



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

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

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

1 Is this program offered via Distance Learning?

50-99% Distance/Traditional

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

No

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

3 Example of Program Improvement

2017-2018:

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

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

2018-2019:

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

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

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

2021-2022:

Aligned to the findings of the Teacher Preparation Quality Rating System evaluation in the spring of 2022, we are making efforts to design specific, measurable, and time-bound diversity goals that is connected to our recruitment goals. We are working to find new pathways to recruit quality candidates into the field of education.

4 Program Highlights from the Reporting Year

2017-2018:

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

2018-2019:

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

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

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

2021-2022:

Results from the Teacher Preparation Quality Rating System in the spring 2022 semester indicated:

- MSU courses reflect strong practices and content that support the effective teaching of literacy instruction across all five essential components of reading instruction. This is attributed to MSU's development of course content in collaboration with partner districts, aligned to agreed-upon source material, and informed by up-to-date research and best practice with the intention of enhancing candidates' ability to internalize and deliver strong instructional practices related to literacy. Candidates leverage effective literacy practices in their PK-12 classrooms leading to tangible, positive outcomes for student learning.
- MSU course delivery reflects strong practices for delivering instruction driven by PK-12 learning standards supported by in-class activities and assignments requiring engagement with standards and related instructional planning and connections to previous and upcoming standards and how they build. Candidate lesson plans and delivery of PK-12 instruction demonstrated their strong ability to plan standards-driven instruction that supported student learning and to deliver instruction using high-leverage teaching practices such as questioning strategies, academic feedback, and modeling.
- A comprehensive group of stakeholders are systematically engaged in the continuous improvement process by MSU using effective structures, tools, and experiences. This engagement is intentional, targeted to particular aspects of the program, and based on authentic, two-way relationships and dialogue. Feedback and collaboration that results from this engagement drives long-term, macro-level improvement as well as more immediate improvements that are turned around quickly for immediate results. In addition to this external engagement, program leaders and faculty collaborate frequently and systematically on continuous improvement efforts through review of relevant data, action planning, and monitoring of progress towards improvement goals.

5 Program Mission

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

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

6 Institutional Mission Reference

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

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

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

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

Going beyond traditional approaches of recruitment and partnering with the Office of Admission and Recruiting, the EPP will actively recruit within the community at least two times each academic year.

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

7.1 Data

MAT Elementary Education Programs - Enrollment and Completer Data:

| Academic Year | # enrolled with EDUC 599 packet | # of completers | | |
|---------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|--------|-------|
| | | Fall | Spring | Total |
| 2013-2014 | 26 | | | 9 |
| 2014-2015 | 16 | | | 9 |
| 2015-2016 | 26 | 4 | 6 | 10 |
| 2016-2017 | 20 | 1 | 7 | 8 |
| 2017-2018 | 17 | 0 | 6 | 6 |
| 2018-2019 | 16 | 1 | 6 | 7 |
| 2019-2020 | 9 | 2 | 4 | 6 |
| 2020-2021 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 2021-2022 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 |

7.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

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

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

Recommendations for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- The EPP will contact and establish relationships with principals from surrounding parishes to recruit potential MAT candidates. The principals are involved in the collaborative process which also meets the CAEP goal of stakeholder input.
- Going beyond traditional approaches of recruitment and partnering with the Office of Admissions and Recruiting, the EPP will actively recruit within the community at least 2 times each academic year.

Graduate school applications could help identify potential candidates and applicants interested in the program. EEP faculty will work with the Graduate School to inform the community about our programs.

2018-2019:

Analysis of Data:

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

Plan for Improvement:

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

Recommendations for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- The MAT Elementary program will be moving to a completely online format by summer 2020 to increase the visibility of the program.
- Recruitment efforts will expand to social media.

- MAT Elementary faculty will attend the Calcasieu Parish Job Fair.
- MAT Elementary faculty will visit schools in the district to identify candidates that qualify for and are interested in the program.
- Faculty will participate in The Awakening Community Event.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

The benchmark for enrollment was not met. Enrollment in the MAT Elementary program has decreased by 85% since the fall 2015 semester. Most recently, from fall 2019 to fall 2020, there was a 56% decline from 9 to 4 students enrolled. Lack of student enrollment in the McNeese MAT Elementary program creates significant concern for the future viability of the program and for McNeese to provide sufficient certified teachers in the 5-parish area of Southwest Louisiana. Only one candidate completed the MAT Elementary program in the 2020-2021 academic year. There is a demand for certified teachers and the EPP is working diligently to recruit candidates to the program to fill this need.

The revised MAT Elementary program was implemented in Fall 2020. The program is offered 100% online and courses are sequenced in a 5-term format. Students are admitted in the fall term only. DEP social media presence was active during the 2020-2021 year to tout candidate activities and generate interest in the education profession. Although not planned, EPP leadership was allowed to provide a 20% tuition discount for candidates who entered the program in Fall 2020.

During the 2022-2022 academic year the EPP representatives will attend McNeese's Grad Fest each and career fairs each semester to recruit graduates for the MAT elementary program. The HubSpot marketing initiative data will be tracked during the 2021-2022 academic year and inquiries will receive follow up within 72 hours to provide detailed program information and encourage enrollment in the MAT Elementary program. The desired result is an uptick in the enrollment trend beginning with the fall 2021 semester and as students who visited the information table at Grad Fest in spring 2021 and respond to promotional activities apply to the program.

2021-2022:

Official enrollment decreased by 50% (4 to 2) from the previous academic year, however, two candidates did complete the program which was an increase from the previous academic year.

A 5-semester sequence has been devised to help candidates progress through the program. Faculty are assigned as advisors and work to assist candidates in continuing successfully through the program as well. The comp exam has been altered to reflect teaching practices and has been received well by students. Faculty will continue to work with candidates and recruit potential candidates into the program.

7.2 Data Graduation Matriculation Rates

MAT Elementary Education - Graduation Matriculation Rates:

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

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|---------------|---|------------|--|--|--|------------|--|--|
| ELEM | 2017 | 7 | 86% | | | | 14% | | |
| MAT ELEM | 2017- 2018 | 6 | N=5 83% | | | | N=1 17% | | |

7.2.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

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

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

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- Advisors will work with candidates at least two to four times a year to review degree plans, academic progress, and provide a list of resources for students who are in need of additional graduation and/or academic support.
- Advisors will document feedback from meetings. Data on courses taken will be gained from Degree Works
- Faculty will review online Praxis tutorial program to measure effectiveness and make changes as needed.
- The sources provided by the EPP may need to be changed and/or updated to better reflect the needs of the candidates as indicated by Praxis scores.

2018-2019:

Analysis of Data:

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

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

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

Recommendations for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

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

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

The Benchmark of 90% completion within 2 years was not met by the 2016-2017 cohort; however, progress toward meeting the benchmark is positive. The 86% completion rate showed improvement over the previous two cycles of 70% and 80% completion.

Praxis tutorial information was provided to candidates to assist with preparation resulting in more success on the Praxis. Advisors tracked candidate progress closely and met with each candidate at least two times per academic year to provide guidance for program progression and answer questions relating to continued enrollment.

