Elementary Education Grades 1-5 [MAT] [EEDU]

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 [MAT] [EEDU]

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

1 Is this program offered via Distance Learning?

50-99% Distance/Traditional

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

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:
In analyzing the data throughout our assessments, it was determined that our students 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 for our candidates. Due to this observation, 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 in May 2016. Professional development will continue that focuses on different components of the observation process.

Additionally, lower student scores associated with lesson planning and application of student data to drive instruction consistently fell below or at 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. Additionally, the department has added a more thorough lesson planning component as well as implemented the revised lesson planning assessments throughout the program. Specifically, these measure were implemented fall 2016 in Education 647: Educational Foundations where lesson planning is first introduced in order to build a solid understanding and basis for sequential coursework to build upon. This course will begin to further clarify, instruct, and assess these lesson plan components early on in the candidates' coursework. With clarification in the introductory course, candidates should be more successful applying content and methodology as they progress throughout the sequential coursework in their degree plan.

2016-2017:
Candidates have continuously scored low on InTASC standard 6/ACEI standard 4 throughout most of the major assessments of the program: FEE, Assessment Plan of the Teacher Candidate Work Sample, Case Study, as well as Lesson Planning (see data charts embedded within student learning outcomes). Because of this the EDUC 654, Problems in Measurement and Evaluation, has been rewritten to include candidate assignment to a P-12 classroom teacher, activities that include alignment of standards to assessments, assignments that incorporate various forms of informal and formal assessments, practice of creating assessments, as well as analysis of P-12 student data.

2017-2018:
During Summer 2018, faculty created an online Praxis tutorial program where students can access digital resources to assist in preparation for Praxis exams.

There was a 5% increase in combined Praxis Content scores from spring 2017 (70%) to Spring 2018 (75%). The spring 2018 cohort average number of attempts by candidates for each Praxis Content subtest did not exceed the benchmark of two. For spring 2018, 100% of candidates scored at proficiency or higher on all ACEI standards in Domain 5 of the FEE.

2018-2019:
Praxis workshops through MSU BCOE were offered for the first time in the spring 2019 semester. New program candidates are using Via software to begin collecting data and developing portfolios.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
The MAT Elementary program admitted the first cohort to follow the revised program sequence in the fall 2020 semester. MAT Elementary faculty participated in professional Development activities provided by the EPP including: US Prep High Leverage Practices and Co-Teaching on January 25, 2021; February 19, 2021; March 5, 2021; April 16, 2021

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.
We created a MAT Teacher Residency Program, which will be implemented Fall 2017.

2016-2017:
Various technologies have been identified and implemented with the scope and sequence of the program. Six of the eight courses now have embedded technology use by candidates.

2017-2018:
Faculty members are currently redesigning the Elementary program in order to better meet the unique needs of our candidates.

2018-2019:
The newly redesigned program has been implemented. We are continuing to create new courses and realign program standards and outcomes throughout the program coursework.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
Although only one candidate completed the program during the 2020-2021year, MAT Elementary program faculty met weekly during the spring 2021 semester on Monday at 11:00 – noon for professional development and discussion of current curricula topics.

5 Program Mission

The purpose of the Elementary MAT Education program is to provide a curriculum leading to the Master of Arts in Teaching Elementary degree and meet the needs of candidates preparing to become professional teachers in the multicultural community of Southwest Louisiana and the global community. This program provides candidates with the necessary competencies to be certified to teach grades 1-5 based upon unit and state requirements. The Elementary Education Program enhances the teaching profession through a focus on: critical thinking, communication, reflection, collaboration, diversity, professionalism, and service to the community.

The purpose of the MAT in Elementary Education is to prepare teacher education candidates for successful entry into elementary education as grade 1-5 teachers, by providing opportunities for developing critical thinking (SL01), communicating effectively through oral, written, and technological communication skills (SL02), and by encouraging sound decision making in the education environment and in the grades 1-5 classroom setting (SL03).

6 Institutional Mission Reference

At McNeese State University, a member of the University of Louisiana System, students cultivate skills for critical thinking (SL01), effective expression (SL02), and gain an understanding of the global community (SL03). The purpose of the Elementary Education Program reflects the department's focus as it relates to fulfilling state, professional, and national standards. The program purpose is consistent with the university's purpose/mission to "stimulate students to maximum intellectual growth and love of learning, to cultivate the skills necessary for critical thinking and effective expression, to foster understanding of the multicultural world community, and to develop a sense of ethical responsibility."

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

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

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

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: A minimum of 90% of candidates complete the MAT program in Elementary Education within two years of being accepted into the program (599 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

MAT Elementary Education Programs - Enrollment and Completer Data:

Academic Year	# enrolled with EDUC 599 packet	# of completers		
		Fall	Spring	Total
2013-2014	26			9
2014-2015	16			9
2015-2016	26	4	6	10
2016-2017	20	1	7	8
2017-2018	17	0	6	6
2018-2019	16	1	6	7
2019-2020	9	2	4	6
2020-2021	4	1	0	1

7.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:

Benchmark met. The State of Louisiana Has made substantial changes to the requirements for becoming a teacher in the P-12 system. Although the need for teachers has risen, there are now multiple avenues that do not require a master's degree to become a teacher. Therefore, enrollment numbers in the MAT program have decreased and fluctuated substantially from year to year.

2016-2017:
The EPP has had fluctuation within our enrollment numbers over the last four academic years. Part of the issue with acceptance into the program is lack of success on Praxis exams. During summer 2018, a program will be developed to help with tutoring/mentoring for these required exams
The EPP was able to recruit candidates into inquiring about the MAT Elementary program during these two days; however the Praxis exams were a barrier to their enrollment.

2017-2018:
Analysis of Data: The benchmark was not met. There was a decrease in officially enrolled candidates from 2016-2017 to 2017-2018 (15% decrease) and total completers from 2016-2017 to 2017-2018 (25% decrease).

Plan for Continuous Improvement: In 2018-2019, the goal will be to increase the number of enrolled candidates by 7%.

Recommendations for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- The EPP will contact and establish relationships with principals from surrounding parishes to recruit potential MAT candidates. The principals are involved in the collaborative process which also meets the CAEP goal of stakeholder input.
- 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 2 times each academic year.
  Graduate school applications could help identify potential candidates and applicants interested in the program. EEP faculty will work with the Graduate School to inform the community about our programs.

2018-2019:
Analysis of Data:
There has been a continual downward trend in enrollment since the 2015-2016 AY. The decrease from 2017-2018 to 2018-2019 has been the smallest in the last three years (-1). There was also an increase in the number of completers from the previous year (+1).

Plan for Improvement:
The goal for the MAT Elementary program is to increase enrollment by a minimum of 7% within the next AY.

Recommendations for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- The MAT Elementary program will be moving to a completely online format by summer 2020 to increase the visibility of the program.
- Recruitment efforts will expand to social media.
- MAT Elementary faculty will attend the Calcasieu Parish Job Fair.
- MAT Elementary faculty will visit schools in the district to identify candidates that qualify for and are interested in the program.
- Faculty will participate in The Awakening Community Event.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
The benchmark for enrollment was not met. Enrollment in the MAT Elementary program has has decreased by 85% since the fall 2015 semester. Most recently, from fall 2019 to fall 2020, there was a 56% decline from 9 to 4 students enrolled. Lack of student enrollment in the McNeese MAT Elementary program creates significant concern for the future viability of the

program and for McNeese to provide sufficient certified teachers in the 5-parish area of Southwest Louisiana. Only one candidate completed the MAT Elementary program in the 2020-2021 academic year. There is a demand for certified teachers and the EPP is working diligently to recruit candidates to the program to fill this need.
The revised MAT Elementary program was implemented in Fall 2020. The program is offered 100% online and courses are sequenced in a 5-term format. Students are admitted in the fall term only. DEP social media presence was active during the 2020-2021 year to tout candidate activities and generate interest in the education profession. Although not planned, EPP leadership was allowed to provide a 20% tuition discount for candidates who entered the program in Fall 2020.
During the 2022-2022 academic year the EPP representatives will attend McNeese's Grad Fest each and career fairs each semester to recruit graduates for the MAT elementary program. The HubSpot marketing initiative data will be tracked during the 2021-2022 academic year and inquiries will receive follow up within 72 hours to provide detailed program information and encourage enrollment in the MAT Elementary program. The desired result is an uptick in the enrollment trend beginning with the fall 2021 semester and as students who visited the information table at Grad Fest in spring 2021 and respond to promotional activities apply to the program.

7.2 Data Graduation Matriculation Rates

MAT Elementary Education - Graduation Matriculation Rates:

Program Type	Cohort Academic Year	Accepted into program with 599 Packet	1-2 Years to Grad	3 Years to Grad	4 Years to Grad	5 Years to Grad	Dropped from university	State Completer	Earned Different Degree	Still Enrolled
MAT ELEM	2013-2014	7	N=5 71%	N=1 14%			N=1 14%		N=1 7%	
MAT ELEM	2014-2015	13	N=9 70%	N=2 15%			N=2 15%			
MAT ELEM	2015-2016	10	N=8 80%	N=1 10%			N=1 10%			
MAT ELEM	2016-2017	7	N=6 86%				N=1 14%			
MAT ELEM	2017-2018									

7.2.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:
Analysis of Data: The benchmark was not met. 71% of the candidates from the 2013-2014 cohort completed the program within 1-2 years.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The goal for 2018-2019 is to have a minimum of 90% of candidates complete the MAT program in Elementary Education within two years of being accepted into the program (599 packet).

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- Advisors will work with candidates at least two to four times 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 document feedback from meetings. Data on courses taken will be gained from Degree Works
- Faculty will review online Praxis tutorial program to measure effectiveness and make changes as needed.
- The sources provided by the EPP may need to be changed and/or updated to better reflect the needs of the candidates as indicated by Praxis scores.

2018-2019:
Analysis of Data:
70% of the candidates completed the program within two years of official entrance into the program as part of the 2014-2015 cohort. 15% of the candidates (n=2) finished in three years and another 15% of the candidates (n=2) dropped from the University.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:
The goal is to have all candidates matriculate through the program within two year of official acceptance with the EDUC 599 packet.

Recommendations for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:
The MAT Elementary program has been redesigned. Coursework has been sequenced into a five semester program with a two semester residency or internship. Candidates following the sequence will complete the program within the two years of acceptance. Advisors will need to meet with candidates to ensure that all testing requirements are met in the appropriate time frame and courses are taken in the appropriate sequence.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
The Benchmark of 90% completion within 2 years was not met by the 2016-2017 cohort; however, progress toward meeting the benchmark is positive. The 86% completion rate showed improvement over the previous two cycles of 70% and 80% completion.
Praxis tutorial information was provided to candidates to assist with preparation resulting in more success on the Praxis. Advisors tracked candidate progress closely and met with each candidate at least two times per academic year to provide guidance for program progression and answer questions relating to continued enrollment.
At the mid-point of each term during 2021-2022 MAT faculty will review candidates progress for the semester and identify those not on track for completing courses for the term. Once these candidates are identified, the MAT advisor will review the program progress for the candidate and contact the candidate to discuss positive progress strategies for program completion. It is recommended that by Fall 2022, EPP should revise admission requirements for applicants for the MAT programs. Applicants should meet ACT/SAT/Praxis I Core exam or the content exam requirements for initial acceptance into the program.

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.

