxis Moodle page has been created to assist candidates who are having difficulties with the Praxis exam. Faculty are advising candidates to take the exam after completing designated courses and are working with content faculty to determine the best courses for candidates.

2018-2019:
Shared Governance meetings are becoming a central piece to the development and improvement of programs. We have held several meetings with district partners concerning candidate requirements and areas for improvements.

Several Praxis workshops have been created for the elementary content and core areas and will be held beginning in the fall 2019 semester. All four areas of the elementary content Praxis should have workshops created by summer 2020.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
EPP faculty quickly transitioned to virtual teaching while managing the impact of COVID-19 and two major hurricanes.

4 Program Highlights from the Reporting Year

2015-2016:
We implemented a Co-teaching model and professional development for MAT teacher candidates in conjunction with the local P-12 school system. Teacher candidates, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors work together to build a co-teaching relationship for the teacher candidate's student teaching or intern experience. During multiple professional development opportunities, each member of the triad (teacher candidate, cooperating teacher, and university supervisor) receives information on co-teaching and how to make it successful for all involved in the process as well as participates in relationship building activities. The goal of the Co-teaching model and professional development is to improve the student teaching or internship experience in order to further the success of our students during their final semester.

2016-2017:
Over the past year we have realigned major assessments in the program, ensured diverse opportunities for field experiences and integrated technology into all courses.

2017-2018:
Faculty worked to redesign the BS Elementary program in accordance with the State's new year-long residency policy. The new program went into effect for 2018-2019.

2018-2019:
Combined Praxis pass rates on first attempt increased from 70% in F18 to 86% in S19 (+16%).

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
The 20-21 academic year was the first time we've had an increase in enrollment since 15-16. The 7.5% increase in enrollment for the 20-21 academic year exceeded the benchmark of 7%. The 20-21 academic year was also the first time we've been able to meet the benchmark of at least 90% of candidates completing the program within three years of being accepted

5 Program Mission

The Bachelor of Science degree in elementary education is designed to prepare teacher education candidates for entry into teaching as an elementary education teacher in grades 1-5. 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 other states and instill professionalism, collaboration, reflection, and a respect for diversity.

6 Institutional Mission Reference

The Bachelor of Science in Elementary 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 Elementary Education program prepares students to fulfill their roles in the teaching profession in grades 1-5 and contribute to the cultural and intellectual advancement of the citizens of Louisiana.

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

Assessment: Enrollment and Completer Data and Graduation Matriculation Rates
CAEP Standard 3

7.1 Benchmark: MSUs strategic plans for enrollment/recruitment goal is to increase enrollment by 7% each year from fall 2017 to fall 2021, the EPP has likewise set a 7% goal for overall enrollment increase across programs each year.

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.

7.2 Benchmark: Create and monitor candidate progress throughout the program. A minimum of 90% of candidates should complete the baccalaureate program in Elementary Education within three years of being accepted into the program (200 packet)

Outcome Links

2013 CAEP Standards [External]

3. Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity

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

7.1 Data

BS Elementary Education Programs - Enrollment and Completer Data:

Academic Year	# of students officially enrolled in program (with completed packet)	# of completers fall semester	# of completers spring semester	Total # of completers
2013-2014	83	20	13	33
2014-2015	42	12	8	20
2015-2016	93	8	15	23
2016-2017	80	9	12	21
2017-2018	73	11	8	19
2018-2019	69	18	12	30
2019-2020	53	8	9	17
2020-2021	56	2	12	14

7.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:
Expected level of enrollment met. Enrollments have been increased over the three-year period. Maintain current recruitment efforts.

2016-2017:
The EPP had a large drop in enrollment in the 2014-2015 academic year, but has remain constant otherwise. The EPP has noted that the Praxis exam has caused a delay or the inability for candidates to be officially enrolled in the program or to matriculate through to student teaching. Therefore, in the summer of 2018, a program will be developed to help with tutoring/mentoring for these required exams.
In addition, the EPP has created a recruitment committee that will work with local high school students to recruit for our undergraduate education programs.

2017-2018:
Analysis of Data: The benchmark was not met. From 2016-2017 through 2017-2018 there was a 9% decrease in the number of students enrolled in the program. The decrease can be attributed to a number of factors such as: lack of funding, poor performance of Praxis exams, and attrition.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The EPP will increase the number of students enrolled in the program by 10% for the 2018-2019 school year.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- The EPP will contact and establish relationships with high school counselors from Calcasieu, Cameron, Allen, Jeff Davis, Beauregard, Lafayette, St. Landry, Acadia parishes to provide their students with information about departmental programs and activities.
- The EPP recruitment committee will meet with local high school students at least twice during the fall 2018 and spring 2019 semesters to recruit for our undergraduate education programs.
- Geaux Teach set for the spring 2019, other events to be determined by recruitment committee.
- The EDUC 204 classes will meet with Junior Achievement representatives to complete lessons in the high schools and to recruit students for the education program.
- Recruitment opportunities can be tracked through the McNeese State University student' s reflection. Maybe ask incoming students if they participated in JA and if that played a role in their decision to attend McNeese State University.
- EPP will establish goals for number of contacts with potential recruits via email and text messages per activity.
- Going beyond traditional approaches of recruitment and partnering with the Office of Admissions and Recruiting, the EPP will actively recruit within the community at least four times each academic year.

2018-2019:
Data Analysis:
The benchmark was not met. There was a 5% decrease in enrollment between the 17-18 AY and the 18-19 AY. There were 34 completers in the 18-19 AY, which is the highest number of completers per year for the last 6 years.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:
The EPP will increase the number of students enrolled in the program by 10% for the 2019-2020 AY.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- Geaux Teach set for spring 2020, other events to be determined by recruitment committee.
- The EDUC 204 classes will meet with Junior Achievement representatives to complete lessons in the high schools and to recruit students for the education program.
- Recruitment opportunities may be tracked through the McNeese State University student's reflection. A survey will be created and given to incoming students to see if they participated in JA and if that played a role in their decision to attend McNeese State University. MSU students may incorporate recruitment into JA visits.
- Going beyond traditional approaches of recruitment and partnering with the Office of Admissions and Recruiting, the EPP will actively recruit through community involvement at least four times each academic year.
- Faculty will be involved in Educators Rising being established on high school campuses in the area and use this opportunity to recruit for McNeese State University Education programs.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
For the 2020-2021 academic year, 57 students were officially enrolled in the BS Elementary Education program compared to 53 students in the 2019-2020 academic year. This is a 7.5% increase in the number of students officially enrolled in the program. The 2020-2021 academic year was the first time there has been an increase in enrollment since 2015-2016. The 7.5% increase in enrollment exceeded the benchmark of 7%.

During the 2020-2021 AY, the EPP hosted the Unlock Education virtual conference for high school students (03.26.2021). Dr. Ogea also traveled to local high schools to recruit for BCOE and promote Ed Rising.

The EPP will continue to work to increase enrollment by 7% across programs each year. They will invite schools and students outside of the 5-parish region to participate in the Unlock Education/Ed Rising conference. The EPP will also implement the "Call Me Mister" program beginning fall 2021.

7.2 Data

Graduation 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
BACH	2013-2014	47	N=33 70%	N=6 13%			N=2 4%		N=6 13%	
BACH	2014-2015	29	N=16 55%	N=4 14%			N=2 7%		N=7 24%	
BACH	2015-2016	27	N=19 70%	N=1 4%			N=1 4%		N=5 19%	N=1 4%
BACH	2016-2017	32	N=27 84%	N=2 6%					N=2 6%	N=1 3%
BACH	2017-2018									
BACH	2018-2019									

7.2.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:
Analysis of Data: For the 2013-2014 Cohort: 83% of the all candidates in the 2013-2014 cohort graduated within three years of official acceptance into the Elementary Ed. program. 100% of the candidates in the 2013-2014 cohort who graduated in Elementary Education completed the program within three years.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: A minimum of 90% of candidates will complete the baccalaureate program in Elementary Education within three years of being accepted into the program (200 packet).

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- Advisors will work with candidates at least twice a year to review degree plans, academic progress, and provide a list of resources for students who are in need of additional graduation and/or academic support.
- Advisors will examine non-completers' transcripts to determine where failure occurs and candidates become at-risk for leaving the program.
- EPP faculty will meet with the content area faculty at least two times throughout the 2018-2019 school year to discuss candidates' academic progress and identify areas of need.
- Faculty will discuss with content area faculty about opportunities for remediation for the students identified as at-risk for leaving the program.

2018-2019:
Data Analysis:
The benchmark was not met. Only 69% of candidates completed the baccalaureate program in Elementary Education within three years of being accepted into the program (200 packet) in the 2014-2015 AY.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:
A minimum of 90% of candidates should complete the baccalaureate program in Elementary Education within 3 years of being accepted into the program with the EDUC 200 packet.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- Advisors will work with candidates at least twice a year to review degree plans, academic progress, and provide a list of resources for students who are in need of additional graduation and/or academic support. This information will be documented in each candidates notes in Degree Works
- EPP faculty will create and offer Praxis workshops
- Create or obtain University survey results for students changing majors to identify factors.
- EPP faculty will meet the week after midterms to flag struggling students, discuss ways to support, and help remediate.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
For the 2016-2017 cohort, 27/32 candidates completed the program in 1-2 years which equates to 84% (up from 70%); 2/32 earned a different degree which equates to 6% (down from 19%); and 1/32 is still enrolled which equates to 3% (down from 4%). The benchmark was met as 90% of the candidates who were accepted into the BS Elementary program in 2016-2017 completed within 3 years of official admission. Two candidates earned a different degree from the university and one candidate is still enrolled in the program. There seems to be a trend in more candidates completing within three years and less candidates dropping from the university or earning different degrees.

During the academic year, advisors worked with candidates at least twice per year to review degree plans and academic progress, and to provide a list of resources for students who are in need of additional support as documented in Degree Works notes for each candidate during the fall 2020 and spring 2021 advising periods. Advisors will continue with this process, documenting the information in Degree Works and posting on the advisor Excel spreadsheet. The co-department chair will spot check the notes for accuracy and completion at least twice during the advising period.

EPP faculty also met the week after mid-terms to identify struggling students and discuss ways to support and remediate (03.12.2021). These meetings will continue in 2021-2022. Advisors or professors will be assigned to contact the student(s) and document a plan of action agreed upon. This will be posted in Degree Works and the advisor will follow up with the student on progress at the end of the semester and submit documentation to either the dean’s office or assessment office.

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/implementations, assessment data, and progress monitoring of action plans.

Outcome Links

2013 CAEP Standards [External]

2. Clinical Partnerships and Practice

The provider ensures that effective partnerships and high-quality clinical practice are central to preparation so that candidates develop the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to demonstrate positive impact on all P-12 students' learning and development.

2. Clinical Partnerships and Practice

The provider ensures that effective partnerships and high-quality clinical practice are central to preparation so that candidates develop the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to demonstrate positive impact on all P-12 students' learning and development.

8.1 Data

2015-2016:
Spring 2015:

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

Fall 2015:

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

Spring 2016:

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

2016-2017:
Meeting #1: December, 2016:
Topic: Alignment of course major assessments across program
Instructors present: King, Anthony, Garner, White, Ogea
Discussion: creation of scope and sequence of major assessments including but not limited to FEE, Lesson planning, TCWS, Case Study, and Praxis data.

Meeting #2: May, 2017:
Topic: Alignment of Louisiana Teacher Preparation Competencies across program
Instructors present: King, Anthony, Garner, White, Ogea
Discussion: discussion of Louisiana Teacher Preparation Competencies across program within each course

2017-2018:
Data table is attached.

2018-2019:
Data table is attached.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
7/24/2020
10:00am-11:00am
Zoom
Nguyen, Garner
Elementary Literacy: reviewed course assignments and assessments, possible updates to EDUC 316/416.

2/25/2021
4:00pm-5:00pm
Zoom
Ogea, Garner, Simpson, Nguyen, (CPSB (Pugh, Bellinger)
Literacy shared governance- reviewed district literacy programs, possible updates to EPP literacy courses.

3/12/2021
9:00am-11:00am
Zoom
DEP Faculty
Student concerns: faculty identified students who they were concerned about, advisors planned to contact candidates.

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

BS_ELEM_Curriculum Development_17-18
Elementary Education Curriculum Development

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.
Program faculty meets at regular intervals throughout the year to discuss advising methods and program implementation.
Program Faculty will continue to collaborate with local districts to strengthen our program and prepare our teacher candidates to fully meet district needs.

2016-2017:
Action/Outcome of meeting #1:
Scope and Sequence was created for BACH elementary program that aligned all major assessments throughout program for implementation, collection, and data analysis.

Action/Outcome of meeting #2:
Working draft of Louisiana Competencies implementation throughout program coursework.

2017-2018:
Analysis of Data: The benchmark was met. The faculty collaborated with local districts six times during the spring 2018 semester. The faculty attended six professional development meetings throughout the spring 2018 semester. Faculty attended eight Retention and Recruitment sessions throughout the spring 2018 semester.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

- Program faculty will continue to meet 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 to prepare our teacher candidates to fully meet district needs.

Recommendations to Successfully Implement Plan for Improvement:

- Faculty will collaborate with local districts at least eight times during the fall 2018-spring 2019 school year.
- Goal: to gather district input for program positive changes and implementation related to field experiences and student teaching.
- Faculty will attend at least eight professional development meetings during the fall 2018-spring 2019 school year.
- Have reflection/plan of action for faculty following PD to be included in course revision efforts for upcoming semesters.
- Faculty will attend 10 Retention and Recruitment sessions during the fall 2018-spring 2019 school year.
- Faculty will establish goals for number of contacts with potential recruits via email and text messages per activity.

2018-2019:
Although faculty did collaborate with local districts, the eight time goal was not met. However, faculty did participate in the Dean's for Impact Collaborative which was a collaboration with other Louisiana universities, participated in shared governance meetings, and participated in professional development opportunities.
Faculty members exceeded the benchmark of attending 10 retention and recruiting sessions.
For the 2019-2020 academic year, elementary education faculty will implement the changes in the mathematics methods and mathematics for education majors content courses. Faculty will continue to collaborate and adjust curriculum content as needed.
In addition, faculty will continue to assess the mastery of standards and outcomes for education candidates and revise content to ensure student success as measured by VAM scores and SLOs one to two years after completion of the program.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
The benchmark was met as EPP faculty met at least twice during the academic year to discuss curriculum changes/implementation, assessment data, and progress monitoring of action plans. Elementary faculty also participated in shared governance meetings with district personnel and other stakeholders for input on programmatic improvements and professional development opportunities throughout the academic year. During the 2021-2022 academic year, all program faculty will continue to meet at least twice to discuss curriculum changes /implementation, student concerns, assessment data, and progress monitoring of action plans.

9 Assessment and Benchmark PRAXIS II Content [Approved]

Assessment: Praxis Content Exam

The Elementary Education Content Praxis Exam is taken by candidates who are planning to enter the field of elementary education. Candidates in the Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education program are required to earn a passing score on the Praxis content exam developed by and administered through the Educational Testing Service (ETS). The test assesses the language arts, mathematics, social studies, and science content knowledge necessary to become an elementary school teacher.

Candidates are advised to register for the content examination once they have completed six (6)-to- nine (9) credit hours in each of the core content areas. Candidates must earn a passing score on this exam prior to enrolling in student teaching. Data is analyzed to determine the percentage of candidates who passed the exam on the first attempt. Subtest scores are analyzed to determine trend strengths and weaknesses in specific core content areas. This data provides a basis for evaluating program requirements, course content sequencing, and remediation opportunities (during individual advising sessions) to assist students in mastering content and preparing for the exam.

Due to changes in state policy regulations pertaining to Praxis testing, current completers in the program may have submitted any of the following three exams to satisfy the Praxis Content exams to meet the requirement depending on the time period the candidate completed the exam: Exam #5014- Elementary Education: Content Knowledge, Exam #5018- Elementary Education: Content Knowledge, or Exam #5001- Elementary Education: Multiple Subjects (including #5002- Reading, #5003- Mathematics, #5004- Social Studies, and #5005- Science).

Alignment of Assessment to Standards:
The content exams required for elementary education candidates were cited for the Association for Childhood Education International (ACEI) Elementary Education Standard 2: Curriculum Standards. Items on each of the above Praxis exams (5014/5018/5001) require candidates to demonstrate fundamental knowledge in the core subject areas required for teaching elementary students. The following elements of Standard 2 are specifically addressed:

- Candidates are required to demonstrate knowledge, understanding, and application of Reading/Language Arts skills on the Praxis content exam (5014/5018/5002). Candidates demonstrate an understanding of reading foundational skills including phonological awareness and the role of phonics and word analysis in literacy development, as well as analyzing literature and informational texts. Candidates are also required to demonstrate writing, speaking, and listening proficiencies through identifying and evaluating various concepts and practices. Assessment of the candidates' performance is aligned to Element 2.1. Reading, Writing, and Oral Language.
- Candidates are required to demonstrate knowledge, understanding, and use of fundamental concepts in earth science, life science, and physical science on the Praxis content exam (5014/5018/5005). In addition, candidates must understand the importance and use of inquiry, research and resources, and the unifying processes of science. Assessment of candidates' performance is aligned to Element 2.2. Science.
- Candidates are required to demonstrate problem solving and reasoning with mathematical skills on the Praxis content exam (5014/5018/5003). Candidates must know, understand, and demonstrate proficiency in the application of numbers and operations, algebraic thinking, geometry and measurement, data analysis, statistics, and probability. Assessment of candidates' performance is aligned to Element 2.3. Mathematics.
- Candidates are required to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of Social Studies concepts on the Praxis content exam (5014/5018/5004). Candidates must interrelate topics from United State history, government, citizenship, geography, anthropology, sociology, world history, and economics to support informed decision making by citizens in modern society. Assessment of candidates' performance is aligned to Element 2.4. Social Studies.

9.1 Benchmark: 100% passage rate on the first attempt for all candidates on all Praxis exams.

Prior to 2018-2019, a minimum of 80% of graduates will pass the Praxis content exam on the first attempt.

