



Secondary Education Grades 6-12 [PBC] [IS**]

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

This PDF document includes any files attached to fields in this report.

To view the attachments you should view this file in Adobe Acrobat XI or higher, or another PDF viewer that supports viewing file attachments.

The default PDF viewer for your device or web browser may not support viewing file attachments embedded in a PDF.

If the attachments are in formats other than PDF you will need any necessary file viewers installed.

Program Name: Secondary Education Grades 6-12 [PBC] [IS]**

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

1 Is this program offered via Distance Learning?

100% Distance only

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:

Domains 3 and 5 exhibit areas of weakness. These areas are being addressed in the program redesign.

2018-2019:

The Praxis Content and PLT exams both had 100% pass rate on the first attempt. FEE scores have improved in the past year.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

The EPP created a minor for secondary education content areas to feed into the PBC program to boost enrollment. EPAC faculty were updated on the minor opportunities and encouraged to promote minors in content areas within their colleges.

2021-2022:

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

4 Program Highlights from the Reporting Year

2017-2018:

67% of PBC/Practitioner teacher candidates are graduating within two years.

2018-2019:

Overall, PBC Secondary candidates are performing well in our program, meeting or exceeding benchmark in the FEE, TCWS, Praxis, and PLT. This would be great information to use to promote the program.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

There are currently four candidates enrolled in a secondary education minor who could potentially feed into the PBC Secondary program to complete and earn certification after graduation.

2021-2022:

Results from the Teacher Preparation Quality Rating System, in which PBC Secondary Math and English were reviewed, in the spring 2022 semester indicated:

- MSU courses reflect strong practices and content that support the effective teaching of literacy instruction across all five essential components of reading instruction. This is attributed to MSU's development of course content in collaboration with partner districts, aligned to agreed-upon source material, and informed by up-to-date research and best

practice with the intention of enhancing candidates' ability to internalize and deliver strong instructional practices related to literacy. Candidates leverage effective literacy practices in their PK-12 classrooms leading to tangible, positive outcomes for student learning.

- MSU course delivery reflects strong practices for delivering instruction driven by PK-12 learning standards supported by in-class activities and assignments requiring engagement with standards and related instructional planning and connections to previous and upcoming standards and how they build. Candidate lesson plans and delivery of PK-12 instruction demonstrated their strong ability to plan standards-driven instruction that supported student learning and to deliver instruction using high-leverage teaching practices such as questioning strategies, academic feedback, and modeling.
- A comprehensive group of stakeholders are systematically engaged in the continuous improvement process by MSU using effective structures, tools, and experiences. This engagement is intentional, targeted to particular aspects of the program, and based on authentic, two-way relationships and dialogue. Feedback and collaboration that results from this engagement drives long-term, macro-level improvement as well as more immediate improvements that are turned around quickly for immediate results. In addition to this external engagement, program leaders and faculty collaborate frequently and systematically on continuous improvement efforts through review of relevant data, action planning, and monitoring of progress towards improvement goals.

5 Program Mission

The purpose of the Post Baccalaureate Secondary certificates in 6-12 is to prepare candidates for successful entry into education as school teachers by providing opportunities for developing expertise in content knowledge, teaching methods and strategies, communication skills, behavior management, and the professional dispositions that will enable completers of the program to succeed as teachers within 6-12 grade levels.

6 Institutional Mission Reference

The PBC in Secondary Education supports McNeese State University's fundamental mission to provide successful education of students and services to the employers and communities in its region. The PBC in Secondary Education program prepares students to fulfill their roles in the teaching profession in grades 6-12 and contribute to the cultural and intellectual advancement of the citizens of Louisiana.

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

Assessment: Enrollment, Completion, Recruitment, and Retention

Track levels of student enrollment, retention, and completion. Active recruitment efforts within the community specific to your program.

CAEP Standard 3

Assessment: Completer 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 PBC program in Secondary Education within two years of being accepted into the program (499 packet).

7.1 Data Enrollment and Completers

Enrollment and Completer Data:

All PBC Secondary Education Programs:

Academic Year	Program	# of students officially enrolled in program with an EDUC 499 packet	# of completers fall semester	# of completers spring semester	Total # of completers
---------------	---------	--	-------------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------

2015-2016		17			9
2016-2017		5	1	2	3
2017-2018	PBC	5	1	2	3
	Practitioner	2	0	2	2
2018-2019	PBC	6	0	3	3
2019-2020	PBC		2	0	2
2020-2021	PBC	1	0	0	0
2021-2022	PBC	2	0	0	0

Secondary Education Grades 6-12, Agriculture PBC:

Academic Year	# of students officially enrolled in program with an EDUC 499 packet	# of completers fall semester	# of completers spring semester	Total # of completers
2015-2016	0	0	0	0
2016-2017	0	0	0	0
2017-2018	1	0	0	0
2018-2019	0	0	0	0
2019-2020		0	0	0
2020-2021	0	0	0	0
2021-2022	0	0	0	0

Secondary Education Grades 6-12, Biology PBC/Practitioner:

Academic Year	# of students officially enrolled in program with an EDUC 499 packet	# of completers fall semester	# of completers spring semester	Total # of completers
2015-2016	4			3
2016-2017	2			1
2017-2018	0	0	0	0
2018-2019	0	0	0	0
2019-2020		0	0	0
2020-2021	0	0	0	0
2021-2022	0	0	0	0

Secondary Education Grades 6-12, Business PBC:

Academic Year	# of students officially enrolled in program with an EDUC 499 packet	# of completers fall semester	# of completers spring semester	Total # of completers
2015-2016	3			2
2016-2017	0	0	0	0
2017-2018	1	0	1	1
2018-2019	1	0	0	0
2019-2020		1	0	1
2020-2021	0	0	0	0
2021-2022	0	0	0	0

Secondary Education Grades 6-12, Chemistry PBC/Practitioner:

Academic Year	# of students officially enrolled in program with an EDUC 499 packet	# of completers fall semester	# of completers spring semester	Total # of completers
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
2020-2021	0	0	0	0
2021-2022	0	0	0	0

Secondary Education Grades 6-12, Chinese PBC:

Academic Year	# of students officially enrolled in program with an EDUC 499 packet	# of completers fall semester	# of completers spring semester	Total # of completers
2015-2016	0	0	0	0
2016-2017	0	0	0	0
2017-2018	0	0	0	0
2018-2019	0	0	0	0

Secondary Education Grades 6-12, English PBC/Practitioner:

Academic Year	Program	# of students officially enrolled in program with an EDUC 499 packet	# of completers fall semester	# of completers spring semester	Total # of completers
2015-2016		2			0
2016-2017		1			1
2017-2018	PBC	2	0	1	1
	Practitioner	1	0	1	1
2018-2019	PBC	4	0	2	2
2019-2020	PBC		1	0	1
2020-2021	PBC	0	0	0	0
2021-2022	PBC	1	0	0	0

Secondary Education Grades 6-12, Environmental Science PBC:

Academic Year	# of students officially enrolled in program with an EDUC 499 packet	# of completers fall semester	# of completers spring semester	Total # of completers
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
2020-2021	0	0	0	0
2021-2022	0	0	0	0

Secondary Education Grades 6-12, French PBC/Practitioner:

Academic Year	Program	# of students officially enrolled in program with an EDUC 599 packet	# of completers fall semester	# of completers spring semester	Total # of completers
2015-2016		0	0	0	0
2016-2017		0	0	0	0
2017-2018	PBC	0	0	0	0
	Practitioner	1	0	1	1
2018-2019	PBC	0	0	0	0

Secondary Education Grades 6-12, General Science PBC/Practitioner:

Academic Year	# of students officially enrolled in program with an EDUC 499 packet	# of completers fall semester	# of completers spring semester	Total # of completers
2015-2016	2			1
2016-2017	0	0	0	0
2017-2018	0	0	0	0
2018-2019	0	0	0	0
2019-2020		0	0	0
2020-2021	0	0	0	0
2021-2022	0	0	0	0

Secondary Education, Grades 6-12, Mathematics PBC/Practitioner:

Academic Year	# of students officially enrolled in program with an EDUC 499 packet	# of completers fall semester	# of completers spring semester	Total # of completers
2015-2016	2			2
2016-2017	0	0	0	0
2017-2018	0	0	0	0
2018-2019	1	0	1	1
2019-2020		0	0	0
2020-2021	0	0	0	0
2021-2022	0	0	0	0

Secondary Education Grades 6-12, Physics Practitioner:

Academic Year	# of students officially enrolled in program with an EDUC 499 packet	# of completers fall semester	# of completers spring semester	Total # of completers
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, Social Studies PBC/Practitioner:

Academic Year	# of students officially enrolled in program with an EDUC 499 packet	# of completers fall semester	# of completers spring semester	Total # of completers
2015-2016	4			1
2016-2017	2			2
2017-2018	1	1	0	0
2018-2019	0	0	0	0
2019-2020		0	0	0
2020-2021	1	0	0	0
2021-2022	1	0	0	0

Secondary Education Grades 6-12, Spanish PBC/Practitioner:

Academic Year	# of students officially enrolled in program with an EDUC 499 packet	# of completers fall semester	# of completers spring semester	Total # of completers
2015-2016	0	0	0	0
2016-2017	0	0	0	0
2017-2018	0	0	0	0
2018-2019	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 has been a decline in completers since 2015-2016 data cycle. Total numbers of completers has declined since 2015-2016 data cycle (N=9); however, has averaged since then at 4.5 completers.

