

Measure 1: Impact on P-12 Learning and Development

As reflected in the data, candidates understand and use multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to document learner progress, and to guide the teacher's and learner's decision making. In Spring 2018, 50% of the candidates received a rating of "Effective: Proficient (3)" on Required Rubric Elements and 50% received a rating of "Effective: Emerging (2)"; Assessment Design, and 38% of the candidates received a rating of "Effective: Proficient (3)" and 50% received a rating of "Effective: Emerging (2)". On the element Data Analysis, 63% of the candidates received a rating of "Effective: Emerging (2)" and 63% received a rating of "Effective: Proficient (3)". Additionally, 63% of the candidates received a rating of "Effective: Proficient and 38% received a rating of "Effective: Emerging (2)". Data showed that 63% of the candidates received a rating of "Effective: Proficient (3)" on Alignment and 38% of the candidates received a rating of "Effective: Emerging (2)" on this element. On the element, Using Assessment in Instruction, 63% of the candidates received a rating of "Effective: Proficient (3)" and 38% of the candidates received a rating of "Effective: Emerging (2)". On the element Interpreting Results, 63% of the candidates received a rating of "Effective: Proficient (3)" and 38% received a rating of "Effective: Emerging (2)". The candidates' performance ratings substantiate their ability to understand and use multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to document learner progress, and to guide the teacher's and learner's decision making to meet the academic needs of all students. Based on these results, teacher candidates were provided opportunities for professional development workshops and student teaching/residency seminars that focus on improving their performance on the InTASC Assessment standards. However, because overall, 80% of the candidates scored Effective: Emerging on all elements of the rubric, results show that improvement is needed in in the area of Using Assessment in Instruction.

Measure 2: Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness

Assessment #4 Evaluation of Student Teachers

Spring 2018

1. A Brief description of the Student Teaching Evaluation and how it is used in the program
The Teacher Preparation Program (TPP) in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at Grambling State University is designed to focus on preparing teachers to effectively facilitate learning in PK-12 settings. The successful teacher candidate must demonstrate proficiencies as content scholars, facilitators of learning, and nurturers of affective behaviors. During student teaching clinical practice, teacher candidates are assessed on pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions using an instrument based on the Louisiana Components of Effective Teaching and the Danielson Rubric. During 2017-2018 the Student Teaching Evaluation was divided into five main sections: Domain I-Planning; Domain II- Management; Domain III- Instruction; IV- Professional Development; and Domain V-Technology.

The observation and evaluation rubric is aligned with the ACEI standards, the State of Louisiana Teacher Preparation Competencies, and best practices research findings. The Special Education addendum is aligned with the CEC Standards. The Teacher Candidate Evaluation Rubric was

revised in 2018. It was adapted from the *Compass-Complete Framework for Teaching Instrument*, (2013). Candidates are observed and evaluated a minimum of two times by cooperating teachers and university supervisors.

Candidate Evaluations

Student Teachers are evaluated by Cooperating Teachers and University Supervisors using the Danielson Compass Rubric

Mid-term evaluations are formal and result in the recommendation of a letter grade from university supervisors and cooperating teachers. These evaluations are followed by additional practice time; therefore, areas in need of remediation can be addressed. Mid-term evaluations are discussed with and signed by the student teacher and sent to the Office of Professional Laboratory Experiences.

Final Evaluations. The cooperating teacher and the university supervisor complete a final evaluation and Dispositions Inventory of each assigned student teacher at the end of the student teaching period. Both the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor recommend a letter grade. Conferences with the student teacher should be conducted prior to submitting the grade to give the student teacher an opportunity to discuss the report. Student teachers are required to sign the form to verify that they have had the opportunity to discuss the report with the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor. The ED 445 Course Requirements for final grades are detailed in the course syllabus.

2. A description or how this assessment specifically aligns with the ACEI standards

Assessment 4 chart provides an alignment of each item on the rubric with the standards.

