2016 LOUISIANA TEACHER PREPARATION DATA DASHBOARD

Northwestern 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://educati	ion.nsula	ı.edu/						
Approval/Accreditation						Agencies				Status
				ntary and Seco	ndary	Education	ı (BESE)			Approved
		State: Board of Regents (BoR)							Approved	
		Regional: Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC)							Accredited	
		National: Nat	ional Co	uncil for Accred	litatio	n of Teach	er Educa	tion (NCA	TE); Teacher	Accredited
		Education Accreditation Council (TEAC); or Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP)								
Type of Prog	ram	Alternate (Master of Arts in Teaching, Practitioner Teacher Program, & Certification-Onl							ly)	
,, <u> </u>		` <u> </u>								,,
Academic Strength		CANDIDATE SELECTION PROFILE Completer Passage Rate on Praxis Skills Assessment (2013-14)							100%	
		Median GPA of Candidates Entering the Program (2013-14)							3.11	
		Median GPA of Candidates Completing the Program (2013-14)							3.75	
		Number of Candidates who Started but Did not Complete the Program Within 6 Years							Data Not Yet	
		Transfer of Canadates who Started but Did not complete the Frogram within o rears							Available	
Teaching Pro	mise	Data not yet a	Data not yet available.							
Candidates/		Candidates	Enrolled			Completers				Total
Completer		(2013-14)	192			58			250	
Diversity		Enrolled	Males				Females			
		Gender		34					158	
		Enrolled	Hispanic	Indian	As	ian	Black	Island	er White	Multi-Racial
		Race	0	3	()	25	1	140	1
		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 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			eriences	_	nber of /eeks	Number of Clock Hours per Week	Total Number of Clock Hours
			N/A				N/A	N/A		
Licensure Requirements		Number and Percentage of 2013-14 Completers That Meet State Licensing							100%	
		Requirements							20070	
Completer Ra	ating	Data Not Yet A	Available							
	PR	OGRAM PRODI	UCTIVITY	AND ALIGNM	ENT T	O STATE N	NEEDS OF	COMPLE	TERS	
Entry and Pe	rsistence in	Percentage &	Number	of 2013-14 Co	mplet	ers That W	/ere Teac	hing in 20)14-15	88% (n=51)
Teaching in P	ublic Schools	Percentage & Number of 2013-14 Completers That Obtained a License to Teach							Data Not Yet	
in Louisiana		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·							Available	
		2009-10 Completers Teaching in Public Schools in Louisiana in 2010-11, 2011-12, 2012-13, 2013-14,							& 2014-15	
(Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these scores.)		Number of 2009-10 Completers	i	Number & Percentage Teaching in 2010-11	Pe Te	umber & ercentage aching in 2011-12	Perce Teacl	ber & entage ning in 2-13	Number & Percentage Teaching in 2013-14	Number & Percentage Teaching in 2014-15
		100% (n=6	1)	90% (n=55)	85	% (n=52)	80% (n=49)	75% (n=46)	75% (n=46)
Placement/Persistence in High-Need Subjects/Schools		Data Not Yet a	available				•	1		

2016 LOUISIANA TEACHER PREPARATION DATA DASHBOARD (CONT'D)

Northwestern State University

Prepared by Louisiana Board of Regents & University of Louisiana System

Master of Arts in Teaching Alternate Teacher Preparation Program

DEDECORMANIC		ACHERC WITH	LECC THAN TWO	TARCOL TEACHING	C)		
	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-	224 (55)					
(Please examine the 2016	15) and Number of Scores for All	3.3 (n=158)					
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 Student Growth Scores for the	Ineffective	Effective Emerging	Effective Proficient	Highly Effective		
		2%	8%	34%	56%		
	New Teachers by LDOE Teacher						
Domonotrated Tooking	Effectiveness Levels	Com	nass Professional Pract	ica Maan & Number of	Scoros		
Demonstrated Teaching Skill	Mean Compass Professional	Compass Professional Practice Mean & Number of Scores			Scores		
SKIII	Practice Score (2012-13, 2013-14,	3.3 (n=158)					
(Please examine the 2016	& 2014-15) and Number of Scores for All New Teachers with Less						
Louisiana Teacher Preparation	than Two Years of Teaching						
Data Fact Book to accurately	Percentage and Number of 2012-	Compass T	eacher Effectiveness Le	vels for Professional Pr	actice Scores		
interpret the meaning of these	13, 2013-14, & 2014-15 <i>Compass</i>	Ineffective	Effective Emerging	Effective Proficient	Highly Effective		
scores.)	Professional Practice Scores for	0%	4%	59%	37%		
	the New Teachers by LDOE		.,,	22,1			
	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-	Compass i mai Evaluation Mean & Mulliper of Scores					
Skill	15) and Number of Scores for	2.2 (n=150)					
SKIII	New Teachers with Less than Two	3.3 (n=158)					
(Please examine the 2016	Years 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	2%	6%	49%	42%		
scores.	New Teachers by LDOE Teacher						
	Effectiveness Levels						
State Value Added Scores		Mean. Numb	er of Scores. & Effective	eness Levels for Value-/	Added Scores of		
State Value Added Scores for Growth in Student	Content Areas	-		eness Levels for Value-A th Less Than Two Years			
for Growth in Student	Content Areas	-	More New Teachers wi		of Teaching who		
	Content Areas Mathematics	-	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	Content Areas Mathematics (Note: A Mean score could not be	-	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	Content Areas Mathematics	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)	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 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 (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	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	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)	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	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 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)	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	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%	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	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 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) (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.)	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%	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	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 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	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 N/A%	More New Teachers wi Taught During 2014-1 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	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	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 N/A%	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	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	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 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%	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 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	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 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	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	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%	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 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	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	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	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	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	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	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 (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) (n=28)	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	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 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%		

