

General Business Administration [GBAD]

Cycles included in this report: Jun 1, 2021 to May 31, 2022

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: General Business Administration [GBAD]

Reporting Cycle: Jun 1, 2021 to May 31, 2022

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

2021-2022:

4 Program Highlights from the Reporting Year

2021-2022:

5 Program Mission

The Bachelor of Science in General Business Administration serves residents of southwest Louisiana seeking a college degree as well as both public and private employers in the regions. The curriculum is specifically designed to meet the needs of regional economic development and prepares students for leadership in the global economy.

6 Institutional Mission Reference

7 Assessment and Benchmark BADM 275 Analytical Paper

Assessment: Faculty require enrolled students to write a short, relevant analytical paper for each course-specific objective. To not overburden the students with writing assignments, the first third of the students in the class roster write a paper related to the first objective, the second third write a paper related to the second objective, and the remaining third write a paper related to the third objective. The papers are written with the periodic guidance of the teaching faculty of the specific course, and the papers are due prior to the final exams.

From each group of three different papers, three papers are randomly drawn for assessment. Thus, each selected course has altogether nine papers assessed. They represent around 20% of the total enrollment of the course. Two faculty members familiar with the subject area independently and blindly assess the papers using the following 100-point scoring scale:

- > 90%: Exceeds expectations
- 80-90%: Meets expectations
- < 80%: Does not meet expectations

Benchmark: The grand mean of the reviewers' scores will be at least 80% (meets expectations).

Outcome Links

Problem Solving and Analysis [Program]

Students will be able to solve and analyze business problems using appropriate quantitative techniques.

7.1 Data

Spring 2022 (see attached file for more detailed assessment information):

Objective	Exceeds Expectations (Average Score >90%)	Meets Expectations (Average Score 80-90%)	Does Not Meet Expectations (Average Score <80%)
Determine appropriate			

quantitative analytical techniques to solve a specific business problem	82.4*	
Apply an appropriate quantitative method to solve a business problem under uncertainty	80.2*	
Analyze quantitative output and arrive at a logical conclusion	81.2*	

*Grand mean of the mean scores of three evaluators.

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

BADM 275 Assessment Information_Spring 2022

Outcome Links

Problem Solving and Analysis [Program]

Students will be able to solve and analyze business problems using appropriate quantitative techniques.

7.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2021-2022:

In term of grand means, the sampled students met expectations for all three objectives. The mean score of the first reviewer for the third objective was below the threshold of 80 to meet expectations. A closer look at Table 1 (attached to Data field above) shows that one sampled student exceeded expectations for objective 1 and another student failed to meet expectations, based on scores, given by first evaluator and second evaluator, respectively. For objective 2, one exceeded expectations and two failed to meet expectations. For objective 3, none exceeded expectations and two failed to meet expectations in all cases except the above.

For further improvement in the future, both evaluators suggest that the teaching faculty should guide students as to how to better organize/structure the paper, to draw logical conclusion from data analyses, and to state business implications of the numerical results. To remedy the situation, Table 1 will be shared with the teaching faculty.

Outcome Links

Problem Solving and Analysis [Program]

Students will be able to solve and analyze business problems using appropriate quantitative techniques.

8 Assessment and Benchmark MGMT 481 Analytical Paper

Assessment: Faculty require enrolled students to write a short, relevant analytical paper for each course-specific objective. To not overburden the students with writing assignments, the first third of the students in the class roster write a paper related to the first objective, the second third write a paper related to the second objective, and the remaining third write a paper related to the third objective. The papers are written with the periodic guidance of the teaching faculty of the specific course, and the papers are due prior to the final exams.

From each group of three different papers, three papers are randomly drawn for assessment. Thus, each selected course has altogether nine papers assessed. They represent around 20% of the total enrollment of the course. Two faculty members familiar with the subject area independently and blindly assess the papers using the following 100-point scoring scale:

- > 90%: Exceeds expectations
- 80-90%: Meets expectations
- < 80%: Does not meet expectations

Benchmark: The grand mean of the reviewers' scores will be at least 80% (meets expectations).

Outcome Links

Critical Thinking [Program]

Students will be able to think critically and strategically about solutions to organizational problems in terms of business goal settings.