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

Outcome Links

LTGC B [Program]
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.

2007 ACEI Elementary Education Standards and Supporting Explanation [External]

1.0 Development, Learning, & Motivation

Candidates know, understand, and use the major concepts, principles, theories, and research related to development of children and young adolescents to construct learning opportunities that support individual studentsâ€™ development, acquisition of knowledge, and motivation.

2.1 Reading, Writing, and Oral Language

Candidates demonstrate a high level of competence in use of English language arts and they know, understand, and use concepts from reading, language and child development, to teach reading, writing, speaking, viewing, listening, and thinking skills and to help students successfully apply their developing skills to many different situations, materials, and ideas.

2.2 Science

Candidates know, understand, and use fundamental concepts of physical, life, and earth/space sciences. Candidates can design and implement age-appropriate inquiry lessons to teach science, to build student understanding for personal and social applications, and to convey the nature of science.

2.3 Mathematics

Candidates know, understand, and use the major concepts and procedures that define number and operations, algebra, geometry, measurement, and data analysis and probability. In doing so they consistently engage problem solving, reasoning and proof, communication, connections, and representation.

2.4 Social Studies

Candidates know, understand, and use the major concepts and modes of inquiry from the social studiesâ€" the integrated study of history, geography, the social sciences, and other related areasâ€"to promote elementary studentsâ€™ abilities to make informed decisions as citizens of a culturally diverse democratic society and interdependent world.

2.5 The Arts

Candidates know, understand, and useâ€"as appropriate to their own understanding and skillsâ€"the content, functions, and achievements of the performing arts (dance, music, theater) and the visual arts as primary media for communication, inquiry, and engagement among elementary students.

2.6 Health Education

Candidates know, understand, and use the major concepts in the subject matter of health education to create opportunities for student development and practice of skills that contribute to good health.

2.7 Physical Education

Candidates know, understand, and useâ€"as appropriate to their own understanding and skillsâ€"human movement and physical activity as central elements to foster active, healthy life styles and enhanced quality of life for elementary students.

2013 InTASC Standards [External]

4. Content Knowledge

The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and creates learning experiences that make the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assure mastery of the content.

9.1 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.

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

BS_ELEM_Content Exam _18-19
BS_ELEM_Content Exam_19-20
BS_ELEM_Content Exam_20-21

9.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:
Candidates overall scores for the Elementary Education Content Knowledge PRAXIS II (0014) / (5018) or (5001) tests are provided to the Burton College of Education's Office of Student Teaching and Professional Education Services by the Educational Testing Service (ETS) at the request of individual candidates. Sub-scores are time sensitive (two semesters); hence content sub-score data are not available for all candidates. Candidates are required to pass the Elementary Content exam before student teaching; therefore 100% pass rate is reported. A one hundred percent pass rate for the Elementary Education candidates has been reported for the past two semesters (2015-2016); Data shows 100 % of candidates for both fall 2015 and spring 2016 passes the Elementary Content prior to student teaching. Students are

required to pass the Praxis II exam prior to their student teaching semester, so they may take the exam at any time during their college experience. This may account for the differences in whether or not the candidates took the exam in fall 2015 or spring 2016.

Inconsistent data is reported for the number of candidates' sub-component scores because of the timeliness of data retrieval. Sub-component reporting is time sensitive as that particular data is only retrievable for two semesters from the time the test was taken. Understanding that the lack of this data prohibits the thorough analysis for each sub-component, new procedures have been put into place in order to regularly retrieve both the overall score and sub-component scores for every candidate within the program. This will allow for more thorough analysis and interpretation of each sub-component in order to better assess student mastery of standards in future semesters.

Interpretation of How Data Provides Evidence for Meeting Standards: In the fall of 2015, 100% of the candidates passed this test on their first attempt. In the spring of 2016, the number of students passing this test on their first attempt was also 100%. As per the reviewer's request, sub-scores were provided for a more in-depth analysis of candidates' performance. The sub-scores of graduating candidates demonstrate that these candidates are knowledgeable about the elementary content including math reading, writing, oral language, social studies and science. These data show that candidates are able to perform on par with other students across the United States on nationally standardized exams.
As of fall 2015, the format of the Praxis exam changed, which reflected a change in the range of the test scores in all sub-components of reading, math, social studies and science. After analyzing the data the subtests were lower from fall 2015 to spring 2016, but the candidates recognized the changes and made the adjustments to increase the test score by spring 2016 and still have 100% passage rate on the Praxis Elementary Content exams (0014, 5014, 5001, 5018) The evidence also shows that there were also 100% passage rate on all subtests of Praxis 5001 except 5005.

2016-2017:
Praxis content exam data shows the following first attempt pass rates for the fall 2015, spring 2016, fall 2016 and spring 2017 semesters: Exam # 5014: 96% (26/27); Exam #5018: 85% (11 /13); Exam #5002: 100% (4/4); Exam #5003: 50% (2/4); Exam #5004: 100% (4/4); and Exam #5005: 75% (3/4).

Also shown in the data table is the percentage of questions answered correctly by the candidates in each subcategory on the exams. Seventy percent (70%) was chosen as the benchmark for the data, corresponding to the lowest "C" on a standard ten-point grading scale. In the breakdown of Exam #5014 subcategory scores, candidates had a mean score of 70% or above across four semesters of data (Fall 2015, Spring 2016, Fall 2016, and Spring 2017) in Reading (72%) and Mathematics (73%) for percentage of questions answered correctly. During this same period, Social Studies (57%) and Science (67%) subcategories fell at or below the mean percentage of 70% each semester.

In the breakdown of Exam #5018 subcategory scores, candidates had a mean percentage of questions answered correctly above 70% only in Mathematics for two of the three semesters reported (spring 2016 (76%), fall 2016 (71%), and spring 2017 (66%)). The following subcategory percentages of questions answered correctly fell below the benchmark: Reading (66%), Social Studies (53%), and Science (64%) across the three-semester data cycle.
For exams #5002, #5003, #5004, and #5005 the percentage of questions answered correctly was also noted. For Exam #5002- Reading (59%) and Exam #5003- Mathematics (64%), means ranged below the 70% benchmark across three semesters of data (spring 2016, fall 2016, and spring 2017). For Exam #5004- Social Studies (74%) and Exam #5005- Science (76%), means were above the benchmark.

Interpretation of Data:
Element 2.1 Reading, Writing, and Oral Language
Reading score means showed a 3% decline from the spring 2016 semester to the fall 2016 semester on Exam #5014 and a decline of 4% from the fall 2016 to the spring 2017 semester

on Exam #5018. On Exam #5002, there was an increase from spring 2016 to fall 2016 (+1%) and then an 8% increase in the spring 2017. There was a 100% first attempt pass rate on Exam #5002- Reading across three semesters of data indicating that candidates have a high level of competence in the use of the English language through reading, writing, speaking, and listening in various situations. Further breakdown of #5004 scores show a 57% mean score for questions answered correctly on the Reading section and a 61% average score on Writing, Speaking, and Listening. Both average scores are below the 70% benchmark set by the EPP.

Element 2.2 Science
Science mean scores showed an increase (+3%) from fall 2015 to spring 2016 and then a decline during the next two semesters- down 3% from spring 2016 to fall 2016 and down 4% from fall 2016 to spring 2017 on Exam #5014. There was also a significant decrease (12%) from the fall 2016 semester to the spring 2017 semester on Exam #5018 mean scores. There was an 75% first attempt pass rate on Exam #5005- Science across three semesters of data indicating that candidates have a strong understanding and use of the fundamentals of physical, life, and earth sciences. Further breakdown of #5005 scores indicate that Earth Science and Physical Science content areas had means above the benchmark of 70% in all semesters. Life Science was below the 70% benchmark in 2-out-of-3 semesters.

Element 2.3 Mathematics
Math scores fluctuated above the benchmark from fall 2015 to spring 2017 on Exam #5014 (-3%, +10%, -10%, respectively). There was a trend of decreasing means on Exam #5018 from spring 2016 to Fall 2016 (-5%) and again from fall 2016 to spring 2017 (-3%). There was a 50% first attempt pass rate on Exam #5003- Mathematics across three semesters of data indicating a need to strengthen the ability of candidates to perform problem solving and reasoning using mathematical skills. Further breakdown of #5003 scores indicate below benchmark averages in all three areas tested: Numbers and Operations (65%); Algebraic Thinking (68%); and Geometry and Measurement, Data, Statistics, and Probability (57%).

Element 2.4 Social Studies
Social Studies mean scores decreased 3% from fall 2015 to spring 2016 and another 4% to fall 2016, then increased 4% in spring 2017 on Exam 5014. All means were below the set benchmark of 70%. There were similar results on Exam 5018 with a 4% increase from spring 2016 to fall 2016 and then a 14% drop in spring 2017- again, all three means were below the 70% benchmark. There was a 100% first attempt pass rate on Exam #5004- Social Studies across three semesters of data indicating that candidates know and understand major concepts of history and are able to implement those skills to make informed decisions as citizens. Further breakdown on #5004 indicates a 77% mean score across the three semesters related to United States history, government, and citizenship; a 72% mean score across three semesters in geography, anthropology, and sociology; and a 70% mean score across three semesters in World History and economics.

2017-2018:
Analysis of Data: The benchmark was met. The overall combined scores for fall 2017 indicated that 82% of the candidates passed on the first attempt. The overall combined scores for spring 2018 indicated that 95% of the candidates passed on the first attempt.
Noticeable Trend: There is a 13% increase from fall 2017 to spring 2018.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The goal for 2018-2019 will be for 80% or more of the candidates on the first Praxis attempt.

Recommendations for Successfully Implementing Plan for Improvement:

- EPP faculty will meet with the Math content faculty at least four times throughout 2018-2019 to analyze and discuss the Praxis test scores, including areas of weaknesses for student not able to pass on the first attempt and teacher competencies in order to increase rigor in the courses.
- In EDUC 334, all candidates will take a practice math pretest in order to identify areas of need. Candidates will utilize the data from that test to create an action plan using an

online tutorial in which they will increase their scores on a practice math post-test by 5-10 points.

2018-2019:
Data Analysis:
The benchmark was not met. 70% of the candidates passed the Praxis content exam on the first attempt in the fall 2018 semester and 86% of the candidates passed on the first attempt in the spring 2019 semester. Of those taking the Praxis 5001 Multiple Subjects Exam. 29% passed all portions of the exam on the first attempt in the fall 2018 semester and 70% passed all portions of the exam on the first attempt in the spring 2019 semester.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:
A minimum of 80% of graduates will pass the Praxis content exam on the first attempt.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- In EDUC 334, all candidates will take a practice math pretest in order to identify areas of need. Candidates will utilize the data from that test to create an action plan using an online tutorial in which they will increase their scores on a practice math post-test by 5-10 points.
- EPP faculty will create Praxis workshops to help candidates pass on first attempt. All four content area Praxis workshops will be completed and ready to be offered by summer 2020.
- EDUC 322 has been created as a standalone social studies methods course. In the course students will review social studies content as review of content for the exam and take one practice social studies Praxis text during the semester to identify areas of weakness.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
For fall 2020, 75% of the sub-tests were passed on the first attempt. However, there were no candidates (0%) that passed all four sub-tests (5001) on the first attempt. For spring 2021, 67% of all sub-tests taken were passed on the first attempt and 42% of the candidates passed all four sub-tests (5001) on the first attempt. The data shows a positive trend in the number of candidates passing all four sub-tests (5001) on the first attempt, from 0% in fall 2020 to 42% in spring 2021.

During the 2020-2021 academic year, candidates took a math pre-test in EDUC 334 then created an action plan using an online tutorial to achieve a 5-10 point increase in score on the post-test. In EDUC 322, candidates complete practice Praxis test questions to review content at the beginning of every class meeting. Praxis workshops were also created but were not made available due to hurricane damage and COVID-19 restrictions.

Since the benchmark was not met, EPP will help candidates to prepare for the Praxis content tests by reviewing test material, subject content, and administering at least one practice test in method courses each semester. Elementary methods faculty will use the practice data to identify areas of weakness and design plans for remediation. The EPP will also make Praxis workshops available to students in the 2021-2022 academic year.

9.2 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.

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

BS_ELEM_Content Exam _18-19
BS_ELEM_Content Exam _20-21
BS_ELEM_Content Exam_17-18
BS_ELEM_Content Exam_19-20

9.2.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:
Analysis of Data: The benchmark was not met.
For fall 2017, the following areas were below benchmark:
5002 Subcategory Writing; Speaking; Listening was 61%.
5003 Subcategory Numbers & Operations was 65%, 5003 Subcategory Algebraic Thinking was 53%, 5003 Subcategory Geometry & Measurement; Data; Statistics; Probability was 53%.
5004 Subcategory U.S. History; Government; Citizenship was 60%, 5004 Subcategory Geography; Anthropology; Sociology was 63%, 5004 Subcategory World History and Economics was 50%.
5005 Subcategory Earth Science was 63%, 5005 Subcategory Life Science was 71%, 5005 Subcategory Physical Science was 59%.

For spring 2018, the following areas were below benchmark:
5002 Subcategory Reading was 63%, 5002 Subcategory Writing; Speaking; Listening was 67%.
5003 Subcategory Numbers & Operations was 65%, 5003 Subcategory Algebraic Thinking was 67%, 5003 Subcategory Geometry & Measurement; Data; Statistics; Probability was 53%.
5004 Subcategory Geography; Anthropology; Sociology was 63%.

Noticeable Trends:
5002 Subcategory Writing; Speaking; Listening - There was a 6% increase of the number of students who fell below benchmark from fall 2017 to spring 2018.
5003 Subcategory Algebraic Thinking – There was a 12% increase of the number of students who fell below benchmark from fall 2017 to spring 2018.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The goal for 2018-2019 will be to increase all areas that were below benchmark to 70% or higher.

Recommendation for Successfully Implementing Plan for Improvement:

- EPP faculty will meet with the Math content faculty at least four times throughout the 2018-2019 school year to analyze and discuss the Praxis test scores, including areas of weaknesses for student not able to pass on the first attempt and teacher competencies in order to increase rigor in the courses.
- In EDUC 334, all candidates will take a practice math pretest in order to identify areas of need. Candidates will utilize the data from that test to create an action plan using an online tutorial in which they will increase their scores on a practice math posttest by 5-10 points.

2018-2019:
Data Analysis:
The benchmark was not met. For Fall 18, the following areas were below benchmark: 5002 subcategory Reading 58%; 5002 subcategory Writing, Speaking, Listening 60%; 5003 subcategory Numbers & Operations 60%; 5003 subcategory Algebraic Thinking 60%; 5003 subcategory Geometry and Measurement, Data, Statistics, Probability 53%; 5004 subcategory United States History, Government, Citizenship 68%; 5004 subcategory Geography, Anthropology, Sociology 69%; 5005 subcategory Earth Science 63%

For Spring 19, the following areas were below benchmark: 5002 subcategory Reading 63%; 5002 subcategory Writing, Speaking, Listening 57%; 5003 subcategory Numbers & Operations 65%; 5003 subcategory Algebraic Thinking 60%; 5003 subcategory Geometry and Measurement, Data, Statistics, Probability 60%; 5005 subcategory Earth Science 63%

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

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- EPP faculty (Deans for Impact team) will meet with the Math content faculty at least four times throughout the 2019-2020 school year to analyze and discuss the Praxis test scores, including areas of weaknesses for students not able to pass on the first attempt.
- In EDUC 334, all candidates will take a practice math pretest in order to identify areas of need. Candidates will utilize the data from that test to create an action plan using an online tutorial in which they will increase their scores on a practice math posttest by 5-10 points.
- EPP faculty will create Praxis workshops to help candidates improve exam scores. All four content area Praxis workshops will be completed and ready to be offered by summer 2020.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
For fall 2020, the benchmark was not met in the following areas: reading (57%), writing /speaking/listening (63%), numbers & operations (68%), algebraic thinking (47%), geometry (40%), US history/government/citizenship (68%), and physical science (62%).

For spring 2021, the benchmark was not in the following areas: reading (55%), writing /speaking/listening (57%), numbers & operations (66%), algebraic thinking (54%), geometry (55%), world history and economics (54%), and earth science (63%).

Areas of concern include #5002 Reading and #5003 Math as none of the sub-categories for either test met the benchmark in fall 2020 or spring 2021. To work toward meeting the benchmark in the 2021-2022 academic year, the EPP faculty will help candidates prepare for the Praxis content tests by reviewing test material, subject content, and administering at least one practice test in method courses each semester. The EPP will use the practice test data to identify areas for improvement and design plans for remediation.

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

BS_ELEM_CONTENT EXAM _19-20

9.3 Data

Attempts and Pass Rates for 5001 Sub-Tests	Fall 2017	Spring 2018	Fall 2018	Spring 2019
	N=2	N=4	N=14	N=10
5002 Reading and ELA First Attempt Pass Rate	100%	100%	79%	79%
Average # of attempts for candidates who do not pass #5002 on 1st attempt	-	-	2.33	2
5003 Mathematics First Attempt Pass Rate	50%	75%	93%	90%
Average # of attempts for candidates who do not pass #5003 on 1st attempt.	2	2	4	2
5004 Social Studies First Attempt Pass Rate	50%	100%	50%	90%

Average # of attempts for candidates who do not pass #5004 on 1st attempt	4	-	3.6	3
5005 Science First Attempt Pass Rate	50%	100%	64%	80%
Average # of attempts for candidates who do not pass #5005 on 1st attempt.	2	-	2.6	2.5

Attempts and Pass Rates for 5001 Sub-Tests	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
	N=8	N=9	N=2	N=12
5002 Reading and ELA First Attempt Pass Rate	63%	78%	100%	58%
Average # of attempts for candidates who do not pass #5002 on 1st attempt	2.67	2.50	-	2.40
5003 Mathematics First Attempt Pass Rate	63%	78%	50%	67%
Average # of attempts for candidates who do not pass #5003 on 1st attempt.	2.33	2.50	2	2.0
5004 Social Studies First Attempt Pass Rate	63%	67%	50%	50%
Average # of attempts for candidates who do not pass #5004 on 1st attempt	3.67	2.67	4	3.00
5005 Science First Attempt Pass Rate	50%	89%	100%	67%
Average # of attempts for candidates who do not pass #5005 on 1st attempt.	2.75	3.00	-	3.50

9.3.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:
Analysis of Data: The benchmark was not met.
For fall 2017, the average number of attempts for the 5004 Social Studies test exceeded 2 (4). For spring 2018, the average number of attempts for each subtest in each area did not exceed 2.
Noticeable Trend: There was a 50% decrease in the average number of attempts for each subtest in each area.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The goal for 2018-2019 will be for 100% passage rate on the first attempt for all candidates on all Praxis exams.