Assessment #4 Teacher Candidate Evaluation/LA Compass Results

SEMESTER: Spring 2018

Danielson Domains	Domain 1C <i>Setting Instructional Outcomes</i> InTASC 6,7 SHAPE 4 ACEI 3.1; 3.2 CEC				Domain 2C <i>Managing Classroom Procedures</i> InTASC 3 SHAPE 4 ACEI 5.1 CEC				Domain 3B <i>Using Questioning/Prompts and Discussion</i> InTASC 5,7,8 SHAPE 4 ACEI 3.3 CEC				Domain 3C <i>Engaging Students in Learning</i> InTASC 5,7,8 SHAPE 4 ACEI 3.4 CEC				Domain 3D <i>Using Assessment in Instruction</i> InTASC 6 SHAPE 5 ACEI 3.5 CEC				COMMENTS
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	
Name/Major																					
# 1976			X				X				X					X			X		States Objectives, Engaged; Directions Clear, Monitors; Clarifies; Wait time; Smooth Transitions; HOTS; Feedback
# 1221			X			X					X				X			X			States Objectives, Directions Clear, Monitors; Clarifies; Smooth Transitions; HOTS
# 2738		X					X			X					X			X			States Objectives, Gives Clear Directions, Monitors; Clarifies; Engages Students
# 7177			X			X					X				X			X			States Objectives, Directions, Monitors; Long Transitions; HOTS
#4587			X			X				X					X				X		States Objectives, Tone Soft; Directions Clear; Monitors; Smooth Transitions; Engaged
#5051		X			X				X					X				X			States Objectives, Directions, Monitors; Clarifies; Rough Transitions; Recall

#0293	X					X			X					X			X			States Objectives, Tone; Directions Confusing, Does not Monitor; Time Lost During Transitions; Recall
#2703	X					X			X					X			X			States Objectives, Directions, Monitors; Clarifies; Smooth Transitions; HOTS

LA Compass/Danielson Rubric

KEY:

Ineffective (1)

- Outcomes lack rigor.
- Outcomes do not represent important learning in the discipline.
- Outcomes are not clear or are stated as activities.
- Outcomes are not suitable for many students in the class.

Effective: Emerging (2)

- Outcomes represent a mixture of low expectations and rigor.
- Some outcomes reflect important learning in the discipline.
- Outcomes are suitable for most of the class.

Effective: Proficient (3)

- Outcomes represent high expectations and rigor.
- Outcomes are related to “big ideas” of the discipline.
- Outcomes are written in terms of what students will learn rather than do.
- Outcomes represent a range of outcomes: factual, conceptual understanding, reasoning, social, management, communication.
- Outcomes are suitable to groups of students in the class, differentiated where necessary.

Highly Effective (4)

In addition to the characteristics of “proficient,”

- Teacher plans reference curricular frameworks or blueprints to ensure accurate sequencing.
- Teacher connects outcomes to previous and future learning
- Outcomes are differentiated to encourage individual students to take educational risks.

3. A Brief Analysis of Data Findings

The data in the Teacher Candidate Evaluation demonstrates how well candidates during the Spring 2018 semester performed on individual evaluations. The rubric individual percentages in each domain explain the overall percentage of total points the candidates received within each domain. The rubric categorizes candidates on a scale (1=ineffective, 2=effective emerging, 3=effective proficient and 4=highly effective). Candidates demonstrated an effective proficient attribute score (mean 3.3) in Domain I, Planning and preparation. Candidates scored the highest (highly effective, 3.5 mean) in the categories of Specifying learner outcomes in clear, concise objectives (IA1) and Identifying and planning for individuals differences (IA3). Candidates demonstrated a highly effective attribute score (mean 3.7) in Domain II, The Classroom environment. Candidates scored highly effective in all categories within this domain. Candidates' highest scores within this domain were (IIB2) Manages Routines and Transitions in a Timely Manner (3.75 mean). Candidates demonstrated a highly effective attribute score (mean 3.5) in Domain III, Instruction. The highest scores within Domain III were (IIIC4) Encourages Candidate Participation and (IIID1) Consistently monitors ongoing performance of candidates (3.8 mean). Candidates demonstrated a highly effective attribute score (mean 3.5) in Domain IV, Professional Development. The highest score within Domain IV was (IVA1) Identifies areas of instruction that need strengthening, develops a plan for improvement with mentor or principal, and works to complete the plan (3.6 mean). Candidates demonstrated effective proficient attribute score (mean 3.3) in Domain V Technology. The highest score within Domain V was (V2) designs, develops and evaluates authentic learning experiences and assessment incorporating contemporary tools and resources to maximize content learning in content and to develop the knowledge, skills and attitudes identified. (3.4 mean).

