



2024-2025 INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AUDIT

Major Organizational Unit Head Henrietta Pichon, Dean; Donna Thomas, Provost

ALL sections are required

Name of Unit/Program: BS, Early Childhood Education, Grades PK-3

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.

Based on Analysis of the 2023-2024 data, what is being implemented during the 2024-2025 cycle to improve results:

SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge)

Although Praxis data for SLO 1 have been used for the past several years, the pass rate data provided by ETS is not disaggregated by degree. As a result there is no way to specifically determine first-time pass rates for undergraduate candidates apart from MAT candidates. Previously, results have been determined by reviewing licensure area data in aggregate for undergraduate and MAT candidates, which does not provide a clear picture of the performance of each group. The SLO and acceptable assessment method will be reviewed during the upcoming year. Baseline data will be set and the benchmark determined.

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

The standards selected for focus during the 2024-2025 cycle are as follows:

3d: Using Assessment for Learning – 2.95(22-23)/3.00(23-24)

3b: Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques - 2.94(22-23)/3.04(23-24). Assessment and questioning strategies are being incorporated and modeled in a scaffolded manner throughout the program. This will begin with the introductory courses and continuing throughout methods and practica coursework culminating with the residency.

SLO 3 (professional behaviors and characteristics)

Beginning in the 24-25 academic, the Professionalism Checklist will replace the TBMS as the measure for this SLO. During this year, baseline data will be set and the benchmark determined.

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

The focus of the 2024-2025 cycle is on Integrating technology to enhance the lesson – 1.00(24-25) and setting appropriate instructional outcomes – 2.42(23-24) this focus directly aligns with the assessment and questioning strategies are being incorporated and modeled in a scaffolded manner throughout the

program. The introductory technology course EDCI 210 includes modules on standards/outcomes and assessment/feedback which has been built upon EDCI 125 skills and builds a foundation for the methods, practica, and residency courses. These two modules build students' outcome and assessment knowledge while effectively integrating technology and developing skills for when (and when not) to integrate technology.

SLO 5 (data-driven decisions)

The standards selected for focus during the 2024-2025 cycle are as follows: Analysis of Student Learning – 2.69 and Assessment Plan 2.92. Assessment and questioning strategies are being incorporated and modeled in a scaffolded manner throughout the program. This will begin with the introductory courses and continuing throughout methods and practica coursework culminating with the residency.

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

Programmatic Outcomes (Learning outcomes specifically tied to students in academic program)

SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge)

Candidates will demonstrate content knowledge mastery in the areas of literacy, math, science, and social studies.

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

Candidates will demonstrate proficiency in the professional skills of planning and preparation, organizing and maintaining a classroom environment, instruction, and professionalism.

SLO 3 (professional behaviors and characteristics)

Candidates will model behaviors and characteristics of professional educators.

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

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 (Learning outcomes specifically tied to GER courses; if program does not provide GERS, put N/A)

N/A

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: TBD

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: Professionalism Checklist (End of Spring)

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 100% of candidates will receive ratings of Effective or Highly Effective

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

Assessment: Lesson Plan

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 100% of candidates earn a rating of Proficiency (3) or better on each rubric criteria

SLO 5 (data-driven decisions)

Assessment: Student Learning Target Assessment

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 100% of candidates earn a rating of Developing (2) or better on each rubric criteria

General Education Course Means of Measurement

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, 2025.

Programmatic Results

SLO 1 Because elementary and early childhood candidates have the same Praxis requirements, the available data cannot be disaggregated by program. The table below shows the results for the four required exams, but includes scores for both programs.

Program	Total Tested	Number Passed	% Passing 1st Attempt
Early Childhood/Elementary – Reading subtest (7002)	29	26	89.66%
Early Childhood/Elementary – Math subtest (7003)	21	16	76.19%

Early Childhood/Elementary – Social Studies subtest (7004)	26	15	57.69%
Early Childhood/Elementary – Science subtest (7005)	30	25	83.33%

SLO 2

Program	Number of Candidates Assessed	% at or Above Benchmark
Early Childhood	11	71%

Strengths and Areas for Improvement

Early Childhood majors show **solid performance in Danielson Domain 3 (Instruction)**, with average scores approaching *Proficient* (around 2.89). This suggests that these candidates are developing strength in active classroom practice, particularly in facilitating discussions and engaging young learners.

In contrast, **Domains 1 and 2 (Planning and Classroom Environment)** show more modest averages (2.6–2.7), with particular weakness in *1b: Knowing and Valuing Students* and *1a: Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy*. These results suggest that candidates may need additional support in connecting instruction to child development principles and in designing plans that respond to diverse needs. Classroom management and environment-building also appear to be areas for further growth.

Trends Across Race and Gender

- **Gender:**
Female candidates slightly outperform male candidates in planning (Domain 1: 2.74 vs. 2.68), while male candidates score slightly higher in classroom environment (Domain 2: 2.73 vs. 2.72). Both groups perform similarly in instruction, averaging close to 2.9. Gender gaps in this major are smaller than those observed in Secondary Education.
- **Race/Ethnicity:**
White candidates show stronger averages across all domains compared to candidates who declined to specify race. For example, in Domain 1, white candidates average ~2.77 versus ~2.60 for “not specified.” The largest difference appears in planning, where unspecified race students lag slightly. Instruction (Domain 3) is more balanced across groups, though white candidates still hold a small advantage (~2.85 vs. ~2.84).

Trends Across Other Majors

When compared with other majors:

- **Elementary Ed/SPED candidates** outperform Early Childhood in planning and instruction, with Domain 1 averages near 2.97 and Domain 3 close to 3.0.
- **Elementary Education candidates** also score higher in planning (2.84 vs. 2.71) but similar in Domain 2 (classroom environment).
- **Secondary Education candidates** slightly surpass Early Childhood in Domain 1 but are similar in Domain 3.

Overall, Early Childhood majors are stronger in instructional practice than in planning or classroom management, and while they perform comparably to peers in instruction, they lag behind Elementary and SPED candidates in planning skills.

Overall takeaway:

Early Childhood majors demonstrate growing strength in instruction but need additional focus on planning and creating effective learning environments. Gender differences are minimal, but there is a consistent, if small, performance gap between white candidates and those who did not specify race. Compared with other majors, Early Childhood candidates are middle performers—stronger in instruction than Elementary Education peers but consistently behind Elementary/SPED candidates in planning.

SLO 3

Program	Number of Candidates Assessed	% at or Above Benchmark
Early Childhood	11	93%

Strengths and Areas for Improvement

Overall, Early Childhood candidates perform strongly, with averages in the **Effective to Highly Effective range (3.4–3.9 on a 4-point scale)**.

Strengths:

- Candidates excel in *acting with integrity and honesty* and *showing appreciation for diversity*, where scores approach 3.7–3.8.
- They also demonstrate professionalism through *regular participation in the professional community* and *seeking feedback constructively*.
- Communication with colleagues and mentors is consistently effective.

Areas for Improvement:

- The lowest scores (though still effective at 3.4) appear in *preparing lessons/units in advance* and *communicating instructional information to students*. These results suggest candidates could benefit from more emphasis on proactive planning and clear instructional communication.

Early Childhood candidates show the **strongest growth pattern** of all majors.

- Starting in **September**, scores were already slightly higher than Secondary (3.01).
- Scores climbed steadily through **October and November (3.15–3.21)**.
- By **December and January**, scores moved firmly into the *Effective* range (3.43–3.54).
- The highest gains occurred in **February (3.65)** and **March (3.81)**, peaking at the *Highly Effective* level.
- In **April and May**, scores remained strong, slightly tapering but holding near **3.77**.

Takeaway: Early Childhood candidates show **consistent and substantial growth**, reaching their peak in March and sustaining high performance through the spring. They finish the year at a stronger level than both Secondary and Elementary majors.

Trends Across Gender

- **Male candidates** (3.95) slightly outperform **female candidates** (3.75). This is a reversal of trends often seen in other majors, indicating that in Early Childhood, males are demonstrating particularly strong professional behaviors.

Trends Across Race/Ethnicity

- **White candidates** (3.82) outperform those who declined to specify race (3.57).
- While all groups remain effective, this difference suggests that candidates who opted not to report race may face some challenges in consistently demonstrating professionalism at the same level as their peers.

Overall takeaway:

Early Childhood candidates are demonstrating strong professionalism, particularly in ethics, diversity, and participation in the professional community. Lesson preparation and instructional communication remain areas for growth. Unlike other majors, male candidates slightly outperform females, and white candidates score higher than those who declined to specify race.