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

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 PBC programs. It is also recommended that a goal of 10 potential PBC students' information be collected on sign-in sheets at these events.

2018-2019:

Analysis of Data:

There was a 14% decrease in enrollment from 2017-2018 to 2018-2019.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

The goal for 2019-2020 is to promote the PBC program via social media and recruiting events.

Recommendations for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- The department will have the presence of faculty or staff members at the TNT conference and Calcasieu Job Fair
- The programs will be promoted via departmental social media sites.
- Faculty will visit with graduates from other disciplines at Grad Fest to encourage them to enter a PBC program for teacher education.
- Minors are being created in education that will feed into the PBC programs.

2019-2020:

	2016-2017	—							
	2017-2018	—							
PBC SEC Business	2013-2014	1	N=1 100%						
	2014-2015	—							
	2015-2016	—							
	2016-2017	—							
	2017-2018	—							
PBC SEC Chemistry	2013-2014	1	N=1 100%						
	2014-2015	—							
	2015-2016	—							
	2016-2017	—							
	2017-2018	—							
PBC SEC English	2013-2014	—							
	2014-2015	1						N=1 100%	
	2015-2016	—							
	2016-2017	3	N=1 33%	N=1 33%			N=1 33%		
	2017-2018	3	N=2 67%					N=1 33%	
PBC SEC Environmental Science	2013-2014	—							
	2014-2015	—							
	2015-2016	—							
	2016-2017	—							
	2017-2018	—							
PBC SEC General Science	2013-2014	—							
	2014-2015	—							
	2015-2016	—							

	2016-2017	—							
	2017-2018	—							
PBC SEC Mathematics	2013-2014	—							
	2014-2015	—							
	2015-2016	—							
	2016-2017	—							
	2017-2018	—							
PBC SEC Physics	2013-2014	—							
	2014-2015	—							
	2015-2016	—							
	2016-2017	—							
	2017-2018	—							
PBC SEC Social Studies	2013-2014	2				N=2 100%			
	2014-2015	2	N=1 50%			N=1 50%			
	2015-2016	—							
	2016-2017	1	N=1 100%						
	2017-2018	—							

7.2.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: The benchmark was met by students in all secondary content areas with the exception of PBC Sec Social Studies. All PBC Sec Social Studies students dropped from the university (N=2); whereas, all PBC Biology, Business, and Chemistry students met the departmental benchmark and completed their programs within 1-2 years (N=4).

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The goal for 2018-2019 is to identify reasons students are dropping from the University 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. The survey information gathered on these students, in addition to reviewing teacher candidate credentials upon admission, can aid in providing additional resources or support to these students in the future.

2018-2019:

Analysis of Data:

The benchmark was not met. Only 50% of the candidates (n=4) completed the program within two years of official admission into the program (EDUC 499).

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

The goal of 2019-2020 is to have a mid-term meeting to check the progress of students within the program to identify candidates in need of additional academic support and resources to complete the program.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- PBC Secondary faculty and advisors will meet at midterm each semester to voice any concerns with the candidates in the program.
- Faculty and advisors will follow up with candidates determined to be "at risk" and will provide additional academic support and resources for success.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

The benchmark was not met since 50% of the candidates accepted into the program in the 2016-2017 cohort either took longer than two years to complete the program or dropped from the university before completing the program. As was done in 2020-2021, the EPP faculty will continue to meet at midterm to discuss any at risk candidates that need specific attention and additional academic support to complete the program. PBC faculty will also advise candidates to follow the course sequence for a more equitable distribution of coursework to increase chances of success for candidates. EPP faculty will also work to better understand the reason candidates are dropping from the program in order to deter candidates from dropping and increase completion rates.

2021-2022:

Of the three candidates accepted into the program in the 17-18 academic year, two were able to complete the program within two years and one became a state completer. Candidates seem to progress well through the program. Program sequences are used to advise candidates with course selection and portal requirements.

8 Assessment and Benchmark Curriculum Development

Assessment: Curriculum Development

Provide a comprehensive curriculum that reflects disciplinary foundations and remains responsive to contemporary developments, student and workforce demand, and university needs and aspirations.

Curriculum alignment includes:

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

CAEP Standard 2

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

8.1 Data

2017-2018:

Data table is attached.

2018-2019:

Data table is attached.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

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

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

August 6, 2020: 8:30am-11:00am DEP Faculty
POP Cycle with Quality Feedback

August 13, 2020: 9:00-11:00 am DEP Faculty
Field Experiences, Internship, Practicum Expectations

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

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).

PBC_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: The departmental benchmark of meeting twice an academic year to discuss curriculum changes/implementations, assessment data, and progress monitoring of action plans was accomplished.

The PBC program faculty met January 9th, 2018 to outline major assessments throughout the program. The program assessments were outlined on a chart in order to visualize the scope and sequence of our assessments. Additionally, the 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 PBC Secondary program.

Recommendations to Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement: Curriculum redesign for the PBC Secondary Programs adopted for the 2019-20 academic year.

2018-2019:

Secondary education and content faculty met multiple times throughout the 18-19 AY to solidify the course sequences and curriculum for the PBC Secondary programs. EPAC meetings and other secondary meetings included both undergraduate and PBC coursework redesign. All PBC Secondary programs will be moving completely online in the upcoming year.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

The benchmark was met as there were multiple opportunities for professional development and program/coursework improvement discussions. EPP faculty attended virtual DEP meetings throughout the fall 2020 and spring 2021 semesters to discuss ongoing matters

including those related to curricula and assessment. Additionally, virtual professional development opportunities provided insight to improving instructional practices in coursework. Due to the circumstances of the hurricanes and COVID, some meetings covered field observations and student teaching opportunities for candidates. For the 2021-2022 academic year, PBC Elementary faculty will continue to attend professional development opportunities and at least two meetings per year to discuss curriculum, assessment data, and the status of action plans.

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 PBC Secondary 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 Content Exam

Assessment: Praxis Content Exam.

Louisiana Teacher General Competency B:

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

InTASC standards included: 4

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

9.2 Benchmark: Candidates will scores a minimum of 70% correct in each sub-category on the Praxis Content exam specific to their subject area.