Recommendation for Successfully Implementing the Plan for Improvement:

- EPP faculty will meet with the content area faculty at least four times throughout 2018-2019 to analyze and discuss the Praxis test scores, including areas of weaknesses for student not able to pass on the first attempt and teacher competencies in order to increase rigor in the courses.
- EPP faculty will ensure at least four to six resources for each content area are available to students via the online tutorial program.

2018-2019:
Data Analysis:
The benchmark was not met. For candidates who did not pass a Praxis content exam on the first attempt, the average attempts for fall 2018 were Reading & ELA (=2.33), Math (=4), Social Studies (=3.6), and Science (=2.6); for spring 2019 Social Studies (=3) and Science (=2.5).

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

For candidates who do not pass a Praxis content sub-test exam, the minimum average attempts should not exceed 2.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- EPP faculty will create Praxis workshops to help candidates pass on their first attempt. All four content area Praxis workshops will be completed and ready to be offered by summer 2020.
- EDUC 322 has been created as a standalone social studies methods course. In the course students will review social studies content as review of content for the exam and take one practice social studies Praxis text during the semester to identify areas of weakness.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
The benchmark was not met for the 2020-2021 academic year. Completers who had to retake an exam averaged 2.40 (S21) attempts for Reading, 3.00 (F20) and 4.00 (S21) for Math, and 3.50 (S21) for Science. Math was the only sub-test to meet the benchmark with 2.00 attempts for each semester.

In 2020-2021, candidates took a math pretest in EDUC 334 and created an action plan using an online tutorial to achieve a 5-10 point increase in score on the post-test. In EDUC 322, candidates complete practice test questions to review social content at the beginning of every class meeting. Praxis workshops have been created but were not made available because of hurricane damage and COVID-19 restrictions. The pre-tests and practice tests will continue to be administered in the methods courses. The EPP will also make every attempt to offer the Praxis workshops to students in the 2021-2022 academic year.

10 Assessment and Benchmark Lesson Planning

Assessment: Lesson Plan
The Lesson Plan template is introduced and developed throughout the Portal II coursework (300-400 level courses). For all courses except the practicum course and student teaching, the Lesson Plan instrument is a written artifact consisting of a thorough one-day lesson. For the practicum course as well as student teaching, the candidate is required to teach a comprehensive unit plan which consists of 4-5 days of thorough lesson plans.

The elements within the Lesson Plan instrument address: 1) student outcomes, 2) procedures, 3) lesson “hook”, 4) pre-planned (SEED) questions, 5) modeled, guided, collaborative and independent practice, 6) technology, 7) formative/ summative assessment, 8) relevance and rationale, 9) exploration, extension, and supplemental, and 10) differentiation. The Lesson Plan is graded using the Lesson Plan Rubric to gauge candidate understanding of the various lesson plan components. Points are assigned to each component using descriptors and a final score is then tabulated. A score of 3.00, Effective Proficient, is considered benchmark on this assessment. The Lesson Plan instrument data has been collected throughout the candidate’s coursework as well as during their student teaching semester in order to better analyze their ability to prepare lessons by individual content areas and determine their preparedness before graduation.

Alignment to the Standards:
The Lesson Plan instrument used for evaluating baccalaureate elementary education candidates while teaching in the field are aligned to Association for Childhood Education International (ACEI) Elementary Education standards as well as the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) standards.

1.0 Development, Learning, and Motivation
This ACEI standard aligns with the Lesson Plan instrument elements: Student Outcomes: Measurable statement that identifies what the student is expected to learn; Procedures: Describes the specific tasks needed to accomplish the lesson; Lesson “Hook”: Lesson introduction that gains the students’ attention and promotes higher order thinking; Modeled, Guided, Collaborative and Independent Practice: A variety of teaching methods are implemented throughout this lesson;

Technology: Incorporates the use of technology by candidates and/or P-12 students; Relevance and Rationale: Outcomes and content of lesson should be relevant to students' ongoing learning, real-world application, and student backgrounds.; Exploration, Extension, and Supplemental: Lesson has appropriate tasks for exploration, extension, and supplemental learning listed; Accommodation/Differentiation: Provides a variety of instruction to ensure all student needs are met.

4.0 Assessment for instruction
This ACEI standard aligns with the Lesson Plan instrument elements: Pre-planned (SEED) Questions: Higher-order thinking questions that provoke student engagement regarding the content and Formative/Summative Assessment: Assessment implemented to measure student ability/knowledge from the lesson.

Benchmark: A minimum of 80% of the candidates will score at the Proficiency level (3.00) or higher in each category assessed on the lesson plan for each of the four content areas and the various subject plan done in EDUC 410 (the semester prior to student teaching).

Outcome Links

LTGC F [Program]
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 [Program]
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.

2007 ACEI Elementary Education Standards and Supporting Explanation [External]

1.0 Development, Learning, & Motivation

Candidates know, understand, and use the major concepts, principles, theories, and research related to development of children and young adolescents to construct learning opportunities that support individual studentsâ€™ development, acquisition of knowledge, and motivation.

2.1 Reading, Writing, and Oral Language

Candidates demonstrate a high level of competence in use of English language arts and they know, understand, and use concepts from reading, language and child development, to teach reading, writing, speaking, viewing, listening, and thinking skills and to help students successfully apply their developing skills to many different situations, materials, and ideas.

2.2 Science

Candidates know, understand, and use fundamental concepts of physical, life, and earth/space sciences. Candidates can design and implement age-appropriate inquiry lessons to teach science, to build student understanding for personal and social applications, and to convey the nature of science.

2.4 Social Studies

Candidates know, understand, and use the major concepts and modes of inquiry from the social studiesâ€” the integrated study of history, geography, the social sciences, and other related areasâ€”to promote elementary studentsâ€™ abilities to make informed decisions as citizens of a culturally diverse democratic society and interdependent world.

3.1 Integrating and applying knowledge

Candidates plan and implement instruction based on knowledge of students, learning theory, connections across the curriculum, curricular goals, and community.

3.2 Adaptation to diverse students

Candidates understand how elementary students differ in their development and approaches to learning, and create instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse students.

3.3 Critical Thinking and Problem Solvin

Candidates understand and use a variety of teaching strategies that encourage elementary studentsâ€™ development of critical thinking and problem solving.

4.0 Assessment for instruction

Candidates know, understand, and use formal and informal assessment strategies to plan, evaluate and strengthen instruction that will promote continuous intellectual, social, emotional, and physical development of each elementary student.

5.1 Professional growth

Candidates are aware of and reflect on their practice in light of research on teaching, professional ethics, and resources available for professional learning; they continually evaluate the effects of their professional decisions and actions on students, families and other professionals in the learning community and actively seek out opportunities to grow professionally.

5.2 Collaboration

Candidates know the importance of establishing and maintaining a positive collaborative relationship with families, school colleagues, and agencies in the larger community to promote the intellectual, social, emotional, physical growth and well-being of children.

2013 InTASC Standards [External]

1. Learner Development

The teacher understands 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, and designs and implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences.

2. Learning Differences

The teacher uses understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards.

4. Content Knowledge

The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and creates learning experiences that make the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assure mastery of the content.

5. Application of Content

The teacher understands 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.

7. Planning for Instruction

The teacher 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.

8. Instructional Strategies

The teacher understands and uses 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.

10.1 Data

Rubric Element	ACEI Standard	InTASC Standard		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017
Student Outcomes	1.0	4	Number	7	15	9	13
			Mean	3.10	3.80	3.00	3.00
			Range	1.00-4.00	3.00-4.00	1.00-4.00	1.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher	85%	100%	67%	54%
Procedures	1.0	3	Number	7	15	9	13
			Mean	3.42	3.40	3.00	3.54
			Range	2.00-4.00	3.00-4.00	2.00-4.00	3.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher	100%	50%	78%	100%
Lesson "Hook"	1.0	8	Number	7	15	9	13
			Mean	2.71	3.30	2.78	3.69
			Range	2.00-4.00	3.00-4.00	1.00-4.00	3.00-4.00
			% Proficient				

			or Higher	57%	100%	56%	100%
Modeled, Guided, Collab. & Ind. Practice	1.0	7	Number	7	15	9	13
			Mean	2.28	3.30	3.00	3.38
			Range	1.00-4.00	2.00-4.00	2.00-4.00	2.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher	85%	85%	67%	93%
Technology	1.0	4	Number	7	15	9	13
			Mean	2.85	3.60	3.22	2.92
			Range	2.00-4.00	3.00-4.00	2.00-4.00	2.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher	25%	83%	78%	69%
Relevance & Rationale	1.0	2	Number	7	15	9	13
			Mean	2.72	3.40	2.67	3.54
			Range	1.00-4.00	3.00-4.00	1.00-4.00	2.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher	57%	93%	67%	93%
Exploration, Extension, Supplemental	1.0	1	Number	7	15	9	13
			Mean	2.80	3.2	2.56	3.15
			Range	2.00-4.00	2.00-4.00	1.00-4.00	2.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher	71%	87%	56%	69%
Differentiation	1.0	7	Number	7	15	9	13
			Mean	2.50	3.10	2.67	2.85
			Range	2.00-4.00	2.00-4.00	1.00-4.00	2.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher	57%	87%	56%	69%
Pre-Planned (Seed) Questions	4.0	8	Number	7	15	9	13
			Mean	2.70	3.30	3.00	3.46
			Range	2.00-3.00	3.00-4.00	2.00-4.00	3.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher	71%	100%	67%	100%
Formative/Summative Assessment	4.0	6	Number	7	15	9	13
			Mean	3.40	3.40	2.89	3.46
			Range	3.00-4.00	2.00-4.00	1.00-4.00	2.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher	100%	93%	78%	93%
Mean Score for ACEI 1.0 Standard				2.80	3.40		

	Element 2.1: Reading,	Element 2.2:	Element	Element 2.4:

ACEI Standard 2: Curriculum Standards				Writing, Oral Language		Mathematics		2.2: Science		Social Studies	
Rubric Element	ACEI Standard	InTASC Standard		Fall 2017	Spring 2018	Fall 2017	Spring 2018	Fall 2017	Spring 2018	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
Student Outcomes	1.0	4	Number	0	4	0	1	0	1	4	7
			Mean		3.50		4.00		4.00	3.25	3.14
			Range		3.00-4.00		4.00		4.00	3.00-4.00	2.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher		100%		100%		100%	100%	86%
Procedures	1.0	3	Number		4	0	1	0	1	4	7
			Mean		3.75		4.00		4.00	4.00	3.71
			Range		3.00-4.00		4.00		4.00	4.00	3.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher		100%		100%		100%	100%	100%
Lesson "Hook"	1.0	8	Number	0	4	0	1	0	1	4	7
			Mean		3.75		3.50		4.00	3.50	3.29
			Range		3.00-4.00		3.00-4.00		4.00	3.00-4.00	2.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher		100%		100%		100%	100%	71%
Pre-Planned (Seed) Questions	4.0	8	Number	0	4	0	1	0	1	4	7
			Mean		3.75		3.75		4.00	3.50	3.43
			Range		3.00-4.00		3.00-4.00		4.00	3.00-4.00	3.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher		100%		100%		100%	100%	100%
Modeled, Guided, Collab. & Ind. Practice	1.0	7	Number	0	4	0	1	0	1	4	7
			Mean		3.75		4.00		3.00	3.92	3.62
			Range		3.00-4.00		4.00		3.00	3.00-4.00	2.33-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher		100%		100%		100%	100%	95%
Technology	1.0	5	Number	0	4	0	1	0	1	4	7
			Mean		2.75		3.75		4.00	4.00	4.00
			Range		2.00-3.00		3.00-4.00		4.00	4.00	4.00
			% Proficient or Higher		75%		100%		100%	100%	100%
			Number	0	4	0	1	0	1	4	7
			Mean		4.00		4.00		4.00	4.00	4.00

Formative /Summative Assessment	4.0	6	Range		4.00		4.00		4.00	4.00	4.00
			% Proficient or Higher		100%		100%		100%	100%	100%
Relevance & Rationale	1.0	2	Number	0	4	0	1	0	1	4	7
			Mean		3.75		3.25		4.00	3.75	3.29
			Range		3.00-4.00		2.00-4.00		4.00	3.00-4.00	2.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher		100%		75%		100%	100%	86
Exploration, Extension, Supplemental	1.0	1	Number	0	4	0	1	0	1	4	7
			Mean		3.00		3.00		3.00	4.00	3.43
			Range		2.00-4.00		3.00		3.00	4.00	3.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher		75%		100%		100%	100%	100%
Accommodations/ Differentiation	1.0	7	Number	0	4	0	1	0	1	4	7
			Mean		2.25		3.75		3.00	3.75	3.29
			Range		2.00-3.00		3.00-4.00		3.00	3.00-4.00	1.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher		25%		100%		100%	100%	86%

ACEI Standard 2: Curriculum Standards				Element 2.1: Reading, Writing, Oral Language		Element 2.2: Mathematics		Element 2.2: Science		Element 2.4: Social Studies	
Rubric Element	ACEI Standard	InTASC Standard		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2018	Spring 2019
Student Outcomes	1.0	4	Number	18	14	18	12	13	11	17	12
			Mean	2.78	3.25	3.44	3.83	3.77	3.36	3.41	3.25
			Range	2.00-4.00	2.00-4.00	3.00-4.00	3.00-4.00	3.00-4.00	1.00-4.00	3.00-4.00	2.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher	56%	57%	100%	100%	100%	91%	100%	92%
Procedures	1.0	3	Number	18	12	18	2	13	11	17	12
			Mean	3.56	3.42	3.67	3.50	3.85	3.36	3.71	3.75
			Range	2.00-4.00	2.00-4.00	3.00-4.00	3.00-4.00	3.00-4.00	3.00-4.00	2.00-4.00	3.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher	89%	71%	100%	100%	100%	100%	94%	100%
Lesson "Hook"	1.0	8	Number	18	12	18	12	13	11	17	12
			Mean	3.33	3.50	3.78	3.67	3.69	3.36	3.18	3.17
			Range	2.00-4.00	2.00-4.00	3.00-4.00	3.00-4.00	3.00-4.00	2.00-4.00	1.00-4.00	2.00-4.00

			% Proficient or Higher	89%	71%	100%	100%	100%	91%	82%	83%
Pre-Planned (Seed) Questions	4.0	8	Number	18	12	18	12	13	11	17	12
			Mean	3.22	3.00	3.67	3.83	3.46	3.18	3.35	3.83
			Range	2.00-4.00	2.00-4.00	3.00-4.00	3.00-4.00	2.00-4.00	1.00-4.00	1.00-4.00	3.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher	89%	64%	100%	100%	92%	91%	82%	100%
Modeled, Guided, Collab. & Ind. Practice	1.0	7	Number	4		18	2	13	11	11	12
			Mean	3.25		3.78	3.50	3.46	2.91	3.64	3.64
			Range	3.00-4.00		3.00-4.00	3.00-4.00	3.00-4.00	1.00-4.00	3.00-4.00	3.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher	100%		100%	100%	100%	91%	100%	92%
Technology	1.0	5	Number	18	12	18	2	13	11	17	12
			Mean	3.56	3.67	3.61	3.00	3.38	3.18	3.35	3.25
			Range	2.00-4.00	2.00-4.00	3.00-4.00	3.00	3.00-4.00	2.00-4.00	2.00-4.00	3.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher	83%	71%	100%	100%	100%	73%	94%	100%
Formative /Summative Assessment	4.0	6	Number	5		18	9	13	11	17	12
			Mean	3.20		3.50	3.89	3.15	3.18	3.65	3.25
			Range	3.00-4.00		2.00-4.00	3.00-4.00	2.00-4.00	2.00-4.00	2.00-4.00	2.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher	100%		94%	100%	92%	91%	94%	92%
Relevance & Rationale	1.0	2	Number	18	12	18	12	13	11	17	12
			Mean	3.39	2.67	3.61	3.67	3.54	2.64	3.41	3.58
			Range	2.00-4.00	1.00-4.00	2.00-4.00	3.00-4.00	2.00-4.00	1.00-4.00	1.00-4.00	3.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher	83%	50%	94%	100%	92%	55%	88%	100%
Exploration, Extension, Supplemental	1.0	1	Number	13	12	18	2	13	11	17	12
			Mean	2.50	2.42	3.33	3.00	3.08	2.91	3.18	2.92
			Range	2.00-4.00	1.00-4.00	3.00-4.00	3.00	3.00-4.00	2.00-4.00	2.00-4.00	2.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher	28%	43%	100%	100%	100%	82%	82%	67%
Accommodations/ Differentiation	1.0	7	Number	5		18	2	13	11	17	12
			Mean	2.60		3.61	3.00	3.15	2.82	3.12	2.58
			Range	2.00-4.00		2.00-4.00	3.00	1.00-4.00	2.00-4.00	1.00-4.00	1.00-4.00

