Elementary Education Grades 1-5 [PBC] [IEED]

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 [PBC] [IEED]

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

1 Is this program offered via Distance Learning?

100% Traditional or less than 50% Distance/Traditional

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

No

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

3 Example of Program Improvement

2015-2016:
Assessment 1 information was provided to demonstrate how the Praxis II content was aligned with ACEI standards. Data was provided for two current semesters of candidate information.
For Assessment 2, the Content Area Rubric is aligned with the ACEI standards and provides evidence of content knowledge. The Content Area Rubric reflects the candidates' ability to apply knowledge in a clinical setting.
Assessment 3 reflects Elementary Lesson Planning utilizing the Comprehensive Unit Plan (CUP). In this assessment, data are provided for two current semesters. The rows of data are aligned with ACEI standards. Ranges and means are provided.
In Assessment 4, sections of the Field Experience Evaluation (FEE) are aligned with the ACEI standards at specific data points. In Assessment 4, the pre and post test allows cooperating teachers and university supervisors to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the candidates. The FEE III is attached to this submission.
For Assessment 5, the Student Learning Analysis (Pretest/Posttest Analysis) is aligned with ACEI standards. Data from fall 2015 and spring 2016 are provided.
In response to the reviewer's comment that an Assessment 6 was lacking, this final report Assessment 6, Case Study Evaluation has been prepared. The data in Assessments 1-6 has been collected and aggregated to monitor and address student growth. As a result of the data, the new rubrics were prepared to be aligned to specific ACEI standards

2017-2018:
The EPP has worked many hours over the past year to redesign the PBC Elementary program to meet all of the necessary standards while preparing candidates for readiness in the classroom. We feel as though these changes will bring about positive changes in the teachers that we are sending out into the field.

2018-2019:
The newly redesigned programs have been implemented. We are continuing to work on ensuring that all candidates are receiving a comprehensive education that is preparing them to become successful teachers in the field. We are working on addressing the new CAEP Elementary Standards in our program coursework which are taking the place of the traditional ACEI standards.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
The EPP created a minor in elementary education that is expected to feed into the PBC Elementary Education program and potentially increase enrollment. The EPP is also implementing site supervisors to work with candidates in both residency and internship as support in the field. The EPP is also working on updating the handbook and processes for matriculating through the program.

4 Program Highlights from the Reporting Year

2015-2016:

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

2016-2017:
Use of Assessment to Improve Instruction:
(1) Content Knowledge:
The Department of Teacher Education is involved in ongoing curriculum review of the Elementary Education program in order to ensure that candidates are well prepared in the area of content knowledge. In particular, performance measured by course grades and the PRAXIS II Elementary Content Knowledge exam (0014/5014) are used to inform recommendations regarding course and programmatic changes. As stated in section IV, course grades along with the passing rate on PRAXIS II, provides evidence that candidates are acquiring the necessary knowledge to integrate theories and research with respect to each content area (Reading/Language Arts, Mathematics, Social Studies, and Science) Content knowledge is also assessed by the cooperating teachers and university supervisors during the student teaching semester. Four of the five ACEI Standards are measured on the Field Experience Evaluation form (FEE) for elementary education. As stated in Section IV, data show positive findings and trends. By incorporating the results of this data with PRAXIS II Elementary Content scores and course grades, it is evident that candidates possess knowledge in the content areas and have an understanding of the central concepts and structures as they relate to the early childhood classroom. A lesson plan format was adopted to correlate with the Louisiana Edition of Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching. The FEE instrument directly correlates to the Danielson framework. Faculty and student teacher candidates are experiencing ongoing training utilizing the above stated instruments for planning and evaluation. Based on the data generated from the four semesters reported, the students have an adequate knowledge of the content. In Fall 2015, the passage rate was 100%, in spring 2016 the passage rate was 75%, in Fall 2016 the passage rate was 67% and in Spring 2017 the passage rate was 100%. It appears that the application of the content through instructional planning and implementation fall short of the proficient level in many areas. For example, the candidates have difficulties in the use of major concepts in the content of English language arts. They also fall short of proficiency in the area of diversity in student learning and instructional opportunities. They experience difficulties in the area of implementing instructional strategies to promote critical thinking and problem solving. Faculty will address these skill areas within each of the candidates' method courses throughout their degree programs. Candidates will work with cooperating teachers to address difficulties and provides additional support in the skill areas mentioned. These sources of information can then be used to make adjustments to the planning and evaluation instruments. Although the data show solid evidence that our candidates are able to demonstrate preparedness in the content areas, our program provides more opportunities for growth and development beyond content, course work and field experiences. For example, the Elementary Education candidates complete 285 hours of field experiences throughout the elementary teaching degree plan before the student teaching semester. Through lesson planning, teaching, collaboration, and reflection in each course, all ACEI Standards are consistently integrated.

(2) Pedagogical and Professional Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions:
Data from the Field Experience Evaluation-form (FEE) assessment used to evaluate candidates in the above stated courses and the student teaching semester are reviewed regularly by program faculty, university supervisors, and staff within the Office of Student Teaching and Professional Education Services. For example, faculty found that candidates needed more remediation and resources in the area of using major principles in the area for individual students' development learning and motivation. Candidates have the knowledge of this information but are not applying this knowledge in their lesson planning and teaching. To address this area of need, faculty collaborated and planned to incorporate this content throughout all methodology courses. Our

findings show that use of formal and informal assessments is another area of concern for our candidates. Another area of concern is that candidates have difficulty in the use of effective communication techniques in the classroom. Faculty analyzed the FEE data and found that candidates are not effectively demonstrating these skills. To address this area of concern, faculty will offer co-teaching opportunities with candidates and they will observe cooperating teachers in the field to further strengthen their understanding. Another area where our candidates are experiencing difficult is delivering instruction based on students' theory, cross-curricular connections, goals, and community. Faculty will address this area of need by providing professional development workshops and remediation in this area. Faculty are now required to include one technology-based assignment in each of their professional education courses. Faculty use technology throughout their courses to model, engage and teach. With increased use of technology in methodology courses, collaboration continues with the area school district in order to provide pre-service teachers the opportunity to further develop technology skills as they relate to teaching and learning. Teacher candidates are required to attend technology seminars prior to and during the student teaching semester. Through this collaboration, candidates are better equipped with the skills necessary to integrate the use of instructional technology (e.g. Promethean Interactive whiteboard technology boards) into daily lessons. Elementary education candidates are required to use technology in every evaluated lesson in student teaching semesters. The addition of these performance-based evaluation elements has provided faculty the ability to assess mastery of teaching and of content.
In addition, through coursework and seminars, the Burton College of Education encourages candidates to become involved with professional teaching organizations which provide a variety of professional development opportunities in their specialty areas. Candidates are encouraged to attend and present at national, regional, and state conferences. At present, the assessments described in this report do not provide clear evidence of candidate experience with these organizations and online resources as addressed in ACEI Standard 5: Professional growth, reflection, and evaluation. Faculty will sponsor monthly professional development opportunities where candidates can collaborate with faculty to address topics of interest. Candidates are also required throughout the program's coursework to read and summarize journal articles pertaining to methodology issues in elementary education.

(3) Student Learning:
During the semester prior to student teaching, the elementary education candidates complete a child case study. The data from this assessment reflects the candidate's ability to interpret the impact of observing and documenting student growth and the tool assists candidates in parent-teacher conferencing. Program faculty uses the child case study for data collection to assess student learning. During student teaching, the candidates must complete the P-12 Learning Analysis by selecting a unit of instruction, administering a pre/post assessment on that unit of instruction, and analyzing the student performance results. That analysis requires the candidates to compare the pre/post results and calculate the difference in student performance. Information from this assessment is used by program faculty to develop student teaching seminars and course-embedded workshops to support candidates in the creation of future work samples. Throughout the degree program there are many opportunities for candidates to engage in lesson planning and activities that impact student achievement.

For the baccalaureate program, the range of scores were below the benchmark for two of the four semesters reported as indicated in the data charts. Faculty analyzed the data and found some areas of need. For example, the area of response to intervention was determined to be an area where the candidates struggled. Faculty will examine their current teaching strategies to determine the level of effectiveness and make modifications as needed.

2017-2018:
The EPP has redesigned the PBC Elementary program that is filled with purposeful experiences to produce better candidates entering the field as teachers.

2018-2019:
The EPP will be adding a minor for non-education majors to enable them to enroll in education coursework that can be applied to a post-baccalaureate certificate. The intention would be to catch those students who are undecided about education but know a content area well. These

students will help to build the pipeline into the PBC program and hopefully increase enrollment numbers.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
Recruitment efforts for the program have led to five candidates enrolled in the Elementary Education minor. These candidates would feed into the PBC program after completing their baccalaureate degrees. The EPP is continuously looking for ways to boost enrollment.

5 Program Mission

The purpose of the Post Baccalaureate certificates in Elementary Education 1- 5 is to prepare candidates for successful entry into education as school teachers by providing opportunities for developing expertise in content knowledge, teaching methods and strategies, communication skills, behavior management, and the professional dispositions that will enable completers of the program to succeed as teachers.

6 Institutional Mission Reference

The PBC in Elementary Education supports McNeese State University's fundamental mission to provide successful education of students and services to the employers and communities in its region. The PBC in Elementary Education program prepares students to fulfill their roles in the teaching profession in grades 1-5 and contribute to the cultural and intellectual advancement of the citizens of Louisiana.

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

Assessment: Enrollment, Completion, Retention, and Recruitment

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: Create and monitor candidate progress throughout the program. A minimum of 90% of candidates should complete the post-baccalaureate program in Elementary Education within two years of being accepted into the program (499 packet). Practitioner candidates should complete the program within one year of acceptance into the program.

7.1 Data Enrollment and Completers

PBC Elementary Education Programs - Enrollment and Completer Data:

Academic Year	Program	# of students officially enrolled in program with an EDUC 499 packet	# of completers fall semester	# of completers spring semester	Total # of completers
2013-2014		13			9
2014-2015		15			8
2015-2016		29	2	8	10
2016-2017		12	3	5	8
2017-2018	PBC	8	0	2	2
	Practitioner	1	0	1	1
2018-2019	PBC	5	0	2	2
	Practitioner	4	0	3	3

2019-2020	PBC	2	0	2	2
2020-2021	PBC	1	0	0	0

7.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

The program has experienced some growth over the three-year period. Continue current recruitment and retention plans.

