



**2019-2020 INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AUDIT**

**ALL sections are required.**

<b>Major Organizational Unit Head: Don Schillinger, Dean; Terry McConathy, Provost</b>
<b>Name of Unit/Program: MAT, Early Childhood Education, Grades PK-3</b>
<b>Mission:</b> To provide high-quality educational experiences for students across the lifespan, to enhance and extend knowledge bases through research and other scholarly activities, and to serve the community through collaborative endeavors.
<b>DUE OCTOBER 15, 2019. Based on analysis of the 2018-2019 data, what is being implemented during the 2019-2020 cycle to improve results:</b>  The program’s quality assurance system is being revamped during the 2019-2020 academic year. Plans submitted for 2018-2019 reflected only a single assessment for all initial teacher preparation programs. While that single assessment is valuable to the program, no single measure can provide adequate evidence to determine overall program quality and yield valid, actionable data.  Data from that single measure that were reported reflected that 100% of candidates met the benchmark performance expectation; therefore, actionability of the data were questioned. Expected outcomes identified below have been strengthened and structured. Five departmental constructs were identified (noted parenthetically below), and these constructs are common across all initial teacher preparation degree programs. They are aligned to both accreditation evidence requirements and best practices in teacher preparation accordingly to current literature.
<b>DUE OCTOBER 15, 2019. Expected Outcomes: (based upon and linked to overall Mission of Program or Unit)</b>  <u>Programmatic Outcomes</u> <b>SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge)</b> Candidates will demonstrate content knowledge mastery in the areas of literacy, math, science, and social studies.  <b>SLO 2 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice)</b> Candidates will demonstrate proficiency in the professional skills of planning and preparation, organizing and maintaining a classroom environment, instruction, and professionalism.  <b>SLO 3 (professional behaviors and characteristics)</b> Candidates will model behaviors and characteristics of professional educators.  <b>SLO 4 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences)</b> Candidates will create engaging learning activities that embed college- and career-readiness skills, digital learning experiences, and current best practices in teaching.

**SLO 5 (data-driven decisions)**

Candidates will make instructional decisions by collecting, analyzing, and acting upon student performance data.

General Education Course Assessment

N/A

**DUE OCTOBER 15, 2019. Means of Measurement: (Make sure this is measureable and link each measurement to each expected outcome.)**

Programmatic Means of Measurement

**SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge)**

Assessment: Praxis Subject Assessments: Reading Language Arts (5002), Mathematics (5003), Social Studies (5004), Science (5005)

Method: Nationally-normed test

Benchmark: 80% of candidates earn passing scores (157 on 5002, 157 on 5003, 155 on 5004, 159 on 5005) on first attempt

**SLO 2 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice)**

Assessment: Danielson Framework for Teaching Evaluations

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 100% of candidates will earn a mean rating of 3.0 on all indicators

**SLO 3 (professional behaviors and characteristics)**

Assessment: Teacher Beliefs and Mindset Survey

Method: Survey

Benchmark: 100% of candidates will have a mean rating of 3.0 on all items

**SLO 4 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences)**

Assessment: Lesson Plan

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 80% of candidates earn passing score of at least 80%

**SLO 5 (data-driven decisions)**

Assessment: Student Learning Target Assessment

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 80% of candidates earn passing score of at least 80%

General Education Course Means of Measurement

N/A

**DUE OCTOBER 15, 2020. 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, 2020.

## Programmatic Results

The most notable changes during this cycle were changes to our quality assurance system overall. Utility of the quality assurance system prior to 2019-2020 was limited, and this became evident when the 2019-2020 plans were drafted. To that end, the following timeline of completed events summarizes the work completed in 2019-2020 for all programs to improve the quality assurance system's overall utility.

- Fall 2019
  - Reviewed current process and examined areas for growth in how the process has been implemented.
  - Identified data needs by program.
  - Completed 2018-2019 reports based on outcomes and measures identified during the 2017-2018 academic year.
- Winter 2020
  - Identified common programmatic outcome areas for all programs. Those are:
    - Discipline-specific content knowledge
    - Discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice
    - Professional behaviors and characteristics
    - Creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences
    - Data-driven decisions
- Spring 2020
  - Identify student learning outcomes for each programmatic outcome area.
  - Identify measures to yield data per outcome.
  - Complete 2019-2020 plans based on the new outcomes with data currently available.
    - Given that 2019-2020 is a transition year between the former and new processes, data collection as evidence for some new outcomes might not yet be underway but would commence fall 2020.
- Fall 2020
  - Complete 2019-2020 reports based on new plans constructed spring 2020.
  - Identify plan for 2020-2021 based on 2019-2020 results.
    - Plans address areas of concern in 2019-2020 results and action steps to address each area of concern.

In all, data comparisons of 2019-2020 to 2018-2019 would not be valid as the entire process and suite of measures now used are different. Efforts in 2019-2020 were focused on retooling all accountability practices and not on analyzing program-level data given the fragmented quality assurance system we had. Now that our overall system is much more sound and includes measures that will yield actionable results, the 2020-2021 data captures will provide us with a second comparison point for most measures. COVID-19 school closures and a misinterpretation of available data on another measure will limit our capacity to compare both years of data; however, we do not anticipate a repetition of those circumstances in 2020-2021.

**SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge)**

Assessment: Praxis Subject Assessments: Reading Language Arts (5002), Mathematics (5003), Social Studies (5004), Science (5005)

Method: Nationally-normed test

Benchmark: 80% of candidates earn passing scores (157 on 5002, 157 on 5003, 155 on 5004, 159 on 5005) on first attempt

Measure	Total N	Benchmark Met N	Institutional Pass Rate	National Pass Rate
Reading Language Arts (5002)	17	17	100.00	75.26
Mathematics (5003)	17	17	100.00	74.93
Social Studies (5004)	17	17	100.00	70.71
Science (5005)	17	17	100.00	72.94

**SLO 2 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice)**

Assessment: Danielson Framework for Teaching Evaluations

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 100% of candidates will earn a mean rating of 3.0 on all indicators

Measure	Total N	Benchmark Met N	Pass Rate
Danielson Framework for Teaching	17	2	11.76

**SLO 3 (professional behaviors and characteristics)**

Assessment: Teacher Beliefs and Mindset Survey

Method: Survey

Benchmark: 100% of candidates will have a mean rating of 3.0 on all items

Data are not available for the benchmark as written. This measure is a proprietary tool, and administration of the tool is controlled by Deans for Impact, the entity that owns the tool. To ensure respondent confidentiality, results are not accessible by respondent. Thus, a calculation by candidate is not possible. This limitation was unknown when we added this tool to our quality assurance system in 2019-2020. The tool will remain a measure in our system; however, the benchmark will be adjusted for 2020-2021 to ensure results are available in the form needed to report data for the benchmark.

**SLO 4 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences)**

Assessment: Lesson Plan

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 80% of candidates earn passing score of at least 80%

COVID-19 school closures prevented these data from being collected.

**SLO 5 (data-driven decisions)**

Assessment: Student Learning Target Assessment

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 80% of candidates earn passing score of at least 80%

COVID-19 school closures prevented these data from being collected.

General Education Course Results

N/A

**DUE OCTOBER 15, 2020. 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, 2020.

Programmatic Use of Results**SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge)**

Benchmark status: Cannot determine whether benchmark was met

Candidates complete the Praxis Subject Assessments at points during their academic programs prior to the senior year. This results in candidates taking the exams during sophomore and junior years and in some cases prior to completing general education courses that serve as preparation for the exams. Given this, the 80% benchmark was overly ambitious. Upon reflection, we recognize that a benchmark not exceeding 60% is more reasonable when considering the percentage of students who complete all or at least most general education courses prior to attempting the first exam. Moreover, comparing the 80% benchmark to the national pass rates certainly reflects how overly ambitious that benchmark is. A decision to adjust the benchmark to 55% for 2020-2021 was made.

**SLO 2 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice)**

Benchmark status: Not met

Candidates typically perform well overall during their residency/student teaching experiences. Three candidates in this cohort, and one in particular, struggled to succeed. On a 4-point scale, two of the candidates did not earn ratings above 3, and one candidate did not earn ratings about 2. These results led to interventions with each candidate and also impacted the cohort's performance negatively. We believe this is an anomaly and decided against making sweeping assessment changes on a single snapshot of data given the circumstances of these individual students. Should multiple years of data yield trends in the data, however, we will revisit the measure, the measure's use, and how evaluators and candidates are prepared for the implementation.

**SLO 3 (professional behaviors and characteristics)**

Benchmark status: Cannot determine whether benchmark was met

Data from this proprietary assessment are not available for disaggregation by candidate, which is how the expected outcome was framed. For 2020-2021, the outcome will be adjusted to reflect a benchmark in terms of how data are available. This was the first year this proprietary tool was used in the quality assurance system, and details provided did not identify data reporting limitations.

**SLO 4 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences)**

**SLO 5 (data-driven decisions)**

Benchmark status: Cannot be determined due to impact of COVID-19 on data collection

General Education Use of Results

N/A



**2019-2020 INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AUDIT**

**ALL sections are required.**

<b>Major Organizational Unit Head: Don Schillinger, Dean; Terry McConathy, Provost</b>
<b>Name of Unit/Program: MAT, Early Childhood Education, Grades PK-3</b>
<b>Mission:</b> To provide high-quality educational experiences for students across the lifespan, to enhance and extend knowledge bases through research and other scholarly activities, and to serve the community through collaborative endeavors.
<b>DUE OCTOBER 15, 2019. Based on analysis of the 2018-2019 data, what is being implemented during the 2019-2020 cycle to improve results:</b>  The program’s quality assurance system is being revamped during the 2019-2020 academic year. Plans submitted for 2018-2019 reflected only a single assessment for all initial teacher preparation programs. While that single assessment is valuable to the program, no single measure can provide adequate evidence to determine overall program quality and yield valid, actionable data.  Data from that single measure that were reported reflected that 100% of candidates met the benchmark performance expectation; therefore, actionability of the data were questioned. Expected outcomes identified below have been strengthened and structured. Five departmental constructs were identified (noted parenthetically below), and these constructs are common across all initial teacher preparation degree programs. They are aligned to both accreditation evidence requirements and best practices in teacher preparation accordingly to current literature.
<b>DUE OCTOBER 15, 2019. Expected Outcomes: (based upon and linked to overall Mission of Program or Unit)</b>  <u>Programmatic Outcomes</u> <b>SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge)</b> Candidates will demonstrate content knowledge mastery in the areas of literacy, math, science, and social studies.  <b>SLO 2 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice)</b> Candidates will demonstrate proficiency in the professional skills of planning and preparation, organizing and maintaining a classroom environment, instruction, and professionalism.  <b>SLO 3 (professional behaviors and characteristics)</b> Candidates will model behaviors and characteristics of professional educators.  <b>SLO 4 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences)</b> Candidates will create engaging learning activities that embed college- and career-readiness skills, digital learning experiences, and current best practices in teaching.

**SLO 5 (data-driven decisions)**

Candidates will make instructional decisions by collecting, analyzing, and acting upon student performance data.

General Education Course Assessment

N/A

**DUE OCTOBER 15, 2019. Means of Measurement: (Make sure this is measureable and link each measurement to each expected outcome.)**

Programmatic Means of Measurement

**SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge)**

Assessment: Praxis Subject Assessments: Reading Language Arts (5002), Mathematics (5003), Social Studies (5004), Science (5005)

Method: Nationally-normed test

Benchmark: 80% of candidates earn passing scores (157 on 5002, 157 on 5003, 155 on 5004, 159 on 5005) on first attempt

**SLO 2 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice)**

Assessment: Danielson Framework for Teaching Evaluations

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 100% of candidates will earn a mean rating of 3.0 on all indicators

**SLO 3 (professional behaviors and characteristics)**

Assessment: Teacher Beliefs and Mindset Survey

Method: Survey

Benchmark: 100% of candidates will have a mean rating of 3.0 on all items

**SLO 4 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences)**

Assessment: Lesson Plan

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 80% of candidates earn passing score of at least 80%

**SLO 5 (data-driven decisions)**

Assessment: Student Learning Target Assessment

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 80% of candidates earn passing score of at least 80%

General Education Course Means of Measurement

N/A

**DUE OCTOBER 15, 2020. 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, 2020.

## Programmatic Results

The most notable changes during this cycle were changes to our quality assurance system overall. Utility of the quality assurance system prior to 2019-2020 was limited, and this became evident when the 2019-2020 plans were drafted. To that end, the following timeline of completed events summarizes the work completed in 2019-2020 for all programs to improve the quality assurance system's overall utility.