			% Proficient or Higher	40%		94%	100%	77%	64%	76%	50%
Student Use of Technology			Number	13	12		10				
			Mean	2.46	2.42		4.00				
			Range	1.00-4.00	1.00-3.00		4.00				
			% Proficient or Higher	62%	62%		100%				
Teacher Use of Technology			Number	13	12		10				
			Mean	3.69	3.42		3.90				
			Range	3.00-4.00	2.00-4.00		3.00-4.00				
			% Proficient or Higher	100%	85%		100%				
Educational Materials			Number	14	12					6	1
			Mean	3.71	3.50					4.00	4.00
			Range	3.00-4.00	1.00-4.00					4.00	4.00
			% Proficient or Higher	100%	71%					100%	100%
Interdisciplinary Connections			Number	18	12					1	1
			Mean	2.43	3.33					4.00	4.00
			Range	1.00-4.00	3.00-4.00					4.00	4.00
			% Proficient or Higher	50%	100%					100%	100%
Method: Modeled, Guided Practice			Number	14	12		10			6	1
			Mean	3.71	3.50		4.00			3.00	4.00
			Range	3.00-4.00	2.00-4.00		4.00			2.00-4.00	4.00
			% Proficient or Higher	100%	71%		100%			50%	100%
Method: Collaborative Practice			Number	14	12		10			6	1
			Mean	3.43	3.42		4.00			3.50	3.00
			Range	2.00-4.00	2.00-4.00		4.00			2.00-4.00	3.00
			% Proficient or Higher	86%	64%		100%			83%	100%
			Number	14	12		10			6	1
			Mean	3.50	3.58		3.90			3.67	4.00

Method: Independent Practice			Range	2.00-4.00	2.00-4.00		3.00-4.00			3.00-4.00	4.00
			% Proficient or Higher	86%	71%		100%			100%	100%
Closure			Number	14	12		10			6	1
			Mean	3.79	3.42		3.90			2.83	4.00
			Range	2.00-4.00	3.00-4.00		3.00-4.00			1.00-4.00	4.00
			% Proficient or Higher	93%	100%		100%			83%	100%
Informal Assessment			Number	13	12						
			Mean	3.31	3.42						
			Range	2.00-4.00	2.00-4.00						
			% Proficient or Higher	92%	71%						
Formal Assessment			Number	13	12						
			Mean	3.69	3.42						
			Range	2.00-4.00	2.00-4.00						
			% Proficient or Higher	92%	71%						
Differentiation by Content, Product, Process			Number	13	12		10				
			Mean	2.92	3.08		4.00				
			Range	2.00-4.00	2.00-4.00		4.00				
			% Proficient or Higher	69%	69%		100%				
Differentiation by Learning Environment			Number	13	12		10				
			Mean	2.85	3.17		4.00				
			Range	2.00-4.00	2.00-4.00		4.00				
			% Proficient or Higher	54%	54%		100%				
Post-Lesson Reflection			Number	13	12		10				
			Mean	3.31	2.92		4.00				
			Range	1.00-4.00	1.00-4.00		4.00				
			% Proficient or Higher	85%	69%		100%				
			Number				10				
			Mean				4.00				

Add Standards ELA			Range				4.00				
			% Proficient or Higher				100%				
Add Standards Content			Number				10				
			Mean				4.00				
			Range				4.00				
			% Proficient or Higher				100%				
Student Misconceptions			Number				8				
			Mean				3.88				
			Range				3.00-4.00				
			% Proficient or Higher				100%				
Lesson Progression			Number				10				
			Mean				4.00				
			Range				4.00				
			% Proficient or Higher				100%				
Learning Environment			Number				10				
			Mean				4.00				
			Range				4.00				
			% Proficient or Higher				100%				
Instructional Resources			Number				10				
			Mean				3.60				
			Range				3.00-4.00				
			% Proficient or Higher				100%				
Response to Intervention			Number				10				
			Mean				4.00				
			Range				4.00				
			% Proficient or Higher				100%				
Content Standards			Number	14			10			6	1
			Mean	3.36			4.00			4.00	3.00
			Range	2.00-4.00			4.00			4.00	3.00
			% Proficient or Higher	79%			100%			100%	100%

ACEI Standard 2: Curriculum Standards				EDUC 410 Lesson Plan Various Subject Areas	
Rubric Element	ACEI Standard	InTASC Standard		Fall 2017	Spring 2018
Student Outcomes	1.0	4	Number	0	7
			Mean		3.43
			Range		3.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher		100%
Procedures	1.0	3	Number		7
			Mean		3.86
			Range		3.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher		100%
Lesson "Hook"	1.0	8	Number	0	7
			Mean		2.86
			Range		2.00-3.00
			% Proficient or Higher		86%
Pre-Planned (Seed) Questions	4.0	8	Number	0	7
			Mean		3.29
			Range		3.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher		100%
Modeled, Guided, Collab. & Ind. Practice	1.0	7	Number	0	7
			Mean		3.29
			Range		3.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher		100%
Technology	1.0	5	Number	0	7
			Mean		3.00
			Range		3.00
			% Proficient or Higher		100%
Formative/Summative Assessment	4.0	6	Number	0	7
			Mean		3.00
			Range		3.00
			% Proficient or Higher		100%
			Number	0	4

Relevance & Rationale	1.0	2	Mean		3.14
			Range		2.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher		86%
Exploration, Extension, Supplemental	1.0	1	Number	0	7
			Mean		2.57
			Range		2.00-3.00
			% Proficient or Higher		57%
Accommodations/ Differentiation	1.0	7	Number	0	7
			Mean		2.71
			Range		2.00-3.00
			% Proficient or Higher		71%

ACEI Standard 2: Curriculum Standards				EDUC 410 Lesson Plan Various Subject Areas	
Rubric Element	ACEI Standard	InTASC Standard		Fall 2018	Spring 2019
Student Outcomes	1.0	4	Number	18	12
			Mean	3.56	3.92
			Range	2.00-4.00	3.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher	89%	100%
Procedures	1.0	3	Number	18	
			Mean	3.72	
			Range	3.99-4.00	
			% Proficient or Higher	100%	
Lesson "Hook"	1.0	8	Number	18	12
			Mean	3.28	3.92
			Range	2.00-4.00	3.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher	89%	100%
Pre-Planned (Seed) Questions	4.0	8	Number	18	12
			Mean	3.67	4.00
			Range	2.00-4.00	4.00
			% Proficient or Higher	89%	100%
Modeled, Guided, Collab. & Ind. Practice	1.0	7	Number	18	
			Mean	3.61	
			Range	3.00-4.00	
			% Proficient or Higher	100%	

Technology	1.0	5	Number	18	
			Mean	3.00	
			Range	1.00-4.00	
			% Proficient or Higher	94%	
Formative/Summative Assessment	4.0	6	Number	18	12
			Mean	3.39	3.17
			Range	3.00-4.00	3.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%
Relevance & Rationale	1.0	2	Number	18	12
			Mean	3.83	3.67
			Range	3.00-4.00	2.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher	100%	92%
Exploration, Extension, Supplemental	1.0	1	Number	18	
			Mean	2.78	
			Range	2.00-4.00	
			% Proficient or Higher	67%	
Accommodations/ Differentiation	1.0	7	Number	18	
			Mean	2.83	
			Range	2.00-3.00	
			% Proficient or Higher	83%	
Content Standards			Number		12
			Mean		4.00
			Range		4.00
			% Proficient or Higher		100%
Student Use of Technology			Number		12
			Mean		2.42
			Range		2.00-3.00
			% Proficient or Higher		42%
Teacher Use of Technology			Number		12
			Mean		4.00
			Range		4.00
			% Proficient or Higher		100%
Method: Modeled, Guided Practice			Number		12
			Mean		4.00
			Range		4.00
			% Proficient or Higher		100%
			Number		12

Method: Collaborative Practice			Mean		4.00
			Range		4.00
			% Proficient or Higher		100%
Method: Independent Practice			Number		12
			Mean		3.08
			Range		2.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher		75%
Closure			Number		12
			Mean		3.08
			Range		2.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher		92%
Differentiation by Content, Product, Process			Number		11
			Mean		3.36
			Range		2.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher		91%
Differentiation by Learning Environment			Number		11
			Mean		3.45
			Range		2.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher		91%
Post-Lesson Reflection			Number		11
			Mean		3.73
			Range		2.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher		91%
Add Standards ELA			Number		12
			Mean		3.92
			Range		3.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher		100%
Add Standards Content			Number		12
			Mean		3.17
			Range		2.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher		92%
Student Misconceptions			Number		12
			Mean		3.42
			Range		2.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher		92%
			Number		12
			Mean		4.00

Lesson Progression			Range		4.00
			% Proficient or Higher		100%
Learning Environment			Number		12
			Mean		3.33
			Range		2.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher		92%
Instructional Resources			Number		12
			Mean		3.58
			Range		3.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher		100%
Response to Intervention			Number		11
			Mean		3.55
			Range		3.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher		100%

2019-2020:
Data table is attached.

2020-2021:
Data table is attached.

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

BS_ELEM_Lesson Plan Data_19-20
BS_ELEM_Lesson Plan Data_20-21

10.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:
Candidates' scores over the two semesters have improved over two semesters. The overall mean score for ACEI Standard 1.0 went from 2.8 to 3.4 showing a marked improvement. In the area of Procedures, it was noted that the mean remained stable (3.42 to 3.4). In the other areas, there was improvement in Lesson "hook", technology, relevance and rationale, and differentiation. In ACEI Standard 4.0, the candidates improved in pre-planned SEED questions and remained stable in the area of formative and summative assessment. The data indicate that students are mastering the objectives for designing and implementing a science and social studies CUP. The data reflect that students are improving from mid-term evaluations to final evaluation.

Interpretation of How Data Provides Evidence for Meeting Standards:
The data support the assumption that students are mastering ACEI Standards 2, 3, and 4 – confirming that they possess a high level of competence in content knowledge and that they know and understand how to use this knowledge to teach in and assess various situations. Lastly, Standard 5 is demonstrated by the candidates' CUPs that are created in cooperation with the course instructor and that include reflection components. A workable plan is characteristic of a professional educator who understands the process. In sum, these data suggest that candidates are being well prepared to enter the field of Elementary Education.

2016-2017:
Analysis of Data:
Data was collected on baccalaureate elementary education candidates' ability to write lesson plans within their student teaching semester for the fall 2015, spring 2016, fall 2016, and spring 2017 semesters. All lesson plan data is reported as one mean score from these

courses no matter the content area written for in order to represent the candidates' level of mastery for each element of the lesson plan.
Part of the reviewer's comments concerned alignment of the standards to the assessment reported. From this point forward within our program progression, specific courses have been identified to assign, score, and collect the data for each of the content areas (ACEI 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, and 2.4 which are required) so that future completer data reported will relate to specific content area lesson plans.
When examining student teaching lesson plan data, two elements of the rubric were noted as meeting the benchmark of 3.00 for all three semesters: Student Outcomes with mean scores of 3.10, 2.80, 3.00, and 3.00 and Procedures with mean scores of 3.42, 3.40, 3.11, and 3.54.
The Differentiation component scored below the 3.00 benchmark mean for three of the four semesters: fall 2015 (=2.50), fall 2016 (=2.67) and spring 2017 (=2.85). The following components had two semesters of data in which the mean did not meet the benchmark: Technology: fall 2015 (=2.85) and spring 2017 (=2.92); Lesson "Hook": fall 2015 (=2.71) and fall 2016 (=2.78); Relevance and Rationale: fall 2015 (=2.72) and fall 2016 (2.67); and Exploration, Extension, and Supplemental: fall 2015 (=2.80) and fall 2016 (=2.56). The following components had one semester of data that fell below the benchmark mean: Pre-Planned (SEED) Questions: fall 2015 (=2.70); Modeled, Guided. Collaborative, and Independent Practice: fall 2015 (=2.28); and Formative/Summative Assessment: fall 2016 (=2.89).
With clearer Lesson Plan Template instructions along with inter-rater reliability of instructors the EPP believes future candidates will score higher and in turn become better prepared to write a lesson plan for any content area.

Interpretation of Data:
1.0 Development, Learning, and Motivation
Overall mean scores earned for ACEI standard 1.0 across the four semesters for student teaching do not show a pattern/trend in most cases.

Student Outcomes: Measurable statement that identifies what the student is expected to learn.
Mean scores for student teaching semester for this element of the rubric were as follows: 3.10, 3.80, 3.00 and 3.00. Three of the four semesters seem to be hovering just at the benchmark with a spike found in the spring 2016 data.

Procedures: Describes the specific tasks needed to accomplish the lesson
Mean scores for student teaching semester for this element of the rubric were as follows: 3.42, 3.40, 3.11, and 3.54. The fall 2016 semester had a slight dip, but the spring 2017 semester came back strong.

Lesson "Hook": Lesson introduction that gains the students' attention and promotes higher order thinking
Mean scores for student teaching semester for this element of the rubric were as follows: 2.71, 3.30, 2.78, and 3.69. Even though there was a dip for the fall 2016 semester below benchmark, the spring 2017 semester mean score has risen to benchmark again.

Modeled, Guided, Collaborative and Independent Practice: A variety of teaching methods are implemented throughout this lesson
Mean scores for student teaching semester for this element of the rubric were as follows: 2.28, 3.30, 3.00, and 3.38. For the three most recent semesters the benchmark of 3.00 has been met.

Technology: Incorporates the use of technology by candidates and/or P-12 students
Mean scores for student teaching semester for this element of the rubric were as follows: 2.85, 3.60, 3.22, and 2.92. Although there were two semesters below benchmark, the ranges for all four semesters were between 2 and 4.

Relevance and Rationale: Outcomes and content of lesson should be relevant to students' ongoing learning, real-world application, and student backgrounds
Mean scores for student teaching semester for this element of the rubric were as follows: 2.72, 3.40, 2.67, and 3.54. The two semesters that fell below benchmark had students who earned a 1 in this category.

Exploration, Extension, and Supplemental: Lesson has appropriate tasks for exploration, extension, and supplemental learning listed
Mean scores for student teaching semester for this element of the rubric were as follows: 2.80, 3.20, 2.56, and 3.15. Candidates scored below the benchmark of 3.00 in each of the fall semesters. Template instructions, classroom exemplars, and clearer expectations for candidates will all be implemented to help support candidate understanding of the importance of this element for furthering student cognitive engagement.

Accommodation/Differentiation: Provides a variety of instruction to ensure all student needs are met
Mean scores for student teaching semester for this element of the rubric were as follows: 2.50, 3.10, 2.67, and 2.85. For three of the four semesters, the mean scores fell below the benchmark of 3.00,

Differentiation is a concept that the EPP knows its candidates struggle with. Differentiation components by instruction and student have been separated into two sections to help support candidate's understanding of the differences.

4.0 Assessment for instruction
This ACEI standard aligns with the Lesson Plan instrument elements: Pre-planned (SEED) Questions and Formative/Summative Assessment.
Pre-planned (SEED) Questions: Higher-order thinking questions that provoke student engagement regarding the content
Mean scores for student teaching semester for this element of the rubric were as follows: 2.70, 3.30, 3.00 and 3.46. The mean score for fall 2015 was below benchmark, however, mean scores for the most recent three semesters have met or exceeded benchmark.
Formative/Summative Assessment: Assessment implemented to measure student ability /knowledge from the lesson
Mean scores for student teaching semester for this element of the rubric were as follows: 3.40, 3.40, 2.89, and 3.46. The scores are consistent across three of the four semesters, with a large dip in the fall 2016 semester. This is also the only of the four semesters where the minimum range score was a 1.

2017-2018:
Analysis of Data: The proficiency was not met in all areas.
These areas were close to meeting benchmark:
ELA Technology percent proficient or higher was 75%
ELA Exploration, Extension, Supplemental percent proficient or higher was 75%
Math Relevance and Rationale percent proficient or higher was 75%
EDUC 410 Various Subject Areas Accommodations/Differentiation percent proficient or higher was 71%
Social Studies Lesson Hook percent proficient or higher was 71%

These areas were not close to meeting benchmark:
EDUC 410 Various Subject Areas Exploration, Extension, Supplemental percent proficient or higher was 57%
ELA Accommodations/Differentiation percent proficient or higher was 25%

Noticeable Trends:
There was a 14% decrease in the area of Student Outcomes from fall 2017 to spring 2018.
There was a 19% decrease in the area of Lesson Hook from fall 2017 to spring 2018.

There was a 5% decrease in the area of Modeled, Guided, Collaborative and Independent Practice.
There was a 14% decrease in the area of Differentiation/Accommodations.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: A minimum of 80% of the candidates will score at the Proficiency level (3.00) or higher in each category assessed on the lesson plan for each of the four content areas and the various subject plan done in EDUC 410 (the semester prior to student teaching).

Recommendation to Successfully Implement the Plan for Improvement:

- Technology rubric using ISTE standards will be created and used in all education courses.
- Degree plan has been changed to include the EDUC 317 Lesson Plan course which will be taken by all elementary education majors.
- Lesson plan data will be collected and analyzed from EDUC 317 to determine areas of candidates' strengths and weaknesses.

2018-2019:
Analysis of Data:
The benchmark was not met. In spring 2018, the proficiency was not met in all areas.
For ELA- Technology= 75%, Exploration/Extension/Supplemental= 75%, Accommodations /Differentiation= 25%, Content Standards= 79%, Student Outcomes= 57%, Pre-Planned SEED Questions= 64%, Relevance & Rationale= 50%, Exploration/Extension/Supplemental= 43%, Educational Materials= 71%, Student Use of Technology= 62%, Method: Modeled, Guided Practice= 71%, Method: Collaborative Practice= 64%, Method: Independent Practice= 71%, Informal Assessment= 71%, Differentiation by Content/Product/Process= 69%, Differentiation by Learning Environment= 54%, Post-Lesson Reflection= 69%
For Math-Relevance/Rationale= 75%,
For Science- Technology= 73%, Relevance/Rationale=55%, Accommodations /Differentiation= 64%
For Social Studies- Lesson Hook= 71%, Exploration/Extension/Supplemental= 67%
For 410 Various Subjects- Exploration/Extension/Supplemental= 57%, Accommodations /Differentiation= 71%, Method: Independent Practice= 75%

Plan for Continuous Improvement:
A minimum of 80% of candidates will score at the Proficiency level (2) or higher in each category assessed on the lesson plan for each of the four content areas and the various subjects plan done in EDUC 410 (the semester prior to student teaching).