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

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

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:
1) The Recruitment Committee will document two in-services and job fairs attended with the intent to recruit for the Elementary PBC program.
2) A minimum of 10 potential PBC students' information will be collected on sign-in sheets at these events.

2018-2019:
Analysis of Data:
The benchmark was not met. From 2017-2018 to 2018-2019, the number of candidates officially enrolled in the PBC Elementary program remained constant.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:
The PBC Elementary program will increase enrollment by 7% to coincide with the MSU Strategic Plan goal concerning enrollment and recruitment.

Recommendations for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- EPP faculty will document attending two recruitment opportunities for the Elementary PBC program. This may include the TNT conference, Lake Charles Job Fair, and graduation practice or grad fest.
- Make inquiries into advertising Elementary PBC programs within the community (billboards)
- Devise a plan to recruit non-education majors to the elementary minor program which will feed into the Elementary PBC program.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
Analysis of Data: There has been a steady decline in enrollment since 2015-2016. Therefore, the benchmark was not met for the current year. From 2019-2020 to 2020-2021, the number of students officially enrolled in the program with an EDUC 499 packet decreased from 2 to 1 student.
Plan for Continuous Improvement: The PBC program will have an increase in enrollment for the 2021-2022 academic year as a result of recruitment efforts by the education faculty throughout the year.
Recommendation for Implementation of Improvement Plan: EPP faculty will document attending two recruitment events/opportunities for the PBC Elementary Education program. This may include events such as the TNT conference, Lake Charles Job Fair, and graduation practice or grad fest.

7.2 Data Completion Matriculation Rates

Completer Matriculation Rates:

Program Type	Cohort Academic Year	Accepted into program	1-2 Years to Grad	3 Years to Grad	4 Years to Grad	5 Years to Grad	Dropped from university	State Completer	Earned Different Degree	Still Enrolled
PBC	2011	16		N=5 32%	N=2 12%	N=1 6%				N=8 50%
PBC	2012	20	N=10 50%	N=2 10%	N=1 5%		N=4 20%			N=3 15%
PBC	2013	24	N=4 16%	N=5 21%	N=1 5%		N=7 29%			N=7 29%
PBC	2013-2014	8	N=4 50%				N=4 50%			
PBC	2014-2015	11	N=8 73%	N=1 9%		N=1 9%	N=1 9%			
PBC	2015-2016									
PBC	2016-2017	1	N=1 100%							

7.2.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:
Analysis of Data: The benchmark was met. For the 2013-2014 Cohort: 100% of all PBC students in the 2013-2014 school year completed the program within two years of acceptance into the PBC Elementary program.
Plan for Continuous Improvement: PBC faculty will identify reasons students are dropping from the university and determine intervention activities.
Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- Advisors will work with candidates at least twice a year to review degree plans, academic progress, and provide a list of resources for students who are in need of additional graduation and/or academic support.
- Develop a survey to give to students who wish to drop from the university prior to their withdrawal. The survey information gathered on these students, in addition to reviewing teacher candidate credentials upon admission, can aid in providing additional resources or support to these students in the future.

2018-2019:
Analysis of Data:
The benchmark was not met. For the 2018-2019 AY, 73% of candidates completed the post-baccalaureate program in Elementary Education within 2 years of being accepted into the program (EDUC 499).

Plan for Continuous Improvement:
The goal for 2019-2020 will be for 90% of candidates to complete the PBC Elementary Education program within two years of being accepted into the program.

Recommendations for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- PBC faculty will identify reasons candidates drop from the university to determine intervention activities
- Advisors will work with candidates at least twice a year to review degree plans, academic progress, and provide a list of resources for students who are in need of additional academic support.
- EPP faculty will meet the week after midterms to flag struggling students, discuss ways to support students in need, and determine ways to help remediate candidates to try to prevent them from not being successful in the program or dropping out.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
The benchmark was met as the one candidate accepted into the 2016-2017 cohort completed the PBC program within 1-2 years. The goal is for candidates to continue to matriculate through the program within 1-2 years of acceptance noted by the approval of the EDUC 499 packet. PBC faculty will work to identify reasons candidates drop from the university to determine necessary intervention activities. PBC faculty will create exit surveys and contact candidates to inquire why they have dropped from the program and determine resources and support to assist them in re-entering and completing the program. Advisors will work with candidates at least twice a year to review program sequences, academic progress, and provide resources for students who are in need of additional academic support. All advising meetings will be documented in Degree Works. EPP faculty will also meet the week after midterm each semester to flag struggling students, discuss ways to support students in need, and determine ways to help remediate candidates to prevent dropping from the program.

8 Assessment and Benchmark Curriculum Development

Assessment: Curriculum Development
Provide a comprehensive curriculum that reflects disciplinary foundations and remains responsive to contemporary developments, student and workforce demand, and university needs and aspirations.
Curriculum alignment includes:
-InTASC standards
-Program standards
-Year-long residency
-Louisiana Components of Effective Teaching
-Louisiana Teacher Preparation Competencies
-Louisiana Student Standards
CAEP Standard 2

Benchmark: All program faculty will meet at least twice an academic year to discuss curriculum changes/implementations, assessment data, and progress monitoring of action plans.

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

8.1 Data

2015-2016:
Spring 2015:

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

Fall 2015:

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

Spring 2016:

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

- May 17, 2016 - DEP workshop/SPA
- May 26, 2016 - CAEP Webinar 3:00

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

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

2017-2018:
Data table is attached.

2018-2019:
Data table is attached.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
June 24, 2020: 8:00am-12:00pm DEP Faculty
Major assessments for all programs

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

August 6, 2020: 8:30am-11:00am DEP Faculty
POP Cycle with Quality Feedback
August 13, 2020: 9:00am-11:00am DEP Faculty
Field Experiences, Internship, Practicum Expectations

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

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

Elementary Education Curriculum Development
PBC_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 six times during the spring 2018 semester. The faculty attended six professional development meetings throughout the spring 2018 semester. Faculty attended eight Retention and Recruitment sessions throughout the spring 2018 semester.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:
- Program faculty will continue to meet at regular intervals throughout the year to discuss curriculum redesign and other programming issues/concerns.
- Program faculty will 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 gather district input for consideration as curriculum changes are approved and adopted in regard to field experiences and student teaching.
- Information obtained from district will be made when appropriate to strengthen candidate preparedness for the teaching profession.

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

2019-2020:

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

9 Assessment and Benchmark PRAXIS II Content

Assessment: Praxis Content Exam (5014/5018/5001)
Louisiana Teacher General Competency B: The teacher candidate demonstrates mastery of the content knowledge and skills and content pedagogy needed to teach the current academic standards as defined in BESE policy.
InTASC standards included: 4 ACEI Standard 2.0 Element 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4
Knowledge:
Content Knowledge: InTASC Standard 4 - The candidate applies the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches.
Candidate will pass their Praxis content area exam before entering their student teaching/intern semester.
The content exams required for elementary education candidates were cited for the Association for Childhood Education International (ACEI) Elementary Education Standard 2: Curriculum

Standards. Items on each of the above Praxis exams (5014/5018/5001) require candidates to demonstrate fundamental knowledge in the core subject areas required for teaching elementary students. The following elements of Standard 2 are specifically addressed:
Candidates are required to demonstrate knowledge, understanding, and application of Reading /Language Arts skills on the Praxis content exam (5014/5018/5002). Candidates demonstrate an understanding of reading foundational skills including phonological awareness and the role of phonics and word analysis in literacy development, as well as analyzing literature and informational texts. Candidates are also required to demonstrate writing, speaking, and listening proficiencies through identifying and evaluating various concepts and practices. Assessment of the candidates' performance is aligned to Element 2.1. Reading, Writing, and Oral Language.
Candidates are required to demonstrate knowledge, understanding, and use of fundamental concepts in earth science, life science, and physical science on the Praxis content exam (5014 /5018/5005). In addition, candidates must understand the importance and use of inquiry, research and resources, and the unifying processes of science. Assessment of candidates' performance is aligned to Element 2.2. Science.
Candidates are required to demonstrate problem solving and reasoning with mathematical skills on the Praxis content exam (5014/5018/5003). Candidates must know, understand, and demonstrate proficiency in the application of numbers and operations, algebraic thinking, geometry and measurement, data analysis, statistics, and probability. Assessment of candidates' performance is aligned to Element 2.3. Mathematics.
Candidates are required to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of Social Studies concepts on the Praxis content exam (5014/5018/5004). Candidates must interrelate topics from United State history, government, citizenship, geography, anthropology, sociology, world history, and economics to support informed decision making by citizens in modern society. Assessment of candidates' performance is aligned to Element 2.4. Social Studies.
CAEP Standard 1

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

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

Outcome Links

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

2007 ACEI Elementary Education Standards and Supporting Explanation [External]

2.2 Science

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

2.4 Social Studies

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

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.