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 7, 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 16, 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:
Date of Meeting: June 24, 2020
Meeting Location and Duration: Zoom, 8:00 a.m. to noon
Attendees: DEP faculty
Topic and brief description, results of meeting, next steps, etc.: Major assessments for programs

Date of Meeting: August 4, 2020
Meeting Location and Duration: Zoom: 9:00 – 11:30 a.m.
Attendees: DEP Faculty
Topic and brief description, results of meeting, next steps, etc.: Class Measures Rubric

Date of Meeting: August 6, 2020
Meeting Location and Duration: Zoom: 8:30 to 11:00 a.m.
Attendees: DEP faculty
Topic and brief description, results of meeting, next steps, etc.: POP cycle with Quality Feedback

Date of Meeting: August 13, 2020
Meeting Location and Duration: Zoom: 9:00 to 11:00 a.m.
Attendees: DEP faculty

Topic and brief description, results of meeting, next steps, etc.: Field Experience, Internship, Practicum expectations

Date of Meeting: January 25, 2021
Meeting Location and Duration: Zoom: 4:00 to 5:30 p.m.
Attendees: Mentor Teachers, university Supervisors, DEP faculty
Topic and brief description, results of meeting, next steps, etc.: Expectation of student teaching and evaluation

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

Elementary Education Curriculum Development
MAT_ELEM_Curriculum Development_17-18

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 MAT 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 6 times during the spring 2018 semester. The faculty attended 6 professional development meetings throughout the spring 2018 semester.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: In 2018-2019, program faculty will continue to meet at regular intervals throughout the year to discuss advising methods and program implementation. Program faculty will also continue to collaborate with local districts to strengthen our program to prepare our teacher candidates to fully meet district needs.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- Faculty will collaborate with local districts at least eight times during the fall 2018-spring 2019 school year.
  EPP and local school district will collaborate on topics for professional development and plan for implementation during the year.
- Faculty will attend at least eight professional development meetings during the fall 2018-spring 2019 school year.
  Those meetings haven’t been set yet. Once those meetings have been scheduled, that information will be provided.
- Faculty will attend 10 Retention and Recruitment sessions during the fall 2018-spring 2019 school year.
  EPP faculty will collect interest cards at the retention and recruitment sessions and follow-up will be conducted by the Office for Admissions and Recruitment.

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. Though the primary focus was on the development of coursework for undergraduate programs, the MAT program was also redesigned and mirrored the coursework in the other initial certification programs.

Faculty members exceeded the benchmark of attending 10 retention and recruiting sessions.

For the 2019-2020 academic year, MAT elementary education faculty will implement the redesigned coursework. 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 leadership and faculty strengthened presence in the virtual environment and improved communication and use of technology to enable focus on the goals of the MAT Elementary program and the launch of the revised program course sequence in Fall 2020.

EPP leadership scheduled meetings for faculty each Monday during the Spring 2021 semester for the purpose of discussion of programmatic issues and adaptation to the COVID-19 environment for field observations and student teaching. The BCOE Moodle page posted resources and procedures for field observations throughout the semester. Moving forward, MAT Elementary program faculty will continue to meet at least twice during the 2021-2022 academic year to review and discuss curriculum changes, assessment data, and status of action plans.

9 Assessment and Benchmark Field Experience Evaluation with Content Standards

Assessment: Field Experience Evaluation Domains 1-5

9.1 Benchmark: Candidates will score a 3.00 or higher on each component of the Field Experience Evaluation Rubric for Domains 1-4.

9.2 Benchmark: Candidates will score 3.00 or higher on each ACEI standard assessed in the Field Experience Evaluation Rubric.

9.3 Benchmark: Candidates will score 3.00 or higher on each element assessed in Domain 5 of the Field Experience Evaluation rubric.

9.4 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.

9.5 Benchmark: Candidates will score a 3.00 or higher on each ACEI standard assessed in the FEE rubric for each content area.

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.

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]

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.

9.1 Data Field Experience Evaluation Domains 1-4

2017-2018:
Data table is attached.

2018-2019:
Data table is attached.

2019-2020:
Data table is attached.

2020-2021:
Data table is attached.

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

MAT ELEM_FEE Domains 1-4_18-19
MAT ELEM_FEE Domains 1-4_19-20
MAT ELEM_FEE Domains 1-4_20-21
MAT_ELEM_FEE Domains 1-4

9.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:
Analysis of Data:
Field Experience Evaluation (FEE) data was collected on MAT elementary candidates for the Spring 2016, Fall 2016, and Spring 2017 semesters. Data collected from these three semesters indicated that the cohort of candidates' final scores on each element of the FEE was above the proficient level of a score of 3.00 as identified by overall mean scores except for element 3.1.3- Student participation for the Fall 2016 cohort, n=6, had a mean score of 2.9 which fell below the set benchmark of 3.00.
When further examining element scores across all three cohorts of candidates, Spring 2016 (n=6), Fall 2016 (n=1), and Spring 2017 (n=7), there were no patterns of data that indicated ranges of mean scores that fell below benchmark, score of 3.00, across all three semesters. Also, when further examining the data chart across all three cohorts of candidates, it was noted that the Spring 2017 (n=7) cohort had one element that had a range score that fell below the EPP benchmark of 3.00 as well as the accepted score of 2.00, Effective: Emerging, from the Louisiana Department of Education. The element 3.3.4-Student self-assessment and monitoring of progress had a range score of 1.50-3.80.
Future program decisions:
A scope and sequence has been created for the MAT ELEM program that now includes teaching in the field with an evaluation and feedback using the FEE. With more practice and better feedback, future candidates should score higher across all elements of the rubric.

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

- 67% of candidates met benchmark on FEE Element: 2.2.2 Monitoring of Student Behavior with a mean score of 3.27.
- 67% of candidates met benchmark on FEE Element: 3.3.4 Student Self-Assessment and Monitoring of Progress with a mean score of 3.21.

Trends cannot be determined at this time due to lack of data from previous semesters.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: In 2018-2019, candidates will score a 3.00 or higher on each component of the FEE rubric for Domains 1-4

Recommendation 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.
  100% of candidates will participate. Candidate and University Supervisor feedback will determine the effectiveness of the conferences. Change will be determined by the scores on the FEE.
- Faculty will facilitate field experience assignment where candidates evaluate host teacher using FEE rubric in an effort to better understand the evaluation process using

this rubric.
100% of candidates and host teachers will participate. Candidates' scores and feedback will be used to measure effectiveness. Host teachers' grading of candidates' teaching on the FEE will also be used to measure effectiveness.

- Faculty will host FEE workshop for candidates and cooperating teachers.
  Candidates and host teachers will indicate their understanding of the FEE from pre and post conference and document this growth of knowledge on quadrant chart. EPP faculty can then identify areas of need and further remediation.

2018-2019:
Analysis of data: The benchmark was met.
The mean score for all components of the FEE ranged from 3.00-4.00 indicating that mean scores were at or above the level of proficiency set by the EPP.
The following elements had individual candidates score below the 3.00 benchmark in the spring 2019 semester: 3.1.3- 33% (n=6); 3.2.2- 17% (n=6); 3.3.2- 17% (n=6);

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- Faculty and University Supervisors will continue to conduct pre and post conferences with all candidates to discuss better prepare candidates for the lesson being taught and then to reflect on the lesson taught. 100% of ST candidates will participate. Candidate and University Supervisor feedback will determine the effectiveness of the conferences. Change will be determined by the scores on the FEE.
- Faculty will begin using elements of the POP Cycle throughout the courses in the program in order to better prepare candidates for the student teaching experience, understand the components of the FEE, and become better prepared for their role as educators.
- Each semester ST candidates will participate in a session to better understand the expectations of the FEE, POP Cycle, and other elements of the student teaching experience. This will continue until the POP Cycle has been fully implemented throughout the coursework in the program.
- Candidates and host teachers will indicate their understanding of the FEE from pre and post conference and document this growth of knowledge on quadrant chart. EPP faculty can then identify areas of need and further remediation.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
The candidate met or exceeded the benchmark for Domains 1, 2 and 4. One component fell below benchmark in Domain 3 (3.1) and the following subcomponents fell below benchmark: 3.1.3, 3.3.1 and 3.3.4 The data for one candidate may not represent a program trend. Trends with the assessment will be reviewed across programs to identify issues and trends in future data will be used to make specific program improvements that may not be evident with the one student's data.

The EPP implemented the revised course scope and sequence for MAT Elementary program candidates in the fall 2020. A revised FEE was implemented during the 2020-2021 academic year and the POP Cycle was used to provide high quality academic feedback on each domain and component.

During each term in 2021-2022 when MAT elementary candidates are in residency, the FEE will be reviewed by the faculty supervisor and mentor teacher in pre- and post-conference sessions to ensure candidates understand the components and expectation of meeting those components at a level of proficiency when reviewing the lesson plan prior to and then evaluating the lesson after the observation. The FEE results will be reviewed by MAT Elementary program faculty at the end of the 2021-2022 academic year to determine areas of concern and if clarification of data or program/course revisions should be recommended to improve achievement of the benchmark.

9.2 Data FEE_ACEI Standards

2015-2016:

		Fall 2015		Spring 2016	
		N=4		N=6	
ACEI 1.0 Standard	1.0	Mean	3.35	Mean	3.72
Uses major principles for individual students' development, learning, and motivation.		Range	2.75-4.00	Range	3.25-4.00
		%	100%	%	100%
Mean Score for ACEI 1.0 Standard		Mean	3.35	Mean	3.72
		Fall 2015		Spring 2016	
ACEI 2.0 Standards	2.1	Mean	3.33	Mean	3.88
Uses of major concepts in the content of English language arts.		Range	3.00-3.60	Range	3.50-4.00
		%	100%	%	100%
ACEI Standard	2.2	Mean	3.17	Mean	3.75
Uses concepts of physical, life, and earth/space sciences.		Range	3.00-3.50	Range	3.25-4.00
		%	100%	%	100%
ACEI Standard	2.3	Mean	3.56	Mean	3.70
Uses of major concepts in the content of mathematics.		Range	3.00-4.00	Range	3.25-4.00
		%	100%	%	100%
ACEI Standard	2.4	Mean	3.80	Mean	3.90
Uses of major concepts in the social studies content.		Range	3.25-4.00	Range	3.75-4.00
		%	100%	%	100%
ACEI Standard	2.5	Mean	3.00	Mean	3.72
Performing and visual arts.		Range	3.00	Range	3.50-4.00
		%	100%	%	100%
ACEI Standard	2.6	Mean	3.00	Mean	3.89
Uses of major concepts in health education.		Range	3.00	Range	3.66-4.00
		%	100%	%	100%
ACEI Standard	2.6	Mean	3.00	Mean	3.25
Movement and physical activity.		Range	3.00	Range	3.50-4.00
		%	100%	%	100%
Mean Score for ACEI 2.0 Standards		Mean	3.27	Mean	3.72
		Fall 2015		Spring 2016	
ACEI 3.0 Standards	3.1	Mean	3.33	Mean	3.69
Instruction based on students, theory, cross-curricular connections, goals, and community.		Range	3.15-3.66	Range	3.00-4.00
		%	100%	%	100%
ACEI Standard	3.2	Mean	3.65	Mean	3.65
Student diversity.		Range	3.45-4.00	Range	3.00-4.00

		%	100%	%	100%
ACEI Standard	3.3	Mean	3.41	Mean	3.64
Understands and uses variety of teaching strategies that encourage students' development of critical thinking and problem solving.		Range	3.00-3.75	Range	3.00-4.00
		%	100%	%	100%
ACEI Standard	3.4	Mean	3.77	Mean	3.72
Individual and group motivation and behavior		Range	3.45-4.00	Range	3.13-4.00
		%	100%	%	100%
ACEI Standard	3.5	Mean	3.67	Mean	3.70
Effective communication techniques.		Range	3.27-4.00	Range	3.25-4.00
		%	100%	%	100%
Mean Score for ACEI 3.0 Standard		Mean	3.57	Mean	3.68
		Fall 2015		Spring 2016	
ACEI 4.0 Standard	4.0	Mean	3.22	Mean	3.39
Formal and informal assessment.		Range	2.95-3.66	Range	
		%	100%	%	
Mean Score for ACEI Standard		Mean	3.22	Mean	3.39

2016-2017:
Data for the FEE and content standards are reported in 9.1

2017-2018:

ACEI	Spring 2018		
	Mean	Range	% Prof.
1.0	3.82	3.38-4.00	100%
2.1	3.71	3.50-4.00	100%
2.2	3.75	3.75	100%
2.3	3.96	3.88-4.00	100%
2.4			
2.5			
2.6			
2.7	4.00	4.00	100%
3.1	3.60	3.00-4.00	100%
3.2	3.83	3.63-4.00	100%
3.3	3.60	3.00-4.00	100%
3.4	3.54	2.75-4.00	97%
3.5	3.51	2.88-4.00	94%
4.0	3.64	2.50-4.00	90%
5.1	3.99	3.88-4.00	100%
5.2	4.00	4.00	100%

2018-2019:

ACEI	Fall 2018			Spring 2019		
	Mean	Range	% Prof.	Mean	Range	% Prof.
1.0	3.63	3.50-3.75	100%	3.53	3.13-3.98	100%
2.0	3.63	3.63	100%	3.46	3.38-3.50	100%
3.0	3.57	3.50-3.63	100%	3.49	2.63-4.00	96%
4.0	3.75	3.75	100%	3.45	2.88-3.83	96%
5.0	3.68	3.63-3.73	100%	3.44	3.00-3.75	100%

2019-2020:

ACEI	Fall 2019				Spring 2020			
	N	Mean	Range	% Prof.	N	Mean	Range	% Prof.
1.0	4	3.78	3.63-4.00	100%	8	3.83	3.5-4.00	100%
2.0	14	3.64	3.25-4.00	100%	28	3.23	2.00-4.00	86%
3.0	2	3.25	3.25	100%	4	3.25	3.00-4.00	100%
4.0	2	3.69	3.50-3.88	100%	4	3.25	3.00-3.58	100%
5.0	4	3.57	3.25-3.75	100%	8	3.11	2.50-3.73	88%

2020-2021:

ACEI	Fall 2020				Spring 2021			
	N	Mean	Range	% Prof.	N	Mean	Range	% Prof.
1.0	1	3.25	3.00-3.50	100%	0			
3.1	1	3.00	3.00	100%				
3.3	1	3.00	3.00	100%				
3.4	1	3.36	3.00-3.50	100%				
3.5	1	2.75	2.50-3.00	50%				
4.0	1	3.50	3.50	100%				
5.1	1	3.75	3.50-4.00	100%				

9.2.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:
The Content Standard Observation Rubric is an instrument designed to address candidate content knowledge during their student teaching experience, Education 683: MAT Clinical Experience. The items on the Content Standard Observation Rubric are aligned to the ACEI standards. The instrument addresses development, learning and motivation, instruction, assessment, and professionalism and is aligned with multiple ACEI components. The Content Standard Observation Rubric is a 4-point scale that includes explicit descriptors of the behaviors and actions in each of the following performance levels: Highly Effective, Effective: Proficient, Effective: Emerging, and Ineffective. This evaluation form mirrors the Louisiana COMPASS, the evaluation system for teachers and school leaders in Louisiana P-12 settings. Performance evaluation of student teaching candidates are conducted by the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor. A score of 3.00 or higher has been set as the proficiency benchmark by the department. Additionally, the department's target for student achievement is 80% passing.

Since each element on the Content Standard Observation Rubric has been aligned with an ACEI Standard, this artifact shows the average score for each element by semester and is categorized by ACEI Standards. This assessment includes two cycles of data from fall 2015 and spring 2016 semesters and was completed by 10 candidates. It must be further noted that the Content Standard Observation Rubric rounds up to the whole number based on the tenths' decimal. Therefore, the data indicates that 100% of candidates earned an average evaluation

score of effective proficient or higher in each of the elements on the Content Standard Observation Rubric based on this rounding system.

For both cycles of data, the elements on the Content Standard Observation Rubric that aligned with ACEI 1.0, 2.0, and 3.0 Standards had consistently similar findings. Elements that aligned with ACEI 1.0 Standard had a mean score of 3.35 in fall 2015 and 3.72 in spring 2016. Elements that aligned with ACEI 2.0 Standards had similar mean scores of 3.27 in fall 2015 and 3.72 in spring 2016. Elements that aligned with ACEI 3.0 yielded mean scores of 3.57 in fall 2015 and 3.68 in spring 2016. In both cycles of data, fall 2015 indicated a rating of effective proficient; whereas, spring 2016 indicated student outcomes of highly effective within these elements. Additionally, data indicated that elements, Performing and visual arts, Uses of major concepts in health education, and Movement and physical activity, aligned with ACEI 2.0 Standard indicated lower mean scores of 3.00 in fall 2015; however, these mean scores increased to range between 3.25-3.9 in spring 2016. Furthermore, it was noted that the fall 2015 mean score of 3.27 was one of the lowest overall mean scores due to these elements' impact. It is believed that these initial scores were outliers; nevertheless, these elements will be monitored further for patterns or trends. The element aligned with ACEI 4.0 Standard was Formal and Informal assessment. This element yielded the lowest mean score of 3.22 in fall 2015, but increased to 3.39 in spring 2016. Since this element rendered the lowest mean, the element will be monitored for consistently lower performance scores. It is believed that the fall 2015 data may have contained outliers since the following data cycle indicated growth from the previous semester. Nevertheless, the mean scores met the proficiency benchmark set by the department.
Since the scores associated with the Content Standard Observation Rubric are consistently high throughout all elements, it is possible that the high scores may indicate that evaluators are not critical enough for our candidates. Due to the findings and trends within this data cycle, 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 in May 2016. Professional development will continue that focuses on the evaluation of specific elements on the Content Standards Observation Rubric as further data is reported and evaluated.

2016-2017:
Data and analysis for the FEE and content standards are reported in 9.1.

2017-2018:
Analysis of Data: The benchmark was met. For Spring 2018, more than 80% of candidates scored at proficiency or higher on all ACEI standards.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: In 2018-2019, 100% of candidates will score at proficiency or higher on all ACEI standards.

Recommendation 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.
  100% of candidates will participate. Candidate and University Supervisor feedback will determine the effectiveness of the conferences. Change will be determined by the scores on the FEE.
- Faculty will facilitate field experience assignment where candidates evaluate host teacher using FEE rubric in an effort to better understand the evaluation process using this rubric.
  100% of candidates and host teachers will participate. Candidates' scores and feedback will be used to measure effectiveness. Host teachers' grading of candidates' teaching on the FEE will also be used to measure effectiveness.
- Faculty will host FEE workshop for candidates and cooperating teachers.
  Candidates and host teachers will indicate their understanding of the FEE from pre and post conference and document this growth of knowledge on quadrant chart. EPP faculty can then identify areas of need and further remediation.

2018-2019:
Analysis of Data: The benchmark was not met. For both fall 18 and spring 19, more than 80% of candidates scored at proficiency or higher on all ACEI standards. However, as indicated in the 17-18 plans for continuous improvement, the goal for 18-19 was for 100% of the candidates to score at proficiency or higher. There were two ACEI categories (3.0 and 4.0) in which 96% of the candidates scored at proficiency or above.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- Faculty and University Supervisors will continue to conduct pre and post conferences with all candidates to discuss better prepare candidates for the lesson being taught and then to reflect on the lesson taught. 100% of ST candidates will participate. Candidate and University Supervisor feedback will determine the effectiveness of the conferences. Change will be determined by the scores on the FEE.
- Faculty will begin using elements of the POP Cycle throughout the courses in the program in order to better prepare candidates for the student teaching experience, understand the components of the FEE, and become better prepared for their role as educators.
- Each semester ST candidates will participate in a session to better understand the expectations of the FEE, POP Cycle, and other elements of the student teaching experience. This will continue until the POP Cycle has been fully implemented throughout the coursework in the program.
- Candidates and host teachers will indicate their understanding of the FEE from pre and post conference and document this growth of knowledge on quadrant chart. EPP faculty can then identify areas of need and further remediation.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
Data from the single candidate indicate ACEI Standard 3.5 on the FEE had a range of 2.5 to 3.00 which yielded a mean of 2.75 with 50% proficiency, which is below benchmark. All other ACEI standards met the benchmark. The data compares to previous cycles apart from ACEI Standard 3.5 which was met in previous cycles. More instances of data are needed to interpret the downward score in the one area as a trend with significance.

During the 2020-2021 academic year, MAT candidates reviewed the FEE observation tool and the POP Cycle through a seminar presented by the Office of Student Teaching and Professional Education Services and supported by US PREP. Mentor teachers and university supervisors were provided information and opportunities to discuss the POP Cycle and FEE rubric during professional development on January 25, 2021.

Moving forward, at least one meeting with MAT Elementary faculty will include discussion of the FEE evaluation process and implementation. Beginning in the fall 2021 semester, the EPP will begin collecting student assessment data using the revised FEE which will be aligned to the CAEP Elementary standards.

9.3 Data FEE Domain 5

2016-2017:
Data for the FEE and content standards are reported in 9.1.

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).

MAT ELEM_FEE Domain 5_18-19
MAT ELEM_FEE Domain 5_19-20
MAT ELEM_FEE Domain 5_20-21
MAT_ELEM_FEE Domains 1-4

9.3.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:
The Content Standard Observation Rubric is an instrument designed to address candidate content knowledge during their student teaching experience, Education 683: MAT Clinical Experience. The items on the Content Standard Observation Rubric are aligned to the ACEI standards. The instrument addresses development, learning and motivation, instruction, assessment, and professionalism and is aligned with multiple ACEI components. The Content Standard Observation Rubric is a 4-point scale that includes explicit descriptors of the behaviors and actions in each of the following performance levels: Highly Effective, Effective: Proficient, Effective: Emerging, and Ineffective. This evaluation form mirrors the Louisiana COMPASS, the evaluation system for teachers and school leaders in Louisiana P-12 settings. Performance evaluation of student teaching candidates are conducted by the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor. A score of 3.00 or higher has been set as the proficiency benchmark by the department. Additionally, the department's target for student achievement is 80% passing.

Since each element on the Content Standard Observation Rubric has been aligned with an ACEI Standard, this artifact shows the average score for each element by semester and is categorized by ACEI Standards. This assessment includes two cycles of data from fall 2015 and spring 2016 semesters and was completed by 10 candidates. It must be further noted that the Content Standard Observation Rubric rounds up to the whole number based on the tenths' decimal. Therefore, the data indicates that 100% of candidates earned an average evaluation score of effective proficient or higher in each of the elements on the Content Standard Observation Rubric based on this rounding system.

The Content Standard Observation Rubric elements that aligned with the ACEI 5.0 Standards yielded the highest mean scores, 3.88 in fall 2015 and 3.71 in spring 2016. In both data cycles, 100% of candidates scored highly effective in both elements. Since the scores associated with the Content Standard Observation Rubric are consistently high throughout all elements, it is possible that the high scores may indicate that evaluators are not critical enough for our candidates. Due to the findings and trends within this data cycle, 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 in May 2016. Professional development will continue that focuses on the evaluation of specific elements on the Content Standards Observation Rubric as further data is reported and evaluated.

2016-2017:
Data and analysis for the FEE and content standards are reported in 9.1.

2017-2018:
Analysis of Data: The benchmark was met. For spring 2018, 100% of the candidates scored at proficiency or above on all ACEI standards.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The goal for 2018-2019 is for 100% of the candidates to score at proficiency or above on all domain 5 components.
Recommendation 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.
  100% of candidates will participate. Candidate and University Supervisor feedback will determine the effectiveness of the conferences. Change will be determined by the scores on the FEE.

- Faculty will facilitate field experience assignment where candidates evaluate host teacher using FEE rubric in an effort to better understand the evaluation process using this rubric.
  100% of candidates and host teachers will participate. Candidates' scores and feedback will be used to measure effectiveness. Host teachers' grading of candidates' teaching on the FEE will also be used to measure effectiveness.
- Faculty will host FEE workshop for candidates and cooperating teachers.
  Candidates and host teachers will indicate their understanding of the FEE from pre and post conference and document this growth of knowledge on quadrant chart. EPP faculty can then identify areas of need and further remediation.