9.1 Data

PBC Secondary Education - Praxis Content Exam:

All PBC Secondary Content		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
Combined	Number	3	2	1	3	1	4
	% Pass 1st attempt	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	75%

All PBC Secondary Content		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
Combined	Number	0	3			0	0
	% Pass 1st attempt		100%				

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

Agriculture		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
#5701 overall	Number				1		
	Mean				158		
	Range				158		
	% Pass 1st						

	attempt				100%		
	% Pass prior to ST/intern				100%		
#5701 breakdown:	Number				1		
Agriculture Systems	Mean				7		
	Range				7		
Animal Systems	Mean				15		
	Range				15		
Food Science	Mean				4		
	Range				4		
Environmental & Natural Resources	Mean				12		
	Range				12		
Plant Systems	Mean				11		
	Range				11		
Power & Technical Systems	Mean				13		
	Range				13		
Leadership	Mean				10		
	Range				10		

Agriculture		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
#5701 overall	Number	0	0			0	0
	Mean						
	Range						
	% Pass 1st attempt						
	% Pass prior to ST/intern						
#5701 breakdown:	Number						
Agriculture Systems	Mean						
	Range						
Animal Systems	Mean						
	Range						
Food Science	Mean						
	Range						
Environmental & Natural Resources	Mean						
	Range						
Plant Systems	Mean						
	Range						
Power & Technical Systems	Mean						
	Range						
Leadership	Mean						
	Range						

Agriculture		Fall 2021	Spring 2022	Fall 2022	Spring 2023	Fall 2023	Spring 2024
#5701 overall	Number						
	Mean						
	Range						
	% Pass 1st attempt						
	% Pass prior to ST/intern						
#5701 breakdown:	Number						
Agriculture Systems	Mean						
	Range						
Animal Systems	Mean						
	Range						
Food Science	Mean						
	Range						
Environmental & Natural Resources	Mean						
	Range						
Plant Systems	Mean						
	Range						
Power & Technical Systems	Mean						
	Range						
Leadership	Mean						
	Range						

Biology		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
#5235 overall	Number	1	2	1	0	0	0
	Mean	163	154	153			
	Range	163	154	153			
	% correct (120)	100%	100%	100%			
	% 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	Mean						
	Range						

Evolution	% correct (24)						
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)						

Biology		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
#5235 overall	Number	0	0			0	0
	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct (120)						
	% 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)						
Diversity of Life and Organismal Biology	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct (24)						
Ecology: Organisms and Environments	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct (19)						
Science, Technology, and Social	Mean						
	Range						

Perspectives	% correct (12)						
--------------	----------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

Biology		Fall 2021	Spring 2022	Fall 2022	Spring 2023	Fall 2023	Spring 2024
#5235 overall	Number						
	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct (120)						
	% 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)						
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)						

Business		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
#5101 overall	Number	1	1				1
	Mean	154	620				176
	Range	154	620				176
	% Pass 1st attempt	100%	100%				100%
	% Pass prior to ST/intern	100%					

#5101 breakdown:	Number	1					
Accounting & Finance	Mean	9					
	Range	9					
Communication & Career Development	Mean	14					
	Range	14					
Economics	Mean	6					
	Range	6					
Entrepreneurship	Mean	9					
	Range	9					
Information Technology	Mean	13					
	Range	13					
Law & International Business	Mean	8					
	Range	8					
Marketing & Management	Mean	6					
	Range	6					
Professional Business Education	Mean	8					
	Range	8					

Business		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
#5101 overall	Number	0	0			0	0
	Mean						
	Range						
	% Pass 1st attempt						
	% Pass prior to ST/intern						
#5101 breakdown:	Number						
Accounting & Finance	Mean						
	Range						
Communication & Career Development	Mean						
	Range						
Economics	Mean						
	Range						
Entrepreneurship	Mean						
	Range						
Information Technology	Mean						
	Range						
Law & International Business	Mean						
	Range						
Marketing & Management	Mean						
	Range						
Professional Business Education	Mean						
	Range						

Business		Fall 2021	Spring 2022	Fall 2022	Spring 2023	Fall 2023	Spring 2024
#5101 overall	Number						
	Mean						
	Range						
	% Pass 1st attempt						
	% Pass prior to ST/intern						
#5101 breakdown:	Number						
Accounting & Finance	Mean						
	Range						
Communication & Career Development	Mean						
	Range						
Economics	Mean						
	Range						
Entrepreneurship	Mean						
	Range						
Information Technology	Mean						
	Range						
Law & International Business	Mean						
	Range						
Marketing & Management	Mean						
	Range						
Professional Business Education	Mean						
	Range						

English		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
#5041/5039 overall	Number			1			
#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			1			2
	Mean			169			180
	Range			169			178-182
	% Pass 1st attempt			100%			50%
#5039 breakdown:	Number			1			1
	Mean			169			178
	Range			169			178
	% correct (122)			100%			74%
Reading	Mean			30			33
	Range			30			33
	% correct (41)						80%
Language Use and Vocabulary	Mean			23			23
	Range			23			23
	% correct (28)						82%
Writing, Speaking, Listening	Mean			26			24
	Range			26			24
	% correct (41)						59%
Constructed Response	Mean						10
	Range						10
	% correct (12)						83%

English		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
#5041/5039 overall	Number	0	2			0	0
#5041 overall	Number		2				
	Mean		174				
	Range		174				
	% Pass 1st attempt		100%				
#5041 breakdown:	Number						
	Range						
	Mean						
Literature & Understanding Text	Mean						
	Range						
Language & Linguistics	Mean						
	Range						
Composition & Rhetoric	Mean						
	Range						
	Number						

#5039 overall	Mean						
	Range						
	% Pass 1st attempt						
#5039 breakdown:	Number		1				
	Mean		174				
	Range		174				
	% correct (122)		75%				
Reading	Mean		35				
	Range		35				
	% correct (41)		85%				
Language Use and Vocabulary	Mean		22				
	Range		22				
	% correct (28)		79%				
Writing, Speaking, Listening	Mean		27				
	Range		27				
	% correct (41)		68%				
Constructed Response	Mean		8				
	Range		8				
	% correct (12)		67%				

English		Fall 2021	Spring 2022	Fall 2022	Spring 2023	Fall 2023	Spring 2024
#5041/5039 overall	Number						
#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						
	Mean						

#5039 overall	Range						
	% Pass 1st attempt						
#5039 breakdown:	Number						
	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct (122)						
Reading	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct (41)						
Language Use and Vocabulary	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct (28)						
Writing, Speaking, Listening	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct (41)						
Constructed Response	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct (12)						

French		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
#5174 overall	Number						1
	Mean						179
	Range						179
	% Pass 1st attempt						100%
#5174 breakdown:	Number						
Interpretive Mode: Listening	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct (30)						
Interpretive Mode: Reading	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct (30)						
Cultural Knowledge	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct (15)						
Interpersonal and	Mean						
	Range						

Presentational Writing	% correct (3)						
Presentational and Interpersonal Speaking	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct (3)						

Math*		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
#5062/5161 overall	Number	0	1			0	0
	Mean		174				
	Range		174				
	% correct		100%				
	% Pass 1st attempt		100%				
#5161 breakdown:	Number		1				
Number and Quantity, Algebra, Functions, and Calculus	Mean		30				
	Range		30				
	% correct		88%				
Geometry, Probability and Statistics, and Discrete Mathematics	Mean		13				
	Range		13				
	% correct		81%				

*No data for Fall 2015-Spring 2018.

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

Social Studies		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
#5086 overall	Number	1			2	1	
	Mean	164			157	187	
	Range	164			153-161	187	

	% Pass 1st attempt	100%			100%	100%	
#5086 breakdown:	Number	1			1		
United States History	Mean	13			14		
	Range	13			14		
World History	Mean	9			15		
	Range	9			15		
Government/ Civics	Mean	14			12		
	Range	14			12		
Economics	Mean	7			9		
	Range	7			9		
Geography	Mean	11			8		
	Range	11			8		
Behavioral Sciences	Mean	8			6		
	Range	8			6		
0083 overall	Number				1		
	Mean				153		
	Range				153		

Social Studies		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
#5086 overall	Number	0	0			0	0
	Mean						
	Range						
	% Pass 1st attempt						
#5086 breakdown:	Number						
United States History	Mean						
	Range						
World History	Mean						
	Range						
Government/ Civics	Mean						
	Range						
Economics	Mean						
	Range						
Geography	Mean						
	Range						
Behavioral Sciences	Mean						
	Range						
0083 overall	Number						
	Mean						
	Range						

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						
World History	Mean						
	Range						
Government/ Civics	Mean						
	Range						
Economics	Mean						
	Range						
Geography	Mean						
	Range						
Behavioral Sciences	Mean						
	Range						
0083 overall	Number						
	Mean						
	Range						

9.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: Overall, the passing rate in the secondary content areas fell below benchmark at 75% pass rate on the first Praxis attempt. Business and French had a 100% first time pass rate; however, the English PBC students fell below benchmark at 50% passing rate on first Praxis attempt. The English PBC teacher candidate pass rate on the Praxis first attempt brought the overall pass rate of PCB content areas below benchmark to 75%.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The goal for 2018-2019 is to set one meeting with content area faculty across campus in order to share Praxis data and facilitate discussion of learning outcomes within coursework as related to the Praxis content area exams.

Recommendations to Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement: It is recommended that the department hold one meeting with content area faculty that specifically address Praxis reporting and areas of improvement in order to identify if course contents adequately address Praxis material. It is also recommended that the department review the areas of weakness within the Praxis content exam during curriculum redesign meetings as well as during syllabi objective revisions.

