



2018-2019 INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AUDIT

Major Organizational Unit Head Don Schillinger, Dean: Terri McConathy, Provost

Name of Unit/Program: Bachelor of Science Early Childhood Education - Gr PK-3 (ED04)

Mission:

The College of Education's mission statement has also recently been revised to better express how it is intended that the shared vision is to be attained in reality.

The mission of the College of Education is to:

1. Provide high quality educational programs and experiences;
2. Enhance and extend the knowledge bases of developing professionals through research and other scholarly activities;
3. Extend the boundaries of knowledge through vigorous research and dissemination;
4. Collaborate within the university and with the broader community; and
5. Provide professional services to the community.

Based on Analysis of the 2017-2018 data, what is being implemented during the 2018-2019 cycle to improve results:

1. During the 2017-2018 cycle, we evaluated the results of Framework for Teaching assessments across all teacher education programs. We found that the assessment results were skewed positive and we did not find the range of variability that we know existed through other measures such as Value-Added Modeling. Because of this, we established training procedures for evaluators which included a requirement for all evaluators to demonstrate inter-rater reliability. Additionally, new lesson planning templates, rubrics, and planning protocols were developed. Professors were trained to use the instrument and have introduced the new planning strategies to students.
2. For Outcome 1, we will work with candidates who are completing clinical residencies to assure that they fully understand the linkages between their planning and preparation to teach, the LA Tech Lesson Plan Template and Domain 1 (Planning and Preparation) of the Framework for Teaching.

Expected Outcomes: (based upon and linked to overall Mission of Program or Unit)

Programmatic Outcomes We expect to see growth within Domain 1 (mean score of 1a through 1f) between the first and final Framework for Teaching evaluations during the clinical residency. Because we are using trained evaluators who have demonstrated interrater reliability and new protocols for evaluating performance on the FFT we can not specify an expected level of growth between evaluations. We expect that students will demonstrate mean performance of equal to or

greater than 2.5 out of 4 on their final Domain 1 evaluation. We will analyze assessment results this year and be able to quantify more precisely expected levels of growth for 2-19--2020

General Education Course Assessment N/A

Means of Measurement: (Make sure this is measureable and link each measurement to each expected outcome.)

Programmatic Means of Measurement: The difference between the first FFT evaluation and the final FFT evaluation will be calculated for Domain 1. The mean, standard deviation and range of differences will be calculated. Additionally, the mean, standard deviation, and range of Domain 1 scores for the final FFT evaluation will be calculated across the program.

General Education Course Means of Measurement N/A

Measurements of Results: (disaggregate data based on mode of delivery and/or location (e.g., Ruston Campus vs. Academic Success Center; Ruston Campus vs. distance education; Barksdale vs. online vs. Ruston Campus; etc.)

To be completed by October 15, 2019.

Programmatic Results

	PRE	POST	DIFF	BNCH	DIFF
Mean	2.79	3.28	+0.49	2.5	+0.78
St. Dev.	0.57	0.64	+0.07		
Range	2	2	0		

General Education Course Results

Use of Results (Describe what changes were made during this cycle. State clearly what improvements have taken place during this cycle-What was actually done to improve the outcomes? Did this work? Discuss strengths and weaknesses. You can compare previous year to current year to identify improvement).

To be completed by October 15, 2019.

Programmatic Use of Results

Results exceeded the expected 2.5/4 benchmark by 0.78. Efforts during 2018-2019 to train evaluators and conduct regular evaluation calibrations resulted in greater consistency among evaluators, thus improving the validity of results and consistency of feedback provided to students on their performance. In 2017-2018, the evaluator training was being phased-in across all sites where students

are placed for clinical residency experiences. The evaluation results from that year were not completely accurate representations of candidate performance because the evaluations were conducted by a blend of trained and yet-to-be trained evaluators. By the 2018-2019 year, all evaluators had completed the same training and were better equipped to provide comparable evaluations across all programs.

General Education Use of Results



2018-2019 INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AUDIT

Major Organizational Unit Head Don Schillinger, Dean: Terri McConathy, Provost

Name of Unit/Program:

Bachelor of Science Elementary Education and Special Education Mild/Moderate - Gr 1-5 (ED38)

Mission:

The College of Education's mission statement has also recently been revised to better express how it is intended that the shared vision is to be attained in reality.

The mission of the College of Education is to:

1. Provide high quality educational programs and experiences;
2. Enhance and extend the knowledge bases of developing professionals through research and other scholarly activities;
3. Extend the boundaries of knowledge through vigorous research and dissemination;
4. Collaborate within the university and with the broader community; and
5. Provide professional services to the community.

