Secondary Education Grades 6-12 [MAT]
[SE**]

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

Program Name: Secondary Education Grades 6-12 [MAT] [SE]**

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

1 Is this program offered via Distance Learning?

100% Traditional or less than 50% Distance/Traditional

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

No

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

3 Example of Program Improvement

2017-2018:
The course assessments were outlined in the scope and sequence. This semester, course assessments were laid out so that data can be collected, analyzed and used for program improvements.

2018-2019:
We are maintaining/increasing enrollment within our MAT program overall (N=26 to N=31). The Teacher Candidate Work Sample has been revised and is now called the Teaching Cycle.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
MAT candidates entered the program as a cohort and followed sequenced courses for term 1 and 2 of the program. EDUC 510 is required in term 1 for all MAT candidates to enter portfolio and other assessment data to track achievement and program improvement.

2021-2022:

4 Program Highlights from the Reporting Year

2017-2018:
67% of MAT teacher candidates are graduating within two years of official acceptance into the program.

2018-2019:
Candidates continue to excel when taking the PLT.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
EDUC 510 was added to the redesigned curriculum and introduced Via. This will allow for effective data collection of all candidates moving forward. Additionally, EDUC 600 was added to monitor progress of candidates and provide a portal for ensuring all requirements for teacher residency are met.

2021-2022:

5 Program Mission

The purpose of the Secondary MAT Education program is to provide a curriculum leading to the Master of Arts in Teaching Secondary 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 6-12 based upon unit and state requirements for specific content areas.

The Secondary 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 Secondary Education is to prepare teacher education candidates for successful entry into secondary education as middle or high school 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 6-12 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 Secondary 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 Numbers.
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.
CAEP Standard 3

Assessment: Graduation Matriculation Rates.

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.

7.2 Benchmark: Create and monitor candidate progress throughout the program. A minimum of 90% of candidates should complete the MAT program in Secondary Education within 2 years of being accepted into the program (599 packet).

7.1 Data

Enrollment and Completer Data:

All MAT Secondary Education Programs:

Academic Year	# of students officially enrolled in program with an EDUC 599 packet	# of completers fall semester	# of completers spring semester	Total # of completers
2013-2014	28			11
2014-2015	20			9
2015-2016	29	1	5	6
2016-2017	43	4	9	13
2017-2018	26	4	6	10
2018-2019	31	2	7	9
2019-2020	22	3	5	8
2020-2021	13	5	5	10
2021-2022	4	0	3	3

Secondary Education Grades 6-12, Agriculture MAT:

	# of students officially			

Academic Year	enrolled in program with an EDUC 599 packet	# of completers fall semester	# of completers spring semester	Total # of completers
2017-2018	0	0	0	0
2018-2019	0	0	0	0
2019-2020	0	0	0	0
2020-2021	0	0	0	0
2021-2022	0	0	0	0

Secondary Education Grades 6-12, Biology MAT:

Academic Year	# of students officially enrolled in program with an EDUC 599 packet	# of completers fall semester	# of completers spring semester	Total # of completers
2013-2014	8			3
2014-2015	5			4
2015-2016	5	1	2	3
2016-2017	2	0	1	1
2017-2018	7	2	0	2
2018-2019	8	1	3	4
2019-2020	5	2	0	2
2020-2021	2	0	2	2
2021-2022	0	0	0	0

Secondary Education Grades 6-12, Business MAT:

Academic Year	# of students officially enrolled in program with an EDUC 599 packet	# of completers fall semester	# of completers spring semester	Total # of completers
2013-2014	3			1
2014-2015	0	0	0	0
2015-2016	1	0	0	0
2016-2017	3	0	0	0
2017-2018	0	0	0	0
2018-2019	1	0	0	0
2019-2020	1	0	1	1
2020-2021	0	0	0	0
2021-2022	0	0	0	0

Secondary Education Grades 6-12, Chemistry MAT:

Academic Year	# of students officially enrolled in program with an EDUC 599 packet	# of completers fall semester	# of completers spring semester	Total # of completers
2013-2014	2			1
2014-2015	0	0	0	0
2015-2016	1	0	0	0
2016-2017	1	0	0	0
2017-2018	0	0	0	0
2018-2019	0	0	0	0
2019-2020	0	0	0	0

2020-2021	0	0	0	0
2021-2022	0	0	0	0

Secondary Education Grades 6-12, Chinese MAT:

Academic Year	# of students officially enrolled in program with an EDUC 599 packet	# of completers fall semester	# of completers spring semester	Total # of completers
2017-2018	1	0	0	0
2018-2019	0	0	0	0
2019-2020	0	0	0	0
2020-2021	0	0	0	0
2021-2022	0	0	0	

Secondary Education Grades 6-12, English MAT:

Academic Year	# of students officially enrolled in program with an EDUC 599 packet	# of completers fall semester	# of completers spring semester	Total # of completers
2013-2014	8			2
2014-2015	8			5
2015-2016	6	0	0	0
2016-2017	14	1	3	4
2017-2018	7	0	3	3
2018-2019	9	0	0	0
2019-2020	8	0	2	2
2020-2021	5	3	2	5
2021-2022	3	0	3	3

Secondary Education Grades 6-12, Environmental Science MAT:

Academic Year	# of students officially enrolled in program with an EDUC 599 packet	# of completers fall semester	# of completers spring semester	Total # of completers
2013-2014	1			1
2014-2015	0	0	0	0
2015-2016	0	0	0	0
2016-2017	0	0	0	0
2017-2018	0	0	0	0
2018-2019	0	0	0	0
2019-2020	0	0	0	0
2020-2021	0	0	0	0
2021-2022	0	0	0	0

Secondary Education Grades 6-12,French MAT:

Academic Year	# of students officially enrolled in program with an EDUC 599 packet	# of completers fall semester	# of completers spring semester	Total # of completers
2013-2014	1			1
2014-2015	0	0	0	0

2015-2016	0	0	0	0
2016-2017	1	0	0	0
2017-2018	1	0	0	0
2018-2019	1	0	0	0
2019-2020	1	0	1	1
2020-2021	0	0	0	0
2021-2022	0	0	0	0

Secondary Education Grades 6-12, Latin MAT:

Academic Year	# of students officially enrolled in program with an EDUC 599 packet	# of completers fall semester	# of completers spring semester	Total # of completers
2017-2018	0	0	0	0
2018-2019	0	0	0	0
2019-2020	0	0	0	0
2020-2021	0	0	0	0
2021-2022	0	0	0	0

Secondary Education, Grades 6-12, Mathematics MAT:

Academic Year	# of students officially enrolled in program with an EDUC 599 packet	# of completers fall semester	# of completers spring semester	Total # of completers
2013-2014	2			1
2014-2015	0	0	0	0
2015-2016	3	0	1	1
2016-2017	6	0	1	1
2017-2018	4	1	1	2
2018-2019	5	0	2	2
2019-2020	2	1	1	2
2020-2021	0	0	0	0
2021-2022	0	0	0	0

Secondary Education Grades 6-12, Social Studies MAT:

Academic Year	# of students officially enrolled in program with an EDUC 599 packet	# of completers fall semester	# of completers spring semester	Total # of completers
2013-2014	0	0	0	0
2014-2015	5	0	0	0
2015-2016	9	0	1	1
2016-2017	10	3	4	7
2017-2018	2	0	0	0
2018-2019	5	1	1	2
2019-2020	4	0	0	0
2020-2021	3	2	1	3
2021-2022	1	0	0	0

Secondary Education Grades 6-12, Spanish MAT:

Academic Year	# of students officially enrolled in program with an EDUC 599 packet	# of completers fall semester	# of completers spring semester	Total # of completers
2013-2014	3			1
2014-2015	2	0	0	0
2015-2016	4	0	1	1
2016-2017	3	0	0	0
2017-2018	4	1	2	3
2018-2019	2	0	1	1
2019-2020	1	0	0	0
2020-2021	0	0	0	0
2021-2022	0	0	0	0

7.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:
Analysis of Data: The benchmark was not met. There was an overall decline in completers this last data cycle. Total number of completers doubled from 2015-2016 (N=6) in 2016-2017 (N=13); however declined slightly from 2016-2017 this current data cycle (N=10). There were no completers this year in the Social Studies MAT program, which had previously had seven completers. This may be the reason our completer rate declined this year since all other programs were consistent with number of completers within the programs.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The goal of 2018-2019 is to identify content areas that are high needs within local districts.

Recommendations to Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement: A recommendation is that the Recruitment Committee document two in-service and job fairs attended with information on the MAT programs. It is also recommended that a goal of 10 potential MAT students' information be collected on sign-in sheets at these events.

2018-2019:
The benchmark was not met and the total number of MAT Secondary completers decreased from the previous year.

The goal of the 19-20 AY is to promote the MAT program via social media and at local events.

A recommendation is that the department have a presence of a faculty or staff member at the TNT conference and Calcasieu Career Fair to promote the program via Department social media sites.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
The EPP goal to increase MAT Secondary Education program enrollment by 7% per year was not met in the 2020-2021 academic year. Further analysis indicates the goal has not been met for two years. Enrollment in the MAT Secondary program for fall 2020 totaled 13 students, down from 22 the previous year. The program experienced a 41% decrease in enrollment from fall 2019 to fall 2020. The data trend has been a decrease in enrollment every year since 2016-2017 except for a slight increase in 2018-2019. The significant 2-year downward trend in enrollment in the MAT Secondary program is of major concern due to the need for certified teachers in the surrounding school districts.

During the 2020-2021 academic year, the EPP increased its presence on social media via Facebook posts of commencement ceremonies and launched HubSpot for online recruitment. The Fall 2020 career fair and Grad Fest events did not occur as usual due to COVID-19 and Hurricanes Laura and Delta which damaged campus and local infrastructure. EPP leadership

worked at the spring 2021 Grad Fest on March 18 to recruit students in content disciplines to enroll in the MAT program. EPP leadership provided a 20% tuition discount for the Fall 2020 MAT cohort if the student enrolled full-time and stayed on track with program requirements. Enrollment in the spring 2021 semester to stay on track despite not having met Praxis exam admission requirements was allowed due to COVID-19 AND hurricanes Laura and Delta disruption to usual operations for exam opportunities.

EPP faculty will attend McNeese Grad Fest events in the fall and spring to recruit students into the MAT program. The EPP will respond timely with follow up to all MAT program inquiries form the online recruitment initiative (HubSpot). EPP leadership will promote the MAT program to local district representatives at least once per academic year. Fall 2022 enrollment is expected to meet benchmark.

2021-2022:
Enrollment dropped by 69% from 2020-2021 to 2021-2022. Faculty have attended Grad Fest, Teacher Leader, TechCom and other events to recruit non-certified teachers in Louisiana. MSU leadership is also attending HR meetings within the state to promote the programs and recruit candidates.