SLO 4

Program	Number of Candidates Assessed	% at or Above Benchmark
Early Childhood	3	96%

Strengths and Areas for Improvement

Strengths:

- Candidates perform strongest in **Design for Instruction – Lesson and Unit Structure** (~2.91), showing emerging skill in developing coherent instructional plans.
- **Assessment Plan – Multiple Modes and Approaches** (~2.73) is another area of relative strength, indicating candidates are experimenting with different ways to assess young learners.

Areas for Improvement:

- Lower scores appear in **Contextual Factors – Implications for Instruction** (~2.64) and **Design for Instruction – Variety of Instructional Strategies** (~2.64). This suggests candidates need further support in adapting instruction to diverse developmental needs and applying a range of instructional approaches.
- **Analysis of Student Learning – Evidence of Impact** (~2.70) is also a growth area, signaling a need to strengthen the ability to demonstrate how instructional choices affect learning outcomes.

- Overall, averages remain in the **Developing to Effective** range, with no criteria at the highest performance level.

Trends Across Gender

- **Female candidates** (2.90) slightly outperform **male candidates** (2.77).
- While the gap is small, female candidates show stronger performance overall, particularly in instructional planning.

Trends Across Race/Ethnicity

- **White candidates** (2.89) and those who **did not specify race** (2.88) perform almost identically.
- This indicates equity across racial reporting groups, with no major performance gaps evident in the Early Childhood major.

Trends Across Primary Major Concentration

- No separate concentrations were reported for Early Childhood majors, so concentration-level analysis is not applicable.

Overall takeaway:

Early Childhood candidates are developing strengths in lesson/unit planning and varied assessment approaches. They continue to need support in **connecting contextual factors to instruction** and **demonstrating evidence of student learning impact**. Gender differences are modest, with females slightly outperforming males, and racial performance is essentially even across groups.

SLO 5

Program	Number of Candidates Assessed	% at or Above Benchmark
Early Childhood	11	100%

Strengths and Areas for Improvement

Strengths:

- Early Childhood candidates demonstrate consistent performance (~3.0) in **knowledge of content, pedagogy, students, and student knowledge development**. These results suggest that candidates understand subject matter, how young children learn, and how to align instruction accordingly.

Areas for Improvement:

- The weakest area is **Designing appropriate assessments to determine student learning** (~2.67). This indicates candidates need more support in developing effective, developmentally appropriate assessment tools to measure learning outcomes.

- While most areas are in the *Effective range*, scores are clustered at the lower end of effectiveness, highlighting the need for growth in both assessment design and refining instructional planning skills.

Trends Across Gender

- **Female candidates** averaged ~2.96 overall. No male candidates were represented in this group, so no gender comparisons can be made.

Trends Across Race/Ethnicity

- **Black/African American candidates** averaged 3.00, slightly higher than **white candidates** (2.94).
- Both groups remain within the effective range, but this suggests that Black/African American candidates are performing at the same or slightly stronger levels compared to their white peers.

Trends Across Primary Major Concentration

- No concentrations were reported for Early Childhood majors, so concentration-level analysis is not applicable.

Overall takeaway:

Early Childhood candidates show consistency in content and pedagogy but need targeted support in **assessment design** to better measure student learning. Performance is balanced across race, with no notable equity gaps, though overall averages remain at the lower effective range, suggesting a need for ongoing growth in lesson planning skills.

General Education Course Results

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

To be completed by October 15, 2025.

Programmatic Use of Results

SLO 1

A decision was made to change the benchmark to “100% of candidates will obtain a passing score by June 1 prior to residency.”

SLO 2

- Describe what was actually done to improve the outcomes?
 - Students in the Instructional Technology course received the following:
 - Introduction to assessment
 - Alignment of standard, objective, and assessment
 - Creation of an objective aligned with a standard
 - Creation of an assessment aligned with the objective
 - Students are introduced to Blooms and scaffolding content
 - Questioning strategies and techniques are also discussed and assessed especially during their “level-up” lesson plan assignment
 - For assessment, students in Literacy Block 1 (EDCI 4233–Writing Methods, EDCI 4243–Reading methods, and EDCI 4313 Word study methods) receive an introduction to the teaching, learning, assessment cycle across the courses. As teacher candidates are exposed to skills addressed in each Literacy Block 1 course, they also are provided ways to collect assessment data related to those skills. When they move into Literacy Block 2, teacher candidates take EDCI4203-Reading practicum where they are in a mentor classroom for 4.5 hours a week across the quarter. Teacher candidates plan literacy lessons that they then teach in that placement classroom. The second course in Literacy Block 2 is a literacy assessment class, EDCI 4173. Students are provided modeling, scaffolding, and guidance as they develop assessments that will be used to collect student data connected to the lesson they teach. Teacher candidates write a reflection after teaching the literacy lesson where they analyze that student data collected during or after the teaching of the lesson.
- Describe the impact of these changes. You can compare previous year to current year to identify improvement.
 - The score for 2023-2024 for 3d was 3.0. For AY 2024-2025, Danielson Domain 1-1f: Designing and Analyzing Assessment– shows that teacher candidates scored 3.23 (N=10); Danielson 3d-Using Assessment for Learning–Clear Standards for Success was 2.97; 3d - Using Assessment for Learning–Monitoring Student Learning was 3.10; 3d-Using Assessment for Learning–Timely, Constructive Feedback was 3.0. The overall score for 3d was 3.02.
 - The current year’s data show that 1f: Designing & Analyzing Assessments is a weakness, scoring as the second lowest indicator at 3.13. This was an increase from 2.64 last year. While this is not the same indicator, it is connected to assessment.
 - The current year’s data show that 3b: Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques did not increase from last year, with a score of 3.06. This was an increase from 3.04 last year.
- State clearly what improvements have taken place during this cycle
 - Refer to answer for first question.

SLO 3

The change in the assessment was made. Data for 24-25 presented in this IE Audit reflects scores from the new assessment.

SLO 4

- Describe what was actually done to improve the outcomes?
 - The CEHS Lesson Plan template is introduced in the Introduction to Teaching course. The students complete a backward lesson plan assignment, and identify components of lesson plans from observations.
 - The lesson plan assessment in the Instructional Technology course was reworked. Additional lesson plan skills were also added. These include the following:
 - Introduction to CEHS Lesson Plan template
 - Introduction to assessment
 - Alignment of standard, objective, and assessment
 - Creation of an objective aligned with a standard
 - Creation of an assessment aligned with the objective
 - Build a partial lesson plan using the CEHS template
 - Students are introduced to Blooms and scaffolding content
 - Questioning strategies and techniques are also discussed and assessed especially during their “level-up” lesson plan assignment
 - Students “level-up” a lesson plan with technology and annotate glows and grows throughout with a focus on standard/objective/assessment/questioning
 - Effective technology integration for teaching and learning was/is modeled and practiced in the Instructional Technology course. Technology skills are integrated throughout various courses including the Introduction to Teaching course.
- Literacy Block reinforcement of lesson plan—students in Literacy Block 1 are required to use the lesson plan to write one of the lessons they teach in one of their field experiences. They peer teach the lesson in class using the lesson plan as a guide, then they teach the lesson in either Grade 3, 4, or 5. In Literacy Block 2, students use the lesson plan format for the lessons they will teach in their placement classroom. As part of that planning, students identify appropriate technology that could be used to teach and/or engage students in the activities.
- Describe the impact of these changes. You can compare previous year to current year to identify improvement.
 - In 23-24, Integrating Technology to Enhance the Lesson was 1.0. A committee determined that the rubric needed to be changed. The current score for this is 3.23.
- State clearly what improvements have taken place during this cycle
 - Refer to first bullet point.

SLO 5

- Describe what was actually done to improve the outcomes?
 - The CEHS Lesson Plan template is introduced in the Introduction to Teaching course. The students complete a backward lesson plan assignment, and identify components of lesson plans from observations.
 - Students in the Instructional Technology course received the following:
 - Introduction to CEHS Lesson Plan template
 - Introduction to assessment
 - Alignment of standard, objective, and assessment
 - Creation of an objective aligned with a standard
 - Creation of an assessment aligned with the objective
 - Build a partial lesson plan using the CEHS template
 - Students are introduced to Blooms and scaffolding content
 - Questioning strategies and techniques are also discussed and assessed especially during their “level-up” lesson plan assignment
 - Students “level-up” a lesson plan with technology and annotate glows and grows throughout with a focus on standard/objective/assessment/questioning
- Describe the impact of these changes. You can compare previous year to current year to identify improvement.
 - Teacher work sample rubric was reviewed and revised as part of our validity and reliability studies last year. The focus area from last year, Designs appropriate assessments to determine level of

student learning toward master of instructional outcome, does not exist as a specific indicator in the new rubric so that a specific impact can be identified. However, for the two items in the area of Assessment in the revised rubric, students scored well, with Assessment Plan: Alignment of Assessments with Learning Outcomes and Instruction tied for highest rating (3.0) and Assessment Plan: Multiple Modes and Assessment only slightly lower at 2.73.