2013 InTASC Standards [External]

4. Content Knowledge

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

9.1 Data

PBC Elementary Education - Praxis Content Exam:

Elementary Education		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018	
							PBC	Pract.
Combined	Number	2	8	3	5	0	2	1
	% Pass 1st attempt	100%	75%	66%			100%	100%
#0014/5014 overall	Number	2	8	3	4	0	2	1
	Mean	163	163	157	162		153	162
	Range	156-170	152-177	153-162	158-170		152-154	162
	% Pass 1st attempt	100%	75%	66%	100%		100%	100%
	Pass prior to ST/intern	100%	100%					
#0014/5014 breakdown:	Number		2		2		1	
Reading	Mean		23		23		22	
	Range		21-25		22-24		22	
	% correct (30)		77%		77%		73%	
Math	Mean		25		22		15	
	Range		21-27		20-23		15	
	% correct (30)		83%		73%		50%	
Social Studies	Mean		19		19		19	
	Range		16-21		17-20		19	
	% correct (30)		63%		63%		63%	
Science	Mean		19		21		17	
	Range		18-19		17-25		17	
	% correct (30)		63%		70%		57%	
#	Number							
	Mean							
	Range							
	% Pass 1st attempt							
#5018 breakdown:	Number							
Reading	Mean							
	Range							
Mathematics	Mean							
	Range							
Social Studies	Mean							
	Range							
	Mean							

Science	Range							
#5002 Reading overall	Number				1			
	Mean				176			
	Range				176			
	% correct (80)				61%			
	% Pass 1st attempt				100%			
#5002 breakdown:	Number				1			
Reading	Mean				25			
	Range				25			
	% correct (38)				66%			
Writing; Speaking; Listening	Mean				24			
	Range				24			
	% correct (42)				57%			
#5003 Math overall	Number				1			
	Mean				185			
	Range				185			
	% correct (50)				66%			
	% Pass 1st attempt				100%			
#5003 breakdown:	Number				1			
Numbers and Operations	Mean				15			
	Range				15			
	% correct (20)				75%			
Algebraic Thinking	Mean				9			
	Range				9			
	% correct (15)				60%			
Geometry and Measurement; Data; Statistics; Probability	Mean				9			
	Range				9			
	% correct (15)				60%			
#5004 Social Studies overall	Number				1			
	Mean				183			
	Range				183			
	% correct (55)				78%			
	% Pass 1st attempt				100%			
#5004								

breakdown:	Number				1			
United States History; Government; Citizenship	Mean				20			
	Range				20			
	% correct (25)				80%			
Geography; Anthropology; Sociology	Mean				14			
	Range				14			
	%correct (16)				88%			
World History and Economics	Mean				9			
	Range				9			
	% correct (14)				64%			
#5005 Science overall	Number				1			
	Mean				186			
	Range				186			
	% correct (50)				80%			
	% Pass 1st attempt				100%			
#5005 breakdown:	Number				1			
Earth Science	Mean				13			
	Range				13			
	% correct (16)				81%			
Life Science	Mean				14			
	Range				14			
	% correct (17)				82%			
Physical Science	Mean				13			
	Range				13			
	% correct (17)				76%			

PBC Elementary Education - Praxis Content Exam:

Elementary Education		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
Combined	Number	0	14	0	5	0	0
	% Pass 1st attempt		64%		60%		
#0014/5014 overall	Number		1				
	Mean		154				
	Range		154				
	% Pass 1st attempt		0%				
	Pass prior						

	to ST/intern		100%				
#0014/5014 breakdown:	Number		0				
Reading	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct (30)						
Math	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct (30)						
Social Studies	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct (30)						
Science	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct (30)						
#5018 overall	Number		1		1		
	Mean		195		170		
	Range		195		170		
% Pass 1st attempt		100%		0%			
#5018 breakdown:	Number		1		1		
Reading	Mean		36		30		
	Range		36		30		
Mathematics	Mean		31		33		
	Range		31		33		
Social Studies	Mean		17		15		
	Range		17		15		
Science	Mean		19		11		
	Range		19		11		
#5002 Reading overall	Number		3		1		
	Mean		167		164		
	Range		162-172		164		
% Pass 1st attempt		67%		100%			
#5002 breakdown:	Number		3		1		
Reading	Mean		23		25		
	Range		20-25		25		
	% correct (38)		73%		81%		
Writing; Speaking; Listening	Mean		23		19		
	Range		22-24		19		
	% correct (42)		69%		58%		

#5003 Math overall	Number		3		1		
	Mean		172		192		
	Range		166-180		192		
	% Pass 1st attempt		67%		100%		
#5003 breakdown:	Number		3		1		
Numbers and Operations	Mean		13		14		
	Range		12-14		14		
	% correct (16-20)		81%		88%		
Algebraic Thinking	Mean		9		11		
	Range		6-10		11		
	% correct (12-15)		72%		92%		
Geometry and Measurement; Data; Statistics; Probability	Mean		9		10		
	Range		8-10		10		
	% correct (12-15)		72%		83%		
#5004 Social Studies overall	Number		3		1		
	Mean		160		164		
	Range		155-168		164		
	% Pass 1st attempt		67%		100%		
#5004 breakdown:	Number		3		1		
United States History; Government; Citizenship	Mean		15		13		
	Range		13-18		13		
	% correct (25)		61%		52%		
Geography; Anthropology; Sociology	Mean		8		12		
	Range		7-11		12		
	%correct (16)		52%		75%		
World History and Economics	Mean		9		12		
	Range		8-11		12		
	% correct (14)		67%		86%		
#5005 Science overall	Number		3		1		
	Mean		165		164		
	Range		161-167		164		
	% Pass 1st attempt		67%		0%		
#5005 breakdown:	Number		3		1		
Earth Science	Mean		8		9		
	Range		6-10		9		
	% correct (16)		52%		56%		
	Mean		13		14		

Life Science	Range		12-14		14		
	% correct (17)		78%		82%		
Physical Science	Mean		11		12		
	Range		11-12		12		
	% correct (17)		67%		71%		

9.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2017:
Analyze data after three years of data collection to determine benchmark.

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: 85% (14/17); Exam #5018:no data; 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. Seventy percent (70%) was chosen as the benchmark for the data, corresponding to the lowest “C” on a standard ten-point grading scale. In the breakdown of Exam #5014 subcategory scores, candidates had a mean score of 70% or above in the two semesters of data (spring 2016 and spring 2017) in Reading (77%) and Mathematics (78%) for percentage of questions answered correctly. The two subcategory scores that fell below the benchmark of 70% in the two semesters of data were Social Studies (63%) and Science (67).

2017-2018:
Analysis of Data: The benchmark was met. Praxis content exam data first attempt pass rates collectively for fall 2015, spring and fall 2016, and spring 2017 ranged from 85% to 100%.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: Faculty will analyze Praxis scores and disaggregate data to more adequately align coursework with Praxis standards to ensure coursework addresses the scope and sequence of standards and that scaffolding is appropriate within coursework to support student success in passing the Praxis the first attempt.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:
- Elementary program faculty will meet at least twice a semester and document attendance on sign-in sheets to scaffold Praxis standards for content knowledge in education content specific courses in preparation for Praxis test first attempt.
- Specific curriculum changes adopted will be noted separately and kept on file as they are incorporated.

2018-2019:
Analysis of Data:
The benchmark was not met. The following Content Exams fell below the 80% benchmark for first time pass rate: 5014 (0%), 5002 (67%), 5003 (67%), 5004 (67%) and 5005 (67%).

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

Recommendations for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:
- Praxis workshops will be created for each of the content areas to better prepare candidates for exams.
- Upon admission to the University, candidates will receive information about the Praxis workshops.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
There were no completers in the PBC Elementary program during the 2020-2021 academic year, therefore, there is no new data to report. Based on previous data and recommendations for improvement, the EPP will provide a written list of Praxis resources for all candidates during their first advising session. Additionally, Praxis workshops were created and administered for 1-2 semesters prior to COVID and the hurricanes. The EPP will attempt to offer these workshops again at least twice during the 2021-2022 academic year. EPP faculty is also discussing the possibility of requiring either the Praxis content or Praxis Core be completed before entering the program to lessen the pressure of completing multiple tests in the first semester to progress through the program.

9.2 Data

PBC Elementary Education - Praxis Content Exam:

Elementary Education		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018	
							PBC	Pract.
Combined	Number	2	8	3	5	0	2	1
	% Pass 1st attempt	100%	75%	66%			100%	100%
#0014/5014 overall	Number	2	8	3	4	0	2	1
	Mean	163	163	157	162		153	162
	Range	156-170	152-177	153-162	158-170		152-154	162
	% Pass 1st attempt	100%	75%	66%	100%		100%	100%
	Pass prior to ST/intern	100%	100%					
#0014/5014 breakdown:	Number		2		2		1	
Reading	Mean		23		23		22	
	Range		21-25		22-24		22	
	% correct (30)		77%		77%		73%	
Math	Mean		25		22		15	
	Range		21-27		20-23		15	
	% correct (30)		83%		73%		50%	
Social Studies	Mean		19		19		19	
	Range		16-21		17-20		19	
	% correct (30)		63%		63%		63%	
Science	Mean		19		21		17	
	Range		18-19		17-25		17	
	% correct (30)		63%		70%		57%	
#5018 overall	Number							
	Mean							
	Range							
	% Pass 1st attempt							

#5018 breakdown:	Number							
Reading	Mean							
	Range							
Mathematics	Mean							
	Range							
Social Studies	Mean							
	Range							
Science	Mean							
	Range							
#5002 Reading overall	Number				1			
	Mean				176			
	Range				176			
	% correct (80)				61%			
	% Pass 1st attempt				100%			
#5002 breakdown:	Number				1			
Reading	Mean				25			
	Range				25			
	% correct (38)				66%			
Writing; Speaking; Listening	Mean				24			
	Range				24			
	% correct (42)				57%			
#5003 Math overall	Number				1			
	Mean				185			
	Range				185			
	% correct (50)				66%			
	% Pass 1st attempt				100%			
#5003 breakdown:	Number				1			
Numbers and Operations	Mean				15			
	Range				15			
	% correct (20)				75%			
Algebraic Thinking	Mean				9			
	Range				9			
	% correct (15)				60%			
Geometry and Measurement; Data; Statistics; Probability	Mean				9			
	Range				9			
	% correct (15)				60%			
	Number				1			

#5004 Social Studies overall	Mean				183			
	Range				183			
	% correct (55)				78%			
	% Pass 1st attempt				100%			
#5004 breakdown:	Number				1			
United States History; Government; Citizenship	Mean				20			
	Range				20			
	% correct (25)				80%			
Geography; Anthropology; Sociology	Mean				14			
	Range				14			
	%correct (16)				88%			
World History and Economics	Mean				9			
	Range				9			
	% correct (14)				64%			
#5005 Science overall	Number				1			
	Mean				186			
	Range				186			
	% correct (50)				80%			
	% Pass 1st attempt				100%			
#5005 breakdown:	Number				1			
Earth Science	Mean				13			
	Range				13			
	% correct (16)				81%			
Life Science	Mean				14			
	Range				14			
	% correct (17)				82%			
Physical Science	Mean				13			
	Range				13			
	% correct (17)				76%			

PBC Elementary Education - Praxis Content Exam:

Elementary Education		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
Combined	Number	0	14	0	5	0	0
	% Pass 1st attempt		64%		60%		
	Number		1				