7.2 Data

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 SEC ALL	2013-2014	15	N=10 67%		N=1 7%		N=3 20%		N=1 7%	
	2014-2015	17	N=10 59%	N=3 18%	N=1 5%		N=3 18%			
	2015-2016	15	N=11 73%		N=1 7%		N=2 13%			N=1 7%
	2016-2017	13	N=9 69%	N=2 15%			N=2 15%			
	2017-2018	7	N=7 100%							
MAT SEC Agriculture	2013-2014	—								
	2014-2015	—								
	2015-2016	1	N=1 100%							
	2016-2017	0								
	2017-2018	0								
MAT SEC Biology	2013-2014	3	N=3 100%							
	2014-2015	3	N=2 67%	N=1 33%						
	2015-2016	2	N=2 100%							
	2016-2017	4	N=3 75%	N=1 25%						

	2017-2018	4	N=4 100%								
MAT SEC Business	2013-2014	2					N=2 100%				
	2014-2015	—									
	2015-2016	0									
	2016-2017	1	N=1 100%								
	2017-2018	0									
MAT SEC Chemistry	2013-2014	2	N=2 100%								
	2014-2015	—									
	2015-2016	1					N=1 100%				
	2016-2017	0									
	2017-2018	0									
MAT SEC Chinese	2013-2014	—									
	2014-2015	—									
	2015-2016	0									
	2016-2017	—									
	2017-2018	0									
MAT SEC English	2013-2014	2	N=2 100%								
	2014-2015	6	N=2 33%	N=1 17%			N=3 50%				
	2015-2016	3	N=2 67%				N=1 33%				
	2016-2017	3	N=1 33%	N=1 33%			N=1 33%				
	2017-2018	1	N=1 100%								
MAT SEC Environmental Science	2013-2014	—									
	2014-2015	—									
	2015-2016	0									
	2016-2017	0									

	Year										
	2017-2018	0									
MAT SEC French	2013-2014	—									
	2014-2015	—									
	2015-2016	0									
	2016-2017	0									
	2017-2018	0									
MAT SEC Latin	2013-2014	—									
	2014-2015	—									
	2015-2016	0									
	2016-2017	0									
	2017-2018	0									
MAT SEC Mathematics	2013-2014	2	N=1 50%		N=1 50%						
	2014-2015	1		N=1 50%							
	2015-2016	2	N=1 50%		N=1 50%						
	2016-2017	2	N=1 50%				N=1 50%				
	2017-2018	1	N=1 100%								
MAT SEC Social Studies	2013-2014	—									
	2014-2015	6	N=4 66%	N=1 17%	N=1 17%						
	2015-2016	4	N=3 75%				N=1 25%				
	2016-2017	1	N=1 100%								
	2017-2018	0									
MAT SEC Spanish	2013-2014	1	N=1 100%								
	2014-2015	—									
	2015-2016	2	N=2 100%								
	2016-2017	0									

Program	Year									
	2017-2018	1	N=1 100%							
MAT SEC Family and Consumer Science Program*	2013-2014	1	N=1 100%							
MAT SEC Content	2013-2014	2					N=1 50%		N=1 50%	
	2014-2015	1	N=1 100%							
	2015-2016	—								
	2016-2017	2	N=2 100%							
	2017-2018	—								

*No longer offered
**Area undetermined

7.2.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:
Analysis of Data:
This benchmark was met by students in all secondary content areas, with the exception of mathematics, business, and undetermined content areas. Business students dropped from the university and did not graduate. Similarly, teacher candidates, who did not identify a content area, either dropped from the university (50%) or earned a different degree (50%). Teacher candidates in secondary mathematics did graduate; however, 50% took four years to do so.

Overall, the MAT Secondary Content Areas graduated 67% of teacher candidates graduated within 1 to 2 years of starting their program. This fell below our departmental benchmark of 80%.

All content areas, with the exception of business, mathematics, and undetermined content areas, graduated teacher candidates within 1-2 years of starting their program (N=9, 100%). Business students dropped from the university and did not graduate; therefore, reporting 0% of students graduating from the program (N=2, 0%). Similarly, teacher candidates, who did not identify a content area, either dropped from the university (N=1, 50%) or earned a different degree (N=1, 50%). Teacher candidates in secondary mathematics did graduate within the department's goal of 1 to 2 years (N=1, 50%); however, 50% of these teacher candidates took 4 years to do so (N=1).

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The goal for 2018-2019 is to identify reasons students are dropping from the university or earning a different degree and determine intervention activities.

Recommendations to Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement: The most beneficial action the department can take is to develop a survey for students who wish to drop from the university or change degrees. The survey information gathered on these students, in addition to reviewing teacher candidate credentials upon admission, can aid in providing additional resources or support to these students in the future.

2018-2019:
The recommendations from the previous year were not met as no action was taken to develop a survey to identify reasons students drop from the university.

The benchmark was not met. The benchmark states a minimum of 90% of candidates should complete the MAT program within 2 years. Only 59% of completers finished the program within the two year benchmark date.

The goal of 2019-2020 is to have a mid-term meeting to check the progress of students within the program.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
The benchmark was not met. Aggregated data across MAT Secondary programs 69% of candidates completed in two years which is a decrease from 73% the previous year. However, 84% completed within 3 years. The relatively low percentage of MAT secondary program students who drop out of the program is encouraging. Given the relatively low enrollment number and the 84% completion rate within 3 years with 69% within two years is productive.

At mid-term of the 2020-2021 academic year, informed discussions about MAT student progression were held with EPP leadership and faculty and follow-up communication with candidates regarding progression concerns were completed by the MAT advisor. Due to extraordinary circumstances of COVID -19 restrictions as well as the impact of three Federally declared natural disasters to the campus community, provisions for extending enrollment opportunities in spring 2021 pending formal admission (EDUC 599) were provided to the fall 2020 cohort.

A survey to gather information about candidates' reasons for discontinuing the program has not been developed; however, the MAT advisor communicates with candidates who do not re-enroll. Informal data indicate extenuating circumstances such as the challenges to recovery from natural disasters or health issues contributed to the decision to drop out for candidates who met admission requirements for the program.

MAT Secondary candidates in good standing who do not re-enroll will be contacted by the MAT advisor to determine a reasonable path forward for completion. Information about reasons for discontinuing enrollment will be reviewed to determine if remedial measures can be taken to prevent drop out. EPP faculty will review program admission requirements in summer 2021 to determine a better support to candidates for progression and matriculation. Any revisions will be available in the 2022-2023 academic catalog.

2021-2022:
100% of the candidates accepted into the program in MAT secondary programs during the 2017-2018 academic year (N=7) completed the program within 1-2 years of official acceptance into the program.

Current candidates are participating in focus groups for opinions on course progressions and coursework for current candidates in order to continue the matriculation numbers.

8 Assessment and Benchmark Curriculum Development

Assessment: Curriculum Development
All program faculty will meet at least twice an academic year to discuss curriculum changes /implementation, assessment data, and progress monitoring of action plans.
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; program revisions
Date of Meeting: August 6, 2020
Meeting Location and Duration: Zoom: 9-11:30 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: BCOE Faculty
Topic and brief description, results of meeting, next steps, etc.: Field Experience Expectations, Internship, and Practicum expectations

Date of Meeting: January 25, 2021
Meeting Location and Duration: Zoom: 4:00 to 5:30 p.m..
Attendees: DEP Faculty, University Supervisors, Mentor Teachers
Topic and brief description, results of meeting, next steps, etc.: Expectations of Student Teachers 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).

MAT_Secondary_Curriculum Development_17-18
Secondary Education Curriculum Development

8.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:
Analysis of Data: One of the outcomes was met and our overall benchmark of meeting twice an academic year to discuss curriculum changes/implementations, assessment data, and progress monitoring of action plans was accomplished.
The MAT program faculty met January 9th, 2018 to outline major assessments throughout the MAT Secondary Program. The program assessments were outlined on a chart in order to visualize the scope and sequence of our assessments. Additionally, the MAT faculty met February 28, 2018 to discuss assessment data and to obtain curriculum redesign information.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The goal for 2018-2019 will be to implement curriculum changes to the MAT Secondary program.

Recommendations to Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement: The redesign of the MAT Secondary curriculum will be adopted for the 2019-2020 academic year.

2018-2019:
There were a number of meeting held throughout the 18-19 AY to finalize the MAT program course sequence and curriculum. The MAT program will be going 100% online. In the upcoming semesters, faculty will be working to ensure that standards and outcomes are covered throughout the progression of the five-semester coursework.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
The benchmark was met for the 2020-2021 academic year as the intent was for there to be an exchange of information among MAT faculty and leadership. Rather than hosting special meetings, discussions among faculty and leadership were held as needed to discuss emerging issues related to the MAT Secondary program revised structure and residency requirements. Problems were resolved in a timely manner and noted for consideration when assessing program improvements. At least two meetings will be held during the 2021-2022 academic year with EPP leadership and faculty to identify areas for program improvement and to formulate plans for implementing improvement. The EPP faculty will also review admission requirements to begin coursework in the program and make any necessary changes to be available in the 2022-2023 academic catalog.

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 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 PRAXIS II Content

Assessment: Praxis Content Exam.
Content Knowledge: InTASC Standard 4.
The candidate applies the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches. These tests must be taken and passed prior to the candidate being officially admitted into the program.