At the mid-point of each term during 2021-2022 MAT faculty will review candidates progress for the semester and identify those not on track for completing courses for the term. Once these candidates are identified, the MAT advisor will review the program progress for the candidate and contact the candidate to discuss positive progress strategies for program

completion. It is recommended that by Fall 2022, EPP should revise admission requirements for applicants for the MAT programs. Applicants should meet ACT/SAT/Praxis I Core exam or the content exam requirements for initial acceptance into the program.

2021-2022:

Of the 6 candidates officially accepted into the MAT Elementary program in 2017-2018, 5 of them or 83% completed the program within two years. One candidate dropped from the program and the university. The program has consistently lost one candidate in each of the last three admission years reported.

Mid-semester check-ins, advising, course sequences, along with 240 Tutoring discounts and other resources are being implemented in order to continue to try to increase retention.

8 Assessment and Benchmark Curriculum Development

Assessment: Curriculum Development

Curriculum alignment includes:

- InTASC standards
- Program standards
- Year-long residency
- Louisiana Components of Effective Teaching
- Louisiana Teacher Preparation Competencies
- Louisiana Student Standards

CAEP Standard 2

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

8.1 Data

2017-2018:

Data table is attached.

2018-2019:

Data table is attached.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

Date of Meeting: June 24, 2020

Meeting Location and Duration: Zoom, 8:00 a.m. to noon

Attendees: DEP faculty

Topic and brief description, results of meeting, next steps, etc.: Major assessments for programs

Date of Meeting: August 4, 2020

Meeting Location and Duration: Zoom: 9:00 – 11:30 a.m.

Attendees: DEP Faculty

Topic and brief description, results of meeting, next steps, etc.: Class Measures Rubric

Date of Meeting: August 6, 2020

Meeting Location and Duration: Zoom: 8:30 to 11:00 a.m.

Attendees: DEP faculty

Topic and brief description, results of meeting, next steps, etc.: POP cycle with Quality Feedback

Date of Meeting: August 13, 2020

Meeting Location and Duration: Zoom: 9:00 to 11:00 a.m.

Attendees: DEP faculty

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

Date of Meeting: January 25, 2021

Meeting Location and Duration: Zoom: 4:00 to 5:30 p.m.

Attendees: Mentor Teachers, university Supervisors, DEP faculty

Topic and brief description, results of meeting, next steps, etc.: Expectation of student teaching and evaluation

2021-2022:

January 15, 2022: Site Coordinator Professional Development

- Residency 1 seminar topics for alt cert: Logistical aspects, academic feedback, assessment criteria, discussion techniques, HOT questions, structure and pacing.
- Residency 2 seminar topics for alt.cert.: planning, culturally responsive teaching, eliciting student thinking

Weekly faculty meetings were held to discuss current topics, concerns, and celebrations throughout the semester.

Professional Development with US PREP twice during each semester.

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

Elementary Education Curriculum Development

MAT_ELEM_Curriculum Development_17-18

8.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: The benchmark was met. The faculty collaborated with local districts 6 times during the spring 2018 semester. The faculty attended 6 professional development meetings throughout the spring 2018 semester.

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

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

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

2018-2019:

Although faculty did collaborate with local districts, the eight time goal was not met. However, faculty did participate in the Dean's for Impact Collaborative which was a collaboration with other Louisiana universities, participated in shared governance meetings, and participated in professional development opportunities. Though the primary focus was on the development of coursework for undergraduate programs, the MAT program was also redesigned and mirrored the coursework in the other initial certification programs.

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

For the 2019-2020 academic year, MAT elementary education faculty will implement the redesigned coursework. Faculty will continue to collaborate and adjust curriculum content as

needed. In addition, faculty will continue to assess the mastery of standards and outcomes for education candidates and revise content to ensure student success as measured by VAM scores and SLOs one to two years after completion of the program.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

The benchmark was met as EPP leadership and faculty strengthened presence in the virtual environment and improved communication and use of technology to enable focus on the goals of the MAT Elementary program and the launch of the revised program course sequence in Fall 2020.

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

2021-2022:

The benchmark was met as there were multiple opportunities for professional development /coursework improvement discussions. In preparation for the onsite Teacher Preparation Quality Rating System visit faculty met to discuss data and program improvement, including changes that had been made and current data being collected. The MAT Elementary faculty will continue to attend professional development opportunities and the discussion of major assessments and data collection analyses for continuous program improvement.

9 Assessment and Benchmark Field Experience Evaluation with Content Standards

Assessment: Field Experience Evaluation Domains 1-5

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

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

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

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

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

9.1 Data Field Experience Evaluation Domains 1-4

2017-2018:

Data table is attached.

2018-2019:

Data table is attached.

2019-2020:

Data table is attached.

2020-2021:

Data table is attached.

2021-2022:

Data table is attached.

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

MAT ELEM_FEE Domains 1-4_18-19

MAT ELEM_FEE Domains 1-4_19-20

MAT ELEM_FEE Domains 1-4_20-21

MAT ELEM_FEE Domains 1-4_21-22

MAT_ELEM_FEE Domains 1-4

9.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: The benchmark was not met.

For Spring 2018:

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

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

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

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

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

2018-2019:

Analysis of data: The benchmark was met.

The mean score for all components of the FEE ranged from 3.00-4.00 indicating that mean scores were at or above the level of proficiency set by the EPP.

The following elements had individual candidates score below the 3.00 benchmark in the spring 2019 semester: 3.1.3- 33% (n=6); 3.2.2- 17% (n=6); 3.3.2- 17% (n=6);

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- Faculty and University Supervisors will continue to conduct pre and post conferences with all candidates to discuss better prepare candidates for the lesson being taught and then to reflect on the lesson taught. 100% of ST candidates will participate. Candidate and University Supervisor feedback will determine the effectiveness of the conferences. Change will be determined by the scores on the FEE.
- Faculty will begin using elements of the POP Cycle throughout the courses in the program in order to better prepare candidates for the student teaching experience, understand the components of the FEE, and become better prepared for their role as educators.
- Each semester ST candidates will participate in a session to better understand the expectations of the FEE, POP Cycle, and other elements of the student teaching

experience. This will continue until the POP Cycle has been fully implemented throughout the coursework in the program.

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

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

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

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

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

2021-2022:

The benchmark was not met for the Field Experience Evaluation data for any of the elements within domain 3 except for element 3.2.1. All other components on the rubric met or exceeded proficiency.