8.1 Data

Spring 2022 (see attached file for more detailed assessment information):

Objective	Exceeds Expectations (Average Score >90%)	Meets Expectations (Average Score 80-90%)	Does Not Meet Expectations (Average Score <80%)
Identify organizational problems		86.5*	
Apply relevant analysis to develop solutions		88.5*	
Develop strategic solutions to address problems		83.2*	

*Grand mean of the mean scores of three evaluators.

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

MGMT 481 Assessment Information_Spring 2022

Outcome Links

Critical Thinking [Program]

Students will be able to think critically and strategically about solutions to organizational problems in terms of business goal settings.

8.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2021-2022:

In the outcome-column on Table 2 (attached to Data field above), each objective has two components. Both evaluators scored each component to assign average scores for each objective, as recorded in Table 2. As observed above, the sampled students met expectations in terms of individual means and grand means with some deviations across two reviewers. In Table 2, it is noticed that one student exceeded expectations for objective 1 and another student did so for objective 2, as assessed by the first evaluator. In both cases, none failed to meet expectations. For objective 3, none exceeded expectations. The first evaluator and second evaluator put one student each failing to meet expectations.

For further improvement in the future, the reviewers suggest more detailed data analyses, better integration of contents, drawing logical conclusions, stating business policy implications, etc. To rectify the deficiencies, Table 2 will be shared with the teaching faculty to guide the future students.

Outcome Links

Critical Thinking [Program]

Students will be able to think critically and strategically about solutions to organizational problems in terms of business goal settings.

9 Assessment and Benchmark ECON 325 Analytical Paper

Assessment: Faculty require enrolled students to write a short, relevant analytical paper for each course-specific objective. To not overburden the students with writing assignments, the first third of the students in the class roster write a paper related to the first objective, the second third write a paper related to the second objective, and the remaining third write a paper related to the

third objective. The papers are written with the periodic guidance of the teaching faculty of the specific course, and the papers are due prior to the final exams.

From each group of three different papers, three papers are randomly drawn for assessment. Thus, each selected course has altogether nine papers assessed. They represent around 20% of the total enrollment of the course. Two faculty members familiar with the subject area independently and blindly assess the papers using the following 100-point scoring scale:

- > 90%: Exceeds expectations
- 80-90%: Meets expectations
- < 80%: Does not meet expectations

Benchmark: The grand mean of the reviewers' scores will be at least 80% (meets expectations).

Outcome Links

Market Behaviors [Program]

Students will understand interest rate behaviors, stock and bond valuation, and their market behaviors linking to the real economy.

9.1 Data

Spring 2022 (see attached file for more detailed assessment information):

Objective	Exceeds Expectations (Average Score >90%)	Meets Expectations (Average Score 80-90%)	Does Not Meet Expectations (Average Score <80%)
Understanding of how interest rates behave		81.8*	
Determination of stock and bond prices		82.8*	
Understanding of behaviors of stock and bond markets		82.4*	

*Grand mean of the mean scores of three evaluators.

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

ECON 325 Assessment Information_Spring 2022

Outcome Links

Market Behaviors [Program]

Students will understand interest rate behaviors, stock and bond valuation, and their market behaviors linking to the real economy.

9.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2021-2022:

In terms of the mean scores of individual evaluators, sampled students met expectations for all three objectives except objective 1, as assessed by second evaluator. However, they all met expectations in term of grand means. Table 5 (attached to Data field above) depicts that there is one case of exceeding expectations, as assessed by the first evaluator. There are two cases of failure to meet expectations according to the second evaluator for objective 1. For objective 2, there is one case of exceeding expectations and one case of marginal failure to meet expectations according to the assessment by the second reviewer. For objective 3, none exceeded expectations. There is one case of failure to meet expectations, as assessed by the first evaluator.

The reviewers suggested for future improvement that students be more specific to the topic with relevant academic citations, include more data analyses with graphic presentation of actual data and providing policy implications. Table 5 is to be shared with teaching faculty for future remediation.

Outcome Links

Market Behaviors [Program]

Students will understand interest rate behaviors, stock and bond valuation, and their market behaviors linking to the real economy.