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

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

9.1 Data

MAT Secondary Education - Praxis Content Exam:

All MAT Secondary Content		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
Combined	Number	1	5	4	9	4	6
	% Pass 1st attempt	100%	100%	75%	100%	75%	83%

All MAT Secondary		Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring

Content		2018	2019	2019	2020	2020	2021
Combined	Number	2	7	3	5	5	5
	% Pass 1st attempt	100%	57%	67%	80%	60%	100%

All MAT Secondary Content		Fall 2021	Spring 2022	Fall 2022	Spring 2023	Fall 2023	Spring 2024
Combined	Number	0	3				
	% Pass 1st attempt		100%				

Biology		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
#5235 overall	Number	1	2	0	1	2	0
	Mean	165	172		154	151.5	
	Range	165	164-179		154	150-153	
	% correct					49%	
	% Pass 1st attempt	100%	100%		100%	100%	
#5235 breakdown:	Number	1	0	0	0	2	0
Nature of Science: Scientific Inquiry, Methodology, Techniques, and History	Mean	13				10	
	Range	13				10	
	% correct (17)					59%	
Molecular and Cellular Biology	Mean	17				7	
	Range	17				7	
	% correct (24)					29%	
Genetics and Evolution	Mean	15				12.5	
	Range	15				11-14	
	% correct (24)					52%	
Diversity of Life and Organismal Biology	Mean	14				11	
	Range	14				9-13	
	% correct (24)					46%	
Ecology: Organisms and Environments	Mean	10				11	
	Range	10				10-12	
	% correct (19)					58%	
Science, Technology, and Social Perspectives	Mean	11				7.5	
	Range	11				6-9	
	% correct (12)					63%	

		Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring

Biology		2018	2019	2019	2020	2020	2021
#5235 overall	Number	1	3	2	0	0	2
	Mean	189	158	157			163
	Range	189	153-165	153-161			152-174
	% Pass 1st attempt	100%	33%	100%			100%
#5235 breakdown:	Number	1	3	1			0
Nature of Science: Scientific Inquiry, Methodology, Techniques, and History	Mean	16	12	14			
	Range	16	10-13	14			
	% correct (17)	94%	69%	82%			
Molecular and Cellular Biology	Mean	21	13	13			
	Range	21	13-14	13			
	% correct (23-24)	88%	56%	57%			
Genetics and Evolution	Mean	22	13	8			
	Range	22	11-16	8			
	% correct (24-25)	88%	56%	33%			
Diversity of Life and Organismal Biology	Mean	22	13	9			
	Range	22	10-17	9			
	% correct (23-24)	92%	53%	39%			
Ecology: Organisms and Environments	Mean	15	12	9			
	Range	15	9-13	9			
	% correct (19)	79%	61%	47%			
Science, Technology, and Social Perspectives	Mean	11	7	10			
	Range	11	6-8	10			
	% correct (12)	92%	61%	83%			

Biology		Fall 2021	Spring 2022	Fall 2022	Spring 2023	Fall 2023	Spring 2024
#5235 overall	Number	0	0				
	Mean						
	Range						
	% Pass 1st attempt						
#5235 breakdown:	Number						
Nature of Science: Scientific Inquiry, Methodology, Techniques, and History	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct (17)						

Molecular and Cellular Biology	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct (23-24)						
Genetics and Evolution	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct (24-25)						
Diversity of Life and Organismal Biology	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct (23-24)						
Ecology: Organisms and Environments	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct (19)						
Science, Technology, and Social Perspectives	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct (12)						

Math		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
#5062/5161 overall	Number	0	1	0	1	1	1
	Mean		171		141	141	167
	Range		171		141	141	167
	% correct						
	% Pass 1st attempt		100%		100%	100%	100%
#5161 breakdown:	Number	0	1	0	0	0	0
Number and Quantity, Algebra, Functions, and Calculus	Mean		26				
	Range		26				
	% correct						
Geometry, Probability and Statistics, and Discrete Mathematics	Mean		12				
	Range		12				
	% correct						

Math		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
#5062/5161 overall	Number	0	2			0	0
	Mean		160				
	Range		160				
	% correct						
	% Pass 1st attempt		50%				
#5161 breakdown:	Number		1				

Number and Quantity, Algebra, Functions, and Calculus	Mean		22				
	Range		22				
	% correct (34)		65%				
Geometry, Probability and Statistics, and Discrete Mathematics	Mean		10				
	Range		10				
	% correct (16)		63%				

Math		Fall 2021	Spring 2022	Fall 2022	Spring 2023	Fall 2023	Spring 2024
#5062/5161 overall	Number	0	0				
	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct						
	% Pass 1st attempt						
#5161 breakdown:	Number						
Number and Quantity, Algebra, Functions, and Calculus	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct (34)						
Geometry, Probability and Statistics, and Discrete Mathematics	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct (16)						

English		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
#5041/5039 overall	Number	0	0	1	3	0	3
#5041 overall	Number	0	0	1	3	0	0
	Mean			171	175		
	Range			171	168-181		
	% Pass 1st attempt			100%	100%		
#5041 breakdown:	Number				2		
	Range				172		
	Mean				168-176		
Literature & Understanding Text	Mean				48		
	Range				45-50		
Language & Linguistics	Mean				13		
	Range				13		
Composition & Rhetoric	Mean				28		
	Range				27-28		

#5039 overall	Number	0	0	0	1	0	3
	Mean				181		180.33
	Range				181		175-186
	% Pass 1st attempt						67%
#5039 breakdown:	Number	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Mean						175
	Range						175
	% correct (122)						75%
Reading	Mean				40		30
	Range				40		30
	% correct (41)						73%
Language Use and Vocabulary	Mean				28		24
	Range				28		24
	% correct (28)						86%
Writing, Speaking, Listening	Mean				32		31
	Range				32		31
	% correct (41)						76%
Constructed Response	Mean						7
	Range						7
	% correct (12)						58%

English		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
#5041/5039 overall	Number	0	0			3	2
#5041 overall	Number						
	Mean						
	Range						
	% Pass 1st attempt						
#5041 breakdown:	Number						
	Range						
	Mean						
Literature & Understanding Text	Mean						
	Range						
Language & Linguistics	Mean						
	Range						
Composition & Rhetoric	Mean						
	Range						
	Number					3	2

						Fall 2023	Spring 2024
#5039 overall	Mean					173.67	178
	Range					172-176	177-179
	% Pass 1st attempt					33%	100%
#5039 breakdown:	Number					1	1
	Mean					172	177
	Range					172	177
	% correct (122)					172	177
Reading	Mean					32	35
	Range					32	35
	% correct (41)					78%	85%
Language Use and Vocabulary	Mean					20	22
	Range					20	22
	% correct (28)					71%	79%
Writing, Speaking, Listening	Mean					31	32
	Range					31	32
	% correct (41)					76%	78%
Constructed Response	Mean					8	8
	Range					8	8
	% correct (12)					67%	67%

English		Fall 2021	Spring 2022	Fall 2022	Spring 2023	Fall 2023	Spring 2024
#5041/5039 overall	Number	0	3				
#5041 overall	Number						
	Mean						
	Range						
	% Pass 1st attempt						
#5041 breakdown:	Number						
	Range						
	Mean						
Literature & Understanding Text	Mean						
	Range						
Language & Linguistics	Mean						
	Range						
Composition & Rhetoric	Mean						
	Range						
	Number		3				

		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
#5039 overall	Mean		177				
	Range		168-187				
	% Pass 1st attempt		100%				
#5039 breakdown:	Number		3				
	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct (41)						
Reading	Mean		32				
	Range		23-37				
	% correct (41)		79%				
Language Use and Vocabulary	Mean		23				
	Range		19-26				
	% correct (28)		83%				
Writing, Speaking, Listening	Mean		33				
	Range		31-34				
	% correct (41)		80%				
Constructed Response	Mean		9				
	Range		7-11				
	% correct (12)		72%				

Social Studies		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
#5086 overall	Number	0	1	3	4	0	0
	Mean		161	169.3	168		
	Range		161	167-172	161-177		
	% Pass 1st attempt		100%	75%	100%		
#5086 breakdown:	Number			2	4		
United States History	Mean			12	13		
	Range			11-12	10-15		
World History	Mean			15	13		
	Range			12-15	12-15		
Government/ Civics	Mean			10	14		
	Range			9-11	13-16		
Economics	Mean			10	10		
	Range			8-11	8-11		
Geography	Mean			8	8		
	Range			7-8	4-10		

Behavioral Sciences	Mean			12	6		
	Range			10-14	5-8		

Social Studies		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
#5086 overall	Number	1	1			2	1
	Mean	178	167			175.5	184
	Range	178	167			169-182	184
	% Pass 1st attempt	100%	100%			100%	100%
#5086 breakdown:	Number					1	0
United States History	Mean					12	
	Range					12	
	% Correct					67%	
World History	Mean					12	
	Range					12	
	% Correct					67%	
Government/ Civics	Mean					13	
	Range					13	
	% Correct					72%	
Economics	Mean					7	
	Range					7	
	% Correct					54%	
Geography	Mean					11	
	Range					11	
	% Correct					85%	
Behavioral Sciences	Mean					7	
	Range					7	
	% Correct					70%	
Short Content Essay	Mean					16	
	Range					16	
	% Correct					89%	

Social Studies		Fall 2021	Spring 2022	Fall 2022	Spring 2023	Fall 2023	Spring 2024
#5086 overall	Number	0	0				
	Mean						
	Range						
	% Pass 1st attempt						
#5086 breakdown:	Number						
United States History	Mean						
	Range						
	% Correct						

World History	Mean						
	Range						
	% Correct						
Government/ Civics	Mean						
	Range						
	% Correct						
Economics	Mean						
	Range						
	% Correct						
Geography	Mean						
	Range						
	% Correct						
Behavioral Sciences	Mean						
	Range						
	% Correct						
Short Content Essay	Mean						
	Range						
	% Correct						

Spanish		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
#5195 overall	Number	0	1	0	0	1	2
	Mean		172			159	189.5
	Range		172			157	185-194
	% Pass 1st attempt		100%			0%	100%
#5195 breakdown:	Number						1
Interpretive Mode: Listening	Mean						23
	Range						23
	% correct (25)						92%
Interpretive Mode: Reading	Mean						22
	Range						22
	% correct (24)						92%
Cultural Knowledge	Mean						11
	Range						11
	% correct (11)						100%
Interpersonal and Presentational Writing	Mean						16
	Range						16
	% correct (18)						89%
Presentational	Mean						15
	Range						15

and Interpersonal Speaking	% correct (18)						83%

Spanish		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
#5195 overall	Number	0	1			0	0
	Mean		195				
	Range		195				
	% Pass 1st attempt		100%				
#5195 breakdown:	Number		1				
Interpretive Mode: Listening	Mean		23				
	Range		23				
	% correct (25)		92%				
Interpretive Mode: Reading	Mean		24				
	Range		24				
	% correct (24-25)		96%				
Cultural Knowledge	Mean		11				
	Range		11				
	% correct (11-12)		92%				
Interpersonal and Presentational Writing	Mean		14				
	Range		14				
	% correct (18)		78%				
Presentational and Interpersonal Speaking	Mean		18				
	Range		18				
	% correct (18)		100%				

Spanish		Fall 2021	Spring 2022	Fall 2022	Spring 2023	Fall 2023	Spring 2024
#5195 overall	Number	0	0				
	Mean						
	Range						
	% Pass 1st attempt						
#5195 breakdown:	Number						
Interpretive Mode: Listening	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct (25)						
Interpretive Mode: Reading	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct						

	(24-25)							
Cultural Knowledge	Mean							
	Range							
	% correct (11-12)							
Interpersonal and Presentational Writing	Mean							
	Range							
	% correct (18)							
Presentational and Interpersonal Speaking	Mean							
	Range							
	% correct (18)							

2019-2020:
See attached data file.