#0014/5014 overall	Mean		154				
	Range		154				
	% Pass 1st attempt		0%				
	Pass prior to ST/intern		100%				
#0014/5014 breakdown:	Number		0				
Reading	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct (30)						
Math	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct (30)						
Social Studies	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct (30)						
Science	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct (30)						
#5018 overall	Number		1		1		
	Mean		195		170		
	Range		195		170		
	% Pass 1st attempt		100%		0%		
#5018 breakdown:	Number		1		1		
Reading	Mean		36		30		
	Range		36		30		
Mathematics	Mean		31		33		
	Range		31		33		
Social Studies	Mean		17		15		
	Range		17		15		
Science	Mean		19		11		
	Range		19		11		
#5002 Reading overall	Number		3		1		
	Mean		167		164		
	Range		162-172		164		
	% Pass 1st attempt		67%		100%		
#5002 breakdown:	Number		3		1		
Reading	Mean		23		25		
	Range		20-25		25		
	% correct						

	(38)		73%		81%		
Writing; Speaking; Listening	Mean		23		19		
	Range		22-24		19		
	% correct (42)		69%		58%		
#5003 Math overall	Number		3		1		
	Mean		172		192		
	Range		166-180		192		
	% Pass 1st attempt		67%		100%		
#5003 breakdown:	Number		3		1		
Numbers and Operations	Mean		13		14		
	Range		12-14		14		
	% correct (20)		81%		88%		
Algebraic Thinking	Mean		9		11		
	Range		6-10		11		
	% correct (15)		72%		92%		
Geometry and Measurement; Data; Statistics; Probability	Mean		9		10		
	Range		8-10		10		
	% correct (15)		72%		83%		
#5004 Social Studies overall	Number		3		1		
	Mean		160		164		
	Range		155-168		164		
	% Pass 1st attempt		67%		100%		
#5004 breakdown:	Number		3		1		
United States History; Government; Citizenship	Mean		15		13		
	Range		13-18		13		
	% correct (25)		61%		52%		
Geography; Anthropology; Sociology	Mean		8		12		
	Range		7-11		12		
	%correct (16)		52%		75%		
World History and Economics	Mean		9		12		
	Range		8-11		12		
	% correct (14)		67%		86%		
#5005 Science overall	Number		3		1		
	Mean		165		164		
	Range		161-167		164		
	% Pass 1st attempt		67%		0%		

#5005 breakdown:	Number		3		1		
Earth Science	Mean		8		9		
	Range		6-10		9		
	% correct (16)		52%		56%		
Life Science	Mean		13		14		
	Range		12-14		14		
	% correct (17)		78%		82%		
Physical Science	Mean		11		12		
	Range		11-12		12		
	% correct (17)		67%		71%		

9.2.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018
Analysis of Data: The benchmark was not met.
Spring 2016 and Spring 2017 Exam #5014: Candidates had a mean score of 70% or above in the two semesters of data in Reading (77%) and Mathematics (78%) for percentage of questions answered correctly. The two-subcategory scores that fell below the benchmark of 70% in the two semesters of data were Social Studies (63%) and Science (67).

Plan for Continuous Improvement: PBC faculty will collect and analyze sub-category area data for all teacher candidates who take the Praxis prior to submitting their 499 Packet.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement: Faculty will meet once each semester and document on sign-in sheets to review and analyze sub-category scores collected from all students that report/submit their Praxis scores with their 499 Packet for the next academic year and results will be used to inform course revision/redesign.

2018-2019:
Analysis of Data:
The benchmark was not met. The following subcategories of the Content area exams fell below the 70% answered correctly benchmark:
5002: Reading- Writing, Speaking, Listening (69%)
5003: Math- All were above benchmark
5004: Social Studies- United States History, Government, Citizenship (61%); Geography, Anthropology, Sociology (52%); World History and Economics (67%)
5005: Science- Earth Science (52%); Physical Science (67%)

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

Recommendations for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:
- Praxis workshops will be created for each of the content areas to better prepare candidates for the exams.
- Encourage enrollment in the minor program to complete the content exam after 6-9 hours of general education content coursework.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
There were no completers in the PBC Elementary program during the 2020-2021 academic year, therefore, there is no new data to report. Based on previous data and recommendations for improvement, the EPP will provide a written list of Praxis resources for all candidates

during their first advising session. Additionally, Praxis workshops were created and administered for 1-2 semesters prior to COVID and the hurricanes. The EPP will attempt to offer these workshops again at least twice during the 2021-2022 academic year. EPP faculty is also discussing the possibility of requiring either the Praxis content or Praxis Core be completed before entering the program to lessen the pressure of completing multiple tests in the first semester to progress through the program.

10 Assessment and Benchmark Field Experience Evaluation from Subject Area Method Courses

Assessment: Field Experience Evaluation conducted in subject area methods courses.

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

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.

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.

5.1 Professional growth

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

5.2 Collaboration

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

2013 InTASC Standards [External]

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.

10.1 Data Field Experience Evaluation from Subject Area Method Courses

2017-2018:
Data table is attached.

2018-2019:
Data table is attached.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
There were no completers for this program in the 2020-2021 academic year and therefore, no new data to report.

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

PBC_ELEM_FEE_Content Area_17-18
PBC_ELEM_FEE_Content Area_18-19

10.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

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

- Science and social studies data for PBC was not available.
- Math: all practitioner students achieved the goal.
- ELA: Subcomponent 3.1.1 had a mean of 2.67 and subcomponent 3.2.1 had a mean of 2.00

Plan for Continuous Improvement: Data findings will be shared with faculty to communicate the importance of data collection for driving instruction.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- Data analysis will be conducted using FEE data from content area faculty and education faculty will be provided with results.
- Data analysis will be used to strengthen FEE components in the content area subjects.

2018-2019:
Analysis of Data: The benchmark was not met.

- Science and social studies data for PBC was not available.
- Math: The following subcomponents had at least one candidate that scored below a 3.00; Scoring was based on a 1-3 point scale.
    - 1.1.1 =2.67, 67% proficient
    - 1.1.2 =2.67, 67% proficient
    - 1.1.3 =2.67, 67% proficient
    - 1.1.4 =2.67, 67% proficient
    - 2.1.1 =2.33, 33% proficient
    - 2.1.2 =2.67, 67% proficient
    - 2.1.3 =2.67, 67% proficient
    - 2.1.4 =2.67, 67% proficient
    - 2.2.1 =2.33, 33% proficient
    - 3.1.1 =2.67, 67% proficient
    - 3.1.3 =2.33, 33% proficient
    - 3.2.1 =2.00, 0% proficient
    - 3.2.2 =2.67, 67% proficient
    - 3.2.3 =2.67, 67% proficient
    - 3.2.4 =2.67, 67% proficient
    - 3.3.1 =2.00, 0% proficient
    - 3.3.3 =2.67, 67% proficient
    - 3.3.4 =2.33, 33% proficient
- ELA: The following subcomponents had at least one candidate that scored below a 3.00
    - There were no subcomponents in which any candidate fell below a 3.00
- EDUC 410: Various Subject Areas- The following subcomponents had at least one candidate that scored below a 3.00
    - 1.1.4 =2.67, 67% proficient
    - 2.1.2 =2.67, 67% proficient
    - 2.2.1 =3.00, 67% proficient
    - 2.2.2 =2.67, 67% proficient
    - 2.2.3 =3.00, 67% proficient
    - 3.1.1 =2.67, 67% proficient
    - 3.1.2 =3.00, 67% proficient
    - 3.1.3 =3.00, 67% proficient
    - 3.3.3 =3.00, 67% proficient

Plan for Continuous Improvement: Data findings will be shared with faculty to communicate the importance of data collection for driving instruction. In addition, all methods faculty will discuss implementing the 1-3 scale for underclassmen when grading them on the FEE. This will help to provide more critical scoring with understanding that beginning methods course candidates are not expected to begin their teaching practice as experts (4) and accommodating for that within their grading.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- Data analysis will be conducted using FEE data from content area faculty and education faculty will be provided with results.
- Data analysis will be used to strengthen FEE components in the content area subjects by addressing the needs in coursework within the program.
- Program faculty will discuss the grading scale that will be used so that they are consistent across methods courses for comparison and growth moving forward.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
There were no completers in the 2020-2021 academic year and therefore, no new data to report. Data will continue to be analyzed by course professors to determine areas of strength

and areas for improvement at the end of each semester. Data will also be pulled together for analysis at the end of each academic year to determine if there is a pattern of progression on the assessment as candidates move through the program. Methods faculty will meet prior to the Fall 2021 semester to make a final decision on implementing the 1-3 scale on the FEE for candidates in methods courses. With the implementation of site supervisors, they will be able to facilitate communication between the candidate, mentor teacher/administrator, and university faculty particularly in using the FEE and provide high quality academic feedback.

11 Assessment and Benchmark Lesson Plan

Assessment: Lesson Plan
Louisiana Teacher General Competency F: The teacher candidate differentiates instruction, behavior management techniques, and the learning environment in response to individual student differences in cognitive, socio-emotional, language, and physical development.
Louisiana Teacher General Competency G: The teacher candidate develops and applies instructional supports and plans for an Individual Education Plan (IEP) or Individualized Accommodation Plan (IAP) to allow a student with exceptionalities developmentally appropriate access to age- or grade-level instruction, individually and in collaboration with colleagues.
InTASC standards included: 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8.
Knowledge:
Learner Development: InTASC Standard 1 - The candidate determines how learners grow and develop, recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas.
Learning Differences: InTASC Standard 2 - The candidate identifies individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards.
Content Knowledge: InTASC Standard 4 - The candidate applies the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches.
ACEI Standard 1.0 & 4.0
The CUP is one of the major assessments for Elementary Education candidates, all of whom must take EDUC 324 Methods of Teaching Science in Elementary School (Gr. K-8). In this assessment, students develop a CUP for a science and a social studies CUP to be taught in an elementary (1-5) classroom in multi-day lesson plans. A Comprehensive Unit Plan (CUP) is based on the Louisiana Common Core State Standards (LA CCSS). One can look at the following items: (1) a Unit Plan Template (Elaborated) that is based on the LA CCSS. Each component of this template literally explains what to do. (2) a Unit Plan Template (Plain or Non-elaborated), that is also based on the LA CCSS, to be used by you for your CUP. You simply type your input in the various components of this format. (3) a Unit Plan Rubric that is also based on the LA CCSS so that you can assess your results. It can be a “Three-Day” unit plan on a topic of the curriculum or a "Five-Day" unit plan.
Just as teachers in the profession must design sequenced, aligned, and effective, lessons in order to be successful teachers, so Elementary Education candidates must master these skill if they are to be successful in the classroom.
Statistical analysis of student learning through pre- and post-assessments. This documentation attempts to show if the students learned from the candidate’s teaching. This assessment represents an analysis of difference between pre-/post-assessment scores of PK-12 student performance during a unit of instruction.
During their 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. That analysis requires them to compare the pre/post results and calculate the difference in student performance. This information is used by program faculty to analyze the impact student teachers’ instruction has on PK-12 student learning between the pre/post assessments. This assessment allows the candidates to reflect on their teaching and discuss strong points as well as challenges with University faculty. Examples of common points that could arise as a result of this assessment: 1) Do some students need further instruction? 2) What will your next lesson entail? 3) What worked and why? 4) What failed and why?