Based on Analysis of the 2017-2018 data, what is being implemented during the 2018-2019 cycle to improve results:

1. During the 2017-2018 cycle, we evaluated the results of Framework for teaching assessments across all teacher education programs. We found that the assessment results were skewed positive and we did not find the range of variability that we know existed through other measures such as Value-Added Modeling. Because of this, we established training procedures for evaluators which included a requirement for all evaluators to demonstrate inter-rater reliability. Additionally, new lesson planning templates, rubrics, and planning protocols were developed. Professors were trained to use the instrument and have introduced the new planning strategies to students.
2. For Outcome 1, we will work with candidates who are completing clinical residencies to assure that they fully understand the linkages between their planning and preparation to teach, the LA Tech Lesson Plan Template and Domain 1 (Planning and Preparation) of the Framework for Teaching.

Expected Outcomes: (based upon and linked to overall Mission of Program or Unit)

Programmatic Outcomes We expect to see growth within Domain 1 (mean score of 1a through 1f) between the first and final Framework for Teaching evaluations during the clinical residency. Because we are using trained evaluators who have demonstrated interrater reliability and new protocols for evaluating performance on the FFT we can not specify an expected level of growth

between evaluations. We expect that students will demonstrate mean performance of equal to or greater than 2.5 out of 4 on their final Domain 1 evaluation. We will analyze assessment results this year and be able to quantify more precisely expected levels of growth for 2-19--2020

General Education Course Assessment N/A

Means of Measurement: (Make sure this is measureable and link each measurement to each expected outcome.)

Programmatic Means of Measurement: The difference between the first FFT evaluation and the final FFT evaluation will be calculated for Domain 1. The mean, standard deviation and range of differences will be calculated. Additionally, the mean, standard deviation, and range of Domain 1 scores for the final FFT evaluation will be calculated across the program.

General Education Course Means of Measurement N/A

Measurements of Results: (disaggregate data based on mode of delivery and/or location (e.g., Ruston Campus vs. Academic Success Center; Ruston Campus vs. distance education; Barksdale vs. online vs. Ruston Campus; etc.)

To be completed by October 15, 2019.

Programmatic Results

	PRE	POST	DIFF	BNCH	DIFF
Mean	2.79	3.28	+0.49	2.5	+0.78
St. Dev.	0.57	0.64	+0.07		
Range	2	2	0		

General Education Course Results

Use of Results (Describe what changes were made during this cycle. State clearly what improvements have taken place during this cycle-What was actually done to improve the outcomes? Did this work? Discuss strengths and weaknesses. You can compare previous year to current year to identify improvement).

To be completed by October 15, 2019.

Programmatic Use of Results

Results exceeded the expected 2.5/4 benchmark by 0.78. Efforts during 2018-2019 to train evaluators and conduct regular evaluation calibrations resulted in greater consistency among evaluators, thus

improving the validity of results and consistency of feedback provided to students on their performance. In 2017-2018, the evaluator training was being phased-in across all sites where students are placed for clinical residency experiences. The evaluation results from that year were not completely accurate representations of candidate performance because the evaluations were conducted by a blend of trained and yet-to-be trained evaluators. By the 2018-2019 year, all evaluators had completed the same training and were better equipped to provide comparable evaluations across all programs.

General Education Use of Results



2018-2019 INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AUDIT

Major Organizational Unit Head Don Schillinger, Dean: Terri McConathy, Provost

Name of Unit/Program:

Bachelor of Science Secondary Education & Teaching - Gr 6-12 (ED39)

Mission: The College of Education's mission statement has also recently been revised to better express how it is intended that the shared vision is to be attained in reality. The mission of the College of Education is to:

- 1. Provide high quality educational programs and experiences;**
- 2. Enhance and extend the knowledge bases of developing professionals through research and other scholarly activities;**
- 3. Extend the boundaries of knowledge through vigorous research and dissemination;**
- 4. Collaborate within the university and with the broader community; and**
- 5. Provide professional services to the community.**

Based on Analysis of the 2017-2018 data, what is being implemented during the 2018-2019 cycle to improve results:

- 1. During the 2017-2018 cycle, we evaluated the results of Framework for Teaching assessments across all teacher education programs. We found that the assessment results were skewed positive and we did not find the range of variability that we know existed through other measures such as Value-Added Modeling. Because of this, we established training procedures for evaluators which included a requirement for all evaluators to demonstrate inter-rater reliability. Additionally, new lesson planning templates, rubrics, and planning protocols were developed. Professors were trained to use the instrument and have introduced the new planning strategies to students.**
- 2. For Outcome 1, we will work with candidates who are completing clinical residencies to assure that they fully understand the linkages between their planning and preparation to teach, the LA Tech Lesson Plan Template and Domain 1 (Planning and Preparation) of the Framework for Teaching.**

Expected Outcomes: (based upon and linked to overall Mission of Program or Unit)

Programmatic Outcomes We expect to see growth within Domain 1 (mean score of 1a through 1f) between the first and final Framework for Teaching evaluations during the clinical residency. Because we are using trained evaluators who have demonstrated interrater reliability and new protocols for evaluating performance on the FFT we can not specify an expected level of growth between evaluations. We expect that students will demonstrate mean performance of equal to or greater than 2.5 out of 4 on their final Domain 1 evaluation. We will analyze assessment results this year and be able to quantify more precisely expected levels of growth for 2-19--2020

General Education Course Assessment N/A

Means of Measurement: (Make sure this is measureable and link each measurement to each expected outcome.)