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

MAT_Secondary_Praxis Content_19-20

9.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:
Analysis of Data: During the spring 2018 semester, the MAT Secondary Content areas exceeded benchmark at 83%. Overall, the passing rate of students taking the Praxis Content exam increased in every content area, yielding an 8% increase from fall 2017 to spring 2018. During the spring 2018 semester, the MAT Secondary Content areas exceeded benchmark at 83%. The English content area was the only program that reported below our benchmark. This is the first semester this has occurred within our data analysis. It is noteworthy that no Social Studies teacher candidates took the Praxis Content exam this semester.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The goal for 2018-2019 should be for candidates to achieve at least 80% or higher passage rate on Praxis first attempt.

Recommendations to Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement: It is recommended that the department select two faculty members to complete the History Praxis Exam, as previously recommended in 2016-2017. Selected faculty will then outline content on the exam in order to ensure alignment during curriculum redesign.

2018-2019:
The benchmark was not met due to 78% of students passing the Praxis on the first attempt in the fall and spring semesters combined.

The goal of 2019-2020 is to have 80% of students pass the Praxis on the first attempt.

The recommendation is that Praxis Workshops are promoted throughout the department and on social media. Other Praxis workshops will be created and offered to students, such as Biology, English and Math.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
The benchmark was met for the 2020-2021 academic year aggregate data. The fall 2020 data indicate a 60 % passing rate on the first attempt (3 of 5 students) and the spring 2021 data indicate 100% passing rate or 5 of 5 candidates passed on the first attempt. The data indicate 2/3 candidates seeking certification in English fell short of the Praxis content exam passing score on the first attempt in Fall 2020. The mean overall score achieved by the English

candidates improved from 173.67 to 178 from fall 2020 to spring 2021. The lowest scores for the fall 2020 exams were in language use and vocabulary at 71% correct and constructed response at 67% correct. All other content exams taken by 2020-2021 completers were passed on the first attempt.

Candidates were provided access to resources to prepare for the Praxis content exam in EDUC 510. Resources like Mometrix were also available in the library and additional online resources were recommended to students. EPP faculty will continue to provide candidates with Praxis practice resources through advising, EDUC 510, and when faculty/advisors explain the EDUC 599 packet. EPP faculty will meet to review requirements to begin coursework within the MAT programs. Changes recommended will be added to the 2022-2023 academic catalog.

2021-2022:
100% of the completers passed the Praxis content exam on the first attempt. All three completers were in the Secondary English concentration. Candidates will continue to be provided resources for passing the Praxis content exam. 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.

9.2 Data

MAT Secondary Education - Praxis Content Exam:

All MAT Secondary Content		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
Combined	Number	1	5	4	9	4	6
	% Pass 1st attempt	100%	100%	75%	100%	75%	83%

All MAT Secondary Content		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
Combined	Number	2	7	3	5	5	5
	% Pass 1st attempt	100%	57%	67%	80%	60%	100%

All MAT Secondary Content		Fall 2021	Spring 2022	Fall 2022	Spring 2023	Fall 2023	Spring 2024
Combined	Number	0	3				
	% Pass 1st attempt		100%				

Biology		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
#5235 overall	Number	1	2	0	1	2	0
	Mean	165	172		154	151.5	
	Range	165	164-179		154	150-153	
	% correct					49%	
	% Pass 1st attempt	100%	100%		100%	100%	
#5235 breakdown:	Number	1	0	0	0	2	0
Nature of Science: Scientific Inquiry,	Mean	13				10	
	Range	13				10	

Category	Metric	Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
Methodology, Techniques, and History	% correct (17)					59%	
Molecular and Cellular Biology	Mean	17				7	
	Range	17				7	
	% correct (24)					29%	
Genetics and Evolution	Mean	15				12.5	
	Range	15				11-14	
	% correct (24)					52%	
Diversity of Life and Organismal Biology	Mean	14				11	
	Range	14				9-13	
	% correct (24)					46%	
Ecology: Organisms and Environments	Mean	10				11	
	Range	10				10-12	
	% correct (19)					58%	
Science, Technology, and Social Perspectives	Mean	11				7.5	
	Range	11				6-9	
	% correct (12)					63%	

Biology		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
#5235 overall	Number	1	3			0	2
	Mean	189	158				163
	Range	189	153-165				152-174
	% Pass 1st attempt	100%	33%				100%
#5235 breakdown:	Number	1	3				-
Nature of Science: Scientific Inquiry, Methodology, Techniques, and History	Mean	16	12				
	Range	16	10-13				
	% correct (17)	94%	69%				
Molecular and Cellular Biology	Mean	21	13				
	Range	21	13-14				
	% correct (24)	88%	56%				
Genetics and Evolution	Mean	22	13				
	Range	22	11-16				
	% correct (24-25)	88%	56%				
Diversity of Life and Organismal Biology	Mean	22	13				
	Range	22	10-17				
	% correct						

	(24)	92%	53%
Ecology: Organisms and Environments	Mean	15	12
	Range	15	9-13
	% correct (19)	79%	61%
Science, Technology, and Social Perspectives	Mean	11	7
	Range	11	6-8
	% correct (12)	92%	61%

Biology		Fall 2021	Spring 2022	Fall 2022	Spring 2023	Fall 2023	Spring 2024
#5235 overall	Number	0	0				
	Mean						
	Range						
	% Pass 1st attempt						
#5235 breakdown:	Number						
Nature of Science: Scientific Inquiry, Methodology, Techniques, and History	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct (17)						
Molecular and Cellular Biology	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct (24)						
Genetics and Evolution	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct (24-25)						
Diversity of Life and Organismal Biology	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct (24)						
Ecology: Organisms and Environments	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct (19)						
Science, Technology, and Social Perspectives	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct (12)						

Math		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
	Number	0	1	0	1	1	1
	Mean		171		141	141	167

#5062/5161 overall	Range		171		141	141	167
	% correct						
	% Pass 1st attempt		100%		100%	100%	100%
#5161 breakdown:	Number	0	1	0	0	0	0
Number and Quantity, Algebra, Functions, and Calculus	Mean		26				
	Range		26				
	% correct						
Geometry, Probability and Statistics, and Discrete Mathematics	Mean		12				
	Range		12				
	% correct						

Math		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
#5062/5161 overall	Number	0	2			0	0
	Mean		160				
	Range		160				
	% correct						
	% Pass 1st attempt		50%				
#5161 breakdown:	Number		1				
Number and Quantity, Algebra, Functions, and Calculus	Mean		22				
	Range		22				
	% correct (34)		65%				
Geometry, Probability and Statistics, and Discrete Mathematics	Mean		10				
	Range		10				
	% correct (16)		63%				

Math		Fall 2021	Spring 2022	Fall 2022	Spring 2023	Fall 2023	Spring 2024
#5062/5161 overall	Number	0	0				
	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct						
	% Pass 1st attempt						
#5161 breakdown:	Number						
Number and Quantity, Algebra, Functions, and Calculus	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct (34)						
Geometry, Probability and Statistics,	Mean						
	Range						

and Discrete Mathematics	% correct (16)						

English		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
#5041/5039 overall	Number	0	0	1	3	0	3
#5041 overall	Number	0	0	1	3	0	0
	Mean			171	175		
	Range			171	168-181		
	% Pass 1st attempt			100%	100%		
#5041 breakdown:	Number				2		
	Range				172		
	Mean				168-176		
Literature & Understanding Text	Mean				48		
	Range				45-50		
Language & Linguistics	Mean				13		
	Range				13		
Composition & Rhetoric	Mean				28		
	Range				27-28		
#5039 overall	Number	0	0	0	1	0	3
	Mean				181		180.33
	Range				181		175-186
	% Pass 1st attempt						67%
#5039 breakdown:	Number	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Mean						175
	Range						175
	% correct (122)						75%
Reading	Mean				40		30
	Range				40		30
	% correct (41)						73%
Language Use and Vocabulary	Mean				28		24
	Range				28		24
	% correct (28)						86%
Writing, Speaking, Listening	Mean				32		31
	Range				32		31
	% correct (41)						76%
	Mean						7

Constructed Response							7
	% correct (12)						58%

English		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
#5041/5039 overall							
#5041 overall	Number	0	0			3	2
	Mean					173.67	178
	Range					172-176	177-179
	% Pass 1st attempt					33%	100%
#5041 breakdown:	Number						
	Range						
	Mean						
Literature & Understanding Text	Mean						
	Range						
Language & Linguistics	Mean						
	Range						
Composition & Rhetoric	Mean						
	Range						
#5039 overall	Number						
	Mean						
	Range						
	% Pass 1st attempt						
#5039 breakdown:	Number					1	1
	Mean					172	177
	Range					172	177
Reading	Mean					32	35
	Range					32	35
	% correct					78%	85%
Language Use and Vocabulary	Mean					20	22
	Range					20	22
	% correct					71%	79%
Writing, Speaking, Listening	Mean					31	32
	Range					31	32
	% correct					76%	78%
Constructed Response	Mean					8	8
	Range					8	8
	% correct					67%	67%

English		Fall 2021	Spring 2022	Fall 2022	Spring 2023	Fall 2023	Spring 2024

#5041/5039 overall		0	3				
#5041 overall	Number						
	Mean						
	Range						
	% Pass 1st attempt						
#5041 breakdown:	Number						
	Range						
	Mean						
Literature & Understanding Text	Mean						
	Range						
Language & Linguistics	Mean						
	Range						
Composition & Rhetoric	Mean						
	Range						
#5039 overall	Number		3				
	Mean		177				
	Range		168-187				
	% Pass 1st attempt		100%				
#5039 breakdown:							
Reading	Number	0	3				
	Mean		32				
	Range		23-37				
	% correct		79%				
Language Use and Vocabulary	Mean		23				
	Range		19-26				
	% correct		83%				
Writing, Speaking, Listening	Mean		33				
	Range		31-34				
	% correct		80%				
Constructed Response	Mean		9				
	Range		7-11				
	% correct		72%				

Social Studies		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
#5086 overall	Number	0	1	3	4	0	0
	Mean		161	169.3	168		
	Range		161	167-172	161-177		
	% Pass 1st						

	attempt		100%	75%	100%		
#5086 breakdown:	Number			2	4		
United States History	Mean			12	13		
	Range			11-12	10-15		
World History	Mean			15	13		
	Range			12-15	12-15		
Government/ Civics	Mean			10	14		
	Range			9-11	13-16		
Economics	Mean			10	10		
	Range			8-11	8-11		
Geography	Mean			8	8		
	Range			7-8	4-10		
Behavioral Sciences	Mean			12	6		
	Range			10-14	5-8		