Recommendation to Successfully Implement the Plan for Improvement:
A revised lesson plan template and rubric will be implemented across all courses beginning in the fall 2019 semester and candidates will be required to enroll in EDUC 317 as part of the redesigned program.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
The benchmark was not met for the 2020-2021 academic year. While candidates show growth as they progress through the sequence of courses, areas for improvement include: Student outcomes & assessment, Student use of tech, Assessments, Differentiation by content/product/process, Differentiation by learner, Post instruction RTI, and Reflection of instructional strategies. Moving forward the benchmark will require a minimum of 80% of the candidates to score at the Proficiency level or higher in each category assessed on the lesson plan for each of the four content areas and the various subject plan done in EDUC 410 (the semester prior to student teaching). To work toward meeting the benchmark, at the end of each academic year, the elementary program coordinator will send lesson plan data and areas for improvement to faculty. Faculty will plan to address areas of concern (ex. clarifying directions and expectations, modeling, providing exemplars).

11 Assessment and Benchmark Field Experience Evaluation (FEE)_Student Teaching

Assessment: Field Experience Evaluation (FEE)
The Field Experience Evaluation is an instrument designed to address candidate performance during their student teaching experience. The elements on the FEE are aligned with InTASC and ACEI standards as well as Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching. The instrument is divided into five domains: 1) Planning and Preparation, 2) Classroom Environment, 3) Instruction, 4) Professionalism Dispositions and 5) Content Standards and also contains six individual components within the domains including: Setting instructional outcomes; Managing classroom procedures; Managing student behavior; Using questioning and discussion techniques; Engaging students in learning; Using assessment in instruction; Modeling professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions (partially from Danielson); ACEI content standards (from ACEI). This evaluation form mirrors the Louisiana Department of Education Compass performance assessment and is based on a rubric that includes four columns of descriptors to identify behaviors to aid in scoring candidates. The FEE is used to determine the ability of candidates to teach various content areas in the field.
Both the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor conduct performance evaluations of student teachers. Student teachers are evaluated a total of eight times during one semester with four being prior to mid-term and four conducted prior to the end of the semester. Student teacher cumulative averages for each indicator are computed for mid-term and final averages. In alignment with the benchmark set by the Louisiana Department of Education for practicing classroom teachers, a score of 2.00 would be considered proficient for this assessment; however, since the EPP candidates consistently score higher than a 2.00, the new benchmark has been identified as a score of 3.00, or Effective Proficient.
It is important to note that the scores used within the data chart are an average of the 8 observations completed during student teaching semesters and were rounded to the hundredths position in order to determine the mean for each element.
Alignment of Assessment to Standards:
The FEE instrument used for evaluating baccalaureate elementary education candidates while teaching in the field are aligned to the Association for Childhood Education International (ACEI) Elementary Education standards, as well as the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) standards.
1.0 Development, Learning, and Motivation: This ACEI standard aligns with FEE Domain 1: Planning and Preparation, Component 1.1 Setting Instructional Outcomes, specifically elements 1.1.1 Value, sequence, and alignment, 1.1.2 Clarity, 1.1.3 Balance, as well as is scored independently in Domain 5: ACEI Content Standards, element 5.1 Uses major principles for individual students' development, learning and motivation.
2.1 Reading, Writing, and Oral Language: This ACEI standard aligns with FEE Domain 5: ACEI Content Standards, element 5.2 Uses of major concepts in the content of English language arts.
2.2 Science: This ACEI standard aligns with FEE Domain 5: ACEI Content Standards, element 5.3 Uses concepts of physical, life, and earth/space sciences.
2.3 Mathematics: This ACEI standard aligns with FEE Domain 5: ACEI Content Standards, element 5.4 Uses of major concepts in the content area of mathematics.
2.4 Social Studies: This ACEI standard aligns with FEE Domain 5: ACEI Content Standards, element 5.5 Uses of major concepts in the social studies content.
2.5 The Arts: This ACEI standard aligns with FEE Domain 5: ACEI Content Standards, element 5.6 Performing and visual arts.
2.6 Health Education: This ACEI standard aligns with FEE Domain 5: ACEI Content Standards, element 5.7 Uses of major concepts in health education.
2.7 Physical Education: This ACEI standard aligns with FEE Domain 5: ACEI Content Standards, element 5.8 Movement and physical activity.
3.1 Integrating and applying knowledge for instruction: This ACEI standard aligns with FEE Domain 3: Instruction, Component 3.2 Engaging Students in Learning, specifically element 3.2.3 Instructional materials and resources, as well as is scored independently in Domain 5: ACEI Content Standards, element 5.9 Instruction based on students, theory, cross-curricular connections, goals, and community.
3.2 Adaptation to diverse students: This ACEI standard aligns with FEE Domain 5: ACEI Content Standards, element 5.10 Student diversity.
3.3 Development of critical thinking and problem solving: This ACEI standard aligns with FEE Domain 3: Instruction, Component 3.1 Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques, specifically element 3.1.1 Quality of Questions; as well as is scored independently in Domain 5: ACEI Content

Standards, element 5.11 Understands and uses variety of teaching strategies that encourage students' development of critical thinking and problem solving.
3.4 Active engagement in learning: This ACEI standard aligns with FEE Domain 2: The Classroom Environment, Component 2.1 Managing Classroom Procedures, specifically element 2.1.1 Management of instructional groups; Component 2.2 Managing Student Behavior, specifically elements 2.2.1 Expectation, and 2.2.2 Monitoring of student behavior; Domain 3 Instruction, Component 3.2 Engaging Students in Learning, specifically element 3.2.2 Grouping of students as well as is scored independently in Domain 5: ACEI Content Standards, element 5.12 Individual and group motivation and behavior.
3.5 Communication to foster collaboration: This ACEI standard aligns with FEE Domain 3 Instruction, Component 3.1 Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques, specifically elements 3.1.2 Discussion techniques and 3.1.3 Student participation as well as is scored independently in Domain 5: ACEI Content Standards, element 5.13 Effective communication techniques.
4.0 Assessment for instruction: This ACEI standard aligns with FEE Domain 1: Planning and Preparation, Component 1.1 Setting Instructional Outcomes, specifically element 1.1.2 Clarity; Domain 3 Instruction, Component 3.3 Using Assessment in Instruction, specifically elements 3.3.1 Assessment criteria, 3.3.2 Monitoring of Student Learning, and 3.3.4 Student self-assessment and monitoring of progress as well as is scored independently in Domain 5: ACEI Content Standards, element 5.14 Formal and informal assessment.
5.1 Professional growth, reflection, and evaluation: This ACEI standard aligns with FEE Domain 4: Professionalism, Component 4.1 Modeling Professional Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions, specifically elements 4.1.2 Receptivity to feedback; and decision making and 4.1.3 Integrity and ethical conduct as well as is scored independently in Domain 5: ACEI Content Standards, element 5.15 Best practice, professional ethics, and professional growth.
5.2 Collaboration with families, colleagues, and community agencies: This ACEI standard aligns with FEE Domain 5: ACEI Content Standards, element 5.16 Positive collaborative relationship with others.

Benchmark: Candidates will score a 3.00 or higher on each element in the FEE rubric for Domains 1-5.

Outcome Links

LTGC A [Program]
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 [Program]
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 studentsâ€™ needs.

2007 ACEI Elementary Education Standards and Supporting Explanation [External]

2.1 Reading, Writing, and Oral Language

Candidates demonstrate a high level of competence in use of English language arts and they know, understand, and use concepts from reading, language and child development, to teach reading, writing, speaking, viewing, listening, and thinking skills and to help students successfully apply their developing skills to many different situations, materials, and ideas.

2.2 Science

Candidates know, understand, and use fundamental concepts of physical, life, and earth/space sciences. Candidates can design and implement age-appropriate inquiry lessons to teach science, to build student understanding for personal and social applications, and to convey the nature of science.

2.3 Mathematics

Candidates know, understand, and use the major concepts and procedures that define number and operations, algebra, geometry, measurement, and data analysis and probability. In doing so they consistently engage problem solving, reasoning and proof, communication, connections, and representation.

2.4 Social Studies

Candidates know, understand, and use the major concepts and modes of inquiry from the social studiesâ€” the integrated study of history, geography, the social sciences, and other related areasâ€”to promote elementary studentsâ€™ abilities to make informed decisions as citizens of a culturally diverse democratic society and interdependent world.

3.1 Integrating and applying knowledge

Candidates plan and implement instruction based on knowledge of students, learning theory, connections across the curriculum, curricular goals, and community.

3.3 Critical Thinking and Problem Solvin

Candidates understand and use a variety of teaching strategies that encourage elementary studentsâ€™ development of critical thinking and problem solving.

3.4 Active engagement in learning

Candidates use their knowledge and understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior among students at the K-6 level to foster active engagement in learning, self motivation, and positive social interaction and to create supportive learning environments.

3.4 Active engagement in learning

Candidates use their knowledge and understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior among students at the K-6 level to foster active engagement in learning, self motivation, and positive social interaction and to create supportive learning environments.

3.5 Communication

Candidates use their knowledge and understanding of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the elementary classroom.

4.0 Assessment for instruction

Candidates know, understand, and use formal and informal assessment strategies to plan, evaluate and strengthen instruction that will promote continuous intellectual, social, emotional, and physical development of each elementary student.

4.0 Assessment for instruction

Candidates know, understand, and use formal and informal assessment strategies to plan, evaluate and strengthen instruction that will promote continuous intellectual, social, emotional, and physical development of each elementary student.

5.1 Professional growth

Candidates are aware of and reflect on their practice in light of research on teaching, professional ethics, and resources available for professional learning; they continually evaluate the effects of their professional decisions and actions on students, families and other professionals in the learning community and actively seek out opportunities to grow professionally.

5.1 Professional growth

Candidates are aware of and reflect on their practice in light of research on teaching, professional ethics, and resources available for professional learning; they continually evaluate the effects of their professional decisions and actions on students, families and other professionals in the learning community and actively seek out opportunities to grow professionally.

2013 InTASC Standards [External]

1. Learner Development

The teacher understands 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, and designs and implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences.

2. Learning Differences

The teacher uses understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards.

3. Learning Environments

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

4. Content Knowledge

The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and creates learning experiences that make the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assure mastery of the content.

5. Application of Content

The teacher understands 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.

6. Assessment

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

7. Planning for Instruction

The teacher 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.

8. Instructional Strategies

The teacher understands and uses 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.

9. Professional Lrng & Ethical Practice

The teacher 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.

11.1 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.

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

BS ELEM_FEE_17-18
BS ELEM_FEE_18-19
BS ELEM_FEE_19-20
BS ELEM_FEE_20-21

11.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:
Analysis of Data
Field Experience Evaluation (FEE) data was collected on baccalaureate elementary education candidates for the fall 2015, spring 2016, fall 2016, and spring 2017 semesters. Data collected from these four semesters indicated that the cohort of candidates' final scores on each element of the FEE was above the benchmark of 3 as identified by the overall mean scores for each component.
When further examining component scores across all four cohorts, component 3.3.1: Assessment Criteria had three semesters in which the range of mean scores fell below the benchmark (3). The following components also had two semesters in which the range of mean scores fell below the benchmark of 3: 2.1.1 Management of Instructional Groups; 3.1.3 Student Participation; 3.3.4 Student Self-Assessment and Monitoring of Progress; 5.1 Uses major principles for individual students' development, learning, and motivation; 5.8 Movement and physical activity; 5.9 Instruction based on student, theory, cross-curricular connections, goals, and community; 5.11 Understands and uses variety of teaching strategies that encourage students' development of critical thinking and problem solving; and 5.14 Formal and informal assessment. There were thirteen other components that had one cohort that had a mean range minimum that fell below the 3.00 benchmark.
The pattern noted from this data cam from the examination of the data chart across the four cohorts of candidates. The Fall 2015 and Fall 2016 cohorts each had only one mean range with a minimum that fell below the 3.00 benchmark. However, the Spring 2016 cohort had fourteen components in which the minimum mean range score was below the benchmark of 3.00 and the Spring 2017 cohort had seventeen components in which the minimum mean range score fell below the 3.00 benchmark.
Interpretation of Data

Mean scores for all ACEI standards addressed within this assessment are at or above the set benchmark of 3.00, therefore disaggregation of data by rubric element has been completed to determine specific skill mastery.

1.0 Development, Learning, and Motivation
Mean scores for ACEI standard 1.0 across the four semesters (Fall 2015, Spring 2016, Fall 2016, and Spring 2017) show that the mean score for each cohort of candidates met the benchmark of 3.00 on the following components: 1.1.1 Value, Sequence, and Alignment (=3. 83, 3.71, 3.79, and 3.64); 1.1.3 Balance (=3.80, 3.72, 3.86, and 3.66); and 5.1 Uses major principles for individual students' development, learning and motivation (=3.77, 3.74, 3.62, and 3.63). Further disaggregation of the range scores for this element indicated that the following cohort minimum range scores fell below the 3.00 benchmark on the following: Spring 2017 (2.75-4.00) for component 1.1.3 and Fall 2016 (2.00-4.00) and spring 2017 (2.50-4.00) for component 5.1.

2.1 Reading Writing, and Oral Language
Mean scores for ACEI standard 2.1 across the four semesters of cohorts show that the mean score for each cohort of candidates met the benchmark of 3.00 on the following component: 5.2 Uses of major concepts in the content of English language arts (=3.83, 3.63, 3.62, and 3.83). Further disaggregation of the range scores for this element indicate that the spring 2017 semester cohort minimum range score fell below the 3.00 benchmark with a range of 2.50-4.00.

2.2 Science
Mean scores earned for ACEI standard 2.2 across the four semesters of cohorts show that candidates have met the benchmark of 3.00 on the following component: 5.3 Uses of concepts in physical, life, and earth/space sciences (=3.93, 3.88, 3.00 and 3.78).

2.3 Mathematics
Mean scores for ACEI standard 2.3 across the four semesters of cohorts show that the mean score for each cohort of candidates met the benchmark of 3.00 on the following component: 5.4 Uses of major concepts in the content of mathematics (=3.96, 3.63, 3.67, and 3.78). Further disaggregation of the range scores for this element indicate that the spring 2016 semester cohort minimum range score fell below the 3.00 benchmark with a range of 2.54-4.00.

2.4 Social Studies
Mean scores for ACEI standard 2.4 across the four semesters of cohorts show that the mean score for each cohort of candidates met the benchmark of 3.00 on the following component: 5.5 Uses of major concepts in social studies content (=4.00, 3.60, 3.42, and 3.80). Further disaggregation of the range scores for this element indicate that the spring 2016 semester cohort minimum range score fell below the 3.00 benchmark with a range of 2.00-4.00.

2.5 The Arts
Mean scores for ACEI standard 2.5 across the three semesters of cohorts (there were no candidates in fall 2016) show that the mean score for each cohort of candidates met the benchmark of 3.00 on the following component: 5.6 Performing and Visual Arts (=4.00, 3.63, ---, and 3.80). Further disaggregation of the range scores for this element indicate that the spring 2016 semester cohort minimum range score fell below the 3.00 benchmark with a range of 2.75-4.00.

2.6 Health Education
Mean scores for ACEI standard 2.6 across the three semesters of cohorts (there were no candidates in fall 2015) show that the mean score for each cohort of candidates met the benchmark of 3.00 on the following component: 5.7 Uses of major concepts in health education (= ---, 3.00, 3.00, and 3.44).

2.7 Physical Education
Mean scores for ACEI standard 2.7 across the four semesters of cohorts show that the mean

score for each cohort of candidates met the benchmark of 3.00 on the following component: 5.8 Movement and Physical Activity (=3.83, 3.64, 3.66, and 3.490. Further disaggregation of the range scores for this component indicated that the following cohort minimum range scores fell below the 3.00 benchmark: spring 2016 (2.50-4.00) and spring 2017 (2.00-4.00) for component 5.8.

3.1 Integrating and applying knowledge for instruction
Mean scores for ACEI standard 3.1 across the four semesters (fall 2015, spring 2016, fall 2016, and spring 2017) show that the mean score for each cohort of candidates met the benchmark of 3.00 on the following components: 3.2.3 Instructional materials and resources (=3.53, 3.62, 3.57, and 3.52) and 5.9 Instruction based on students, theory, cross-curricular connections, goals, and community (=3.78, 3.52, 3.58 and 3.40). Further disaggregation of the scores for this element indicated that the following cohort minimum range scores fell below the 3.00 benchmark: spring 2017 (2.75-4.00) for component 3.2.3, and spring 2016 (2.50-4.00) and spring 2017 (2.00-4.00) for component 5.9.

3.2 Adaptation to diverse students
Mean scores for ACEI standard 3.2 across the four semesters of cohorts show that the mean score for each cohort of candidates met the benchmark of 3.00 on the following component: 5.10 Student diversity (=3.77, 3.64, 3.67, and 3.66). Further disaggregation of the range scores for this element indicate that the spring 2016 semester cohort minimum range score fell below the 3.00 benchmark with a range of 2.46-4.00.

3.3 Development of critical thinking and problem solving
Mean scores for ACEI standard 3.3 across the four semesters (fall 2015, spring 2016, fall 2016, and spring 2017) show that the mean score for each cohort of candidates met the benchmark of 3.00 on the following components: 3.1.1 Quality of questions (=3.44, 3.50, 3.40, and 3.18) and 5.11 Understands and uses variety of teaching strategies that encourage students' development of critical thinking and problem solving (=3.76, 3.65, 3.75, and 3.49). Further disaggregation of the scores for this element indicated that the following cohort minimum range scores fell below the 3.00 benchmark: spring 2017 (2.75-3.75) for component 3.1.1, and spring 2016 (2.75-4.00) and spring 2017 (2.00-4.00) for component 5.11.