- State clearly what improvements have taken place during this cycle
 - In progress

General Education Use of Results



2024-2025 INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AUDIT

Major Organizational Unit Head Henrietta Pichon, Dean; Donna Thomas, Provost

ALL sections are required

Name of Unit/Program: BS, Elementary Education, Grades 1-5

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.

Based on Analysis of the 2023-2024 data, what is being implemented during the 2024-2025 cycle to improve results:

SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge)

Although Praxis data for SLO 1 have been used for the past several years, the pass rate data provided by ETS is not disaggregated by degree. As a result there is no way to specifically determine first-time pass rates for undergraduate candidates apart from MAT candidates. Previously, results have been determined by reviewing licensure area data in aggregate for undergraduate and MAT candidates, which does not provide a clear picture of the performance of each group. The SLO and acceptable assessment method will be reviewed during the upcoming year. Baseline data will be set and the benchmark determined.

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

For the 2024-25 academic year, we will shift our focus to 3b: Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques. Although this is not the lowest area, we believe addressing this attribute will directly impact the others. We will focus on pre-requisite knowledge, personal research and resources along with the questioning column on the lesson plan. Beginning in EDCI 207, students will be introduced to theories of learning, and this information will be infused across the methods and practicum courses through lesson planning.

SLO 3 (professional behaviors and characteristics)

Beginning in the 24-25 academic, the Professionalism Checklist will replace the TBMS as the measure for this SLO. During this year, baseline data will be set and the benchmark determined.

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

The focus of the 2024-2025 cycle is on Integrating technology to enhance the lesson – 1.00(24-25) and setting appropriate instructional outcomes – 2.42(23-24) this focus directly aligns with the assessment and questioning strategies are being incorporated and modeled in a scaffolded manner throughout the program. The introductory technology course EDCI 210 includes modules on standards/outcomes and assessment/feedback which has been

built upon EDCI 125 skills and builds a foundation for the methods, practica, and residency courses. These two modules build students' outcome and assessment knowledge while effectively integrating technology and developing skills for when (and when not) to integrate technology.

SLO 5 (data-driven decisions)

The group for which the action step was used has just entered residency this year. Spring of 2024-25 will be the first opportunity to see how the action plan has had an impact. Therefore no changes are planned at this time.

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

Programmatic Outcomes (Learning outcomes specifically tied to students in academic program)

SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge)

Candidates will demonstrate content knowledge mastery in the areas of literacy, math, science, and social studies.

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

Candidates will demonstrate proficiency in the professional skills of planning and preparation, organizing and maintaining a classroom environment, instruction, and professionalism.

SLO 3 (professional behaviors and characteristics)

Candidates will model behaviors and characteristics of professional educators.

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

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 (Learning outcomes specifically tied to GER courses; if program does not provide GERs, put N/A)

N/A

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: TBD

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: Professionalism Checklist (End of Spring)
 Method: Rubric
 Benchmark: 100% of candidates will receive ratings of Effective or Highly Effective

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

Assessment: Lesson Plan
 Method: Rubric
 Benchmark: 100% of candidates earn a rating of Proficiency (3) or better on each rubric criteria

SLO 5 (data-driven decisions)

Assessment: Student Learning Target Assessment
 Method: Rubric
 Benchmark: 100% of candidates earn a rating of Developing (2) or better on each rubric criteria

General Education Course Means of Measurement

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, 2025.

Programmatic Results

SLO 1

Because elementary and early childhood candidates have the same Praxis requirements, the available data cannot be disaggregated by program. The table below shows the results for the four required exams, but includes scores for both programs.

Program	Total Tested	Number Passed	% Passing 1st Attempt
Early Childhood/Elementary – Reading subtest (7002)	29	26	89.66%
Early Childhood/Elementary – Math subtest (7003)	21	16	76.19%

Early Childhood/Elementary – Social Studies subtest (7004)	26	15	57.69%
Early Childhood/Elementary – Science subtest (7005)	30	25	83.33%

SLO 2

Program	Number of Candidates Assessed	% at or Above Benchmark
Elementary	18	78%

Strengths and Areas for Improvement

Elementary Education majors perform **consistently well in Danielson Domain 3 (Instruction)**, averaging close to *Proficient* (~2.92). Elements related to engaging students, instructional strategies, and questioning/discussion techniques are relative strengths.

Scores in **Domain 1 (Planning)** are also comparatively strong (averaging ~2.83–2.89 across elements), showing that Elementary candidates are more skilled in lesson design and pedagogical knowledge than peers in some other majors.

The **main area for improvement is Domain 2 (Classroom Environment)**, where averages (~2.71) are slightly lower, particularly in managing student behavior and creating a positive classroom culture. Strengthening classroom management skills and proactive environment-building strategies would help candidates improve further.

Trends Across Race and Gender

- **Gender:**
Female candidates perform stronger overall than male candidates. For example, in Domain 1, female averages are ~2.86 compared to ~2.49 for males. Domain 2 and Domain 3 show similar trends, with females holding a consistent advantage of ~0.3–0.4 points. This gap suggests targeted support for male candidates, particularly in planning and classroom environment.
- **Race/Ethnicity:**
Black/African American candidates slightly outperform white candidates in planning (Domain 1: 2.89 vs. 2.83) and classroom environment (2.78 vs. 2.71), while white candidates are marginally stronger in instruction (Domain 3: 2.92 vs. 2.86). These differences are modest, but the data suggest equitable performance across race, with small strengths and weaknesses distributed between groups.

Trends Across Other Majors

- Compared to **Early Childhood**, Elementary Education majors score higher in planning (2.83 vs. 2.71) and slightly higher in instruction (2.92 vs. 2.89).
- Compared to **Secondary Education**, Elementary Education candidates are stronger in planning (2.83 vs. 2.78) and show similar performance in instruction.
- **Elementary/SPED majors** slightly outperform Elementary Education in planning (2.97 vs. 2.83) and instruction (2.99 vs. 2.92), suggesting SPED candidates may be more advanced in differentiated planning and classroom strategies.

Overall, Elementary Education majors demonstrate broad strengths across planning and instruction, placing them among the stronger-performing majors. The largest gap appears in classroom environment, where additional focus may be needed.

Overall takeaway:

Elementary Education majors are strong in both planning and instruction, with averages consistently in the proficient range. Their primary need is growth in Domain 2 (Classroom Environment), particularly classroom management. Female candidates outperform males across all domains, and racial performance is largely balanced, with small differences by domain. Compared to other majors, Elementary candidates are among the stronger groups, particularly in planning, though still slightly behind Elementary/SPED candidates.

SLO 3

Program	Number of Candidates Assessed	% at or Above Benchmark
Elementary	17	93%

Strengths and Areas for Improvement

Elementary Education candidates perform well overall, with scores ranging from **3.35 to 3.59 (Effective to Highly Effective range)**.

Strengths:

- Candidates excel in *adhering to university/district professional dress and conduct expectations and participating in school-related activities*, with averages above 3.5.
- They also demonstrate professionalism in *participating in the professional community and collaborating with peers and mentors*.

Areas for Improvement:

- The lowest scores (3.35–3.41) are in *communicating instructional information to students and reflecting on teaching and identifying ways to improve*. This suggests a need for further development in professional communication and self-reflection practices.

Elementary Education (Grades 1–5) Majors

Elementary Education candidates also show **steady improvement**, though growth is more gradual than in Early Childhood.

- **September averages were 2.89**, similar to Secondary.
- Scores increased through **October and November (3.07–3.15)** and rose to **3.30 by December**.
- By **January and February**, averages reached **3.40–3.54**, with February marking a significant improvement.
- Scores plateaued slightly in **March (3.51)** but increased again through **April and May (~3.58)**.

Takeaway: Elementary candidates show **steady growth across the year**, with gains especially evident in the winter months. They consistently finish the year in the effective range, though not as high as Early Childhood candidates.

Trends Across Gender

- Female candidates are the majority, and their averages cluster between **3.52 and 3.59**.
- The dataset includes duplicate gender labels ("Female" and "female"), but scores across both groups are similar, indicating no major gender-based differences within this major.

Trends Across Race/Ethnicity

- **Black/African American candidates** scored highest, averaging **4.0**, which places them in the *Highly Effective* range.
- **White candidates** averaged **3.56**, also effective but slightly lower.
- This suggests that, in Elementary Education, Black/African American candidates are excelling in demonstrating professional behaviors, outperforming their white peers.

Overall takeaway:

Elementary Education candidates demonstrate strong professional behaviors, particularly in conduct, participation, and community engagement. They show room for growth in communication with students and reflective practice. Unlike trends seen in Secondary Education, Black/African American candidates outperform white candidates, averaging in the highly effective range. Gender-based differences are negligible.