4. An interpretation of how that data provides evidence for meeting standards.

Based on the data in the Teacher Candidate Education Evaluation, Grambling State candidates demonstrated mastery as scores were in the highly effective attribute score range for three of the five domains (II, III & IV) and effective proficient attribute score range for two domains (I & V). The mean scores of Domain II (3.7), Domain III (3.5) and Domain IV (3.5) categorized the candidates as being highly effective attributes within these domains. Candidates scored with highly effective attributes within all categories of Domain II. The mean scores of Domain I (3.3) and Domain V (3.3) categorizes the candidates as being effective proficient attributes within these domains.

Measure 3: Satisfaction of employers and employment milestones

The Employee Questionnaire is distributed annually to Louisiana school district principals to measure their satisfaction of the preparation of the College of Education's teacher education graduates for their assigned responsibilities in working with P-12 students.

A data chart is not provided because the number of respondents is too low to receive data.

We are working towards developing relationships with employers to improve responses to Employee Questionnaire, as employers may perceive there to be issues of confidentiality.

Measure 4: Satisfaction of completers.

The Follow-Up survey is distributed annually to program completers who are employed in Louisiana school districts to measure their satisfaction with the preparation received in the College of Education’s teacher education programs and to provide feedback regarding areas of improvement.

Overall, our completers are very satisfied with the preparation they received while in their program. We continue to monitor this measure, as we believe it is vital to better preparing our candidates.

How satisfied are you with the education you received from the Teacher Preparation Program at Grambling State University.	2018-19 Initial		2018-19 Advanced	
Very Dissatisfied				
Dissatisfied				
Satisfied				
Very Satisfied	7	100%	5	100%

Measure 5: Graduation Rates (Initial & Advanced)

Graduation rates have been defined as the program completer's ability to complete their degree program. Below are Graduation Rates for Initial and Advanced students.

2018-19	Accepted & Enrolled	Graduated	%
Initial	18	7	38.9%
Advanced	9	5	55.6%

Below is a link to our Title II reports for 2018-19 academic year.

- Title II Report

<https://title2.ed.gov/Secured/DataCollection/Institution/Institution.aspx?pid=dfe87b5b-8908-47bf-9c13-8db2c5eccac0&c=ReportHome>

Measure 6: Ability of Completers to Meet Licensing Requirements and Additional State Requirements

In order for a candidate to complete any program supported by the unit they must meet all licensing requirements outlined by the Louisiana Department of Education. As a result, 100% of

the unit's completers have the ability to meet licensing requirements. The following chart outlines the unit completer numbers for the 2018-19 academic year.

2018-19	Candidates Recommended for Certification	Program Completers
Initial	7	7
Advanced	5	5

Measure 7: Ability of Completers to be Hired in Education Positions for Which They Have Been Prepared (Initial and Advanced)

The EPP offers opportunities for candidates to be prepared in the following areas leading to an initial certification.

Data is provided indicating the number of students certified in their respective certification areas which enables their ability to be hired in at least two certification areas (elementary) and secondary for which they have been prepared.

Majors	Number of completers certified	Numbers in position in which certified
Initial		
Elementary Education	6	6
All-Level – Music	1	1
Advanced		
Elementary Education	4	4
Secondary	1	1
Special Education	5	5

Measure 8: Student Loan Default Rate (Initial and Advanced)

Based on the information from the Office of Financial Aid, the loan default rate is 17.9%.