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

Outcome Links

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

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

2007 ACEI Elementary Education Standards and Supporting Explanation [External]

1.0 Development, Learning, & Motivation

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

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.

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.

11.1 Data

		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017
Student Outcomes	Number	8	2	3	5
	Mean	3.25	3.00	3.00	2.80
	Range	2.00-4.00	2.00-4.00	3.00	1.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	87%	50%	100%	60%
Procedures	Number	8	2	3	5
	Mean	3.25	3.50	3.00	3.40
	Range	3.00-4.00	2.00-4.00	3.00	1.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%	100%	80%

Lesson "Hook"	Number	8	2	3	5
	Mean	3.30	3.00	2.00	2.00
	Range	3.00-4.00	2.00-4.00	1.00-3.00	1.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	100%	50%	33%	40%
Modeled, Guided, Collab. & Ind. Practice	Number	8	2	3	5
	Mean	3.10	3.00	3.00	3.00
	Range	2.00-4.00	3.00-4.00	3.00	1.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	87%	100%	100%	80%
Technology	Number	8	2	3	5
	Mean	3.00	3.10	3..33	3.40
	Range	2.00-4.00	2.00-4.00	3.00-4.00	1.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	50%	100%	100%	80%
Relevance & Rationale	Number	8	2	3	5
	Mean	3.10	3.00	2.67	2.80
	Range	3.00-4.00	3.00-4.00	2.00-3.00	1.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%	67%	40%
Exploration, Extension, Supplemental	Number	8	2	3	5
	Mean	3.00	3.00	2.67	2.60
	Range	2.00-4.00	2.00-4.00	2.00-3.00	1.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	87%	50%	67%	40%
Differentiation	Number	8	2	3	5
	Mean	2.87	3.50	3.00	2.60
	Range	2.00-4.00	3.00-4.00	3.00	1.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	75%	100%	100%	60%
Mean Score for ACEI 1.0 Standard		3.17	3.10	2.83	3.17

		Fall 2015	Spring 2016
Alignment of Lesson	Number	5	2
	Mean	2.60	3.00
	Range	2.00-4.00	3.00
	% Proficient or Higher	40%	100%
Response to Intervention	Number	5	2
	Mean	1.00	3.00
	Range	1.00	3.00
	% Proficient or Higher	0%	100%
Mean Score for ACEI 1.0 Standard		1.80	3.00

Rubric Element	ACEI Standard	InTASC Standard		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017
Student Outcomes	1.0	4	Number	2	8	3	5
			Mean	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.80
			Range	3.00	3.00	3.00	1.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%	100%	60%
Procedures	1.0	3	Number	2	8	3	5
			Mean	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.40
			Range	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%	100%	100%
Lesson "Hook"	1.0	8	Number	2	8	3	5
			Mean	3.50	2.75	2.00	2.00
			Range	3.00-4.00	2.00-3.00	1.00-3.00	1.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher	100%	85%	33%	40%
Modeled, Guided, Collab. & Ind. Practice	1.0	7	Number	2	8	3	5
			Mean	3.00	3.13	3.00	3.00
			Range	3.00	3.00-4.00	3.00	1.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%	100%	80%
Technology	1.0	5	Number	2	8	3	5
			Mean	3.00	3.25	3.33	3.40
			Range	3.00	3.00-4.00	3.00-4.00	1.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%	100%	80%
Relevance & Rationale	1.0	2	Number	2	8	3	5
			Mean	3.00	3.00	2.67	2.80
			Range	3.00	3.00	2.00-3.00	1.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%	67%	80%
Exploration, Extension, Supplemental	1.0	1	Number	2	8	3	5
			Mean	2.00	2.50	2.67	2.20
			Range	2.00	2.00-3.00	2.00-3.00	1.00-3.00
			% Proficient or Higher	0%	50%	67%	40%
Differentiation	1.0	7	Number	2	8	3	5
			Mean	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.60
			Range	2.00	2.00	3.00	1.00-4.00

			% Proficient or Higher	0%	0%	100%	60%
Pre-Planned (Seed) Questions	4.0	4	Number	2	8	3	5
			Mean	3.00	3.00	2.67	2.40
			Range	3.00	3.00	1.00-2.00	1.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%	67%	60%
Formative / Summative Assessment	4.0	6	Number	2	8	3	5
			Mean	2.50	2.75	2.67	3.40
			Range	2.00-3.00	2.00-3.00	2.00-3.00	2.00-4.00
			% Proficient or Higher	100%	75%	67%	80%
Mean Score for ACEI 1.0 Standard				3.10	2.875	2.83	3.17
Mean Score for ACEI 4.0 Standard				3.20	2.875	2.67	2.90

		Element 2.1: Reading, Writing, Oral Language		Element 2.2: Mathematics		Element 2.2: Science		Element 2.4: Social Studies	
Rubric Element		Fall 2017	Spring 2018	Fall 2017	Spring 2018	Fall 2017	Spring 2018	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
Content Standards	Number	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
	Mean		4.00						
	Range		4.00						
	% Proficient or Higher		100%						
Student Outcomes	Number		1		1				
	Mean		4.00		3.00				
	Range		4.00		3.00				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%		100%				
Procedures	Number		1		1				
	Mean		4.00		3.00				
	Range		4.00		3.00				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%		100%				
Lesson "Hook"	Number		1		1				
	Mean		4.00		4.00				
	Range		4.00		4.00				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%		100%				
	Number		1						

Pre-Planned (Seed) Questions	Mean		3.00						
	Range		3.00						
	% Proficient or Higher		100%						
Modeled, Guided, Collab. & Ind. Practice	Number		1		1				
	Mean		4.00		3.00				
	Range		4.00		3.00				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%		100%				
Technology	Number		1		1				
	Mean		4.00		3.00				
	Range		4.00		3.00				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%		100%				
Formative / Summative Assessment	Number		1		1				
	Mean		4.00		3.00				
	Range		4.00		3.00				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%		100%				
Relevance & Rationale	Number		1		1				
	Mean		3.00		4.00				
	Range		3.00		4.00				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%		100%				
Exploration, Extension, Supplemental	Number		1		1				
	Mean		4.00		4.00				
	Range		4.00		4.00				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%		100%				
Accomodations / Differentiation	Number		1		1				
	Mean		4.00		4.00				
	Range		4.00		4.00				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%		100%				

		Element 2.1: Reading, Writing, Oral Language		Element 2.2: Mathematics		Element 2.2: Science		Element 2.4: Social Studies	
Rubric Element		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2018	Spring 2019

Content Standards	Number	0	3	0	3	0	0	0	0
	Mean		3.33		3.00				
	Range		3-4		3				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%		100%				
Student Outcomes	Number		3		3				
	Mean		3.67		3.00				
	Range		3-4		3				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%		100%				
Additional Standards/Cross Disciplinary Connections 6 ELA	Number		3		3				
	Mean		3.67		1.33				
	Range		3-4		1-2				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%		0%				
Additional Standards/Cross Disciplinary Connections Content	Number		3		3				
	Mean		3.67		2.67				
	Range		3-4		2-3				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%		67%				
Relevance and Rationale	Number		3		3				
	Mean		3.67		3.00				
	Range		3-4		3				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%		100%				
Misconceptions	Number		3		3				
	Mean		4.00		2.33				
	Range		4.00		2-3				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%		33%				
Lesson Progression	Number		3		3				
	Mean		3.67		3.00				
	Range		3-4		3				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%		100%				
Learning Environment	Number		3		3				
	Mean		3.33		2.67				
	Range		2-4		2-3				
	% Proficient or Higher		67%		67%				

Seed Questions	Number		3		3				
	Mean		3.00		1.67				
	Range		2-4		1-2				
	% Proficient or Higher		67%		0%				
Lesson Intro.	Number		3		3				
	Mean		3.67		3.00				
	Range		3-4		3				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%		100%				
Whole Group	Number		3		3				
	Mean		3.33		3.00				
	Range		3-4		3				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%		100%				
Small Group	Number		3		3				
	Mean		3.33		3.00				
	Range		3-4		3				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%		100%				
Independent Practice	Number		3		3				
	Mean		3.67		2.00				
	Range		3-4		2				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%		0%				
Closure	Number		3		3				
	Mean		3.67		2.33				
	Range		3-4		2-3				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%		33%				
Resources and Materials	Number		3		3				
	Mean		3.67		3.00				
	Range		3-4		3				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%		100%				
Teacher Technology Use	Number		3		3				
	Mean		4.00		3.00				
	Range		4		3				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%		100%				

Student Technology Use	Number		3		3				
	Mean		3.33		2.00				
	Range		3-4		2				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%		0%				
Assessment	Number		3		3				
	Mean		3.67		2.33				
	Range		3-4		2-3				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%		33%				
Differentiation by Content, Process, Product	Number		3		3				
	Mean		3.67		3.00				
	Range		3-4		3				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%		100%				
Differentiation by Learner	Number		3		3				
	Mean		3.67		3.00				
	Range		3-4		3				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%		100%				
RTI	Number		3		3				
	Mean		3.00		2.67				
	Range		3-4		3				
	% Proficient or Higher		67%		67%				
Instructional Strategies	Number		3		3				
	Mean		4.00		2.67				
	Range		4.00		2-3				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%		67%				

2019-2020:

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

		EDUC 410 Lesson Plan Various Subject Areas	
Rubric Element		Fall 2017	Spring 2018
Student Outcomes	Number	0	1
	Mean		4.00
	Range		4.00