Programmatic Means of Measurement: The difference between the first FFT evaluation and the final FFT evaluation will be calculated for Domain 1. The mean, standard deviation and range of differences will be calculated. Additionally, the mean, standard deviation, and range of Domain 1 scores for the final FFT evaluation will be calculated across the program.

General Education Course Means of Measurement N/A

Measurements of Results: (disaggregate data based on mode of delivery and/or location (e.g., Ruston Campus vs. Academic Success Center; Ruston Campus vs. distance education; Barksdale vs. online vs. Ruston Campus; etc.)

To be completed by October 15, 2019.

Programmatic Results

	PRE	POST	DIFF	BNCH	DIFF
Mean	2.79	3.28	+0.49	2.5	+0.78
St. Dev.	0.57	0.64	+0.07		
Range	2	2	0		

General Education Course Results

Use of Results (Describe what changes were made during this cycle. State clearly what improvements have taken place during this cycle-What was actually done to improve the outcomes? Did this work? Discuss strengths and weaknesses. You can compare previous year to current year to identify improvement).

To be completed by October 15, 2019.

Programmatic Use of Results

Results exceeded the expected 2.5/4 benchmark by 0.78. Efforts during 2018-2019 to train evaluators and conduct regular evaluation calibrations resulted in greater consistency among evaluators, thus improving the validity of results and consistency of feedback provided to students on their performance. In 2017-2018, the evaluator training was being phased-in across all sites where students are placed for clinical residency experiences. The evaluation results from that year were not

completely accurate representations of candidate performance because the evaluations were conducted by a blend of trained and yet-to-be trained evaluators. By the 2018-2019 year, all evaluators had completed the same training and were better equipped to provide comparable evaluations across all programs.

General Education Use of Results



2018-2019 INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AUDIT

Major Organizational Unit Head Don Schillinger, Dean: Terri McConathy, Provost

Name of Unit/Program: Master of Arts in Teaching Early Childhood Education

Mission: The College of Education's mission statement has also recently been revised to better express how it is intended that the shared vision is to be attained in reality.

The mission of the College of Education is to:

- 1. Provide high quality educational programs and experiences;**
- 2. Enhance and extend the knowledge bases of developing professionals through research and other scholarly activities;**
- 3. Extend the boundaries of knowledge through vigorous research and dissemination;**
- 4. Collaborate within the university and with the broader community; and**
- 5. Provide professional services to the community.**

Based on Analysis of the 2017-2018 data, what is being implemented during the 2018-2019 cycle to improve results:

- 1. During the 2017-2018 cycle, we evaluated the results of Framework for Teaching assessments across all teacher education programs. We found that the assessment results were skewed positive and we did not find the range of variability that we know existed through other measures such as Value-Added Modeling. Because of this, we established training procedures for evaluators which included a requirement for all evaluators to demonstrate inter-rater reliability. Additionally, new lesson planning templates, rubrics, and planning protocols were developed. Professors were trained to use the instrument and have introduced the new planning strategies to students.**
- 2. For Outcome 1, we will work with candidates who are completing clinical residencies to assure that they fully understand the linkages between their planning and preparation to teach, the LA Tech Lesson Plan Template and Domain 1 (Planning and Preparation) of the Framework for Teaching.**

Expected Outcomes: (based upon and linked to overall Mission of Program or Unit)

Programmatic Outcomes We expect to see growth within Domain 1 (mean score of 1a through 1f) between the first and final Framework for Teaching evaluations during the clinical residency. Because we are using trained evaluators who have demonstrated interrater reliability and new protocols for evaluating performance on the FFT we can not specify an expected level of growth between evaluations. We expect that students will demonstrate mean performance of equal to or

greater than 2.5 out of 4 on their final Domain 1 evaluation. We will analyze assessment results this year and be able to quantify more precisely expected levels of growth for 2-19--2020

General Education Course Assessment N/A

Means of Measurement: (Make sure this is measureable and link each measurement to each expected outcome.)

Programmatic Means of Measurement: The difference between the first FFT evaluation and the final FFT evaluation will be calculated for Domain 1. The mean, standard deviation and range of differences will be calculated. Additionally, the mean, standard deviation, and range of Domain 1 scores for the final FFT evaluation will be calculated across the program.

General Education Course Means of Measurement N/A

Measurements of Results: (disaggregate data based on mode of delivery and/or location (e.g., Ruston Campus vs. Academic Success Center; Ruston Campus vs. distance education; Barksdale vs. online vs. Ruston Campus; etc.)

To be completed by October 15, 2019.

