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

## **University of Louisiana at Lafayette**

Prepared by Louisiana Board of Regents & University of Louisiana System

Public Undergraduate Teacher Preparation Program

			Е	ASIC PROGRAM	1 INFO	RMATI	ON					
Program We	b Site	http://coe.lou	uisiana.e	du/								
Approval/Accreditation		Names of Agencies										
		State: Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE)									Approved	
		State: Board of Regents (BoR)									Approved	
		Regional: Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC)									Accredited	
		National: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE); Teacher									Accredited	
		Education Accreditation Council (TEAC); or Council for the Accreditation of Educator										
		Preparation (CAEP)										
Type of Prog	ram	Traditional (U	ndergra	duate)							•	
			(	CANDIDATE SELE	CTIO	N PROF	ILE					
Academic Strength		Completer Passage Rate on Praxis Skills Assessment (2013-14)									100%	
		Median GPA of Candidates Entering the Program (2013-14)									2.90	
		Median GPA of Candidates Completing the Program (2013-14)									3.20	
		Number of Candidates who Started but Did not Complete the Program Within 6 Years									Data Not Yet	
										Available		
Teaching Pro	omise	Data not yet a	available									
Candidates/		Candidates		Enrolled			Completers				Total	
Completer		(2013-14)	378			223					601	
Diversity		Enrolled		Males				Females				
		Gender		47	<u> </u>					331		
		Enrolled						lack	Islande		Multi-Racial	
		Race	7	0	3			36	1	320	11	
		KNOV	VLEDGE	AND SKILLS FOR	RTEAC	HING (	OF CO	MPLETE	RS			
Knowledge	Content	Completer Passage Rate on Praxis Content Assessments (2013-14)									100%	
	Pedagogical	Completer Passage Rate on Praxis Professional Knowledge Assessments (2013-14)								100%		
	Overall	Completer Passage Rate on all Assessments (2013-14)									100%	
Clinical Expe	riences	Student Clock Hours of Clinical Experiences Prior to Student Teaching								180		
r		Teaching Clock Hours of Clinical Experie				erience	cherices			Number of	Total Number of	
			During Student Teaching					W	eeks	Clock Hours per Week	Clock Hours	
		14 35						490				
Licensure Requirements  Completer Rating		Number and Percentage of 2013-14 Completers That Meet State Licensing								100%		
		Requirements									10070	
		Data Not Yet Available										
				TY AND ALIGNM	IENIT T	O STA	TE NIE	EDS OF	COMDIE.	TEDC		
Entry and Pe				r of 2013-14 Cor							81% (n=177)	
-			Data Not Yet									
Teaching in Public Schools in Louisiana		Percentage & Number of 2013-14 Completers That Obtained a License to Teach									Available	
		2009-10	) Complete	ers Teaching in Publi	ic Schoo	ls in Lou	isiana i	in 2010-1	1. 2011-12.	2012-13, 2013-14,		
(Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these scores.)		Number o		Number &	umber & Num			umber & Number &		Number &		
		2009-10 Completers 100% (n=166)		Percentage		Percentage		Percei	_	Percentage	Percentage	
				Teaching in 2010-11		Teaching ir 2011-12			Teaching in 2012-13	Teaching in 2013-14	Teaching in 2014-15	
				63% (n=104)		6 (n=10		66% (n		66% (n=109)	64% (n=106)	
Placement/Persistence in		Data Not Yet available								. ,		
High-Need	CI SISTERICE III	Data Not let	avanable	•								
Subjects/Sch	nools											
- maj = 000/ 001		l .										