2018-2019:

Analysis of Data:

The benchmark for proficiency was met. 100% of students in the PBC program passed the Praxis on their first attempt.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

The goal will remain as having 80% of graduates passing the Praxis content exam on the first attempt.

Recommendations for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- The Burton College of Education will offer Praxis workshops and have study guide materials available for candidates preparing to sit for the exam in content areas.
- All content areas will be asked to create a Praxis content workshop to be offered at least once each semester.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

There were no completers in the 2020-2021 academic year and therefore no new data to report. The goal will remain as having 80% of completers passing the Praxis content exam on the first attempt. The EPP will provide a written list of Praxis resources for all candidates during their first advising session. Additionally, faculty in the content colleges have been offered the opportunity to be reimbursed to take the Praxis content exam and also receive compensation to create and administer content workshops for candidates. COVID 19 and hurricanes Delta and Laura interrupted these plans, but there will be a push to get these workshops in place during the 2021-2022 academic year.

2021-2022:

There were no completers in the 2021-2022 academic year and therefore no new data to report. The EPP has partnered with 240 Tutoring for candidates to receive a 50% discount for online Praxis study materials.

9.2 Data

PBC Secondary Education - Praxis Content Exam:

All PBC Secondary Content		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
Combined	Number	3	2	1	3	1	4
	% Pass 1st attempt	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	75%

All PBC Secondary Content		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
Combined	Number	0	3			0	0
	% Pass 1st attempt		100%				

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

Agriculture		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
#5701 overall	Number				1		
	Mean				158		
	Range				158		
	% Pass 1st attempt				100%		
	% Pass prior to ST/intern				100%		
#5701 breakdown:	Number				1		
Agriculture	Mean				7		

Systems	Range				7		
Animal Systems	Mean				15		
	Range				15		
Food Science	Mean				4		
	Range				4		
Environmental & Natural Resources	Mean				12		
	Range				12		
Plant Systems	Mean				11		
	Range				11		
Power & Technical Systems	Mean				13		
	Range				13		
Leadership	Mean				10		
	Range				10		

Agriculture		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
#5701 overall	Number	0	0			0	0
	Mean						
	Range						
	% Pass 1st attempt						
	% Pass prior to ST/intern						
#5701 breakdown:	Number						
Agriculture Systems	Mean						
	Range						
Animal Systems	Mean						
	Range						
Food Science	Mean						
	Range						
Environmental & Natural Resources	Mean						
	Range						
Plant Systems	Mean						
	Range						
Power & Technical Systems	Mean						
	Range						
Leadership	Mean						
	Range						

Agriculture		Fall 2021	Spring 2022	Fall 2022	Spring 2023	Fall 2023	Spring 2024
#5701 overall	Number						
	Mean						
	Range						
	% Pass 1st						

	attempt						
	% Pass prior to ST/intern						
#5701 breakdown:	Number						
Agriculture Systems	Mean						
	Range						
Animal Systems	Mean						
	Range						
Food Science	Mean						
	Range						
Environmental & Natural Resources	Mean						
	Range						
Plant Systems	Mean						
	Range						
Power & Technical Systems	Mean						
	Range						
Leadership	Mean						
	Range						

Biology		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
#5235 overall	Number	1	2	1	0	0	0
	Mean	163	154	153			
	Range	163	154	153			
	% correct (120)	100%	100%	100%			
	% 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)						
Diversity of Life and Organismal Biology	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct (24)						
	Mean						

Ecology: Organisms and Environments	Range						
	% correct (19)						
Science, Technology, and Social Perspectives	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct (12)						

Biology		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
#5235 overall	Number	0	0			0	0
	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct (120)						
	% 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)						
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)						

Biology		Fall 2021	Spring 2022	Fall 2022	Spring 2023	Fall 2023	Spring 2024
	Number						
	Mean						

#5235 overall	Range						
	% correct (120)						
	% 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)						
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)						

Business		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
#5101 overall	Number	1	1				1
	Mean	154	620				176
	Range	154	620				176
	% Pass 1st attempt	100%	100%				100%
	% Pass prior to ST/intern	100%					
#5101 breakdown:	Number	1					
Accounting & Finance	Mean	9					
	Range	9					
Communication & Career Development	Mean	14					
	Range	14					
Economics	Mean	6					
	Range	6					

Entrepreneurship	Mean	9					
	Range	9					
Information Technology	Mean	13					
	Range	13					
Law & International Business	Mean	8					
	Range	8					
Marketing & Management	Mean	6					
	Range	6					
Professional Business Education	Mean	8					
	Range	8					

Business		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
#5101 overall	Number	0	0			0	0
	Mean						
	Range						
	% Pass 1st attempt						
	% Pass prior to ST/intern						
#5101 breakdown:	Number						
Accounting & Finance	Mean						
	Range						
Communication & Career Development	Mean						
	Range						
Economics	Mean						
	Range						
Entrepreneurship	Mean						
	Range						
Information Technology	Mean						
	Range						
Law & International Business	Mean						
	Range						
Marketing & Management	Mean						
	Range						
Professional Business Education	Mean						
	Range						

Business		Fall 2021	Spring 2022	Fall 2022	Spring 2023	Fall 2023	Spring 2024
#5101 overall	Number						
	Mean						
	Range						
	% Pass 1st attempt						

	% Pass prior to ST/intern						
#5101 breakdown:	Number						
Accounting & Finance	Mean						
	Range						
Communication & Career Development	Mean						
	Range						
Economics	Mean						
	Range						
Entrepreneurship	Mean						
	Range						
Information Technology	Mean						
	Range						
Law & International Business	Mean						
	Range						
Marketing & Management	Mean						
	Range						
Professional Business Education	Mean						
	Range						

English		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
#5041/5039 overall	Number			1			
#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			1			2
	Mean			169			180
	Range			169			178-182
	% Pass 1st attempt			100%			50%
	Number			1			1
	Mean			169			178

#5039 breakdown:	Range			169			178
	% correct (122)			100%			74%
Reading	Mean			30			33
	Range			30			33
	% correct (41)						80%
Language Use and Vocabulary	Mean			23			23
	Range			23			23
	% correct (28)						82%
Writing, Speaking, Listening	Mean			26			24
	Range			26			24
	% correct (41)						59%
Constructed Response	Mean						10
	Range						10
	% correct (12)						83%

English		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
#5041/5039 overall	Number	0	2			0	0
#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		2				
	Mean		174				
	Range		174				
	% Pass 1st attempt		100%				
#5039 breakdown:	Number		1				
	Mean		174				
	Range		174				

	% correct (122)	85%				
Reading	Mean	35				
	Range	35				
	% correct (41)	85%				
Language Use and Vocabulary	Mean	22				
	Range	22				
	% correct (28)	79%				
Writing, Speaking, Listening	Mean	27				
	Range	27				
	% correct (41)	68%				
Constructed Response	Mean	8				
	Range	8				
	% correct (12)	67%				

English		Fall 2021	Spring 2022	Fall 2022	Spring 2023	Fall 2023	Spring 2024
#5041/5039 overall	Number						
#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						
	Mean						
	Range						
	% Pass 1st attempt						
#5039 breakdown:	Number						
	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct (122)						

Reading	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct (41)						
Language Use and Vocabulary	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct (28)						
Writing, Speaking, Listening	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct (41)						
Constructed Response	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct (12)						

French		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
#5174 overall	Number						1
	Mean						179
	Range						179
	% Pass 1st attempt						100%
#5174 breakdown:	Number						
Interpretive Mode: Listening	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct (30)						
Interpretive Mode: Reading	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct (30)						
Cultural Knowledge	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct (15)						
Interpersonal and Presentational Writing	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct (3)						
Presentational and Interpersonal Speaking	Mean						
	Range						
	% correct (3)						

		Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring
--	--	------	--------	------	--------	------	--------

Math*		2018	2019	2019	2020	2020	2021
#5062/5161 overall	Number	0	1			0	0
	Mean		174				
	Range		174				
	% correct		100%				
	% Pass 1st attempt		100%				
#5161 breakdown:	Number		1				
Number and Quantity, Algebra, Functions, and Calculus	Mean		30				
	Range		30				
	% correct		88%				
Geometry, Probability and Statistics, and Discrete Mathematics	Mean		13				
	Range		13				
	% correct		81%				

*No data for Fall 2015-Spring 2018.