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

9.2 Data FEE_ACEI Standards

2017-2018:

| ACEI | Spring 2018 | | |
|------|-------------|-----------|---------|
| | Mean | Range | % Prof. |
| 1.0 | 3.82 | 3.38-4.00 | 100% |
| 2.1 | 3.71 | 3.50-4.00 | 100% |
| 2.2 | 3.75 | 3.75 | 100% |
| 2.3 | 3.96 | 3.88-4.00 | 100% |
| 2.4 | | | |
| 2.5 | | | |
| 2.6 | | | |
| 2.7 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 100% |
| 3.1 | 3.60 | 3.00-4.00 | 100% |
| 3.2 | 3.83 | 3.63-4.00 | 100% |
| 3.3 | 3.60 | 3.00-4.00 | 100% |

| | | | |
|-----|------|-----------|------|
| 3.4 | 3.54 | 2.75-4.00 | 97% |
| 3.5 | 3.51 | 2.88-4.00 | 94% |
| 4.0 | 3.64 | 2.50-4.00 | 90% |
| 5.1 | 3.99 | 3.88-4.00 | 100% |
| 5.2 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 100% |

2018-2019:

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

2019-2020:

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

2020-2021:

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

2021-2022:

| ACEI | Fall 2021 | | | | Spring 2022 | | | |
|------|-----------|------|-------|---------|-------------|------|-----------|---------|
| | N | Mean | Range | % Prof. | N | Mean | Range | % Prof. |
| 1.0 | 0 | | | | 2 | 3.50 | 3.00-4.00 | 100% |
| 3.1 | | | | | 2 | 2.50 | 2.00-3.00 | 50% |
| 3.3 | | | | | 2 | 2.50 | 2.00-3.00 | 50% |
| 3.4 | | | | | 2 | 3.36 | 2.00-4.00 | 93% |
| 3.5 | | | | | 2 | 2.25 | 1.00-3.00 | 50% |
| 4.0 | | | | | 2 | 2.63 | 1.00-4.00 | 63% |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|--|--|---|------|-----------|------|
| 5.1 | | | | 2 | 3.50 | 3.00-4.00 | 100% |
|-----|--|--|--|---|------|-----------|------|

9.2.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

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

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

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

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

2018-2019:

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

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

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

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

Data from the single candidate indicate ACEI Standard 3.5 on the FEE had a range of 2.5 to 3.00 which yielded a mean of 2.75 with 50% proficiency, which is below benchmark. All other

ACEI standards met the benchmark. The data compares to previous cycles apart from ACEI Standard 3.5 which was met in previous cycles. More instances of data are needed to interpret the downward score in the one area as a trend with significance.

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

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

2021-2022:

The mean score for the following ACEI Standards fell below proficiency: 3.1, 3.3, 3.5, and 4.0. All major assessments, including the field experience evaluation, are being realigned to the Danielson Framework for Effective Teaching Model in preparation for the Fall 2024 CAEP accreditation visit therefore a new assessment will be implemented in Fall 2022.

9.3 Data FEE Domain 5

2017-2018:

Data table is attached.

2018-2019:

Data table is attached.

2019-2020:

Data table is attached.

2020-2021:

Data table is attached.

2021-2022:

Domain 5 data was not available for the spring 2022 completers.

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

MAT ELEM_FEE Domain 5_18-19

MAT ELEM_FEE Domain 5_19-20

MAT ELEM_FEE Domain 5_20-21

MAT_ELEM_FEE Domains 1-4

9.3.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

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

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The goal for 2018-2019 is for 100% of the candidates to score at proficiency or above on all domain 5 components.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- Faculty and University Supervisors will conduct pre and post conferences with all candidates to discuss expectations for the lesson taught. 100% of candidates will participate. Candidate and University Supervisor feedback will determine the effectiveness of the conferences. Change will be determined by the scores on the FEE.
- Faculty will facilitate field experience assignment where candidates evaluate host teacher using FEE rubric in an effort to better understand the evaluation process using this rubric. 100% of candidates and host teachers will participate. Candidates' scores and

feedback will be used to measure effectiveness. Host teachers' grading of candidates' teaching on the FEE will also be used to measure effectiveness.

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

2018-2019:

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

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

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

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

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

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

2021-2022:

Data was not collected for Domain 5 on the spring 2022 completers.

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

9.4 Data FEE Domain 1-4, Content Areas

2017-2018:

Data table is attached.

2018-2019:

Data table is attached.

2019-2020:

Data table is attached.

2020-2021:

Data table is attached.

2021-2022:

Data table is attached.

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

MAT ELEM FEE_Domains 1-4 By Content_18-19

MAT ELEM FEE_Domains 1-4 By Content_19-20
 MAT ELEM FEE_Domains 1-4 By Content_20-21
 MAT ELEM FEE_Domains 1-4 By Content_21-22
 MAT_ELEM_FEE by Subject_17-18

9.4.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

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

Spring 2018 Science:

- Element 1.1.3 was 2.50.
- Element 1.1.4 was 2.75.
- Element 3.3.2 was 2.75.
- Element 3.3.4 was 2.50.

Spring 2018 Social Studies:

- Element 1.1.1 was 2.75.
- Element 1.1.2 was 2.75.
- Element 1.1.3 was 2.75.
- Element 1.1.4 was 2.50.
- Element 2.2.2 was 2.75.
- Element 3.1.2 was 2.50.
- Element 3.1.3 was 2.25.
- Element 3.2.2 was 2.75.
- Element 3.3.1 was 2.50.
- Element 3.3.4 was 2.75.

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

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The goal for 2018-2019 is that candidates will score a 3.00 or higher on each element of the FEE rubric for Domains 1-4 in each of the subject areas from the corresponding methods courses.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

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

2018-2019:

Analysis of Data: The benchmark was not met. The following components had scores that fell below benchmark:

Spring 2019 ELA: 3.2.2 (0% scored above benchmark, n=1);

Spring 2019 Science: 3.3.4 (0% scored above benchmark, n=2)

Recommendations for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

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

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

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

2021-2022:

The FEE collected from EDUC 530 (Science) was reported for the spring 2022 completers. Candidates had a mean score below proficiency (3.00) in Domains 1, 2, and 3. 33% of the elements within these domains had a mean score at proficiency or above.

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

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

Spring 2018:

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

Spring 2019:

| ACEI | Science | | | Social Studies | | | ELA | | | Mathematics | | |
|------|---------|-------|---------|----------------|-------|---------|------|-----------|---------|-------------|-------|---------|
| | Mean | Range | % Prof. | Mean | Range | % Prof. | Mean | Range | % Prof. | Mean | Range | % Prof. |
| 1.0 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 100% | | | | 4.00 | 4.00 | 100% | | | |
| 3.1 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 100% | | | | 3.50 | 3.00-4.00 | 100% | | | |
| 3.3 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 100% | | | | 4.00 | 4.00 | 100% | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------|-----------|------|--|--|--|--|------|-----------|------|--|--|--|
| 3.4 | 3.50 | 3.00-4.00 | 100% | | | | | 3.75 | 3.00-4.00 | 100% | | | |
| 3.5 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 100% | | | | | 4.00 | 4.00 | 100% | | | |
| 4.0 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 100% | | | | | 4.00 | 4.00 | 100% | | | |
| 5.1 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 100% | | | | | 4.00 | 4.00 | 100% | | | |