Programmatic Results

	PRE	POST	DIFF	BNCH	DIFF
Mean	2.79	3.28	+0.49	2.5	+0.78
St. Dev.	0.57	0.64	+0.07		
Range	2	2	0		

General Education Course Results

Use of Results (Describe what changes were made during this cycle. State clearly what improvements have taken place during this cycle-What was actually done to improve the outcomes? Did this work? Discuss strengths and weaknesses. You can compare previous year to current year to identify improvement).

To be completed by October 15, 2019.

Programmatic Use of Results

Results exceeded the expected 2.5/4 benchmark by 0.78. Efforts during 2018-2019 to train evaluators and conduct regular evaluation calibrations resulted in greater consistency among evaluators, thus improving the validity of results and consistency of feedback provided to students on their

performance. In 2017-2018, the evaluator training was being phased-in across all sites where students are placed for clinical residency experiences. The evaluation results from that year were not completely accurate representations of candidate performance because the evaluations were conducted by a blend of trained and yet-to-be trained evaluators. By the 2018-2019 year, all evaluators had completed the same training and were better equipped to provide comparable evaluations across all programs.

General Education Use of Results



2018-2019 INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AUDIT

Major Organizational Unit Head Don Schillinger, Dean: Terri McConathy, Provost
Name of Unit/Program: Master of Arts in Teaching Elementary Education & Special Education
<p>Mission:</p> <p>The College of Education's mission statement has also recently been revised to better express how it is intended that the shared vision is to be attained in reality.</p> <p>The mission of the College of Education is to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Provide high quality educational programs and experiences;2. Enhance and extend the knowledge bases of developing professionals through research and other scholarly activities;3. Extend the boundaries of knowledge through vigorous research and dissemination;4. Collaborate within the university and with the broader community; and5. Provide professional services to the community.
<p>Based on Analysis of the 2017-2018 data, what is being implemented during the 2018-2019 cycle to improve results:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. During the 2017-2018 cycle, we evaluated the results of Framework for Teaching assessments across all teacher education programs. We found that the assessment results were skewed positive and we did not find the range of variability that we know existed through other measures such as Value-Added Modeling. Because of this, we established training procedures for evaluators which included a requirement for all evaluators to demonstrate inter-rater reliability. Additionally, new lesson planning templates, rubrics, and planning protocols were developed. Professors were trained to use the instrument and have introduced the new planning strategies to students.2. For Outcome 1, we will work with candidates who are completing clinical residencies to assure that they fully understand the linkages between their planning and preparation to teach, the LA Tech Lesson Plan Template and Domain 1 (Planning and Preparation) of the Framework for Teaching.
<p>Expected Outcomes: (based upon and linked to overall Mission of Program or Unit)</p> <p>Programmatic Outcomes We expect to see growth within Domain 1 (mean score of 1a through 1f) between the first and final Framework for Teaching evaluations during the clinical residency. Because we are using trained evaluators who have demonstrated interrater reliability and new protocols for evaluating performance on the FFT we can not specify an expected level of growth</p>

between evaluations. We expect that students will demonstrate mean performance of equal to or greater than 2.5 out of 4 on their final Domain 1 evaluation. We will analyze assessment results this year and be able to quantify more precisely expected levels of growth for 2-19--2020

General Education Course Assessment N/A

Means of Measurement: (Make sure this is measureable and link each measurement to each expected outcome.)

Programmatic Means of Measurement: The difference between the first FFT evaluation and the final FFT evaluation will be calculated for Domain 1. The mean, standard deviation and range of differences will be calculated. Additionally, the mean, standard deviation, and range of Domain 1 scores for the final FFT evaluation will be calculated across the program.

General Education Course Means of Measurement N/A

Measurements of Results: (disaggregate data based on mode of delivery and/or location (e.g., Ruston Campus vs. Academic Success Center; Ruston Campus vs. distance education; Barksdale vs. online vs. Ruston Campus; etc.)

To be completed by October 15, 2019.

Programmatic Results

	PRE	POST	DIFF	BNCH	DIFF
Mean	2.79	3.28	+0.49	2.5	+0.78
St. Dev.	0.57	0.64	+0.07		
Range	2	2	0		

General Education Course Results

Use of Results (Describe what changes were made during this cycle. State clearly what improvements have taken place during this cycle-What was actually done to improve the outcomes? Did this work? Discuss strengths and weaknesses. You can compare previous year to current year to identify improvement).

To be completed by October 15, 2019.

Programmatic Use of Results

Results exceeded the expected 2.5/4 benchmark by 0.78. Efforts during 2018-2019 to train evaluators and conduct regular evaluation calibrations resulted in greater consistency among evaluators, thus

improving the validity of results and consistency of feedback provided to students on their performance. In 2017-2018, the evaluator training was being phased-in across all sites where students are placed for clinical residency experiences. The evaluation results from that year were not completely accurate representations of candidate performance because the evaluations were conducted by a blend of trained and yet-to-be trained evaluators. By the 2018-2019 year, all evaluators had completed the same training and were better equipped to provide comparable evaluations across all programs.

