## **2016 LOUISIANA TEACHER PREPARATION DATA DASHBOARD**

## **University of Louisiana at Monroe**

Prepared by Louisiana Board of Regents & University of Louisiana System

Public Undergraduate Teacher Preparation Program

			В	ASIC PROGRAM	INFO	RMATI	ON						
Program We		http://ulm.ed	u/educat	ion/index.html									
Approval/Accreditation		Names of Agencies										Status	
		State: Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE)										Approved	
		State: Board of Regents (BoR)										Approved	
		Regional: Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC)										Accredited	
		National: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE); Teacher										Accredited	
		Education Accreditation Council (TEAC); or Council for the Accreditation of Educator											
		Preparation (0											
Type of Prog	ram	Traditional (U	ndergrad	uate)									
			C	ANDIDATE SELE	CTIO	N PROF	ILE						
Academic Strength		Completer Passage Rate on Praxis Skills Assessment (2013-14)										100%	
		Median GPA of Candidates Entering the Program (2013-14)										3.14	
		Median GPA of Candidates Completing the Program (2013-14)										3.32	
		Number of Candidates who Started but Did not Complete the Program Within 6 Years								[	Data Not Yet		
												Available	
Teaching Pro	mise	Data not yet a	ivailable.			г							
Candidates/		Candidates		Enrolled			-	Complete	rs		Total		
Completer		(2013-14)	85					46			131		
Diversity		Enrolled		Male 9	es					Females 76			
		Gender	Hispania		۸۰							Multi-Racial	
		Enrolled	Hispanic Indian  1 0			ian O	В	llack 3	Islande ()	er White 81		O	
		Race	_					3	O	01		Ü	
				ND SKILLS FOR									
Knowledge	Content	•	mpleter Passage Rate on Praxis Content Assessments (2013-14)								100%		
Pedagogical		Completer Passage Rate on Praxis Professional Knowledge Assessments (2013-14)										100%	
	Overall	Completer Passage Rate on all Assessments (2013-14)										100%	
Clinical Expe	riences	Student	Clock Hours of Clinical Experiences Prior to Student Teaching							180			
		Teaching	Clock Hours of Clinical Exper During Student Teaching					ber of Number of eeks Clock Hours per			otal Number of Clock Hours		
							Weeks		eeks	Week		Clock Hours	
								1	15 35			525	
Licensure Requirements		Number and Percentage of 2013-14 Completers That Meet State Licensing Requirements										100%	
Completer R	ating	Data Not Yet											
- Compression		ROGRAM PROI		Y AND ALIGNM	IFNT T	O STAT	TF NF	FDS OF	COMPLE	TFRS			
Entry and Pe	rsistence in	Percentage &	Number	of 2013-14 Con	nplete	rs That	Were	e Teachi	ng in 201	4-15	Т	72% (n=33)	
Teaching in Public		Percentage & Number of 2013-14 Completers That Obtained a License to Teach									_	Data Not Yet	
Schools in Louisiana  (Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these scores.)												Available	
		2009-10 Completers Teaching in Public Schools in Louisiana in 2010-11, 2011-12, 2012-13, 2013-14,										014-15	
		Number of 2009-10 Completers		Number & Percentage Teaching in 2010-11	Pe Te	umber 8 ercentage eaching in 2011-12	e n	Numb Percer Teachi 2012	ntage ng in	Number & Percentage Teaching in 2013-14		Number & Percentage Teaching in 2014-15	
		100% (n=76)		76% (n=58)	78	% (n=5	9)	72% (r	n=55)	71% (n=54)		70% (n=53)	
Placement/F High-Need Subjects/Sch	ersistence in	Data Not Yet a	available		1		<u> </u>						