- Fall 2019
  - Reviewed current process and examined areas for growth in how the process has been implemented.
  - Identified data needs by program.
  - Completed 2018-2019 reports based on outcomes and measures identified during the 2017-2018 academic year.
- Winter 2020
  - Identified common programmatic outcome areas for all programs. Those are:
    - Discipline-specific content knowledge
    - Discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice
    - Professional behaviors and characteristics
    - Creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences
    - Data-driven decisions
- Spring 2020
  - Identify student learning outcomes for each programmatic outcome area.
  - Identify measures to yield data per outcome.
  - Complete 2019-2020 plans based on the new outcomes with data currently available.
    - Given that 2019-2020 is a transition year between the former and new processes, data collection as evidence for some new outcomes might not yet be underway but would commence fall 2020.
- Fall 2020
  - Complete 2019-2020 reports based on new plans constructed spring 2020.
  - Identify plan for 2020-2021 based on 2019-2020 results.
    - Plans address areas of concern in 2019-2020 results and action steps to address each area of concern.

In all, data comparisons of 2019-2020 to 2018-2019 would not be valid as the entire process and suite of measures now used are different. Efforts in 2019-2020 were focused on retooling all accountability practices and not on analyzing program-level data given the fragmented quality assurance system we had. Now that our overall system is much more sound and includes measures that will yield actionable results, the 2020-2021 data captures will provide us with a second comparison point for most measures. COVID-19 school closures and a misinterpretation of available data on another measure will limit our capacity to compare both years of data; however, we do not anticipate a repetition of those circumstances in 2020-2021.

**SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge)**

Assessment: Praxis Subject Assessments: Reading Language Arts (5002), Mathematics (5003), Social Studies (5004), Science (5005)

Method: Nationally-normed test

Benchmark: 80% of candidates earn passing scores (157 on 5002, 157 on 5003, 155 on 5004, 159 on 5005) on first attempt

Measure	Total N	Benchmark Met N	Institutional Pass Rate	National Pass Rate
Reading Language Arts (5002)	13	13	100.00	75.26
Mathematics (5003)	13	13	100.00	74.93
Social Studies (5004)	13	13	100.00	70.71
Science (5005)	13	13	100.00	72.94

**SLO 2 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice)**

Assessment: Danielson Framework for Teaching Evaluations

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 100% of candidates will earn a mean rating of 3.0 on all indicators

Measure	Total N	Benchmark Met N	Pass Rate
Danielson Framework for Teaching	13	2	15.38

**SLO 3 (professional behaviors and characteristics)**

Assessment: Teacher Beliefs and Mindset Survey

Method: Survey

Benchmark: 100% of candidates will have a mean rating of 3.0 on all items

Data are not available for the benchmark as written. This measure is a proprietary tool, and administration of the tool is controlled by Deans for Impact, the entity that owns the tool. To ensure respondent confidentiality, results are not accessible by respondent. Thus, a calculation by candidate is not possible. This limitation was unknown when we added this tool to our quality assurance system in 2019-2020. The tool will remain a measure in our system; however, the benchmark will be adjusted for 2020-2021 to ensure results are available in the form needed to report data for the benchmark.

**SLO 4 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences)**

Assessment: Lesson Plan

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 80% of candidates earn passing score of at least 80%

COVID-19 school closures prevented these data from being collected.

**SLO 5 (data-driven decisions)**

Assessment: Student Learning Target Assessment

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 80% of candidates earn passing score of at least 80%

COVID-19 school closures prevented these data from being collected.

General Education Course Results

N/A

**DUE OCTOBER 15, 2020. 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, 2020.

Programmatic Use of Results**SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge)**

Benchmark status: Cannot determine whether benchmark was met

Candidates complete the Praxis Subject Assessments at points during their academic programs prior to the senior year. This results in candidates taking the exams during sophomore and junior years and in some cases prior to completing general education courses that serve as preparation for the exams. Given this, the 80% benchmark was overly ambitious. Upon reflection, we recognize that a benchmark not exceeding 60% is more reasonable when considering the percentage of students who complete all or at least most general education courses prior to attempting the first exam. Moreover, comparing the 80% benchmark to the national pass rates certainly reflects how overly ambitious that benchmark is. A decision to adjust the benchmark to 55% for 2020-2021 was made.

**SLO 2 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice)**

Benchmark status: Not met

Candidates typically perform well overall during their residency/student teaching experiences. Three candidates in this cohort, and one in particular, struggled to succeed. On a 4-point scale, two of the candidates did not earn ratings above 3, and one candidate did not earn ratings about 2. These results led to interventions with each candidate and also impacted the cohort's performance negatively. We believe this is an anomaly and decided against making sweeping assessment changes on a single snapshot of data given the circumstances of these individual students. Should multiple years of data yield trends in the data, however, we will revisit the measure, the measure's use, and how evaluators and candidates are prepared for the implementation.

**SLO 3 (professional behaviors and characteristics)**

Benchmark status: Cannot determine whether benchmark was met

Data from this proprietary assessment are not available for disaggregation by candidate, which is how the expected outcome was framed. For 2020-2021, the outcome will be adjusted to reflect a benchmark in terms of how data are available. This was the first year this proprietary tool was used in the quality assurance system, and details provided did not identify data reporting limitations.

**SLO 4 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences)**

**SLO 5 (data-driven decisions)**

Benchmark status: Cannot be determined due to impact of COVID-19 on data collection

General Education Use of Results

N/A



**2019-2020 INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AUDIT**

**ALL sections are required.**

<b>Major Organizational Unit Head: Don Schillinger, Dean; Terry McConathy, Provost</b>
<b>Name of Unit/Program: BS, Secondary Education and Teaching, Grades 6-12</b>
<b>Mission:</b> To provide high-quality educational experiences for students across the lifespan, to enhance and extend knowledge bases through research and other scholarly activities, and to serve the community through collaborative endeavors.
<b>DUE OCTOBER 15, 2019. Based on analysis of the 2018-2019 data, what is being implemented during the 2019-2020 cycle to improve results:</b>  The program’s quality assurance system is being revamped during the 2019-2020 academic year. Plans submitted for 2018-2019 reflected only a single assessment for all initial teacher preparation programs. While that single assessment is valuable to the program, no single measure can provide adequate evidence to determine overall program quality and yield valid, actionable data.  Data from that single measure that were reported reflected that 100% of candidates met the benchmark performance expectation; therefore, actionability of the data were questioned. Expected outcomes identified below have been strengthened and structured. Five departmental constructs were identified (noted parenthetically below), and these constructs are common across all initial teacher preparation degree programs. They are aligned to both accreditation evidence requirements and best practices in teacher preparation accordingly to current literature.
<b>DUE OCTOBER 15, 2019. Expected Outcomes: (based upon and linked to overall Mission of Program or Unit)</b>  <u>Programmatic Outcomes</u> <b>SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge)</b> Candidates will demonstrate content knowledge mastery in their certification areas.  <b>SLO 2 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice)</b> Candidates will demonstrate proficiency in the professional skills of planning and preparation, organizing and maintaining a classroom environment, instruction, and professionalism.  <b>SLO 3 (professional behaviors and characteristics)</b> Candidates will model behaviors and characteristics of professional educators.  <b>SLO 4 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences)</b> Candidates will create engaging learning activities that embed college- and career-readiness skills, digital learning experiences, and current best practices in teaching.

**SLO 5 (data-driven decisions)**

Candidates will make instructional decisions by collecting, analyzing, and acting upon student performance data.

General Education Course Assessment

N/A

**DUE OCTOBER 15, 2019. Means of Measurement: (Make sure this is measureable and link each measurement to each expected outcome.)**

Programmatic Means of Measurement

**SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge)**

Assessment: Praxis Subject Assessments: Agriculture (5701), Business (5101), English (5039), Social Studies (5086)

Method: Nationally-normed test

Benchmark: 80% of candidates earn passing scores (147 on 5701, 154 on 5101, 168 on 5039, 153 on 5086) on first attempt

**SLO 2 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice)**

Assessment: Danielson Framework for Teaching Evaluations

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 100% of candidates will earn a mean rating of 3.0 on all indicators

**SLO 3 (professional behaviors and characteristics)**

Assessment: Teacher Beliefs and Mindset Survey

Method: Survey

Benchmark: 100% of candidates will have a mean rating of 3.0 on all items

**SLO 4 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences)**

Assessment: Lesson Plan

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 80% of candidates earn passing score of at least 80%

**SLO 5 (data-driven decisions)**

Assessment: Student Learning Target Assessment

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 80% of candidates earn passing score of at least 80%

General Education Course Means of Measurement

N/A

**DUE OCTOBER 15, 2020. 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, 2020.

## Programmatic Results

The most notable changes during this cycle were changes to our quality assurance system overall. Utility of the quality assurance system prior to 2019-2020 was limited, and this became evident when the 2019-2020 plans were drafted. To that end, the following timeline of completed events summarizes the work completed in 2019-2020 for all programs to improve the quality assurance system's overall utility.

- Fall 2019
  - Reviewed current process and examined areas for growth in how the process has been implemented.
  - Identified data needs by program.
  - Completed 2018-2019 reports based on outcomes and measures identified during the 2017-2018 academic year.
- Winter 2020
  - Identified common programmatic outcome areas for all programs. Those are:
    - Discipline-specific content knowledge
    - Discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice
    - Professional behaviors and characteristics
    - Creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences
    - Data-driven decisions
- Spring 2020
  - Identify student learning outcomes for each programmatic outcome area.
  - Identify measures to yield data per outcome.
  - Complete 2019-2020 plans based on the new outcomes with data currently available.
    - Given that 2019-2020 is a transition year between the former and new processes, data collection as evidence for some new outcomes might not yet be underway but would commence fall 2020.
- Fall 2020
  - Complete 2019-2020 reports based on new plans constructed spring 2020.
  - Identify plan for 2020-2021 based on 2019-2020 results.
    - Plans address areas of concern in 2019-2020 results and action steps to address each area of concern.

In all, data comparisons of 2019-2020 to 2018-2019 would not be valid as the entire process and suite of measures now used are different. Efforts in 2019-2020 were focused on retooling all accountability practices and not on analyzing program-level data given the fragmented quality assurance system we had. Now that our overall system is much more sound and includes measures that will yield actionable results, the 2020-2021 data captures will provide us with a second comparison point for most measures. COVID-19 school closures and a misinterpretation of available data on another measure will limit our capacity to compare both years of data; however, we do not anticipate a repetition of those circumstances in 2020-2021.

**SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge)**

Assessment: Praxis Subject Assessments: Agriculture (5701), Business (5101), English (5039), Social Studies (5086)

Method: Nationally-normed test

Benchmark: 80% of candidates earn passing scores (147 on 5701, 154 on 5101, 168 on 5039, 153 on 5086) on first attempt

Measure	Total N	Benchmark Met N	Institutional Pass Rate	National Pass Rate
Agriculture (5701)	-	-	-	-
Business (5101)	-	-	-	-
English (5039)	34	13	38.24	50.90
Social Studies (5086)	24	9	37.50	51.77

**SLO 2 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice)**

Assessment: Danielson Framework for Teaching Evaluations

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 100% of candidates will earn a mean rating of 3.0 on all indicators

Measure	Total N	Benchmark Met N	Pass Rate
Danielson Framework for Teaching	11	7	63.63

**SLO 3 (professional behaviors and characteristics)**

Assessment: Teacher Beliefs and Mindset Survey

Method: Survey

Benchmark: 100% of candidates will have a mean rating of 3.0 on all items

Data are not available for the benchmark as written. This measure is a proprietary tool, and administration of the tool is controlled by Deans for Impact, the entity that owns the tool. To ensure respondent confidentiality, results are not accessible by respondent. Thus, a calculation by candidate is not possible. This limitation was unknown when we added this tool to our quality assurance system in 2019-2020. The tool will remain a measure in our system; however, the benchmark will be adjusted for 2020-2021 to ensure results are available in the form needed to report data for the benchmark.