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

Social Studies		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
#5086 overall	Number	1			2	1	
	Mean	164			157	187	
	Range	164			153-161	187	
	% Pass 1st attempt	100%			100%	100%	
#5086 breakdown:	Number	1			1		
United States History	Mean	13			14		
	Range	13			14		
World History	Mean	9			15		
	Range	9			15		

Government/ Civics	Mean	14			12		
	Range	14			12		
Economics	Mean	7			9		
	Range	7			9		
Geography	Mean	11			8		
	Range	11			8		
Behavioral Sciences	Mean	8			6		
	Range	8			6		
0083 overall	Number				1		
	Mean				153		
	Range				153		

Social Studies		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
#5086 overall	Number	0	0			0	0
	Mean						
	Range						
	% Pass 1st attempt						
#5086 breakdown:	Number						
United States History	Mean						
	Range						
World History	Mean						
	Range						
Government/ Civics	Mean						
	Range						
Economics	Mean						
	Range						
Geography	Mean						
	Range						
Behavioral Sciences	Mean						
	Range						
0083 overall	Number						
	Mean						
	Range						

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	Mean						

History	Range						
World History	Mean						
	Range						
Government/ Civics	Mean						
	Range						
Economics	Mean						
	Range						
Geography	Mean						
	Range						
Behavioral Sciences	Mean						
	Range						
0083 overall	Number						
	Mean						
	Range						

9.2.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: Benchmark was met in all sub-categories on the Praxis content areas, with the exception of the English Praxis sub-category: Writing, Speaking, and Listening.

All Praxis content area sub-category scoring met or exceeded the departmental benchmark of 70% or higher, with the exception of the English Praxis sub-category: Writing, Speaking, and Listening (59%).

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The goal for 2018-2019 is to collect and analyze sub-category area data for all teacher candidates that report their Praxis scores.

Recommendations to Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement: It is recommended that sub-category scores are collected from all students that report/submit their Praxis scores with their 599 Packet for the next academic year.

2018-2019:

Analysis of Data:

The benchmark for proficiency was met in all areas except for the English Praxis sub-categories of Writing, Speaking, Listening (67%) and Constructed Response (68%).

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

The goal is to have all candidates score at the 70% proficiency in all sub-categories.

Recommendations for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

The lower sub-category areas in English will be flagged in order to address these lower performing areas in the Praxis workshops.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

There were no completers in the PBC Secondary Education programs during the 2020-2021 academic year, therefore, there is no new data to report. Based on previous data and recommendations for improvement, the EPP will provide a written list of Praxis resources for all candidates during their first advising session. Additionally, faculty in the content colleges have been offered the opportunity to be reimbursed to take the Praxis content exam and also receive compensation to create and administer content workshops for candidates. COVID 19 and hurricanes Delta and Laura interrupted these plans, but there will be a push to get these workshops in place during the 2021-2022 academic year.

2021-2022:

There were no completers in the PBC Secondary Education program during the 2021-2022 academic year. Therefore, there is no new data to report.

10 Assessment and Benchmark Field Experience Evaluation by Subject Area

Assessment: Field Experience Evaluation by Subject Area.

Louisiana Teacher General Competency B:

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

InTASC standards included: 4, 5

10.1 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.

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

10.1 Data

2017-2018:

Data table is attached.

2018-2019:

Data table is attached.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

There were no completers for the PBC Secondary Education program during the 2020-2021 academic year and therefore, no new data to report.

2021-2022:

There were no completers for the PBC Secondary Education program during the 2021-2022 academic year and therefore, no new data to report.

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

PBC_Secondary_FEE by Content Area_17-18

PBC_Secondary_FEE by Content Area_18-19

10.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: Benchmark was met in the majority of component listed on the FEE assessment. However, the following components fell below benchmark during fall 2017: all components under domain 1 and 3, Components 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.2.1, 2.2.2, and 2.2.3. In spring 2018, the following components fell below benchmark: 2.1.1, 2.2.2, 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.1.3, 3.2.2, 3.3.4.

During the fall 2017 semester, all components that did not meet benchmark specifically fell below benchmark with candidates in the Social Studies PBC program. During the spring 2018 semester, teacher candidates in the French, English, and Business PBC/Practitioner programs fell below benchmark in FEE components 2.1.1, 2.2.2, 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.1.3, 3.2.2, 3.3.4.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The goal for 2018-2019 is to share data findings with the faculty of the PBC and Practitioner programs during curriculum redesign so that they can reinforce expectations and provide examples to PBC/Practitioner students on weak domains 2 and 3.

Recommendations to Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement: Identified FEE Domains 2 and 3 weaknesses discussed with PBC and Practitioner program faculty during

curriculum redesign meetings during 2018-2019 academic year. Implementation and teaching of the revised FEE domains throughout the scope and sequence of Education coursework in the curriculum redesign.

2018-2019:

Analysis of Data:

The benchmark was met. The PBC Secondary candidates met or exceeded the benchmark of 3.00 in all areas of the FEE.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

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

Recommendations for Successful Implementation of the Plan for Improvement:

- 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 for improvement within their teaching at earlier points within the program.
- Methods instructors will meet once per year to view a sample video, evaluate the teaching video using the FEE, and discuss high quality academic feedback that would be provided.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

There were no completers in the 2020-2021 academic year in the PBC Secondary Education programs. Therefore, there was no new data to report. The POP Cycle will be implemented for the two observations in each of the internship/residency semesters. Data driven professional development sessions for the candidates will be delivered each week. Additionally, the EPP faculty will ensure all elements are aligned to InTASC and CAEP standards during the summer 2021 semester.

2021-2022:

There were no completers in the 2021-2022 academic year in the PBC Secondary education programs. Therefore, there is no new data to report.

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

10.2 Data

2017-2018:

Data table is attached.

2018-2019:

Data table is attached.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

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

2021-2022:

There were no completers in the 2021-2022 academic year and therefore no new data to report.

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

PBC_Secondary_FEE by Content Area_17-18

PBC_Secondary_FEE by Content Area_18-19

10.2.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: Proficiency was met in all components within Domain 5 with the exception of 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4 for spring 2018.

All candidates met or exceeded all components under domain 5 with the exception of the teacher candidate within the PBC program. The Business PBC student did not meet benchmark in the following domain 5 components: 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The goal for 2018-2019 is to share data findings/analysis with the faculty of the PBC and Practitioner programs during curriculum redesign so that they can reinforce expectations and provide examples to PBC/Practitioner students on weak domains of 5.2, 5.3 and 5.4 which are content area specific.

Recommendations to Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement: Identified FEE Domains 5.2, 5.3, 5.4 weaknesses discussed with PBC and Practitioner program faculty during curriculum redesign meetings during 2018-2019 academic year. Implementation and teaching of the revised FEE domains throughout the scope and sequence of Education coursework in the curriculum redesign.

2018-2019:

Analysis of Data:

The benchmark was met. The PBC candidates met or exceeded the benchmark on each element in Domain 5 of the FEE.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

The Secondary faculty will share the domain 5 scores with the EPAC committee to address any needs that are noted.

Recommendations for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- PBC Secondary faculty will meet to review and revise (if necessary) the elements of Domain 5 to ensure that elements are aligned to current content standards.
- EPAC members will assist in identifying additional coursework, resources, or tutoring sessions that would assist candidates in improving content knowledge.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

There were no completers in the PBC Secondary Education programs during the 2020-2021 academic year and therefore no new data to report. The domain 5 elements will be aligned to current program standards for each content area during the summer 2021 semester to be implemented in fall 2021. Norming and inter-rater reliability will be established for domain 5 elements.

2021-2022:

There were no completers in the PBC Secondary Education programs during the 2021-2022 academic year. Therefore, there is no new data to report. 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. Domain 5 elements are being reviewed.

11 Assessment and Benchmark Lesson Planning

Assessment:

Louisiana Teacher General Competency F:

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

Louisiana Teacher General Competency G:

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

InTASC standards included: 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8.

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

11.1 Data

2017-2018:

Data tables are attached.

2018-2019:

Data tables are attached.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

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

2021-2022:

There were no completers in the 2021-2022 academic year and therefore no new data to report.