3.4 Active engagement in learning
Mean scores for ACEI standard 3.4 across the four semesters (fall 2015, spring 2016, fall 2016, and spring 2017) show that the mean score for each cohort of candidates met the benchmark of 3.00 on the following components: 2.1.1 Management of instructional groups (=3.66, 3.58, 3.67, and 3.48); 2.2.1 Expectations (=3.69, 3.55, 3.63, and 3.46); 2.2.2 Monitoring of student behavior (=3.37, 3.34, 3.49, and 3.13); 3.2.2 Grouping of students (= 3.41, 3.48, 3.54, and 3.46); and 5.12 Individual and group motivation and behavior (=3.83, 3.70, 3.63, and 3.52). Further disaggregation of the scores for this element indicated that the following cohort minimum range scores fell below the 3.00 benchmark: spring 2016 (2.75-4.00) and spring 2017 (2.88-3.88) for component 2.1.1; spring 2017 (2.25-3.88) for component 2.2.1; spring 2017 (2.50-4.00) for component 2.2.2; spring 2016 (2.63-3.88) for component 3.2.2; and spring 2017 (2.50-4.00) for component 5.12.

3.5 Communication to foster collaboration
Mean scores for ACEI standard 3.5 across the four semesters (fall 2015, spring 2016, fall 2016, and spring 2017) show that the mean score for each cohort of candidates met the benchmark of 3.00 on the following components: 3.1.2 Discussion Techniques (=3.45, 3.53, 3.47, and 3.33); 3.1.3 Student participation (=3.30, 3.43, 3.46, and 3.28); and 5.13 Effective communication techniques (=3.89, 3.70, 3.74, and 3.73). Further disaggregation of the scores for this element indicated that the following cohort minimum range scores fell below the 3.00 benchmark: spring 2017 (2.50-3.75) for component 3.1.2; and spring 2016 (2.63-4.00) and spring 2017 (2.50-3.75) for component 3.1.3.

4.0 Assessment for instruction
Mean scores for ACEI standard 4.0 across the four semesters (fall 2015, spring 2016, fall

2016, and spring 2017) show that the mean score for each cohort of candidates met the benchmark of 3.00 on the following components: 1.1.2 Clarity (=3.77, 3.75, 3.86, and 3.75); 3.3.1 Assessment criteria (= 3.36, 3.36, 3.39, and 3.28); 3.3.2 Monitoring of student learning (=3.77, 3.74, 3.81, and 3.58); 3.3.4 Student self-assessment and monitoring of progress (= 3.45, 3.37, 3.54 and 3.15) and 5.14 Formal and informal assessment (=3.81, 3.67, 3.78, and 3.54). Further disaggregation of the scores for this element indicated that the following cohort minimum range scores fell below the 3.00 benchmark: fall 2015 (2.88-3.88), spring 2016 (2.75-4.00) and spring 2017 (2.50-3.75) for component 3.3.1; spring 2016 (2.50-4.00) and spring 2017 (2.00-3.75) for component 3.3.4; and spring 2016 (2.92-4.00) and spring 2017 (2.00-4.00) for component 5.14.

5.1 Professional growth, reflection and evaluation
Mean scores for ACEI standard 4.0 across the four semesters (fall 2015, spring 2016, fall 2016, and spring 2017) show that the mean score for each cohort of candidates met the benchmark of 3.00 on the following components: 4.1.2 Receptivity to feedback; decision making (= 4.00, 3.95, 4.00, and 3.91); 4.1.3 Integrity and ethical conduct (=3.86, 3.92, 4.00, and 3.85); and 5.15 Best practice, professional ethics, and professional growth (=3.92, 3.89, 3.77, and 3.81).

5.2 Collaboration with families, colleagues, and community agencies
Mean scores for ACEI standard 4.0 across the four semesters (fall 2015, spring 2016, fall 2016, and spring 2017) show that the mean score for each cohort of candidates met the benchmark of 3.00 on the following component: 5.16 Positive collaborative relationship with others (= 3.91, 3.65, 3.83, and 3.87). Further disaggregation of the range scores for this element indicate that the spring 2016 semester cohort minimum range score fell below the 3.00 benchmark with a range of 2.79-4.00.

2017-2018:
Analysis of Data: The benchmark was not met.

For Fall 2017:
The benchmark was met. The mean score for all elements were above 3.00. The percentage of candidates who met the benchmark were 80% and above for all elements.
For spring 2018:
75% of candidates met benchmark on FEE Element 2.1.1 Management of Instructional Groups with a mean score of 3.55.
75% of candidates met benchmark on FEE Element 3.1.2 Discussion Techniques with a mean score of 3.39.
75% of candidates met benchmark on FEE Element 3.1.3 Student Participation with a mean score of 3.4.
75% of candidates met benchmark on FEE Element 3.3.1 Assessment Criteria with a mean score of 3.45.
63% of candidates met benchmark on FEE Element 3.3.4 Student Self-Assessment and Monitoring of Progress with a mean score of 3.4.
Noticeable Trends:
Domain 1 Planning and Preparation – There was a 4% decrease from fall 2017 to spring 2018.
Domain 2 The Classroom Environment – There was a 7% decrease from fall 2017 to spring 2018.
Domain 3 Instruction – There was a 27% decrease from fall 2017 to spring 2018.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: 80% or more of candidates will score 3.00 or higher on each element in the FEE rubric for Domains 1-4.

Recommendation to Successfully Implement Plan of Improvement:

- Faculty and University Supervisors will conduct pre- and post- conferences with all candidates to discuss expectations for the lesson taught.
  Candidates' lesson reflections, candidates' and university supervisors' feedback can be used to measure the effectiveness of pre and post conferences.

- Faculty will host FEE workshop for candidates and cooperating teachers.
  FEE Workshop will be conducted for those candidates that scores below proficiency. This workshop will help them to understand each element and how to improve their teaching skills. Candidates' and cooperating teachers' feedback can be used to measure the effectiveness of the workshop.

2018-2019:
Analysis of Data:
The mean score for candidates was a 3.00 or higher on each element in the FEE rubric for Domains 1-4. However, the percentage of candidates scoring at the proficiency level or higher fell below 80% for the following elements: 3.1.3 (67%), 3.3.1 (72%) and 3.3.4 (72%) for the F18 semester. For the S19 semester, 2.2.2 (58%), 3.1.1 (75%), 3.1.2 (75%), 3.1.3 (75%), 3.3.1 (75%), and 3.3.4 (67%) fell below 80% proficiency.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:
Candidates will score a 3.00 or higher on each element in the FEE rubric for Domains 1-4.

Recommendation to Successfully Implement Plan for Improvement:

- Realign ACEI standards on FEE rubric to CAEP elementary standards.
- Create and schedule a FEE workshop/PD for candidates and mentor teachers.
- Faculty and University Supervisors will conduct pre and post conferences (implement POP Cycle) with all candidates to discuss expectations for the lesson taught.
- The POP Cycle will be distributed into courses within the program to increase understanding, usefulness, and implementation expectations before student residency.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
Component 2.1 is an area of concern as all three of its elements (3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.1.2) had mean scores below the benchmark for both the fall 2020 and spring 2021 semesters. Faculty and University Supervisors have begun to conduct pre and post conferences (POP Cycles) with candidates to discuss expectations for the lesson taught and review after the lesson is taught. In preparation for the fall 2021 semester and to work toward the benchmark, elementary faculty will distribute and implement components of the POP Cycle in their courses. This will help to increase understanding, usefulness, and implementation expectations and to prepare candidates to achieve higher scores on the assessment during teacher residency. The EPP will provide training and opportunities to establish inter-rater reliability and norming of the FEE rubric.

11.2 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.

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

BS_ELEM_FEE Content_17-18
BS_ELEM_FEE Content_18-19
BS_ELEM_FEE Content_19-20
BS_ELEM_FEE Content_20-21

11.2.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:
Analysis of Data: The benchmark was met. All candidates scored at 3.00 or above for each of the elements in Domain 5 on the FEE relative to ACEI standards. At the student teaching level, 100% of the candidates scored at the proficiency level or higher.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: Candidates will score 3.00 or higher on each ACEI standard assessed in the FEE rubric.

Recommendation for Implementation for Plan of Improvement:

- Faculty and University Supervisors will conduct pre and post conferences with all candidates to discuss expectations for the lesson taught.
- Candidates' lesson reflections and candidate and university supervisor feedback can be used to measure the effectiveness of pre and post conferences.
- Faculty will host FEE workshop for candidates and cooperating teachers.
- FEE Workshop will be conducted for those candidates that scores below proficiency. This workshop will help them to understand each element and how to improve their teaching skills. Candidates' and cooperating teachers' feedback can be used to measure effectiveness of the workshop.

2018-2019:
Analysis of Data:
Candidates scored a mean of 3.00 or higher for each of the elements in Domain 5 and at least 80% of the candidates scored at the Proficiency level or higher for each element.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:
The FEE Content items will need to be aligned to the CAEP Elementary Standards. Candidates will then be expected to score a mean of 3.00 or higher on each element of Domain 5.

Recommendations for Implementing Continuous Improvement Plan:

- Realign elements on the FEE Domain 5 Rubric to align with CAEP Elementary Standards.
- Create and administer workshops on scoring Domain 5 elements of the rubric.
- POP Cycles will be implemented to ensure proper feedback and coaching are given to candidates for improvement.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
For the spring 2021 semester, the combined mean score for the students for each element in Domain 5 met or exceeded the 3.00 benchmark except for the Tech 3 element which had a mean score of 2.98. The benchmark was not met, however, since there were candidates who did not score at the proficiency level on the following elements: 5.1 (70%), 5.5 (70%), 5.6 (57%), 5.7 (71%), Tech 1(75%), Tech 2 (75%), and Tech 3 (67%). To better prepare candidates to reach benchmark on the elements of domain 5, EPP faculty will utilize POP Cycles to ensure proper coaching and feedback are provided. Components of the POP Cycle will be distributed throughout courses within the program to increase understanding, usefulness, and implementation expectations before teacher residency. Domain 5 for each elementary content area will reviewed and aligned to current content standards by fall 2021. Elementary faculty will establish inter-rater reliability for Domain 5.

12 Assessment and Benchmark Teaching Cycle (FormerlyTeacher Candidate Work Sample (TCWS)

Assessment: Teacher Candidate Work Sample (TCWS)
The Assessment Plan is one component of the Teacher Candidate Work Sample (TCWS) that is completed on a comprehensive unit of study consisting of 4-to-5 days of lesson planning, teaching, and assessing student learning in grades 1-5. It is completed during the candidate's practicum semester, which is taken the semester before beginning student teaching. Candidates

create an Excel chart with pre- and post-data analyzing student growth in grades 1-5 for one or two instructional learning outcomes embedded within the unit. The Assessment Plan is graded using a rubric. A score of 3, Effective Proficient, has been set as the benchmark.
Alignment of Assessment to Standards:
The Assessment Plan instrument is used for evaluating a candidate's ability to plan, teach, and assess students in grades 1-5 in a real-world classroom setting with the requirement of consecutive days of teaching students in the field.
The Assessment Plan is aligned to Association for Childhood Education International (ACEI) Elementary Education standards as well as the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) standards.
1.0 Development, Learning, and Motivation - This ACEI standard aligns with The Assessment Plan Domain element: Alignment of Lesson Evidence where candidates are to make connections as to how their learning outcomes, pre-assessment instrument, instructional strategies, and post-assessment instrument are aligned with the rigor of the identified standard for the comprehensive unit.
4.0 Assessment for Instruction - This ACEI standard aligns with The Assessment Plan Domain elements: Choice of Assessments, Pre-assessment, Post-assessment, Student Level of Mastery and Evaluation of Factors, Data to Determine Patterns and Gaps, and Response to Intervention.
The Choice of Assessments element requires candidates to apply and balance formal and informal measures each day throughout their unit of teaching.
The Pre-assessment element requires a candidate to identify an assessment to administer that aligns with the standards chosen for the unit, analyze the data from the pre-assessment to determine student levels of knowledge, instructional groupings, and differentiation strategies by instructor and student.
The Post-assessment element requires candidates to identify an assessment to administer after the lesson that aligns with the rigor of the standard as well as analysis t of student data for levels of mastery of student outcomes and growth over time.
The Student Level of Mastery and Evaluation of Factors element requires candidates to determine the number and percentage of students who accomplished and did not accomplish mastery for each outcome of the unit. Candidates must also conclude what factors may have contributed to those successes or challenges as related to the student, teacher, environment, etc.
The Data to Determine Patterns and Gaps element requires candidates to analyze the data to determine patterns and gaps in student learning specific to a skill or concept within a standard and supported using the collected data.
The Response to Intervention element requires candidates to create plans for future small group instructional work on a specific skill using differentiation and supporting their plan with the collected data.

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

Outcome Links

LTGC C1 [Program]
The teacher candidate observes and reflects on studentsâ€™ responses to instruction to identify areas of need and make adjustments to practice.

LTGC H [Program]
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.

2007 ACEI Elementary Education Standards and Supporting Explanation [External]

1.0 Development, Learning, & Motivation

Candidates know, understand, and use the major concepts, principles, theories, and research related to development of children and young adolescents to construct learning opportunities that support individual studentsâ€™ development, acquisition of knowledge, and motivation.

4.0 Assessment for instruction

Candidates know, understand, and use formal and informal assessment strategies to plan, evaluate and strengthen instruction that will promote continuous intellectual, social, emotional, and physical development of each elementary student.

5.1 Professional growth

Candidates are aware of and reflect on their practice in light of research on teaching, professional ethics, and resources available for professional learning; they continually evaluate the effects of their professional decisions and actions on students, families and other professionals in the learning community and actively seek out opportunities to grow professionally.

5.2 Collaboration

Candidates know the importance of establishing and maintaining a positive collaborative relationship with families, school colleagues, and agencies in the larger community to promote the intellectual, social, emotional, physical growth and well-being of children.

2013 InTASC Standards [External]

6. Assessment

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

12.1 Data

Criteria	ACEI Standard	InTASC Standard		Fall 2015 N=6	Spring 2016 N=13	Fall 2016 N=9	Spring 2017 N=11	Fall 2017 N=0	Spring 2018 N=7
Choice of Assessment	4.0	6	Mean	3.00	3.00	3.89	4.00		3.71
			Range	2.00-4.00	1.00-4.00	3.00-4.00	4.00		3.00-4.00
			% proficient or higher	86%	84%	100%	100%		100%
Pre-Assessment	4.0	6	Mean	1.00	1.00	3.67	3.77		2.43
			Range	1.000	1.00	3.00-4.00	3.00-4.00		1.00-4.00
			% proficient or higher	0%	0%	100%	100%		57%
Post-Assessment	4.0	6	Mean	4.00	3.00	3.44	3.77		2.14
			Range	4.00	1.00-4.00	2.00-4.00	3.00-4.00		1.00-4.00
			% proficient or higher	100%	84%	89%	100%		43%
Alignment of Lesson Evidence	1.0	6	Mean	1.60	2.50	3.78	3.77		2.86
			Range	1.00-2.00	1.00-300	3.00-4.00	3.00-4.00		2.00-3.00
			% proficient or higher	0%	69%	100%	100%		86%
Student Level of Mastery and Evaluation of Factors	4.0	6	Mean	1.60	3.50	3.78	3.77		
			Range	1.00-4.00	1.00-4.00	3.00-4.00	3.00-4.00		
			% proficient or higher	16%	92%	100%	100%		
Data to Determine Patterns and Gaps	4.0	6	Mean	2.30	2.50	3.56	4.00		
			Range	1.00-3.00	1.00-3.00	2.00-4.00	4.00		
			% proficient	66%	69%	89%	100%		

			or higher						
Response to Interventions	4.0	6	Mean	1.00	1.00	3.67	3.77		
			Range	1.00	1.00	2.00-4.00	3.00-4.00		
			% proficient or higher	0%	0%	89%	100%		

Criteria	ACEI Standard	InTASC Standard		Fall 2018 N=18	Spring 2019 N=12
Choice of Assessment	4.0	6	Mean	3.94	4.00
			Range	3.00-4.00	4.00
			% proficient or higher	100%	100%
Pre-Assessment	4.0	6	Mean	2.89	3.33
			Range	1.00-4.00	2.00-4.00
			% proficient or higher	61%	75%
Post-Assessment	4.0	6	Mean	2.89	2.83
			Range	1.00-4.00	1.00-4.00
			% proficient or higher	67%	67%
Alignment of Lesson Evidence	1.0	6	Mean	3.72	3.75
			Range	2.00-4.00	3.00-4.00
			% proficient or higher	94%	100%

2019-2020:
Data table is attached.

2020-2021:
Data table is attached.

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

BS ELEM_Teaching Cycle_19-20
BS ELEM_Teaching Cycle_20-21

12.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:
Analysis of Data:
The Assessment Plan data was collected on Baccalaureate elementary candidates for the fall 2015, spring 2016, fall 2016, and spring 2017 semesters with the number of candidates in each cohort being 6, 13, 9, and 11, respectively. A significant pattern was observed within the elements of: Pre-Assessment; Alignment of Lesson Evidence; Student Level of Mastery & Evaluation of Factors; Data to Determine Patterns & Gaps; and Response to Interventions.

In each of these elements, each cycle of data indicated an increased overall mean score and percent passing from the semester prior. Therefore, by the third and fourth cycle of data (fall 2016 and spring 2017) mean scores in each of these elements reached and exceeded the department benchmark of proficiency, scoring a 3. Similarly, by the third and fourth cycle of data (fall 2016 and spring 2017) candidate's percentage passing also met or exceeded the department benchmark of 80%.
When examining the first two cycles of data (fall 2015 and spring 2016), candidates fell below the department benchmark for proficiency in overall mean scores and percentage passing in all components except Choice of Assessment and Post-assessment. Nevertheless, in fall 2016 and spring 2017, candidate's met or exceeded both of the department's benchmarks for proficiency in mean scores and percentage passing. Moreover, by spring 2017 all rubric elements indicate a 100% pass rate for all candidates.