Fall 2019:

| ACEI | Science | | | | Social Studies | | | | ELA | | | | Mathematics | | | |
|------|---------|------|-----------|---------|----------------|------|-------|---------|-----|------|-----------|---------|-------------|------|-----------|---------|
| | N | Mean | Range | % Prof. | N | Mean | Range | % Prof. | N | Mean | Range | % Prof. | N | Mean | Range | % Prof. |
| 1.0 | 4 | 3.00 | 2.00-4.00 | 75% | | | | | 4 | 3.75 | 3.00-4.00 | 100% | 2 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 100% |
| 3.1 | 14 | 3.00 | 2.00-4.00 | 79% | | | | | 14 | 3.93 | 3.00-4.00 | 100% | 7 | 3.71 | 3.00-4.00 | 100% |
| 3.3 | 2 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 100% | | | | | 2 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 100% | 1 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 100% |
| 3.4 | 2 | 3.50 | 3.00-4.00 | 100% | | | | | 2 | 3.50 | 3.00-4.00 | 100% | 1 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 100% |
| 3.5 | 4 | 3.00 | 2.00-4.00 | 75% | | | | | 4 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 100% | 2 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 100% |
| 4.0 | 8 | 3.25 | 2.00-4.00 | 75% | | | | | 8 | 3.88 | 3.00-4.00 | 100% | 4 | 3.25 | 3.00-4.00 | 100% |
| 5.1 | 4 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 100% | | | | | 4 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 100% | 2 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 100% |

Spring 2020:

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

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

| ACEI | Science | | | | Social Studies | | | | ELA | | | | Mathematics | | | |
|------|---------|------|-------|---------|----------------|------|-------|---------|-----|------|-------|---------|-------------|------|-------|---------|
| | N | Mean | Range | % Prof. | N | Mean | Range | % Prof. | N | Mean | Range | % Prof. | N | Mean | Range | % Prof. |
| 1.0 | | | | | | | | | 1 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 100% | | | | |
| 3.1 | | | | | | | | | 1 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 100% | | | | |
| 3.3 | | | | | | | | | 1 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 100% | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|------|-----------|------|--|--|--|--|
| 3.4 | | | | | | | | 1 | 3.29 | 3.00-4.00 | 100% | | | | |
| 3.5 | | | | | | | | 1 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 100% | | | | |
| 4.0 | | | | | | | | 1 | 3.33 | 3.00-4.00 | 100% | | | | |
| 5.1 | | | | | | | | 1 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 100% | | | | |

Spring 2021: No completers.

Fall 2021: No completers.

Spring 2022

| ACEI | Science | | | | Social Studies | | | | ELA | | | | Mathematics | | | |
|------|---------|------|-----------|---------|----------------|------|-------|---------|-----|------|-------|---------|-------------|------|-------|---------|
| | N | Mean | Range | % Prof. | N | Mean | Range | % Prof. | N | Mean | Range | % Prof. | N | Mean | Range | % Prof. |
| 1.0 | 2 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 100% | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.1 | 2 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 100% | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.3 | 2 | 2.50 | 2.00-3.00 | 50% | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.4 | 2 | 2.57 | 2.00-3.00 | 57% | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.5 | 2 | 2.25 | 2.00-3.00 | 25% | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.0 | 2 | 2.67 | 2.00-3.00 | 67% | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5.1 | 2 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 67% | | | | | | | | | | | | |

9.5.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

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

For Spring 2018 Science:

- ACEI Standard 1.0 was 2.75.
- ACEI Standard 4.0 was 2.90.

For Spring 2018 Social Studies:

- ACEI Standard 1.0 was 2.75.
- ACEI Standard 3.5 was 2.40.
- ACEI Standard 4.0 was 2.75.

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

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

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- Faculty and University Supervisors will conduct pre and post conferences with all candidates to discuss expectations for the lesson taught. Candidates will indicate their understanding of the FEE from pre and post conference and document this growth of knowledge on quadrant chart. EPP faculty and University Supervisors can then identify areas of need and further remediation.

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

2018-2019:

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

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

Recommendations for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

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

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

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

2021-2022:

Completers in the spring 2022 semester earned a mean score of 3.00 on ACEI 1, 3.1, and 5.1. Mean scores fell below proficiency on 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, and 4.0. ACTI 3.5 had the lowest percentage of proficiency or above scores at 25%.

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

10 Assessment and Benchmark Lesson Planning

Assessment: Lesson Plan

The Lesson Plan template is introduced and developed throughout the Portal II coursework; however, this data was collected in Education 683: MAT Clinical Experience, which occurs at the end of the MAT program. The Lesson Plan is a written artifact consisting of a thorough one day lesson. The elements within the Lesson Plan and Lesson Plan Rubric that aligned with ACEI 1.0 Standard include: 1) student outcomes, 2) procedures, 3) lesson "hook", 4) modeled, guided, collaborative and independent practice, 5) technology, 6) relevance and rationale, 7) exploration, extension, and supplemental, and 8) differentiation. The elements within the Lesson Plan and Lesson Plan Rubric that aligned with ACEI 4.0 Standard include: pre-planned (SEED) questions and formative/ summative assessment. The Lesson Plan is graded using the Lesson Plan Rubric to ensure that each component is addressed. Points are assigned to each component using descriptors and a final score is then tabulated. A score of 3 is considered proficient on this assessment. Additionally, the department's target for student achievement is 80% passing.

Knowledge:

Learner Development: InTASC Standard 1 - The candidate determines how learners grow and develop, recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas.

Learning Differences: InTASC Standard 2 - The candidate identifies individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards.

Content Knowledge: InTASC Standard 4 - The candidate applies the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches.

Application of Content: InTASC Standard 5 - The candidate decides how to connect concepts and use differing perspectives to engage learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local and global issues.

Planning for Instruction: InTASC Standard 7 - The candidate draws upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and the community context to plan instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals.

Skills:

Instructional Strategies: InTASC Standard 8 - The candidate implements a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways.

CAEP Standard 1

ACEI Standard alignment:

1.0 Development, Learning, and Motivation: This ACEI standard aligns with the Lesson Plan instrument elements: Student outcomes; Procedures; Lesson “Hook”; Technology; Relevance and Rationale; Exploration, Extension, and Supplemental; as well as Differentiation.

- **Student Outcomes:** Measurable statement that identifies what the student is expected to learn
- **Procedures:** Describes the specific tasks needed to accomplish the lesson
- **Lesson “Hook”:** Lesson introduction that gains the students’ attention and promotes higher order thinking
- **Modeled, Guided, Collaborative and Independent Practice:** A variety of teaching methods are implemented throughout this lesson
- **Technology:** Incorporates the use of technology by candidates and/or P-12 students
- **Relevance and Rationale:** Outcomes and content of lesson should be relevant to students’ ongoing learning, real-world application, and student backgrounds.
- **Exploration, Extension, and Supplemental:** Lesson has appropriate tasks for exploration, extension, and supplemental learning listed
- **Accommodation/Differentiation:** Provides a variety of instruction to ensure all student needs are met

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

2.2 Science: This ACEI standard aligns with the overall application of candidate knowledge to the process of writing a lesson plan which covers Louisiana Student Standards in Science.

2.3 Mathematics: This ACEI standard aligns with the overall application of candidate knowledge to the process of writing a lesson plan which covers Louisiana Student Standards in Mathematics.

2.4 Social Studies: This ACEI standard aligns with the overall application of candidate knowledge to the process of writing a lesson plan which covers Louisiana Student Standards in Social Studies.

4.0 Assessment for instruction : This ACEI standard aligns with the Lesson Plan instrument elements: Pre-planned (SEED) Questions and Formative/Summative Assessment.

- **Pre-planned (SEED) Questions:** Higher-order thinking questions that provoke student engagement regarding the content
- **Formative/Summative Assessment:** Assessment implemented to measure student ability /knowledge from the lesson.