SLO 4

Program	Number of Candidates Assessed	% at or Above Benchmark
Elementary	4	100%

Strengths and Areas for Improvement

Strengths:

- Candidates perform strongest in **Analysis of Student Learning – Alignment with Learning Goals** and **Design for Instruction – Lesson and Unit Structure** (both ~2.94). These results indicate that Elementary candidates are relatively stronger in aligning plans with standards and creating structured instructional sequences.
- **Assessment Plan – Multiple Modes and Approaches** (~2.76) is another emerging strength, showing candidates' ability to begin integrating diverse ways of checking for student understanding.

Areas for Improvement:

- The lowest averages are in **Analysis of Student Learning – Evidence of Impact** (~2.71) and **Contextual Factors – Implications for Instruction** (~2.71). These scores suggest candidates need more support in analyzing data to show student growth and in connecting contextual knowledge (such as cultural, linguistic, and developmental factors) directly to instructional planning.

- Overall, scores remain within the **Developing to Effective range**, with no element averaging at the highest performance level.

Trends Across Gender

- Female candidates generally perform slightly higher (~2.92) compared to male candidates (~2.77).
- The gap is modest, but it suggests females are demonstrating somewhat stronger overall performance in TWS components.

Trends Across Race/Ethnicity

- **Black/African American candidates** (2.92) and **White candidates** (2.91) perform nearly identically.
- This indicates **no significant racial performance gap** within Elementary Education, unlike the disparities observed in Secondary Education.

Overall takeaway:

Elementary Education candidates demonstrate relative strengths in aligning learning goals with instruction and in structuring lesson/unit plans. The greatest need for improvement lies in **analyzing evidence of student learning impact** and **connecting contextual factors to instruction**. Gender differences are modest, with females slightly outperforming males, and racial performance is essentially equitable across groups.

SLO 5

Program	Number of Candidates Assessed	% at or Above Benchmark
Elementary	18	100%

Strengths and Areas for Improvement

Strengths:

- Elementary Education candidates scored consistently at **3.0 (Effective)** across all rubric elements, including **content knowledge, pedagogy, student knowledge, instructional outcomes, assessment, resources, and technology integration**.
- This suggests candidates are reliably meeting expectations for lesson planning and can demonstrate competence across all areas.

Areas for Improvement:

- While candidates are consistently effective, **no elements scored above 3.0**, meaning there is limited evidence of performance at the *Highly Effective* level.
- Growth is needed in moving from meeting expectations to exceeding them, particularly in areas such as **assessment design** and **technology integration**, where candidates have the opportunity to demonstrate stronger innovation and differentiation.

Trends Across Gender

- **Female and male candidates both averaged 3.0**, indicating no gender-based differences within this group.

Trends Across Race/Ethnicity

- Only **white candidates** were represented, with averages at 3.0.
- This limits the ability to evaluate equity trends across race/ethnicity for this group.

Trends Across Primary Major Concentration

- No concentrations were reported for Elementary Education majors, so concentration-level analysis is not applicable.

Overall takeaway:

Elementary Education candidates consistently perform at the **Effective level** across all aspects of lesson planning. The challenge moving forward is helping candidates grow into the *Highly Effective* range, particularly in **assessment design** and **technology integration**. Performance is uniform across gender, though limited racial diversity in the dataset prevents equity analysis.

General Education Course Results

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

To be completed by October 15, 2025.

Programmatic Use of Results

SLO 1

A decision was made to change the benchmark to "100% of candidates will obtain a passing score by June 1 prior to residency."

SLO 2

The change in the assessment was made. Data for 24-25 presented in this IE Audit reflects scores from the new assessment.

A questioning column on the lesson plan template was added. Additionally, in science, a focus was added on types of questions, pre-requisite knowledge, personal research, and resources. In math, an emphasis was placed on questioning; this emphasis began with the first class. Preservice teachers are required to create a "script" on the lesson plan that shows their ability to compare, contrast, and connect student strategies. They plan for

different question types and indicate these by differences in font color. Questions to clarify student strategies and questions to compare, contrast, and connect strategies are included.

SLO 3

The change in the assessment was made. Data for 24-25 presented in this IE Audit reflects scores from the new assessment.

SLO 4

To improve outcomes, EDCI 125 incorporated opportunities to build students' knowledge and use of technology. For example, students are required to build a Prezi presentation and create and name/rename/change format, etc. files and folders. In 207 and 210, technology modules rooted in standards/outcomes and assessments/feedback have been created. These two modules build students' outcome and assessment knowledge while effectively integrating technology and developing skills for when (and when not) to integrate technology.

SLO 5

No changes were implemented due to students' progression through the plan of study.

General Education Use of Results



2024-2025 INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AUDIT

Major Organizational Unit Head Henrietta Pichon, Dean; Donna Thomas, Provost

ALL sections are required

Name of Unit/Program: BS, Secondary Education and Teaching, Grades 6-12, UTeachTech (STEM Education Studies)

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.

Based on Analysis of the 2023-2024 data, what is being implemented during the 2024-2025 cycle to improve results:

SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge)

Although Praxis data for SLO 1 have been used for the past several years, the pass rate data provided by ETS is not disaggregated by degree. As a result there is no way to specifically determine first-time pass rates for undergraduate candidates apart from MAT candidates. Previously, results have been determined by reviewing licensure area data in aggregate for undergraduate and MAT candidates, which does not provide a clear picture of the performance of each group. The SLO and acceptable assessment method will be reviewed during the upcoming year. Baseline data will be set and the benchmark determined.

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

Three areas for growth are identified as the focus for this upcoming year: 3d: Using Assessment for Learning – 3.13, 3b: Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques – 3.15, and 1f: Designing and Analyzing Assessments – 3.19, which are also in line with areas for growth in SLO 4. In order to strengthen performance in these areas, the Assessment course taken by all secondary education majors will be redesigned, and the instructor will collaborate with instructor of the methods course to have students develop assessments aligned to unit plan created in the methods course.

SLO 3 (professional behaviors and characteristics)

Beginning in the 24-25 academic, the Professionalism Checklist will replace the TBMS as the measure for this SLO. During this year, baseline data will be set and the benchmark determined.

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

Beginning in the 24-25 academic, the Professionalism Checklist will replace the TBMS as the measure for this SLO. During this year, baseline data will be set and the benchmark determined.

SLO 5 (data-driven decisions)

Lowest ratings for the TWS are Designs appropriate assessments to determine level of student learning toward mastery of instructional outcomes – 2.36, which is also the area of focus for SLO 2. In order to strengthen performance in these areas, the Assessment course taken by all secondary education majors will be redesigned, and the instructor will collaborate with instructor of the methods course to have students develop assessments aligned to unit plan created in the methods course.

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

Programmatic Outcomes (Learning outcomes specifically tied to students in academic program)

SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge)

Candidates will demonstrate content knowledge mastery in their respective certification areas.

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

Candidates will demonstrate proficiency in the professional skills of planning and preparation, organizing and maintaining a classroom environment, instruction, and professionalism.

SLO 3 (professional behaviors and characteristics)

Candidates will model behaviors and characteristics of professional educators.

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

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 (Learning outcomes specifically tied to GER courses; if program does not provide GERs, put N/A)

N/A

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: Agriculture (5701), Business (5101), English (5039), Social Studies (5086)

Method: Nationally-normed test

Benchmark: TBD

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: Professionalism Checklist (End of Spring)

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 100% of candidates will receive ratings of Effective or Highly Effective

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

Assessment: Lesson Plan

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 100% of candidates earn a rating of Proficiency (3) or better on each rubric criteria

SLO 5 (data-driven decisions)

Assessment: Student Learning Target Assessment

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 100% of candidates earn a rating of Developing (2) or better on each rubric criteria

General Education Course Means of Measurement**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, 2025.

Programmatic Results**SLO 1**

Program	Total Tested	Number Passed	% Passing 1 st Attempt
Secondary – English (5039)	6	2	33.33%
Secondary – Social Studies (5086)	8	4	50.00%
Secondary – Math (5165)	4	*	*
Secondary – Biology (5236)	2	*	*
Secondary – Agriculture (5701)	5	5	100.00%

Data not available when test taker count is fewer than 5.*SLO 2**

Program	Number of Candidates Assessed	% at or Above Benchmark
Secondary	7	71%

Strengths and Areas for Improvement

Across the **Secondary Education majors**, average performance tends to cluster between **2.6 and 3.0** on the 4-point scale. Students demonstrate relative **strength in Danielson Domain 3 (Instruction)**, where average scores are closer to *Proficient*, especially in elements related to engaging students in learning and using questioning techniques. This suggests that secondary candidates are stronger in classroom practice once teaching begins.