**SLO 4 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences)**

Assessment: Lesson Plan

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 80% of candidates earn passing score of at least 80%

COVID-19 school closures prevented these data from being collected.

**SLO 5 (data-driven decisions)**

Assessment: Student Learning Target Assessment

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 80% of candidates earn passing score of at least 80%

COVID-19 school closures prevented these data from being collected.

General Education Course Results

N/A

**DUE OCTOBER 15, 2020. 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, 2020.

Programmatic Use of Results**SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge)**

Benchmark status: Not met

Candidates complete the Praxis Subject Assessments at points during their academic programs prior to the senior year. This results in candidates taking the exams during sophomore and junior years and in some cases prior to completing general education courses that serve as preparation for the exams. Given this, the 80% benchmark was overly ambitious. Upon reflection, we recognize that a benchmark not exceeding 60% is more reasonable when considering the percentage of students who complete all or at least most general education courses prior to attempting the first exam. Moreover, comparing the 80% benchmark to the national pass rates certainly reflects how overly ambitious that benchmark is. A decision to adjust the benchmark to 55% for 2020-2021 was made.

**SLO 2 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice)**

Benchmark status: Not met

Candidates typically perform well overall during their residency/student teaching experiences. Three candidates in this cohort, and one in particular, struggled to succeed. On a 4-point scale, two of the candidates did not earn ratings above 3, and one candidate did not earn ratings about 2. These results led to interventions with each candidate and also impacted the cohort's performance negatively. We believe this is an anomaly and decided against making sweeping assessment changes on a single snapshot of data given the circumstances of these individual students. Should multiple years of data yield trends in the data, however, we will revisit the measure, the measure's use, and how evaluators and candidates are prepared for the implementation.

**SLO 3 (professional behaviors and characteristics)**

Benchmark status: Cannot determine whether benchmark was met

Data from this proprietary assessment are not available for disaggregation by candidate, which is how the expected outcome was framed. For 2020-2021, the outcome will be adjusted to reflect a benchmark in terms of how data are available. This was the first year this proprietary tool was used in the quality assurance system, and details provided did not identify data reporting limitations.

**SLO 4 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences)**

**SLO 5 (data-driven decisions)**

Benchmark status: Cannot be determined due to impact of COVID-19 on data collection

General Education Use of Results

N/A



## 2019-2020 INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AUDIT

**ALL sections are required.**

**Major Organizational Unit Head: Don Schillinger, Dean; Terry McConathy, Provost**

**Name of Unit/Program: EdD, Educational Leadership; GC, Higher Education Administration**

**Mission:** To provide high-quality educational experiences for students across the lifespan, to enhance and extend knowledge bases through research and other scholarly activities, and to serve the community through collaborative endeavors.

**DUE OCTOBER 15, 2019. Based on analysis of the 2018-2019 data, what is being implemented during the 2019-2020 cycle to improve results:**

The program's quality assurance system is being revamped during the 2019-2020 academic year. Plans submitted for 2018-2019 reflected limited evidence for decision-making. Assessments, alignments to standards, and performance expectations are being retooled to yield valid, actionable data.

**DUE OCTOBER 15, 2019. Expected Outcomes: (based upon and linked to overall Mission of Program or Unit)**

Programmatic Outcomes

**SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge)**

Candidates will demonstrate content knowledge mastery in core educational leadership topics.

**SLO 2 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice)**

Candidates will engage in practice-based research on current topics in educational leadership.

**SLO 3 (professional behaviors and characteristics)**

Candidates will reflect on the role of professional educational leaders and model that role in their professional contexts.

**SLO 4 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences)**

Candidates will design research studies to investigate topics of current need in educational leadership.

**SLO 5 (data-driven decisions)**

Candidates will conduct scholarly research on topics of current need in educational leadership.

General Education Course Assessment

N/A

**DUE OCTOBER 15, 2019. Means of Measurement: (Make sure this is measureable and link each measurement to each expected outcome.)**

Programmatic Means of Measurement

**SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge)**

Assessment: EDLE course content GPA

Method: GPA

Benchmark: 100% of candidates will maintain a minimum 3.0 GPA on EdD coursework

**SLO 2 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice)**

Assessment: Publication manuscript

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 80% of candidates will earn a minimum final score of 80%

**SLO 3 (professional behaviors and characteristics)**

Assessment: Comprehensive portfolio

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 100% of candidates will have a minimum final score of 80%

**SLO 4 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences)**

Assessment: Dissertation proposal (Chapters 1-3)

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 100% of candidates will have a minimum final score of 80% and committee approval to conduct the proposed study after the initial proposal defense

**SLO 5 (data-driven decisions)**

Assessment: Dissertation results and discussion (Chapters 4-5)

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 100% of candidates will have a minimum final score of 80% and committee approval of the final dissertation after the initial dissertation defense

General Education Course Means of Measurement

N/A

**DUE OCTOBER 15, 2020. 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, 2020.

Programmatic Results

**SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge)**

Of the candidates who remain in the EdD, 100% have maintained a GPA of 3.0 or better in core courses for the EdD. This standard applies equally to the Ruston campus, the Academic Success Center, and face-to-face or distance-delivery formats.

**SLO 2 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice)**

Of the students completing EDLE 777, Professional Project, more than 80% created a manuscript worthy of publication. EDLE 777 is a directed study course and is not able to be disaggregated by place of instruction or type of delivery format.

**SLO 3 (professional behaviors and characteristics)**

One hundred percent of candidates constructed a comprehensive portfolio that scored above 80% on the assessment rubric. The assessment rubric is applied to all students entering their third year of the program and is not able to be disaggregated by geography or type of delivery format.

**SLO 4 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences)**

All candidates who achieved proposal approval from their committee did so with a score of 80% or better as assessed by the dissertation rubric. The process for gaining committee approval is a threshold for all EdD students and is not able to be disaggregated by geography or delivery format.

**SLO 5 (data-driven decisions)**

One hundred percent of candidates who achieved committee approval of the final dissertation did so with a score of 80% or better. The process for gaining committee approval of the final dissertation is experienced by all EdD students and is not able to be disaggregated by geography or delivery format.

General Education Course Results

N/A

**DUE OCTOBER 15, 2020. 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, 2020.

Programmatic Use of Results**SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge)**

Benchmark status: Met

We have not changed this expectation during this cycle. The quality assurance framework used for this audit was implemented in 2019-2020; therefore, this audit represents the first occasion where data reported here were collected and analyzed. Since at least two cycles of data are necessary to identify trends, the measures and benchmarks used in 2019-2020 will be repeated in 2020-2021 so that two comparable data captures may be used for a trend analysis. Subsequent changes to measures or benchmarks will be considered.

**SLO 2 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice)**

Benchmark status: Met

Considering the uncertainty of getting published due to supply-and-demand considerations which are outside of the candidate's influence, we modified the original expectation for the published-manuscript requirement for EDLE 777 to an expectation that candidates would produce a manuscript worthy of publication. This allows us to guide candidates through a process of data-based writing without the pressure of getting selected for publication.

**SLO 3 (professional behaviors and characteristics)**

Benchmark status: Met

We have not changed this expectation during this cycle. The quality assurance framework used for this audit was implemented in 2019-2020; therefore, this audit represents the first occasion where data reported here were collected and analyzed. Since at least two cycles of data are necessary to identify trends, the measures and benchmarks used in 2019-2020 will be repeated in 2020-2021 so that two comparable data captures may be used for a trend analysis. Subsequent changes to measures or benchmarks will be considered.

**SLO 4 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences)**

Benchmark status: Met

During this cycle, faculty and administration designed a new course for improving candidates who were approaching research-proposal approval with inadequate readiness. With the previous rigidity of program timelines prior to this cycle, candidates could be forced to enter proposal-defense stages of the program with insufficient preparedness. The reason for the implementation of this exit-portal design was to prevent students from remaining in the program without making forward progress on their dissertations; however, the weakness of that approach was that students were put into positions of removal without remediation. The improvement now is that students can remain in the program by taking the new course without being approved for additional courses until they achieve proposal approval.

**SLO 5 (data-driven decisions)**

Benchmark status: Met

We have not changed this expectation during this cycle. The quality assurance framework used for this audit was implemented in 2019-2020; therefore, this audit represents the first occasion where data reported here were collected and analyzed. Since at least two cycles of data are necessary to identify trends, the measures and benchmarks used in 2019-2020 will be repeated in 2020-2021 so that two comparable data captures may be used for a trend analysis. Subsequent changes to measures or benchmarks will be considered.

General Education Use of Results

N/A



**2019-2020 INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AUDIT**

**ALL sections are required.**

<b>Major Organizational Unit Head: Don Schillinger, Dean; Terry McConathy, Provost</b>
<b>Name of Unit/Program (CERTIFICATE PROGRAMS ONLY): GC, Cyber Education</b>
<b>Mission:</b> To provide high-quality educational experiences for students across the lifespan, to enhance and extend knowledge bases through research and other scholarly activities, and to serve the community through collaborative endeavors.
<b>DUE OCTOBER 15, 2019. Based on analysis of the 2018-2019 data, what is being implemented during the 2019-2020 cycle to improve results:</b>  The program’s quality assurance system is being revamped during the 2019-2020 academic year. Plans submitted for 2018-2019 reflected limited evidence for decision-making. Assessments, alignments to standards, and performance expectations are being retooled to yield valid, actionable data.
<b>DUE OCTOBER 15, 2019. Expected Outcomes: (based upon and linked to overall Mission of Program or Unit)</b>  <u>Programmatic Outcomes</u> <b>SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge):</b> Candidates will demonstrate content knowledge mastery in cyber education topics.  <b>SLO 2 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice):</b> Candidates will demonstrate proficiency in the professional practice skills required of cyber educators.  <u>General Education Course Assessment</u> N/A
<b>DUE OCTOBER 15, 2019. Means of Measurement: (Make sure this is measureable and link each measurement to each expected outcome.)</b>  <u>Programmatic Means of Measurement</u> <b>SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge):</b> Assessment: Core course content GPA Method: GPA Benchmark: 100% of candidates will maintain a minimum 3.0 GPA on core courses  <b>SLO 2 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice):</b> Assessment: (assessment being developed) Method: Rubric Benchmark: 80% of candidates will a minimum score of 80%  <u>General Education Course Means of Measurement</u> N/A

**DUE OCTOBER 15, 2020. 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, 2020.

Programmatic Results

**SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge):**

Assessment: Core course content GPA

Method: GPA

Benchmark: 100% of candidates will maintain a minimum 3.0 GPA on core courses

No students completed the certificate program during 2019-2020 in order to provide data for this measure.

**SLO 2 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice):**

Assessment: (assessment being developed)

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 80% of candidates will a minimum score of 80%

No students completed the certificate program during 2019-2020 in order to provide data for this measure.

General Education Course Results

N/A

**DUE OCTOBER 15, 2020. 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, 2020.

Programmatic Use of Results

**SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge):**

**SLO 2 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice):**

Benchmark status: Cannot be determined

No students completed the certificate program during 2019-2020 in order to provide data for these SLOs.