Benchmark: A minimum of 80% of the candidates will score at the Proficiency level (3.00) or higher in each category assessed on the lesson plan for each of the four content areas.

10.1 Data

| ACEI Standard 2: Curriculum Standards | | | | Element 2.1: Reading, Writing, Oral Language | | Element 2.2: Mathematics | | Element 2.3: Science | | Element 2.4: Social Studies | |
|---|------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|---|----------------|-----------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|----------------|-----------------------------------|----------------|
| Rubric Element | ACEI Standard | InTASC Standard | | Fall 2017 | Spring 2018 | Fall 2017 | Spring 2018 | Fall 2017 | Spring 2018 | Fall 2017 | Spring 2018 |
| Student Outcomes | 1.0 | 4 | Number | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| | | | Mean | | | | | | 2.75 | | 2.75 |
| | | | Range | | | | | | 2.00- 4.00 | | 2.00- 4.00 |
| | | | % Proficient or Higher | | | | | | 50% | | 50% |
| Procedures | 1.0 | 3 | Number | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| | | | Mean | | | | | | 3.75 | | 3.75 |
| | | | Range | | | | | | 3.00- 4.00 | | 3.00- 4.00 |
| | | | % Proficient or Higher | | | | | | 100% | | 100% |
| Lesson "Hook" | 1.0 | 8 | Number | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| | | | Mean | | | | | | 2.50 | | 2.50 |
| | | | Range | | | | | | 2.00- 3.00 | | 2.00- 4.00 |
| | | | % Proficient or Higher | | | | | | 50% | | 25% |
| Pre-Planned (Seed) Questions | 4.0 | 8 | Number | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| | | | Mean | | | | | | 3.00 | | 2.75 |
| | | | Range | | | | | | 3.00 | | 2.00- 3.00 |
| | | | % Proficient or Higher | | | | | | 100% | | 75% |
| Modeled, Guided, Collab. & Ind. Practice | 1.0 | 7 | Number | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| | | | Mean | | | | | | 3.00 | | 3.00 |
| | | | Range | | | | | | 3.00 | | 3.00 |
| | | | % Proficient or Higher | | | | | | 100% | | 100% |
| Technology | 1.0 | 5 | Number | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| | | | Mean | | | | | | 1.75 | | 3.00 |
| | | | Range | | | | | | 1.00- 2.00 | | 3.00 |
| | | | % Proficient or Higher | | | | | | 0% | | 100% |
| | | | Number | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----|---|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----------|---|-----------|
| Formative /Summative Assessment | 4.0 | 6 | Mean | | | | | | 2.50 | | 2.50 |
| | | | Range | | | | | | 2.00-3.00 | | 2.00-3.00 |
| | | | % Proficient or Higher | | | | | | 50% | | 50% |
| Relevance & Rationale | 1.0 | 2 | Number | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| | | | Mean | | | | | | 1.75 | | 2.25 |
| | | | Range | | | | | | 1.00-2.00 | | 1.00-3.00 |
| | | | % Proficient or Higher | | | | | | 0% | | 50% |
| Exploration, Extension, Supplemental | 1.0 | 1 | Number | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| | | | Mean | | | | | | 2.00 | | 2.00 |
| | | | Range | | | | | | 1.00-3.00 | | 1.00-3.00 |
| | | | % Proficient or Higher | | | | | | 25% | | 25% |
| Accommodations/ Differentiation | 1.0 | 7 | Number | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| | | | Mean | | | | | | 2.25 | | 2.50 |
| | | | Range | | | | | | 2.00-3.00 | | 2.00-3.00 |
| | | | % Proficient or Higher | | | | | | 25% | | 50% |

| ACEI Standard 2: Curriculum Standards | | | | Element 2.1: Reading, Writing, Oral Language | | Element 2.2: Mathematics | | Element 2.2: Science | | Element 2.4: Social Studies | |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------|--|-------------|--------------------------|-------------|----------------------|-------------|-----------------------------|-------------|
| Rubric Element | ACEI Standard | InTASC Standard | | Fall 2018 | Spring 2019 | Fall 2018 | Spring 2019 | Fall 2018 | Spring 2019 | Fall 2018 | Spring 2019 |
| Student Outcomes | 1.0 | 4 | Number | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| | | | Mean | 1.00 | 2.40 | | | 3.00 | | | 3.33 |
| | | | Range | 1 | 1-3 | | | 3 | | | 3-4 |
| | | | % Proficient or Higher | 0% | 60% | | | 100% | | | 100% |
| Procedures | 1.0 | 3 | Number | 1 | 5 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| | | | Mean | 2.00 | 3.20 | | | 4.00 | | | 3.33 |
| | | | Range | 2 | 3-4 | | | 4 | | | 3-4 |
| | | | % Proficient or Higher | 0% | 100% | | | 100% | | | 100% |
| Lesson "Hook" | 1.0 | 8 | Number | 1 | 5 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| | | | Mean | 4.00 | 2.80 | | | 3.00 | | | 2.67 |
| | | | Range | 4 | 2-4 | | | 3 | | | 2-4 |

| | | | % Proficient or Higher | 100% | 60% | | | 100% | | | 33% |
|--|-----|---|-------------------------|------|------|--|--|------|---|---|------|
| Pre-Planned (Seed) Questions | 4.0 | 8 | Number | 1 | 5 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| | | | Mean | 3.00 | 3.20 | | | 3.00 | | | 3.17 |
| | | | Range | 3 | 1-4 | | | 3 | | | 3-4 |
| | | | % Proficient or Higher | 100% | 80% | | | 100% | | | 100% |
| Modeled, Guided, Collab. & Ind. Practice | 1.0 | 7 | Number | 1 | 5 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| | | | Mean | 2.00 | 3.00 | | | 3.00 | | | 3.00 |
| | | | Range | 2 | 2-4 | | | 3 | | | 3 |
| | | | % Proficient or Higher | 0% | 80% | | | 100% | | | 100% |
| Technology | 1.0 | 5 | Number | 1 | 5 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| | | | Mean | 2.00 | 2.40 | | | 2.00 | | | 2.50 |
| | | | Range | 2 | 1-3 | | | 2 | | | 2-3 |
| | | | % Proficient or Higher | 0% | 60% | | | 0% | | | 50% |
| Formative /Summative Assessment | 4.0 | 6 | Number | 1 | 5 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| | | | Mean | 2.00 | 2.60 | | | 2.00 | | | 2.33 |
| | | | Range | 2 | 2-3 | | | 2 | | | 1-3 |
| | | | % Proficient or Higher | 0% | 60% | | | 0% | | | 50% |
| Relevance & Rationale | 1.0 | 2 | Number | 1 | 5 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| | | | Mean | 3.00 | 2.60 | | | 3.00 | | | 2.67 |
| | | | Range | 3 | 1-4 | | | 3 | | | 2-4 |
| | | | % Proficient or Higher1 | 100% | 60% | | | 100% | | | 50% |
| Exploration, Extension, Supplemental | 1.0 | 1 | Number | 1 | 5 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| | | | Mean | 2.00 | 2.20 | | | 2.00 | | | 2.00 |
| | | | Range | 2 | 1-3 | | | 2 | | | 1-3 |
| | | | % Proficient or Higher | 0% | 40% | | | 0% | | | 25% |
| Accommodations/ Differentiation | 1.0 | 7 | Number | 1 | 5 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| | | | Mean | 2.00 | 2.40 | | | 2.00 | | | 1.75 |
| | | | Range | 2 | 2-3 | | | 2 | | | 1-2 |
| | | | % Proficient or Higher | 0% | 40% | | | 0% | | | 0% |

2019-2020:
Data table attached.