2018-2019:
Analysis of Data: The benchmark was met for Domain 5. All candidates scored at or above the 3.00 proficiency level on each of the indicators graded in the domain.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The goal for 2019-2020 is to have a minimum of 75% of the candidates scored on the elements of Domain 5 and to have 85% of the candidates meet the proficiency level on each of the elements.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- Professors are working on the elementary domain elements for each of the content areas. These updated domain elements will create a more detailed understanding of the content knowledge of the candidates.
- All student teaching supervisors will be asked to complete the domain 5 as a standard part of the FEE instrument.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
The benchmark was not met in 3 sub-components of the Domain 5 elements. MAT Elementary faculty will work with the BS Elementary faculty to revise the domain 5 elements to align with the current content standards. This revision will keep the program aligned to current standards for CAEP accreditation. During the 2020-2021 academic year, DEP hosted informational meetings for faculty and university supervisors to explain FEE rubric elements and evaluation expectations (August 13, 2020 and January 25, 2021). MAT Elementary faculty will revise Domain 5 elements on the FEE for alignment with current standards during the summer 2021 semester and implement the revised versions effective fall 2021.

9.4 Data FEE Domain 1-4, Content Areas

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).

MAT ELEM FEE_Domains 1-4 By Content_18-19
MAT ELEM FEE_Domains 1-4 By Content_19-20
MAT ELEM FEE_Domains 1-4 By Content_20-21
MAT_ELEM_FEE by Subject_17-18

9.4.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: The benchmark was not met. The following elements were below benchmark:

Spring 2018 Science:
- Element 1.1.3 was 2.50.
- Element 1.1.4 was 2.75.
- Element 3.3.2 was 2.75.
- Element 3.3.4 was 2.50.

Spring 2018 Social Studies:
- Element 1.1.1 was 2.75.
- Element 1.1.2 was 2.75.
- Element 1.1.3 was 2.75.
- Element 1.1.4 was 2.50.
- Element 2.2.2 was 2.75.
- Element 3.1.2 was 2.50.
- Element 3.1.3 was 2.25.
- Element 3.2.2 was 2.75.
- Element 3.3.1 was 2.50.
- Element 3.3.4 was 2.75.

Based on the available data, Spring 2018 candidates struggled with the following FEE Elements in both Science and Social Studies courses: 1.1.3 Balance, 1.1.4 Suitability for Diverse Learners, 3.3.4 Student Self-Assessment and Monitoring of Progress.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The goal for 2018-2019 is that 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.

Recommendation 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 will indicate their understanding of the FEE from pre and post conference and document this growth of knowledge on quadrant chart. EPP faculty and University Supervisors can then identify areas of need and further remediation.
- Faculty will facilitate field experience assignment where candidates evaluate host teacher using FEE rubric in an effort to better understand the evaluation process using this rubric.
  100% of candidates and host teachers will participate. Candidates' scores and feedback will be used to measure effectiveness. Host teachers' grading of candidates' teaching on the FEE will also be used to measure effectiveness.
- Faculty will host FEE workshop for candidates and cooperating teachers.
  Candidates and host teachers will indicate their understanding of the FEE from pre and post conference and document this growth of knowledge on quadrant chart. EPP faculty can then identify areas of need and further remediation.

2018-2019:
Analysis of Data: The benchmark was not met. The following components had scores that fell below benchmark:
Spring 2019 ELA: 3.2.2 (0% scored above benchmark, n=1);
Spring 2019 Science: 3.3.4 (0% scored above benchmark, n=2)

Recommendations for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:
- Via will be implemented with the new programs in order to better track data and have all data reported in the same format each semester. This will increase the number of data points reported and will show a truer picture of the candidate experiences in the field.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
The benchmark was met for data collected in the 2020-2021 academic year. Due to COVID-19 restrictions and damage from hurricanes, candidates were not able to perform the traditional field experiences. Therefore, data was not collected in all courses for a true trend to be established. Moving forward, data will be collected from all courses identified to collect these assessments to ensure consistency and comprehensive evaluation of candidate performance on Domains 1-4. Data will be collected using Via in EDUC 642 (ELA), EDUC 621 (Math), and EDUC 694 (Science/Social Studies). DEP faculty, university supervisors, and mentor teachers will attend at least one norming session during the 2021-022 academic year regarding the FEE rubric.

9.5 Data Data (FEE Domain 1-4, Content Area, ACEI)

Spring 2018:

ACEI	Science			Social Studies			ELA			Mathematics		
	Mean	Range	% Prof.	Mean	Range	% Prof.	Mean	Range	% Prof.	Mean	Range	% Prof.
1.0	2.75	2.00-4.00	63%	2.75	2.00-4.00	63%						
3.1	3.25	3.00-4.00	100%	3.50	3.00-4.00	100%						
3.3	3.00	3.00	100%	3.25	3.00-4.00	100%						
3.4	3.40	2.00-4.00	93%	3.00	2.00-4.00	71%						
3.5	3.40	3.00-4.00	100%	2.40	2.00-3.00	38%						
4.0	2.90	1.00-4.00	81%	2.75	2.00-3.00	75%						
5.1	4.00	4.00	100%	4.00	4.00	100%						

Spring 2019:

ACEI	Science			Social Studies			ELA			Mathematics		
	Mean	Range	% Prof.	Mean	Range	% Prof.	Mean	Range	% Prof.	Mean	Range	% Prof.
1.0	4.00	4.00	100%				4.00	4.00	100%			
3.1	3.00	3.00	100%				3.50	3.00-4.00	100%			
3.3	4.00	4.00	100%				4.00	4.00	100%			
3.4	3.50	3.00-4.00	100%				3.75	3.00-4.00	100%			
3.5	4.00	4.00	100%				4.00	4.00	100%			
4.0	4.00	4.00	100%				4.00	4.00	100%			
5.1	4.00	4.00	100%				4.00	4.00	100%			

Fall 2019:

ACEI	Science				Social Studies				ELA				Mathematics			
	N	Mean	Range	% Prof.	N	Mean	Range	% Prof.	N	Mean	Range	% Prof.	N	Mean	Range	% Prof.
1.0	4	3.00	2.00-4.00	75%					4	3.75	3.00-4.00	100%	2	4.00	4.00	100%
			2.00-								3.00-				3.00-	

3.1	14	3.00	4.00	79%					14	3.93	4.00	100%	7	3.71	4.00	100%
3.3	2	4.00	4.00	100%					2	4.00	4.00	100%	1	3.00	3.00	100%
3.4	2	3.50	3.00-4.00	100%					2	3.50	3.00-4.00	100%	1	3.00	3.00	100%
3.5	4	3.00	2.00-4.00	75%					4	4.00	4.00	100%	2	3.00	3.00	100%
4.0	8	3.25	2.00-4.00	75%					8	3.88	3.00-4.00	100%	4	3.25	3.00-4.00	100%
5.1	4	4.00	4.00	100%					4	4.00	4.00	100%	2	4.00	4.00	100%

Spring 2020:

ACEI	Science				Social Studies				ELA				Mathematics			
	N	Mean	Range	% Prof.	N	Mean	Range	% Prof.	N	Mean	Range	% Prof.	N	Mean	Range	% Prof.
1.0	6	3.83	3.00-4.00	100%					8	3.38	3.00-4.00	100%	6	4.00	4.00	100%
3.1	21	3.38	2.00-4.00	86%					28	3.46	3.00-4.00	100%	21	3.33	3.00-4.00	100%
3.3	3	4.00	4.00	100%					4	3.25	2.00-4.00	75%	3	3.33	3.00-4.00	100%
3.4	3	3.67	3.00-4.00	100%					4	3.25	3.00-4.00	100%	3	3.33	3.00-4.00	100%
3.5	6	3.00	2.00-4.00	83%					8	2.86	2.00-4.00	63%	6	3.00	3.00	100%
4.0	12	3.33	2.00-4.00	83%					16	3.50	2.00-4.00	94%	12	3.42	2.00-4.00	92%
5.1	6	4.00	4.00	100%					8	3.75	3.00-4.00	100%	6	3.67	3.00-4.00	100%

Fall 2020: Data was not reported for Science, Social Studies or Math

ACEI	Science				Social Studies				ELA				Mathematics			
	N	Mean	Range	% Prof.	N	Mean	Range	% Prof.	N	Mean	Range	% Prof.	N	Mean	Range	% Prof.
1.0									1	4.00	4.00	100%				
3.1									1	3.00	3.00	100%				
3.3									1	3.00	3.00	100%				
3.4									1	3.29	3.00-4.00	100%				
3.5									1	3.00	3.00	100%				
4.0									1	3.33	3.00-4.00	100%				
5.1									1	4.00	4.00	100%				

Spring 2021: No completers

ACEI	Science				Social Studies				ELA				Mathematics			
	N	Mean	Range	% Prof.	N	Mean	Range	% Prof.	N	Mean	Range	% Prof.	N	Mean	Range	% Prof.
1.0																
3.1																

3.3																
3.4																
3.5																
4.0																
5.1																

9.5.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018
Analysis of Data: The benchmark was not met. The mean score was below benchmark on the following standards:

For Spring 2018 Science:
- ACEI Standard 1.0 was 2.75.
- ACEI Standard 4.0 was 2.90.

For Spring 2018 Social Studies:
- ACEI Standard 1.0 was 2.75.
- ACEI Standard 3.5 was 2.40.
- ACEI Standard 4.0 was 2.75.

Based on the available data, ACEI Standards 1.0 and 4.0 were common areas of struggle for the candidates.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The goal set for 2018-2019 is that candidates will score 3.00 or higher on each ACEI standard assessed in the FEE rubric for each content area.

Recommendation 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 will indicate their understanding of the FEE from pre and post conference and document this growth of knowledge on quadrant chart. EPP faculty and University Supervisors can then identify areas of need and further remediation.
- Faculty will facilitate field experience assignment where candidates evaluate host teacher using FEE rubric in an effort to better understand the evaluation process using this rubric.
  100% of candidates and host teachers will participate. Candidates' scores and feedback will be used to measure effectiveness. Host teachers' grading of candidates' teaching on the FEE will also be used to measure effectiveness.
- Faculty will host FEE workshop for candidates and cooperating teachers.
  Candidates and host teachers will indicate their understanding of the FEE from pre and post conference and document this growth of knowledge on quadrant chart. EPP faculty can then identify areas of need and further remediation.

2018-2019:
Analysis of Data: For all ACEI components evaluated in the FEE rubric in the content areas, the benchmark was met.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: Faculty will be held accountable for reporting all data that is needed for both the assessment plans and annual reporting measures. The rainbow chart with necessary data to report will be distributed to all faculty and meetings to discuss what data needs to be reported will be held several times throughout the academic year.

Recommendations for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:
- Via will be implemented with the new programs in order to better track data and have all data reported in the same format each semester. This will increase the number of data points reported and will show a truer picture of the candidate experiences in the field.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
The benchmark was met for the data reported for the one completer although the scores were below those of previous cycles. The FEE will be aligned to CAEP Elementary Standards during the summer 2021 semester and implemented in the fall 2021. Via will be implemented to collect and track data beginning in the fall 2021 semester. Trends will be identified as new sets of data are collected with the CAEP alignment.