Areas for improvement appear in **Domain 1 (Planning)**, particularly in *1a: Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy* and *1b: Knowing and Valuing Students*. These elements consistently show scores below 2.8, indicating that candidates may need additional support in lesson design, applying pedagogical content knowledge, and tailoring instruction to student backgrounds and needs. Planning remains a weaker area compared to instruction.

Trends Across Race and Gender

- Gender:**
 Female candidates score consistently higher than male candidates across all domains. For example, in Domain 1 females average ~ 2.86 compared to ~ 2.26 for males, and in Domain 3 females average ~ 2.96 compared to ~ 2.67 . This gap suggests that male candidates may need targeted mentoring in planning and instructional strategies.
- Race/Ethnicity:**
 White candidates and Black/African American candidates show similar trends, but white candidates score slightly higher overall (e.g., Domain 1: 2.78 vs. 2.70; Domain 3: 2.91 vs. 2.72). While the differences are not large, they may indicate that Black/African American candidates could benefit from added support in instructional domains to close the gap.

Trends Across Concentration

When disaggregated by concentration within Secondary Education:

- English majors** perform the strongest overall, with averages near *Proficient* across all domains. They are especially strong in **Domain 3 (Instruction)**, averaging ~ 2.97 , suggesting confidence in engaging students and using questioning techniques.
- Social Studies majors** show weaker performance, particularly in **Domain 1 (Planning)**, averaging only ~ 2.55 compared to ~ 2.86 for English. Their Domain 3 (Instruction) scores are also lower (~ 2.75), indicating less strength in classroom practice than their English peers.

This suggests that Secondary English candidates are more consistently meeting expectations in planning and instruction, while Secondary Social Studies candidates may need additional targeted support, particularly in planning lessons and executing effective instructional strategies.

Trends Across Other Majors

When compared to **other education majors**, Secondary Education candidates perform at comparable levels in most areas but with a few distinctions:

- **Elementary Ed/SPED majors** tend to score higher in Domain 1 (Planning), averaging close to 2.97, whereas Secondary Education lags behind at ~2.78.
- **Early Childhood majors** score slightly below Secondary in some planning and classroom management elements, but they often equal or exceed Secondary majors in Domain 3 (Instruction).
- In general, **Secondary Education scores are mid-range**, not the lowest but also not the strongest across majors. The most consistent gap is in planning (Domain 1), where Elementary and SPED students appear better prepared.

Overall takeaway:

Secondary Education candidates are stronger in instructional practice (Domain 3) but need improvement in planning (Domain 1), particularly in applying content knowledge and considering student backgrounds. Female candidates and white candidates are outperforming male and Black/African American candidates, suggesting possible equity gaps. Compared with other majors, Secondary Education candidates are average overall, but consistently behind Elementary/SPED peers in planning skills.

SLO 3

Program	Number of Candidates Assessed	% at or Above Benchmark
Secondary	7	92%

Strengths and Areas for Improvement

Overall, Secondary Education candidates perform well on the Professional Checklist, with most averages in the **Effective range (3.3–3.6 on a 4-point scale)**.

Strengths:

- Candidates show strong professionalism in areas such as *completing assignments on time* and *participating in the professional community*, where scores are consistently above 3.4.
- They also score highly in *collaboration and communication with colleagues and mentors*, suggesting strong interpersonal and workplace professionalism.

Areas for Improvement:

- The lowest averages appear in *maintaining accurate records* and *preparing all lessons/units in advance*, which are closer to 3.3. While still effective, these results indicate room for strengthening organizational skills and proactive preparation.
- *Communicating instructional information to students* also shows slightly lower averages, suggesting candidates may need more focus on clarity and consistency in professional communication.

Secondary Education Majors

Scores for Secondary Education candidates show a **steady upward trend across the academic year**.

- In **September and October**, averages were about **2.89 (Developing to Effective)**.
- By **December and January**, scores rose above **3.0 (Effective)**.
- The most consistent growth occurred in **February through April**, averaging **3.22–3.35**, reflecting increasing professionalism.
- By **May**, averages reached **3.52**, solidly in the *Effective to Highly Effective* range.

Takeaway: Secondary candidates demonstrate **progressive improvement across the year**, with steady gains each month. Professionalism develops gradually, suggesting growth in responsibility and consistency over time.

Trends Across Gender

- **Female candidates** average slightly higher (3.55) than **male candidates** (3.38). Both groups fall in the effective range, but females consistently show stronger results in professionalism indicators.

Trends Across Race/Ethnicity

- **White candidates** average higher overall (3.61) than **Black/African American candidates** (3.00).
- The gap is most noticeable in areas tied to preparedness and professionalism, suggesting a need for targeted supports to ensure equity in outcomes.

Trends Across Primary Major Concentration

- **Social Studies candidates** show the strongest performance overall (3.69), slightly outperforming **English candidates** (3.46).
- This suggests that, within Secondary Education, Social Studies candidates are demonstrating somewhat stronger consistency in professionalism, though both concentrations remain solidly in the effective range.

Overall takeaway:

Secondary Education candidates demonstrate professional strengths in timeliness, collaboration, and participation in professional communities. Organizational skills such as record-keeping and lesson preparation remain areas for improvement. Gender and racial disparities are evident, with female and white candidates scoring higher than their peers. By concentration, Social Studies candidates slightly outperform English candidates in professionalism.

SLO 4

Program	Number of Candidates Assessed	% at or Above Benchmark
Secondary	12	96%

Strengths and Areas for Improvement

Strengths:

- Candidates perform relatively well in the **Assessment Plan** criteria, particularly in *using multiple modes and approaches to assess learning* (average ~2.86).
- They also show strength in *Contextual Factors – Implications for Instruction* (~2.71), indicating developing ability to consider student needs when planning.

Areas for Improvement:

- The weakest area is **Analysis of Student Learning**, especially *Evidence of Impact on Student Learning* (~2.29). This suggests candidates need additional support in analyzing data, demonstrating student growth, and making instructional adjustments based on results.
- **Design for Instruction** (lesson and unit structure, ~2.43) also falls below the desired level, signaling that planning coherent, standards-aligned instruction remains a challenge.
- Overall, scores are clustered in the **Developing to Effective** range, with no areas averaging at the highest performance level.

Trends Across Gender

- **Female candidates** slightly outperform **male candidates** (2.85 vs. 2.77).
- Both genders remain in the Developing–Effective range, but females show a modest advantage in overall performance.

Trends Across Race/Ethnicity

- **White candidates** score higher overall (2.90) compared to **Black/African American candidates** (2.46).
- The largest differences appear in *Analysis of Student Learning*, where white candidates demonstrate stronger evidence of analyzing impact. This highlights a potential equity gap that may need additional support and scaffolding.

Trends Across Primary Major Concentration

- **Social Studies candidates** (2.88) slightly outperform **English candidates** (2.82).
- Both concentrations remain in the Developing–Effective range, with Social Studies candidates showing a small advantage in instructional planning and assessment.

Overall takeaway:

Secondary Education candidates show emerging strengths in assessment planning and considering contextual factors. However, they struggle with **analysis of student learning** and **instructional design**, which are critical areas for growth. Female and white candidates perform modestly higher than their peers, while Social Studies candidates slightly outperform English candidates.

SLO 5

Program	Number of Candidates Assessed	% at or Above Benchmark
Secondary	7	98%

Strengths and Areas for Improvement

Strengths:

- Secondary candidates score highest in **Demonstrating knowledge of content** (~3.67) and **knowledge of students** (~3.58), showing strong understanding of their subject matter and learner characteristics.
- **Demonstrating knowledge of pedagogy** (~3.58) is also a relative strength, suggesting candidates can connect instructional strategies to content.

Areas for Improvement:

- The lowest scores are in **Using appropriate resources** (~3.42) and **Integrating technology** (~3.42). While still within the *Effective range*, these areas suggest that candidates may need more emphasis on leveraging instructional materials and technology to enhance lesson quality.

Trends Across Gender

- **Female candidates** (3.69) score higher than **male candidates** (3.42), a modest but consistent gap.
- This mirrors trends seen in other assessments where female candidates outperform male peers in planning and instructional design.

Trends Across Race/Ethnicity

- **Black/African American candidates** scored the highest (4.00), at the *Highly Effective* level.
- **White candidates** averaged 3.57, still effective but lower than their peers.
- This suggests strong performance among Black/African American candidates, reversing the equity gaps observed in other assessments (e.g., TWS).

Trends Across Primary Major Concentration

- **Math candidates** scored the highest overall (4.00), demonstrating strong lesson planning skills.
- **Social Studies candidates** also scored well (3.79), above the Secondary average.
- **English candidates** scored lower (3.17), indicating that lesson planning may be a greater challenge for English concentrations compared to Math and Social Studies peers.