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

PBC_Secondary_Lesson Plan_17-18

PBC_Secondary_Lesson Plan_17-18.2

PBC_Secondary_Lesson Plan_18-19.1

PBC_Secondary_Lesson Plan_18-19.2

PBC_Secondary_Lesson Plan_Previous Data

11.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: Benchmark was met in every component of the Lesson Plan rubric with the exception of Technology; Exploration, Extension, Supplemental; and Accommodations /Differentiation for our English Practitioner teacher candidate and Student Outcomes and Closure for our Business PCB teacher candidate.

The only components on the Lesson Plan rubric that fell below benchmark within our English Practitioner program was Technology (N=1, M=2); Exploration, Extension, Supplemental (N=1, M=2); and Accommodations/Differentiation (N=1, M=1). In our Business PBC program, the following components fell below benchmark: Student Outcomes (N=1, M=2) and Closure (N=1, M=2).

Plan for Continuous Improvement: Adopt the new Lesson Plan rubric in PBC and Practitioner programs 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:

Analysis of Data:

The benchmark was met. The PBC candidates averaged a 3.00 or higher on all components of the lesson plan.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

The goal for 2019-2020 will be to implement and utilize the revised Lesson Plan in order to better identify student weakness.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of the Plan for Improvement:

Faculty will meet to complete inter-rater reliability on the new lesson plan. The new lesson plan will also have two rubric rows to identify if students struggle with relevance and/or rationale, which will help highlight the area(s) candidates struggle with.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

There were no completers during the 2020-2021 academic year and therefore no new data to report. EDUC 318 was added as a requirement to the PBC Secondary Education programs to provide candidates with a foundation to implement lesson planning throughout their methods coursework. Faculty will continue to evaluate lesson plan data within their courses at the end of each semester. Each summer semester, faculty make recommendations for edits to the Lesson Plan Template and Rubric based on the analysis of data collected. The plan is revised and an updated version is put in to place for the following fall semester.

2021-2022:

There were no completers during the 2021-2022 academic year. Therefore, there is no new data to report.

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.

12 Assessment and Benchmark Field Experience Evaluation

Assessment: Field Experience Evaluation Domains 1-4 and Domain 5.

Louisiana Teacher General Competency A:

The teacher candidate demonstrates, at an effective level, the Louisiana Components of Effective Teaching as defined in Bulletin 130 and the Compass Teacher Rubric.

Louisiana Teacher General Competency C2:

The teacher candidate gathers, synthesizes, and analyzes a variety of data from a variety of sources to adapt instructional practices and other professional behaviors to better meet students' needs.

InTASC standards included: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9.

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

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

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

12.1 Data

2017-2018:

Data tables are attached.

2018-2019:

Data table is attached.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

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

2021-2022:

There were no completers in the 2021-2022 academic year. Therefore, there is no new data to report.

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

PBC_Secondary_FEE Domains 1-4_17-18

PBC_Secondary_FEE Domains 1-4_18-19

PBC_Secondary_FEE_Previous Data

12.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: Benchmark was met in the majority of component listed on the FEE assessment. However, the following components fell below benchmark during fall 2017: all components under domain 1 and 3, Components 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.2.1, 2.2.2, and 2.2.3. In spring 2018, the following components fell below benchmark: 2.1.1, 2.2.2, 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.1.3, 3.2.2, 3.3.4.

The following components fell below benchmark during fall 2017: all components under domain 1 and 3 (N= 1, 0% Proficiency), Components 2.1.1 (N=1, M= 2.5), 2.1.2 (N=1, M=2.5), 2.2.1 (N=1, M=1.75), 2.2.2 (N= 1, M=2.13), and 2.2.3 (N=1, M=2).

In spring 2018, the following components fell below benchmark: 2.1.1 (N=4, M= 3.54), 2.2.2 (N=4, M=3.35), 3.1.1 (N=4, M=2.97), 3.1.2 (N=4, M=3.03), 3.1.3 (N=4, M=3.03), 3.2.2 (N=4, M=3.47), and 3.3.4 (N=4, M=3.04).

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

Recommendations to Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement: Identified FEE Domains 1-4 weaknesses discussed with PBC and Practitioner program faculty during curriculum redesign meetings during 2018-2019. Implementation and teaching of the revised FEE domains throughout the scope and sequence of Education coursework in the curriculum redesign.

2018-2019:

Analysis of Data:

The benchmark was met. The mean score met or exceeded the departmental benchmark on all components of the FEE rubric.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

The goal in 2019-2020 will be to incorporate the proficiency percentage as part of the benchmark.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

Incorporate the proficiency percentage into the benchmark as well as the mean score. This will allow for a more holistic view of student success in each component of the FEE rubric.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

There were no completers in the 2020-2021 academic year in the PBC Secondary Education programs. Therefore, there was no new data to report. The POP Cycle will be implemented for the two observations in each of the internship/residency semesters. Data driven professional development sessions for the candidates will be delivered each week. Additionally, the EPP faculty will ensure all elements are aligned to InTASC and CAEP standards during the summer 2021 semester.

2021-2022:

There were no completers in the 2021-2022 academic year. Therefore, there is no new data to report.

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.

12.2 Data

2017-2018:

Data tables are attached.

2018-2019:

Data table is attached.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

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

2021-2022:

There were no completers in the 2021-2022 academic year. Therefore, there is no new data to report.

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

PBC_Secondary_FEE Domains 1-4_17-18

PBC_Secondary_FEE Domains 1-4_18-19

PBC_Secondary_FEE InTASC_Previous Data

12.2.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: Proficiency was met in the majority of component listed on the FEE assessment. However, the following components fell below benchmark during fall 2017: all components under domain 1 and 3, Components 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.2.1, 2.2.2, and 2.2.3. In spring 2018, the following components fell below benchmark: 2.1.1, 2.2.2, 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.1.3, 3.2.2, 3.3.4.

The following components fell below benchmark during fall 2017: all components under domain 1 and 3 (N= 1, 0% Proficiency), Components 2.1.1 (N=1, M= 2.5), 2.1.2 (N=1, M=2.5), 2.2.1 (N=1, M=1.75), 2.2.2 (N= 1, M=2.13), and 2.2.3 (N=1, M=2).

In spring 2018, the following components fell below benchmark: 2.1.1 (N=4,M= 3.54), 2.2.2 (N=4, M=3.35), 3.1.1 (N=4, M=2.97), 3.1.2 (N=4, M=3.03), 3.1.3 (N=4, M=3.03), 3.2.2 (N=4, M=3.47), and 3.3.4 (N=4, M=3.04).

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The goal for 2018-2019 is to share data findings/analysis with the faculty of the PBC and Practitioner programs during curriculum redesign so that they can reinforce expectations and provide examples to PBC/Practitioner students on weak domains 1-3.

Recommendations to Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement: Identified FEE Domains 1-3 weaknesses discussed with PBC and Practitioner program faculty during curriculum redesign meetings during 2018-2019 academic year. Implementation and teaching of the revised FEE domains throughout the scope and sequence of Education coursework in the curriculum redesign.

2018-2019:

Analysis of Data:

The benchmark was met. All InTASC components on the FEE had a mean score of 3.00 or above.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

The EPP will host professional development opportunities for University Supervisors, University Professors, Administrators and Mentor Teachers to participate in inter-rater reliability and norming sessions.

Recommendations for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

Host at least one opportunity per year for those scoring the FEE to participate in inter-rater reliability and norming sessions.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

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

2021-2022:

There were no completers in the 2021-2022 academic year. Therefore, there is no new data to report.

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.

12.3 Data

2017-2018:

Data tables are attached.

2018-2019:

Data table is attached.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

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

2021-2022:

There were no completers in the 2021-2022 academic year. Therefore, there is no new data to report.

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

PBC_Secondary_FEE Domain 5_18-19

PBC_Secondary_FEE Domain 5_Previous Data

PBC_Secondary_FEE_Domain 5_17-18

12.3.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: Benchmark was met in all components within Domain 5 with the exception of 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4 for spring 2018.

Benchmark was not met in spring 2018 in the following domain 5 components: 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4. All components listed had a 75% of teacher candidates scoring proficiency.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The goal for 2018-2019 is to share data findings with the faculty of the PBC and Practitioner programs during curriculum redesign so that they can reinforce expectations and provide examples to PBC/Practitioner students on weak domains of 5.2, 5.3 and 5.4.

Recommendations to Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement: Identified FEE Domain 5.2, 5.3, 5.4 weaknesses discussed with PBC and Practitioner program faculty during curriculum redesign meetings during 2018-2019 academic year. Implementation and teaching of the revised FEE domains throughout the scope and sequence of Education coursework in the curriculum redesign.

