2016 LOUISIANA TEACHER PREPARATION DATA DASHBOARD

Nicholls State University

Prepared by Louisiana Board of Regents & University of Louisiana System

Public University Alternate Teacher Preparation Program

			ВА	SIC PROGRAM	INFO	RMATION				
Program Wel	b Site	http://www.n	icholls.e	du/education/						
Approval/Accreditation		Names of Agencies							Status	
		State: Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE)							Approved	
		State: Board of Regents (BoR)							Approved	
		Regional: Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC)						Accredited		
		National: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE); Teacher							Accredited	
		Education Accreditation Council (TEAC); or Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP)								
Type of Prog	ram			rts in Teaching	, Certi	fication-O	nly, & Pr	actitioner	Teacher Progra	m)
,, ,		,								•
Academic Str	Academic Strength		CANDIDATE SELECTION PROFILE Completer Passage Pate on Prayic Skills Assessment (2012-14)							100%
Academic Strength		Completer Passage Rate on Praxis Skills Assessment (2013-14) Median GPA of Candidates Entering the Program (2013-14)							3.03	
		Median GPA of Candidates Entering the Program (2013-14)							3.89	
		Number of Candidates who Started but Did not Complete the Program Within 6 Years							Data Not Yet	
		Number of Canadates who Started but Did not complete the Frogram Within 0 feats							Available	
Teaching Pro	mise	Data not yet a	vailable.							ı
Candidates/		Candidates	Enrolled			Completers			Total	
Completer		(2013-14)	134		41				175	
Diversity		Enrolled	Males Fema			Females	emales			
		Gender		42	-				92	
		Enrolled	Hispanic	Indian	As	ian	Black	Island		Multi-Racial
		Race	0	5	:	2	23	0	102	2
		KNOWI	LEDGE A	ND SKILLS FOR	TEAC	HING OF C	OMPLET	ERS		
Knowledge	Content	Completer Passage Rate on Praxis Content Assessments (2013-14)							100%	
	Pedagogical	Completer Pas	Passage Rate on Praxis Professional Knowledge Assessments (2013-14)					100%		
	Overall	Completer Passage Rate on all Assessments (2013-14)							100%	
Clinical Expe	riences	Full Time Internships are Offered as an Option for the Academic Year							Yes	
		Student	Clock Hours of Clinical Experiences Prior to Student Teaching					N/A		
		Teaching		Clock Hours of Clinical Expe During Student Teaching			_	mber of Veeks	Number of Clock Hours per	Total Number of Clock Hours
							Week N/A	N/A		
Licensure Re	nuirements	Number and P	Percenta	ge of 2013-14 (`omnl	eters That		•	-	100%
Licensure Requirements		Number and Percentage of 2013-14 Completers That Meet State Licensing 100% Requirements								100%
Completer Ra	ating	Data Not Yet A	Available							
	PR	OGRAM PRODU	JCTIVITY	AND ALIGNM	ENT T	O STATE N	NEEDS O	COMPLE	TERS	
Entry and Pe	rsistence in	Percentage &	Number	of 2013-14 Co	mplet	ers That W	/ere Tea	ching in 20)14-15	83% (n=34)
Teaching in P	ublic Schools	Percentage & Number of 2013-14 Completers That Obtained a License to Teach							Data Not Yet	
in Louisiana									Available	
/n/		-			1				, 2012-13, 2013-14,	
(Please examine Louisiana Teache Data Fact Book t interpret the me	er Preparation to accurately	Number of 2009-10 Completers		Number & Percentage Teaching in 2010-11	Pe Te	umber & ercentage aching in 2011-12	Perc Teac	nber & entage hing in L2-13	Number & Percentage Teaching in 2013-14	Number & Percentage Teaching in 2014-15
scores.)		100% (n=76	5)	79% (n=60)	80	% (n=61)	71%	(n=54)	71% (n=54)	68% (n=52)
Placement/Persistence in High-Need Subjects/Schools		Data Not Yet a	available				,			