	% Proficient or Higher		100%
Procedures	Number		1
	Mean		4.00
	Range		4.00
	% Proficient or Higher		100%
Lesson "Hook"	Number	0	1
	Mean		4.00
	Range		4.00
	% Proficient or Higher		100%
Pre-Planned (Seed) Questions	Number	0	1
	Mean		4.00
	Range		4.00
	% Proficient or Higher		100%
Modeled, Guided, Collab. & Ind. Practice	Number	0	1
	Mean		4.00
	Range		4.00
	% Proficient or Higher		100%
Technology	Number	0	1
	Mean		2.00
	Range		2.00
	% Proficient or Higher		0%
Formative / Summative Assessment	Number	0	1
	Mean		4.00
	Range		4.00
	% Proficient or Higher		100%
Relevance & Rationale	Number	0	1
	Mean		4.00
	Range		4.00
	% Proficient or Higher		100%
Exploration, Extension, Supplemental	Number	0	1
	Mean		4.00
	Range		4.00
	% Proficient or Higher		100%
Accommodations / Differentiation	Number	0	1
	Mean		2.00
	Range		2.00
	% Proficient or		

	Higher		0%

		EDUC 410 Lesson Plan Various Subject Areas	
Rubric Element		Fall 2018	Spring 2019
Content Standards and Outcomes	Number		3
	Mean		3.00
	Range		3
	% Proficient or Higher		100%
Student Outcomes and Assessments	Number		3
	Mean		4.00
	Range		4
	% Proficient or Higher		100%
Additional Standards/Cross Disciplinary Connections 6 ELA	Number		3
	Mean		3.33
	Range		3-4
	% Proficient or Higher		100%
Additional Standards/Cross Disciplinary Connections Content	Number		3
	Mean		3.67
	Range		3-4
	% Proficient or Higher		100%
Relevance and Rationale	Number		3
	Mean		4.00
	Range		4
	% Proficient or Higher		100%
Misconceptions	Number		3
	Mean		2.33
	Range		2-3
	% Proficient or Higher		33%
Lesson Progression	Number		3
	Mean		4.00
	Range		4
	% Proficient or Higher		100%
Learning Environment	Number		3
	Mean		3.33
	Range		3-4
	% Proficient or Higher		100%
	Number		3

Seed Questions	Mean		2.33
	Range		1-3
	% Proficient or Higher		67%
Lesson Introduction	Number		3
	Mean		3.33
	Range		3-4
	% Proficient or Higher		100%
Whole Group	Number		3
	Mean		3.67
	Range		3-4
	% Proficient or Higher		100%
Small Group	Number		3
	Mean		3.33
	Range		3-4
	% Proficient or Higher		100%
Independent Practice	Number		3
	Mean		3.00
	Range		2-4
	% Proficient or Higher		67%
Closure	Number		3
	Mean		2.33
	Range		1-3
	% Proficient or Higher		67%
Resources and Materials	Number		3
	Mean		3.00
	Range		3.00
	% Proficient or Higher		100%
Teacher Technology Use	Number		3
	Mean		4.00
	Range		4
	% Proficient or Higher		100%
Student Technology Use	Number		3
	Mean		2.00
	Range		2
	% Proficient or Higher		0%
	Number		3
	Mean		3.00

Assessment	Range		3
	% Proficient or Higher		100%
Differentiation by Content, Process, Product	Number		3
	Mean		3.00
	Range		2-4
	% Proficient or Higher		67%
Differentiation by Learner	Number		3
	Mean		3.33
	Range		3-4
	% Proficient or Higher		100%
Response to Intervention	Number		3
	Mean		3.00
	Range		3
	% Proficient or Higher		100%
Instructional Strategies	Number		3
	Mean		3.33
	Range		3-4
	% Proficient or Higher		100%

2019-2020:

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

11.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:
Candidate's scores over the two semesters have improved over two semesters. The overall mean score for ACEI Standard 1.0 remained stable increasing slightly from 3.1 to 3.17. In the areas of student outcomes, lesson “hook”, technology, and exploration, extension and supplemental resources, it was noted that the means for those domains showed a minimal increase. (3 to 3.25, 3 to 3.3, 3 to 3.1 and 3 to 3. In ACEI Standard 4.0, the overall mean decreased from 3.25 to 2.9. In the area of formative and summative assessment the mean decreased from 3.5 to 2.87 and increased minimally in the area of pre-planned (SEED) questions from 3 to 3.1.
Interpretation of How Data Provides Evidence for Meeting Standards:
The data support the assumption that students are progressing and demonstrating growth in their mastery of ACEI Standards 1.0 and 4.0. There are many areas, however, where the candidates need improvement mainly in the areas of modeling, guided, collaborative and independent practice and differentiation of instruction. Those are areas that can be addressed by the cooperating teacher and university supervisor during observations.
This is a new assessment as of 2015-2016. A benchmark will be set after three years of data collection.

2016-2017:

When examining student teaching/internship lesson plan data, two elements of the rubric were noted as meeting the benchmark of 3 for all four semesters: Modeled, Guided, Collaborative, and Individual Practice with mean scores of 3.0, 3.0, 3.0 and 3.40 respectively; Procedures with mean scores of 3, 3, 3, and 3.40 respectively; and
One element of the rubric, Exploration, Extension, Supplemental, did not meet benchmark, score of 3, for any of the four iterations of data with mean scores of 2.0, 2.5, 2.67, and 2.20 respectively.
In the area of Exploration, Extension, and Supplemental, the passage rate is below proficiency (75%) for all for semesters reported (fall 2015= 0%, spring 2016= 50%, fall 2016= 67%, spring 2017= 40%). In the area of Differentiation, the passage rate is below proficiency (75%) for three of the four semesters reported (fall 2015= 0%, spring 2016= 0%, spring 2017= 60%). In the area of Lesson “Hook” the mean score shows a decline from spring 2016 (2.75) to fall 2016 (2.0) to spring 2017 (2.0). For ACEI Standard 4.0, in the area of Formative and Summative Assessment, the mean scores showed an increase from fall 2015 (2.5) to fall 2016 (2.67) to spring 2017 (3.40). In Relevance and Rationale, the mean scores showed a decrease from spring 2016 (3.0) to fall 2016 (2.67). In Pre-Planned (Seed) Questions, the mean scores showed a decrease from spring 2016 (3.0) to fall 2016 (2.67) to spring 2017 (2.40). Faculty will pilot a new lesson planning template with instructions and lesson plan rubric with clearer descriptors for Exploration, Extension, and Supplemental; Differentiation, Lesson “Hook”, Relevance & Rationale, and Pre-Planned (Seed) Questions in EDUC 316 beginning fall 2017.

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

- Element 2.1. Reading, Writing, Oral Language and Element 2.2. Mathematics: The one student received a rating of 3.0 or higher in each area of the rubric.
- EDUC 410 Lesson Plan Various Subject Areas: Ten of the 11 areas received a rating of 3.0 or higher.
- EDUC 410 Lesson Plan Various Subject Areas: Accommodations/Differentiation received a rating of 2.0 which is below the benchmark.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: A revised lesson plan rubric will be adopted in the Elementary PBC and Practitioner programs during 2018-2019.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement: Develop and implement a systematic process to track student performance data from the new Lesson Plan rubric in order to more accurately identify areas of weakness on the Lesson Plan assessment.

2018-2019:
Analysis of Data: The benchmark was not met in all areas.

- Math: The following elements fell below the 80% proficiency benchmark:
  - Learning Environment: =3.33, 67% proficient
  - Seed Questions: =3.00, 67% proficient
  - Response to Intervention: =3.00, 67% proficient
- ELA: The following elements fell below the 80% proficiency benchmark:
  - Additional Standards/Cross Disciplinary Connections 6 ELA: =1.22, 0% proficient
  - Additional Standards/Cross Disciplinary Connections Content: =2.67, 67% proficient
  - Misconceptions: =2.33, 33% proficient
  - Learning Environment: =2.67, 67% proficient
  - Seed Questions: =1.67, 0% proficient
  - Independent Practice: =2.00, 0% proficient
  - Closure: =2.33, 33% proficient
  - Student Technology Use: =2.00, 0% proficient
  - Assessment: =2.33, 33% proficient
  - Response to Intervention: =2.67, 67% proficient
  - Instructional Strategies: =2.67, 67% proficient

- Classroom Management (Various Subject Areas): The following elements fell below the 80% proficiency benchmark:
  - Misconceptions: =2.33, 33% proficient
  - Seed Questions: =2.33, 67% proficient
  - Independent Practice: =3.00, 67% proficient
  - Closure: =2.33, 67% proficient
  - Student Technology Use: =2.00, 0% proficient
  - Differentiation by Content, Process, Product: =3.00, 67% proficient

Plan for Continuous Improvement: A revised lesson plan rubric was implemented in the 2018-2019 AY. Faculty and candidates are adjusting to the modified lesson plan expectations and how/where those elements are addressed throughout the program.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement: Develop and implement a systematic process to track student performance data from the new Lesson Plan rubric in order to more accurately identify areas of weakness on the Lesson Plan assessment. Candidates will be encouraged to enroll in the lesson planning course in order to have a solid background in understanding the components and expectations for writing a successful plan.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
There were no completers during the 2020-2021 academic year and therefore no new data to report. EDUC 315 was added as a requirement to the PBC program to provide candidates with a foundation to implement lesson planning throughout their methods coursework. Faculty will continue to evaluate lesson plan data within their courses at the end of each semester. In the summer semester, faculty make recommendations for edits to the Lesson Plan Template and Rubric based on the analysis of the data collected. The plan is revised and an updated version is put in to place for the following fall semester.

12 Assessment and Benchmark Field Experience Evaluation - Student Teaching

Assessment: Field Experience Evaluation Domains 1-5
Louisiana Teacher General Competency A: The teacher candidate demonstrates, at an effective level, the Louisiana Components of Effective Teaching as defined in Bulletin 130 and the Compass Teacher Rubric
Louisiana Teacher General Competency C2: The teacher candidate gathers, synthesizes, and analyzes a variety of data from a variety of sources to adapt instructional practices and other professional behaviors to better meet students' needs
InTASC standards included: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9
ACEI Standard 1.0, Element 3.1, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, Standard 4.0, Element 5.1

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

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

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.