Social Studies		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
#5086 overall	Number	1	1			2	1
	Mean	178	167			175.5	184
	Range	178	167			169-182	184
	% Pass 1st attempt	100%	100%			100%	100%
#5086 breakdown:	Number					1	
United States History	Mean					12	
	Range					12	
	% Correct					67%	
World History	Mean					12	
	Range					12	
	% Correct					67%	
Government/ Civics	Mean					13	
	Range					13	
	% Correct					72%	
Economics	Mean					7	
	Range					7	
	% Correct					54%	
Geography	Mean					11	
	Range					11	
	% Correct					85%	
Behavioral Sciences	Mean					7	
	Range					7	
	% Correct					70%	

Social Studies		Fall 2021	Spring 2022	Fall 2022	Spring 2023	Fall 2023	Spring 2024

#5086 overall	Number						
	Mean						
	Range						
	% Pass 1st attempt						
#5086 breakdown:	Number						
United States History	Mean						
	Range						
	% Correct						
World History	Mean						
	Range						
	% Correct						
Government/ Civics	Mean						
	Range						
	% Correct						
Economics	Mean						
	Range						
	% Correct						
Geography	Mean						
	Range						
	% Correct						
Behavioral Sciences	Mean						
	Range						
	% Correct						

Spanish		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
#5195 overall	Number	0	1	0	0	1	2
	Mean		172			159	189.5
	Range		172			157	185-194
	% Pass 1st attempt		100%			0%	100%
#5195 breakdown:	Number						1
Interpretive Mode: Listening	Mean						23
	Range						23
	% correct (25)						92%
Interpretive Mode: Reading	Mean						22
	Range						22
	% correct (24)						92%
Cultural Knowledge	Mean						11
	Range						11
	% correct (11)						100%

Interpersonal and Presentational Writing	Mean						16
	Range						16
	% correct (18)						89%
Presentational and Interpersonal Speaking	Mean						15
	Range						15
	% correct (18)						83%

Spanish		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
#5195 overall	Number	0	1			0	0
	Mean		195				
	Range		195				
	% Pass 1st attempt		100%				
#5195 breakdown:	Number		1				
Interpretive Mode: Listening	Mean		23				
	Range		23				
	% correct (25)		92%				
Interpretive Mode: Reading	Mean		24				
	Range		24				
	% correct (24-25)		96%				
Cultural Knowledge	Mean		11				
	Range		11				
	% correct (11-12)		92%				
Interpersonal and Presentational Writing	Mean		14				
	Range		14				
	% correct (18)		78%				
Presentational and Interpersonal Speaking	Mean		18				
	Range		18				
	% correct (18)		100%				

Spanish		Fall 2021	Spring 2022	Fall 2022	Spring 2023	Fall 2023	Spring 2024
#5195 overall	Number						
	Mean						
	Range						
	% Pass 1st attempt						
#5195 breakdown:	Number						
	Mean						

Interpretive Mode: Listening	Range							
	% correct (25)							
Interpretive Mode: Reading	Mean							
	Range							
	% correct (24-25)							
Cultural Knowledge	Mean							
	Range							
	% correct (11-12)							
Interpersonal and Presentational Writing	Mean							
	Range							
	% correct (18)							
Presentational and Interpersonal Speaking	Mean							
	Range							
	% correct (18)							

2019-2020:
See attached data file.

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

MAT_Secondary_Praxis Content_19-20

9.2.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:
Analysis of Data: All content areas met the departmental benchmark of correctly answering 70% of exam sub-category questions correctly, with the expectation of Biology and English. Biology fell below our benchmark in the following sub-category questions: Nature of Science: Scientific Inquiry, Methodology, Techniques, and History (59%); Molecular and Cellular Biology (29%); Genetics and Evolution (52%); Diversity of Life and Organismal Biology (46%); Ecology: Organisms and Environments (58%); and Science, Technology, and Social Perspectives (63%). The English sub-category question that did not meet the department benchmark was: Constructive Response (58%).

It is noteworthy to mention, that even though these subcategories fall below our departmental benchmarks, all teacher candidates passed this content exam even though they had a low percentage of questions answered correctly on the exam. The English Praxis Content exam also had a sub-category question that did not meet the department benchmark. This sub-category was Constructive Response (58%).

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The goal for 2018-2019 should be to elevate the sub-category scores within the Biology Praxis Content exam to 70%.

Recommendations to Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement: An in depth analysis of student data needs to be completed. It is recommended that an analysis on the following areas be completed in order to understand the low success rate on Praxis Content questions: course completion/success, Praxis subcategory scoring, and biology courses taken during program. Conclusions from this analysis can validate curriculum redesign changes.

2018-2019:
The benchmark was not met due to Math and Biology sub-category scores falling below the 70% proficiency benchmark.

The goal of 2019-2020 is to have students score 70% proficiency in all sub-categories.

The recommendation is to flag lower sub-category areas in Biology and Math in order to address these lower performing areas in the Praxis Workshops. All sub-categories within the Biology Praxis fell below the benchmark of 70% proficiency (Nature of Science, Molecular and Cellular Biology, Genetics and Evolution, Diversity of Life and Organismal Biology, Ecology, Science, Technology, and Social Perspectives). Math also fell below benchmark in all sub-categories (Number and Quantity, Algebra, Functions, and Calculus; and Geometry, Probability, and Statistics, and Discrete Mathematics.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
The benchmark was met for candidates taking the Biology Praxis Content exam. Data for candidates taking the Social Studies and English Praxis Content exams indicate the benchmark was not met for two sub-categories in social studies and one sub-category in English. Most sub-category scores on the Praxis content exams indicate candidates answered at least 70% of the questions correctly. Areas where candidates pass the exam but showed sub-category scores less than 70% were social studies US History at 67% and World History at 67%. Candidates who took the English content exam achieved 67% on the Constructed Response sub-category. The mean score Social Studies Content Exam subcategory for United States History compares to Fall 2016 results and World History data show a decline from the Fall 2016 results. The English Constructed Response sub-category indicates improvement over previous data where candidates achieved 58% correct responses. The Social Studies Content exam data show an improved overall mean score from 175.5 to 184 from fall 2020 to spring 2021; however due to time limits on Praxis sub-category score report availability, sub-category scores are not available. The increase in the overall mean indicates improvement in sub-categories.

The plan for Praxis workshops was revised due to COVID-19 and natural disaster recovery during the 2020-2021 academic year. Candidates were provided with Praxis resource materials and information for obtaining exam preparation assistance during EDUC 599 preparation and advising communications. For the 2021-2022 academic year, an updated document listing resources for Praxis Exam preparation will be posted in the BCOE Faculty Services Moodle page in the Advising section and will be included in EDUC 510 and in advising sessions with MAT students preparing for the EDUC 599 packet.

2021-2022:
The benchmark was met as the mean score for all four categories of the Praxis Content exam for the completers (#5039) exceeded the 70% benchmark. The subcategory with the lowest percentage correct was Constructed Response (83%); the highest subcategory was Language Use and Vocabulary (83%).

Praxis study materials and resources will continue to be made available to candidates as needed.

10 **Assessment and Benchmark** Lesson Planning

Assessment: Lesson Plan.
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

Benchmark: A minimum of 80% of the candidates will score at the Proficiency level (3) or higher in each category assessed on the lesson plan.

10.1 Data

2017-2018:
Data tables are attached.

2018-2019:
Data tables are attached.

2019-2020:
Data tables are attached.

2020-2021:
Data tables are attached.

2021-2022:
Data tables are attached.

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

MAT_SEC_Lesson Plan Data_17-18
MAT_SEC_Lesson Plan Data_17-18.2
MAT_SEC_Lesson Plan Data_18-19
MAT_SEC_Lesson Plan Data_19-20
MAT_SEC_Lesson Plan Data_20-21
MAT_SEC_Lesson Plan Data_21-22

10.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:
Analysis of Data: Benchmark was met in all Secondary Content Areas, with the exception of Spanish. All other content areas exceeded our benchmark of 80%.

Within the Secondary MAT program, Spanish was the only content area that fell below the departmental benchmark. In the following areas, only 50% of teacher candidates (N=2) within the Spanish program received a proficiency score within the lesson plan assessment: Procedures; Lesson Hook; Modeled, Guided, Collaborative, and Independent Practice; and Formative/Summative Assessment.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The goal for 2018-2019 will be to continue to exceed or maintain the departmental benchmark for this assessment and to implement the new Lesson Plan rubric during the next academic year.

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

2018-2019:
The benchmark was met in all components of the lesson plan with the exception of Relevance and Rationale.

The goal of 2019-2020 will be to implement and utilize the updated Lesson Plan in order to better identify student weaknesses.

Faculty will meet to complete inner rater reliability on the new Lesson Plan. The new lesson plan will also have two rubric rows to identify if students struggle with relevance or/and rationale, which will help highlight the area students struggle in.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
The benchmark was not met as there were candidates who did not meet the proficiency level in several categories in both the fall 2020 and spring 2021 data. However, the aggregate lesson plan data from EDUC 624 and 678 show a much more positive result as candidates mean scores were at the proficiency level or higher in 21 of the 22 lesson plan assessed categories. The trends are positive with the candidates scoring higher in spring 2021 than in fall 2020. The lesson plan assessment indicates candidates are being well-prepared to plan, deliver, and assess a lesson.

The updated lesson plan and rubric was implemented during 2020-2021 and data collected for the assessment plan benchmark. Two rows for relevance and rationale were added to the lesson plan rubric and data collected to better identify student progress. The data indicate that no one category of the Lesson Plan fell below benchmark consistently during the 2020-2021 academic year.

EDUC 617: Planning and Instruction in the Content Area is in the redesigned program. This course is in the first semester of the program and is designed to teach candidates about the components of the lesson plan and how to think critically about the plan. As these candidates move into their other coursework, they will now have a foundation in lesson planning to work from. This should result in improvement in scores. Additionally, MAT faculty will review the rainbow chart (assessments in program) to ensure that the lesson plan data is being pulled from the appropriate courses in the redesigned program.

2021-2022:
For all components of the lesson plan rubric, 100% of the candidates scored at or above proficiency except for Differentiation by Content, Product, and Process and Post-Instruction Response to Intervention. Candidates are continuously showing improvement on elements scored on the rubric for planning.