General Education Use of Results

N/A



**2019-2020 INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AUDIT**

**ALL sections are required.**

<b>Major Organizational Unit Head: Don Schillinger, Dean; Terry McConathy, Provost</b>
<b>Name of Unit/Program (CERTIFICATE PROGRAMS ONLY): GC, Reading Specialist</b>
<b>Mission:</b> To provide high-quality educational experiences for students across the lifespan, to enhance and extend knowledge bases through research and other scholarly activities, and to serve the community through collaborative endeavors.
<b>DUE OCTOBER 15, 2019. Based on analysis of the 2018-2019 data, what is being implemented during the 2019-2020 cycle to improve results:</b>  The program’s quality assurance system is being revamped during the 2019-2020 academic year. Plans submitted for 2018-2019 reflected limited evidence for decision-making. Assessments, alignments to standards, and performance expectations are being retooled to yield valid, actionable data.
<b>DUE OCTOBER 15, 2019. Expected Outcomes: (based upon and linked to overall Mission of Program or Unit)</b>  <u>Programmatic Outcomes</u> <b>SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge):</b> Candidates will demonstrate content knowledge mastery in literacy education topics.  <b>SLO 2 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice):</b> Candidates will demonstrate proficiency in the professional practice skills required of reading specialists.  <u>General Education Course Assessment</u> N/A
<b>DUE OCTOBER 15, 2019. Means of Measurement: (Make sure this is measureable and link each measurement to each expected outcome.)</b>  <u>Programmatic Means of Measurement</u> <b>SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge):</b> Assessment: Core course content GPA Method: GPA Benchmark: 100% of candidates will maintain a minimum 3.0 GPA on core courses  <b>SLO 2 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice):</b> Assessment: (assessment being developed) Method: Rubric Benchmark: 80% of candidates will a minimum score of 80%  <u>General Education Course Means of Measurement</u> N/A

**DUE OCTOBER 15, 2020. 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, 2020.

Programmatic Results

**SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge):**

Assessment: Core course content GPA

Method: GPA

Benchmark: 100% of candidates will maintain a minimum 3.0 GPA on core courses

No students completed the certificate program during 2019-2020 in order to provide data for this measure.

**SLO 2 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice):**

Assessment: (assessment being developed)

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 80% of candidates will a minimum score of 80%

No students completed the certificate program during 2019-2020 in order to provide data for this measure.

General Education Course Results

N/A

**DUE OCTOBER 15, 2020. 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, 2020.

Programmatic Use of Results

**SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge):**

**SLO 2 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice):**

Benchmark status: Cannot be determined

No students completed the certificate program during 2019-2020 in order to provide data for these SLOs.

General Education Use of Results

N/A



**2019-2020 INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AUDIT**

**ALL sections are required.**

<b>Major Organizational Unit Head: Don Schillinger, Dean; Terry McConathy, Provost</b>
<b>Name of Unit/Program: MAT, Early Childhood Education, Grades PK-3</b>
<b>Mission:</b> To provide high-quality educational experiences for students across the lifespan, to enhance and extend knowledge bases through research and other scholarly activities, and to serve the community through collaborative endeavors.
<b>DUE OCTOBER 15, 2019. Based on analysis of the 2018-2019 data, what is being implemented during the 2019-2020 cycle to improve results:</b>  The program’s quality assurance system is being revamped during the 2019-2020 academic year. Plans submitted for 2018-2019 reflected only a single assessment for all initial teacher preparation programs. While that single assessment is valuable to the program, no single measure can provide adequate evidence to determine overall program quality and yield valid, actionable data.  Data from that single measure that were reported reflected that 100% of candidates met the benchmark performance expectation; therefore, actionability of the data were questioned. Expected outcomes identified below have been strengthened and structured. Five departmental constructs were identified (noted parenthetically below), and these constructs are common across all initial teacher preparation degree programs. They are aligned to both accreditation evidence requirements and best practices in teacher preparation accordingly to current literature.
<b>DUE OCTOBER 15, 2019. Expected Outcomes: (based upon and linked to overall Mission of Program or Unit)</b>  <u>Programmatic Outcomes</u> <b>SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge)</b> Candidates will demonstrate content knowledge mastery in the areas of literacy, math, science, and social studies.  <b>SLO 2 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice)</b> Candidates will demonstrate proficiency in the professional skills of planning and preparation, organizing and maintaining a classroom environment, instruction, and professionalism.  <b>SLO 3 (professional behaviors and characteristics)</b> Candidates will model behaviors and characteristics of professional educators.  <b>SLO 4 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences)</b> Candidates will create engaging learning activities that embed college- and career-readiness skills, digital learning experiences, and current best practices in teaching.

**SLO 5 (data-driven decisions)**

Candidates will make instructional decisions by collecting, analyzing, and acting upon student performance data.

General Education Course Assessment

N/A

**DUE OCTOBER 15, 2019. Means of Measurement: (Make sure this is measurable and link each measurement to each expected outcome.)**

Programmatic Means of Measurement

**SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge)**

Assessment: Praxis Subject Assessments: Reading Language Arts (5002), Mathematics (5003), Social Studies (5004), Science (5005)

Method: Nationally-normed test

Benchmark: 80% of candidates earn passing scores (157 on 5002, 157 on 5003, 155 on 5004, 159 on 5005) on first attempt

**SLO 2 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice)**

Assessment: Danielson Framework for Teaching Evaluations

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 100% of candidates will earn a mean rating of 3.0 on all indicators

**SLO 3 (professional behaviors and characteristics)**

Assessment: Teacher Beliefs and Mindset Survey

Method: Survey

Benchmark: 100% of candidates will have a mean rating of 3.0 on all items

**SLO 4 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences)**

Assessment: Lesson Plan

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 80% of candidates earn passing score of at least 80%

**SLO 5 (data-driven decisions)**

Assessment: Student Learning Target Assessment

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 80% of candidates earn passing score of at least 80%

General Education Course Means of Measurement

N/A

**DUE OCTOBER 15, 2020. 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, 2020.

## Programmatic Results

The most notable changes during this cycle were changes to our quality assurance system overall. Utility of the quality assurance system prior to 2019-2020 was limited, and this became evident when the 2019-2020 plans were drafted. To that end, the following timeline of completed events summarizes the work completed in 2019-2020 for all programs to improve the quality assurance system's overall utility.

- Fall 2019
  - Reviewed current process and examined areas for growth in how the process has been implemented.
  - Identified data needs by program.
  - Completed 2018-2019 reports based on outcomes and measures identified during the 2017-2018 academic year.
- Winter 2020
  - Identified common programmatic outcome areas for all programs. Those are:
    - Discipline-specific content knowledge
    - Discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice
    - Professional behaviors and characteristics
    - Creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences
    - Data-driven decisions
- Spring 2020
  - Identify student learning outcomes for each programmatic outcome area.
  - Identify measures to yield data per outcome.
  - Complete 2019-2020 plans based on the new outcomes with data currently available.
    - Given that 2019-2020 is a transition year between the former and new processes, data collection as evidence for some new outcomes might not yet be underway but would commence fall 2020.
- Fall 2020
  - Complete 2019-2020 reports based on new plans constructed spring 2020.
  - Identify plan for 2020-2021 based on 2019-2020 results.
    - Plans address areas of concern in 2019-2020 results and action steps to address each area of concern.

In all, data comparisons of 2019-2020 to 2018-2019 would not be valid as the entire process and suite of measures now used are different. Efforts in 2019-2020 were focused on retooling all accountability practices and not on analyzing program-level data given the fragmented quality assurance system we had. Now that our overall system is much more sound and includes measures that will yield actionable results, the 2020-2021 data captures will provide us with a second comparison point for most measures. COVID-19 school closures and a misinterpretation of available data on another measure will limit our capacity to compare both years of data; however, we do not anticipate a repetition of those circumstances in 2020-2021.

**SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge)**

Assessment: Praxis Subject Assessments: Reading Language Arts (5002), Mathematics (5003), Social Studies (5004), Science (5005)

Method: Nationally-normed test

Benchmark: 80% of candidates earn passing scores (157 on 5002, 157 on 5003, 155 on 5004, 159 on 5005) on first attempt

Measure	Total N	Benchmark Met N	Institutional Pass Rate	National Pass Rate
Reading Language Arts (5002)	13	13	100.00	75.26
Mathematics (5003)	13	13	100.00	74.93
Social Studies (5004)	13	13	100.00	70.71
Science (5005)	13	13	100.00	72.94

**SLO 2 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice)**

Assessment: Danielson Framework for Teaching Evaluations

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 100% of candidates will earn a mean rating of 3.0 on all indicators

Measure	Total N	Benchmark Met N	Pass Rate
Danielson Framework for Teaching	13	2	15.38

**SLO 3 (professional behaviors and characteristics)**

Assessment: Teacher Beliefs and Mindset Survey

Method: Survey

Benchmark: 100% of candidates will have a mean rating of 3.0 on all items

Data are not available for the benchmark as written. This measure is a proprietary tool, and administration of the tool is controlled by Deans for Impact, the entity that owns the tool. To ensure respondent confidentiality, results are not accessible by respondent. Thus, a calculation by candidate is not possible. This limitation was unknown when we added this tool to our quality assurance system in 2019-2020. The tool will remain a measure in our system; however, the benchmark will be adjusted for 2020-2021 to ensure results are available in the form needed to report data for the benchmark.

**SLO 4 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences)**

Assessment: Lesson Plan

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 80% of candidates earn passing score of at least 80%

COVID-19 school closures prevented these data from being collected.

**SLO 5 (data-driven decisions)**

Assessment: Student Learning Target Assessment

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 80% of candidates earn passing score of at least 80%

COVID-19 school closures prevented these data from being collected.

General Education Course Results

N/A

**DUE OCTOBER 15, 2020. 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, 2020.

Programmatic Use of Results**SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge)**

Benchmark status: Cannot determine whether benchmark was met

Candidates complete the Praxis Subject Assessments prior to program admission. Thus, pass rates are 100% as passage is an admission requirement. This measure is the only content knowledge measure in the suite of program-level assessments. Louisiana teacher preparation program policy (Bulletin 996) sets the admission and curricular requirements for MAT programs. Those require curricula focused on pedagogy with the certification exam being the only content assessment. Data on these exams must be collected and reported regularly, but, obviously, a 100% passage rate does not provide for actionable data. Beginning in 2020-2021, we will begin collecting complete records of candidate test results so that each attempt is recorded rather than just the passing attempt. This will allow for first-attempt results to be reported, which we expect this will result in data variance and, thus, have potential for decision-making.

**SLO 2 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice)**

Benchmark status: Not met

Candidates typically perform well overall during their internship experiences. These results led us to evaluate our evaluator training practices, and we discovered that our training of evaluators for the BS and MAT programs was not comparable. This accounts for at least some of the noticeable variance between scores for each type of program. During 2020-2021, we will institute standardized training for all evaluators because the same measure is used across all programs; however, to this point, particular evaluators and trainings have been exclusive to each level of program.

**SLO 3 (professional behaviors and characteristics)**

Benchmark status: Cannot determine whether benchmark was met

Data from this proprietary assessment are not available for disaggregation by candidate, which is how the expected outcome was framed. For 2020-2021, the outcome will be adjusted to reflect a benchmark in terms of how data are available. This was the first year this proprietary tool was used in the quality assurance system, and details provided did not identify data reporting limitations.

**SLO 4 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences)**

**SLO 5 (data-driven decisions)**

Benchmark status: Cannot be determined due to impact of COVID-19 on data collection

General Education Use of Results

N/A



**2019-2020 INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AUDIT**

**ALL sections are required.**

<b>Major Organizational Unit Head: Don Schillinger, Dean; Terry McConathy, Provost</b>
<b>Name of Unit/Program: MAT, Elementary Education, Grades 1-5; GC, Special Education – Mild/Moderate, Grades 1-5</b>
<b>Mission:</b> To provide high-quality educational experiences for students across the lifespan, to enhance and extend knowledge bases through research and other scholarly activities, and to serve the community through collaborative endeavors.
<b>DUE OCTOBER 15, 2019. Based on analysis of the 2018-2019 data, what is being implemented during the 2019-2020 cycle to improve results:</b>  The program’s quality assurance system is being revamped during the 2019-2020 academic year. Plans submitted for 2018-2019 reflected only a single assessment for all initial teacher preparation programs. While that single assessment is valuable to the program, no single measure can provide adequate evidence to determine overall program quality and yield valid, actionable data.  Data from that single measure that were reported reflected that 100% of candidates met the benchmark performance expectation; therefore, actionability of the data were questioned. Expected outcomes identified below have been strengthened and structured. Five departmental constructs were identified (noted parenthetically below), and these constructs are common across all initial teacher preparation degree programs. They are aligned to both accreditation evidence requirements and best practices in teacher preparation accordingly to current literature.
<b>DUE OCTOBER 15, 2019. Expected Outcomes: (based upon and linked to overall Mission of Program or Unit)</b>  <u>Programmatic Outcomes</u> <b>SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge)</b> Candidates will demonstrate content knowledge mastery in the areas of literacy, math, science, and social studies.  <b>SLO 2 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice)</b> Candidates will demonstrate proficiency in the professional skills of planning and preparation, organizing and maintaining a classroom environment, instruction, and professionalism.  <b>SLO 3 (professional behaviors and characteristics)</b> Candidates will model behaviors and characteristics of professional educators.  <b>SLO 4 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences)</b> Candidates will create engaging learning activities that embed college- and career-readiness skills, digital learning experiences, and current best practices in teaching.