## 2016 LOUISIANA TEACHER PREPARATION DATA DASHBOARD (CONT'D)

**University of Louisiana at Monroe** 

Prepared by Louisiana Board of Regents & University of Louisiana System

Public Undergraduate Teacher Preparation Program

	Tublic Olidergraduate Tec	<u> </u>								
	CE AS CLASSROOM TEACHERS (NEW TE									
Impact on	Mean Compass Student Growth	Co	ompass Student Growth	Nean & Number of Sc	ores					
K-12 Students	Score (2012-13, 2013-14, & 2014-									
	15) and Number of Scores for All	3.2 (n=256)								
(Please examine the 2016	New Teachers with Less than Two									
Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately	Years of Teaching									
interpret the meaning of these	Percentage and Number of 2012-	Compass Teacher Effectiveness Levels for Student Growth Scores								
scores.)	13, 2013-14, & 2014-15 Compass	Ineffective	Effective Emerging	Effective Proficient	Highly Effective					
	Student Growth Scores for the New	20/	420/	240/	F 40/					
	Teachers by LDOE Teacher	3%	12%	31%	54%					
	Effectiveness Levels									
Demonstrated Teaching	Mean Compass Professional	Compass Professional Practice Mean & Number of Scores								
Skill	Practice Score (2012-13, 2013-14,									
	& 2014-15) and Number of Scores	3.2 (n=256)								
(Please examine the 2016	for All New Teachers with Less than	3.2 (.· 233)								
Louisiana Teacher Preparation	Two Years of Teaching									
Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these	Percentage and Number of 2012-	Compass Teacher Effectiveness Levels for Professional Practice Scores								
scores.)	13, 2013-14, & 2014-15 Compass	Ineffective	Effective Emerging	Effective Proficient	Highly Effective					
•	Professional Practice Scores for the	1%	7%	63%	30%					
	New Teachers by LDOE Teacher									
	Effectiveness Levels									
Overall Impact and	Mean Compass Final Evaluation	Co	ompass Final Evaluation	Mean & Number of Sc	ores					
Demonstrated Teaching	Score (2012-13, 2013-14, & 2014-									
Skill	15) and Number of Scores for New	3.2 (n=256)								
	Teachers with Less than Two Years		5.2 (11-250)							
(Please examine the 2016	of Teaching									
Louisiana Teacher Preparation	Percentage and Number of 2012-	Compass Teacher Effectiveness Levels for Final Evaluation Scores								
Data Fact Book to accurately	13, 2013-14, & 2014-15 Compass	Ineffective	Effective Emerging	Effective Proficient	Highly Effective					
interpret the meaning of these scores.)	Final Evaluation Scores for the New	4%	9%	55%	33%					
360763.)	Teachers by LDOE Teacher									
	Effectiveness Levels									
State Value Added Scores	Content Areas	Mean. Numb	er of Scores. & Effective	eness Levels for Value-A	Added Scores of					
for Growth in Student	Content Areas	Mean, Number of Scores, & Effectiveness Levels for Value-Added Scores of Twenty-five or More New Teachers with Less Than Two Years of Teaching who								
Learning for New		Taught During 2014-15 (3- to 5-Year Averages)								
Teachers in Grades 4-8										
	Mathematics									
with Less than Two Years	(Note: A Mean score could not be			(n=39)						
with Less than Two Years of Teaching by Content	(Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5-	Inoffective	N/A	· ,	Highly Effective					
of Teaching by Content	(Note: A Mean score could not be	Ineffective	N/A Effective Emerging	Effective Proficient	Highly Effective					
of Teaching by Content Areas (Twenty-five or	(Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5-year averages due to differences in cut-off scores for new assessments. Percentages of individual scores within effectiveness levels	Ineffective 26%	N/A	· ,	Highly Effective					
of Teaching by Content	(Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5- year averages due to differences in cut-off scores for new assessments. Percentages of individual scores within effectiveness levels could be determined.)		N/A Effective Emerging	Effective Proficient						
of Teaching by Content Areas (Twenty-five or More New Teachers)	(Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5-year averages due to differences in cut-off scores for new assessments. Percentages of individual scores within effectiveness levels		N/A Effective Emerging 39%	Effective Proficient 36%						
of Teaching by Content Areas (Twenty-five or	(Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5- year averages due to differences in cut-off scores for new assessments. Percentages of individual scores within effectiveness levels could be determined.)		N/A Effective Emerging 39%	Effective Proficient						
of Teaching by Content Areas (Twenty-five or More New Teachers)  (Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately	(Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5- year averages due to differences in cut-off scores for new assessments. Percentages of individual scores within effectiveness levels could be determined.)	26%	N/A  Effective Emerging 39%  -2.3	Effective Proficient 36% (n=32)	0%					
of Teaching by Content Areas (Twenty-five or More New Teachers)  (Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these	(Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5- year averages due to differences in cut-off scores for new assessments. Percentages of individual scores within effectiveness levels could be determined.)	26%	N/A  Effective Emerging 39%  -2.3  Effective Emerging	Effective Proficient 36% (n=32) Effective Proficient	0% Highly Effective					
