

2016 LOUISIANA TEACHER PREPARATION DATA DASHBOARD

University of Louisiana at Monroe

Prepared by Louisiana Board of Regents & University of Louisiana System

Public Undergraduate Teacher Preparation Program

BASIC PROGRAM INFORMATION

Program Web Site	http://ulm.edu/education/index.html		
Approval/Accreditation	Names of Agencies		Status
	State: Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE)		Approved
	State: Board of Regents (BoR)		Approved
	Regional: Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC)		Accredited
National: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE); Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC); or Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP)		Accredited	
Type of Program	Traditional (Undergraduate)		

CANDIDATE SELECTION PROFILE

Academic Strength	Completer Passage Rate on Praxis Skills Assessment (2013-14)		100%				
	Median GPA of Candidates Entering the Program (2013-14)		3.14				
	Median GPA of Candidates Completing the Program (2013-14)		3.32				
	Number of Candidates who Started but Did not Complete the Program Within 6 Years		Data Not Yet Available				
Teaching Promise	Data not yet available.						
Candidates/Completer Diversity	Candidates (2013-14)	Enrolled		Completers		Total	
		85		46		131	
	Enrolled Gender	Males			Females		
		9			76		
Enrolled Race	Hispanic	Indian	Asian	Black	Islander	White	Multi-Racial
	1	0	0	3	0	81	0

KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS FOR TEACHING OF COMPLETERS

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 Experiences	Student Teaching	Clock Hours of Clinical Experiences Prior to Student Teaching			180	
		Clock Hours of Clinical Experiences During Student Teaching		Number of Weeks	Number of Clock Hours per Week	Total Number of Clock Hours
				15	35	525
Licensure Requirements	Number and Percentage of 2013-14 Completers That Meet State Licensure Requirements				100%	
Completer Rating	Data Not Yet Available					

PROGRAM PRODUCTIVITY AND ALIGNMENT TO STATE NEEDS OF COMPLETERS

Entry and Persistence in Teaching in Public Schools in Louisiana	Percentage & Number of 2013-14 Completers That Were Teaching in 2014-15					72% (n=33)	
	Percentage & Number of 2013-14 Completers That Obtained a License to Teach					Data Not Yet Available	
<i>(Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these scores.)</i>	2009-10 Completers Teaching in Public Schools in Louisiana in 2010-11, 2011-12, 2012-13, 2013-14, & 2014-15						
	Number of 2009-10 Completers	Number & Percentage Teaching in 2010-11	Number & Percentage Teaching in 2011-12	Number & Percentage Teaching in 2012-13	Number & Percentage Teaching in 2013-14	Number & Percentage Teaching in 2014-15	
	100% (n=76)	76% (n=58)	78% (n=59)	72% (n=55)	71% (n=54)	70% (n=53)	
	Placement/Persistence in High-Need Subjects/Schools						
Data Not Yet available							

2016 LOUISIANA TEACHER PREPARATION DATA DASHBOARD (CONT'D)

University of Louisiana at Monroe

Prepared by Louisiana Board of Regents & University of Louisiana System

Public Undergraduate Teacher Preparation Program

PERFORMANCE AS CLASSROOM TEACHERS (NEW TEACHERS WITH LESS THAN TWO YEARS OF TEACHING)

Impact on K-12 Students <i>(Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these scores.)</i>	Mean <i>Compass Student Growth Score</i> (2012-13, 2013-14, & 2014-15) and Number of Scores for All New Teachers with Less than Two Years of Teaching	Compass Student Growth Mean & Number of Scores			
		3.2 (n=256)			
	Percentage and Number of 2012-13, 2013-14, & 2014-15 <i>Compass Student Growth Scores</i> for the New Teachers by LDOE Teacher Effectiveness Levels	Compass Teacher Effectiveness Levels for Student Growth Scores			
		Ineffective	Effective Emerging	Effective Proficient	Highly Effective
		3%	12%	31%	54%
Demonstrated Teaching Skill <i>(Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these scores.)</i>	Mean <i>Compass Professional Practice Score</i> (2012-13, 2013-14, & 2014-15) and Number of Scores for All New Teachers with Less than Two Years of Teaching	Compass Professional Practice Mean & Number of Scores			
		3.2 (n=256)			
	Percentage and Number of 2012-13, 2013-14, & 2014-15 <i>Compass Professional Practice Scores</i> for the New Teachers by LDOE Teacher Effectiveness Levels	Compass Teacher Effectiveness Levels for Professional Practice Scores			
		Ineffective	Effective Emerging	Effective Proficient	Highly Effective
		1%	7%	63%	30%
Overall Impact and Demonstrated Teaching Skill <i>(Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these scores.)</i>	Mean <i>Compass Final Evaluation Score</i> (2012-13, 2013-14, & 2014-15) and Number of Scores for New Teachers with Less than Two Years of Teaching	Compass Final Evaluation Mean & Number of Scores			
		3.2 (n=256)			
	Percentage and Number of 2012-13, 2013-14, & 2014-15 <i>Compass Final Evaluation Scores</i> for the New Teachers by LDOE Teacher Effectiveness Levels	Compass Teacher Effectiveness Levels for Final Evaluation Scores			
		Ineffective	Effective Emerging	Effective Proficient	Highly Effective
		4%	9%	55%	33%
State Value Added Scores for Growth in Student Learning for New Teachers in Grades 4-8 with Less than Two Years of Teaching by Content Areas (Twenty-five or More New Teachers) <i>(Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these scores.)</i>	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)			
	Mathematics <i>(Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5-year averages due to differences in cut-off scores for new assessments. Percentages of individual scores within effectiveness levels could be determined.)</i>	N/A (n=39)			
		Ineffective	Effective Emerging	Effective Proficient	Highly Effective
		26%	39%	36%	0%
	Science	-2.3 (n=32)			
		Ineffective	Effective Emerging	Effective Proficient	Highly Effective
		13%	41%	41%	6%
	Social Studies	-1.0 (n=27)			
		Ineffective	Effective Emerging	Effective Proficient	Highly Effective
		7%	56%	15%	22%
English/Language Arts/Reading <i>(Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5-year averages due to differences in cut-off scores for new assessments. Percentages of individual scores within effectiveness levels could be determined.)</i>	N/A (n=48)				
	Ineffective	Effective Emerging	Effective Proficient	Highly Effective	
	15%	50%	27%	8%	