General Education Use of Results



2018-2019 INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AUDIT

Major Organizational Unit Head Don Schillinger, Dean: Terri McConathy, Provost
Name of Unit/Program: Master of Arts in Teaching Middle School Education Grades 4-8
Mission:
Based on Analysis of the 2017-2018 data, what is being implemented during the 2018-2019 cycle to improve results: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. During the 2017-2018 cycle, we evaluated the results of Framework for Teaching assessments across all teacher education programs. We found that the assessment results were skewed positive and we did not find the range of variability that we know existed through other measures such as Value-Added Modeling. Because of this, we established training procedures for evaluators which included a requirement for all evaluators to demonstrate inter-rater reliability. Additionally, new lesson planning templates, rubrics, and planning protocols were developed. Professors were trained to use the instrument and have introduced the new planning strategies to students.2. For Outcome 1, we will work with candidates who are completing clinical residencies to assure that they fully understand the linkages between their planning and preparation to teach, the LA Tech Lesson Plan Template and Domain 1 (Planning and Preparation) of the Framework for Teaching.
Expected Outcomes: (based upon and linked to overall Mission of Program or Unit) To be completed by October 15, 2018. <u>Programmatic Outcomes</u> We expect to see growth within Domain 1 (mean score of 1a through 1f) between the first and final Framework for Teaching evaluations during the clinical residency. Because we are using trained evaluators who have demonstrated interrater reliability and new protocols for evaluating performance on the FFT, we can not specify an expected level of growth between evaluations. We expect that students will demonstrate mean performance of equal to or greater than 2.5 out of 4 on their final Domain 1 evaluation. We will analyze assessment results this year and be able to quantify more precisely expected levels of growth for 2-19--2020 <u>General Education Course Assessment</u> N/A
Means of Measurement: (Make sure this is measurable and link each measurement to each expected outcome.)

Programmatic Means of Measurement: The difference between the first FFT evaluation and the final FFT evaluation will be calculated for Domain 1. The mean, standard deviation and range of differences will be calculated. Additionally, the mean, standard deviation, and range of Domain 1 scores for the final FFT evaluation will be calculated across the program.

General Education Course Means of Measurement N/A

Measurements of Results: (disaggregate data based on mode of delivery and/or location (e.g., Ruston Campus vs. Academic Success Center; Ruston Campus vs. distance education; Barksdale vs. online vs. Ruston Campus; etc.)

To be completed by October 15, 2019.

Programmatic Results

	PRE	POST	DIFF	BNCH	DIFF
Mean	2.79	3.28	+0.49	2.5	+0.78
St. Dev.	0.57	0.64	+0.07		
Range	2	2	0		

General Education Course Results



2018-2019 INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AUDIT

Major Organizational Unit Head Don Schillinger, Dean: Terri McConathy, Provost
Name of Unit/Program: Master of Arts in Teaching Secondary Education
<p>Mission:</p> <p>The College of Education's mission statement has also recently been revised to better express how it is intended that the shared vision is to be attained in reality. The mission of the College of Education is to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Provide high quality educational programs and experiences;2. Enhance and extend the knowledge bases of developing professionals through research and other scholarly activities;3. Extend the boundaries of knowledge through vigorous research and dissemination;4. Collaborate within the university and with the broader community; and5. Provide professional services to the community.
<p>Based on Analysis of the 2017-2018 data, what is being implemented during the 2018-2019 cycle to improve results:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. During the 2017-2018 cycle, we evaluated the results of Framework for Teaching assessments across all teacher education programs. We found that the assessment results were skewed positive and we did not find the range of variability that we know existed through other measures such as Value-Added Modeling. Because of this, we established training procedures for evaluators which included a requirement for all evaluators to demonstrate inter-rater reliability. Additionally, new lesson planning templates, rubrics, and planning protocols were developed. Professors were trained to use the instrument and have introduced the new planning strategies to students.2. For Outcome 1, we will work with candidates who are completing clinical residencies to assure that they fully understand the linkages between their planning and preparation to teach, the LA Tech Lesson Plan Template and Domain 1 (Planning and Preparation) of the Framework for Teaching.
<p>Expected Outcomes: (based upon and linked to overall Mission of Program or Unit)</p> <p><u>Programmatic Outcomes</u> We expect to see growth within Domain 1 (mean score of 1a through 1f) between the first and final Framework for Teaching evaluations during the clinical residency. Because we are using trained evaluators who have demonstrated interrater reliability and new protocols for evaluating performance on the FFT we can not specify an expected level of growth between evaluations. We expect that students will demonstrate mean performance of equal to or</p>

greater than 2.5 out of 4 on their final Domain 1 evaluation. We will analyze assessment results this year and be able to quantify more precisely expected levels of growth for 2-19--2020

General Education Course Assessment N/A

Means of Measurement: (Make sure this is measurable and link each measurement to each expected outcome.)