2018-2019:

Analysis of Data:

The candidate's (n=1) mean scores on Domain 5 of the FEE rubric ranged from 3.63-4.00 on elements 5.1 through 5.1 to 5.8.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

Mentors, University Supervisors, and Administrators scoring with the FEE instrument will be encouraged to look for opportunities to score candidates on Domain 5 of the FEE rubric.

Recommendations for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- Secondary Education faculty will meet to review and revise (if necessary) the elements of Domain 5 to ensure that the elements are aligned to current content standards.
- Domain 5 of the rubric will be attached to the FEE when given to supervisors for scoring.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

There were no completers in the PBC Secondary Education programs during the 2020-2021 academic year and therefore no new data to report. The domain 5 elements will be aligned to current content standards for each subject area during the summer of 2021 to be implemented in fall 2021. Norming and inter-rater reliability will be established for domain 5 elements.

2021-2022:

There were no completers in the 2021-2022 academic year. Therefore, there is no new data to report.

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.

13 Assessment and Benchmark Teacher Candidate Work Sample

Assessment: Teacher Candidate Work Sample.

Louisiana Teacher General Competency H:

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

Louisiana Teacher General Competency C1:

The teacher candidate observes and reflects on students' responses to instruction or identify areas of need and make adjustments to practice.

InTASC standards included: 6

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

13.1 Data

PBC Secondary Education All Content Areas - Teacher Candidate Work Sample Data:

Criteria		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
	Number	9	6	0	8	0	3
	Mean	2.9	2.38		3.75		4.00

Choice of Assessment	Range	1.00-4.00	1.00-4.00		3.00-4.00		4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	78%	33%		100%		100%
Pre-assessment	Number	9	6		8		3
	Mean	2.23	2.13		3.75		3.33
	Range	2.00-3.00	1.00-3.00		3.00-4.00		2.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	22%	33%		100%		67%
Post-assessment	Number	9	6		8		3
	Mean	2.67	2.5		3.5		3.00
	Range	2.00-3.00	2.00-3.00		2.00-4.00		1.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	78%	50%		88%		67%
Alignment of Lesson Evidence	Number	9	6		8		3
	Mean	2.3	2.25		3.63		3.67
	Range	2.00-3.00	2.00-3.00		3.00-4.00		3.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	33%	33%		100%		100%
Student Level of Mastery & Evaluation of Factors	Number	9	6		8		3
	Mean	2.77	3.25		3.75		3.33
	Range	2.00-3.00	3.00-4.00		3.00-4.00		2.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	67%	100%		100%		67%
Data to Determine Patterns & Gaps	Number	9	6		8		3
	Mean	2.43	3.00		3.75		3.33
	Range	2.00-3.00	2.00-4.00		3.00-4.00		2.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	67%	100%		100%		67%
Response to Interventions	Number	9	6		8		3
	Mean	1.2	1.38		3.63		3.67
	Range	1.00-2.00	1.00-4.00		3.00-4.00		3.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	0%	17%		100%		100%

Criteria		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
Choice of Assessment	Number	0	3			0	0
	Mean		3.33				
	Range		3.00-4.00				
	% Proficient						

	or Higher		100%				
Pre-assessment	Number		3				
	Mean		3.33				
	Range		3.00-4.00				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%				
Post-assessment	Number		3				
	Mean		3.33				
	Range		3.00-4.00				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%				
Alignment of Lesson Evidence	Number		3				
	Mean		3.33				
	Range		3.00-4.00				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%				
Student Level of Mastery & Evaluation of Factors	Number		3				
	Mean		3.33				
	Range		3.00-4.00				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%				
Data to Determine Patterns & Gaps	Number		3				
	Mean		3.33				
	Range		3.00-4.00				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%				
Response to Interventions	Number		3				
	Mean		3.33				
	Range		3.00-4.00				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%				

Criteria		Fall 2021	Spring 2022	Fall 2022	Spring 2023	Fall 2023	Spring 2024
Choice of Assessment	Number	0	0				
	Mean						
	Range						
	% Proficient or Higher						
	Number						
	Mean						

Pre-assessment	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						

PBC Secondary Education Agriculture - Teacher Candidate Work Sample Data:

Criteria		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
Choice of Assessment	Number	0	0			0	0
	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						

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	Number						
	Mean						
	Range						

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

PBC Secondary Education Biology - Teacher Candidate Work Sample Data:

Criteria		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
Choice of Assessment	Number	0	0			0	0
	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						
	Number						

Response to Interventions	Mean						
	Range						
	% Proficient or Higher						

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						

PBC Secondary Education Business - Teacher Candidate Work Sample Data:

Criteria		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
	Number	0	0			0	0

Choice of Assessment	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						

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						

PBC Secondary Education Chemistry - Teacher Candidate Work Sample Data:

Criteria		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
Choice of Assessment	Number	0	0			0	0
	Mean						
	Range						
	% Proficient or Higher						
Pre-assessment	Number						
	Mean						
	Range						
	% Proficient or Higher						
Post-assessment	Number						
	Mean						
	Range						
	% Proficient or Higher						
	Number						

Alignment of Lesson Evidence	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						

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							

PBC Secondary Education English - Teacher Candidate Work Sample Data:

Criteria		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018	
							PBC	Pract.
Choice of Assessment	Number	2	2	3	2	0	1	1
	Mean	2.5	3.00	4.00	4.00		4.00	4.00
	Range	1.00-3.00	2.00-4.00	4.00	4.00		4.00	4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	50%	50%	100%	100%		100%	100%
Pre-assessment	Number	2	2	3	2		1	1
	Mean	2.00	2.5	4.00	4.00		4.00	2.00
	Range	2.00	2.00-3.00	4.00	4.00		4.00	2.00
	% Proficient or Higher	0%	50%	100%	100%		100%	0%
Post-assessment	Number	2	2	3	2		1	1
	Mean	2.00	3.00	4.00	3.50		4.00	1.00
	Range	2.00	3.00	4.00	3.00-4.00		4.00	1.00
	% Proficient or Higher	0%	100%	100%	100%		100%	0%
Alignment of Lesson Evidence	Number	2	2	3	2		1	1
	Mean	2.00	3.00	4.00	3.50		4.00	3.00
	Range	2.00	3.00	4.00	3.00-4.00		4.00	3.00
	% Proficient or Higher	0%	100%	100%	100%		100%	100%
Student Level of Mastery &	Number	2	2	3	2		1	1
	Mean	2.50	3.00	4.00	4.00		4.00	2.00
	Range	2.00-3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00		4.00	2.00

Evaluation of Factors	% Proficient or Higher	50%	100%	100%	100%		100%	0%
Data to Determine Patterns & Gaps	Number	2	2	3	2		1	1
	Mean	2.00	3.00	4.00	3.50		4.00	2.00
	Range	2.00	3.00	4.00	3.00-4.00		4.00	2.00
	% Proficient or Higher	0%	100%	100%	100%		100%	0%
Response to Interventions	Number	2	2	3	2		1	1
	Mean	1.00	2.50	4.00	4.00		4.00	3.00
	Range	1.00	1.00-4.00	4.00	4.00		4.00	3.00
	% Proficient or Higher	0%	50%	100%	100%		100%	100%

Criteria		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
Choice of Assessment	Number	0	2			0	0
	Mean		3.00				
	Range		3.00				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%				
Post-assessment	Number		2				
	Mean		3.00				
	Range		3.00				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%				
Alignment of Lesson Evidence	Number		2				
	Mean		3.00				
	Range		3.00				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%				
Student Level of Mastery & Evaluation of Factors	Number		2				
	Mean		3.00				
	Range		3.00				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%				
Data to Determine Patterns & Gaps	Number		2				
	Mean		3.00				
	Range		3.00				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%				
Response to	Number		2				
	Mean		3.00				

Interventions	Range		3.00				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%				

Criteria		Fall 2021	Spring 2022	Fall 2022	Spring 2023	Fall 2023	Spring 2024
Choice of 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						

PBC Secondary Education Math - Teacher Candidate Work Sample Data:

Criteria		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
Choice of Assessment	Number	0	1			0	0
	Mean		4.00				
	Range		4.00				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%				
	Number		1				
	Mean		4.00				

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

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

Criteria		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
Choice of Assessment	Number	0	0			0	0
	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	Number						
	Mean						

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

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						

13.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: Half of the components on the TCWS met departmental benchmarks. Components that fell below benchmark include: Pre-assessment, Post-assessment, Student Level of Mastery & Evaluation of Factors, and Data to Determine Patterns & Gaps. All of the following components had 67% of teacher candidates score proficient (N=3): Pre-assessment, Post-assessment, Student Level of Mastery & Evaluation of Factors, and Data to Determine Patterns & Gaps. The student who did not receive a proficiency rating in these components was in the English PBC program.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The goal for 2018-2019 is to share data findings/analysis with the faculty of the PBC and Practitioner programs during curriculum redesign so that they can reinforce expectations and provide examples to PBC/Practitioner students on weak TCWS components, Pre-assessment, Post-assessment, Student Level of Mastery & Evaluation of Factors, and Data to Determine Patterns & Gaps.