10 Assessment and Benchmark Lesson Planning

Assessment: Lesson Plan
The Lesson Plan template is introduced and developed throughout the Portal II coursework; however, this data was collected in Education 683: MAT Clinical Experience, which occurs at the end of the MAT program. The Lesson Plan is a written artifact consisting of a thorough one day lesson. The elements within the Lesson Plan and Lesson Plan Rubric that aligned with ACEI 1.0 Standard include: 1) student outcomes, 2) procedures, 3) lesson “hook”, 4) modeled, guided, collaborative and independent practice, 5) technology, 6) relevance and rationale, 7) exploration, extension, and supplemental, and 8) differentiation. The elements within the Lesson Plan and Lesson Plan Rubric that aligned with ACEI 4.0 Standard include: pre-planned (SEED) questions and formative/ summative assessment. The Lesson Plan is graded using the Lesson Plan Rubric to ensure that each component is addressed. Points are assigned to each component using descriptors and a final score is then tabulated. A score of 3 is considered proficient on this assessment. Additionally, the department’s target for student achievement is 80% passing.
Knowledge:
Learner Development: InTASC Standard 1 - The candidate determines how learners grow and develop, recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas.
Learning Differences: InTASC Standard 2 - The candidate identifies individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards.
Content Knowledge: InTASC Standard 4 - The candidate applies the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches.
Application of Content: InTASC Standard 5 - The candidate decides how to connect concepts and use differing perspectives to engage learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local and global issues.
Planning for Instruction: InTASC Standard 7 - The candidate draws upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and the community context to plan instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals.
Skills:
Instructional Strategies: InTASC Standard 8 - The candidate implements a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways.
CAEP Standard 1
ACEI Standard alignment:
1.0 Development, Learning, and Motivation: This ACEI standard aligns with the Lesson Plan instrument elements: Student outcomes; Procedures; Lesson “Hook”; Technology; Relevance and Rationale; Exploration, Extension, and Supplemental; as well as Differentiation.

- 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

2.1 Reading, Writing, and Oral Language: This ACEI standard aligns with the overall application of candidate knowledge to the process of writing a lesson plan which covers Louisiana Student Standards in English Language Arts.
2.2 Science: This ACEI standard aligns with the overall application of candidate knowledge to the process of writing a lesson plan which covers Louisiana Student Standards in Science.
2.3 Mathematics: This ACEI standard aligns with the overall application of candidate knowledge to the process of writing a lesson plan which covers Louisiana Student Standards in Mathematics.
2.4 Social Studies: This ACEI standard aligns with the overall application of candidate knowledge to the process of writing a lesson plan which covers Louisiana Student Standards in Social Studies.
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
- 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.

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.

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

ACEI Standard 1.0		Fall 2015	Spring 2016
Standard			
Student Outcomes	Number	4	6
	Mean	2.25	2.33
	Range	1.00-4.00	2.00-3.00
	% Proficient or Higher	25%	33%
Procedures	Number	4	6
	Mean	3.25	3.00
	Range	2.00-4.00	2.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	75%	50%
Lesson "Hook"	Number	4	6
	Mean	2.50	2.50
	Range	2.00-4.00	2.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	25%	33%
Modeled, Guided, Collab. & Ind. Practice	Number	4	6
	Mean	2.50	3.00
	Range	2.00-4.00	2.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	25%	67%
Technology	Number	4	6
	Mean	2.50	3.50
	Range	2.00-4.00	2.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	25%	83%
Relevance & Rationale	Number	4	6
	Mean	2.25	2.17
	Range	1.00-4.00	1.00-3.00
	% Proficient or Higher	25%	33%
Exploration, Extension, Supplemental	Number	4	6
	Mean	2.25	1.67
	Range	1.00-4.00	1.00-3.00
	% Proficient or Higher	25%	17%

Differentiation	Number	4	6
	Mean	2.00	2.83
	Range	1.00-4.00	2.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	25%	50%
Mean Score for ACEI 1.0 Standard		2.44	2.63

ACEI Standard 4.0		Fall 2015	Spring 2016
Standard			
Pre-Planned (Seed) Questions	Number	4	6
	Mean	3.50	2.50
	Range	3.00-4.00	1.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	100%	50%
Formative/Summative Assessment	Number	4	6
	Mean	2.50	3.00
	Range	2.00-3.00	2.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	50%	83%
Mean Score for ACEI 1.0 Standard		2.79	2.75

Data from student teaching/internships and includes all content areas:

Rubric Element	ACEI Standard	InTASC Standard		Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017
Student Outcomes	1.0	4	Number	6	1	7
			Mean	3.17	3.00	2.86
			Range	2.00-4.00	3.00	2.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher	83%	100%	57%
Procedures	1.0	3	Number	6	1	7
			Mean	3.33	2.00	3.43
			Range	3.00-4.00	2.00	3.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher	100%	0%	100%
Lesson "Hook"	1.0	8	Number	6	1	7
			Mean	3.00	2.00	3.00
			Range	3.00	2.00	2.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher	100%	0%	86%
			Number	6	1	7
			Mean	3.17	2.00	2.86

Pre-Planned (Seed) Questions	4.0	8	Range	3.00-4.00	2.00	1.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher	100%	0%	86%
Modeled, Guided, Collab. & Ind. Practice	1.0	7	Number	6	1	7
			Mean	3.33	3.00	3.29
			Range	3.00-4.00	3.00	2.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%	86%
Technology	1.0	5	Number	6	1	7
			Mean	3.17	3.00	3.29
			Range	3.00-4.00	3.00	2.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%	71%
Formative/Summative Assessment	4.0	6	Number	6	1	7
			Mean	2.83	3.00	3.86
			Range	2.00-4.00	3.00	3.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher	67%	100%	100%
Relevance & Rationale	1.0	2	Number	6	1	7
			Mean	3.00	2.00	3.00
			Range	3.00	2.00	1.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher	100%	0%	71%
Exploration, Extension, Supplemental	1.0	1	Number	6	1	7
			Mean	2.00	2.00	2.71
			Range	2.00	2.00	1.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher	0%	0%	71%
Differentiation	1.0	7	Number	6	1	7
			Mean	2.00	3.00	2.71
			Range	2.00	3.00	2.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher	0%	100%	57%

ACEI Standard 2: Curriculum Standards				Element 2.1: Reading, Writing, Oral Language		Element 2.2: Mathematics		Element 2.3: Science		Element 2.4: Social Studies	
Rubric Element	ACEI Standard	InTASC Standard		Fall 2017	Spring 2018	Fall 2017	Spring 2018	Fall 2017	Spring 2018	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
			Number	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4

Student Outcomes	1.0	4	Mean						2.75		2.75
			Range						2.00-4.00		2.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher						50%		50%
Procedures	1.0	3	Number	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4
			Mean						3.75		3.75
			Range						3.00-4.00		3.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher						100%		100%
Lesson "Hook"	1.0	8	Number	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4
			Mean						2.50		2.50
			Range						2.00-3.00		2.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher						50%		25%
Pre-Planned (Seed) Questions	4.0	8	Number	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4
			Mean						3.00		2.75
			Range						3.00		2.00-3.00
			% Proficient or Higher						100%		75%
Modeled, Guided, Collab. & Ind. Practice	1.0	7	Number	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4
			Mean						3.00		3.00
			Range						3.00		3.00
			% Proficient or Higher						100%		100%
Technology	1.0	5	Number	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4
			Mean						1.75		3.00
			Range						1.00-2.00		3.00
			% Proficient or Higher						0%		100%
Formative /Summative Assessment	4.0	6	Number	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4
			Mean						2.50		2.50
			Range						2.00-3.00		2.00-3.00
			% Proficient or Higher						50%		50%
			Number	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4
			Mean						1.75		2.25

Relevance & Rationale	1.0	2	Range						1.00-2.00		1.00-3.00
			% Proficient or Higher						0%		50%
Exploration, Extension, Supplemental	1.0	1	Number	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4
			Mean						2.00		2.00
			Range						1.00-3.00		1.00-3.00
			% Proficient or Higher						25%		25%
Accomodations/ Differentiation	1.0	7	Number	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4
			Mean						2.25		2.50
			Range						2.00-3.00		2.00-3.00
			% Proficient or Higher						25%		50%

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	1	5	0	0	1	0	0	6
			Mean	1.00	2.40			3.00			3.33
			Range	1	1-3			3			3-4
			% Proficient or Higher	0%	60%			100%			100%
Procedures	1.0	3	Number	1	5			1	0	0	6
			Mean	2.00	3.20			4.00			3.33
			Range	2	3-4			4			3-4
			% Proficient or Higher	0%	100%			100%			100%
Lesson "Hook"	1.0	8	Number	1	5			1	0	0	6
			Mean	4.00	2.80			3.00			2.67
			Range	4	2-4			3			2-4
			% Proficient or Higher	100%	60%			100%			33%
Pre-Planned (Seed) Questions	4.0	8	Number	1	5			1	0	0	6
			Mean	3.00	3.20			3.00			3.17
			Range	3	1-4			3			3-4
			% Proficient	100%	80%			100%			100%

			or Higher								
Modeled, Guided, Collab. & Ind. Practice	1.0	7	Number	1	5			1	0	0	4
			Mean	2.00	3.00			3.00			3.00
			Range	2	2-4			3			3
			% Proficient or Higher	0%	80%			100%			100%
Technology	1.0	5	Number	1	5			1	0	0	4
			Mean	2.00	2.40			2.00			2.50
			Range	2	1-3			2			2-3
			% Proficient or Higher	0%	60%			0%			50%
Formative /Summative Assessment	4.0	6	Number	1	5			1	0	0	6
			Mean	2.00	2.60			2.00			2.33
			Range	2	2-3			2			1-3
			% Proficient or Higher	0%	60%			0%			50%
Relevance & Rationale	1.0	2	Number	1	5			1	0	0	6
			Mean	3.00	2.60			3.00			2.67
			Range	3	1-4			3			2-4
			% Proficient or Higher1	100%	60%			100%			50%
Exploration, Extension, Supplemental	1.0	1	Number	1	5			1	0	0	4
			Mean	2.00	2.20			2.00			2.00
			Range	2	1-3			2			1-3
			% Proficient or Higher	0%	40%			0%			25%
Accommodations/ Differentiation	1.0	7	Number	1	5			1	0	0	4
			Mean	2.00	2.40			2.00			1.75
			Range	2	2-3			2			1-2
			% Proficient or Higher	0%	40%			0%			0%

2019-2020:
Data table attached.

2020-2021:
Data table is attached.

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

MAT_ELEM_Lesson Plan Data_19-20
MAT_ELEM_Lesson Plan Data_20-21

10.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:

Since each element on the Lesson Plan Rubric has been aligned with an ACEI Standard, this artifact shows the average score for each element by semester and is categorized by ACEI Standards. This assessment includes two cycles of data from fall 2015 and spring 2016 semesters and was completed by 10 candidates. The data indicates that two of the mean scores, procedures and pre-planned (SEED) questions, within the fall 2015 cycle of data met the benchmark for proficiency and four elements, procedures, modeled, guided, collaborative and independent practice, as well as technology and formative/summative assessment, met the department's benchmark for proficiency with a score of 3 or higher. For both cycles of data, the elements on the Lesson Plan Rubric that align with ACEI Standard 1.0 yielded a mean score of 2.44 in fall 2015 and 2.63 in spring 2016. Within the elements on the Lesson Plan Rubric, data indicated that the element differentiation was the weakest element yielding a mean score of 2.00 for the fall semester and that exploration, extension, and supplemental yielded the lowest mean at 1.67 in the spring. Moreover, this element raised additional concerns since the mean score for the element fell from fall to spring. Exploration, extension, and supplemental went from a mean score of 2.25 in the fall to 1.67 in the spring semester. The element relevance and rationale that aligns with the ACEI Standard 1.0 also showed a decrease in mean scores from 2.25 in the fall to 2.17 in the spring. Additionally, in both cycles of data, only one component, Technology, exceeded the department's target for student achievement at 83%.

Since identifying these pattern trends, the department has added a more thorough lesson planning component Education 647: Educational Foundations, where lesson planning is first introduced. This course will begin to further clarify, instruct, and assess these lesson plan components early on in the candidates' coursework. With clarification in the introductory course, candidates should be more successful applying content and methodology as they progress throughout the sequential coursework in their degree plan. Other patterns and trends that were identified under the ACEI Standard 1.0 alignment to Lesson Plan Rubric elements showed an increase in all other elements' mean scores from the fall to spring semesters. Even though one of these mean scores remain below the proficiency benchmark, the department will continue to monitor for student progress in these areas and appropriate changes will be made based on future findings. Elements that aligned with ACEI Standard 4.0 had mean scores of 2.75 -2.79 for the fall and spring semesters. Whereas the formative/ summative assessment element on the Lesson Plan Rubric reached the proficiency benchmark by spring 2016, the element pre-planned (SEED) questions indicated a decrease in student outcome. Additionally, both components aligned with ACEI 4.0 had an inconsistent student achievement levels or passing percentage.