Programmatic Means of Measurement: The difference between the first FFT evaluation and the final FFT evaluation will be calculated for Domain 1. The mean, standard deviation and range of differences will be calculated. Additionally, the mean, standard deviation, and range of Domain 1 scores for the final FFT evaluation will be calculated across the program.

General Education Course Means of Measurement N/A

Measurements of Results: (disaggregate data based on mode of delivery and/or location (e.g., Ruston Campus vs. Academic Success Center; Ruston Campus vs. distance education; Barksdale vs. online vs. Ruston Campus; etc.)

To be completed by October 15, 2019.

Programmatic Results

	PRE	POST	DIFF	BNCH	DIFF
Mean	2.79	3.28	+0.49	2.5	+0.78
St. Dev.	0.57	0.64	+0.07		
Range	2	2	0		

General Education Course Results

Use of Results (Describe what changes were made during this cycle. State clearly what improvements have taken place during this cycle-What was actually done to improve the outcomes? Did this work? Discuss strengths and weaknesses. You can compare previous year to current year to identify improvement).

To be completed by October 15, 2019.

Programmatic Use of Results

Results exceeded the expected 2.5/4 benchmark by 0.78. Efforts during 2018-2019 to train evaluators and conduct regular evaluation calibrations resulted in greater consistency among evaluators, thus improving the validity of results and consistency of feedback provided to students on their

performance. In 2017-2018, the evaluator training was being phased-in across all sites where students are placed for clinical residency experiences. The evaluation results from that year were not completely accurate representations of candidate performance because the evaluations were conducted by a blend of trained and yet-to-be trained evaluators. By the 2018-2019 year, all evaluators had completed the same training and were better equipped to provide comparable evaluations across all programs.

General Education Use of Results



2018-2019 INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AUDIT

Major Organizational Unit Head Don Schillinger, Dean: Terri McConathy, Provost
Name of Unit/Program: Master of Arts in Teaching SPED Visually Impaired
<p>Mission:</p> <p>The College of Education's mission statement has also recently been revised to better express how it is intended that the shared vision is to be attained in reality.</p> <p>The mission of the College of Education is to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Provide high quality educational programs and experiences;2. Enhance and extend the knowledge bases of developing professionals through research and other scholarly activities;3. Extend the boundaries of knowledge through vigorous research and dissemination;4. Collaborate within the university and with the broader community; and5. Provide professional services to the community.
<p>Based on Analysis of the 2017-2018 data, what is being implemented during the 2018-2019 cycle to improve results:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. During the 2017-2018 cycle, we evaluated the results of Framework for Teaching assessments across all teacher education programs. We found that the assessment results were skewed positive and we did not find the range of variability that we know existed through other measures such as Value-Added Modeling. Because of this, we established training procedures for evaluators which included a requirement for all evaluators to demonstrate inter-rater reliability. Additionally, new lesson planning templates, rubrics, and planning protocols were developed. Professors were trained to use the instrument and have introduced the new planning strategies to students.2. For Outcome 1, we will work with candidates who are completing clinical residencies to assure that they fully understand the linkages between their planning and preparation to teach, the LA Tech Lesson Plan Template and Domain 1 (Planning and Preparation) of the Framework for Teaching.
<p>Expected Outcomes: (based upon and linked to overall Mission of Program or Unit)</p> <p><u>Programmatic Outcomes</u> We expect to see growth within Domain 1 (mean score of 1a through 1f) between the first and final Framework for Teaching evaluations during the clinical residency. Because we are using trained evaluators who have demonstrated interrater reliability and new protocols for evaluating performance on the FFT we can not specify an expected level of growth</p>

between evaluations. We expect that students will demonstrate mean performance of equal to or greater than 2.5 out of 4 on their final Domain 1 evaluation. We will analyze assessment results this year and be able to quantify more precisely expected levels of growth for 2-19--2020

General Education Course Assessment N/A

Means of Measurement: (Make sure this is measureable and link each measurement to each expected outcome.)

Programmatic Means of Measurement: The difference between the first FFT evaluation and the final FFT evaluation will be calculated for Domain 1. The mean, standard deviation and range of differences will be calculated. Additionally, the mean, standard deviation, and range of Domain 1 scores for the final FFT evaluation will be calculated across the program.

General Education Course Means of Measurement N/A

Measurements of Results: (disaggregate data based on mode of delivery and/or location (e.g., Ruston Campus vs. Academic Success Center; Ruston Campus vs. distance education; Barksdale vs. online vs. Ruston Campus; etc.)

To be completed by October 15, 2019.

Programmatic Results

	PRE	POST	DIFF	BNCH	DIFF
Mean	2.79	3.28	+0.49	2.5	+0.78
St. Dev.	0.57	0.64	+0.07		
Range	2	2	0		

General Education Course Results

Use of Results (Describe what changes were made during this cycle. State clearly what improvements have taken place during this cycle-What was actually done to improve the outcomes? Did this work? Discuss strengths and weaknesses. You can compare previous year to current year to identify improvement).