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 Field Experience Evaluation

Assessment: Field Experience Evaluation, Domains 1-4 and Domain 5.
Knowledge:
Learning Differences: InTASC Standard 2.
The candidate identifies individual difference s 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.
Skills:
Learner Development: InTASC Standard 1.
The candidate designs and implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experienced.
Learning Environments: InTASC Standard 3.
The candidate works with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, and that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.
Content Knowledge: InTASC Standard 4.
The candidate creates learning experiences that make aspects of the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assure mastery of the content.
Application of Content: InTASC Standard 5.
The candidate engages learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local and global issues by connecting concepts and using differing perspectives.
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 learners' decision making.
Planning for Instruction: InTASC Standard 7.
The candidate plans instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and the community context.
Instructional Strategies: InTASC 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.
Dispositions:
Professional Learning and Ethical Practice: InTASC 9.
The candidate engages in ongoing professional learning and uses evidence to continually evaluate his/her practice, particularly the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (learners, families, other professionals, and the community), and adapts practice to meet the needs of each learner
Candidates will score at benchmark (score of 2) or higher on their FEE evaluation at the end of their internship or student teaching semester.
CAEP Standard 1

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

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

11.3 Benchmark: Candidates will score a 3.00 or higher on each element assessed in Domain 5 of the FEE rubric.

11.4 Benchmark: Candidates will score a 3.00 or higher on each component of the FEE rubric for Domains 1-4 in each of the secondary content areas.

11.5 Benchmark: Candidates will score a 3.00 or higher on each element assessed in Domain 5 of the FEE rubric for each content area.

11.1 Data

2017-2018:
Data table is attached.

2018-2019:

Data table is attached.

2019-2020:
Data table is attached.

2020-2021:
Data table is attached.

2021-2022:
Data table is attached.

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

MAT SEC FEE from ST_18-19
MAT SEC FEE from ST_19-20
MAT SEC FEE from ST_20-21
MAT SEC FEE from ST_21-22
MAT_Secondary_FEE Combined_17-18

11.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:
Analysis of Data: Benchmark was met in all components on the FEE, with the exception of Domain 1: Component 3.1 in both fall and spring semesters. Teacher candidates fell below benchmark in every element under Domain 3: Component 3.1 in both fall and spring semesters. Component 3.1 encompasses the following elements: 3.1.1 Quality of Questions, 3.1.2 Discussion techniques, and 3,1,3 Student Participation. Within 3.1.1 Quality of Questions, teacher candidates' yielded a mean score of 2.75 (N=4) in fall 2017 and 2.91 (N=6) in the spring 2018 semester. In 3.1.2 Discussion techniques, a mean score of 2.88 (N=4) was reported in fall 2017 and 2.98 (N=6) in spring 2018. Lastly, in the element 3.1.3 Student Participation, teacher candidates' yielded a mean score of 2.75 in fall 2017 and met benchmark in spring 2018 with a mean score of 3.07. It is evident that student scores are improving from fall 2017 to spring 2018; however, two elements still do not meet the departmental benchmark.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The goal for 2018-2019 is to share this data finding with the faculty of the MAT program so that they can reinforce expectations and provide examples to MAT students on Component 3.1.

Recommendations to Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement: Verify the reinforcement of teaching Component 3.1 throughout the scope and sequence of the MAT curriculum, specifically in the curriculum redesign and corresponding meetings.

2018-2019:
The benchmark was met on all components of the FEE with the exception of Component 3.2.2. All components had a mean score of 3.00 or higher with the exception of Component 3.2.2 which had a mean score of 2.98.

The goal of 2019-2020 is to incorporate the proficiency percentage as part of the benchmark.

A recommendation would be to incorporate in the benchmark the proficiency percentage as well as the mean. This would allow for a more holistic view of student success in each component of the FEE rubric.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
Candidates did not meet benchmark on each component for domains 1-4, therefore the benchmark was not met. It is important to consider the data may reflect the challenges of the candidates residency experience or student teaching which was impacted by the extraordinary circumstances in spring 2020, fall 2020, and spring 2021 due to COVID-19 guidelines, two hurricanes, and a winter ice storm in the area.

The FEE rubric data for 2020-2021 indicate three candidates were reviewed in each term of the 2020-2021 academic year. The candidates scored a mean of 3 or higher for Domain 1 Planning and Preparation, Domain 2 The Classroom Environment, and Domain 4 Professionalism; however, the mean for Domain 3: Instruction in Spring 2021 is below 3 (2.72). The score on each domain declined from the previous year, and the score for domain 3 declined more than others.   The Domain 3 score met the 3 or higher benchmark for fall 2020 but fell below the benchmark in spring 2021.

FEE data will be analyzed by MAT Secondary faculty to identify areas for instructional improvement, remediation, and revision. Remediation should be incorporated into courses that use the FEE by Spring 2022.

2021-2022:
Candidates scored above benchmark (3.00) on all components of the FEE rubric with the exception of Component 2.2 (2.96) and Component 3.1 (2.64).

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.

11.2 Data

2017-2018:
Data table is attached.

2018-2019:
Data table is attached.

2019-2020:
Data table is attached.

2020-2021:
Data table is attached.

2021-2022:
Data table is attached.

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

MAT SEC FEE from ST_18-19
MAT SEC FEE from ST_19-20
MAT SEC FEE from ST_21-22
MAT_Secondary_FEE Combined_17-18

11.2.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:
Analysis of Data: Benchmark was met in all components on the FEE, with the exception of Domain 1: Component 3.1 in both fall and spring semesters.

Teacher candidates fell below benchmark in every element under Domain 3: Component 3.1 in both fall and spring semesters. Component 3.1 encompasses the following elements: 3.1.1 Quality of Questions, 3.1.2 Discussion techniques, and 3,1,3 Student Participation. Within 3.1.1 Quality of Questions, teacher candidates' yielded a mean score of 2.75 (N=4) in fall 2017 and 2.91 (N=6) in the spring 2018 semester. In 3.1.2 Discussion techniques, a mean score of 2.88 (N=4) was reported in fall 2017 and 2.98 (N=6) in spring 2018. Lastly, in the element 3.1.3 Student Participation, teacher candidates' yielded a mean score of 2.75 in fall 2017 and met benchmark in spring 2018 with a mean score of 3.07. It is evident that student scores are improving from fall 2017 to spring 2018; however, two elements still do not meet the departmental benchmark.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The goal for 2018-2019 is to share this data finding with the faculty of the MAT program so that they can reinforce expectations and provide examples to MAT students on Component 3.1.

Recommendations to Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement: Verify the reinforcement of teaching Component 3.1 throughout the scope and sequence of the MAT curriculum, specifically in the curriculum redesign and corresponding meetings.

2018-2019:
The benchmark was met on all components of the FEE that were aligned with InTASC with the exception of Component 3.2.2. All components had a mean score of 3.00 or higher with the exception of Component 3.2.2 which had a mean score of 2.98.

The goal of 2019-2020 is to incorporate the proficiency percentage as part of the benchmark.

A recommendation would be to incorporate in the benchmark the proficiency percentage as well as the mean. This would allow for a more holistic view of student success in each component of the FEE rubric.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
The benchmark was not met as there were two domains in which candidates fell below benchmark on at least one InTASC Standard. The data for candidates' performance on InTASC standards measured on the FEE rubric indicates candidates fell below benchmark on Domain 2 InTASC Standard 3j, 3f; Domain 3 InTASC Standard 8f, 4c, 5e, 7a, 3j, 4f, 6d, 6a, 8b; and met benchmark on all Domain 1 and 4 InTASC standards. The InTASC data analysis from the FEE indicates a marginal downward tick for Domain 2 3d, 3f; and all but the InTASC 3d and 6d in Domain 3.   While the downward tick in achievement and fall below benchmark is not desirable, there should be caution to consider the dire and extenuating circumstances of the 2020-2021 academic year with COVID-19 and 3 federally declared natural disasters impacting student learning and teaching environment.

The previous assessment plan recommended reporting proficiency percentage data. The proficiency data is included in the current plan and provides a more wholistic view of the assessment. The revised program courses were implemented in the fall 2020 semester. Therefore, FEE data for the 2021-2022 assessment cycle should reflect the instruction from the updated curriculum content and sequencing. EPP faculty will review and identify any necessary revisions for InTASC standard alignment in the FEE and other major assessments by the end of the fall 2021 semester.

2021-2022:
All InTASC standards with the exception of standard 8 met or exceeded the benchmark of 3.00. Standard 8 fell below with a mean score of 2.88.

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

11.3 Data

2017-2018:
Data table is attached.

2018-2019:
Data table is attached.

2019-2020:
Data table is attached.

2020-2021:
Data table is attached.

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

MAT SEC FEE from ST_18-19
MAT SEC FEE from ST_19-20
MAT SEC FEE from ST_20-21
MAT SEC FEE from ST_21-22
MAT_Secondary_FEE Combined_17-18

11.3.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:
Analysis of Data: Benchmark was met in all areas of Domain 5 on the FEE rubric.

All elements listed in the data chart for fall 2017 and spring 2018 exceed the departmental benchmark of 80% proficiency. The lowest percentage of proficiency is 83% within element 5.4 and 5.5 in the spring 2018 semester.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The recommended goal for 2018-2019 is to maintain the exceptional scores within this Domain.

Recommendations to Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement: A recommendation would be to continue to analyze the data for trends as well as document any correlation between Domain 5 and grades in students' content area course work.

2018-2019:
The benchmark was met on all components of Domain 5 of the FEE with the exception of Component 5.11 and 5.13. All components had a mean score of 3.00 or higher with the exception of Component 5.11 (M =2.75) and 5.13 (M= 2.75).

The goal of 2019-2020 is to share data from Domain 5 with EPAC.

The recommendation is to share the data from Domain 5 with EPAC. EPAC could help evaluate where these subject specific components could be revised, updated, etc. within content courses.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
The benchmark was met for Domain 5 elements assessed on the FEE. Data indicate a score of 4.0 for each Domain 5 element assessed. During the summer 2021 semester, EPAC members and EPP faculty will work to ensure that all Domain 5 elements for each content area are aligned with the correct and most current standards. The revisions for Domain 5 for each content area will be implemented in the fall 2021 semester.

2021-2022:
Benchmark was meet. All elements had a mean score of 4.00 reported.

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

11.4 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 SEC FEE by Content Area_18-19
MAT SEC FEE by Content Area_19-20
MAT SEC FEE by Content Area_20-21
MAT SEC FEE by Content Area_21-22
MAT_SEC_FEE_17-18

11.4.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:
Analysis of Data: Benchmark was met by MAT Mathematic candidates in all areas. The following Secondary Areas fell below benchmark within Component 3.1 (3.1.1 Quality of Questions, 3.1.2 Discussion techniques, and 3.1.3 Student Participation) in both fall and spring semesters: Biology, English, and Spanish. Math fell below benchmark in this component in the fall 2017 semester, but met our benchmark in spring 2018

Component 3.1 encompasses the following elements: 3.1.1 Quality of Questions, 3.1.2 Discussion techniques, and 3,1,3 Student Participation. Within Component 3.1, biology teacher candidates had a mean score of 2.73 in fall 2017. Within this semester, biology teacher candidates' lowest element within Component 3.1 was 3.1.1 Quality of Questions (m= 2.63, n=2) with no students achieving proficiency on this component.