10 Assessment and Benchmark Business Administration Praxis

Assessment: Praxis Business Content Exam

Program: Business Traditional; Exam #: 5101

Benchmark: 90% of the candidates will pass the Praxis Business Content Exam on the first attempt.

10.1 Data

2017-2018:

There were no completers in the Business Education program and, therefore, no new data to report.

2018-2019: Data not reported.

2019-2020: Data not reported.

			Fall 2020	Spring 2021
Ove	rall score information		Mean 166	Mean 163
Uve		Range 166	Range 163	
Pa	sses on first attempt		100%	100%
Passed pri	or to student teaching	ı/intern	100%	100%
Sub-component	Standard Alignment		Fall 2020 N=1	Spring 2021 N=1
		Mean	12	14
Accounting & Finance		Range	12	14
		% Correct (18)	67%	78%
		Mean	13	15
Communication &		Range	13	15
Career Development		% Correct (18)	72%	83%
		Mean	7	6
Economics		Range	7	6
Loononnoo		% Correct (12)	58%	50%
		Mean	10	10
Entrepreneurship		Range	10	10
		% Correct (12)	83%	83%
		Mean	16	10
Information		Range	16	10

Technology	% Correct (18)	89%	56%
	Mean	13	11
Law & International	Range	13	11
Business	% Correct (18)	72%	61%
	Mean	8	5
Marketing &	Range	8	5
Management	% Correct (12)	67%	42%
	Mean	8	8
Professional	Range	8	8
Business Education	% Correct (12)	67%	67%

			Fall 2021	Spring 2022
	rall score information		Mean 158	Mean
076		Range 158	Range	
Pa	sses on first attempt	100%		
Passed pri	or to student teaching	ı/intern	100%	
Sub-component	Standard Alignment		Fall 2021 N=1	Spring 2022 N=0
		Mean	11	
Accounting &		Range	11	
Finance		% Correct (18)	61%	
		Mean	11	
Communication & Career Development		Range	11	
		% Correct (18)	61%	
		Mean	9	
Economics		Range	9	
Loonomioo		% Correct (12)	75%	
		Mean	6	
Entrepreneurship		Range	6	
		% Correct (12)	50%	
		Mean	16	
Information		Range	16	
Technology		% Correct (18)	89%	
		Mean	10	
Law & International		Range	10	
Business		% Correct		

	(18)	56%	
	Mean	9	
Marketing &	Range	9	
Management	% Correct (12)	75%	
	Mean	8	
Professional	Range	8	
Business Education	% Correct (12)	67%	

10.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: There were no completers in the Business Education program and therefore, no new data to analyze.

2018-2019:

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

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

The percentage correct for the fall 2020 sub-categories ranged from 58% to 89%, with Economics having the lowest percentage score. The spring 2021 data for percentage correct ranged from 42% to 83%. Those two lowest scoring categories included *Marketing and Management (42%)* and *Economics (50%)*. For both semesters, *Economics* had the lowest scores.

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

2021-2022:

The benchmark was met. The completer for the 2021-2022 AY achieved a passing score on the first attempt.

The EPAC representative will ensure that the curriculum is aligned to the Praxis content exam and should add this information to the course syllabi to ensure that new instructors understand the importance of the material to the success of the candidate in complete the content exam and in being a successful business educator.

11 Assessment and Benchmark FEE Content

Assessment: Field Experience Evaluation Domain 5.

Benchmark: 100% of candidates will score a 3.00 or better on each element of the Field Experience Evaluation Domain 5 rubric.

Prior to 2017-2018, the benchmark was100% of students will meet or exceed a score of 2.00, which is the benchmark set by the State of Louisiana.

11.1 Data

2017-2018:

There were no completers in the Business Education program and therefore, no new data to report.

2018-2019: Data not reported.

2019-2020: Data not reported.