2020-2021:
Data table is attached.

2021-2022:
Data table is attached. Due to changes in faculty, COVID, etc. some data was not available to be reported.
Files: See list of attachments to view. (Requires Adobe Reader or compatible viewer).

MAT_ELEM_Lesson Plan Data_19-20

MAT_ELEM_Lesson Plan Data_20-21

MAT_ELEM_Lesson Plan Data_21-22

10.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

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

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

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

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

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

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

Plan for Continuous Improvement: In 2018-2019, at least 80% of candidates will score at the Proficiency level (3.00) or higher in each category assessed on the lesson plan for each of the four content areas.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

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

2018-2019:

The benchmark was not met. The benchmark was to have minimum of 80% of the candidates score at the Proficiency level (3) or higher in each category assessed on the lesson plan for each of the four content areas. The benchmark was not met in the following areas:

Element 2.1 Reading:

Fall 18- (n=1) : Student Outcomes (0%), Procedures (0%), Modeled, Guided, Collaborative and Individual Practice (0%), Technology (0%), Formative/Summative Assessment (0%), Exploration, Extension, and Supplemental (0%), and Accommodations/Differentiation (0%).
Spring 19 (n=5): Student Outcomes (60%), Lesson Hook (60%), Technology (60%), Relevance and Rationale (60%), Exploration, Extension, and Supplemental (40%), and Accommodations/Differentiation (40%).

Element 2.2 Mathematics:

Data for mathematics lesson plans was not reported for the MAT ELEM candidates.

Element 2.3 Science:

Fall 2018 (n=1): Technology (0%), Formative/Summative Assessment (0%), Exploration, Extension, Supplemental (0%), Accommodations/Differentiation (0%)

Element 2.4 Social Studies:

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

Plan for Continuous Improvement: In 2019-2020, at least 80% of candidates will score at the Proficiency level (3.00) or higher in each category assessed on the lesson plan for each of the four content areas.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

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

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

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

2021-2022:

100% of candidates had a mean score at the proficiency level for all categories of the lesson plan rubric with the exception of Student Misconceptions, Pre-Planned Seed Questions, Closure, Instructional Resources and Materials, Teacher's Use of Technology, Student Use of Technology, Differentiation by Instruction, Differentiation by Learner, Real-Time Scaffolding, and Reflection of Instructional Strategies.

0% of candidates scored at the proficiency level in Student Misconceptions, Student Use of Technology, Differentiation by Learner, and Real-Time Scaffolding.

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

11 Assessment and Benchmark Case Study

Assessment: Case Study

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

11.1 Data Case Study

| Criteria | ACEI Standard | InTASC Standard | | Fall 2015 N=7 | Spring 2016 N=14 | Fall 2016 N=9 | Spring 2017 N=13 | Fall 2017 N=9 | Spring 2018 N=5 |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------|---------------------|------------------|---------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Analysis of Pre- and Post-test Data | 4.0 | 6 | Mean | — | — | — | — | — | 3.80 |
| | | | Range | — | — | — | — | — | 3.00-4.00 |
| | | | % proficient or higher | — | — | — | — | — | 100% |
| Fluency | 3.1 | 4 | Mean | — | — | — | — | — | 2.80 |
| | | | Range | — | — | — | — | — | 2.00-4.00 |
| | | | % proficient or higher | — | — | — | — | — | 60% |
| Instructional Strategies | 3.1 | 7 | Mean | — | — | — | — | — | 3.20 |
| | | | Range | — | — | — | — | — | 2.00-4.00 |
| | | | % proficient or higher | — | — | — | — | — | 80% |
| Response to Intervention | 1.0 | 6 | Mean | — | — | — | — | — | 3.40 |
| | | | Range | — | — | — | — | — | 3.00-4.00 |
| | | | % proficient or higher | — | — | — | — | — | 100% |

2018-2019:
Data not collected.

2019-2020:
Data not collected.

2020-2021:
Data not collected.

2021-2022:
The Case Study is no longer collected in EDUC 503.

11.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

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

- Spring 2018, Fluency mean was 2.80

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

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

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

2018-2019:

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

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

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

2019-2020:

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

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

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

2020-2021:

Data was not reported for the 2020-2021 completer on the case study. Due to revisions in program and changes in faculty, this assessment will be revisited and either revised or replaced by another assessment that will better inform learning.

2021-2022:

The case study is no longer collected in EDUC 503. Major assessment data across the program is being realigned and the appropriate coursework and assessments will then be reported in upcoming assessment plans.

12 Assessment and Benchmark Teacher Candidate Work Sample

This documentation is a statistical analysis of student learning through pre- and post-assessments. During their Education 683: Clinical Experience, candidates must prepare a unit of instruction, administer a pre/post assessment on that unit of instruction, and analyze the student performance results. The P-12 Student Learning Analysis provides evidence that addresses ACEI Standards.

Skills:

Assessment: InTASC Standard 6 - The candidate uses multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, and to guide the teacher's and learner's decision making.

CAEP Standard 1

ACEI standard alignment

1.0 Development, Learning, and Motivation: This ACEI standard aligns with The Assessment Plan Domain element: Alignment of Lesson Evidence where candidates are to make connections as to how their learning outcomes, pre-assessment instrument, instructional strategies, and post-assessment instrument are aligned with the rigor of the identified standard for the comprehensive unit.

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----|---|------------------------|-----------|-----------|------|-----------|--|--|
| Student Level of Mastery and Evaluation of Factors | 4.0 | 6 | Mean | 3.33 | 3.50 | 4.00 | 3.86 | | |
| | | | Range | 3.00-4.00 | 1.00-4.00 | 4.00 | 3.00-4.00 | | |
| | | | % proficient or higher | 100% | 83% | 100% | 100% | | |
| Data to Determine Patterns and Gaps | 4.0 | 6 | Mean | 2.33 | 1.83 | 4.00 | 3.29 | | |
| | | | Range | 2.00-3.00 | 1.00-2.00 | 4.00 | 2.00-4.00 | | |
| | | | % proficient or higher | 33% | 0% | 100% | 72% | | |
| Response to Interventions | 4.0 | 6 | Mean | 2.33 | 1.33 | 4.00 | 3.29 | | |
| | | | Range | 2.00-3.00 | 1.00-2.00 | 4.00 | 2.00-4.00 | | |
| | | | % proficient or higher | 33% | 0% | 100% | 86% | | |