of Teaching by Content Areas (Twenty-five or More New Teachers)  (Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately	(Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5- year averages due to differences in cut-off scores for new assessments. Percentages of individual scores within effectiveness levels could be determined.)  Science	26%	N/A  Effective Emerging 39%  -2.3	Effective Proficient 36% (n=32)	0%					
of Teaching by Content Areas (Twenty-five or More New Teachers)  (Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these	(Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5- year averages due to differences in cut-off scores for new assessments. Percentages of individual scores within effectiveness levels could be determined.)	26%	N/A  Effective Emerging 39%  -2.3  Effective Emerging 41%	Effective Proficient 36%  (n=32)  Effective Proficient 41%	0% Highly Effective					
of Teaching by Content Areas (Twenty-five or More New Teachers)  (Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these	(Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5- year averages due to differences in cut-off scores for new assessments. Percentages of individual scores within effectiveness levels could be determined.)  Science	26%	N/A  Effective Emerging 39%  -2.3  Effective Emerging 41%	Effective Proficient 36% (n=32) Effective Proficient	0% Highly Effective					
of Teaching by Content Areas (Twenty-five or More New Teachers)  (Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these	(Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5- year averages due to differences in cut-off scores for new assessments. Percentages of individual scores within effectiveness levels could be determined.)  Science	Ineffective 13%	N/A  Effective Emerging 39%  -2.3  Effective Emerging 41%  -1.0	Effective Proficient 36%  (n=32)  Effective Proficient 41%  (n=27)	0%  Highly Effective 6%					
of Teaching by Content Areas (Twenty-five or More New Teachers)  (Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these	(Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5- year averages due to differences in cut-off scores for new assessments. Percentages of individual scores within effectiveness levels could be determined.)  Science	Ineffective 13%	N/A  Effective Emerging 39%  -2.3  Effective Emerging 41%  -1.0  Effective Emerging	Effective Proficient 36%  (n=32)  Effective Proficient 41%  (n=27)  Effective Proficient	0%  Highly Effective 6%  Highly Effective					
of Teaching by Content Areas (Twenty-five or More New Teachers)  (Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these	(Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5- year averages due to differences in cut-off scores for new assessments. Percentages of individual scores within effectiveness levels could be determined.)  Science  Social Studies	Ineffective 13%	N/A  Effective Emerging 39%  -2.3  Effective Emerging 41%  -1.0	Effective Proficient 36%  (n=32)  Effective Proficient 41%  (n=27)	0%  Highly Effective 6%					
of Teaching by Content Areas (Twenty-five or More New Teachers)  (Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these	(Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5- year averages due to differences in cut-off scores for new assessments. Percentages of individual scores within effectiveness levels could be determined.)  Science	Ineffective 13%	N/A  Effective Emerging 39%  -2.3  Effective Emerging 41%  -1.0  Effective Emerging 56%	Effective Proficient 36%  (n=32)  Effective Proficient 41%  (n=27)  Effective Proficient 15%	0%  Highly Effective 6%  Highly Effective					
of Teaching by Content Areas (Twenty-five or More New Teachers)  (Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these	(Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5- year averages due to differences in cut-off scores for new assessments. Percentages of individual scores within effectiveness levels could be determined.)  Science  Social Studies  English/Language Arts/Reading	Ineffective 13%	N/A  Effective Emerging 39%  -2.3  Effective Emerging 41%  -1.0  Effective Emerging 56%	Effective Proficient 36%  (n=32)  Effective Proficient 41%  (n=27)  Effective Proficient	0%  Highly Effective 6%  Highly Effective					
of Teaching by Content Areas (Twenty-five or More New Teachers)  (Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these	(Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5- year averages due to differences in cut-off scores for new assessments. Percentages of individual scores within effectiveness levels could be determined.)  Science  English/Language Arts/Reading (Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5- year averages due to differences in cut-off	Ineffective 13% Ineffective 7%	N/A  Effective Emerging 39%  -2.3  Effective Emerging 41%  -1.0  Effective Emerging 56%  N/A	Effective Proficient 36%  (n=32)  Effective Proficient 41%  (n=27)  Effective Proficient 15%  (n=48)	Highly Effective 6%  Highly Effective 22%					
of Teaching by Content Areas (Twenty-five or More New Teachers)  (Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these	(Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5- year averages due to differences in cut-off scores for new assessments. Percentages of individual scores within effectiveness levels could be determined.)  Science  English/Language Arts/Reading (Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5-	Ineffective 13%	N/A  Effective Emerging 39%  -2.3  Effective Emerging 41%  -1.0  Effective Emerging 56%	Effective Proficient 36%  (n=32)  Effective Proficient 41%  (n=27)  Effective Proficient 15%	0%  Highly Effective 6%  Highly Effective					