2016 LOUISIANA TEACHER PREPARATION DATA DASHBOARD (CONT'D)

Nicholls State University

Prepared by Louisiana Board of Regents & University of Louisiana System

Master of Arts in Teaching Alternate Teacher Preparation Program

DEDECORMANIC	AC CLASSBOOM TEACHERS (NEW TE	A CLIEBC MUTLI	LECC THAN TWO	TARE OF TEACHING	~\		
	AS CLASSROOM TEACHERS (NEW TE		ompass Student Growth				
Impact on	Mean Compass Student Growth	CC	Jiipass Student Growti	i Mean & Number of Sc	ores		
K-12 Students	Score (2012-13, 2013-14, & 2014-	2.9 (n=27)					
(Please examine the 2016	15) and Number of Scores for All						
Louisiana Teacher Preparation	New Teachers with Less than Two						
Data Fact Book to accurately	Years of Teaching	Compass Teacher Effectiveness Levels for Student Growth Scores					
interpret the meaning of these	Percentage and Number of 2012-						
scores.)	13, 2013-14, & 2014-15 Compass	Ineffective	Effective Emerging	Effective Proficient	Highly Effective		
	Student Growth Scores for the	7%	22%	26%	44%		
	New Teachers by LDOE Teacher	,,,	2270	2070	1170		
	Effectiveness Levels						
Demonstrated Teaching	Mean Compass Professional	Compass Professional Practice Mean & Number of Scores					
Skill	Practice Score (2012-13, 2013-14,	3.1 (n=27)					
	& 2014-15) and Number of Scores						
(Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation	for All New Teachers with Less						
Data Fact Book to accurately	than Two Years of Teaching						
interpret the meaning of these	Percentage and Number of 2012-	Compass Teacher Effectiveness Levels for Professional Practice Scores					
scores.)	13, 2013-14, & 2014-15 Compass	Ineffective	Effective Emerging	Effective Proficient	Highly Effective		
	Professional Practice Scores for	0%	15%	56%	30%		
	the New Teachers by LDOE						
	Teacher Effectiveness Levels						
Overall Impact and	Mean Compass Final Evaluation	Co	ompass Final Evaluation	Mean & Number of Sc	ores		
Demonstrated Teaching	Score (2012-13, 2013-14, & 2014-						
Skill	15) and Number of Scores for	3.0 (n=27)					
	New Teachers with Less than Two						
(Please examine the 2016	Years of Teaching	Compass Teacher Effectiveness Levels for Final Evaluation Scores					
Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately	Percentage and Number of 2012-						
interpret the meaning of these	13, 2013-14, & 2014-15 Compass	Ineffective	Effective Emerging	Effective Proficient	Highly Effective		
scores.)	Final Evaluation Scores for the	0%	22%	52%	26%		
	New Teachers by LDOE Teacher						
	Effectiveness Levels						
			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				
State Value Added Scores	Content Areas	•					
for Growth in Student	Content Areas	•	More New Teachers wi	th Less Than Two Years	of Teaching who		
for Growth in Student Learning for New Teachers		•	More New Teachers wi		of Teaching who		
for Growth in Student Learning for New Teachers in Grades 4-8 with Less	Content Areas Mathematics (Note: A Mean score could not be	•	More New Teachers wi Taught During 2014-1	th Less Than Two Years 5 (3-to 5-Year Averages	of Teaching who		
for Growth in Student Learning for New Teachers in Grades 4-8 with Less than Two Years of	Mathematics (Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5-	•	More New Teachers wi Taught During 2014-1	th Less Than Two Years	of Teaching who		
for Growth in Student Learning for New Teachers in Grades 4-8 with Less than Two Years of Teaching by Content Areas	Mathematics (Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5-year averages due to differences in cut-off	•	More New Teachers wi Taught During 2014-1	th Less Than Two Years 5 (3-to 5-Year Averages	of Teaching who		
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	Mathematics (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	Twenty-five or	More New Teachers wi Taught During 2014-1 N/A (th Less Than Two Years 5 (3-to 5-Year Averages n=N/A)	s of Teaching who		
for Growth in Student Learning for New Teachers in Grades 4-8 with Less than Two Years of Teaching by Content Areas	Mathematics (Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5-year averages due to differences in cut-off	Twenty-five or	More New Teachers wi Taught During 2014-1 N/A (Effective Emerging	th Less Than Two Years 5 (3-to 5-Year Averages n=N/A) Effective Proficient	of Teaching who		
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)	Mathematics (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	Twenty-five or	More New Teachers wi Taught During 2014-1 N/A (Effective Emerging	th Less Than Two Years 5 (3-to 5-Year Averages n=N/A) Effective Proficient	of Teaching who		
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)	Mathematics (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.)	Twenty-five or	More New Teachers wi Taught During 2014-1 N/A (Effective Emerging N/A	th Less Than Two Years 5 (3-to 5-Year Averages n=N/A) Effective Proficient	of Teaching who		
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)	Mathematics (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.)	Twenty-five or	More New Teachers wi Taught During 2014-1 N/A (Effective Emerging N/A	th Less Than Two Years 5 (3-to 5-Year Averages n=N/A) Effective Proficient N/A	Highly Effective		
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) (Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these	Mathematics (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.)	Ineffective N/A Ineffective	More New Teachers wi Taught During 2014-1 N/A (Effective Emerging N/A N/A (Effective Emerging	th Less Than Two Years 5 (3-to 5-Year Averages n=N/A) Effective Proficient N/A n=N/A)	Highly Effective N/A Highly Effective		
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) (Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately	Mathematics (Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5-year averages due to differences in cut-off scores for new assessments. Percentages of individual scores within effectiveness levels could be determined.) Science	Ineffective N/A	More New Teachers wi Taught During 2014-1 N/A (Effective Emerging N/A	th Less Than Two Years 5 (3-to 5-Year Averages n=N/A) Effective Proficient N/A n=N/A)	Highly Effective		