Overall takeaway:

Secondary Education candidates show strong performance in content knowledge, pedagogy, and understanding students. They need continued support in **resource use and technology integration**. Female and Black/African American candidates stand out with higher performance, and Math concentrations lead in planning quality, while English concentrations show more need for improvement.

General Education Course Results

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

To be completed by October 15, 2025.

Programmatic Use of Results

SLO 1

Discussion was made this morning and a decision was made to change the benchmark to "100% of candidates will obtain a passing score by June 1 prior to residency."

SLO 2

1f Designing and Analysing Assessments is still lowest area in Domain 1 decrease in average from 3.19 to 3.01, 3d Using Assessment for Learning (2.94) decrease in average from 3.13 to 2.94, 3b Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques decrease in average from 3.15 to 3.06. The assessment has been redesigned and implemented Fall 25. The group of students currently enrolled will not be reflected in this data until 26-27 academic year. Given that, no changes will be made this year until impact of the redesign can be measured.

SLO 3

The change in the assessment was made. Data for 24-25 presented in this IE Audit reflects scores from the new assessment.

SLO 4

No changes were made for this SLO in the current cycle.

SLO 5

Teacher work sample rubric was reviewed and revised as part of our validity and reliability studies last year. The focus area from last year, Designs appropriate assessments to determine level of student learning toward master of instructional outcome, does not exist as a specific indicator in the new rubric so that a specific impact can be identified. However, for the two items in the area of Assessment in the revised rubric, students scored well, with Assessment Plan: Alignment of Assessments with Learning Outcomes and Instruction tied for highest rating (3.0) and Assessment Plan: Multiple Modes and Assessment only slightly lower at 2.86.

General Education Use of Results



2024-2025 INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AUDIT

Major Organizational Unit Head Henrietta Pichon, Dean; Donna Thomas, Provost

ALL sections are required

Name of Unit/Program: Undergraduate Certificate, STEM Education Studies (UTeachTech)

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.

Based on Analysis of the 2023-2024 data, what is being implemented during the 2024-2025 cycle to improve results:

SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge)

For 2024-2025, a more detailed rubric will be provided to students to help with each section of the paper. While the focus of the paper is on the research of classroom strategies, we want students to learn about how the disability is diagnosed, history, changes in treatments, etc. that help inform our candidates about the disability. We can help strengthen how they approach the introductions and conclusions of the paper, providing granular details on what is expected in each section.

SLO 2 (professional behaviors and characteristics)

Beginning in the 24-25 academic, the Professionalism Checklist will replace the TBMS as the measure for this SLO. During this year, baseline data will be set and the benchmark determined.

SLO 3 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences)

There will be a strengthened focus on standards, assessments, questioning, theoretical frameworks, field-based modeling, and technology integration. While we observe and discuss teaching videos and have students self-assess their own teaching, we can provide additional exemplars (such as written lesson plans with comments) and critique more teaching videos. UTCH 302: Technology in the STEM Classroom course can partner with the technology course taken by education majors (EDCI 210) to be sure we are including best practices and expose our students to more technologies available for integration.

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

Programmatic Outcomes (Learning outcomes specifically tied to students in academic program)

SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice)

Candidates will engage in practice-based research on equity issues in science and mathematics education.

SLO 2 (professional behaviors and characteristics)

Candidates will model behaviors and characteristics of professional educators.

SLO 3 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences)

Candidates will create engaging learning activities that embed college- and career-readiness skills, digital learning experiences, and current best practices in teaching.

General Education Course Assessment (Learning outcomes specifically tied to GER courses; if program does not provide GERs, put N/A)

N/A

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 in professional practice)

Assessment: Literature Review

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 100% of candidates will earn a score of 80% or better on the assessment

SLO 2 (professional behaviors and characteristics)

Assessment: Professionalism Checklist (End of Spring)

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 100% of candidates will receive ratings of Effective or Highly Effective

SLO 3 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences)

Assessment: Lesson Plan

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 100% of candidates earn a rating of Proficiency (3) or better on each rubric criteria

General Education Course Means of Measurement

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, 2025.

Programmatic Results

SLO 1 – no data for the 24-25 academic year is available for this assessment

SLO 2 (professional behaviors and characteristics)

During the 24-25 academic year, 5 students completed this assessment. 100% received ratings of Effective or Highly Affective on all elements of the rubric.

SLO 3

Data is not being reported for this assessment because only two students completed the assessment.

General Education Course Results

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

To be completed by October 15, 2025.

Programmatic Use of Results

The rubric used for SLO was updated, but data was not available for the current year.

For SLO 2, the Professionalism Checklist is now being used. This is assessed during residency.

The lesson plan rubric used for SLO 3 was reviewed and revised in the winter quarter just prior to the spring quarter when students take the class where this assessment is used. There were only two students who completed that assessment so ability to determine the impact of these changes is limited.

General Education Use of Results



2024-2025 INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AUDIT

Major Organizational Unit Head Henrietta Pichon, Dean; Donna Thomas, Provost

ALL sections are required

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.

Based on Analysis of the 2023-2024 data, what is being implemented during the 2024-2025 cycle to improve results:

SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice)

Revise the SLO to read - Candidates will demonstrate content knowledge mastery of topics germane to core program competencies of educational leadership. Design and implement a comprehensive exam to assess core program competencies. This item will replace the current assessment, the publication manuscript. Additionally, the comprehensive exam will replace the current comprehensive portfolio. Integrate assessment of core competencies within each of the core program courses. The benchmark - 80% of candidates will earn a minimum final score of 80%.

SLO 2 (professional behaviors and characteristics)

Replace the current assessment with the Professional Project. Candidates will collaborate with a mentor from their professional context to address a problem of practice. Professional behaviors and characteristics will be assessed specifically during the project and at culmination. Assessment methodology: E-Portfolio. The benchmark - 80% of candidates will earn a minimum final score of 80%.

SLO 3 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences)

Increase involvement of the dissertation committee earlier in the proposal process. Increase intentionality of assessing the candidates competencies in meeting the requirements of the proposal. Introduction of a comprehensive exam assessing core program competencies that will be taken by candidates the term before the proposal defense is scheduled. Exam results will be used to alert faculty to candidate weaknesses.

SLO 4 (data-driven decisions)

Consideration of using Generative AI coupled with use of the program for external evaluation of the candidates' research. Complete the expanded Dissertation Rubric - chapters 4 and 5 – which began

during the last cycle (We will continue to develop the expanded Dissertation rubric and put in place an external (to the committee) reviewer.)

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

Programmatic Outcomes (Learning outcomes specifically tied to students in academic program)

SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice)

Candidates will demonstrate content knowledge mastery of topics germane to core program competencies of educational leadership.

SLO 2 (professional behaviors and characteristics)

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

SLO 3 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences)

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

SLO 4 (data-driven decisions)

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

General Education Course Assessment (Learning outcomes specifically tied to GER courses; if program does not provide GERs, put N/A)

N/A

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 in professional practice)

Assessment: Comprehensive Exam

Method: Exam

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

SLO 2 (professional behaviors and characteristics)

Assessment: Professional Project

Method: E-Portfolio

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

SLO 3 (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 4 (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

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, 2025.

Programmatic Results

SLO 1 – No data is available because we have not fully implemented the comprehensive exam process.

SLO 2 - The primary area of growth resulted from the inability to quantify the growth of the candidates. Therefore, the program is discontinuing the portfolio process.

SLO 3 – No data is available for this SLO.

SLO 4 - 100% of candidates earned a passing score and committee approval of the final dissertation.

General Education Course Results

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

To be completed by October 15, 2025.

Programmatic Use of Results

SLO 1

- Created program competencies
- Created and revised course learning objectives
- Created an alignment document: Objectives→ Competencies→ Comprehensive Exam Questions

SLO 2

The primary area of growth resulted from the inability to quantify the growth of the candidates. Therefore, the program is discontinuing the portfolio process.

SLO 3

The program refined the proposal rubrics (narrative and oral) to reflect increased criteria specificity.

SLO 4

The expanded dissertation rubric has not been fully implemented.