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:

Analysis of Data:

All students met or exceeded the benchmark of 3.00 on each element of the Teacher Candidate Work Sample.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

The Teacher Candidate Work Sample will be replaced with the Teaching Cycle which provides specific expectations and increased rigor with scaffolded support to improve candidate abilities to evaluate student learning and plan for instructions.

Recommendations for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

The Teaching Cycle will be scaffolded throughout the program and the Senior Residency Portfolio will include the Teaching Cycle. During the Senior Residency Portfolio course, candidates will be assigned a mentor professor to assist them, answer questions, and guide them through the full process.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

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

2021-2022:

There were no completers during the 2021-2022 academic year. Therefore, there is no new data to report.

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.

14 Assessment and Benchmark PRAXIS PLT

Assessment: Praxis Principles of Learning and Teaching.

Louisiana Teacher General Competency B:

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

Louisiana Teacher General Competency E:

The teacher candidate applies knowledge of state and federal laws related to students' rights and teacher responsibilities for appropriate education for students with and without exceptionalities, parents, teachers, and other professionals in making instructional decisions and communicating with colleagues and families (e.g., laws and policies governing student privacy, special education, and limited English proficient education, including but not limited to Bulletin 1508, Bulletin 1706, and Bulletin 1903).

InTASC standards included: 10

Benchmark: 80% or more of the candidates will pass the Praxis PLT on the first attempt.

14.1 Data

All Secondary Programs		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017
Overall Score Information	Number	3	3	2	3
	Mean	168	178.25	183.5	171
	Range	160-174	184-172	182-185	165-175
	% Pass 1st attempt	67%	67%	100%	100%
	% Pass prior to ST/Intern	100%	100%	100%	100%
Subcomponent	Number	1	2	2	2
Students as Learners	Mean	17	19	17	16.5
	Range	17	19	15-19	16-17
Instructional Process	Mean	9	15	18	15
	Range	9	13-18	18	15
Assessment	Mean	9	13	11	10.5
	Range	9	12-14	11	10-11
Professional Development Leadership and Community	Mean	7	10.5	10.5	9.5
	Range	7	10-11	10-11	9-10
Analysis of Instructional Scenarios	Mean	8	11.5	12	9.5
	Range	8	11-12	11-13	9-10

Agriculture		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017
Overall	Number	0	0	0	1
	Mean				172
	Range				172
	% Pass 1st attempt				100%

	% Pass prior to ST/Intern				100%
Breakdown:	Number	0	0	0	1
Students as Learners	Mean				16
	Range				16
Instructional Process	Mean				15
	Range				15
Assessment	Mean				10
	Range				10
Professional Development Leadership and Community	Mean				10
	Range				10
Analysis of Instructional Scenarios	Mean				9
	Range				9

Biology		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017
Overall	Number	1	2	1	0
	Mean	174	184.5	185	
	Range	174	184-185	185	
	% Pass 1st attempt	100%	100%	100%	
	% Pass prior to ST/Intern	100%	100%	100%	
Breakdown:	Number	0	2	1	0
Students as Learners	Mean		19	19	
	Range		19	19	
Instructional Process	Mean		15	18	
	Range		13-18	13	
Assessment	Mean		13	11	
	Range		12-14	11	
Professional Development Leadership and Community	Mean		10.5	11	
	Range		10-11	11	
Analysis of Instructional Scenarios	Mean		11.5	11	
	Range	11-12	11		

Business		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017
Overall	Number	1	1	0	0
	Mean	160	172		
	Range	160	172		
	% Pass 1st attempt	0%	0%		
	% Pass prior				

	to ST/Intern	100%	100%		
Breakdown:	Number	1	0	0	0
Students as Learners	Mean	17			
	Range	17			
Instructional Process	Mean	9			
	Range	9			
Assessment	Mean	9			
	Range	9			
Professional Development Leadership and Community	Mean	7			
	Range	7			
Analysis of Instructional Scenarios	Mean	8			
	Range	8			

Chemistry		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017
Overall	Number	1	1	0	0
	Mean	160	172		
	Range	160	172		
	% Pass 1st attempt	0%	0%		
	% Pass prior to ST/Intern	100%	100%		
Breakdown:	Number	1	0	0	0
Students as Learners	Mean	17			
	Range	17			
Instructional Process	Mean	9			
	Range	9			
Assessment	Mean	9			
	Range	9			
Professional Development Leadership and Community	Mean	7			
	Range	7			
Analysis of Instructional Scenarios	Mean	8			
	Range	8			

English		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017
Overall	Number	0	0	1	0
	Mean			182	
	Range			182	
	% Pass 1st attempt			100%	
	% Pass prior to ST/Intern			100%	

Breakdown:	Number	0	0	1	0
Students as Learners	Mean			15	
	Range			15	
Instructional Process	Mean			18	
	Range			18	
Assessment	Mean			11	
	Range			11	
Professional Development Leadership and Community	Mean			10	
	Range			10	
Analysis of Instructional Scenarios	Mean			13	
	Range			13	

Social Studies		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017
Overall	Number	1	0	0	2
	Mean	169			170
	Range	169			165-175
	% Pass 1st attempt	100%			100%
	% Pass prior to ST/Intern	100%			100%
Breakdown:	Number				1
Students as Learners	Mean				17
	Range				17
Instructional Process	Mean				15
	Range				15
Assessment	Mean				11
	Range				11
Professional Development Leadership and Community	Mean				9
	Range				9
Analysis of Instructional Scenarios	Mean				10
	Range				10

2017-2018:

The data table for PBC Secondary Assessment: Principles of Learning and Teaching #5624 for Grades 7-12 and 5841 for World Language Pedagogy (Combined Data for PBC Secondary Education Content Areas) is attached.

2018-2019:

Data table is attached.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

There were no PBC Secondary Education completers in the 2020-2021 academic year and therefore no new data to report.

2021-2022:

There were no completers in the PBC Secondary education program for the 2021-2022 academic year. Therefore, there is no new data to report.

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

PBC_Secondary_Praxis_PLT_17-18

PBC_Secondary_Praxis_PLT_18-19

14.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data:

There was one completer who took and passed the Praxis PLT on the first attempt.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: Candidates will pass the PLT with 80% proficiency on their first attempt.

Recommendations to Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement: It is also recommended that the department review the Praxis score data to identify areas of weakness within the PLT exam; data analysis will be discussed during curriculum redesign meetings and curriculum or course revisions adopted as necessary.

2018-2019:

Analysis of Data:

100% of the candidates (n=3) passed the Praxis PLT on the first attempt. Only two of the five sub-categories were passed with 80% proficiency or above: Instructional Process (82.5%) and Assessment (80.95%).

Plan of Continuous Improvement:

The EPP will focus on coursework related to the Praxis PLT within the PBC Secondary program to ensure that it supports the sub-categories within the exam.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- 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.
- Review PLT exam scores to ensure that redesigned programs incorporate the necessary topics needed for candidates to pass the Praxis PLT exam.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

There were no completers in the 2020-2021 academic year and therefore no new data to report. The EPP will continue to focus on coursework that covers the topics and information relative to the principles of learning and teaching. Currently, candidates are advised to complete the Praxis PLT after completing EDUC 203. Advisors will continue to encourage candidates to take this exam in a timely manner. EPP faculty will also compile a list of Praxis resources that will be given to candidates at their first advising session.

2021-2022:

There were no completers in the 2021-2022 academic year and therefore no new data to report. The EPP has partnered with 240 Tutoring for candidates to receive a 50% discount for online Praxis study materials.

End of report