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) (Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these	Mathematics (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.)	Ineffective N/A Ineffective	More New Teachers wi Taught During 2014-1 N/A (Effective Emerging N/A N/A (Effective Emerging N/A	th Less Than Two Years 5 (3-to 5-Year Averages n=N/A) Effective Proficient N/A n=N/A) Effective Proficient N/A	Highly Effective N/A Highly Effective		
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) (Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these	Mathematics (Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5-year averages due to differences in cut-off scores for new assessments. Percentages of individual scores within effectiveness levels could be determined.) Science	Ineffective N/A Ineffective	More New Teachers wi Taught During 2014-1 N/A (Effective Emerging N/A N/A (Effective Emerging N/A	th Less Than Two Years 5 (3-to 5-Year Averages n=N/A) Effective Proficient N/A n=N/A)	Highly Effective N/A Highly Effective		
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) (Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these	Mathematics (Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5-year averages due to differences in cut-off scores for new assessments. Percentages of individual scores within effectiveness levels could be determined.) Science	Ineffective N/A Ineffective N/A	More New Teachers wi Taught During 2014-1 N/A (Effective Emerging N/A N/A (Effective Emerging N/A N/A (th Less Than Two Years 5 (3-to 5-Year Averages n=N/A) Effective Proficient N/A n=N/A) Effective Proficient N/A n=N/A)	Highly Effective N/A Highly Effective N/A		
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) (Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these	Mathematics (Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5-year averages due to differences in cut-off scores for new assessments. Percentages of individual scores within effectiveness levels could be determined.) Science	Ineffective N/A Ineffective N/A	More New Teachers wi Taught During 2014-1 N/A (Effective Emerging N/A N/A (Effective Emerging N/A N/A (Effective Emerging	th Less Than Two Years 5 (3-to 5-Year Averages n=N/A) Effective Proficient N/A n=N/A) Effective Proficient N/A n=N/A) Effective Proficient N/A	Highly Effective N/A Highly Effective N/A Highly Effective		
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) (Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these	Mathematics (Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5- year averages due to differences in cut-off scores for new assessments. Percentages of individual scores within effectiveness levels could be determined.) Science Social Studies	Ineffective N/A Ineffective N/A	More New Teachers wi Taught During 2014-1 N/A (Effective Emerging N/A N/A (Effective Emerging N/A N/A (th Less Than Two Years 5 (3-to 5-Year Averages n=N/A) Effective Proficient N/A n=N/A) Effective Proficient N/A n=N/A)	Highly Effective N/A Highly Effective N/A		
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) (Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these	Mathematics (Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5- year averages due to differences in cut-off scores for new assessments. Percentages of individual scores within effectiveness levels could be determined.) Science Social Studies English/Language Arts/Reading	Ineffective N/A Ineffective N/A	More New Teachers wi Taught During 2014-1 N/A (Effective Emerging N/A N/A (Effective Emerging N/A N/A (Effective Emerging N/A	th Less Than Two Years 5 (3-to 5-Year Averages n=N/A) Effective Proficient N/A n=N/A) Effective Proficient N/A n=N/A) Effective Proficient N/A	Highly Effective N/A Highly Effective N/A Highly Effective		
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) (Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these	Mathematics (Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5- year averages due to differences in cut-off scores for new assessments. Percentages of individual scores within effectiveness levels could be determined.) Science Social Studies English/Language Arts/Reading (Note: A Mean score could not be	Ineffective N/A Ineffective N/A	More New Teachers wi Taught During 2014-1 N/A (Effective Emerging N/A N/A (Effective Emerging N/A N/A (Effective Emerging N/A	th Less Than Two Years 5 (3-to 5-Year Averages n=N/A) Effective Proficient N/A n=N/A) Effective Proficient N/A n=N/A) Effective Proficient N/A	Highly Effective N/A Highly Effective N/A Highly Effective		
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) (Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these	Mathematics (Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5- year averages due to differences in cut-off scores for new assessments. Percentages of individual scores within effectiveness levels could be determined.) Science Social Studies English/Language Arts/Reading	Ineffective N/A Ineffective N/A Ineffective N/A	More New Teachers wi Taught During 2014-1 N/A (Effective Emerging N/A N/A (Effective Emerging N/A N/A (Effective Emerging N/A N/A (N/A (th Less Than Two Years 5 (3-to 5-Year Averages n=N/A) Effective Proficient N/A n=N/A) Effective Proficient N/A n=N/A) Effective Proficient N/A n=N/A)	Highly Effective N/A Highly Effective N/A Highly Effective N/A		
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) (Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these	Mathematics (Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5- year averages due to differences in cut-off scores for new assessments. Percentages of individual scores within effectiveness levels could be determined.) Science English/Language Arts/Reading (Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5-	Ineffective N/A Ineffective N/A	More New Teachers wi Taught During 2014-1 N/A (Effective Emerging N/A N/A (Effective Emerging N/A N/A (Effective Emerging N/A	th Less Than Two Years 5 (3-to 5-Year Averages n=N/A) Effective Proficient N/A n=N/A) Effective Proficient N/A n=N/A) Effective Proficient N/A	Highly Effective N/A Highly Effective N/A Highly Effective		