| Criteria | ACEI Standard | InTASC Standard | | Fall 2018 N=1 | Spring 2019 N=5 | Fall 2019 N=2 | Spring 2020 N=3 | Fall 2020 N=1 | Spring 2021 N= |
|---|---------------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------|--------------------|------------------|--------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| Choice of Assessment | 4.0 | 6 | Mean | 3.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 | |
| | | | Range | 3.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 | |
| | | | % proficient or higher | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | |
| Pre-Assessment | 4.0 | 6 | Mean | 2.00 | 3.60 | 3.00 | 4.00 | 3.00 | |
| | | | Range | 2.00 | 3-4 | 3.00 | 4.00 | 3.00 | |
| | | | % proficient or higher | 0% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | |
| Post-Assessment | 4.0 | 6 | Mean | 3.00 | 3.20 | 3.50 | 4.00 | 4.00 | |
| | | | Range | 3.00 | 1-4 | 3-4 | 4.00 | 4.00 | |
| | | | % proficient or higher | 100% | 80% | 100% | 100% | 100% | |
| Alignment of Lesson Evidence | 1.0 | 6 | Mean | 3.00 | 3.80 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 | |
| | | | Range | 3.00 | 3-4 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 | |
| | | | % proficient or higher | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | |
| Content Standards /Outcomes/ Instructional Strategies | 4.0 | 6 | Teaching Cycle | | | | | | |
| | | | Number | | | | 1 | | |
| | | | Mean | | | | 4.00 | | |
| | | | Range | | | | 4.00 | | |
| % proficient | | | | 100% | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----|---|------------------------|--|--|--|------|--|--|
| | | | or higher | | | | | | |
| Data to Determine Patterns and Gaps (Strengths) | 4.0 | 6 | Mean | | | | 4.00 | | |
| | | | Range | | | | 4.00 | | |
| | | | % proficient or higher | | | | 100% | | |
| Data to Determine Patterns and Gaps (Weaknesses) | 4.0 | 6 | Mean | | | | 4.00 | | |
| | | | Range | | | | 4.00 | | |
| | | | % proficient or higher | | | | 100% | | |
| Analysis of Assessments | | | Mean | | | | 4.00 | | |
| | | | Range | | | | 4.00 | | |
| | | | % proficient or higher | | | | 100% | | |
| Application of Data Results | | | Mean | | | | 3.00 | | |
| | | | Range | | | | 3.00 | | |
| | | | % proficient or higher | | | | 100% | | |
| Post Lesson Scaffolding | | | Mean | | | | 4.00 | | |
| | | | Range | | | | 4.00 | | |
| | | | % proficient or higher | | | | 100% | | |

| Criteria | ACEI Standard | InTASC Standard | | Fall 2021 N=0 | Spring 2022 N=2 | Fall 2022 N= | Spring 2023 N= | Fall 2023 N= | Spring 2024 N= |
|----------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------|--------------------|-----------------|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Choice of Assessment | 4.0 | 6 | Mean | | | | | | |
| | | | Range | | | | | | |
| | | | % proficient or higher | | | | | | |
| Pre-Assessment | 4.0 | 6 | Mean | | | | | | |
| | | | Range | | | | | | |
| | | | % proficient or higher | | | | | | |
| Post-Assessment | 4.0 | 6 | Mean | | | | | | |
| | | | Range | | | | | | |
| | | | % proficient or higher | | | | | | |
| Alignment of Lesson | 1.0 | 6 | Mean | | | | | | |
| | | | Range | | | | | | |
| | | | % | | | | | | |

| Evidence | | | proficient or higher | | | | | |
|---|-----|---|------------------------|--|-----------|--|--|--|
| Content Standards /Outcomes/ Instructional Strategies | 4.0 | 6 | Teaching Cycle | | | | | |
| | | | Number | | 2 | | | |
| | | | Mean | | 4.00 | | | |
| | | | Range | | 4.00 | | | |
| | | | % proficient or higher | | 100% | | | |
| Data to Determine Patterns and Gaps (Strengths) | 4.0 | 6 | Mean | | 4.00 | | | |
| | | | Range | | 4.00 | | | |
| | | | % proficient or higher | | 100% | | | |
| Data to Determine Patterns and Gaps (Weaknesses) | 4.0 | 6 | Mean | | 3.50 | | | |
| | | | Range | | 3.00-4.00 | | | |
| | | | % proficient or higher | | 100% | | | |
| Analysis of Assessments | | | Mean | | 4.00 | | | |
| | | | Range | | 4.00 | | | |
| | | | % proficient or higher | | 100% | | | |
| Application of Data Results | | | Mean | | 4.00 | | | |
| | | | Range | | 4.00 | | | |
| | | | % proficient or higher | | 100% | | | |
| Post Lesson Scaffolding | | | Mean | | 4.00 | | | |
| | | | Range | | 4.00 | | | |
| | | | % proficient or higher | | 100% | | | |

12.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

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

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

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- Faculty will facilitate at least two peer mentoring/coaching sessions to deepen candidates' understanding of each element of the Teacher Candidate Work Sample.

Candidate feedback will determine the effectiveness of the peer mentoring/coaching sessions. Change will be determined by the scores on the Teacher Candidate Work Sample.

2018-2019:

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

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

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- Faculty will continue to facilitate at least two peer mentoring/coaching sessions to deepen candidates' understanding of each element of the Teacher Candidate Work Sample.

Candidate feedback will determine the effectiveness of the peer mentoring/coaching sessions. Change will be determined by the scores on the Teacher Candidate Work Sample.

2019-2020:

Data Analysis:

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

Recommendations for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

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

2020-2021:

The benchmark was met during the 2020-2021 academic year cycle as the completer scored 100% proficient and scored a 3.00 or higher on all components. The performance of the one candidate was comparable to previous semesters. The redesigned program does not require EDUC 523, which is the course this assessment has been pulled from. The MAT Elementary faculty will finalize courses in which assessments will be reported. The rainbow chart (chart with courses and assessments) will be updated and implemented in the fall 2021 semester.

2021-2022:

Completers in the spring 2022 semester scored at or above benchmark in all elements of the Teaching Cycle.

All major assessments, including the teaching cycle, are being realigned to the 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 Praxis Content

Assessment: Praxis Elementary Content Exam (5014/5018/5001)

Knowledge:

Content Knowledge: InTASC Standard 4 - The candidate applies the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches.

Candidate will pass their Praxis content area exam before entering their student teaching/intern semester.

CAEP Standard 1

Candidates are required to demonstrate knowledge, understanding, and application of Reading /Language Arts skills on the Praxis content exam (5014/5018/5002). Candidates demonstrate an understanding of reading foundational skills including phonological awareness and the role of phonics and word analysis in literacy development, as well as analyzing literature and informational texts. Candidates are also required to demonstrate writing, speaking, and listening proficiencies through identifying and evaluating various concepts and practices. Assessment of the candidates' performance is aligned to Element 2.1. Reading, Writing, and Oral Language. Candidates are required to demonstrate knowledge, understanding, and use of fundamental concepts in earth science, life science, and physical science on the Praxis content exam (5014

/5018/5005). In addition, candidates must understand the importance and use of inquiry, research and resources, and the unifying processes of science. Assessment of candidates' performance is aligned to Element 2.2. Science.

Candidates are required to demonstrate problem solving and reasoning with mathematical skills on the Praxis content exam (5014/5018/5003). Candidates must know, understand, and demonstrate proficiency in the application of numbers and operations, algebraic thinking, geometry and measurement, data analysis, statistics, and probability. Assessment of candidates' performance is aligned to Element 2.3. Mathematics.