Similarly, English teacher candidates within the MAT program had a mean score of and 2.80 in spring 2018 within Component 3.1. Students struggled equally in all three elements listed under Component 3.1.

Mathematics teacher candidates within the MAT program fell below benchmark for only the fall 2017 semester in Component 3.1. These students' struggled with element 3.1.3 Student Participation or 3.1.2 Discussion Techniques in this semester with no students receiving a proficiency level on this element. However, Mathematics teacher candidates exceeded benchmark in all areas the following spring semester.

Spanish MAT teacher candidates had a mean score of 2.9 in fall 2017 and 2.91 in spring 2018 within Component 3.1. Students struggled equally in all three elements listed under Component 3.1; however, consistently yielded a 0% proficiency scoring on 3.1.2 Discussion techniques in both fall and spring semesters.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The goal for 2018-2019 is to share this data finding with the faculty of the MAT program so that they can reinforce expectations and provide examples to MAT students on Component 3.1.

Recommendations to Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement: Verify the reinforcement of teaching Component 3.1 throughout the scope and sequence of the MAT curriculum, specifically in the curriculum redesign and corresponding meetings.

2018-2019:
The benchmark was not met. Students in Mathematics struggled in Domains 2 and 3 scoring below benchmark in the following areas: 2.1.3, 2.2.1, 2.2.2, 3.1.1, 3.1.3, 3.2.2, 3.3.1. Additionally, the student in Social Studies fell below benchmark in Domain 1, 2, and 3 in the following areas: 1.1.3, 1.1.4, 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 3.1.3, 3..1, 3.2.2, 3.3.1, 3.3.4. Lastly, Spanish fell below benchmark in Domain 3 in the following area: 3.2.2.

The goal for 2019-2020 will be to implement the FEE, which will be assessed by the professor, in all methods courses within the MAT program.

The recommendation is that the FEE will be implemented in all methods courses and evaluated by the professors (using swivl if needed) in order to offer students consistent and meaningful feedback for growth and to identify areas of weakness within their teaching earlier on in the program. The data will be collected from the MAT methods courses on the FEE rubric.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
The data show the benchmark was not met by all content areas as English (Domain 3) and Social Studies (Domains 1 and 3) candidates fell below expected outcomes during spring 2021. Data indicate candidates in each of the content areas achieved benchmark for Domains 2 and 4.

MAT methods coursework now uses the POP Cycle to prepare candidates for and to provide students with high quality academic feedback to identify areas of strength and areas for improvement. MAT faculty will take a deep dive into the FEE data to identify and implement goals for improvement in MAT coursework that aligns specifically with the components and elements of the FEE rubric.

2021-2022:
Candidates scored above benchmark (3.00) on all components of the FEE rubric with the exception of Component 2.2 (2.96) and Component 3.1 (2.64).

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.

11.5 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 SEC FEE by Content Area_18-19
MAT SEC FEE by Content Area_19-20
MAT SEC FEE by Content Area_20-21
MAT SEC FEE by Content Area_21-22
MAT SEC FEE from ST_20-21
MAT_SEC_FEE_17-18

11.5.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:
Analysis of Data: All secondary content areas received a mean score of 3 or higher within Domain 5; however, English teacher candidates fell below our departmental benchmark of 80% proficiency scoring.

In domain 5.4 and 5.5, English teacher candidates yielded a mean score of 3; however, reported 67% of students received proficiency scoring or higher in both domains for the spring 2018 semester.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The goal for 2018-2019 is to share data findings with English content faculty as well as faculty within the Department of Education in order to identify problematic content application and make program changes during the curriculum redesign.

Recommendations to Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement: Revise learning objectives, or course content, during the curriculum redesign to ensure English MAT candidates meet departmental benchmark within their content knowledge.

2018-2019:
The benchmark was met by all content areas, with the exception of Mathematics in Domain 5.11. This domain fell below benchmark.

The goal for 2019-2020 would be to share data in Domain 5 with EPAC.

The recommendation is to share the data from Domain 5 with EPAC. EPAC could help evaluate where these subject specific components could be revised, updated, etc. within content courses.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
The benchmark was met as all candidates scored at the Proficient level or higher on each element assessed in Domain 5 of the FEE rubric for each content area: English, Math, and Social Studies. Domain 5 data will be shared with faculty during the summer 2021 semester. During the summer, EPAC and EPP faculty will be working to update the Domain 5 rubric for each content area so that it is aligned to the correct and current standards.

2021-2022:
Benchmark was meet. All elements had a mean score of 4.00 reported.

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

12 Assessment and Benchmark Teacher Candidate Work Sample

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

P-12 teachers are required to create a Teacher Candidate Work Sample (TCWS) during their internship/student teaching semester. The TCWS involves writing a unit lesson plan covering at least 5 days of learning as well as student learning outcomes that justify with data whether the P-12 students made progress for learning the content within the teacher candidate's lessons.

12.1 Data

MAT Secondary Education All Content Areas - Teacher Candidate Work Sample Data: InTASC 6

Criteria		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
	Number	1	4	0	0	0	3
	Mean	3.00	3.50				4.00

Choice of Assessment	Range	3.00	3.00-4.00				4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%				100%
Pre-assessment	Number						
	Mean	1.00	1.00				4.00
	Range	1.00	1.00				4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	0%	0%				100%
Post-assessment	Number						
	Mean	3.00	3.00				4.00
	Range	3.00	3.00				4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%				100%
Alignment of Lesson Evidence	Number						
	Mean	3.00	2.25				4.00
	Range	3.00	2.00-3.00				4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	100%	25%				100%
Student Level of Mastery & Evaluation of Factors	Number						
	Mean	3.00	2.75				4.00
	Range	3.00	2.00-4.00				4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	100%	50%				100%
Data to Determine Patterns & Gaps	Number						
	Mean	3.00	2.50				4.00
	Range	3.00	2.00-3.00				4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	100%	50%				100%
Response to Interventions	Number						
	Mean	1.00	1.00				4.00
	Range	1.00	1.00				4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	0%	0%				100%

Criteria		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2021	Spring 2022	Fall 2022	Spring 2023
Choice of Assessment	Number	2	7				
	Mean	4.00	3.71				
	Range	4.00	2.00-4.00				
	% Proficient or Higher	100%	86%				
	Number						

Pre-assessment	Mean	4.00	3.43					
	Range	4.00	1.00-4.00					
	% Proficient or Higher	100%	86%					
Post-assessment	Number							
	Mean	4.00	3.71					
	Range	4.00	2.00-4.00					
	% Proficient or Higher	100%	86%					
Alignment of Lesson Evidence	Number							
	Mean	4.00	3.86					
	Range	4.00	3.00-4.00					
	% Proficient or Higher	100%	86%					
Student Level of Mastery & Evaluation of Factors	Number							
	Mean	4.00	3.29					
	Range	4.00	1.00-4.00					
	% Proficient or Higher	100%	86%					
Data to Determine Patterns & Gaps	Number							
	Mean	3.50	3.29					
	Range	3.00-4.00	1.00-4.00					
	% Proficient or Higher	100%	86%					
Response to Interventions	Number							
	Mean	4.00	3.29					
	Range	4.00	1.00-4.00					
	% Proficient or Higher	100%	86%					

MAT Secondary Education English - Teacher Candidate Work Sample Data:

Criteria		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
Choice of Assessment	Number	0	0	1	3		2
	Mean			4.00	3.33		4.00
	Range			4.00	2.00-4.00		4.00
	% Proficient or Higher			100%	67%		100%
	Number						
	Mean			4.00	3.33		4.00
					2.00-		

Pre-assessment	Range			4.00	4.00		4.00
	% Proficient or Higher			100%	67%		100%
Post-assessment	Number						
	Mean			4.00	3.00		4.00
	Range			4.00	2.00-4.00		4.00
	% Proficient or Higher			100%	67%		100%
Alignment of Lesson Evidence	Number						
	Mean			4.00	3.33		4.00
	Range			4.00	2.00-4.00		4.00
	% Proficient or Higher			100%	67%		100%
Student Level of Mastery & Evaluation of Factors	Number						
	Mean			4.00	2.67		4.00
	Range			4.00	1.00-4.00		4.00
	% Proficient or Higher			100%	67%		100%
Data to Determine Patterns & Gaps	Number						
	Mean			4.00	3.33		4.00
	Range			4.00	2.00-4.00		4.00
	% Proficient or Higher			100%	67%		100%
Response to Interventions	Number						
	Mean			4.00	2.67		4.00
	Range			4.00	1.00-4.00		4.00
	% Proficient or Higher			100%	67%		100%

Criteria		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2021	Spring 2022	Fall 2022	Spring 2023
Choice of Assessment	Number	0	0				
	Mean						
	Range						
	% Proficient or Higher						
Pre-assessment	Number						
	Mean						
	Range						
	% Proficient or Higher						
	Number						

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

MAT Secondary Education Spanish - Teacher Candidate Work Sample Data:

Criteria		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
Choice of Assessment	Number	0	1	0	0	0	1
	Mean		3.00				4.00
	Range		3.00				4.00
	% Proficient or Higher		100%				100%
Pre-assessment	Number		1				
	Mean		1.00				4.00
	Range		1.00				4.00
	% Proficient or Higher		0%				100%
Post-assessment	Number		1				
	Mean		3.00				4.00
	Range		3.00				4.00
	% Proficient or Higher		100%				100%
Alignment of Lesson Evidence	Number		1				
	Mean		2.00				4.00
	Range		2.00				4.00

Criteria		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2021	Spring 2022	Fall 2022	Spring 2023
	% Proficient or Higher		0%				100%
Student Level of Mastery & Evaluation of Factors	Number		1				
	Mean		3.00				4.00
	Range		3.00				4.00
	% Proficient or Higher		100%				100%
Data to Determine Patterns & Gaps	Number		1				
	Mean		2.00				4.00
	Range		2.00				4.00
	% Proficient or Higher		0%				100%
Response to Interventions	Number		1				
	Mean		1.00				4.00
	Range		1.00				4.00
	% Proficient or Higher		0%				100%

Criteria		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2021	Spring 2022	Fall 2022	Spring 2023
Choice of Assessment	Number	0	1				
	Mean		4.00				
	Range		4.00				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%				
Pre-assessment	Number						
	Mean		4.00				
	Range		4.00				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%				
Post-assessment	Number						
	Mean		4.00				
	Range		4.00				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%				
Alignment of Lesson Evidence	Number						
	Mean		4.00				
	Range		4.00				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%				
Student Level of Mastery & Evaluation of Factors	Number						
	Mean		4.00				
	Range		4.00				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%				
	Number						

Data to Determine Patterns & Gaps							
	Mean		4.00				
	Range		4.00				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%				
Response to Interventions	Number						
	Mean		4.00				
	Range		4.00				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%				