**SLO 5 (data-driven decisions)**

Candidates will make instructional decisions by collecting, analyzing, and acting upon student performance data.

General Education Course Assessment

N/A

**DUE OCTOBER 15, 2019. Means of Measurement: (Make sure this is measurable and link each measurement to each expected outcome.)**

Programmatic Means of Measurement

**SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge)**

Assessment: Praxis Subject Assessments: Reading Language Arts (5002), Mathematics (5003), Social Studies (5004), Science (5005)

Method: Nationally-normed test

Benchmark: 80% of candidates earn passing scores (157 on 5002, 157 on 5003, 155 on 5004, 159 on 5005) on first attempt

**SLO 2 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice)**

Assessment: Danielson Framework for Teaching Evaluations

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 100% of candidates will earn a mean rating of 3.0 on all indicators

**SLO 3 (professional behaviors and characteristics)**

Assessment: Teacher Beliefs and Mindset Survey

Method: Survey

Benchmark: 100% of candidates will have a mean rating of 3.0 on all items

**SLO 4 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences)**

Assessment: Lesson Plan

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 80% of candidates earn passing score of at least 80%

**SLO 5 (data-driven decisions)**

Assessment: Student Learning Target Assessment

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 80% of candidates earn passing score of at least 80%

General Education Course Means of Measurement

N/A

**DUE OCTOBER 15, 2020. 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, 2020.

## Programmatic Results

The most notable changes during this cycle were changes to our quality assurance system overall. Utility of the quality assurance system prior to 2019-2020 was limited, and this became evident when the 2019-2020 plans were drafted. To that end, the following timeline of completed events summarizes the work completed in 2019-2020 for all programs to improve the quality assurance system's overall utility.

- Fall 2019
  - Reviewed current process and examined areas for growth in how the process has been implemented.
  - Identified data needs by program.
  - Completed 2018-2019 reports based on outcomes and measures identified during the 2017-2018 academic year.
- Winter 2020
  - Identified common programmatic outcome areas for all programs. Those are:
    - Discipline-specific content knowledge
    - Discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice
    - Professional behaviors and characteristics
    - Creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences
    - Data-driven decisions
- Spring 2020
  - Identify student learning outcomes for each programmatic outcome area.
  - Identify measures to yield data per outcome.
  - Complete 2019-2020 plans based on the new outcomes with data currently available.
    - Given that 2019-2020 is a transition year between the former and new processes, data collection as evidence for some new outcomes might not yet be underway but would commence fall 2020.
- Fall 2020
  - Complete 2019-2020 reports based on new plans constructed spring 2020.
  - Identify plan for 2020-2021 based on 2019-2020 results.
    - Plans address areas of concern in 2019-2020 results and action steps to address each area of concern.

In all, data comparisons of 2019-2020 to 2018-2019 would not be valid as the entire process and suite of measures now used are different. Efforts in 2019-2020 were focused on retooling all accountability practices and not on analyzing program-level data given the fragmented quality assurance system we had. Now that our overall system is much more sound and includes measures that will yield actionable results, the 2020-2021 data captures will provide us with a second comparison point for most measures. COVID-19 school closures and a misinterpretation of available data on another measure will limit our capacity to compare both years of data; however, we do not anticipate a repetition of those circumstances in 2020-2021.

**SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge)**

Assessment: Praxis Subject Assessments: Reading Language Arts (5002), Mathematics (5003), Social Studies (5004), Science (5005)

Method: Nationally-normed test

Benchmark: 80% of candidates earn passing scores (157 on 5002, 157 on 5003, 155 on 5004, 159 on 5005) on first attempt

Measure	Total N	Benchmark Met N	Institutional Pass Rate	National Pass Rate
Reading Language Arts (5002)	86	53	61.63	75.26
Mathematics (5003)	77	50	64.94	74.93
Social Studies (5004)	105	57	54.29	70.71
Science (5005)	103	54	52.43	72.94

**SLO 2 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice)**

Assessment: Danielson Framework for Teaching Evaluations

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 100% of candidates will earn a mean rating of 3.0 on all indicators

Measure	Total N	Benchmark Met N	Pass Rate
Danielson Framework for Teaching	11	2	18.18

**SLO 3 (professional behaviors and characteristics)**

Assessment: Teacher Beliefs and Mindset Survey

Method: Survey

Benchmark: 100% of candidates will have a mean rating of 3.0 on all items

Data are not available for the benchmark as written. This measure is a proprietary tool, and administration of the tool is controlled by Deans for Impact, the entity that owns the tool. To ensure respondent confidentiality, results are not accessible by respondent. Thus, a calculation by candidate is not possible. This limitation was unknown when we added this tool to our quality assurance system in 2019-2020. The tool will remain a measure in our system; however, the benchmark will be adjusted for 2020-2021 to ensure results are available in the form needed to report data for the benchmark.

**SLO 4 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences)**

Assessment: Lesson Plan

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 80% of candidates earn passing score of at least 80%

COVID-19 school closures prevented these data from being collected.

**SLO 5 (data-driven decisions)**

Assessment: Student Learning Target Assessment

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 80% of candidates earn passing score of at least 80%

COVID-19 school closures prevented these data from being collected.

General Education Course Results

N/A

**DUE OCTOBER 15, 2020. 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, 2020.

Programmatic Use of Results**SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge)**

Benchmark status: Not met

Candidates complete the Praxis Subject Assessments at points during their academic programs prior to the senior year. This results in candidates taking the exams during sophomore and junior years and in some cases prior to completing general education courses that serve as preparation for the exams. Given this, the 80% benchmark was overly ambitious. Upon reflection, we recognize that a benchmark not exceeding 60% is more reasonable when considering the percentage of students who complete all or at least most general education courses prior to attempting the first exam. Moreover, comparing the 80% benchmark to the national pass rates certainly reflects how overly ambitious that benchmark is. A decision to adjust the benchmark to 55% for 2020-2021 was made.

**SLO 2 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice)**

Benchmark status: Not met

Candidates typically perform well overall during their internship experiences. These results led us to evaluate our evaluator training practices, and we discovered that our training of evaluators for the BS and MAT programs was not comparable. This accounts for at least some of the noticeable variance between scores for each type of program. During 2020-2021, we will institute standardized training for all evaluators because the same measure is used across all programs; however, to this point, particular evaluators and trainings have been exclusive to each level of program.

**SLO 3 (professional behaviors and characteristics)**

Benchmark status: Cannot determine whether benchmark was met

Data from this proprietary assessment are not available for disaggregation by candidate, which is how the expected outcome was framed. For 2020-2021, the outcome will be adjusted to reflect a benchmark in terms of how data are available. This was the first year this proprietary tool was used in the quality assurance system, and details provided did not identify data reporting limitations.

**SLO 4 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences)**

**SLO 5 (data-driven decisions)**

Benchmark status: Cannot be determined due to impact of COVID-19 on data collection

General Education Use of Results

N/A



**2019-2020 INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AUDIT**

**ALL sections are required.**

<b>Major Organizational Unit Head: Don Schillinger, Dean; Terry McConathy, Provost</b>
<b>Name of Unit/Program: MAT, Middle School Education, Grades 4-8</b>
<b>Mission:</b> To provide high-quality educational experiences for students across the lifespan, to enhance and extend knowledge bases through research and other scholarly activities, and to serve the community through collaborative endeavors.
<b>DUE OCTOBER 15, 2019. Based on analysis of the 2018-2019 data, what is being implemented during the 2019-2020 cycle to improve results:</b>  The program’s quality assurance system is being revamped during the 2019-2020 academic year. Plans submitted for 2018-2019 reflected only a single assessment for all initial teacher preparation programs. While that single assessment is valuable to the program, no single measure can provide adequate evidence to determine overall program quality and yield valid, actionable data.  Data from that single measure that were reported reflected that 100% of candidates met the benchmark performance expectation; therefore, actionability of the data were questioned. Expected outcomes identified below have been strengthened and structured. Five departmental constructs were identified (noted parenthetically below), and these constructs are common across all initial teacher preparation degree programs. They are aligned to both accreditation evidence requirements and best practices in teacher preparation accordingly to current literature.
<b>DUE OCTOBER 15, 2019. Expected Outcomes: (based upon and linked to overall Mission of Program or Unit)</b>  <u>Programmatic Outcomes</u> <b>SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge)</b> Candidates will demonstrate content knowledge mastery in their certification areas.  <b>SLO 2 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice)</b> Candidates will demonstrate proficiency in the professional skills of planning and preparation, organizing and maintaining a classroom environment, instruction, and professionalism.  <b>SLO 3 (professional behaviors and characteristics)</b> Candidates will model behaviors and characteristics of professional educators.  <b>SLO 4 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences)</b> Candidates will create engaging learning activities that embed college- and career-readiness skills, digital learning experiences, and current best practices in teaching.

**SLO 5 (data-driven decisions)**

Candidates will make instructional decisions by collecting, analyzing, and acting upon student performance data.

General Education Course Assessment

N/A

**DUE OCTOBER 15, 2019. Means of Measurement: (Make sure this is measureable and link each measurement to each expected outcome.)**

Programmatic Means of Measurement

**SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge)**

Assessment: Praxis Subject Assessments: Mathematics (5169) or Science (5440)

Method: Nationally-normed test

Benchmark: 80% of candidates earn passing scores (165 on 5169, 150 on 5440) on first attempt

**SLO 2 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice)**

Assessment: Danielson Framework for Teaching Evaluations

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 100% of candidates will earn a mean rating of 3.0 on all indicators

**SLO 3 (professional behaviors and characteristics)**

Assessment: Teacher Beliefs and Mindset Survey

Method: Survey

Benchmark: 100% of candidates will have a mean rating of 3.0 on all items

**SLO 4 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences)**

Assessment: Lesson Plan

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 80% of candidates earn passing score of at least 80%

**SLO 5 (data-driven decisions)**

Assessment: Student Learning Target Assessment

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 80% of candidates earn passing score of at least 80%

General Education Course Means of Measurement

N/A

**DUE OCTOBER 15, 2020. 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, 2020.

## Programmatic Results

The most notable changes during this cycle were changes to our quality assurance system overall. Utility of the quality assurance system prior to 2019-2020 was limited, and this became evident when the 2019-2020 plans were drafted. To that end, the following timeline of completed events summarizes the work completed in 2019-2020 for all programs to improve the quality assurance system's overall utility.

- Fall 2019
  - Reviewed current process and examined areas for growth in how the process has been implemented.
  - Identified data needs by program.
  - Completed 2018-2019 reports based on outcomes and measures identified during the 2017-2018 academic year.
- Winter 2020
  - Identified common programmatic outcome areas for all programs. Those are:
    - Discipline-specific content knowledge
    - Discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice
    - Professional behaviors and characteristics
    - Creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences
    - Data-driven decisions
- Spring 2020
  - Identify student learning outcomes for each programmatic outcome area.
  - Identify measures to yield data per outcome.
  - Complete 2019-2020 plans based on the new outcomes with data currently available.
    - Given that 2019-2020 is a transition year between the former and new processes, data collection as evidence for some new outcomes might not yet be underway but would commence fall 2020.
- Fall 2020
  - Complete 2019-2020 reports based on new plans constructed spring 2020.
  - Identify plan for 2020-2021 based on 2019-2020 results.
    - Plans address areas of concern in 2019-2020 results and action steps to address each area of concern.

In all, data comparisons of 2019-2020 to 2018-2019 would not be valid as the entire process and suite of measures now used are different. Efforts in 2019-2020 were focused on retooling all accountability practices and not on analyzing program-level data given the fragmented quality assurance system we had. Now that our overall system is much more sound and includes measures that will yield actionable results, the 2020-2021 data captures will provide us with a second comparison point for most measures. COVID-19 school closures and a misinterpretation of available data on another measure will limit our capacity to compare both years of data; however, we do not anticipate a repetition of those circumstances in 2020-2021.

**SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge)**

Assessment: Praxis Subject Assessments: Mathematics (5169) or Science (5440)

Method: Nationally-normed test

Benchmark: 80% of candidates earn passing scores (165 on 5169, 150 on 5440) on first attempt

Measure	Total N	Benchmark Met N	Institutional Pass Rate	National Pass Rate
Mathematics (5169)	2	2	100.00	42.44
Science (5440)	-	-	-	-

**SLO 2 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice)**

Assessment: Danielson Framework for Teaching Evaluations

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 100% of candidates will earn a mean rating of 3.0 on all indicators

Measure	Total N	Benchmark Met N	Pass Rate
Danielson Framework for Teaching	2	1	50.00

**SLO 3 (professional behaviors and characteristics)**

Assessment: Teacher Beliefs and Mindset Survey

Method: Survey

Benchmark: 100% of candidates will have a mean rating of 3.0 on all items

Data are not available for the benchmark as written. This measure is a proprietary tool, and administration of the tool is controlled by Deans for Impact, the entity that owns the tool. To ensure respondent confidentiality, results are not accessible by respondent. Thus, a calculation by candidate is not possible. This limitation was unknown when we added this tool to our quality assurance system in 2019-2020. The tool will remain a measure in our system; however, the benchmark will be adjusted for 2020-2021 to ensure results are available in the form needed to report data for the benchmark.

**SLO 4 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences)**

Assessment: Lesson Plan

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 80% of candidates earn passing score of at least 80%

COVID-19 school closures prevented these data from being collected.

**SLO 5 (data-driven decisions)**

Assessment: Student Learning Target Assessment

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 80% of candidates earn passing score of at least 80%

COVID-19 school closures prevented these data from being collected.

General Education Course Results

N/A

**DUE OCTOBER 15, 2020. 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, 2020.

Programmatic Use of Results

**SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge)**

Benchmark status: Not met

Candidates complete the Praxis Subject Assessments prior to program admission. Thus, pass rates are 100% as passage is an admission requirement. This measure is the only content knowledge measure in the suite of program-level assessments. Louisiana teacher preparation program policy (Bulletin 996) sets the admission and curricular requirements for MAT programs. Those require curricula focused on pedagogy with the certification exam being the only content assessment. Data on these exams must be collected and reported regularly, but, obviously, a 100% passage rate does not provide for actionable data. Beginning in 2020-2021, we will begin collecting complete records of candidate test results so that each attempt is recorded rather than just the passing attempt. This will allow for first-attempt results to be reported, which we expect this will result in data variance and, thus, have potential for decision-making.

**SLO 3 (professional behaviors and characteristics)**

Benchmark status: Cannot determine whether benchmark was met

Data from this proprietary assessment are not available for disaggregation by candidate, which is how the expected outcome was framed. For 2020-2021, the outcome will be adjusted to reflect a benchmark in terms of how data are available. This was the first year this proprietary tool was used in the quality assurance system, and details provided did not identify data reporting limitations.

**SLO 2 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice)**

Benchmark status: Not met

Candidates typically perform well overall during their internship experiences. These results led us to evaluate our evaluator training practices, and we discovered that our training of evaluators for the BS and MAT programs was not comparable. This accounts for at least some of the noticeable variance between scores for each type of program. During 2020-2021, we will institute standardized training for all evaluators because the same measure is used across all programs; however, to this point, particular evaluators and trainings have been exclusive to each level of program.

**SLO 4 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences)**

**SLO 5 (data-driven decisions)**

Benchmark status: Cannot be determined due to impact of COVID-19 on data collection

General Education Use of Results

N/A



**2019-2020 INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AUDIT**

**ALL sections are required.**

<b>Major Organizational Unit Head: Don Schillinger, Dean; Terry McConathy, Provost</b>
<b>Name of Unit/Program: MAT, Secondary Education, Grades 6-12</b>
<b>Mission:</b> To provide high-quality educational experiences for students across the lifespan, to enhance and extend knowledge bases through research and other scholarly activities, and to serve the community through collaborative endeavors.
<b>DUE OCTOBER 15, 2019. Based on analysis of the 2018-2019 data, what is being implemented during the 2019-2020 cycle to improve results:</b>  The program’s quality assurance system is being revamped during the 2019-2020 academic year. Plans submitted for 2018-2019 reflected only a single assessment for all initial teacher preparation programs. While that single assessment is valuable to the program, no single measure can provide adequate evidence to determine overall program quality and yield valid, actionable data.  Data from that single measure that were reported reflected that 100% of candidates met the benchmark performance expectation; therefore, actionability of the data were questioned. Expected outcomes identified below have been strengthened and structured. Five departmental constructs were identified (noted parenthetically below), and these constructs are common across all initial teacher preparation degree programs. They are aligned to both accreditation evidence requirements and best practices in teacher preparation accordingly to current literature.
<b>DUE OCTOBER 15, 2019. Expected Outcomes: (based upon and linked to overall Mission of Program or Unit)</b>  <u>Programmatic Outcomes</u> <b>SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge)</b> Candidates will demonstrate content knowledge mastery in their certification areas.  <b>SLO 2 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice)</b> Candidates will demonstrate proficiency in the professional skills of planning and preparation, organizing and maintaining a classroom environment, instruction, and professionalism.  <b>SLO 3 (professional behaviors and characteristics)</b> Candidates will model behaviors and characteristics of professional educators.  <b>SLO 4 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences)</b> Candidates will create engaging learning activities that embed college- and career-readiness skills, digital learning experiences, and current best practices in teaching.

**SLO 5 (data-driven decisions)**

Candidates will make instructional decisions by collecting, analyzing, and acting upon student performance data.

General Education Course Assessment

N/A

**DUE OCTOBER 15, 2019. Means of Measurement: (Make sure this is measureable and link each measurement to each expected outcome.)**

Programmatic Means of Measurement

**SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge)**

Assessment: Praxis Subject Assessments: Agriculture (5701), Biology (5235), Business (5101), Chemistry (5245), English (5039), Family and Consumer Sciences (5122), General Science (5435), Mathematics (5161), Physics (5265), Social Studies (5086)

Method: Nationally-normed test

Benchmark: 80% of candidates earn passing scores (147 on 5701, 150 on 5235, 154 on 5101, 151 on 5245, 168 on 5039, 153 on 5122, 156 on 5435, 160 on 5161, 141 on 5265, 153 on 5086) on first attempt

**SLO 2 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice)**

Assessment: Danielson Framework for Teaching Evaluations

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 100% of candidates will earn a mean rating of 3.0 on all indicators

**SLO 3 (professional behaviors and characteristics)**

Assessment: Teacher Beliefs and Mindset Survey

Method: Survey

Benchmark: 100% of candidates will have a mean rating of 3.0 on all items

**SLO 4 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences)**

Assessment: Lesson Plan

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 80% of candidates earn passing score of at least 80%

**SLO 5 (data-driven decisions)**

Assessment: Student Learning Target Assessment

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 80% of candidates earn passing score of at least 80%

General Education Course Means of Measurement

N/A

**DUE OCTOBER 15, 2020. 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, 2020.

## Programmatic Results

The most notable changes during this cycle were changes to our quality assurance system overall. Utility of the quality assurance system prior to 2019-2020 was limited, and this became evident when the 2019-2020 plans were drafted. To that end, the following timeline of completed events summarizes the work completed in 2019-2020 for all programs to improve the quality assurance system's overall utility.

- Fall 2019
  - Reviewed current process and examined areas for growth in how the process has been implemented.
  - Identified data needs by program.
  - Completed 2018-2019 reports based on outcomes and measures identified during the 2017-2018 academic year.
- Winter 2020
  - Identified common programmatic outcome areas for all programs. Those are:
    - Discipline-specific content knowledge
    - Discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice
    - Professional behaviors and characteristics
    - Creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences
    - Data-driven decisions
- Spring 2020
  - Identify student learning outcomes for each programmatic outcome area.
  - Identify measures to yield data per outcome.
  - Complete 2019-2020 plans based on the new outcomes with data currently available.
    - Given that 2019-2020 is a transition year between the former and new processes, data collection as evidence for some new outcomes might not yet be underway but would commence fall 2020.
- Fall 2020
  - Complete 2019-2020 reports based on new plans constructed spring 2020.
  - Identify plan for 2020-2021 based on 2019-2020 results.
    - Plans address areas of concern in 2019-2020 results and action steps to address each area of concern.

In all, data comparisons of 2019-2020 to 2018-2019 would not be valid as the entire process and suite of measures now used are different. Efforts in 2019-2020 were focused on retooling all accountability practices and not on analyzing program-level data given the fragmented quality assurance system we had. Now that our overall system is much more sound and includes measures that will yield actionable results, the 2020-2021 data captures will provide us with a second comparison point for most measures. COVID-19 school closures and a misinterpretation of available data on another measure will limit our capacity to compare both years of data; however, we do not anticipate a repetition of those circumstances in 2020-2021.

**SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge)**

Assessment: Praxis Subject Assessments: Agriculture (5701), Biology (5235), Business (5101), Chemistry (5245), English (5039), Family and Consumer Sciences (5122), General Science (5435), Mathematics (5161), Physics (5265), Social Studies (5086)

Method: Nationally-normed test

Benchmark: 80% of candidates earn passing scores (147 on 5701, 150 on 5235, 154 on 5101, 151 on 5245, 168 on 5039, 153 on 5122, 156 on 5435, 160 on 5161, 141 on 5265, 153 on 5086) on first attempt

Measure	Total N	Benchmark Met N	Institutional Pass Rate	National Pass Rate
Agriculture (5701)	3	3	100.00	81.25
Biology (5235)	2	2	100.00	64.00
Business (5101)	1	1	100.00	86.27
Chemistry (5245)	-	-	-	-
English (5039)	5	5	100.00	50.90
Family and Consumer Sciences (5122)	-	-	-	-
General Science (5435)	1	1	100.00	40.48
Mathematics (5161)	1	1	100.00	26.32
Physics (5265)	-	-	-	-
Social Studies (5086)	8	8	100.00	51.77

**SLO 2 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice)**

Assessment: Danielson Framework for Teaching Evaluations

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 100% of candidates will earn a mean rating of 3.0 on all indicators

Measure	Total N	Benchmark Met N	Pass Rate
Danielson Framework for Teaching	2	1	50.00

**SLO 3 (professional behaviors and characteristics)**

Assessment: Teacher Beliefs and Mindset Survey

Method: Survey

Benchmark: 100% of candidates will have a mean rating of 3.0 on all items

Data are not available for the benchmark as written. This measure is a proprietary tool, and administration of the tool is controlled by Deans for Impact, the entity that owns the tool. To ensure respondent confidentiality, results are not accessible by respondent. Thus, a calculation by candidate is not possible. This limitation was unknown when we added this tool to our quality assurance system in

2019-2020. The tool will remain a measure in our system; however, the benchmark will be adjusted for 2020-2021 to ensure results are available in the form needed to report data for the benchmark.

**SLO 4 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences)**

Assessment: Lesson Plan

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 80% of candidates earn passing score of at least 80%

COVID-19 school closures prevented these data from being collected.

**SLO 5 (data-driven decisions)**

Assessment: Student Learning Target Assessment

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 80% of candidates earn passing score of at least 80%

COVID-19 school closures prevented these data from being collected.

General Education Course Results

N/A

**DUE OCTOBER 15, 2020. 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, 2020.

Programmatic Use of Results

**SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge)**

Benchmark status: Not met

Candidates complete the Praxis Subject Assessments prior to program admission. Thus, pass rates are 100% as passage is an admission requirement. This measure is the only content knowledge measure in the suite of program-level assessments. Louisiana teacher preparation program policy (Bulletin 996) sets the admission and curricular requirements for MAT programs. Those require curricula focused on pedagogy with the certification exam being the only content assessment. Data on these exams must be collected and reported regularly, but, obviously, a 100% passage rate does not provide for actionable data. Beginning in 2020-2021, we will begin collecting complete records of candidate test results so that each attempt is recorded rather than just the passing attempt. This will allow for first-attempt results to be reported, which we expect this will result in data variance and, thus, have potential for decision-making.