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]

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.

12.1 Data Field Experience Evaluation Domains 1-4

2017-2018:
Data table is attached.

2018-2019:
Data table is attached.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
There were no new completers in the PBC Elementary program during the 2020-2021 academic year and therefore no new data to report.

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

PBC_ELEM_FEE_Domains 1-4
PBC_ELEM_FEE_Domains 1-4_18-19

12.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:
Under ACEI Standard 1.0, the mean for value, sequence, and alignment remained stable from fall 2015 to spring 2016. Under Standard 3.0 the mean for monitoring of student behavior reflected a significant increase demonstrating a marked improvement in student performance in that domain. In ACEI Standard 4.0, the means for assessment criteria and monitoring of student learning increased demonstrating that students were improving in their ability to evaluate student performance and observe student academic progress in the classroom. Under Standard 5.0, the means for receptivity to feedback; and decision-making; and integrity and ethical conduct increased from fall 2015 to spring 2016 demonstrating

growth in candidate professionalism in the areas of openness to cooperating teacher and university supervisor's comments and candidate honesty and ethical behavior in the classroom .
The FEE III, is designed to provide a comprehensive assessment of the candidate. This tool is designed to align closely with ACEI standards. As evidenced by the scores (see Attachment #4: Field Experience Evaluation Data for fall 2015 and spring 2016), candidates are performing at effective levels with regards to content knowledge, lesson planning, diversity, assessment of student learning and technology with growth evidenced each semester. In the analysis of the data, ACEI standards have been aligned with specific data points and candidate performance in specific domains are addressed.
This is a new assessment as of 2015-2016. A benchmark will be set after three years of data collection.

2016-2017:
ACEI Standard 1.0 (element 1.1.1), the mean scores for fall 2015 were 3.56, the mean scores for spring 2016 were 3.55, the mean scores for fall 2016 were 3.87, and the mean scores for spring 2017 were 3.48. The mean scores for the four semesters reported were above proficiency (2.0) for this standard. There was an increase in the mean scores from fall 2015 to fall 2016 followed by a slight decrease in spring 2017.

For ACEI Standard 1.0 (element 1.1.2), the mean scores for fall 2015 were 3.56, the mean scores for spring 2016 were 3.55, the mean scores for fall 2016 were 3.83, and the mean scores for spring 2017 were 3.48. The mean scores for the four semesters reported were above proficiency (2.0) for this standard. There was an increase in the mean scores from fall 2015 to fall 2016 followed by a slight decrease in spring 2017.

For ACEI Standard 1.0 (element 1.1.3), the mean scores for fall 2015 were 3.19, the mean scores for spring 2016 were 3.52, the mean scores for fall 2016 were 3.77, and the mean scores for spring 2017 were 3.29. The mean scores for the four semesters reported were above proficiency (2.0) for this standard. There was an increase in the mean scores from fall 2015 to fall 2016 followed by a slight decrease in spring 2017.

For ACEI Standard 3.4 (element 2.1.1), the mean scores for fall 2015 were 3.31, the mean scores for spring 2016 were 3.03, the mean scores for fall 2016 were 3.64, and the mean scores for spring 2017 were 3. Although there were considerable fluctuations in the mean scores for this standard, the scores were above the proficiency level (2.0).

For ACEI Standard 3.4 (element 2.2.1), the mean scores for fall 2015 were 3.44, the mean scores for spring 2016 were 3.25, the mean scores for fall 2016 were 4, and the mean scores for spring 2017 were 3.07. Although there were considerable fluctuations in the mean scores for this standard, the scores were above the proficiency level (2.0).

For ACEI Standard 3.4 (element 2.2.2), the mean scores for fall 2015 were 3.75, the mean scores for spring 2016 were 2.98, the mean scores for fall 2016 were 3.67, and the mean scores for spring 2017 were 3.02. Although there were considerable fluctuations in the mean scores for this standard, the scores were above the proficiency level for all four semesters reported.

For ACEI Standard 1.0 (element 3.1.1), the mean scores for fall 2015 were 3.19, the mean scores for spring 2016 were 2.81, the mean scores for fall 2016 were 3.23, and the mean scores for spring 2017 were 3.16. The mean scores for the four semesters reported were above proficiency (2.0) for this standard. There was an increase in the mean scores from fall 2015 to fall 2016 followed by a slight decrease in spring 2017.

For ACEI Standard 3.5 (element 3.1.2), the mean scores for fall 2015 were 2.94, the mean scores for spring 2016 were 2.75, the mean scores for fall 2016 were 3.56, and the mean scores for spring 2017 were 2.9. Although there were considerable fluctuations in the mean scores for this standard, the candidates scored above the proficient level (2.0) for all four semesters reported.

For ACEI Standard 3.5 (element 3.1.3), the mean scores for fall 2015 were 3, the mean scores for spring 2016 were 2.73, the mean scores for fall 2016 were 3.27, and the mean scores for spring 2017 were 2.82. Although there were considerable fluctuations in the mean scores for this standard, the candidates scored above the proficiency level (2.0) for all four semesters reported.

For ACEI Standard 1.0 (element 3.2.2), the mean scores for fall 2015 were 3.13, the mean scores for spring 2016 were 2.92, the mean scores for fall 2016 were 3.29, and the mean scores for spring 2017 were 2.97. The mean scores for the four semesters reported were above proficiency (2.0) for this standard. There was an increase in the mean scores from fall 2015 to fall 2016 followed by a slight decrease in spring 2017.

For ACEI Standard 1.0 (element 3.2.3), the mean scores for fall 2015 were 3.44, the mean scores for spring 2016 were 3.08, the mean scores for fall 2016 were 3.23, and the mean scores for spring 2017 were 3.3. The mean scores for the four semesters reported were above proficiency (2.0) for this standard. There was a decrease in the mean scores from fall 2015 to fall 2016 followed by a slight crease in spring 2017.

For ACEI Standard 4.0 (element 3.3.1), the mean scores for fall 2015 were 3, the mean scores for spring 2016 were 2.97, the mean scores for fall 2016 were 3.29, and the mean scores for spring 2017 were 2.99. Although there were considerable fluctuations in the mean scores for this standard, the candidates scored above the proficiency level (2.0) for all four semesters reported.

For ACEI Standard 1.0 (element 3.3.2), the mean scores for fall 2015 were 3.06, the mean scores for spring 2016 were 3.19, the mean scores for fall 2016 were 3.73, and the mean scores for spring 2017 were 3.54. The mean scores for the four semesters reported were above proficiency (2.0) for this standard. There was an increase in the mean scores from fall 2015 to fall 2016 followed by a slight decrease in spring 2017.

For ACEI Standard 4.0 (element 3.3.4), the mean scores for fall 2015 were 2.94, the mean scores for spring 2016 were 2.75, the mean scores for fall 2016 were 3.27, and the mean scores for spring 2017 were 2.96. The candidates scored above the proficiency level (2.0) in all four semesters reported.

For ACEI Element 5.1 (element 4.1.2), the mean scores for fall 2015 were 3.94, the mean scores for spring 2016 were 3.84, the mean scores for fall 2016 were 4.0, and the mean scores for spring 2017 were 3.84. The mean scores for the four semesters reported were above proficiency (2.0) for this standard. There was an increase in the mean scores from fall 2015 to fall 2016 followed by a slight decrease in spring 2017.

For ACEI Element 5.1 (element 4.1.3), the mean scores for fall 2015 were 3.88, the mean scores for spring 2016 were 3.78, the mean scores for fall 2016 were 4, and the mean scores for spring 2017 were 3.79. The mean scores for the four semesters reported were above proficiency (2.0) for this standard. There was an increase in the mean scores from fall 2015 to fall 2016 followed by a slight decrease in spring 2017.

2017-2018:
Analysis of Data: The benchmark of 3.00 or higher on each element was not met.

- Spring 2018: One of two (50%) PBC students scored below 3.0 on element 3.3.4: Student self-assessment and monitoring of progress.
- Spring 2018: The practitioner (100%) scored below benchmark on Assessment Criteria (element 3.3.1) and Student Self-Assessment and Monitoring of Progress (element 3.3.4)

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

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- Effectiveness of pre- and post-conferences will be measured through candidates' completion of a survey as well as their performance on lesson reflections.
- Identified FEE Domains 1-4 weaknesses discussed with PBC and Practitioner program faculty during curriculum redesign meetings during 2018-2019. Implementation and teaching of the revised FEE domains throughout the scope and sequence of Education coursework in the curriculum redesign

2018-2019:
Analysis of Data: The benchmark of 3.00 or higher on each element was not met.

- Spring 2019 (n=5):
  - Element 2.2.2: =2.85, 40% proficient
  - Element 3.1.3: =2.95, 40% proficient

Plan for Continuous Improvement: Faculty will continue to support candidates in improving their teaching in the field.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement: Professors will be implementing the use of the POP Cycle for coursework throughout the program. In addition, POP Cycles will be used for candidates during the student teaching/residency semesters to provide timely and actionable academic feedback to candidates to foster improved teaching in the field.

2019-2020:

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

12.2 Data Field Experience Evaluation_Domain 5

2017-2018:
Data table is attached.

2018-2019:
Data table for Domain 5 of the FEE from Student Teaching is attached.

2019-2020:

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

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

PBC_ELEM_FEE_Content Area_17-18
PBC_ELEM_FEE_Domain 5_18-19

12.2.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:
Analysis of Data: The benchmark was met.

- Spring 2018: One of two (50%) PBC students scored below 3.0 on ACEI Standard 4, elements 3.3.1: Student self-assessment and monitoring of progress.

- Spring 2018: The practitioner (100%) scored below benchmark onACEI Standard 4, Assessment Criteria (element 3.3.1) and Student Self-Assessment and Monitoring of Progress (element 3.3.4)

Plan for Continuous Improvement: FEE Domain data addressing ACEI standard findings /analysis will be shared with the faculty of the Elementary PBC and Practitioner programs during curriculum redesign so they can reinforce expectations and provide examples to students on weak domains.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- Effectiveness of pre- and post-conferences will be measured through candidates' completion of a survey as well as their performance on lesson reflections.
- Identified FEE Domains weaknesses in relation to ACEI standards will be discussed with PBC and Practitioner program faculty during curriculum redesign meetings during 2018-2019.
- Implementation and teaching of the revised FEE domains throughout the scope and sequence of Education coursework in the curriculum redesign.