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

**University of Louisiana at Lafayette** 

Prepared by Louisiana Board of Regents & University of Louisiana System

Public Undergraduate Teacher Preparation Program

	rubile officergraduate rec				_,			
	E AS CLASSROOM TEACHERS (NEW TE							
Impact on	Mean Compass Student Growth	Compass Student Growth Mean & Number of Scores						
K-12 Students	Score (2012-13, 2013-14, & 2014-	3.2 (n=821)						
	15) and Number of Scores for All							
(Please examine the 2016	New Teachers with Less than Two							
Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately	Years of Teaching							
interpret the meaning of these	Percentage and Number of 2012-	Compass Teacher Effectiveness Levels for Student Growth Scores						
scores.)	13, 2013-14, & 2014-15 Compass	Ineffective	Effective Emerging	Effective Proficient	Highly Effective			
	Student Growth Scores for the New	40/	420/	250/	500/			
	Teachers by LDOE Teacher	4%	12%	35%	50%			
	Effectiveness Levels							
Demonstrated Teaching	Mean Compass Professional	Compass Professional Practice Mean & Number of Scores						
Skill	Practice Score (2012-13, 2013-14,	3.1 (n=821)						
	& 2014-15) and Number of Scores							
(Please examine the 2016	for All New Teachers with Less than							
Louisiana Teacher Preparation	Two Years of Teaching							
Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these	Percentage and Number of 2012-	Compass Teacher Effectiveness Levels for Professional Practice Scores						
scores.)	13, 2013-14, & 2014-15 <i>Compass</i>	Ineffective	Effective Emerging	Effective Proficient	Highly Effective			
,	Professional Practice Scores for the	1%	11%	67%	21%			
	New Teachers by LDOE Teacher							
	Effectiveness Levels							
Overall Impact and	Mean Compass Final Evaluation	Compass Final Evaluation Mean & Number of Scores						
Demonstrated Teaching	Score (2012-13, 2013-14, & 2014-							
Skill	15) and Number of Scores for New		21/	n=821\				
J. M.	Teachers with Less than Two Years	3.1 (n=821)						
(Please examine the 2016	of Teaching							
Louisiana Teacher Preparation	Percentage and Number of 2012-	Compass Teacher Effectiveness Levels for Final Evaluation Scores						
Data Fact Book to accurately	13, 2013-14, & 2014-15 Compass	Ineffective Effective Emerging Effective Proficient Highly Effective						
interpret the meaning of these scores.)	Final Evaluation Scores for the New	4%	8%	60%	29%			
scores./	Teachers by LDOE Teacher							
	Effectiveness Levels							
State Value Added Scores	Content Areas	Mean Numb	er of Scores & Effective	eness Levels for Value-4	Added Scores of			
for Growth in Student	Content Areas	Mean, Number of Scores, & Effectiveness Levels for Value-Added Scores of Twenty-five or More New Teachers with Less Than Two Years of Teaching who Taught During 2014-15 (3- to 5-Year Averages)  N/A (n=103)						
Learning for New								
Teachers in Grades 4-8	Mathematics							
with Less than Two Years	(Note: A Mean score could not be							
of Teaching by Content	determined this year to calculate 3- to 5- year averages due to differences in cut-off	Ineffective	1		Highly Effective			
Areas (Twenty-five or			Effective Francisco					
More New Teachers)	scores for new assessments. Percentages of		Effective Emerging	Effective Proficient	Highly Effective			
	individual scores within effectiveness levels	14%	Effective Emerging 42%	29%	16%			
	individual scores within effectiveness levels could be determined.)							
(Please examine the 2016	individual scores within effectiveness levels		42%	29%				
·	individual scores within effectiveness levels could be determined.)		42%					
(Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately	individual scores within effectiveness levels could be determined.)	14%	-0.9	29% (n=80)	16%			
(Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these	individual scores within effectiveness levels could be determined.)	14%	-0.9	29% (n=80)  Effective Proficient	16% Highly Effective			
(Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately	individual scores within effectiveness levels could be determined.)  Science	14%	-0.9	29% (n=80)	16%			
(Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these	individual scores within effectiveness levels could be determined.)	14%	-0.9 Effective Emerging 46%	29% (n=80)  Effective Proficient 36%	16% Highly Effective			
(Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these	individual scores within effectiveness levels could be determined.)  Science	14%	-0.9 Effective Emerging 46%	29% (n=80)  Effective Proficient	16% Highly Effective			
(Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these	individual scores within effectiveness levels could be determined.)  Science	14% Ineffective 5%	-0.9  Effective Emerging 46%	29% (n=80)  Effective Proficient 36% (n=84)	Highly Effective			
(Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these	individual scores within effectiveness levels could be determined.)  Science	Ineffective 5%	-0.9  Effective Emerging 46%  -2.0  Effective Emerging	29% (n=80)  Effective Proficient 36% (n=84)  Effective Proficient	Highly Effective 13% Highly Effective			
(Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these	individual scores within effectiveness levels could be determined.)  Science  Social Studies	14% Ineffective 5%	-0.9  Effective Emerging 46%	29% (n=80)  Effective Proficient 36% (n=84)	Highly Effective			
(Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these	individual scores within effectiveness levels could be determined.)  Science  Social Studies  English/Language Arts/Reading	Ineffective 5%	-0.9  Effective Emerging 46%  -2.0  Effective Emerging 48%	29% (n=80)  Effective Proficient 36% (n=84)  Effective Proficient 29%	Highly Effective 13% Highly Effective			
(Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these	individual scores within effectiveness levels could be determined.)  Science  Social Studies	Ineffective 5%	-0.9  Effective Emerging 46%  -2.0  Effective Emerging 48%	29% (n=80)  Effective Proficient 36% (n=84)  Effective Proficient	Highly Effective 13% Highly Effective			
(Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these	individual scores within effectiveness levels could be determined.)  Science  Social Studies  English/Language Arts/Reading (Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5- year averages due to differences in cut-off	Ineffective 5% Ineffective 10%	-0.9  Effective Emerging 46%  -2.0  Effective Emerging 48%	29%  (n=80)  Effective Proficient 36%  (n=84)  Effective Proficient 29%  n=117)	Highly Effective 13% Highly Effective 14%			
(Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these	individual scores within effectiveness levels could be determined.)  Science  Social Studies  English/Language Arts/Reading (Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5-	Ineffective 5%	-0.9  Effective Emerging 46%  -2.0  Effective Emerging 48%	29% (n=80)  Effective Proficient 36% (n=84)  Effective Proficient 29%	Highly Effective 13% Highly Effective			