Again, since identifying this pattern trend, the department has added a more thorough lesson planning component Education 647: Educational Foundations, where lesson planning is first introduced. This course will begin to further clarify, instruct, and assess these lesson plan components early on in the candidates' coursework. With clarification in the introductory course, candidates should be more successful applying content and methodology as they progress throughout the sequential coursework in their degree plan. Overall, it has been determined that a possibility for the initial low scores yielded within these two cycles of data is due to the reconfiguration of the Lesson Plan Rubric. The Lesson Plan Rubric was revised to reflect the expectations and rigor found in the Field Experience Evaluation Rubric that is also aligned with the state observation evaluation Danielson rubric. If the data continues to yield scores that are below the proficiency benchmark, more training will be provided to faculty on the instruction and assessment of the Lesson Plan and rubric. Additionally, professional development will begin that focuses on the specific elements highlighted.

2016-2017:
Data was collected on MAT elementary candidates ability to write lesson plans within their student teaching/internship semesters for the 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 delineation of lesson plan writing by MAT elementary candidate for each of the content areas (ACEI 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, and 2.4 which are required). Lesson plans were gathered by candidate for content areas

taken from the middle coursework of the program. From this point forward within our program progression, specific courses have been identified to assign, score, and collect the data so that future graduates will have all required data. Lesson Plan data from these middle courses has been disaggregated by content and then aggregated as one mean score to help with analysis and interpretation.

When examining student teaching/internship lesson plan data, two elements of the rubric were noted as meeting the benchmark of 3.00 for all three semesters: Modeled, Guided, Collaborative, and Individual Practice with mean scores of 3.33, 3.00, and 3.29 respectively; Technology with mean scores of 3.17, 3.0, and 3.29 respectively. One element of the rubric, Exploration, Extension, Supplemental, did not meet benchmark, score of 3.00, for any of the three iterations of data with mean scores of 2.0, 2.0, and 2.71 respectively. When examining this data by individual candidate, the EPP discovered the pattern that although candidates were planning for early finishers, it was only one assigned activity instead of a choice of activities as identified by rubric description for scoring Effective: Proficient, 3.00.

Further disaggregation of lesson plan data by specific content area for courses within the program progression found that for Procedures; Modeled, Guided, Collaborative, and Independent Practice; Technology; and Exploration, Extension, and Supplemental the mean scores for both Fall 2016 and Spring 2017 cohorts were above a 3.00. Upon closer examination the individual ACEI standard content areas for these four elements, it was discovered that the following cohorts met the benchmark of 3.00 or higher on the following elements of the rubric:
Procedures: Fall 2016 for ACEI 2.1 Reading, Writing, and Oral Language and ACEI 2.3 Mathematics; Spring 2017 for ACEI 2.1 Reading, Writing, and Oral Language, ACEI 2.2 Science, ACEI Mathematics, ACEI 2.4 Social Studies.
Modeled, Guided, Collaborative, and Independent Practice: Fall 2016 for ACEI 2.1 Reading, Writing, and Oral Language and ACEI 2.3 Mathematics; Spring 2017 for ACEI 2.1 Reading, Writing, and Oral Language, ACEI 2.2 Science, ACEI Mathematics, ACEI 2.4 Social Studies.
Technology: Fall 2016 for ACEI 2.1 Reading, Writing, and Oral Language and ACEI 2.3 Mathematics; Spring 2017 for ACEI 2.1 Reading, Writing, and Oral Language, ACEI Mathematics, ACEI 2.4 Social Studies.
Exploration, Extension, and Supplemental: Fall 2016 for ACEI 2.3 Mathematics; Spring 2017 for ACEI 2.1 Reading, Writing, and Oral Language, ACEI 2.2 Science, ACEI 2.4 Social Studies.

When examining MAT elementary candidate ability to lesson plan by specific content area for courses within the program progression, the lowest mean score was found within the lesson plan element of Differentiation with a mean score of 2.00 for Fall 2016 and 2.50 for Spring 2016 cohorts. Within ACEI standards, the Fall 2016 cohort had a mean score of 2.00 for Differentiation within lesson plans covering ACEI 2.1 Reading, Writing, and Oral Language as well as ACEI 2.3 Mathematics. Within ACEI standards, the Fall 2017 cohort had a mean score of 2.00 for Differentiation within lesson plans covering ACEI 2.1 Reading, Writing, and Oral Language as well as ACEI 2.3 Mathematics and a mean score of 1.0 within lesson plans covering ACEI 2.2 Science.

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.

Future program decisions:
A scope and sequence has been created for the MAT ELEM program that now includes creating lesson plans for each core content area with feedback using the lesson planning rubric. With more practice and better feedback, future candidates should score higher across all elements of the rubric.

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

The following areas did not meet benchmark for the science lesson plan in Spring 2018:

- Student Outcomes was 50%
- Lesson Hook was 50%
- Technology was 0%
- Relevance & Rationale was 0%
- Exploration, Extension, & Supplemental was 25%
- Accommodations & Differentiation was 25%

The following areas did not meet the benchmark for the social studies lesson plan in Spring 2018:

- Student Outcomes was 50%
- Lesson Hook was 25%
- Pre-Planned SEED Questions was 75%
- Formative, Summative Assessment was 50%
- Relevance & Rationale was 50%
- Exploration, Extension, & Supplemental was 25%
- Accommodations & Differentiation was 50%

Based on the available data, candidates seemed to struggle in the following lesson planning elements for both Science and Social Studies for Spring 2018: Student Outcomes; Lesson Hook; Relevance & Rationale; Exploration, Extension, & Supplemental; Accommodations & Differentiations.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: In 2018-2019, at least 80% of 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.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- Faculty will model and explain each element of the lesson plan to ensure candidates' understanding and effective implementation.
- Faculty teaching MAT courses with lesson plan requirements (EDUC 503, 523, 621, 642, 643, 647, 694, 683/685) will provide instruction in the appropriate implementation of the lesson plan in the classroom.
- Faculty will facilitate creation of lesson plan writing assignment with candidates' assigned host teacher to further candidates' understanding and their ability to write lesson plans.
- The candidates' feedback and scores on the lesson plan rubric will be used to measure the effectiveness of this recommendation.
- Faculty will explore the creation of a lesson plan course in program redesign. The creation of the course will be the measure to determine the effectiveness of the recommendation.

2018-2019:
The benchmark was not met. The benchmark was to have minimum of 80% of the candidates score at the Proficiency level (3) or higher in each category assessed on the lesson plan for each of the four content areas. The benchmark was not met in the following areas:
Element 2.1 Reading:
Fall 18- (n=1) : Student Outcomes (0%), Procedures (0%), Modeled, Guided, Collaborative and Individual Practice (0%), Technology (0%), Formative/Summative Assessment (0%), Exploration, Extension, and Supplemental (0%), and Accommodations/Differentiation (0%).
Spring 19 (n=5): Student Outcomes (60%), Lesson Hook (60%), Technology (60%), Relevance and Rationale (60%), Exploration, Extension, and Supplemental (40%), and Accommodations/Differentiation (40%).
Element 2.2 Mathematics:
Data for mathematics lesson plans was not reported for the MAT ELEM candidates.
Element 2.3 Science:
Fall 2018 (n=1): Technology (0%), Formative/Summative Assessment (0%), Exploration, Extension, Supplemental (0%), Accommodations/Differentiation (0%)

Element 2.4 Social Studies:
Spring 2019 (n=6): Lesson Hook (33%), Technology (50%), Formative/Summative Assessment (50%), Relevance and Rationale (50%), Exploration, Extension, Supplemental (25%), Accommodations/Differentiation (0%)

Plan for Continuous Improvement: In 2019-2020, at least 80% of 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.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- EDUC 617: Planning and Instruction in the Content Area will be added to the MAT Program as a course. Within this course, candidates will develop an understanding of the lesson plan components which should lead to improvement in the lesson plan requirements in later coursework.
- The candidates' feedback and scores on the lesson plan rubric will be used to measure the effectiveness of this recommendation.
- All four lesson plan content areas will be reported for each candidate moving forward.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
Lesson plan data was collected in EDUC 642 (ELA) and EDUC 621 (Math). Data was not reported for EDUC 694 (Science/Social Studies). Due to COVID-19 and hurricanes, some assessments had to be modified and therefore, comparable data may not be available. The benchmark was met as the candidate scored at the Proficiency level (3.00) or higher in each category assessed on the lesson plan in ELA and Mathematics. In the upcoming academic year, the lesson plan assessment will be administered and data reported in each content area (ELA, Math, Science/Social Studies). Trends will be established and norming the tool will continue with additional use of the lesson plan tool.

11 Assessment and Benchmark Case Study

Assessment: Case Study

Benchmark: Candidates will score a 3.00 or higher on each element of the Case Study Assessment.

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]

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.

3.3 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.

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 Case Study

Data was not reported for the Case Study for several semesters. Please consider revising the assessment, changing the assessment, or ensuring submission of data moving forward.

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=5
Analysis of Pre- and Post-test Data	4.0	6	Mean	—	—	—	—	—	3.80
			Range	—	—	—	—	—	3.00-4.00
			% proficient or higher	—	—	—	—	—	100%
			Mean	—	—	—	—	—	2.80

Fluency	3.1	4	Range	—	—	—	—	—	2.00-4.00
			% proficient or higher	—	—	—	—	—	60%
Instructional Strategies	3.1	7	Mean	—	—	—	—	—	3.20
			Range	—	—	—	—	—	2.00-4.00
			% proficient or higher	—	—	—	—	—	80%
Response to Intervention	1.0	6	Mean	—	—	—	—	—	3.40
			Range	—	—	—	—	—	3.00-4.00
			% proficient or higher	—	—	—	—	—	100%

Criteria	ACEI Standard	InTASC Standard		Fall 2018 N=0	Spring 2019 N=0	Fall 2019 N=0	Spring 2020 N=0	Fall 2020 N=0	Spring 2021 N=0
Analysis of Pre- and Post-test Data	4.0	6	Mean	—	—	—	—	—	—
			Range	—	—	—	—	—	—
			% proficient or higher	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fluency	3.1	4	Mean	—	—	—	—	—	—
			Range	—	—	—	—	—	—
			% proficient or higher	—	—	—	—	—	—
Instructional Strategies	3.1	7	Mean	—	—	—	—	—	—
			Range	—	—	—	—	—	—
			% proficient or higher	—	—	—	—	—	—
Response to Intervention	1.0	6	Mean	—	—	—	—	—	—
			Range	—	—	—	—	—	—
			% proficient or higher	—	—	—	—	—	—

11.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:
Most areas exceed the benchmark. Work to develop students in areas that did not meet the benchmark.

2016-2017:
Analysis of Data:

Case Study data was collected on MAT elementary candidates for the Spring 2016, Fall 2016, and Spring 2017 semesters. Data collected from these three semesters indicated that the cohort of candidates' final mean scores for Analysis of Pre-test and Post-test Data as well as Instructional Strategies were above the benchmark of 3.00 for all three semesters. For the Spring 2016 cohort, both Fluency and Response to Intervention elements of the rubric had means scores for the first iteration of data below benchmark at 2.60 and 2.20, respectively; however, the last two semesters of data collected on these two elements show growth in candidates knowledge with scores above benchmark, Fluency at 4.00 (n=1) and 3.44 (n=7); Response to Intervention at 4.00 (n=1) and 3.71 (n=7).
Also, when further examining the data chart across all three cohorts of candidates, it was noted that the three components had range scores that fell below benchmark with at least one candidate scoring a 2.00, Effective: Emerging. No candidates scored a 1.00, Ineffective, on any component of the rubric over the span of the three semesters.