2016 LOUISIANA TEACHER PREPARATION DATA DASHBOARD (CONT'D)

Nicholls State University

Prepared by Louisiana Board of Regents & University of Louisiana System

Certification-Only Alternate Teacher Preparation Program

PERFORMANC Impact on K-12 Students	E AS CLASSROOM TEACHERS (NEW TE	ACHEDS WITH					
=		ACHERS WITH	LESS THAN TWO Y	EARS OF TEACHING	G)		
K-12 Students	Mean Compass Student Outcome	Cor	mpass Student Outcom	e Mean & Number of S	cores		
1	Score (2012-13, 2013-14, & 2014-						
	15) and Number of Scores for All	3.1 (n=240)					
(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 Outcome Scores					
scores.)	13, 2013-14, & 2014-15 Compass	Ineffective	Effective Emerging	Effective Proficient	Highly Effective		
,	Student Outcome Scores for the						
ļ	New Teachers by LDOE Teacher	2%	15%	38%	46%		
	Effectiveness Levels						
Demonstrated Teaching	Mean Compass Professional	Compass Professional Practice Mean & Number of Scores					
Skill	Practice Score (2012-13, 2013-14,						
3KIII	& 2014-15) and Number of Scores	3.0 (n=240)					
(Please examine the 2016	for All New Teachers with Less than						
Louisiana Teacher Preparation	Two Years of Teaching						
Data Fact Book to accurately		Compace T	mpass Teacher Effectiveness Levels for Professional Practice Scores				
interpret the meaning of these	Percentage and Number of 2012-	Ineffective	Effective Emerging	Effective Proficient	Highly Effective		
scores.)	13, 2013-14, & 2014-15 Compass	0%	12%	70%	18%		
ļ	Professional Practice Scores for the	076	12/0	7076	10/0		
ļ	New Teachers by LDOE Teacher						
	Effectiveness Levels	-					
Overall Impact and	Mean Compass Final Evaluation	Co	ompass Final Evaluation	n Mean & Number of Sc	ores		
Demonstrated Teaching	Score (2012-13, 2013-14, & 2014-						
Skill	15) and Number of Scores for New	3.1 (n=240)					
	Teachers with Less than Two Years						
(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 interpret the meaning of these	13, 2013-14, & 2014-15 Compass	Ineffective	Effective Emerging	Effective Proficient	Highly Effective		
scores.)	Final Evaluation Scores for the New	2%	12%	63%	23%		
,	Teachers by LDOE Teacher						
í	Effectiveness Levels						
State Value Added Scores	Effectiveness Levels Content Areas	Mean, Numb	er of Scores, & Effective	eness Levels for Value-A	Added Scores of		
State Value Added Scores	Content Areas	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	•	eness Levels for Value-Aith Less Than Two Years			
for Growth in Student	Content Areas	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	More New Teachers wi		of Teaching who		
for Growth in Student Learning for New	Content Areas Mathematics	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	More New Teachers wi	ith Less Than Two Years	of Teaching who		
for Growth in Student Learning for New Teachers in Grades 4-8	Content Areas Mathematics (Note: A Mean score could not be	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	More New Teachers wi Taught During 2014-1	ith Less Than Two Years	of Teaching who		
for Growth in Student Learning for New Teachers in Grades 4-8 with Less than Two Years	Content Areas Mathematics (Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5-	Twenty-five or	More New Teachers wi Taught During 2014-1 N/A	ith Less Than Two Years 5 (3-to 5-Year Averages (n=31)	of Teaching who		
for Growth in Student Learning for New Teachers in Grades 4-8 with Less than Two Years of Teaching by Content	Content Areas Mathematics (Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5- year averages due to differences in cut-off	Twenty-five or	More New Teachers wi Taught During 2014-1 N/A Effective Emerging	ith Less Than Two Years 5 (3-to 5-Year Averages (n=31) Effective Proficient	of Teaching who		
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	Content Areas Mathematics (Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5-	Twenty-five or	More New Teachers wi Taught During 2014-1 N/A	ith Less Than Two Years 5 (3-to 5-Year Averages (n=31)	of Teaching who		
for Growth in Student Learning for New Teachers in Grades 4-8 with Less than Two Years of Teaching by Content	Content Areas Mathematics (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	Twenty-five or	More New Teachers wi Taught During 2014-1 N/A Effective Emerging	ith Less Than Two Years 5 (3-to 5-Year Averages (n=31) Effective Proficient	of Teaching who		