2016 LOUISIANA TEACHER PREPARATION DATA DASHBOARD (CONT'D)

Northwestern State University

Prepared by Louisiana Board of Regents & University of Louisiana System

Practitioner Teacher Alternate Teacher Preparation Program

PERFORMANO	CE AS CLASSROOM TEACHERS (NEW TE				3)			
Impact on	ACHERS WITH LESS THAN TWO YEARS OF TEACHING) Compass Student Growth Mean & Number of Scores							
K-12 Students	•		Company State of Grant Income a statistical of States					
K 12 Students	15) and Number of Scores for All	2.1/n=70\						
(Please examine the 2016	New Teachers with Less than Two	3.1 (n=70)						
Louisiana Teacher Preparation	Years of Teaching							
Data Fact Book to accurately	Percentage and Number of 2012-	Compass Teacher Effectiveness Levels for Student Growth Scores						
interpret the meaning of these scores.)	13, 2013-14, & 2014-15 Compass	Ineffective	Effective Emerging					
Scores.y	Student Growth Scores for the New	meneenee	Encoure Emerging	2. Court Troncient	Highly Effective			
	Teachers by LDOE Teacher	4%	13%	34%	49%			
	Effectiveness Levels							
Demonstrated Teaching	Mean Compass Professional	Com	pass Professional Pract	ice Mean & Number of	Scores			
Skill	Practice Score (2012-13, 2013-14,		,,,,,					
S	& 2014-15) and Number of Scores		2.1.	(n-70)				
(Please examine the 2016	for All New Teachers with Less than	3.1 (n=70)						
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 Compass	Ineffective	Effective Emerging	Effective Proficient	Highly Effective			
,	Professional Practice Scores for the	1%	9%	66%	24%			
	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	3.1 (n=70)						
	Teachers with Less than Two Years		,					
(Please examine the 2016	of Teaching							
Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately	Percentage and Number of 2012-	Compass Teacher Effectiveness Levels for Final Evaluation Scores						
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	6%	6%	64%	24%			
	Teachers by LDOE Teacher							
	Effectiveness Levels							
State Value Added Scores	Content Areas	Mean, Number of Scores, & Effectiveness Levels for Value-Added Scores of						
for Growth in Student		Twenty-five or More New Teachers with Less Than Two Years of Teaching who Taught During 2014-15 (3-to 5-Year Averages)						
Learning for New	Mathematics							
Teachers in Grades 4-8 with Less than Two Years	(Note: A Mean score could not be	N/A (n=N/A)						
of Teaching by Content	determined this year to calculate 3- to 5- year averages due to differences in cut-off	. "	I =# .: = .					
Areas (Twenty-five or	scores for new assessments. Percentages of	Ineffective	Effective Emerging	Effective Proficient	Highly Effective			
More New Teachers)	individual scores within effectiveness levels	N/A%	N/A%	N/A%	N/A%			
Wiore New Teachers,	could be determined.)							
(Please examine the 2016	Science		N/A (n=N/A)					
Louisiana Teacher Preparation		N/A (N=N/A)						
Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these		Ineffective	Effective Emerging	Effective Proficient	Highly Effective			
scores.)		N/A%	N/A%	N/A%	N/A%			
	Social Studies	,		,	,			
		N/A (n=N/A)						
		Ineffective	Effective Emerging	Effective Proficient	Highly Effective			
		N/A%	N/A%	N/A%	N/A%			
	English/Language Arts/Reading							
	(Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5-		N/A (n=25)					
	year averages due to differences in cut-off	Inoffactive	Effective Emarcin	Effective Proficient	Highly Effective			
	scores for new assessments. Percentages of	Ineffective	Effective Emerging	Lifective Frontient	Highly Effective			
	individual scores within effectiveness levels could be determined.)	28%	20%	32%	20%			
	/			•				