Business		Fall 2	020		Spring	ng 2021 Fall 2021				Spring	2022	
Component	#	Mean	Range	#	Mean	Range	#	Mean	Range	#	Mean	Range
5.1	0			1	4.00	4.00	1	3.54	3.54			
5.2				1	3.33	3.33	1	3.42	3.42			
5.3				1	3.58	3.58	1	3.42	3.42			
5.4				1	3.00	3.00	1	3.75	3.75			
5.5				1	3.08	3.08	1	4.00	4.00			
5.6							1	2.00	2.00			
5.7							1	3.13	3.13			
5.8							1	3.75	3.75			
5.9							1	3.75	3.75			
5.10				1	4.00	4.00	1	3.75	3.75			
TECH 1				1	4.00	4.00	1	3.63	3.63			
TECH 2				1	4.00	4.00	1	3.88	3.88			
TECH 3				1	4.00	4.00	1	3.63	3.63			

11.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: There were no completers in the Business Education program and therefore, no new data to analyze.

2018-2019:

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

The benchmark was met for the Domain 5 elements and the three added TECH components. There were no domain 5 scores reported for the fall 2020 semester partially due to COVID-19 restrictions and issues arising from hurricanes Laura and Delta.

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

2021-2022:

The benchmark was not met as there was one element (5.8) in which the candidate scored below the benchmark of 3.00.

EPAC representatives from the College of Business will ensure that the content portion of domain 5 aligns to the appropriate standards and will assist in the evaluation of content knowledge of candidates during their residency semester evaluations.

12 Assessment and Benchmark inTASC Standards - Lesson Planning

Assessment: Lesson Planning Rubric

Benchmark: 80% of candidates will score 3.00 or better on each element of the lesson plan rubric.

12.1 Data

2017-2018:

There were no completers in the Business Education program and therefore, no new data to report.

2018-2019: Data not reported.

2019-2020: Data not reported.

2020-2021: Data table attached.

2021-2022: Data table attached.

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

SEC BUS_Lesson Plan _20-21 SEC BUS_Lesson Plan _21-22

12.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: There were no completers in the Business Education program and therefore, no new data to analyze.

2018-2019:

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

The benchmark was not met for the 2020-2021 academic year. 72% (16/22) of the categories had less than 80% proficiency. It is important to note the low n value (N=2).

Completers of the redesigned one-year residency programs are required to enroll in *EDUC 318: Planning and Instruction for Literacy in the Content Area* course early on in the program (Term 4, spring). This course is designed to teach candidates the importance of planning for instruction, taking into consideration the students within the P-12 courses and the objectives and content that needs to be covered. This course will provide a foundation for understanding the components of the plan utilized in methods coursework. Additionally, future data will include a progression of lesson plan data from the initial work in EDUC 318 to the teacher residency semester.

2021-2022:

There was only one completer for the 2021-2022 academic year, therefore, data could not be fully analyzed with such a small sample.

All major assessments, including the lesson plan, are being realigned to the 2022 Danielson Framework for Teaching Model in preparation for the Fall 2024 CAEP accreditation visit therefore a new assessment will be implemented in Fall 2022.

13 Assessment and Benchmark FEE - Specific inTASC Standards

Assessment: Field Experience Evaluation Domains 1-4

Benchmark: 100% of candidates will score a 3.00 or better on each element of the Field Experience Evaluation Domains 1-4 rubric.

Prior to 2017-2018, the benchmarkwas 100% of students will meet or exceed a score of 2.00, which is the benchmark set by the State of Louisiana.

13.1 Data

2017-2018:

There were no completers in the Business Education program and therefore, no new data to report.

2018-2019: Data not reported.

2019-2020: Data not reported.