Interpretation of Data:
In order to determine specific skill mastery of ACEI standards 1.0 and 4.0 by cohort, The Assessment Plan has been examined by task element for better analysis of data.

1.0 Development, Learning, and Motivation
Mean scores earned for ACEI standard 1.0, element Alignment of Lesson Evidence, across the four semesters (fall 2015, spring 2016, fall 2016, spring 2017) shows that candidates have grown in their knowledge of this standard over the last two semesters with each cohort's mean as 1.60, 2.50, 3.78, and 3.77, respectively. Within the last two semesters, 100% of the candidates (N=20) scored at or above the benchmark of 3 on this particular element.

4.0 Assessment for Instruction
Mean scores earned for ACEI standard 4.0 of The Assessment Plan across the four semesters (fall 2015, spring 2016, fall 2016, spring 2017) shows that candidates have grown in their knowledge of this standard over the last two semesters for each element included in the rubric. This is particularly evident in in the last semester's data indicating that 100% of candidates met or exceeded the department's benchmark for proficiency in all rubric components.

The Choice of Assessment element had mean scores for each cohort as 3.00, 2.00, 3.89, and 4.00, respectively. When comparing mean scores of cohorts, there was a constant increase in mean scores from spring 2016 to spring 2017 on this particular element. By spring 2017, all candidates received the highest rating, exceeding the department benchmark, on this rubric element.

The Pre-assessment element had mean scores for each cohort as 1.00, 1.00, 3.67, and 3.77, respectively. When comparing mean scores of cohorts, there was a 2.67 point increase from spring 2016 to fall 2016 on this particular element. This elevation in proficiency on this element was maintained, only indicating a slightly increase from fall 2016 to spring 2017.

The Post-assessment element had mean scores for each cohort as 4.00, 3.00, 3.44, and 3.77, respectively. When comparing mean scores of cohorts, there was no significant trend; however, each cohort maintained or exceeded the department benchmark for proficiency.

The Student Level of Mastery & Evaluation of Factors element had mean scores for each cohort as 1.60, 3.50, 3.78, and 3.77, respectively. When comparing mean scores of cohorts, there was a 1.90 point increase from fall 2015 to spring 2016 on this particular element. This elevation in proficiency on this element was maintained from spring 2016 to spring 2017.

The Data to Determine Patterns and Gaps element had mean scores for each cohort as 2.30, 2.50, 3.56, and 4.00, respectively. When comparing mean scores of cohorts, there was steady increase in scores from semester to semester. The most substantial increase in mean scores was a 1.06 point increase from spring 2016 to fall 2016 on this particular element.

The Response to Interventions element had mean scores for each cohort as 2.30, 2.50, 3.67, and 4.00, respectively. When comparing mean scores of cohorts, there was a steady increase in scores from semester to semester. The most substantial increase in mean scores was a 2.67 point increase from spring 2016 to fall 2016 on this particular element.

2017-2018:
Analysis of Data: The benchmark was not met.
Data was not available for the fall 2017 completers.
In spring 2018, the following benchmarks were not met:

- Pre-assessment mean score was 2.43, with 57% of candidates meeting benchmark
- Post-assessment mean score was 2.14, with 43% of candidates meeting benchmark
- Alignment of Lesson Evidence mean score 2.86, with 86% of candidates meeting benchmark.

No noticeable trends due to lack of comparative data.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: In 2018-2019, 80% or more of the candidates will score a 3.00 or above on each of the elements of the Teacher Candidate Work Sample Rubric.

Recommendations for Successful Implementation of the Plan for Improvement:

- Faculty will facilitate at least two peer mentoring/coaching sessions to deepen candidate's understanding of pre and post assessment.
  100% of candidates will participate. Data from TCWS will be collected and analyzed for program and curricular improvement.

2018-2019:
Analysis of Data:
The benchmark was not met. The mean score fell below a 3.00 for Pre-Assessment (2.89) and Post-Assessment (2.89) in F18 and Post-Assessment (2.83) in S19. The percentage of candidates scoring at or above the proficiency level (3.00) fell below 80% for Pre-Assessment in both the F18 (61%) and S19 (75%) semesters and Post-Assessment in both the F18 (67%) and S19 (67%) semesters.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:
Candidates will score a 3.00 or above on each of the elements on the Teaching Cycle Rubric.

Recommendations for Implementing Plan for Improvement:
The Teacher Candidate Work Sample will be replaced with the Teaching Cycle. The Teaching Cycle outcomes will be aligned to standards and will be taught in several courses throughout the program. The Teacher Candidate Work Sample is currently pulled from EDUC 410, however, the Teaching Cycle data may be better pulled from the Teacher Residency first semester as candidates begin the full year residency.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
For fall 2020 and spring 2021, EDUC 335 had at least 80% of candidates scoring at proficiency or higher and a mean score of 3.00 or higher for all elements of the Teaching Cycle. For Fall 2020, EDUC 316 had at least 80% of candidates scoring at proficiency or higher in the following areas: Content Standards, outcomes, etc. (100%); Analysis of Assessment (100%), and Application of Data Results (100%). Overall, the benchmark was not met in EDUC 315 but was met in EDUC 335 for the 2020-2021 academic year.

Candidates struggle with the Teaching Cycle in EDUC 316 as the benchmark was met for 3 out of the 6 elements in fall 2020 and 0 out of the 6 elements in spring 2021. This can be attributed to EDUC 316 being the first time candidates implement the Teaching Cycle. There is a positive trend as candidates in EDUC 335 met the benchmark for all 6 elements (100%) of the Teaching Cycle in fall 2020 and spring 2021. It seems that having multiple engagements with the assessment help the candidates be more proficient.

At the end of each academic year, the Elementary Program Coordinator will send Teaching Cycle data and areas of concern to faculty. Faculty will plan to address areas for improvement or concern (ex. clarifying directions and expectations, modeling, providing exemplars, etc.)

13 Assessment and Benchmark EDUC 416 Case Study

Assessment: Case Study
The Case Study is an assessment component that aligns with the one-on-one tutoring requirement within Education 416: Diagnostic and Remedial Reading in Elementary School Practicum. The candidates must: administer diagnostic tests, analyze the data to determine fluency ratings and processing of texts, create lesson plans based upon their conclusions, implement instructional strategies for remediation (Response to Intervention), as well as determine recommendations for continued support from parents within the home. Moreover, candidates must relate each requirement to the stages of literacy development. A score of 3.00, Effective: Proficient, has been identified as the benchmark for this assessment.
Alignment of Assessment to Standards:
The Case Study instrument used for evaluating baccalaureate elementary education candidates' knowledge about student data collection and analysis, instructional strategies, and creating a response to intervention are aligned to Association for Childhood Education International (ACEI) Elementary Education standards as well as the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) standards.
1.0 Development, Learning, and Motivation - ACEI standard 1.0 aligns with the candidate's task of creating a remediation action plan to be implemented by the candidate throughout the semester in which the field experiences are taking place as well the for the parent to continue after the semester is completed.
3.1 Integrating and applying knowledge for instruction - ACEI standard 3.1 aligns with the candidate's task of integrating and applying knowledge of content, learning theory, and curricular goals within the Case Study as identified in the section covering Fluency and Instructional Strategies Used with Students. These lesson plans will be based on constructing learning opportunities that support the individual student's development toward the stated learning outcome.
4.0 Assessment for instruction - ACEI standard 4.0 aligns with the candidate's task of administration of various assessments, collection of data, and analysis of data to determine the specific stage of reading development the student is working in. The candidate must determine both strengths and weaknesses of their student pertaining to reading skills.

Benchmark: Candidates will score 3.00 or higher on all ACEI Standards assessed in the Case Study.

Outcome Links

LTGC C1 [Program]
The teacher candidate observes and reflects on studentsâ€™ responses to instruction to identify areas of need and make adjustments to practice.

LTGC C2 [Program]
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 studentsâ€™ needs.

LTGC C3 [Program]
The teacher candidate uses structured input and feedback from a variety of sources (e.g., colleagues, mentor teachers, school leaders, preparation faculty) to make changes to instructional practice and professional behaviors to better meet studentsâ€™ needs.

LTGC D [Program]
The teacher candidate elicits and uses information about students and their experiences from families and communities to support student development and learning and adjust instruction and the learning environment.

LTGC F [Program]
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 [Program]
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.

LTGC H [Program]
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.

2007 ACEI Elementary Education Standards and Supporting Explanation [External]

1.0 Development, Learning, & Motivation

Candidates know, understand, and use the major concepts, principles, theories, and research related to development of children and young adolescents to construct learning opportunities that support individual studentsâ€™ development, acquisition of knowledge, and motivation.

3.1 Integrating and applying knowledge

Candidates plan and implement instruction based on knowledge of students, learning theory, connections across the curriculum, curricular goals, and community.

3.2 Adaptation to diverse students

Candidates understand how elementary students differ in their development and approaches to learning, and create instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse students.

3.3 Critical Thinking and Problem Solvin

Candidates understand and use a variety of teaching strategies that encourage elementary studentsâ€™ development of critical thinking and problem solving.

3.4 Active engagement in learning

Candidates use their knowledge and understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior among students at the K-6 level to foster active engagement in learning, self motivation, and positive social interaction and to create supportive learning environments.

3.5 Communication

Candidates use their knowledge and understanding of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the elementary classroom.

4.0 Assessment for instruction

Candidates know, understand, and use formal and informal assessment strategies to plan, evaluate and strengthen instruction that will promote continuous intellectual, social, emotional, and physical development of each elementary student.

2013 InTASC Standards [External]

1. Learner Development

The teacher understands 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, and designs and implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences.

2. Learning Differences

The teacher uses understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards.

3. Learning Environments

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

6. Assessment

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

7. Planning for Instruction

The teacher 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.

8. Instructional Strategies

The teacher understands and uses 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.

13.1 Data

Criteria	ACEI Standard	InTASC Standard		Fall 2015 N=7	Spring 2016 N=14	Fall 2016 N=9	Spring 2017 N=13	Fall 2017 N=9	Spring 2018 N=7
Analysis of Pre- and Post-test Data	4.0	6	Mean	2.71	3.42	3.33	3.62	3.11	3.29
			Range	2.00-4.00	2.00-4.00	2.00-4.00	3.00-4.00	1.00-4.00	3.00-4.00
			% proficient or higher	57%	92%	89%	100%	89%	100%
Fluency	3.1	4	Mean	3.00	3.42	3.56	3.54	3.22	3.57
			Range	2.00-4.00	2.00-4.00	2.00-4.00	1.00-4.00	2.00-4.00	3.00-4.00
			% proficient or higher	85%	92%	89%	92%	89%	100%
Instructional Strategies	3.1	7	Mean	3.14	3.35	4.00	3.46	2.33	2.43
			Range	2.00-4.00	3.00-4.00	4.00	1.00-4.00	2.00-4.00	1.00-4.00
			% proficient or higher	71%	86%	100%	85%	22%	43%
Response to Intervention	1.0	6	Mean	3.28	3.14	3.00	3.46	2.89	2.86
			Range	3.00-4.00	2.00-4.00	1.00-4.00	2.00-4.00	1.00-4.00	2.00-4.00
			% proficient or higher	100%	92%	67%	85%	56%	57%

Criteria	ACEI Standard	InTASC Standard		Fall 2018 N=18	Spring 2019 N=10	Fall 2019 N=0	Spring 2020 N=0	Fall 2020 N=0	Spring 2021 N=5
Analysis of Pre- and Post-test Data	4.0	6	Mean	3.72	3.80				2.60
			Range	2.00-4.00	2.00-4.00				2.00-4.00
			% proficient or higher	94%	90%				40%
Fluency	3.1	4	Mean	3.17	4.00				3.00
			Range	1.00-4.00	4.00				2.00-4.00
			% proficient or higher	72%	100%				80%
Instructional Strategies	3.1	7	Mean	3.00	3.40				3.20
			Range	1.00-4.00	1.00-4.00				2.00-4.00
			% proficient or higher	72%	80%				80%
			Mean	3.17	3.50				3.20

Response to Intervention	1.0	6	Range	1.00-4.00	1.00-4.00				2.00-4.00
			% proficient or higher	78	80%				80%

13.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:
This was the first year of data collection.
The Case Study, is designed to offer the candidaten intensive individualized tutoring opportunity in a real world setting as the candidate administers diagnostic tests, designs and implements lessons plans, fluency screenings, as texts are possessed in this remediation setting. This tool is designed to align closely with ACEI standards. As evidenced by the scores (see Attachment: Case Study Evaluation Data for fall 2015 and spring 2016), candidates are performing at Highly Effective levels with regards To Response to Intervention which corresponds with ACEI Stand I. Candidates are performing at Highly Effective/Effective levels in regards to Instructional Strategies and Fluency which aligns with ACEI standards 3.0. Lastly in terms of Analysis of Pre-Test and Post-Test Data relating to ACEI Standards 4.0, there has this Case Study, candidates in fall 2015 were rated Highly Proficient Levels. In spring, 2016 rating of Highly Effective. In the analysis of the data, ACEI standards have been aligned with specific data points and candidate performance in specific domains are addressed.
Interpretation of the Data
Under ACEI Standard 1.0, the mean for Response to Intervention remained stable from fall 2015 to spring 2016. Under Standard 3.0 the means for expectations, monitoring of student behavior, quality of questions, discussion techniques, and student participation experienced a marginal increase. In ACEI Standard 4.0, the means for clarity, monitoring of student learning, and student self-assessment and monitoring or progress domains noted a marked improvement from fall 2015 to spring 2016.

2016-2017:
Analysis of Data:
Case Study data was collected on baccalaureate elementary candidates for the fall 2015, spring 2016, fall 2016, and spring 2017 semesters. Data collected from these three semesters indicated that the cohort of candidates' final mean scores for Fluency, Instructional Strategies, and Response to Intervention were above the benchmark of 3.00 for all four semesters.
Analysis of Pre-test and Post-test Data on the rubric had a mean score of 2.71 for the fall 2015 semester which is below the benchmark of 3.00. However, the next three semesters of data collected show a significant increase with means of 3.42 (n=14), 3.33 (n=9), and 3.62 (n=13).
Further examination of the data indicated that in all four instances, the minimum value of the range of scores had a value below the benchmark.

Interpretation of Data:
Disaggregation of data by rubric element has been completed on this assessment to determine specific skill mastery by each cohort of candidates.

1.0 Development, Learning, and Motivation
Mean scores for Response to Intervention for ACEI standard 1.0 across the four semesters of cohorts show that the mean score for the four cohorts (fall, 2015, spring 2016, fall 2016, and spring 2017) of candidates met the benchmark of 3.00 (= 3.28, 3.14, 3.00, and 3.46). Further disaggregation of the range scores for this element indicate that the spring 2016 (2.00-4.00), fall 2016 (1.00-4.00), and spring 2017 (2.00-4.00) cohorts minimum range scores fell below the 3.00 benchmark.

3.1 Integrating and applying knowledge for instruction
Mean scores for Fluency for ACEI standard 3.1 across the four semesters of cohorts show that the mean score for the four cohorts (fall 2015, spring 2016, fall 2016, and spring 2017)

of candidates met the benchmark of 3.00 (= 3.00, 3.42, 3.56, and 3.54). Further disaggregation of the range scores for this element indicate that the fall 2015 (2.00-4.00), spring 2016 (2.00-4.00), fall 2016 (2.00-4.00), and spring 2017 (1.00-4.00) cohorts minimum range scores fell below the 3.00 benchmark.
Mean scores for Instructional Strategies for ACEI standard 3.1 across the four semesters of cohorts show that the mean score for the four cohorts (fall 2015, spring 2016, fall 2016, and spring 2017) of candidates met the benchmark of 3.00 (= 3.14, 3.35, 4.00, and 3.46). Further disaggregation of the range scores for this element indicate that the fall 2015 (2.00-4.00), and spring 2017 (1.00-4.00) cohorts minimum range scores fell below the 3.00 benchmark.

4.0 Assessment for instruction
Mean scores for Analysis of Pre-test and Post-test Data for ACEI standard 4.0 across the four semesters of cohorts show that the mean score for three of the four cohorts (spring 2016, fall 2016, and spring 2017) of candidates met the benchmark of 3.00 (= 3.42, 3.33, and 3.62). The fall 2015 cohort had a mean score of 2.71. Further disaggregation of the range scores for this element indicate that the fall 2015 (2.00-4.00), spring 2016 (2.00-4.00), and fall 2016 (2.00-4.00) cohorts minimum range scores fell below the 3.00 benchmark.

2017-2018:
Analysis of Data: The benchmark was not met.

In the fall 2017 semester:
- The mean score for ACEI Standard 3.1 was 2.33.
- The mean score for ACEI Standard 1.0 was 2.89.

In the spring 2018 semester:
- The mean score for ACEI Standard 3.1 was 2.43.
- The mean score for ACEI Standard 1.0 was 2.86.

Noticeable Trends:
- Analysis of Pre-test and Post-test data – There was an 11% increase from 89% to 100%.
- Fluency - There was an 11% increase from 89% to 100%.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: In 2018-2019, candidates will score 3.00 or higher on all ACEI standards assessed in the Case Study.

Recommendations for Implementations of Plan for Improvement:
- Faculty will revise instructions on assessment to ensure alignment with rubric. Course instructor sees potential issues with misalignment of assessment instructions and rubric, thus necessitating the change.
- Faculty will provide candidates with additional resources, including modeling differentiation and Response to Intervention, and instructional strategies. Data from Case Study will be collected and analyzed for program and curricular improvement.

2018-2019:
Analysis of Data:
The mean scores of each element were above 3.00 for each element. However, less than 80% of the candidates scored at the proficiency level or above for the following: F18 Fluency (72%) and Instructional Strategies (72%). For the spring 19 semester, Instructional Strategies and Response to Intervention mat the benchmark at exactly 80% scoring at benchmark or above.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:
Candidates will score a 3.00 or higher on all CAEP Elementary Standards or ACEI Standards assessed in the Case Study.