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)	Content Areas Mathematics (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	Twenty-five or	More New Teachers with Taught During 2014-1 N/A Effective Emerging 36%	ith Less Than Two Years 5 (3-to 5-Year Averages (n=31) Effective Proficient 29%	of Teaching who		
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)	Content Areas Mathematics (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.)	Twenty-five or	More New Teachers with Taught During 2014-1 N/A Effective Emerging 36%	ith Less Than Two Years 5 (3-to 5-Year Averages (n=31) Effective Proficient	of Teaching who		
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) (Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately	Content Areas Mathematics (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.)	Ineffective 19%	More New Teachers wi Taught During 2014-1 N/A Effective Emerging 36% -2.4	ith Less Than Two Years 5 (3-to 5-Year Averages (n=31) Effective Proficient 29% (n=37)	Highly Effective		
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) (Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation	Content Areas Mathematics (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.)	Ineffective 19% Ineffective	More New Teachers with Taught During 2014-1 N/A Effective Emerging 36%	ith Less Than Two Years 5 (3-to 5-Year Averages (n=31) Effective Proficient 29%	of Teaching who		
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) (Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately	Content Areas Mathematics (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.)	Ineffective 19%	More New Teachers wi Taught During 2014-1 N/A Effective Emerging 36% -2.4	ith Less Than Two Years 5 (3-to 5-Year Averages (n=31) Effective Proficient 29% (n=37)	Highly Effective		
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) (Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these	Content Areas Mathematics (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.)	Ineffective 19% Ineffective	More New Teachers wi Taught During 2014-1 N/A Effective Emerging 36% -2.4 Effective Emerging	ith Less Than Two Years 5 (3-to 5-Year Averages (n=31) Effective Proficient 29% (n=37) Effective Proficient	Highly Effective Highly Effective		
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) (Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these	Content Areas Mathematics (Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5- year averages due to differences in cut-off scores for new assessments. Percentages of individual scores within effectiveness levels could be determined.) Science	Ineffective 19% Ineffective	More New Teachers wi Taught During 2014-1 N/A Effective Emerging 36% -2.4 Effective Emerging 54%	ith Less Than Two Years 5 (3-to 5-Year Averages (n=31) Effective Proficient 29% (n=37) Effective Proficient	Highly Effective Highly Effective		
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) (Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these	Content Areas Mathematics (Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5- year averages due to differences in cut-off scores for new assessments. Percentages of individual scores within effectiveness levels could be determined.) Science	Ineffective 19% Ineffective	More New Teachers wi Taught During 2014-1 N/A Effective Emerging 36% -2.4 Effective Emerging 54%	ith Less Than Two Years 5 (3-to 5-Year Averages (n=31) Effective Proficient 29% (n=37) Effective Proficient 30%	Highly Effective Highly Effective		
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) (Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these	Content Areas Mathematics (Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5- year averages due to differences in cut-off scores for new assessments. Percentages of individual scores within effectiveness levels could be determined.) Science	Ineffective 19% Ineffective	More New Teachers wi Taught During 2014-1 N/A Effective Emerging 36% -2.4 Effective Emerging 54%	ith Less Than Two Years 5 (3-to 5-Year Averages (n=31) Effective Proficient 29% (n=37) Effective Proficient 30%	Highly Effective Highly Effective		