To be completed by October 15, 2019.

Programmatic Use of Results

Results exceeded the expected 2.5/4 benchmark by 0.78. Efforts during 2018-2019 to train evaluators and conduct regular evaluation calibrations resulted in greater consistency among evaluators, thus

improving the validity of results and consistency of feedback provided to students on their performance. In 2017-2018, the evaluator training was being phased-in across all sites where students are placed for clinical residency experiences. The evaluation results from that year were not completely accurate representations of candidate performance because the evaluations were conducted by a blend of trained and yet-to-be trained evaluators. By the 2018-2019 year, all evaluators had completed the same training and were better equipped to provide comparable evaluations across all programs.

General Education Use of Results



2018-2019 INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AUDIT

Major Organizational Unit Head Don Schillinger, Dean: Terri McConathy, Provost
Name of Unit/Program: Master of Education, Educational Leadership
Mission: The College of Education's mission statement has also recently been revised to better express how it is intended that the shared vision is to be attained in reality. The mission of the College of Education is to: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Provide high quality educational programs and experiences;2. Enhance and extend the knowledge bases of developing professionals through research and other scholarly activities;3. Extend the boundaries of knowledge through vigorous research and dissemination;4. Collaborate within the university and with the broader community ; and5. Provide professional services to the community.
Based on Analysis of the 2017-2018 data, what is being implemented during the 2018-2019 cycle to improve results: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. During the 2017-2018 cycle, we evaluated the results of the internship portfolio. The existing rubric resulted was primarily based on counting of artifacts and required activities. We found that because of the nature of the rubric, student performance measured through the portfolio did not accurately reflect the actual performance of students as identified through observation. Subsequently, the Educational Leadership Faculty developed a new rubric which both counts and evaluates the quality of artifacts and activities which are documented through the portfolio process.2. For Outcome 1, we will work with candidates who are completing an educational leadership internship to assure they have deep knowledge of the revised rubric and how the rubric is designed to inform the quality of their activities and the quality of the artifacts within their portfolios.
Expected Outcomes: (based upon and linked to overall Mission of Program or Unit) <u>Programmatic Outcomes</u> We expect a minimum of 80% of candidates to successfully score a mean of 80% or above across all required internship activities. <u>General Education Course Assessment</u> N/A
Means of Measurement: (Make sure this is measureable and link each measurement to each expected outcome.)

Programmatic Means of Measurement: Candidate performance is measured by evaluating a portfolio using a rubric. Portfolios are evaluated by professors who teach in the educational leadership program.

General Education Course Means of Measurement N/A

Measurements of Results: (disaggregate data based on mode of delivery and/or location (e.g., Ruston Campus vs. Academic Success Center; Ruston Campus vs. distance education; Barksdale vs. online vs. Ruston Campus; etc.)

To be completed by October 15, 2019.

Programmatic Results

Number of students enrolled in EDLE 564 in spring 2019	51
Number of required activities per student per the rubric for the internship portfolio	44
Total number of activities completed by all students	2,244
Percentage of students who scored 80% or above across all required internship activities	100
Percentage of students who scored 90% or above across all required internship activities	98
Percentage of total activities that earned a score of 80% or above	96

General Education Course Results

Use of Results (Describe what changes were made during this cycle. State clearly what improvements have taken place during this cycle-What was actually done to improve the outcomes? Did this work? Discuss strengths and weaknesses. You can compare previous year to current year to identify improvement).

To be completed by October 15, 2019.

Programmatic Use of Results

Results exceeded the expected outcome by 20%. Louisiana Tech's educational leadership professors held training sessions where the rubric and examples of acceptable artifacts were discussed and shared. The data supports that efforts during the 2018-2019 to educate educational leadership candidates on the revised rubric were successful. The students gained the knowledge needed to complete activities and submit artifacts that increased their overall score on the rubric that affected their final grade for the year-long internship course. Eighty-four activities completed by the interns did not earn a score of 80% or higher. In order to raise this percentage, plans are in place to continue to meet with the candidates

prior to and during the year of their internship to ensure quality activities are being completed and appropriate artifacts are being submitted as documentation of their internship.