MAT Secondary Education Math - Teacher Candidate Work Sample Data:

Criteria		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2018	Spring 2019
Choice of Assessment	Number	0	1	0	1	0	2
	Mean		4.00		3.00		4.00
	Range		4.00		3.00		4.00
	% Proficient or Higher		100%		100%		100%
Pre-assessment	Number		1		1		2
	Mean		1.00		4.00		4.00
	Range		1.00		4.00		4.00
	% Proficient or Higher		0%		100%		100%
Post-assessment	Number		1		1		2
	Mean		3.00		4.00		4.00
	Range		3.00		4.00		4.00
	% Proficient or Higher		100%		100%		100%
Alignment of Lesson Evidence	Number		1		1		2
	Mean		2.00		3.00		4.00
	Range		2.00		3.00		4.00
	% Proficient or Higher		0%		100%		100%
Student Level of Mastery & Evaluation of Factors	Number		1		1		2
	Mean		4.00		4.00		4.00
	Range		4.00		4.00		4.00
	% Proficient or Higher		100%		100%		100%
Data to Determine Patterns & Gaps	Number		1		1		2
	Mean		3.00		4.00		4.00
	Range		3.00		4.00		4.00
	% Proficient or Higher		100%		100%		100%
Response to Interventions	Number		1		1		2
	Mean		1.00		4.00		4.00
	Range		1.00		4.00		4.00

	% Proficient or Higher		0%		100%		100%

Criteria		Fall 2021	Spring 2022	Fall 2022	Spring 2023	Fall 2023	Spring 2024
Choice of Assessment	Number						
	Mean						
	Range						
	% Proficient or Higher						
Pre-assessment	Number						
	Mean						
	Range						
	% Proficient or Higher						
Post-assessment	Number						
	Mean						
	Range						
	% Proficient or Higher						
Alignment of Lesson Evidence	Number						
	Mean						
	Range						
	% Proficient or Higher						
Student Level of Mastery & Evaluation of Factors	Number						
	Mean						
	Range						
	% Proficient or Higher						
Data to Determine Patterns & Gaps	Number						
	Mean						
	Range						
	% Proficient or Higher						
Response to Interventions	Number						
	Mean						
	Range						
	% Proficient or Higher						

MAT Secondary Education Social Studies - Teacher Candidate Work Sample Data:

Criteria		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2018	Spring 2019
Choice of	Number	0	1	3	4	0	1
	Mean		3.00	4.00	3.50		2.00
					3.00-		

Criteria		Fall 2021	Spring 2022	Fall 2022	Spring 2023	Fall 2023	Spring 2024
Assessment	Range		3.00	4.00	4.00		2.00
	% Proficient or Higher		100%	100%	100%		0%
Pre-assessment	Number		1	3	4		1
	Mean		1.00	4.00	4.00		1.00
	Range		1.00	4.00	4.00		1.00
	% Proficient or Higher		0%	100%	100%		0%
Post-assessment	Number		1	3	4		1
	Mean		3.00	4.00	3.75		2.00
	Range		3.00	4.00	3.00-4.00		2.00
	% Proficient or Higher		100%	100%	100%		0%
Alignment of Lesson Evidence	Number		1	3	4		1
	Mean		3.00	4.00	3.25		3.00
	Range		3.00	4.00	2.00-4.00		3.00
	% Proficient or Higher		100%	100%	75%		100%
Student Level of Mastery & Evaluation of Factors	Number		1	3	4		1
	Mean		2.00	4.00	4.00		1.00
	Range		2.00	4.00	4.00		1.00
	% Proficient or Higher		0%	100%	100%		0%
Data to Determine Patterns & Gaps	Number		1	3	4		1
	Mean		3.00	4.00	4.00		1.00
	Range		3.00	4.00	4.00		1.00
	% Proficient or Higher		100%	100%	100%		0%
Response to Interventions	Number		1	3	4		1
	Mean		1.00	4.00	2.50		1.00
	Range		1.00	4.00	1.00-4.00		1.00
	% Proficient or Higher		0%	100%	50%		0%

Criteria		Fall 2021	Spring 2022	Fall 2022	Spring 2023	Fall 2023	Spring 2024
Choice of Assessment	Number						
	Mean						
	Range						
	% Proficient or Higher						
Pre-assessment	Number						
	Mean						
	Range						

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

MAT Secondary Education Biology - Teacher Candidate Work Sample Data:

Criteria		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2018	Spring 2019
Choice of Assessment	Number	1	2	0	1	1	3
	Mean	3.00	3.50		4.00	4.00	4.00
	Range	3.00	3.00-4.00		4.00	4.00	4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%		100%	100%	100%
Pre-assessment	Number	1	2		1	1	3
	Mean	1.00	1.00		4.00	4.00	3.67
	Range	1.00	1.00		4.00	4.00	3.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	0%	0%		100%	100%	100%
Post-assessment	Number	1	2		1	1	3
	Mean	3.00	3.00		4.00	4.00	4.00
	Range	3.00	3.00		4.00	4.00	4.00
	% Proficient						

	or Higher	100%	100%		100%	100%	100%
Alignment of Lesson Evidence	Number	1	2		1	1	3
	Mean	3.00	2.00		4.00	4.00	4.00
	Range	3.00	2.00		4.00	4.00	4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	100%	0%		100%	100%	100%
Student Level of Mastery & Evaluation of Factors	Number	1	2		1	1	3
	Mean	3.00	2.50		4.00	4.00	3.33
	Range	3.00	2.00-3.00		4.00	4.00	3.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	100%	50%		100%	100%	100%
Data to Determine Patterns & Gaps	Number	1	2		1	1	3
	Mean	3.00	2.00		4.00	4.00	3.33
	Range	3.00	2.00		4.00	4.00	3.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	100%	0%		100%	100%	100%
Response to Interventions	Number	1	2		1	1	3
	Mean	1.00	1.00		4.00	4.00	3.67
	Range	1.00	1.00		4.00	4.00	3.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	0%	0%		100%	100%	100%

Criteria		Fall 2021	Spring 2022	Fall 2022	Spring 2023	Fall 2023	Spring 2024
Choice of Assessment	Number						
	Mean						
	Range						
	% Proficient or Higher						
Pre-assessment	Number						
	Mean						
	Range						
	% Proficient or Higher						
Post-assessment	Number						
	Mean						
	Range						
	% Proficient or Higher						
Alignment of Lesson Evidence	Number						
	Mean						
	Range						
	% Proficient or Higher						

Student Level of Mastery & Evaluation of Factors	Number							
	Mean							
	Range							
	% Proficient or Higher							
Data to Determine Patterns & Gaps	Number							
	Mean							
	Range							
	% Proficient or Higher							
Response to Interventions	Number							
	Mean							
	Range							
	% Proficient or Higher							

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 SEC_19-20_Teaching Cycle
MAT SEC_20-21_Teaching Cycle
MAT SEC_21-22_Teaching Cycle

12.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:
Analysis of Data: Benchmark was met and exceeded in all areas of the Teacher Candidate Work Sample rubric. In all components of the TCWS rubric, teacher candidates within the MAT Secondary Content Areas earned a mean score of 4 and 100% of candidates received proficiency or higher.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The goal for 2018-2019 is to collect additional data on the TCWS so that trends may be identified.

Recommendations to Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement: Discuss TCWS data analysis with PBC and Practitioner program faculty in order to ensure TCWS implementation and teachings throughout the scope and sequence of Education coursework is consistently incorporated into the curriculum redesign and adoption.

2018-2019:
The benchmark was met by all students with the exception of the Social Studies candidate. This candidate fell below benchmark in the follow areas on the assessment: Choice of Assessment, Pre-Assessment, Post-Assessment, Student Level of Mastery and Evaluation of Factors, Data, and RTI.

The goal of 2019-2020 will be to refer to the Teacher Candidate Work Sample as the Teaching Cycle and adopt the revisions for the Teaching Cycle.

The recommendation is that the revised Teaching Cycle Assessment is implemented in all appropriate MAT courses and data is collected.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
The assessment data indicate at least a 3.00 was scored on each of the Teaching Cycle Criteria by all candidates in the content areas of English, Social Studies, Biology, and Math during the 2020-2021 academic year. During the 2020-2021 academic year, the Teaching Cycle assessment was implemented and data was collected to track candidate achievement in each of the criteria. The Teaching Cycle was incorporated within MAT methods courses and as a portion of the final portfolio. During the summer 2021 semester, the rainbow chart will be reviewed to ensure that candidates are receiving instruction on the elements of the Teaching Cycle as a progression through coursework.

2021-2022:
Data reported for one completer from spring 2022. Candidates were in classrooms affected by hurricanes and COVID during semesters in which alternate assignments were given.

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 PLT

Assessment: Praxis Principles of Learning and Teaching:
Dispositions:
Leadership and Collaboration: InTASC 10.
The candidate seeks appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to take responsibility for student learning, to collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, other school professionals, and community members to ensure leaner growth, and to advance the profession.

Benchmark: 100% of candidates will pass the Praxis Principles of Learning and Teaching Exam on the first attempt.

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 SEC_Praxis PLT_17-18
MAT SEC_Praxis PLT_18-19
MAT SEC_Praxis PLT_19-20
MAT SEC_Praxis PLT_20-21
MAT SEC_Praxis PLT_21-22

13.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:
Analysis of Data: 100% of candidates passed the PLT on the first attempt.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: 100% of candidates will pass PLT exam on first attempt.

Recommendations to Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement: Determine action plans based on adopted departmental benchmarks.

2018-2019:
Benchmark was determined to be 90% of candidates will pass the PLT on their first attempt.

The goal of 2019-2020 will be for 100% of candidates to pass the PLT on their first attempt.

The recommendation is to advise students to use Mometrix as a study guide prior to taking the PLT and/or develop a PLT Workshop for any students struggling to pass the PLT.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
Data indicates that 100% (7/7) of completers in the 2020-2021 academic year passed the Principles of Learning and Teaching Praxis exam on the first attempt. The current assessment cycle data shows improvement of the first attempt passage rate over the previous assessment cycle. The redesigned program offers a course in Educational Foundations and another on the Principles of Learning and Teaching. These two courses should continue to assist candidates in leaning the material assessed on the Praxis PLT. MAT candidates will also be provided additional resources and study materials as needed in preparation for the exam. MAT Secondary faculty will review completer data at the end of each academic year to determine any areas for improvement and adjust instruction as needed.

2021-2022:
Data shows that 100% of the MAT Secondary candidates completed the PLT successfully on the first attempt. There were two areas where the percentage of correct answers fell below 70%: Professional Development (64%) and Analysis of Instructional Scenarios (65%). Faculty will review course content to determine where these materials can be better covered within the program.

End of report