General Education Use of Results



2024-2025 INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AUDIT

<p>Major Organizational Unit Head Henrietta Pichon, Dean; Donna Thomas, Provost</p> <p>ALL sections are required</p>
<p>Name of Unit/Program: MAT, Early Childhood Education, Grades PK-3</p>
<p>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.</p>
<p>Based on Analysis of the <u>2023-2024 data</u>, what is being implemented during the <u>2024-2025</u> cycle to improve results:</p> <p>SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice) There were no students who completed the assessment during the 23-24 cycle; therefore, no changes are planned at this time.</p> <p>SLO 2 (professional behaviors and characteristics) Beginning in the 24-25 academic, the Professionalism Checklist will replace the TBMS as the measure for this SLO. During this year, baseline data will be set and the benchmark determined.</p> <p>SLO 3 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences) During the 23-24 year, the first cycle of data was collected; however, we feel a minimum of two cycles are needed in order to identify trends. Therefore, no changes are planned for this SLO during this cycle.</p> <p>SLO 4 (data-driven decisions) There were no students who completed the assessment during the 23-24 cycle; therefore, no changes are planned at this time.</p>
<p>Expected Outcomes: (based upon and linked to overall Mission of Program or Unit)</p> <p><u>Programmatic Outcomes</u> (Learning outcomes specifically tied to students in academic program)</p> <p>SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice) Candidates will demonstrate proficiency in the professional skills of planning and preparation, organizing and maintaining a classroom environment, instruction, and professionalism.</p> <p>SLO 2 (professional behaviors and characteristics)</p>

Candidates will model behaviors and characteristics of professional educators.

SLO 3 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences)

Candidates will create engaging learning activities that embed college- and career-readiness skills, digital learning experiences, and current best practices in teaching.

SLO 4 (data-driven decisions)

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

General Education Course Assessment (Learning outcomes specifically tied to GER courses; if program does not provide GERS, put N/A)

N/A

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 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 2 (professional behaviors and characteristics)

Assessment: Professionalism Checklist (End of Spring)

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 100% of candidates will receive ratings of Effective or Highly Effective

SLO 3 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences)

Assessment: Lesson Plan

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 100% of candidates earn a rating of Proficiency (3) or better on each rubric criteria

SLO 4 (data-driven decisions)

Assessment: Student Learning Target Assessment

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 100% of candidates earn a rating of Developing (2) or better on each rubric criteria

General Education Course Means of Measurement

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, 2025.

Programmatic Results

Because there were less than 5 students (2) who completed the assessments for this program last year, data is not being reported.

General Education Course Results

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

To be completed by October 15, 2025.

Programmatic Use of Results

Because of the low enrollment numbers in this program over the last few years, the decision was made to discontinue offering the program. The last two enrolled students graduated in Spring 2025.

General Education Use of Results



2024-2025 INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AUDIT

<p>Major Organizational Unit Head Henrietta Pichon, Dean; Donna Thomas, Provost</p>
<p>ALL sections are required</p>
<p>Name of Unit/Program: MAT, Elementary Education, Grades 1-5; GC, Special Education – Mild/Moderate, Grades 1-5</p>
<p>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.</p>
<p>Based on Analysis of the <u>2023-2024</u> data, what is being implemented during the <u>2024-2025</u> cycle to improve results:</p> <p>SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice) There were no students who completed the assessment during the 23-24 cycle; therefore, no changes are planned at this time.</p> <p>SLO 2 (professional behaviors and characteristics) Beginning in the 24-25 academic, the Professionalism Checklist will replace the TBMS as the measure for this SLO. During this year, baseline data will be set and the benchmark determined.</p> <p>SLO 3 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences) During the 23-24 year, the first cycle of data was collected; however, we feel a minimum of two cycles are needed in order to identify trends. Therefore, no changes are planned for this SLO during this cycle.</p> <p>SLO 4 (data-driven decisions) There were no students who completed the assessment during the 23-24 cycle; therefore, no changes are planned at this time.</p>
<p>Expected Outcomes: (based upon and linked to overall Mission of Program or Unit)</p> <p><u>Programmatic Outcomes</u> (Learning outcomes specifically tied to students in academic program)</p> <p>SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice) Candidates will demonstrate proficiency in the professional skills of planning and preparation, organizing and maintaining a classroom environment, instruction, and professionalism.</p>

SLO 2 (professional behaviors and characteristics)

Candidates will model behaviors and characteristics of professional educators.

SLO 3 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences)

Candidates will create engaging learning activities that embed college- and career-readiness skills, digital learning experiences, and current best practices in teaching.

SLO 4 (data-driven decisions)

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

General Education Course Assessment (Learning outcomes specifically tied to GER courses; if program does not provide GERs, put N/A)

N/A

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 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 2 (professional behaviors and characteristics)

Assessment: Professionalism Checklist (End of Spring)

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 100% of candidates will receive ratings of Effective or Highly Effective

SLO 3 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences)

Assessment: Lesson Plan

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 100% of candidates earn a rating of Proficiency (3) or better on each rubric criteria

SLO 4 (data-driven decisions)

Assessment: Student Learning Target Assessment

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 100% of candidates earn a rating of Developing (2) or better on each rubric criteria

General Education Course Means of Measurement

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, 2025.

Programmatic Results

Because there were less than 5 students (3) who completed the assessments for this program last year, data is not being reported.

General Education Course Results

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

To be completed by October 15, 2025.

Programmatic Use of Results

Because of the low enrollment numbers in this program over the last few years, the decision was made to discontinue offering the program. The last three enrolled students graduated in Spring 2025.

General Education Use of Results



2024-2025 INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AUDIT

<p>Major Organizational Unit Head Henrietta Pichon, Dean; Donna Thomas, Provost</p> <p>ALL sections are required</p>
<p>Name of Unit/Program: MAT, Middle School Education, Grades 4-8</p>
<p>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.</p>
<p>Based on Analysis of the <u>2023-2024</u> data, what is being implemented during the <u>2024-2025</u> cycle to improve results:</p> <p>SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice) There were no students who completed the assessment during the 23-24 cycle; therefore, no changes are planned at this time.</p> <p>SLO 2 (professional behaviors and characteristics) Beginning in the 24-25 academic, the Professionalism Checklist will replace the TBMS as the measure for this SLO. During this year, baseline data will be set and the benchmark determined.</p> <p>SLO 3 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences) There were no students who completed the assessment during the 23-24 cycle; therefore, no changes are planned at this time.</p> <p>SLO 4 (data-driven decisions) There were no students who completed the assessment during the 23-24 cycle; therefore, no changes are planned at this time.</p>
<p>Expected Outcomes: (based upon and linked to overall Mission of Program or Unit)</p> <p><u>Programmatic Outcomes</u> (Learning outcomes specifically tied to students in academic program)</p> <p>SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice) Candidates will demonstrate proficiency in the professional skills of planning and preparation, organizing and maintaining a classroom environment, instruction, and professionalism.</p> <p>SLO 2 (professional behaviors and characteristics)</p>

Candidates will model behaviors and characteristics of professional educators.

SLO 3 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences)

Candidates will create engaging learning activities that embed college- and career-readiness skills, digital learning experiences, and current best practices in teaching.

SLO 4 (data-driven decisions)

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

General Education Course Assessment (Learning outcomes specifically tied to GER courses; if program does not provide GERS, put N/A)

N/A

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 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 2 (professional behaviors and characteristics)

Assessment: Professionalism Checklist (End of Spring)

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 100% of candidates will receive ratings of Effective or Highly Effective

SLO 3 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences)

Assessment: Lesson Plan

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 100% of candidates earn a rating of Proficiency (3) or better on each rubric criteria

SLO 4 (data-driven decisions)

Assessment: Student Learning Target Assessment

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 100% of candidates earn a rating of Developing (2) or better on each rubric criteria

General Education Course Means of Measurement

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, 2025.

Programmatic Results

There were no students who completed assessment in this program during the 24-25 academic year.

General Education Course Results

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

To be completed by October 15, 2025.

Programmatic Use of Results

Because of the low enrollment numbers in this program over the last few years, the decision was made to discontinue offering the program. The one remaining student in this program will graduate in Spring 2026.

General Education Use of Results



2024-2025 INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AUDIT

Major Organizational Unit Head Henrietta Pichon, Dean; Donna Thomas, Provost

ALL sections are required

Name of Unit/Program: MAT, Secondary Education, Grades 6-12, Secondary Education and Special Education Mild/Moderate Grades 6-12

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.

Based on Analysis of the 2023-2024 data, what is being implemented during the 2024-2025 cycle to improve results:

SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice)

1f: Designing and Analyzing Assessments (2.86) was chosen as the focus of this cycle. The area of assessment is a trend that is also seen in other SLOs. Critical indicators for 1f show that candidates score lower in planning formative assessments than other critical indicators in 1f. To address this, EDCI 580 Principles of Teaching in Middle/Secondary Schools is being redesigned to focus more on planning effective instruction. Planning effective instruction also includes planning formative assessments to evaluate student learning.

SLO 2 (professional behaviors and characteristics)

Beginning in the 24-25 academic, the Professionalism Checklist will replace the TBMS as the measure for this SLO. During this year, baseline data will be set and the benchmark determined.