Business	InTASC		Fall 2	020		Spring	2021		Fall 2	2021 Spring		2022	
Component	Standard	#	Mean	Range	#	Mean	Range	#	Mean	Range	#	Mean	Range
1.1.1	4n	1	4.00	4.00	1	3.88	3.88	1	3.38	3.38	0	—	
1.1.2	6r	1	4.00	4.00	1	3.88	3.88	1	3.88	3.88	0	—	—
1.1.3	2g	1	4.00	4.00	1	3.88	3.88	1	3.50	3.50	0	_	—
1.1.4	1b	1	4.00	4.00	1	3.63	3.63	1	3.00	3.00	0	-	—
2.1.1	Зј	1	3.67	3.67	1	3.25	3.25	1	3.63	3.63	0	_	—
2.1.2	3d	1	4.00	4.00	1	3.38	3.38	1	3.75	3.75	0	—	—
2.1.3	3d	1	3.67	3.67	1	3.75	3.75	1	3.25	3.25	0	_	—
2.1.4	3d	1	4.00	4.00	1	3.50	3.50	1	3.75	3.75	0		—
2.2.1	3c	1	3.67	3.67	1	3.63	3.63	1	4.00	4.00	0	_	—
2.2.2	Зf	1	4.00	4.00	1	2.88	2.88	1	3.75	3.75	0		—
2.2.3	Зf	1	3.67	3.67	1	3.13	3.13	1	3.88	3.88	0		
3.1.1	8f	1	4.00	4.00	1	2.50	2.50	1	2.75	2.75	0		
3.1.2	4c	1	4.00	4.00	1	2.88	2.88	1	2.75	2.75	0		
3.1.3	5e	1	4.00	4.00	1	2.75	2.75	1	3.13	3.13	0		
3.2.1	7a	1	4.00	4.00	1	3.13	3.13	1	3.75	3.75	0		
3.2.2	Зј	1	4.00	4.00	1	3.25	3.25	1	3.75	3.75	0		
3.2.3	4f	1	4.00	4.00	1	3.50	3.50	1	3.13	3.13	0		
3.2.4	3d	1	4.00	4.00	1	2.50	2.50	1	3.63	3.63	0		
3.3.1	6d	1	3.33	3.33	1	3.13	3.13	1	3.38	3.38	0		
3.3.2	6a	1	4.00	4.00	1	3.25	3.25	1	3.75	3.75	0		
3.3.3	6d	1	4.00	4.00	1	3.38	3.38	1	3.75	3.75	0		
3.3.4	8b	1	3.67	3.67	1	2.50	2.50	1	3.50	3.50	0		
4.1.1	90	1	4.00	4.00	1	3.38	3.38	1	4.00	4.00	0		_
4.1.2	91	1	4.00	4.00	1	4.00	4.00	1	4.00	4.00	0		
4.1.3	90	1	4.00	4.00	1	4.00	4.00	1	4.00	4.00	0		—

13.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: There were no completers in the Business Education program and therefore, no new data to analyze.

2018-2019:

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

The benchmark was not met for the 2020-2021 academic year on each component for domains 1-4 of the FEE. It is important to consider the data may reflect the challenges of the candidates' student teaching experience which was impacted by the extraordinary circumstances of COVID-19 and continued recovery from the fall 2020 hurricanes.

The FEE data from the fall 2020 semester did meet benchmark. All Domain scores and sub scores were above 3.00. However, in the spring 2021 semester, the following sub-categories were below 3.00: 2.2.2, 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.1.3, 3.2.4, and 3.3.4. Faculty and University Supervisors have begun to conduct pre- and post-conferences (POP Cycles) with candidates to discuss expectations for the lesson being taught and to evaluate the success of the lesson afterward. IN preparation for the fall 2021 semester and to work toward meeting benchmark in all components, EPP secondary faculty will distribute and implement components of the POP Cycle within their courses. This will assist in increasing understanding, usefulness, and implementation expectations to prepare candidates to achieve higher scores on the assessment during teacher residency. The EPP will provide training and opportunities to establish inter-rater reliability and norming of the FEE rubric.

2021-2022:

The benchmark was not met. There were two elements in which the benchmark of 3.00 was not met: 3.1.1 (2.75) and 3.1.2 (2.75). This is consistent with other data as candidates typically have more difficulty meeting benchmark in domain 3.

All major assessments, including the field experience evaluation, are being realigned to the 2022 Danielson Framework for Teaching Model in preparation for the Fall 2024 CAEP accreditation visit therefore a new assessment will be implemented in Fall 2022.

14 Assessment and Benchmark Outcomes - TCWS

Assessment: Teacher Candidate Work Sample

Benchmark: 80% or more of the candidates will score a 3.00 or better on each element assessed in the Teacher Candidate Work Sample Rubric.

14.1 Data

2017-2018:

There were no completers in the Business Education program and, therefore, no new data to report.

2018-2019: Data not reported.

2019-2020: Data not reported.