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) (Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these	Content Areas Mathematics (Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5- year averages due to differences in cut-off scores for new assessments. Percentages of individual scores within effectiveness levels could be determined.) Science	Ineffective 19% Ineffective 8%	N/A Effective Emerging 36% -2.4 Effective Emerging 54%	ith Less Than Two Years 5 (3-to 5-Year Averages (n=31) Effective Proficient 29% (n=37) Effective Proficient 30% (n=35)	Highly Effective 16% Highly Effective 8%		
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) (Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these	Content Areas Mathematics (Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5- year averages due to differences in cut-off scores for new assessments. Percentages of individual scores within effectiveness levels could be determined.) Science	Ineffective 19% Ineffective 8%	N/A Effective Emerging 36% -2.4 Effective Emerging 54% -3.7 Effective Emerging	ith Less Than Two Years 5 (3-to 5-Year Averages (n=31) Effective Proficient 29% (n=37) Effective Proficient 30% (n=35) Effective Proficient	Highly Effective 16% Highly Effective 8% Highly Effective		
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) (Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these	Content Areas Mathematics (Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5- year averages due to differences in cut-off scores for new assessments. Percentages of individual scores within effectiveness levels could be determined.) Science English/Language Arts/Reading (Note: A Mean score could not be	Ineffective 19% Ineffective 8%	N/A Effective Emerging 36% -2.4 Effective Emerging 54% -3.7 Effective Emerging 49%	ith Less Than Two Years 5 (3-to 5-Year Averages (n=31) Effective Proficient 29% (n=37) Effective Proficient 30% (n=35) Effective Proficient	Highly Effective 16% Highly Effective 8% Highly Effective		
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) (Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these	Content Areas Mathematics (Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5- year averages due to differences in cut-off scores for new assessments. Percentages of individual scores within effectiveness levels could be determined.) Science English/Language Arts/Reading (Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5-	Ineffective 19% Ineffective 8%	N/A Effective Emerging 36% -2.4 Effective Emerging 54% -3.7 Effective Emerging 49%	ith Less Than Two Years 5 (3-to 5-Year Averages (n=31) Effective Proficient 29% (n=37) Effective Proficient 30% (n=35) Effective Proficient 23%	Highly Effective 16% Highly Effective 8% Highly Effective		
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) (Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these	Content Areas Mathematics (Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5- year averages due to differences in cut-off scores for new assessments. Percentages of individual scores within effectiveness levels could be determined.) Science Social Studies English/Language Arts/Reading (Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5- year averages due to differences in cut-off	Ineffective 19% Ineffective 8%	N/A Effective Emerging 36% -2.4 Effective Emerging 54% -3.7 Effective Emerging 49%	ith Less Than Two Years 5 (3-to 5-Year Averages (n=31) Effective Proficient 29% (n=37) Effective Proficient 30% (n=35) Effective Proficient 23%	Highly Effective 16% Highly Effective 8% Highly Effective		
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) (Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these	Content Areas Mathematics (Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5- year averages due to differences in cut-off scores for new assessments. Percentages of individual scores within effectiveness levels could be determined.) Science English/Language Arts/Reading (Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5-	Ineffective 19% Ineffective 8% Ineffective 14%	N/A Effective Emerging 36% -2.4 Effective Emerging 54% -3.7 Effective Emerging 54% N/A	ith Less Than Two Years 5 (3-to 5-Year Averages (n=31) Effective Proficient 29% (n=37) Effective Proficient 30% (n=35) Effective Proficient 23% (n=47)	Highly Effective 16% Highly Effective 8% Highly Effective 14%		