2018-2019:
Analysis of Data: All elements in domain 5 scored had a mean value of 3.00 or higher. On elements 5.11 and 5.14, there was one candidate in each element with an average range that fell below the 3.00 benchmark.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:
The FEE Content items will be reviewed for alignment to specific content Elementary Standards. Candidates will then be expected to score a mean of 3.00 or higher on each element of Domain 5.

Recommendations for Implementing Continuous Improvement Plan:

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

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
There were no completers in the PBC Elementary program during the 2020-2021 academic year and therefore no new data to report. The domain 5 elements will be aligned to current standards for science, social studies, and ELA in elementary during the summer 2021 semester to be implemented in the fall 2021. Norming and inter-rater reliability will be established for domain 5 elements.

13 Assessment and Benchmark Teacher Candidate Work Sample

Assessment: Teacher Candidate Work Sample
Louisiana Teacher General Competency H: The teacher candidate applies knowledge of various types of assessments and their purposes, strengths, and limitations to select, adapt, and modify assessments to accommodate the abilities and needs of students with exceptionalities.
Louisiana Teacher General Competency C1:The teacher candidate observes and reflects on students' responses to instruction o identify areas of need and make adjustments to practice.
InTASC standards included: 6
ACEI Standards: 1.0 Development, Learning, and Motivation; 4.0 Assessment for Instruction

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

Outcome Links

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

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

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.

13.1 Data

Criteria	ACEI Standard	InTASC Standard		Spring 2016 N=13	Fall 2016 N=9	Spring 2017 N=11	Fall 2017 N=0	Spring 2018 N=7	
								PBC N=2	Pract. N=1
Choice of Assessment	4.0	6	Mean	2.20	3.67	3.60			4.00
			Range	2.00-3.00	3.00-4.00	3.00-4.00			4.00
			% proficient or higher	20%	100%	100%			100%
Pre-Assessment	4.0	6	Mean	1.00	2.33	2.80			4.00
			Range	1.00	1.00-4.00	1.00-4.00			4.00
			% proficient or higher	0%	33%	60%			100%
Post-Assessment	4.0	6	Mean	3.00	3.00	2.20			4.00
			Range	3.00	1.00-4.00	1.00-4.00			4.00
			% proficient or higher	100%	67%	40%			100%
Alignment of Lesson Evidence	1.0	6	Mean	2.60	3.33	2.20			4.00
			Range	2.00-4.00	2.00-4.00	1.00-4.00			4.00
			% proficient or higher	40%	67%	40%			100%
Student Level of Mastery and Evaluation of Factors	4.0	6	Mean	2.60	3.667	2.80			4.00
			Range	2.00-4.00	3.00-4.00	2.00-4.00			4.00
			% proficient or higher	40%	100%	40%			100%
Data to Determine Patterns and Gaps	4.0	6	Mean	2.20	3.00	2.80			4.00
			Range	2.00-3.00	3.00-4.00	1.00-4.00			4.00
			% proficient or higher	20%	67%	60%			100%

Response to Interventions	4.0	6	Mean	1.00	3.33	3.00			4.00
			Range	1.00	2.00-4.00	1.00-4.00			4.00
			% proficient or higher	0%	67%	60%			100%

Criteria	ACEI Standard	InTASC Standard	EDUC 410	Fall 2018 N=	Spring 2019 N=3	Fall 2019 N=0	Spring 2020 N=0	Fall 2020 N=	Spring 2021 N=
Choice of Assessment	4.0	6	Mean		4.00				
			Range		4.00				
			% proficient or higher		100%				
Pre-Assessment	4.0	6	Mean		2.33				
			Range		2-3				
			% proficient or higher		33%				
Post-Assessment	4.0	6	Mean		2.67				
			Range		2-3				
			% proficient or higher		67%				
Alignment of Lesson	1.0	6	Mean		4.00				
			Range		4				
			% proficient or higher		100%				

Criteria	EDUC 334	Spring 2019 N=4	Spring 2020	Spring 2021
Standards and Alignment Question 2	Mean	4.00		
	Range	4		
	% Proficient or Higher	100%		
Patterns and Gaps (Strength)	Mean	3.50		
	Range	3-4		
	% Proficient or Higher	100%		
Patterns and Gaps (Challenges)	Mean	3.25		
	Range	3-4		
	% Proficient or Higher	100%		

Analysis of Assessment	Mean	3.50		
	Range	3-4		
	% Proficient or Higher	100%		
Evidence of Alignment	Mean	2.25		
	Range	2-3		
	% Proficient or Higher	25%		
Application of Data	Mean	3.75		
	Range	3-4		
	% Proficient or Higher	100%		
RTI	Mean	3.50		
	Range	3-4		
	% Proficient or Higher	100%		

13.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:
Analysis of Data: The benchmark was met.

- No PBC student data was available.
- One Practitioner achieved 100% in all ACEI standards of the TCWS.

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

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- TCWS data analysis results will be documented and filed, then shared with PBC and Practitioner program faculty in order to ensure TCWS implementation and teachings throughout the scope and sequence of education coursework is consistently incorporated into the curriculum redesign and adoption.
- Recommendations for course content changes made as a result of the analysis and discussion will be documented.

2018-2019:
Analysis of Data: The benchmark was not met.
EDUC 410: Candidates fell below benchmark on the Pre-Assessment with a mean score of 2.33 and 33% proficiency (n=3) and Post-Assessment with a mean score of 2.67 and 67% proficiency
EDUC 334: The Teaching Cycle: Candidate scored at or above the proficiency level in all categories except for Evidence of Alignment which had a mean score of 2.25 and 25% proficiency (n=4).

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The Teacher Candidate Work Sample has now been morphed into the Teaching Cycle. This was piloted in the 18-19 AY and will be fully implemented in all programs and methods courses in the 19-20 AY. This evaluation tool will provide useful data for diagnosing the strengths and weaknesses in the practices of our candidates.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- Faculty will work together to distribute the learning and familiarity with the Teaching Cycle throughout coursework and explain the transition to the revised assessment.

2019-2020:

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

14 Assessment and Benchmark EDUC 416 Case Study

Assessment: Case Study Assessment

Benchmark: 80% of candidates will pass the Case Study assignment at the proficiency level (3.00) or higher.

Outcome Links

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.

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.

14.1 Data

Criteria	ACEI Standard	InTASC Standard		Fall 2015 N=7	Spring 2016 N=2	Fall 2016 N=0	Spring 2017 N=0	Fall 2017 N=0	Spring 2018 N=2
Analysis of Pre- and Post-test Data	4.0	6	Mean						
			Range						
			% proficient or higher						
Fluency	3.1	4	Mean						
			Range						
			% proficient or higher						
			Mean						

Instructional Strategies	3.1	7	Range						
			% proficient or higher						
Response to Intervention	1.0	6	Mean	3.14	3.00				
			Range	2.00-4.00	2.00-4.00				
			% proficient or higher	71%	50%				

Criteria	ACEI Standard	InTASC Standard		Fall 2018 N=	Spring 2019 N=3	Fall 2019 N=0	Spring 2020 N=0	Fall 2020 N=	Spring 2021 N=
Analysis of Pre- and Post-test Data	4.0	6	Mean		3.00				
			Range		3				
			% proficient or higher		100%				
Fluency	3.1	4	Mean		3.33				
			Range		3-4				
			% proficient or higher		100%				
Instructional Strategies	3.1	7	Mean		3.33				
			Range		3-4				
			% proficient or higher		100%				
Response to Intervention	1.0	6	Mean		3.00				
			Range		3				
			% proficient or higher		100%				

14.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:
A Brief Analysis of Data Findings:
The Case Study, is designed to offer the candidate intensive individualized tutoring opportunity in a real world setting as the candidate administers diagnostic tests, designs and implements lessons plans, fluency screenings, as texts are possessed in this remediation setting. This tool is designed to align closely with ACEI standards. As evidenced by the scores (see Attachment: Case Study Evaluation Data for fall 2015 and spring 2016), candidates are performing at Highly Proficient levels in regards To Response to Intervention which corresponds with ACEI Stand I. Candidates are performing at the Highly Proficient level in regards to Instructional Strategies which aligns with ACEI standards 3.0. In fall 2015 candidates were rated at the Effective Emerging level, in spring 2016, candidates scored at the Effective Proficient level. Lastly in terms of Analysis of Pre-Test and Post-Test Data relating to ACEI Standards 4.0, candidates in fall 2015 and spring 2016 were rated Highly Proficient. In the analysis of the data, ACEI standards have been aligned with specific data points and candidate performance in specific domains are addressed.

Interpretation of the Data

Under ACEI Standard 1.0, the mean for Response to Intervention remained stable from fall 2015 to spring 2016. In terms of Fluency relating to Standard 3.0 the scores revealed a marginal increase. In ACEI Standard 4.0, specifically referencing Analysis of Pre-test and Post-test Data, a marked improvement from fall 2015 to spring 2016 occurred.
This is a new assessment as of 2015-2016. A benchmark will be set after three years of data collection.

2017-2018:
Analysis of Data: There was no data reported on the candidates.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: 80% of candidates will pass the Case Study assignment at the proficiency level (3.00) or higher.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:
- The department will review the candidates' performance data on the Case Study to identify areas of weakness within the PLT exam.
- Data analysis will be discussed during curriculum redesign meetings and curriculum or course revisions adopted as necessary.

2018-2019:
Analysis of Data: The benchmark was met as all candidates scored at the proficiency level or above on the rubric elements reported from the Case Study assignment.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: Due to small sample size. faculty will review data over a period of time to identify trends in strengths and areas of improvement.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:
- Faculty are working to revise the rubric to contain elements that are clear, concise, and rigorous.
- Reading faculty are continuing to collaborate on the progression of course content throughout the reading sequence in the program.
- At the end of the 19-20 AY, faculty will look at the two years of data to determine trends in strengths and weaknesses and create a plan for improvement to strengthen candidate performance.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
There were no completers in this program in the 2020-2021 academic year and therefore no new data to report. Faculty will review the assessment and determine whether the rubric needs to be revised or a new assessment should be used. The revision or replacement should be in effect in the fall 2022.

End of report