Recommendations for Implementation of Improvement Plan:

- Faculty will continue to evaluate the impact of previously made revisions and will make additional revisions as seen fit.
- Faculty will align the Case Study Rubric to the CAEP Elementary Standards.

2019-2020:
Data Analysis:
Data for the 2019-2020 completers was not available due to the change in faculty and not having data reported to the assessment office.
Plans for Continuous Improvement:
Recommendations for Implementation of Improvement Plan:

2020-2021:
ACEI standard 4.0 is an area of concern as 40% of candidates scoring at proficiency or higher with a mean score of 2.60. The other ACEI standards measured had a mean score above 3.00. The benchmark was not met for the spring 2021. A modified case study was used in the spring 2021 semester due to COVID-19 restrictions at school sites. Moving forward, EDUC 416 faculty, along with other elementary education faculty, will align the Case Study to CAEP Elementary standards by the fall 2021 semester or determine another activity that would better align with the goals and objectives of the program.

14 Assessment and Benchmark Field Experience Evaluation (FEE)_Subject Areas

Assessment: Field Experience Evaluation assessments completed in the ELA Methods, Science Methods, Social Studies Methods, and EDUC 410 (various subject areas) prior to student teaching.

15.1 Benchmark: Candidates will score 3.00 or higher on each ACEI Standard assessed in the FEE rubric.

15.2 Benchmark: Candidates will score a 3.00 or higher on each element of the FEE rubric for Domains 1-4 in each of the subject areas from the corresponding methods courses and EDUC 410.

14.1 Data

Spring 2018:

ACEI	ELA			Science			Social Studies			Various Subjects		
	Mean	Range	% Prof.	Mean	Range	% Prof.	Mean	Range	% Prof.	Mean	Range	% Prof.
1.0	3.60	3.00-4.00	100%	4.00	4.00	100%	3.30	2.00-4.00	93%	2.93	2.00-4.00	74%
3.1	3.25	3.00-4.00	100%	3.00	3.00-4.00	100%	2.57	2.00-3.00	57%	3.00	3.00	100%
3.3	3.00	3.00	100%	4.00	3.00-4.00	100%	3.00	2.00-4.00	86%	2.71	2.00-4.00	57%
3.4	3.32	3.00-4.00	100%	3.57	3.00-4.00	100%	3.04	2.00-4.00	77%	2.73	2.00-4.00	67%
3.5	2.75	1.00-4.00	75%	3.50	3.00-4.00	100%	2.80	1.00-4.00	72%	2.57	2.00-3.00	57%
4.0	2.90	2.00-4.00	69	3.50	3.00-4.00	100%	3.00	2.00-4.00	82%	2.75	1.00-3.00	79%
5.1	3.60	3.00-4.00	100%	4.00	4.00	100%	3.80	3.00-4.00	100%	3.90	3.00-4.00	100%

2018-2019 AY:

ACEI	ELA			Science			Social Studies			Various Subjects		
	Mean	Range	% Prof.	Mean	Range	% Prof.	Mean	Range	% Prof.	Mean	Range	% Prof.
1.0	3.39	2.00-4.00	90%	3.72	2.00-4.00	98%	3.57	2.00-4.00	95%	3.56	1.00-4.00	90%
3.1	3.06	2.00-4.00	83%	3.59	3.00-4.00	100%	3.14	2.00-4.00	91%	3.39	3.00-4.00	100%
3.3	2.64	1.00-3.00	67%	3.15	2.00-4.00	92%	3.09	2.00-4.00	95%	3.07	2.00-4.00	80%
3.4	3.07	1.00-4.00	78%	3.38	2.00-4.00	88%	3.12	2.00-4.00	71%	3.31	2.00-4.00	89%
3.5	2.91	1.00-4.00	75%	3.35	2.00-4.00	85%	2.91	2.00-4.00	77%	3.09	2.00-4.00	75%

4.0	2.60	1.00-4.00	49%	3.53	1.00-4.00	96%	3.08	2.00-4.00	90%	3.23	2.00-4.00	88%
5.1	3.84	2.00-4.00	98%	3.94	3.00-4.00	100%	4.00	4.00	100%	4.00	4.00	100%

2019-2020 AY:

ACEI	ELA N=16			Math N=16			Science N=16			Social Studies			Various Subjects		
	Mean	Range	% Prof.	Mean	Range	% Prof.	Mean	Range	% Prof.	Mean	Range	% Prof.	Mean	Range	% Pro
1.0	3.28	1-4	91%	3.28	2-4	94%	3.79	2-4	93%	3.92	3-4	100%	3.65	3-4	100
3.1	3.19	2-4	88%	3.00	2-4	94%	3.83	3-4	100%	3.29	2-4	93%	3.47	3-4	100
3.3	2.81	2-4	69%	3.26	2-4	75%	2.86	2-4	71%	2.71	2-4	64%	3.18	2-4	82%
3.4	3.26	2-4	91%	2.92	1-4	80%	3.21	2-4	88%	2.91	2-4	73%	3.33	1-4	86%
3.5	3.06	2-4	75%	2.63	2-3	63%	3.00	2-4	81%	2.64	2-3	50%	3.00	2-4	76%
4.0	3.02	1-4	75%	2.97	2-4	78%	3.21	2-4	80%	3.14	2-4	80%	3.35	2-4	90%
5.1	3.59	2-4	97%	3.47	3-4	100%	4.00	4	100%	3.89	3-4	100%	3.82	2-4	96%

2020-2021 AY:

ACEI	ELA N=11			Math N=10			Science N=13			Social Studies N=14			Various Subjects N=1		
	Mean	Range	% Prof.	Mean	Range	% Prof.	Mean	Range	% Prof.	Mean	Range	% Prof.	Mean	Range	% Pro
1.0	3.05	2.00-4.00	82%	3.00	2.00-4.00	90%	3.58	2.00-4.00	90%	3.71	1.00-4.00	93%	2.50	2.00-3.00	50%
3.1	3.18	2.00-4.00	91%	2.70	2.00-3.00	70%	3.85	3.00-4.00	100%	3.50	3.00-4.00	100%	2.00	2.00	0%
3.3	2.09	1.00-3.00	27%	2.40	2.00-4.00	30%	3.15	3.00-4.00	100%	2.64	2.00-4.00	50%	2.00	2.00	0%
3.4	3.10	2.00-4.00	78%	2.83	2.00-4.00	77%	3.26	2.00-4.00	92%	3.17	2.00-4.00	84%	2.14	2.00-3.00	86%
3.5	2.82	2.00-4.00	41%	2.40	2.00-4.00	45%	3.27	3.00-4.00	100%	2.50	1.00-4.00	50%	1.50	1.00-2.00	0%
4.0	2.80	1.00-4.00	70%	2.70	2.00-4.00	63%	3.19	2.00-4.00	88%	3.07	1.00-4.00	73%	2.50	2.00-3.00	50%
5.1	3.91	3.00-4.00	100%	3.10	3.00-4.00	100%	3.70	3.00-4.00	100%	3.93	3.00-4.00	100%	4.00	4.00	100

14.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:
Analysis of Data: The benchmark was not met.

For spring 2018 ELA:

- The mean score for ACEI Standard 3.5 was 2.75 and 75% of candidates scored at proficiency or higher.
- The mean score for ACEI Standard 4.0 was 2.90 and 69% of candidates scored at proficiency or higher.

For spring 2018 Social Studies:

- The mean score for ACEI Standard 3.1 was 2.57 and 57% of candidates scored at proficiency or higher.
- The mean score for ACEI Standard 3.5 was 2.80 and 72% of candidates scored at proficiency or higher.

For spring 2018 EDUC 410 Various Subjects:

- The mean score for ACEI Standard 1.0 was 2.93 and 74% of candidates scored at proficiency or higher.
- The mean score for ACEI Standard 3.3 was 2.71 and 57% of candidates scored at proficiency or higher.
- The mean score for ACEI Standard 3.4 was 2.73 and 67% of candidates scored at proficiency or higher.
- The mean score for ACEI Standard 3.5 was 2.57 and 57% of candidates scored at proficiency or higher.
- The mean score for ACEI Standard 4.0 was 2.75 and 79% of candidates scored at proficiency or higher.

Based on the available data, a common area of struggle for the candidates was ACEI Standard 3.5

Plan for Continuous Improvement: For 2018-2019, candidates will score 3.00 or higher on each ACEI standard assessed in the FEE rubric.

Recommendations for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- Faculty and University Supervisors will conduct pre and post conferences with all candidates to discuss expectations for the lesson taught.
- Candidates' lesson reflections and candidate and university supervisor feedback can be used to measure the effectiveness of pre and post conferences.
- Faculty will host FEE workshop for candidates and cooperating teachers.
- FEE Workshop will be conducted for those candidates that scores below proficiency. This workshop will help them to understand each element and how to improve their teaching skills. Candidates' and cooperating teachers' feedback can be used to measure effectiveness of the workshop.

2018-2019:
Analysis of Data:
The benchmark was not met for the following:
ELA: Elements 3.3 (=2.64); 3.5 (=2.91); 4.0 (=2.60)
Social Studies: Element 3.5 (=2.91)
Additionally, the only ACEI Components in which 100% of the candidates scored at proficiency or above were:
Science: 3.1 and 3.94
Social Studies: 5.1
Various Subjects: 3.1 and 5.1
Plan for Continuous Improvement: For 2019-2020, candidates will score 3.00 or higher on each CAEP Elementary standard assessed in the FEE rubric.
Recommendations for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- The standards for elementary education have changed from ACEI to CAEP Elementary Standards. Therefore, the faculty will realign the FEE rubric components to the CAEP Elementary Standards.
- Faculty will conduct pre and post conferences with all candidates to discuss expectations for and reflect on the lessons taught.
- Each POP Cycle component will be reviewed and practiced throughout the program within various courses.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
For the 2020-2021 academic year, the benchmark of at least 80% of the candidates scoring at or above proficiency was not met in ELA, Math, Social Studies and Various Subjects for elements 3.3, 3.5, or 4.0. Therefore these three standards (3.3, 3.5, and 4.0) are areas of concern. Faculty will align this assessment to the CAEP Elementary standards. In preparation for the fall 2021 semester, and to reach the benchmark, elementary faculty will

distribute and implement components of the POP Cycle in their courses. This will assist in preparing candidates to achieve higher scores on the assessment. Inter-rater reliability will be established among mentors and site supervisors for more accurate scoring.

14.2 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.

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

Â BS _ELEM_FEE_Subject D1-4_18-19
BS_ELEM_FEE_Subject D1-4_17-18
BS_ELEM_FEE_Subject D1-4_19-20
BS_ELEM_FEE_Subject_D1-D4_20-21

14.2.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:
Analysis of Data: The benchmark was not met.

In the fall 2017 semester, the Social Studies FEE results indicate that all candidates scored at benchmark (3.00) or above in all domains and elements of the FEE rubric.

In the spring 2018 semester, there were several areas in which candidates did not meet benchmark:

- In EDUC 410 with the Various Subject Area FEE evaluations:
    - Element 1.1.3 had a mean score of 2.86 with 71% of candidates meeting benchmark.
    - Domain 2 had a mean score of 2.71 with 65% of the candidates meeting benchmark.
        - All eleven elements in this domain had a mean score below benchmark.
    - Domain 3 had a mean score of 2.75
        - Only three of the eleven elements in this domain met benchmark
- In the ELA FEE:
    - Domain 3 had a mean score of 2.95 with 80% of the candidates meeting benchmark
        - Only six of the eleven elements in this domain met benchmark
    - Element 4.1.1 had a mean score of 2.75 with 75% of the candidates meeting benchmark.
- In the Science FEE, data was available for only one completer and benchmark was met for all elements.
- Completer data was not available in mathematics.

Noticeable Trends:
Domain 3 seems to be the area that poses the most difficulty for candidates.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: In 2018-2019, candidates will score a 3.00 or higher on each element of the FEE rubric for Domains 1-4 in each of the subject areas corresponding to the methods courses and EDUC 410.

Recommendations for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- Faculty and University Supervisors will conduct pre and post conferences with all candidates to discuss expectations for the lesson taught.

- Candidates' lesson reflections and candidate and university supervisor feedback can be used to measure the effectiveness of pre and post conferences.
- Faculty will host FEE workshop for candidates and cooperating teachers.
- FEE Workshop will be conducted for those candidates that scores below proficiency. This workshop will help them to understand each element and how to improve their teaching skills. Candidates' and cooperating teachers' feedback can be used to measure effectiveness of workshop.

2018-2019:
Analysis of Data:
The benchmark was not met.
For Fall 18: ELA- element 1.1.4= 2.39, element 2.1.1= 2.94, element 2.1.2= 2.72, element 2.2.1= 2.94, element 2.2.2= 2.56, element 3.1.1= 2.61, element 3.1.2= 2.67, element 3.1.3= 2.72, element 3.2.1= 2.67, element 3.2.3= 2.78, element 3.2.4= 2.94, element 3.3.1= 2.33, element 3.3.2= 2.44, element 3.3.3= 2.78, element 3.3.4= 2.00
Social Studies- element 2.2.2= 2.45, element 2.2.3= 2.91, element 3.1.2= 2.64, element 3.1.3 = 2.91, element 3.3.2= 2.82
410 Various Subjects- element 2.2.2= 2.78, element 3.1.1= 2.89, element 3.1.2= 2.78, element 3.3.2= 2.94, element 3.3.4= 2.94
For Spring 19: ELA- element 1.1.4= 2.67, element 2.1.2= 2.92, element 2.1.3= 2.92, element 2.2.2= 2.75, element 3.1.1= 2.67, element 3.2.1= 2.75, element 3.2.2= 2.92, element 3.2.4= 2.83, element 3.3.1= 2.83, element 3.3.2= 2.42, element 3.3.3= 2.92, element 3.3.4= 1.92
Science- element 3.1.1= 2.91
Social Studies- element 2.1.3= 2.91, element 2.2.2= 2.55, element 3.3.4= 2.73

Plan for Continuous Improvement:
The FEE elements will be aligned to the CAEP Elementary Standards to be assessed in coursework for the 19-20 AY.

Recommendations for Implementing Plan for Improvement:
Faculty will align the FEE rubric to CAEP Elementary Standards and begin assessing candidates using the realigned rubric in the 19-20 AY.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
For the fall 2020 and spring 2021 semesters, the benchmark was not met. Areas of concern noted from the data include: 2.1.1 (Management of Instructional Groups), 2.1.2 (Management of Transitions), 2.2.2 (Monitoring of Student Behavior), 2.2.3 (Response to Student Misbehavior), 3.1.1 (Quality of Questions), 3.1.2 (Discussion Techniques), 3.2.1 (Activities and Assignments), 3.2.2 (Grouping of Students), 3.3.1 (Assessment Criteria), 3.3.2 (Monitoring of Student Learning), 3.3.3 (Feedback to Students), and Tech 2. To achieve the benchmark in the future, components of the POP Cycle will be distributed into courses throughout the program to increase understanding, usefulness, and implementation expectations before teacher residency. EPP faculty will utilize the POP Cycles to ensure proper coaching and high quality feedback are provided to candidates.

15 Assessment and Benchmark Course Content GPA

Assessment: Course Content GPA

Benchmark: Candidates will have a mean score of 3.00 or above for each ACEI standard assessed in the "Course Content GPA".

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.

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

BS_ELEM_Course Content GPA_17-18
BS_ELEM_Course Content GPA_18-19
BS_ELEM_Course Content GPA_19-20
BS_ELEM_Course Content GPA_20-21

15.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:
Analysis of Data: The benchmark was not met.
In the fall 2017 semester, the mean score for Science was 2.65.
In the spring 2018 semester, the mean scores for all subject totals were at 3.00 or above.
No noticeable trends due to lack of comparative data.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: In 2018-2019, candidates will have a mean score of 3.00 or above for each ACEI standard assessed in the Course Content GPA.

Recommendations to Implement Plan for Improvement: EPP faculty will meet at least once a semester with content faculty to discuss candidates' academic progress in the content areas and identify areas of need. Faculty will examine candidates' transcripts to identify courses where students have earned a grade of D or below. Faculty will then meet with those course instructors to create opportunities for remediation and to reflect on their teaching practices to find areas of improvement.

2018-2019:
Analysis of Data:
Candidate mean scores fell below the 3.00 benchmark in the following courses: F18- BIOL 105, MATH 223, and MATH 231. For F18, the following percentages of students scoring below a 3.00 were as follows: BIOL 105 (67%), Science Total (72%), HIST 201 (67%), MATH 113 (72%), MATH 223 (72%), MATH 231 (67%) and Mathematics Total (74%). For S19, Math 113 was the only course with less than 80% of the candidates scoring below a 3.00 (67%).

Plan for Continuous Improvement:
Elementary programs will no longer adhere to ACEI standards, but instead will move to CAEP Elementary Standards. Therefore, course content GPA coursework will be modified as needed to meet these standards.

Recommendations for Implementation of Improvement Plan:
The requirements for the teacher education program raised the requirements of MATH 113 from a "D" to a "C". Also, the faculty will look at the coursework that aligns to the CAEP Elementary Standards and choose the appropriate courses to be included in the content GPA.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
The benchmark was not met in either semester of the 2020-2021 academic year. In both semesters, scores for MATH 231 (2.50, 2.50) fell below benchmark. Additionally, in spring 2021, the mean score for BIOL 105 (2.92) and HIST 122 (2.58) fell below benchmark. This is not a new trend, as MATH 231 has not met benchmark for the last four semesters, BIOL 105 has not met benchmark for three of the last four semesters, and HIST 122 has also not met benchmark for three of the last four semesters. EPP faculty have initiated discussions with course instructors for HIST 122 (Noseworthy) and MATH 231 (Eastman) about candidates' academic progress. As Elementary faculty work on alignment to the CAEP

Elementary Standards, a new benchmark will be created by the fall 2021. Faculty will work with course instructors to discuss candidates' academic progress, identify areas of need, and plan for student supports.

End of report