Program decisions:
In order to continue MAT ELEM success within this assessment, during Summer of 2017, EDUC 654 was rewritten to include portions of The Assessment Plan found within the TCWS so that students had an opportunity to learn and implement with feedback this assessment before it is taken as an evaluation.

2017-2018:
Analysis of Data: The benchmark was not met. The following areas were below benchmark:

- Spring 2018, Fluency mean was 2.80

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The goal for 2018-2019 is for candidates to score 3.00 or higher on each element of the Case Study Assessment.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- Faculty will review assignment rubric to ensure alignment with assignment goals and outcomes and revise if necessary.
- Course instructor sees potential issues with misalignment of assessment instructions and rubric, thus necessitating the change. Data from Case Study will be collected and analyzed for program and curricular improvement.

2018-2019:
Data for the 18-19 completers was not reported. The goal for 19-20 will remain the same, candidates will score 3.00 or higher on each element of the Case Study Assessment.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- Faculty will report data on the candidates into the data collection system.
- Faculty will continue to revise the assignment rubric to ensure alignment with assignment goals and outcomes.

2019-2020:
Data for the 2019-2020 completers was not reported. Due to change in faculty, the data could not be gathered for reporting. The benchmark will remain the same and data will be collected and reported for current candidates in the program.
Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- Faculty will report data on the candidates into the data collection system.
- Faculty will review and revise the current assessment to ensure alignment with assignment goals and outcomes.

2020-2021:
Data was not reported for the 2020-2021 completer on the case study. Due to revisions in program and changes in faculty, this assessment will be revisited and either revised or replaced by another assessment that will better inform learning. The new/revised assessment will go into effect with the next course offering in summer 2022.

12 Assessment and Benchmark Teacher Candidate Work Sample

This documentation is a statistical analysis of student learning through pre- and post-assessments. During their Education 683: Clinical Experience, candidates must prepare a unit of instruction, administer a pre/post assessment on that unit of instruction, and analyze the student performance results. The P-12 Student Learning Analysis provides evidence that addresses ACEI Standards.
Skills:
Assessment: InTASC Standard 6 - The candidate uses multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, and to guide the teacher's and learner's decision making.
CAEP Standard 1
ACEI standard alignment
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 candidates 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 at benchmark (score of 3.00) or higher on their TCWS evaluation at the end of their practicum course (EDUC 523).

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.

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=3	Spring 2016 N=6	Fall 2016 N=1	Spring 2017 N=7	Fall 2017 N=0	Spring 2018 N=2
Choice of Assessment	4.0	6	Mean	3.00	2.67	4.00	3.29		3.50
			Range	2.00-4.00	1.00-4.00	4.00	1.00-4.00		3.00-4.00
			% proficient or higher	67%	50%	100%	86%		100%
Pre-Assessment	4.0	6	Mean	1.33	1.67	4.00	3.00		4.00
			Range	1.00-2.00	1.00-2.00	4.00	1.00-4.00		4.00
			% proficient or higher	0%	0%	100%	57%		100%
Post-Assessment	4.0	6	Mean	1.00	2.33	4.00	2.86		3.50
			Range	1.00	1.00-4.00	4.00	1.00-4.00		3.00-4.00
			% proficient or higher	0%	33%	100%	86%		100%
Alignment of Lesson Evidence	1.0	6	Mean	2.33	1.50	4.00	3.43		4.00
			Range	2.00-3.00	1.00-2.00	4.00	2.00-4.00		4.00
			% proficient or higher	33%	0%	100%	86%		100%
Student Level of Mastery and Evaluation of Factors	4.0	6	Mean	3.33	3.50	4.00	3.86		
			Range	3.00-4.00	1.00-4.00	4.00	3.00-4.00		
			% proficient or higher	100%	83%	100%	100%		
Data to Determine Patterns and Gaps	4.0	6	Mean	2.33	1.83	4.00	3.29		
			Range	2.00-3.00	1.00-2.00	4.00	2.00-4.00		
			% proficient or higher	33%	0%	100%	72%		
Response to Interventions	4.0	6	Mean	2.33	1.33	4.00	3.29		
			Range	2.00-3.00	1.00-2.00	4.00	2.00-4.00		
			% proficient or higher	33%	0%	100%	86%		

Criteria	ACEI Standard	InTASC Standard		Fall 2018 N=1	Spring 2019 N=5	Fall 2019 N=2	Spring 2020 N=3	Fall 2020 N=1	Spring 2021 N=
Choice of Assessment	4.0	6	Mean	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	
			Range	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	
			% proficient or higher	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Pre-Assessment	4.0	6	Mean	2.00	3.60	3.00	4.00	3.00	
			Range	2.00	3-4	3.00	4.00	3.00	
			% proficient or higher	0%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Post-Assessment	4.0	6	Mean	3.00	3.20	3.50	4.00	4.00	
			Range	3.00	1-4	3-4	4.00	4.00	
			% proficient or higher	100%	80%	100%	100%	100%	
Alignment of Lesson Evidence	1.0	6	Mean	3.00	3.80	4.00	4.00	4.00	
			Range	3.00	3-4	4.00	4.00	4.00	
			% proficient or higher	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Content Standards /Outcomes/ Instructional Strategies	4.0	6	**Teaching Cycle**						
			Number				1		
			Mean				4.00		
			Range				4.00		
			% proficient or higher				100%		
Data to Determine Patterns and Gaps (Strengths)	4.0	6	Mean				4.00		
			Range				4.00		
			% proficient or higher				100%		
Data to Determine Patterns and Gaps (Weaknesses)	4.0	6	Mean				4.00		
			Range				4.00		
			% proficient or higher				100%		
Analysis of Assessments			Mean				4.00		
			Range				4.00		
			% proficient or higher				100%		
			Mean				3.00		

Application of Data Results			Range				3.00		
			% proficient or higher				100%		
Post Lesson Scaffolding			Mean				4.00		
			Range				4.00		
			% proficient or higher				100%		

12.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:
Since each element on the Teacher Candidate Work Sample Rubric has been aligned with an ACEI Standard, this artifact shows the average score, range, and percentage passing for each element by semester and is categorized by ACEI Standards. This assessment includes two cycles of data, which was collected and reported for nine candidates.
For both cycles of data, the elements on the Teacher Candidate Work Sample Rubric that aligned with ACEI 1.0 Standard, yielded mean scores of 2.33 in fall 2015 and 1.42 in spring 2016. In both cycles of data, the mean scores fell below the department's proficiency benchmark with the fall mean being equivalent to effective emerging and the spring mean being equivalent to ineffective. Additionally, within both elements aligned to ACEI 1.0 Standard, the mean scores decreased from the fall 2015 semester to the spring 2016 semester. In fall 2015, 0% of the candidates scored higher than ineffective for the pre-assessment and post-assessment element; followed by the spring 2016 semester where 0% of the candidates scored higher than ineffective for the pre-assessment element. Since this raised concern, the department faculty met and revised the instructions on the Teacher Candidate Work Sample fall 2016 in order to further clarify directions and expectations on the assessment. The rubric was also realigned with the revised assessment. Data will be monitored to further identify if the revisions impacted student outcomes on this assessment and further changes will be made as needed.
Elements aligned with ACEI 4.0 Standard yielded an overall mean score of 2.20 in fall 2015 and 2.40 in spring 2016. In both cycles of data, student overall mean scores were equivalent to an effective emerging rating, which falls below the department's proficiency benchmark. Furthermore, the scores aligned with ACEI 4.0 Standard were not consistent, indicating higher passing rates for the elements Choice of assessment and Student level of mastery and a 0-33% pass rate in elements Pre-assessment, Post-assessment, and Data. Again, because the data raised concern throughout the department, the faculty met and revised the instructions on the Teacher Candidate Work Sample fall 2016 in order to further clarify directions and expectations on the assessment. The rubric was also realigned with the revised assessment. Data will be monitored to further identify if the revisions impacted student outcomes on this assessment and further changes will be made as needed.

2016-2017:
Analysis of Data:
The Assessment Plan data was collected on MAT elementary candidates for the Spring 2016, Fall 2016, and Spring 2017 semesters with the number of candidates in each cohort being 6, 1, and 7, respectively. No pattern or trend could be identified examining candidates' mean scores over the three semesters when Fall 2016 was included as only one candidate was in this cohort and therefore, only one data point. The Fall 2016 candidate scored above the benchmark of 3 on all components of The Assessment Plan.
When examining the Spring 2016 and Spring 2017 data collected, a pattern does emerge that indicates a growth in our candidates' understanding of ACEI 1.0 and 4.0 within The Assessment Plan over these two semesters with the highest growth being within element Response to Intervention where the mean score in Spring 2016 was 1.33, well below the benchmark of 3.00, and in Spring 2017 was 3.29, above the benchmark of 3.00.

Spring 2016 cohort had only one element scored above benchmark on The Assessment Plan which was Student Level of Mastery and Evaluation of Factors; however, Spring 2017 cohort had only one element scored below benchmark on The Assessment Plan which was Post-assessment with a mean score of 2.86.
The growth of candidates' mean scores from Spring 2016 to Spring 2017 can be contributed to clearer directions of the task as well as better delineation of rubric element requirements. Examples and explanations of what is expected are now taught explicitly within the practicum course.

Program decisions:
In previous academic years, candidates were not exposed to the TCWS until their practicum course where it was taught, implemented, and evaluated. During Summer of 2017, EDUC 654 was rewritten to include portions of The Assessment Plan found within the TCWS so that students had an opportunity to learn and implement with feedback this assessment before it is taken as an evaluation.

2017-2018:
Analysis of Data: The benchmark was met. In spring 2018, 100% of the candidates scored 3.00 or higher on all elements of the Teacher Candidate Work Sample.

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

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- Faculty will facilitate at least two peer mentoring/coaching sessions to deepen candidates' understanding of each element of the Teacher Candidate Work Sample. Candidate feedback will determine the effectiveness of the peer mentoring/coaching sessions. Change will be determined by the scores on the Teacher Candidate Work Sample.

2018-2019:
Analysis of Data: The benchmark was not met. In fall 2018 semester, 0% (n=1) of the candidates scored 3.00 or above on the Pre-assessment. In the spring 2019 semester, 20% (n=5) of the candidates scored below a 3.00 on the Post-assessment.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: In 2019-2020, candidates will score a 3.00 or above on each of the elements of the Teacher Candidate Work Sample rubric.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- Faculty will continue to facilitate at least two peer mentoring/coaching sessions to deepen candidates' understanding of each element of the Teacher Candidate Work Sample.
  Candidate feedback will determine the effectiveness of the peer mentoring/coaching sessions. Change will be determined by the scores on the Teacher Candidate Work Sample.

2019-2020:
Data Analysis:
Plan for Continuous Improvement:
Recommendations for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- Data from the Teaching Cycle administered in EDUC 654 will need to be reported in Google Drive for data analysis purposes

2020-2021:
The benchmark was met during the 2020-2021 academic year cycle as the completer scored 100% proficient and scored a 3.00 or higher on all components. The performance of the one candidate was comparable to previous semesters. The redesigned program does not require

EDUC 523, which is the course this assessment has been pulled from. The MAT Elementary faculty will finalize courses in which assessments will be reported. The rainbow chart (chart with courses and assessments) will be updated and implemented in the fall 2021 semester.

13 Assessment and Benchmark Praxis Content

Assessment: Praxis Elementary Content Exam (5014/5018/5001)
Knowledge:
Content Knowledge: InTASC Standard 4 - The candidate applies the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches.
Candidate will pass their Praxis content area exam before entering their student teaching/intern semester.
CAEP Standard 1
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.

13.1 Benchmark: A minimum of 80% of graduates will pass the Praxis content exam on the first attempt.

13.2 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.