**SLO 2 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice)**

Benchmark status: Not met

Candidates typically perform well overall during their internship experiences. These results led us to evaluate our evaluator training practices, and we discovered that our training of evaluators for the BS and MAT programs was not comparable. This accounts for at least some of the noticeable variance between scores for each type of program. During 2020-2021, we will institute standardized training for all evaluators because the same measure is used across all programs; however, to this point, particular evaluators and trainings have been exclusive to each level of program.

**SLO 3 (professional behaviors and characteristics)**

Benchmark status: Cannot determine whether benchmark was met

Data from this proprietary assessment are not available for disaggregation by candidate, which is how the expected outcome was framed. For 2020-2021, the outcome will be adjusted to reflect a benchmark in terms of how data are available. This was the first year this proprietary tool was used in the quality assurance system, and details provided did not identify data reporting limitations.

**SLO 4 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences)****SLO 5 (data-driven decisions)**

Benchmark status: Cannot be determined due to impact of COVID-19 on data collection

General Education Use of Results

N/A



**2019-2020 INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AUDIT**

**ALL sections are required.**

<b>Major Organizational Unit Head: Don Schillinger, Dean; Terry McConathy, Provost</b>
<b>Name of Unit/Program: MAT, Special Education – Visually Impaired, Grades K-12; GC, Visual Impairments – Blind Education</b>
<b>Mission:</b> To provide high-quality educational experiences for students across the lifespan, to enhance and extend knowledge bases through research and other scholarly activities, and to serve the community through collaborative endeavors.
<b>DUE OCTOBER 15, 2019. Based on analysis of the 2018-2019 data, what is being implemented during the 2019-2020 cycle to improve results:</b>  The program’s quality assurance system is being revamped during the 2019-2020 academic year. Plans submitted for 2018-2019 reflected only a single assessment for all initial teacher preparation programs. While that single assessment is valuable to the program, no single measure can provide adequate evidence to determine overall program quality and yield valid, actionable data.  Data from that single measure that were reported reflected that 100% of candidates met the benchmark performance expectation; therefore, actionability of the data were questioned. Expected outcomes identified below have been strengthened and structured. Five departmental constructs were identified (noted parenthetically below), and these constructs are common across all initial teacher preparation degree programs. They are aligned to both accreditation evidence requirements and best practices in teacher preparation accordingly to current literature.
<b>DUE OCTOBER 15, 2019. Expected Outcomes: (based upon and linked to overall Mission of Program or Unit)</b>  <u>Programmatic Outcomes</u> <b>SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge)</b> Candidates will demonstrate content knowledge mastery in their certification area.  <b>SLO 2 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice)</b> Candidates will demonstrate proficiency in the professional skills of planning and preparation, organizing and maintaining a classroom environment, instruction, and professionalism.  <b>SLO 3 (professional behaviors and characteristics)</b> Candidates will model behaviors and characteristics of professional educators.  <b>SLO 4 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences)</b> Candidates will create engaging learning activities that embed college- and career-readiness skills, digital learning experiences, and current best practices in teaching.

**SLO 5 (data-driven decisions)**

Candidates will make instructional decisions by collecting, analyzing, and acting upon student performance data.

General Education Course Assessment

N/A

**DUE OCTOBER 15, 2019. Means of Measurement: (Make sure this is measureable and link each measurement to each expected outcome.)**

Programmatic Means of Measurement

**SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge)**

Assessment: Praxis Subject Assessments: Reading Language Arts (5002), Mathematics (5003), Social Studies (5004), Science (5005), Special Education: Core Knowledge and Applications (5354)

Method: Nationally-normed test

Benchmark: 80% of candidates earn passing scores (157 on 5002, 157 on 5003, 155 on 5004, 159 on 5005, 145 on 5354) on first attempt

**SLO 2 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice)**

Assessment: Danielson Framework for Teaching Evaluations

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 100% of candidates will earn a mean rating of 3.0 on all indicators

**SLO 3 (professional behaviors and characteristics)**

Assessment: Teacher Beliefs and Mindset Survey

Method: Survey

Benchmark: 100% of candidates will have a mean rating of 3.0 on all items

**SLO 4 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences)**

Assessment: Lesson Plan

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 80% of candidates earn passing score of at least 80%

**SLO 5 (data-driven decisions)**

Assessment: Student Learning Target Assessment

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 80% of candidates earn passing score of at least 80%

General Education Course Means of Measurement

N/A

**DUE OCTOBER 15, 2020. 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, 2020.

### Programmatic Results

The most notable changes during this cycle were changes to our quality assurance system overall. Utility of the quality assurance system prior to 2019-2020 was limited, and this became evident when the 2019-2020 plans were drafted. To that end, the following timeline of completed events summarizes the work completed in 2019-2020 for all programs to improve the quality assurance system's overall utility.

- Fall 2019
  - Reviewed current process and examined areas for growth in how the process has been implemented.
  - Identified data needs by program.
  - Completed 2018-2019 reports based on outcomes and measures identified during the 2017-2018 academic year.
- Winter 2020
  - Identified common programmatic outcome areas for all programs. Those are:
    - Discipline-specific content knowledge
    - Discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice
    - Professional behaviors and characteristics
    - Creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences
    - Data-driven decisions
- Spring 2020
  - Identify student learning outcomes for each programmatic outcome area.
  - Identify measures to yield data per outcome.
  - Complete 2019-2020 plans based on the new outcomes with data currently available.
    - Given that 2019-2020 is a transition year between the former and new processes, data collection as evidence for some new outcomes might not yet be underway but would commence fall 2020.
- Fall 2020
  - Complete 2019-2020 reports based on new plans constructed spring 2020.
  - Identify plan for 2020-2021 based on 2019-2020 results.
    - Plans address areas of concern in 2019-2020 results and action steps to address each area of concern.

In all, data comparisons of 2019-2020 to 2018-2019 would not be valid as the entire process and suite of measures now used are different. Efforts in 2019-2020 were focused on retooling all accountability practices and not on analyzing program-level data given the fragmented quality assurance system we had. Now that our overall system is much more sound and includes measures that will yield actionable results, the 2020-2021 data captures will provide us with a second comparison point for most measures. COVID-19 school closures and a misinterpretation of available data on another measure will limit our capacity to compare both years of data; however, we do not anticipate a repetition of those circumstances in 2020-2021.

**SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge)**

Assessment: Praxis Subject Assessments: Reading Language Arts (5002), Mathematics (5003), Social Studies (5004), Science (5005)

Method: Nationally-normed test

Benchmark: 80% of candidates earn passing scores (157 on 5002, 157 on 5003, 155 on 5004, 159 on 5005) on first attempt

No candidates completed these assessments in the 2019-2020 cycle.

**SLO 2 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice)**

Assessment: Danielson Framework for Teaching Evaluations

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 100% of candidates will earn a mean rating of 3.0 on all indicators

No candidates completed these assessments in the 2019-2020 cycle.

**SLO 3 (professional behaviors and characteristics)**

Assessment: Teacher Beliefs and Mindset Survey

Method: Survey

Benchmark: 100% of candidates will have a mean rating of 3.0 on all items

No candidates completed these assessments in the 2019-2020 cycle.

**SLO 4 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences)**

Assessment: Lesson Plan

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 80% of candidates earn passing score of at least 80%

COVID-19 school closures prevented these data from being collected.

**SLO 5 (data-driven decisions)**

Assessment: Student Learning Target Assessment

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 80% of candidates earn passing score of at least 80%

COVID-19 school closures prevented these data from being collected.

General Education Course Results

N/A

**DUE OCTOBER 15, 2020. 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, 2020.

Programmatic Use of Results

**SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge)**

Benchmark status: Cannot determine whether benchmark was met

No candidates completed these assessments in the 2019-2020 cycle.

**SLO 2 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice)**

Benchmark status: Cannot determine whether benchmark was met

No candidates completed these assessments in the 2019-2020 cycle.

**SLO 3 (professional behaviors and characteristics)**

Benchmark status: Cannot determine whether benchmark was met

Data from this proprietary assessment are not available for disaggregation by candidate, which is how the expected outcome was framed. For 2020-2021, the outcome will be adjusted to reflect a benchmark in terms of how data are available. This was the first year this proprietary tool was used in the quality assurance system, and details provided did not identify data reporting limitations.

**SLO 4 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences)**

**SLO 5 (data-driven decisions)**

Benchmark status: Cannot be determined due to impact of COVID-19 on data collection

General Education Use of Results

N/A



**2019-2020 INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AUDIT**

**ALL sections are required.**

<b>Major Organizational Unit Head: Don Schillinger, Dean; Terry McConathy, Provost</b>
<b>Name of Unit/Program: MEd, Curriculum and Instruction</b>
<b>Mission:</b> To provide high-quality educational experiences for students across the lifespan, to enhance and extend knowledge bases through research and other scholarly activities, and to serve the community through collaborative endeavors.
<b>DUE OCTOBER 15, 2019. Based on analysis of the 2018-2019 data, what is being implemented during the 2019-2020 cycle to improve results:</b>  The program’s curriculum and quality assurance system is being revamped during the 2019-2020 academic year. Plans submitted for 2018-2019 reflected limited evidence for decision-making. Assessments, alignments to standards, and performance expectations are being retooled to yield valid, actionable data.
<b>DUE OCTOBER 15, 2019. Expected Outcomes: (based upon and linked to overall Mission of Program or Unit)</b>  <u>Programmatic Outcomes</u> <b>SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge)</b> Candidates will demonstrate content knowledge mastery in core curriculum and instruction topics.  <b>SLO 2 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice)</b> Candidates will demonstrate proficiency in the professional practice skills required of mentor teachers or content leaders.  <b>SLO 3 (professional behaviors and characteristics)</b> Candidates will model behaviors and characteristics of mentor teachers or content leaders.  <b>SLO 4 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences)</b> Candidates will examine current problems in curriculum and instruction and propose either change theory/innovation-oriented or educational policy-oriented solutions.  <b>SLO 5 (data-driven decisions)</b> Candidates will utilize action research approaches to plan for data-driven decision-making.  <u>General Education Course Assessment</u> N/A
<b>DUE OCTOBER 15, 2019. Means of Measurement: (Make sure this is measurable and link each measurement to each expected outcome.)</b>

Programmatic Means of Measurement

**SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge)**

Assessment: Core course content GPA

Method: GPA

Benchmark: 100% of candidates will maintain a minimum 3.0 GPA on core courses

**SLO 2 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice)**

Assessment: Curriculum development project

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 80% of candidates will a minimum score of 80%

**SLO 3 (professional behaviors and characteristics)**

Assessment: Professional development project

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 80% of candidates will a minimum score of 80%

**SLO 4 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences)**

Assessment: Change project (Capstone problem-solution assessment)

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 80% of candidates will a minimum score of 80%

**SLO 5 (data-driven decisions)**

Assessment: Action research project

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 80% of candidates will a minimum score of 80%

General Education Course Means of Measurement

N/A

**DUE OCTOBER 15, 2020. 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, 2020.

Programmatic Results

The most notable changed during this cycle were changes to our quality assurance system overall. Utility of the quality assurance system prior to 2019-2020 was limited, and this became evident when the 2019-2020 plans were drafted. To that end, the following timeline of completed events summarizes the work completed in 2019-2020 for all programs to improve the quality assurance system's overall utility.

- Fall 2019
  - Reviewed current process and examined areas for growth in how the process has been implemented.

- Identified data needs by program.
- Completed 2018-2019 reports based on outcomes and measures identified during the 2017-2018 academic year.
- Winter 2020
  - Identified common programmatic outcome areas for all programs. Those are:
    - Discipline-specific content knowledge
    - Discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice
    - Professional behaviors and characteristics
    - Creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences
    - Data-driven decisions
- Spring 2020
  - Identify student learning outcomes for each programmatic outcome area.
  - Identify measures to yield data per outcome.
  - Complete 2019-2020 plans based on the new outcomes with data currently available.
    - Given that 2019-2020 is a transition year between the former and new processes, data collection as evidence for some new outcomes might not yet be underway but would commence fall 2020.
- Fall 2020
  - Complete 2019-2020 reports based on new plans constructed spring 2020.
  - Identify plan for 2020-2021 based on 2019-2020 results.
    - Plans address areas of concern in 2019-2020 results and action steps to address each area of concern.