SLO 3 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences)

During the 23-24 year, the first cycle of data was collected; however, we feel a minimum of two cycles are needed in order to identify trends. Therefore, no changes are planned for this SLO during this cycle.

SLO 4 (data-driven decisions)

The two areas chosen as the focus for this cycle are Assessment Plan (2.67) and Design for Instruction (2.67). The area of assessment is a trend that is also seen in other SLOs. To address this, EDCI 580 Principles of Teaching in Middle/Secondary Schools is being redesigned to focus more on planning effective instruction. Planning effective instruction also includes planning formative assessments to evaluate student learning. It is anticipated that this change will impact both areas for improvement in this SLO.

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

Programmatic Outcomes (Learning outcomes specifically tied to students in academic program)

SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice)

Candidates will demonstrate proficiency in the professional skills of planning and preparation, organizing and maintaining a classroom environment, instruction, and professionalism.

SLO 2 (professional behaviors and characteristics)

Candidates will model behaviors and characteristics of professional educators.

SLO 3 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences)

Candidates will create engaging learning activities that embed college- and career-readiness skills, digital learning experiences, and current best practices in teaching.

SLO 4 (data-driven decisions)

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

General Education Course Assessment (Learning outcomes specifically tied to GER courses; if program does not provide GERs, put N/A)

N/A

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 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 2 (professional behaviors and characteristics)

Assessment: Professionalism Checklist (End of Spring)

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 100% of candidates will receive ratings of Effective or Highly Effective

SLO 3 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences)

Assessment: Lesson Plan

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 100% of candidates earn a rating of Proficiency (3) or better on each rubric criteria

SLO 4 (data-driven decisions)

Assessment: Student Learning Target Assessment

Method: Rubric

Benchmark: 100% of candidates earn a rating of Developing (2) or better on each rubric criteria

General Education Course Means of Measurement

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, 2025.

Programmatic Results

Because there were less than 5 students (3) who completed the assessments for this program last year, data is not being reported.

General Education Course Results

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

To be completed by October 15, 2025.

Programmatic Use of Results

Because of the low enrollment numbers in this program over the last few years, the decision was made to discontinue offering the program. The last four enrolled students will graduate in Spring 2026.

General Education Use of Results



2024-2025 INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AUDIT

Major Organizational Unit Head Henrietta Pichon, Dean; Donna Thomas, Provost

ALL sections are required

Name of Unit/Program: MEd, Curriculum and Instruction, GC, Cyber Education, GC, Reading Specialist, GC, Online Teaching and Learning, GC, Computer Science Education

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.

Based on Analysis of the 2023-2024 data, what is being implemented during the 2024-2025 cycle to improve results:

Enrollment in the MED CI program and related graduate certificates has been low for the past few years, providing limited data on which to base program decisions. During the previous cycle, the number of candidates who completed each assessment ranged from 7 to 18, with all candidates meeting the benchmark for all SLOs. Given the low n value and that no candidate fell below benchmark, no changes are planned for the 24-25 cycle.

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

Programmatic Outcomes (Learning outcomes specifically tied to students in academic program)

SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice)

Candidates will demonstrate proficiency in the professional practice skills required of mentor teachers or content leaders.

SLO 2 (professional behaviors and characteristics)

Candidates will model behaviors and characteristics of mentor teachers or content leaders.

SLO 3 (creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences)

Candidates will examine current problems in curriculum and instruction and propose either change theory/innovation-oriented or educational policy-oriented solutions.

SLO 4 (data-driven decisions)

Candidates will utilize action research approaches to plan for data-driven decision-making.

General Education Course Assessment (Learning outcomes specifically tied to GER courses; if program does not provide GERs, put N/A)

N/A

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 in professional practice)

Assessment: Curriculum development project

Method: Rubric

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

SLO 2 (professional behaviors and characteristics)

Assessment: Professional development project

Method: Rubric

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

SLO 3 (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 4 (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

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, 2025.

Programmatic Results

SLO	Course	Measure	Total N	Benchmark Met N	Percent Meeting Benchmark
1	EDCI 526 (Spring)	Curriculum Development Project	7	7	100%
2	EDCI 530 (Winter)	Professional Development Project	2	2	100%
3	EDCI 571 (Summer)	Change Project	9	9	100%
4	EDCI 517 (Fall)	Action Research Project	5	5	100%

General Education Course Results

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

To be completed by October 15, 2025.

Programmatic Use of Results

No changes were made during this cycle.

General Education Use of Results



2024-2025 INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AUDIT

Major Organizational Unit Head Henrietta Pichon, Dean; Donna Thomas, Provost

ALL sections are required

Name of Unit/Program: MEd, Educational Leadership; GC, Teacher Leader

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.

Based on Analysis of the 2023-2024 data, what is being implemented during the 2024-2025 cycle to improve results:

SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge)

No modifications are planned based on the fact that 100% of the candidates met the benchmark.

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

No modifications to the actual activity need to be made based on the fact that 100% of the candidates who completed this activity met the benchmark. The SLO has rewritten to reflect the revised activity number.

SLO 3 (professional behaviors and characteristics)

During the 23-24 year, the first cycle of data was collected; however, we feel a minimum of two cycles are needed in order to identify trends. Therefore, no changes are planned for this SLO during this cycle.

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

For future data analysis, the assessment for the SLO needs to be modified. When the internship activities were reviewed and revised by the advisory committee, activity 5RA1 was deleted and the content is now being assessed through different activities mainly through the School Improvement Initiative Project.

SLO 5 (data-driven decisions)

It may be hard to make challenges or assumptions based on last year's data. There were only three candidates that completed and presented their SIIP so the data may be skewed. In the spring of 2025, there will be twice as many candidates presenting their SIIP which should generate a better set of data. The lowest rating was earned in "Uses data to evaluate impact on student achievement." The professor that teaches the research class plans to address this area in her course.

Since all candidates met the benchmark for the previous cycle, no other changes are planned at this time.

SLO 6 (family and community relations)

All candidates met the benchmark for the previous cycle, so there are no areas of concern for this SLO. No changes are planned at this time.

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

Programmatic Outcomes (Learning outcomes specifically tied to students in academic program)

SLO 1 (discipline-specific content knowledge)

Candidates will demonstrate content knowledge mastery in core educational leadership topics. (NELP Standard 1)

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

Candidates will demonstrate proficiency in the professional skills associated with curriculum, data systems, supports, and assessment. (NELP Standard 4)

SLO 3 (professional behaviors and characteristics)

Candidates will model behaviors and characteristics of professional school leaders. (NELP Standard 2)

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

Candidates will assist in developing a school's professional capacity by promoting through supervision, evaluation, support and professional learning. (NELP Standard 7)

SLO 5 (data-driven decisions)

Candidates will make instructional decisions and recommendations by collecting, analyzing, and acting upon student performance data. (NELP Standard 8)

SLO 6 (family and community relations)

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)

General Education Course Assessment (Learning outcomes specifically tied to GER courses; if program does not provide GERs, put N/A)

N/A

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: 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 activity 5.6 Prepare and present a presentation to a group external to the school about needs of the school and the 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: Internship Evaluation

Method: Rubric

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 7.4-Accompany a school building level administrator during the observation process. Participate in the pre observation conference, observation, and post conference. Write a reflection about the process.

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

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

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, 2025.

Programmatic Results

SLO 1 One student this year did not earn a passing score on the SLLA 6990. He indicated that he did not prepare for the exam like he should have. He has not retaken it.

SLO 2 Since students now have the option to complete any 40 of the 46 activities, only two students completed this activity. Each student earned full credit.

SLO 3 There is no data for this assessment from the 24-25 academic year.

SLO 4 Of the six interns, five of them completed this activity. All interns earned full credit.

SLO 5 Four out of five students met benchmark. The student who did not, chose not to submit the assignment and has withdrawn from the program.

SLO 6 100% of the interns met the benchmark. Scores ranged from 187-197. There were two indicators that three of the students did not earn full credit that were related to the objectives-(1) states objectives and (2) project has realistic prioritized and measurable goals relevant to the overall objective/purpose. All five students lost two points for not describing specific engagement of internal and external audiences and their role in the decision making process.

General Education Course Results

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

To be completed by October 15, 2025.

Programmatic Use of Results

SLO 1 No modifications were planned based on the fact that 100% of the candidates met the benchmark.

SLO 2

No modifications were planned based on the fact that 100% of the candidates met the benchmark.

SLO 3

No changes were made during this cycle.

SLO 4

Because of the change in the requirements for the internship activities, with the one used as the assessment for this SLO being deleted, the assessment was revised during the previous cycle.

SLO 5

No changes were made during this cycle.

SLO 6

No changes were made during this cycle.

General Education Use of Results