13.3 Benchmark: For candidates who do not pass a Praxis content sub-test on the first attempt, the minimum average attempts should not exceed two.

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.

13.1 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).

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

13.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016- 2017:
Praxis content exam data shows the following first attempt pass rates collectively for the Fall 2015, Spring 2016, Fall 2016 and Spring 2017 semesters were as follows: Exam # 5014: 100% (4/4); Exam #5018: 0% (0/1); Exam #5002: 100% (1/1); Exam #5003: 100% (1/1); Exam #5004: 100% (1/1); and Exam #5005: 100% (1/1).
Also shown in the data table is the percentage of questions answered correctly by the candidates in each subcategory on the exams. 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 (83%), Mathematics (73%), Social Studies (71%) and Science (76%) for percentage of questions answered correctly.
In the breakdown of Exam #5018 subcategory scores, the percentage of questions answered correctly are reported for the one (1) candidate that completed that required exam over the four-semester timeframe. The candidate’s subcategory scores are above 70% in Reading (73%). The following subcategory percentages of questions answered correctly fell below the benchmark of 70% in: Math (34%), Social Studies (48%), and Science (52%).
For exams #5002, #5003, #5004, and #5005 the percentage of questions answered correctly was also noted. Using the same benchmark of 70% of questions being answered correctly, only exam #5004- Social Studies (75%) met the benchmark.
Exams #5002- Reading (59%), Exam #5003- Mathematics (64%), and Exam #5005- Science (60%), means ranged below the 70% benchmark. It is important to note that the subcategory data for these exams are for one student and more importantly still achieved a passing rate for each exam.
Future EPP actions include:
A program will be developed to help with tutoring/mentoring for these required exams if a candidate cannot pass a certain component. The program will be developed Summer 2018.

2017-2018:
Analysis of Data: The benchmark was not met. The overall combined scores for Spring 2018 indicated that 75% of the candidates passed on the first attempt. This was a 5% increase from Spring 2017 (75%-70%).

Plan for Continuous Improvement: In 2018-2019, the goal will be for 80% of MAT Elementary candidates to pass the Praxis content exam (all portions) on the first attempt.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- Identify faculty to conduct Praxis workshops on two Saturdays per semester. Faculty will document students’ attendance and participation, as well as their post-workshop Praxis passage rates, to determine effectiveness and areas for improvement.
- Faculty will compare pre and post PRAXIS scores after the implementation of the PRAXIS workshop in order to make programmatic changes as necessary. We are measuring rates of improvement via the first attempt passage rate and improvement in test scores.

2018-2019:
A minimum of 80% of graduates will pass the Praxis content exam on the first attempt.

The passage rates for the 18-19 AY increased from the 17-18 AY from 75% (n=12) to 92% (n=13). Therefore, the benchmark was met since 92% of the candidates passed the content exam on their first attempt.

Recommendations for 2019-2020:

- Faculty will document students' attendance and participation in Praxis workshops, as well as their post-workshop Praxis passage rates, to determine effectiveness and areas for improvement.
- Elementary ELA, Social Studies, and Science Praxis workshops will be added during the 19-20 AY. Data analysis will be conducted to evaluate the effectiveness of the newly implemented Praxis content workshops.
- Faculty teaching MAT courses tied to Praxis II exams will review tutorial programs and make appropriate changes based on Praxis II scores.
- Faculty will require candidates to attend at least 5 hours of content area professional development opportunities. Student feedback will be used to measure the effectiveness of the professional development.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
The benchmark was not met for the 2020-2021 academic year. The data indicates 0% (0/1) of candidates passed the Praxis content (5001) exam on the first attempt. Of the four subtests, three were passed on the first attempt with science being the only one needing additional attempts. Consideration must be given to the fact that only one completer is included in the data. Overall trends for the subtests (5002, 5003, 5004, and 5005) indicate that completers have passed Reading (5002) and Math (5003) on the first attempt 100% of the time since 2018. Social Studies (5004) had 6/7 completers pass on the first attempt and Science (5005) had 5/7 completers pass on the first attempt since 2018.

By fall 2022, the EPP will update and post to BCOE Moodle Faculty Services Advising section an updated document pertaining resources for Praxis Content exam preparation. This will be provided to candidates when enrolled in EDUC 510 and also by their advisor. During the 2021-2022 academic year, EPP faculty will consider revising the admission requirement to begin coursework in the program prior to official admission. Any changes should be implemented in the 2022-2023 catalog.

13.2 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).

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

13.2.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

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

Spring 2018 data:

- In the breakdown of Exam #5002 subcategory scores, candidates had a mean score of 56%; in Reading (62%), Writing, Speaking, Listening (50%) for percentage of questions answered correctly.
- In the breakdown of Exam #5003 subcategory scores, candidates had a mean score of 57% or above; in Numbers and Operations (63%), Algebraic Thinking (63%), Geometry and Measurement, Data, Statistics, Probability (43%) for percentage of questions answered correctly.
- In the breakdown of Exam #5004 subcategory scores, candidates had a mean score of 65% or above; in United Sates History, Government, and Citizenship (60%), Geography, World History and Economics (68%) for percentage of questions answered correctly.
- In the breakdown of Exam #5005 subcategory scores, candidates had a mean score of 66% or above; in Earth Science (69%), Physical Science (50%) for percentage of questions answered correctly.

Trends cannot be determined at this time due to lack of data from previous semesters.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The goal for 2018-2019 will be for teacher candidates to achieve a mean score of 70% of questions answered correctly in each sub-category will be achieved on the Praxis II Content Exam.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- Faculty will review online Praxis tutorial program to measure effectiveness and make programmatic changes as needed. Faculty teaching MAT courses tied to Praxis II exams will review tutorial program and make appropriate changes based Praxis II scores.
- Faculty will require candidates to attend at least 5 hours of content area professional development opportunities. Student feedback can be used to measure the effectiveness of the professional development opportunities.

2018-2019:
A mean score of 70% for percentage of questions answered correctly in each sub-category will be achieved on the Praxis II Content Exam.
For the spring 2019 data (sub-scores were not available for the fall 2018 completer):
Exam 5002 Reading:

- Reading 50% passage rate, benchmark not met
- Writing, Speaking, Listening 69% passage rate, benchmark not met

Exam 5003 Math:

- Numbers and Operations 70% passage rate, benchmark met
- Algebraic Thinking 60% passage rate, benchmark not met
- Geometry, Measurement, Data, Statistics, Probability 67%, benchmark not met

Exam 5004 Social Studies:

- United States History, Government, and Citizenship 72% passage rate, benchmark met
- Geography, World History, and Economics 81% passage rate, benchmark met

Exam 5005 Science

- Earth Science 75% passage rate, benchmark met
- Life Science 76% passage rate, benchmark met
- Physical Science 71% passage rate, benchmark met

Recommendations for 2019-2020:

- Faculty will document students' attendance and participation in Praxis workshops, as well as their post-workshop Praxis passage rates, to determine effectiveness and areas for improvement.
- Elementary ELA, Social Studies, and Science Praxis workshops will be added during the 19-20 AY. Data analysis will be conducted to evaluate the effectiveness of the newly implemented Praxis content workshops.
- Faculty teaching MAT courses tied to Praxis II exams will review tutorial programs and make appropriate changes based on Praxis II scores.

- Faculty will require candidates to attend at least 5 hours of content area professional development opportunities. Student feedback will be used to measure the effectiveness of the professional development.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
The benchmark was not met in the math, world history, and economics subcategories although progress was made in other subcategories (reading, social studies, and science). The data indicated at least 70% or higher was achieved on Praxis questions in reading and science. The math subcategory indicated the correct answer percentage fell below benchmark in algebraic thinking and geometry and measures; data; statistics; probability; and the World History and Economics categories. It should also be noted that the science score reported was a second attempt score. Praxis resources were distributed through advisors and tutorial sites were provided for candidates.

By fall 2021, the EPP will update and post to the BCOE Moodle Faculty Services Advising section an updated document containing resources for Praxis Content exam preparation. During the 2021-2022 academic year, EPP faculty will review admission requirements to begin courses in the program prior to official admission. If changes are decided, they will go into effect with the 2022-2023 catalog.

13.3 Data

Attempts and Pass Rates for 5001 Sub-Tests	Fall 2017	Spring 2018	Fall 2018	Spring 2019
	N=0	N=2	N=1	N=1
5002 Reading and ELA First Attempt Pass Rate	—	100%	100%	100%
Average # of attempts for candidates who do not pass #5002 on 1st attempt	—	—	—	—
5003 Mathematics First Attempt Pass Rate	—	100%	100%	100%
Average # of attempts for candidates who do not pass #5003 on 1st attempt.	—	—	—	—
5004 Social Studies First Attempt Pass Rate	—	100%	100%	100%
Average # of attempts for candidates who do not pass #5004 on 1st attempt	—	—	—	—
5005 Science First Attempt Pass Rate	—	50%	100%	100%
Average # of attempts for candidates who do not pass #5005 on 1st attempt.	—	2	—	—

Attempts and Pass Rates for 5001 Sub-Tests	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
	N=2	N=2	N=1	N=
5002 Reading and ELA First Attempt Pass Rate	100%	100%	100%	
Average # of attempts for candidates who do not pass #5002 on 1st attempt	—	—	—	
5003 Mathematics First Attempt Pass Rate	100%	100%	100%	
Average # of attempts for candidates who do not pass #5003 on 1st attempt.	—	—	—	

5004 Social Studies First Attempt Pass Rate	100%	50%	100%	
Average # of attempts for candidates who do not pass #5004 on 1st attempt	—	3	—	
5005 Science First Attempt Pass Rate	50%	100%	0%	
Average # of attempts for candidates who do not pass #5005 on 1st attempt.	3	—	2	

13.3.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:
Analysis of Data: The benchmark was met. In the spring of 2018, there was a 100% pass rate on sub-tests 5002 (Reading and ELA), 5003 (Mathematics), and 5004 (Social Studies). For 5005 (Science) there was a 50% first time pass rate and the average number of attempts for candidates not passing on the first attempt was two.
Trends cannot be determined at this time due to lack of data from previous semesters.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: In 2018-2019, for those candidates who do not pass a Praxis content sub-test on the first attempt, the minimum average attempts should not exceed two.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- EPP faculty will ensure at least 4-6 resources for each content area are available to students via the online tutorial program.
  Praxis scores along with student feedback can be used to measure the effectiveness of the tutorial program. Faculty will then make programmatic improvements as needed.
- Faculty will require candidates to attend at least 5 hours of content area professional development opportunities.
  Student feedback can be used to measure the effectiveness of the professional development opportunities. Dr. Burd has a list of the professional development opportunities.

2018-2019:
For candidates who do not pass a Praxis content sub-test on the first attempt, the minimum average attempts should not exceed two.
There was a 100% pass rate on the 5001 subtests in the 18-19 AY (n=2), therefore, the benchmark was met.

Recommendations for 2019-2020:

- Faculty will document students' attendance and participation in Praxis workshops, as well as their post-workshop Praxis passage rates, to determine effectiveness and areas for improvement.
- Elementary ELA, Social Studies, and Science Praxis workshops will be added during the 19-20 AY. Data analysis will be conducted to evaluate the effectiveness of the newly implemented Praxis content workshops.
- Faculty teaching MAT courses tied to Praxis II exams will review tutorial programs and make appropriate changes based on Praxis II scores.
- Faculty will require candidates to attend at least 5 hours of content area professional development opportunities. Student feedback will be used to measure the effectiveness of the professional development.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
The benchmark was met as the one subtest not passed on the first attempt was passed on the second attempt. The EPP provided resources for the content area. Also, content area Praxis workshops were created but were not able to be administered due to COVID-19 and the hurricanes. The workshops will be re-implemented in the 2021-2022 academic year.

MAT Elementary faculty will meet in the fall 2021 semester to review the Praxis benchmarks and take any actions they deem appropriate to be implemented spring 2022.

End of report