In all, data comparisons of 2019-2020 to 2018-2019 would not be valid as the entire process and suite of measures now used are different. Efforts in 2019-2020 were focused on retooling all accountability practices and not on analyzing program-level data given the fragmented quality assurance system we had. Now that our overall system is much more sound and includes measures that will yield actionable results, the 2020-2021 data captures will provide us with a second comparison point for most measures. COVID-19 school closures and a misinterpretation of available data on another measure will limit our capacity to compare both years of data; however, we do not anticipate a repetition of those circumstances in 2020-2021.

**SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge)**

Assessment: Core course content GPA

Method: GPA

Benchmark: 100% of candidates will maintain a minimum 3.0 GPA on core courses

Measure	Total N	Benchmark Met N	Pass Rate
Course content GPA	6	5	83.33

**SLO 2 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice)**

Assessment: Curriculum development project

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 80% of candidates will a minimum score of 80%

This program and all key assessments were redesigned for the 2020-2021 academic year. No candidates have completed this assessment as of fall 2020.

**SLO 3 (professional behaviors and characteristics)**

Assessment: Professional development project

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 80% of candidates will a minimum score of 80%

This program and all key assessments were redesigned for the 2020-2021 academic year. No candidates have completed this assessment as of fall 2020.

**SLO 4 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences)**

Assessment: Change project (Capstone problem-solution assessment)

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 80% of candidates will a minimum score of 80%

Measure	Total N	Benchmark Met N	Pass Rate
Change project	6	5	83.33

**SLO 5 (data-driven decisions)**

Assessment: Action research project

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 80% of candidates will a minimum score of 80%

This program and all key assessments were redesigned for the 2020-2021 academic year. No candidates have completed this assessment as of fall 2020.

General Education Course Results

N/A

**DUE OCTOBER 15, 2020. 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, 2020.

Programmatic Use of Results

**SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge)**

Benchmark status: Not met

Of the two measures for which data are available, one candidate of a total six candidates did not maintain a 3.0 GPA. Given the low n value and that only one candidate fell below benchmark, we do not believe that the n values are sufficient to justify program changes. We believe at least two complete cycles of data are necessary for justifiable adjustments to the outcome.

**SLO 2 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice)**

Benchmark status: Cannot be determined

This program and all key assessments were redesigned for the 2020-2021 academic year. No candidates have completed this assessment as of fall 2020.

**SLO 3 (professional behaviors and characteristics)**

Benchmark status: Cannot be determined

This program and all key assessments were redesigned for the 2020-2021 academic year. No candidates have completed this assessment as of fall 2020.

**SLO 4 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences)**

Benchmark status: Not met

Final project scores ranged from 78.88 to 91.55 (n=6). Only one candidate's final rating fell below benchmark. Given the low n value and that only one candidate fell below benchmark, we do not believe that the n values are sufficient to justify program changes. We believe at least two complete cycles of data are necessary for justifiable adjustments to the outcome.

**SLO 5 (data-driven decisions)**

Benchmark status: Cannot be determined

This program and all key assessments were redesigned for the 2020-2021 academic year. No candidates have completed this assessment as of fall 2020.

General Education Use of Results

N/A



**2019-2020 INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AUDIT**

**ALL sections are required.**

<b>Major Organizational Unit Head: Don Schillinger, Dean; Terry McConathy, Provost</b>
<b>Name of Unit/Program: MEd, Educational Leadership; GC, Teacher Leader</b>
<b>Mission:</b> To provide high-quality educational experiences for students across the lifespan, to enhance and extend knowledge bases through research and other scholarly activities, and to serve the community through collaborative endeavors.
<b>DUE OCTOBER 15, 2019. Based on analysis of the 2018-2019 data, what is being implemented during the 2019-2020 cycle to improve results:</b>  The program’s quality assurance system is being revamped during the 2019-2020 academic year. Plans submitted for 2018-2019 reflected limited evidence for decision-making. Assessments, alignments to standards, and performance expectations are being retooled to yield valid, actionable data.
<b>DUE OCTOBER 15, 2019. Expected Outcomes: (based upon and linked to overall Mission of Program or Unit)</b>  <u>Programmatic Outcomes</u> <b>SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge)</b> Candidates will demonstrate content knowledge mastery in core educational leadership topics. (NELP Standard 1)  <b>SLO 2 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice)</b> Candidates will demonstrate proficiency in the professional skills associated with curriculum, data systems, supports, and assessment. (NELP Standard 4)  <b>SLO 3 (professional behaviors and characteristics)</b> Candidates will model behaviors and characteristics of professional school leaders. (NELP Standard 2)  <b>SLO 4 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences)</b> Candidates will assist in developing a school’s professional capacity by promoting through supervision, evaluation, support and professional learning. (NELP Standard 7)  <b>SLO 5 (data-driven decisions)</b> Candidates will make instructional decisions and recommendations by collecting, analyzing, and acting upon student performance data. (NELP Standard 8)  <b>SLO 6 (family and community relations)</b> Candidates will apply the knowledge and skills necessary to create a plan to engage families, community, and school personnel to advocate for the needs of their students and school. (NELP Standard 5)  <u>General Education Course Assessment</u>

N/A

**DUE OCTOBER 15, 2019. Means of Measurement: (Make sure this is measurable and link each measurement to each expected outcome.)**

Programmatic Means of Measurement

**SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge)**

Assessment: School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA 6990)

Method: Nationally-normed test

Benchmark: 80% of candidates earn passing scores on first attempt (151 on 6990)

**SLO 2 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice)**

Assessment: Internship activities 3RA3-Prepare and present a presentation to a group external to the school about needs of the schools. 3RA4-Prepare and present a presentation to a group external to the school about policies and programs that promote equitable learning opportunities for student success.

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 80% of candidates will earn a rating of 7.0 or higher

**SLO 3 (professional behaviors and characteristics)**

Assessment: Mentor Survey of MEDEL Candidates

Method: Survey

Benchmark: 100% of candidates will have a mean rating of 2.0 on all items

**SLO 4 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences)**

Assessment: Internship activity 5RA1-Organize and lead a faculty group that will collect, analyze, and interpret school, student, faculty, and community information.

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 80% of candidates will earn a rating of 7.0 or higher

**SLO 5 (data-driven decisions)**

Assessment: School Improvement Initiative Project Presentation

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 80% of candidates will earn a rating of 2.0 or higher on all components

**SLO 6 (family and community relations)**

Assessment: Final project for EDLE 551-Facilitating School & Community Partnerships in Diverse Settings

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 80% of candidates will earn a minimum rating of 170 out of 200 points on the rubric

General Education Course Means of Measurement

N/A

**DUE OCTOBER 15, 2020. 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, 2020.

## Programmatic Results

### **SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge)**

Eight students graduated during the 2019-2020 school year which is a significant drop from 51 in 2018-2019. Only five or 63% of these students earned a passing score on their first attempt on the SLLA 6990. Two of the three students who did not pass on their first attempt were successful on their second attempt. The third student was unable to retake the exam due to COVID-19 and the fact that all testing centers were closed in April and May.

### **SLO 2 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice)**

One hundred percent of the eight candidates earned a rating of 7.0 or higher on required activity 3RA3, which requires student to prepare and present a presentation to a group external to the school about the needs of the school and one hundred percent of the eight candidates earned a rating of 7.0 or higher on required activity 3RA4 which requires students to prepare and present a presentation to a group external to the school about policies and programs that promote equitable learning opportunities for student success.

### **SLO 3 (professional behaviors and characteristics)**

Due to COVID-19 school closures, the survey could not be administered, and data could not be collected.

### **SLO 4 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences)**

One hundred percent of the eight candidates earned a rating of 7.0 or higher on required activity 5RA1 which requires candidates to organize and lead a faculty group that will collect, analyze, and interpret school, student, faculty, and community information.

### **SLO 5 (data-driven decisions)**

Due to COVID-19, an abbreviated School Improvement Initiative Project was submitted by candidates in May 2020. Since in person meetings were prohibited and candidates did not attend school after March 13, 2020, candidates submitted a presentation and included notes to reflect an explanation for each slide. Instead of using the proposed rubric, students were given a score out of 100 for the project. One hundred percent of the candidates earned a score of 100 on the School Improvement Initiative Project.

### **SLO 6 (family and community relations)**

Seventeen of the 18 students enrolled in EDLE 551-Facilitating School & Community Partnerships in Diverse Settings in winter 2020 submitted and presented a final project. One hundred percent of the 17 students earned a rating of 170 or higher out of the 200 points on the rubric. Ninety-four percent of the students earned a rating of 195 or higher out of the possible 200 points. One student submitted a medical excuse with extenuating circumstances and was granted an exemption from completing the final project.

## General Education Course Results

N/A

**DUE OCTOBER 15, 2020. 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, 2020.

### Programmatic Use of Results

The chart below shows a comparison of data between 2018-2019 and 2019-2020 associated with the year-long internship, which is addressed in SLO 2, SLO 4, and SLO 5. This chart is included as a point of clarification for the SLOs and their means of measurement. It is important to note that the cohort size was significantly smaller and thus affected the percentages of various data points. In addition, all P-12 schools closed on March 13, 2020, and candidates were unable to complete some of their activities/assignments in the traditional or anticipated manner.

Candidates were exposed to the requirements of their internship and the required activities in their various courses. The high percentage of students attaining benchmark on the programmatic outcomes, with the exception of SLO 1, can be attributed to students being knowledgeable about the internship's expectations and the small cohort size.

	2018-2019	2019-2020
Number of students enrolled in EDLE 564	51	8
Number of required activities per student per the rubric for the internship portfolio	44	42
Total number of activities completed by all students	2,244	336
Percentage of students who scored 80% or above across all required internship activities	100	100
Percentage of students who scored 90% or above across all required internship activities	98	88
Percentage of total activities that earned a score of 80% or above	96	98

### **SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge)**

Benchmark status: Not met

Sixty-three percent of the candidates earned a passing score on the first SLLA attempt . Given the low n value, we do not believe that the n values are sufficient to justify program changes. We believe at least two complete cycles of data are necessary for justifiable adjustments to the outcome.

Throughout their courses, candidates were given the opportunity to respond to scenarios that were similar to those on the SLLA exam as a form of preparation for the test. During the upcoming school year, additional information regarding testing and test prep will be shared with candidates in an attempt to increase the percentage of students who reach the benchmark for SLO 1.

### **SLO 2 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice)**

Benchmark status: Met

One hundred percent of the candidates earned a rating of 7.0 or higher on required activity 3RA3. These data support that candidates mastered this outcome, but only one cycle of data is available. At least two cycles of data are needed to identify trends, and a second cycle will be available in 2020-2021. At that time, trend analysis results will be used to determine whether adjustments to the benchmark or assessment are warranted.

**SLO 3 (professional behaviors and characteristics)**

Benchmark status: Cannot be determined

Use of a survey was slated as a new program measure. Due to COVID-19 school closures, no candidate mentors were able to participate in this activity.

**SLO 4 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences)**

Benchmark status: Met

One hundred percent of the candidates earned a rating of 7.0 or higher on required activity 5RA1. These data support that candidates mastered this outcome, but only one cycle of data is available. At least two cycles of data are needed to identify trends, and a second cycle will be available in 2020-2021. At that time, trend analysis results will be used to determine whether adjustments to the benchmark or assessment are warranted.

**SLO 5 (data-driven decisions)**

Benchmark status: Met

One hundred percent of the candidates earned a score of 100 on the abbreviated School Improvement Initiative Project, which is comparable to the original benchmark of 80% of candidates will earn a rating of 2.0 or higher on all components. These data support that candidates mastered this outcome, but only one cycle of data is available. At least two cycles of data are needed to identify trends, and a second cycle will be available in 2020-2021. At that time, trend analysis results will be used to determine whether adjustments to the benchmark or assessment are warranted.

**SLO 6 (family and community relations)**

Benchmark status: Met

One hundred percent of candidates earned a rating of 170 or higher out of the 200 points on the rubric. These data support that candidates mastered this outcome, but only one cycle of data is available. At least two cycles of data are needed to identify trends, and a second cycle will be available in 2020-2021. At that time, trend analysis results will be used to determine whether adjustments to the benchmark or assessment are warranted.

General Education Use of Results

N/A