			G	TEACHER PRE Grambling Sta	ate U	niversi	ity						
	Prep			oard of Rege						System			
		Public		graduate Tea		-		Prog	yram				
Program We	h Site	http://www.		ASIC PROGRAN	-								
Approval/Ac		1100.77 00 00.8	Status										
		State: Board	Approved										
		State: Board	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 Prog	ram	Traditional (L	Indergrad	duate)									
				CANDIDATE SELI									
Academic Strength				te on Praxis Skil			•	L4)			100%		
		Median GPA of Candidates Entering the Program (2013-14)									3.31		
		Median GPA of Candidates Completing the Program (2013-14)								3.17 Data Not Yet			
		Number of Candidates who Started but Did not Complete the Program Within 6 Years									Available		
Teaching Pro	omise	Data not yet	available										
Candidates/		Candidates	Enrolled			Completer		rs		Total			
Completer		(2013-14)	32			23					55		
Diversity		Enrolled	Males						Females 23				
			Gender 9 Enrolled Hispanic Indian Asian					,	Islander	Multi-Racial			
		Enrolled Race	Hispanic 0	nic Indian 0		0	Black 31	•	0	White 1	0		
		KNO			R ΤΕΔΟ				RS				
Knowledge	Content	KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS FOR TEACHING OF COMPLETERS Completer Passage Rate on Praxis Content Assessments (2013-14) 100%											
-	Pedagogical	-	er Passage Rate on Praxis Professional Knowledge Assessments (2013-14)								100%		
	Overall	Completer Pa	assage Ra	ite on all Assessi	ments	(2013-1	L4)				100%		
Clinical Experiences		Student Teaching								180			
				Clock Hours of Clinical Experiences During Student Teaching						Number of Clock Hours per Week	Total Number of Clock Hours		
								1	14	35	490		
Licensure Requirements		Number and Percentage of 2013-14 Completers That Meet State Licensing Requirements									100%		
Completer R	ating	Data Not Yet	Available	e									
	Р	ROGRAM PRO	DUCTIVI	TY AND ALIGNM	IENT 1	O STAT	E NEEDS	SOF	COMPLET	ERS			
Entry and Persistence in		Percentage 8	74% (n=17)										
Teaching in Public Schools in Louisiana		Percentage & Number of 2013-14 Completers That Obtained a License to Teach									Data Not Yet Available		
(Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately		2009-10 Completers Teaching in Public Schools in Louisiana in 2010-11, 2011-12, 2012-13, 2013-14											
		Number of 2009-10		Number & Percentage		umber & ercentage		Numb Percer		Number & Percentage	Number & Percentage		
		Completers		Teaching in	Te	eaching in		Teachi	ing in	Teaching in	Teaching in		
interpret the me scores.)	interpret the meaning of these scores.)		19)	2010-11 68% (n=13)	-	2011-12 % (n-12) 6	2012		2013-14 68% (n=13)	2014-15 68% (n=13)		
											00% (11=13)		
Placement/F High-Need	Persistence in	Data Not Yet available											
Subjects/Sch	ools												
548,000,000		l											

Assistance in the design of the Louisiana Teacher Preparation Dashboard was provided by the 2020 Key Effectiveness Indicators developed by Michael Allen, Edward Crowe, and Charles Coble, co-partners of Teacher Preparation Analytics.

201	6 LOUISIANA TEACHER PREPAR			CONT'D)							
_	Grambling St										
Prep	ared by Louisiana Board of Rege			na System							
	Public Undergraduate Tec	icher Prepai	ration Program								
	E AS CLASSROOM TEACHERS (NEW TE										
Impact on				Compass Student Growth Mean & Number of Scores							
K-12 Students	Score (2012-13, 2013-14, & 2014- 15) and Number of Scores for All	3.1 (n=52)									
(Please examine the 2016	New Teachers with Less than Two										
Louisiana Teacher Preparation	Years of Teaching										
Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these	Percentage and Number of 2012-	Compass Teacher Effectiveness Levels for Student Growth Scores									
scores.)	13, 2013-14, and 2014-15 Compass	Ineffective	Effective Emerging	Effective Proficient	Highly Effective						
	Student Growth Scores for the New	4%	6%	42%	48%						
	Teachers by LDOE Teacher Effectiveness Levels										
Demonstrated Teaching	Mean Compass Professional	Compass Professional Practice Mean & Number of Scores									
Skill	Practice Score (2012-13, 2013-14,										
	& 2014-15) and Number of Scores	3.0 (n=52)									
(Please examine the 2016	for All New Teachers with Less than										
Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately	Two Years of Teaching										
interpret the meaning of these	Percentage and Number of 2012-	Compass T Ineffective	eacher Effectiveness Le Effective Emerging	evels for Professional Pr Effective Proficient	actice Scores Highly Effective						
scores.)	13, 2013-14, & 2014-15 <i>Compass</i> <i>Professional Practice Scores</i> for the	0%	12%	69%	19%						
	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	3.0 (n=52)									
(Please examine the 2016	Teachers with Less than Two Years										
Louisiana Teacher Preparation	of Teaching Percentage and Number of 2012-	Compas	s Teacher Effectiveness	Levels for Final Evaluat	ion Scores						
Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these	13, 2013-14, & 2014-15 Compass	Ineffective	Effective Emerging	Effective Proficient	Highly Effective						
scores.)	<i>Final Evaluation Scores</i> for the New	4%	10%	67%	19%						
	Teachers by LDOE Teacher										
	Effectiveness Levels										
State Value Added Scores	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									
for Growth in Student		Taught During 2014-15 (3- to 5-Year Averages)									
Learning for New Teachers in Grades 4-8	Mathematics										
with Less than Two Years	(Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5-	N/A (n=N/A)									
of Teaching by Content	year averages due to differences in cut-off	Ineffective	Effective Emerging	Effective Proficient	Highly Effective						
Areas (Twenty-five or	scores for new assessments. Percentages of individual scores within effectiveness levels	N/A%	N/A%	N/A%	N/A%						
More New Teachers)	could be determined.)										
(Please examine the 2016	Science										
Louisiana Teacher Preparation		N/A (n=N/A)									
Data Fact Book to accurately		Ineffective Effective Emerging Effective Prof			Highly Effective						
		ineffective			<u> </u>						
interpret the meaning of these scores.)		N/A%	N/A%	N/A%	N/A%						
interpret the meaning of these	Social Studies			N/A%	N/A%						
interpret the meaning of these	Social Studies		N/A%	N/A% n=N/A)	N/A%						
interpret the meaning of these	Social Studies	N/A%	N/A% N/A (n=N/A)							
interpret the meaning of these	Social Studies	N/A%	N/A% N/A (Effective Emerging	n=N/A) Effective Proficient	Highly Effective						
interpret the meaning of these	Social Studies English/Language Arts/Reading	N/A%	N/A% N/A (n=N/A)							
interpret the meaning of these	English/Language Arts/Reading (Note: A Mean score could not be	N/A%	N/A% N/A (Effective Emerging N/A%	n=N/A) Effective Proficient	Highly Effective						
interpret the meaning of these	English/Language Arts/Reading (Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5-	N/A% Ineffective N/A%	N/A% N/A (Effective Emerging N/A% N/A (n=N/A) Effective Proficient N/A% n=N/A)	Highly Effective N/A%						
interpret the meaning of these	English/Language Arts/Reading (Note: A Mean score could not be	N/A%	N/A% N/A (Effective Emerging N/A%	n=N/A) Effective Proficient N/A%	Highly Effective						