General Education Use of Results



2018-2019 INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AUDIT

Major Organizational Unit Head Don Schillinger, Dean: Terri McConathy, Provost
Name of Unit/Program: Doctor of Education Educational Leadership
Mission: <p>The College of Education's mission statement has also recently been revised to better express how it is intended that the shared vision is to be attained in reality. The mission of the College of Education is to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Provide high quality educational programs and experiences;2. Enhance and extend the knowledge bases of developing professionals through research and other scholarly activities;3. Extend the boundaries of knowledge through vigorous research and dissemination;4. Collaborate within the university and with the broader community ; and5. Provide professional services to the community.
Based on Analysis of the 2017-2018 data, what is being implemented during the 2018-2019 cycle to improve results: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. During the 2017-2018 cycle, we evaluated the results of the dissertation proposal presentations in EDLE 778. We found that a fewer than 80% of candidates failed to meet expectations for this assignment.2. For Outcome 1, we will work with candidates across their doctoral program to assure greater continuity between course and more consistent progress toward developing their dissertation proposals.
Expected Outcomes: (based upon and linked to overall Mission of Program or Unit) <p><u>Programmatic Outcomes</u> We expect a minimum of 80% of candidates to successfully score a mean of 80% or above across all rubric elements which evaluate their performance on the dissertation proposal.</p> <p><u>General Education Course Assessment</u> N/A</p>
Means of Measurement: (Make sure this is measureable and link each measurement to each expected outcome.) <p><u>Programmatic Means of Measurement:</u> Candidate performance is measured by evaluating a using a rubric. Three evaluators evaluate the proposals, and a mean score is calculated across the three evaluations.</p>

General Education Course Means of Measurement N/A

Measurements of Results: (disaggregate data based on mode of delivery and/or location (e.g., Ruston Campus vs. Academic Success Center; Ruston Campus vs. distance education; Barksdale vs. online vs. Ruston Campus; etc.)

To be completed by October 15, 2019.

Programmatic Results

Year	Students Enrolled	Attempted Proposal Approval	Achieved Proposal Approval	Benchmark	Percentage Greater than 80% Benchmark
2016-17	13	100	46%	Not Yet Established	(-34%)
2017-18	14	100	87%	80%	7%
2018-19	11	100	82%	80%	2%

General Education Course Results

Use of Results (Describe what changes were made during this cycle. State clearly what improvements have taken place during this cycle-What was actually done to improve the outcomes? Did this work? Discuss strengths and weaknesses. You can compare previous year to current year to identify improvement).

To be completed by October 15, 2019.

Programmatic Use of Results

Results exceeded the expected 80% benchmark by 7% in 2017-18 and by 2% in 2018-19. Instructors changed instructional methodology to include the use of each candidate's dissertation committee, and committee members were trained to know the process of using EDLE 778 as a proposal-approval format. Prior to this change, candidates were instructed in EDLE 778 separately from their mentoring by committee members. The objective of the change was a candidate who better understood the expectations of his or her committee members, and committee members who better understood the function of EDLE 778 as a threshold to be crossed in order for candidates to retain in the Doctor of Education Program.

General Education Use of Results



2018-2019 INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AUDIT

Major Organizational Unit Head Don Schillinger, Dean: Terri McConathy, Provost
Name of Unit/Program: Master of Arts in Teaching Middle School Education Grades 4-8
Mission:
Based on Analysis of the 2017-2018 data, what is being implemented during the 2018-2019 cycle to improve results: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. During the 2017-2018 cycle, we evaluated the results of Framework for Teaching assessments across all teacher education programs. We found that the assessment results were skewed positive and we did not find the range of variability that we know existed through other measures such as Value-Added Modeling. Because of this, we established training procedures for evaluators which included a requirement for all evaluators to demonstrate inter-rater reliability. Additionally, new lesson planning templates, rubrics, and planning protocols were developed. Professors were trained to use the instrument and have introduced the new planning strategies to students.2. For Outcome 1, we will work with candidates who are completing clinical residencies to assure that they fully understand the linkages between their planning and preparation to teach, the LA Tech Lesson Plan Template and Domain 1 (Planning and Preparation) of the Framework for Teaching.
Expected Outcomes: (based upon and linked to overall Mission of Program or Unit) To be completed by October 15, 2018. <u>Programmatic Outcomes</u> We expect to see growth within Domain 1 (mean score of 1a through 1f) between the first and final Framework for Teaching evaluations during the clinical residency. Because we are using trained evaluators who have demonstrated interrater reliability and new protocols for evaluating performance on the FFT, we can not specify an expected level of growth between evaluations. We expect that students will demonstrate mean performance of equal to or greater than 2.5 out of 4 on their final Domain 1 evaluation. We will analyze assessment results this year and be able to quantify more precisely expected levels of growth for 2-19--2020 <u>General Education Course Assessment</u> N/A
Means of Measurement: (Make sure this is measurable and link each measurement to each expected outcome.)

Programmatic Means of Measurement: The difference between the first FFT evaluation and the final FFT evaluation will be calculated for Domain 1. The mean, standard deviation and range of differences will be calculated. Additionally, the mean, standard deviation, and range of Domain 1 scores for the final FFT evaluation will be calculated across the program.

General Education Course Means of Measurement N/A

Measurements of Results: (disaggregate data based on mode of delivery and/or location (e.g., Ruston Campus vs. Academic Success Center; Ruston Campus vs. distance education; Barksdale vs. online vs. Ruston Campus; etc.)

To be completed by October 15, 2019.

Programmatic Results

	PRE	POST	DIFF	BNCH	DIFF
Mean	2.79	3.28	+0.49	2.5	+0.78
St. Dev.	0.57	0.64	+0.07		
Range	2	2	0		

General Education Course Results