Criteria		Fall 2020	Spring 2021	Fall 2021	Spring 2022	Fall 2022	Spring 2023
	Number	0	1	0	0		
	Mean		4.00				
Choice of	Range		4.00				
Assessment	% Proficient or Higher		100%				
	Number		1				
	Mean		4.00				
	Range		4.00				
Pre-assessment	% Proficient		100%				

	or Higher			
	Number	1		
	Mean	3.00		
Post-assessment	Range	3.00		
	% Proficient or Higher	100%		
	Number	1		
	Mean	2.00		
Alignment of	Range	2.00		
Lesson Evidence	% Proficient or Higher	0%		
	Number	1		
Student Level of	Mean	4.00		
Mastery & Evaluation	Range	4.00		
of Factors	% Proficient or Higher	100%		
	Number	1		
	Mean	4.00		
Data to Determine	Range	4.00		
Patterns & Gaps	% Proficient or Higher	100%		
	Number	1		
	Mean	4.00		
Response to	Range	4.00		
Interventions	% Proficient or Higher	100%		

14.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: There were no completers in the Business Education program and therefore, no new data to analyze.

2018-2019:

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

The benchmark was not met as there was one criteria in which 80% of candidates did not score at the proficiency level or above: Alignment of Lesson Evidence (0%).

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

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

2021-2022:

Due to the semesters impacted by COVID and hurricanes, data was not collected for the teaching cycle on some candidates, therefore there was not data to report here.

All major assessments, including the teaching cycle, are being realigned to the 2022 Danielson Framework for Teaching Model in preparation for the Fall 2024 CAEP accreditation visit therefore a new assessment will be implemented in Fall 2022.

15 Assessment and Benchmark Praxis PLT

Assessment: Praxis Principles of Learning and Teaching

Benchmark: 80% of candidates will achieve a passing score on the Praxis Principles of Learning and Teaching exam on the first attempt.

Prior to 2017-2018, the benchmark was100% of students will pass this exam before student teaching.

15.1 Data

Business/5624:

Overall Score Information		Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
	Number	4	1		—	_	—	1	1
	Mean	173.3	161			_	—	175	166
	Range	164- 181	161				_	175	166
	% Pass 1st Attempt	75%	100%				—	100%	100%
	% Pass Prior to ST/Intern	100%	100%	_	_	_	_	100%	100%

Overall Score Information		Fall 2021	Spring 2022	Fall 2022	Spring 2023	Fall 2023	Spring 2024	Fall 2024	Spring 2025
	Number	1	0						
	Mean	165	—						
	Range	165	_						
	% Pass 1st Attempt	100%	_						
	% Pass Prior to ST/Intern	100%	_						

2017-2018:

There were no completers in the Business Education program and, therefore, no new data to report.

2018-2019: Data not reported.

2019-2020: Data not reported.

Subcomponent		Fall 2020 N=1	Spring 2021 N=1	Fall 2021 N=1	Spring 2022 N=0	Fall 2022 N=	Spring 2023 N=	Fall 2023 N=	Spring 2024 N=
Students as Learners (20-21)	Mean	13	11	11					
	Range	13	11	11					
	% Correct	65%	55%	52%	_				
Instructional Process (20-21)	Mean	18	11	14	—				
	Range	18	11	14					
	% Correct	90%	55%	67%	—				
Assessment (14)	Mean	10	12	11					
	Range	10	12	11	_				
	% Correct	71%	86%	79%	—				
Professional Development, Leadership and Community (14)	Mean	10	11	9					
	Range	10	11	9	_				
	% Correct	71%	79%	64%					
Analysis of Instructional Scenarios (16)	Mean	11	9	11	_				
	Range	11	9	11	_				
	% Correct	69%	56%	69%	_				

15.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: There were no completers in the Business Education program and therefore, no new data to analyze.

2018-2019:

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

The benchmark was met. 100% of candidates passed the Praxis Principles of Learning and Teaching exam on the first attempt. The range of sub-category scores ranged from 55% to 90% correct.

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

2021-2022:

The benchmark was met. 100% of candidates passed the Praxis Principles of Learning and Teaching exam on the first attempt. The range of sub-category scores ranged from 52% to 79%.

It is difficult to analyze data with such few numbers of completers. PLT data across secondary programs will guide the review of secondary education coursework content in preparation for the PLT exam.

Xitracs Program Report

End of report