Candidates are required to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of Social Studies concepts on the Praxis content exam (5014/5018/5004). Candidates must interrelate topics from United State history, government, citizenship, geography, anthropology, sociology, world history, and economics to support informed decision making by citizens in modern society. Assessment of candidates' performance is aligned to Element 2.4. Social Studies.

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

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

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

13.1 Data

2017-2018:

Data table is attached.

2018-2019:

Data table is attached.

2019-2020:

Data table is attached.

2020-2021:

Data table is attached.

2021-2022:

Data table is attached.

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

MAT_ELEM_Praxis Content_17-18

MAT_ELEM_Praxis Content_18-19

MAT_ELEM_Praxis Content_19-20

MAT_ELEM_Praxis Content_20-21

MAT_ELEM_Praxis Content_21-22

13.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

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

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

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- Identify faculty to conduct Praxis workshops on two Saturdays per semester. Faculty will document students' attendance and participation, as well as their post-workshop Praxis passage rates, to determine effectiveness and areas for improvement.

- Faculty will compare pre and post PRAXIS scores after the implementation of the PRAXIS workshop in order to make programmatic changes as necessary. We are measuring rates of improvement via the first attempt passage rate and improvement in test scores.

2018-2019:

A minimum of 80% of graduates will pass the Praxis content exam on the first attempt. The passage rates for the 18-19 AY increased from the 17-18 AY from 75% (n=12) to 92% (n=13). Therefore, the benchmark was met since 92% of the candidates passed the content exam on their first attempt.

Recommendations for 2019-2020:

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

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

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

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

2021-2022:

Candidates in elementary education must take four content subject areas: Reading, Math, Science, and Social Studies. 50% of the candidates (N=2) passed all four portions of the exam on the first attempt. 100% of the candidates passed the Reading subject area test on the first attempt.

The EPP is partnering with 240 Tutoring to provide discounts to students who wish to use the practice materials to prepare for the exams. Additional resources are available in the library including Mometrix materials.

The EPP will continue to view coursework to ensure that program coursework is best aligned to Praxis and teaching content.

13.2 Data

2017-2018:

Data table is attached.

2018-2019:
Data table is attached.

2019-2020:
Data table is attached.

2020-2021:
Data table is attached.

2021-2022:
Data table is attached.

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

MAT_ELEM_Praxis Content_17-18

MAT_ELEM_Praxis Content_18-19

MAT_ELEM_Praxis Content_19-20

MAT_ELEM_Praxis Content_20-21

MAT_ELEM_Praxis Content_21-22

13.2.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

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

Spring 2018 data:

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

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

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

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

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

2018-2019:
A mean score of 70% for percentage of questions answered correctly in each sub-category will be achieved on the Praxis II Content Exam.

For the spring 2019 data (sub-scores were not available for the fall 2018 completer):

Exam 5002 Reading:

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

Exam 5003 Math:

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

Exam 5004 Social Studies:

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

Exam 5005 Science

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

Recommendations for 2019-2020:

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

2019-2020:**2020-2021:**

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

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

2021-2022:

In each of the subject tests, the following benchmarks were met/not met:

#5002: Reading 77% (exceeded benchmark of 70%) and Writing 68%;

#5003: Numbers and Operations 94% (exceeded benchmark of 70%); Algebraic Thinking (67%) and Geometry and Measurement, Data, Statistics, Probability (58%)

#5004: US History, Government, Citizenship 72% (exceeded benchmark of 70%);

Geography, Anthropology, and Sociology (63%) and World History and Economics (50%)

#5005: There were no categories that met benchmark: Earth Science (63%), Life Science (68%), and Physical Science (65%)

Candidates in the MAT ELEM program do not take content specific coursework. The EPP has provided resources for candidates who wish to enroll in the program and has partnered with 240 Tutoring to offer discounted practice materials for the content and PLT exams.

13.3 Data

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

| Attempts and Pass Rates for 5001 Sub-Tests | Fall 2019 | Spring 2020 | Fall 2020 | Spring 2021 |
|---|--------------|----------------|--------------|----------------|
| | N=2 | N=2 | N=1 | N= |
| 5002 Reading and ELA First Attempt Pass Rate | 100% | 100% | 100% | |
| Average # of attempts for candidates who do not pass #5002 on 1st attempt | — | — | — | |
| 5003 Mathematics First Attempt Pass Rate | 100% | 100% | 100% | |
| Average # of attempts for candidates who do not pass #5003 on 1st attempt. | — | — | — | |
| 5004 Social Studies First Attempt Pass Rate | 100% | 50% | 100% | |
| Average # of attempts for candidates who do not pass #5004 on 1st attempt | — | 3 | — | |
| 5005 Science First Attempt Pass Rate | 50% | 100% | 0% | |
| Average # of attempts for candidates who do not pass #5005 on 1st attempt. | 3 | — | 2 | |

| Attempts and Pass Rates for 5001 Sub-Tests | Fall 2021 | Spring 2022 | Fall 2022 | Spring 2023 |
|---|--------------|----------------|--------------|----------------|
| | N=0 | N=2 | N= | N= |
| 5002 Reading and ELA First Attempt Pass Rate | | 100% | | |
| | | | | |

| | | | | |
|--|--|-----|--|--|
| Average # of attempts for candidates who do not pass #5002 on 1st attempt | | — | | |
| 5003 Mathematics First Attempt Pass Rate | | 50% | | |
| Average # of attempts for candidates who do not pass #5003 on 1st attempt. | | 2 | | |
| 5004 Social Studies First Attempt Pass Rate | | 50% | | |
| Average # of attempts for candidates who do not pass #5004 on 1st attempt | | 3 | | |
| 5005 Science First Attempt Pass Rate | | 50% | | |
| Average # of attempts for candidates who do not pass #5005 on 1st attempt. | | 4 | | |

13.3.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: The benchmark was met. In the spring of 2018, there was a 100% pass rate on sub-tests 5002 (Reading and ELA), 5003 (Mathematics), and 5004 (Social Studies). For 5005 (Science) there was a 50% first time pass rate and the average number of attempts for candidates not passing on the first attempt was two.

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

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

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

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

2018-2019:

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

There was a 100% pass rate on the 5001 subtests in the 18-19 AY (n=2), therefore, the benchmark was met.

Recommendations for 2019-2020:

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

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

The benchmark was met as the one subtest not passed on the first attempt was passed on the second attempt. The EPP provided resources for the content area. Also, content area Praxis workshops were created but were not able to be administered due to COVID-19 and the hurricanes. The workshops will be re-implemented in the 2021-2022 academic year. MAT Elementary faculty will meet in the fall 2021 semester to review the Praxis benchmarks and take any actions they deem appropriate to be implemented spring 2022.

2021-2022:

The benchmark was not met for the Social Studies or Science subtest. Completer(s) who had to retake these exams did so three and four times, respectively.

240 Tutoring have been offered to candidates at a discounted price to assist in studying for the exam. Candidates are encouraged to prepare for the exams prior to attempting the test. The EPP will continue to assist candidates in finding the necessary resources to complete the exams.

End of report