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

## **Louisiana Tech 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	on.lated	h.edu/						
Approval/Accreditation						Agencies				Status
				ntary and Seco	ndary	Education	(BESE)			Approved
		State: Board o								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								
Type of Prog	ram	Preparation (CAEP)  Alternate (Master of Arts in Teaching & Certification-Only )								
			C/	NDIDATE SELE	CTION	PROFILE				
Academic Str	ength	Completer Pas		te on Praxis Ski			2013-14)			100%
				lates Entering t						3.20
										3.89
		Median GPA of Candidates Completing the Program (2013-14)  Number of Candidates who Started but Did not Complete the Program Within 6 Years							Data Not Yet	
		realistics of Canadates who Started but Did not complete the Flogram within 0 Teals							Available	
Teaching Promise		Data not yet a	vailable							
Candidates/		Candidates	Enrolled		Completers			Total		
Completer	Completer		99			72			171	
Diversity		Enrolled				Females				
		Gender	30					69		
		Enrolled	Hispanic	Indian		ian	Black	Island		Multi-Racial
		Race	3	0	(	)	11	0	82	3
		KNOWI	EDGE 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	assage 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					180		
		Teaching	cacining clock floars of chilical Experiences				Number of	Total Number of		
			During Student Teaching Weeks Clock Hours per Weeks Week				Clock Hours per	Clock Hours		
			10 40					400		
Licensure Requirements		Number and D	Percenta	ge of 2012-14 (	`omnl	otors That	Moot St			100%
Election of Requirements		Number and Percentage of 2013-14 Completers That Meet State Licensing 100% Requirements								100%
Completer Ra	ating	Data Not Yet A		<u> </u>						
'		OGRAM PRODU	JCTIVIT	AND ALIGNM	ENT T	O STATE N	IEEDS 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	76% (n=55)
Teaching in Public 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		Number of 2009-10 Completers		Number & Percentage Teaching in 2010-11	Pe Te	umber & ercentage eaching in 2011-12	Perce Teacl	ber & entage ning in 2-13	Number & Percentage Teaching in 2013-14	Number & Percentage Teaching in 2014-15
scores.)		100% (n=10	5)	81% (n=85)	74	% (n=78)	74%	n=78)	75% (n=79)	71% (n=74)
Placement/Persistence in High-Need Subjects/Schools		Data Not Yet a	ıvailable					ı		

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

**Louisiana Tech University** 

Prepared by Louisiana Board of Regents & University of Louisiana System

Master of Arts in Teaching Alternate Teacher Preparation Program

DEDECORMANIC	AC CLACCDOOM TEACHEDS (NEW TE	ACLIEDE MAITH	LECC THAN TWO V	EARC OF TEACHING	~1			
		EACHERS WITH LESS THAN TWO YEARS OF TEACHING)  Compass Student Growth Mean & Number of Scores						
Impact on	,		Compass Student Growth Mean & Number of Scores					
K-12 Students	Score (2012-13, 2013-14, & 2014-							
(Please examine the 2016	15) and Number of Scores for All	3.5 (n=290)						
Louisiana Teacher Preparation	New Teachers with Less than Two							
Data Fact Book to accurately	Years of Teaching	Compact Teacher Effectiveness Levels for Student County County						
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	3%	6%	22%	69%			
	New Teachers by LDOE Teacher	370	0,0	22/0	0370			
	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		3.4 (	n=290)				
(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-	•	eacher Effectiveness Le					
scores.)	13, 2013-14, & 2014-15 Compass	Ineffective	Effective Emerging	Effective Proficient	Highly Effective			
	Professional Practice Scores for	0%	4%	51%	45%			
	the 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	3.5 (n=290)						
	New Teachers with Less than Two							
(Please examine the 2016	Years of Teaching	Number of 2012- 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 <i>Compass</i>	Ineffective	Effective Emerging	Effective Proficient	Highly Effective			
scores.)	Final Evaluation Scores for the	3%	3%	40%	54%			
	New Teachers by LDOE Teacher							
	Effectiveness Levels							
State Value Added Scores	Content Areas	-	er of Scores, & Effective					
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)						
			raught burning 2014 15 (5 to 5 real Averag					
Learning for New Teachers	Mathematics							
in Grades 4-8 with Less	Mathematics (Note: A Mean score could not be			(n=32)				
in Grades 4-8 with Less than Two Years of	(Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5-			(n=32)				
in Grades 4-8 with Less than Two Years of Teaching by Content Areas	(Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5-year averages due to differences in cut-off	Ineffective		(n=32)  Effective Proficient	Highly Effective			
in Grades 4-8 with Less than Two Years of Teaching by Content Areas (Twenty-five or More New	(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	Ineffective 9%	N/A	· · ·	Highly Effective			
in Grades 4-8 with Less than Two Years of Teaching by Content Areas	(Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5-year averages due to differences in cut-off		N/A Effective Emerging	Effective Proficient				
in Grades 4-8 with Less than Two Years of Teaching by Content Areas (Twenty-five or More New Teachers)	(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		N/A Effective Emerging	Effective Proficient				
in Grades 4-8 with Less than Two Years of Teaching by Content Areas (Twenty-five or More New Teachers)	(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.)		N/A Effective Emerging 53%	Effective Proficient				
in Grades 4-8 with Less than Two Years of Teaching by Content Areas (Twenty-five or More New Teachers)	(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.)	9%	N/A  Effective Emerging 53%	Effective Proficient 34% (n=28)	3%			
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	(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.)	9% Ineffective	N/A  Effective Emerging 53%  -2.7	Effective Proficient 34% (n=28) Effective Proficient	3% Highly Effective			
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	(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	9%	N/A  Effective Emerging 53%	Effective Proficient 34% (n=28)	3%			
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	(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.)	9% Ineffective	N/A  Effective Emerging 53%  -2.7  Effective Emerging 46%	Effective Proficient 34%  (n=28)  Effective Proficient 36%	3% Highly Effective			
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	(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	9% Ineffective	N/A  Effective Emerging 53%  -2.7  Effective Emerging 46%	Effective Proficient 34% (n=28) Effective Proficient	3% Highly Effective			
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	(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	9% Ineffective 11%	N/A  Effective Emerging 53%  -2.7  Effective Emerging 46%  -5.4	Effective Proficient 34%  (n=28)  Effective Proficient 36%  (n=27)	3%  Highly Effective 7%			
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	(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	9% Ineffective 11% Ineffective	N/A  Effective Emerging 53%  -2.7  Effective Emerging 46%  -5.4  Effective Emerging	Effective Proficient 34%  (n=28)  Effective Proficient 36%  (n=27)  Effective Proficient	3%  Highly Effective  7%  Highly Effective			
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	(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	9% Ineffective 11%	N/A  Effective Emerging 53%  -2.7  Effective Emerging 46%  -5.4	Effective Proficient 34%  (n=28)  Effective Proficient 36%  (n=27)	3%  Highly Effective 7%			
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	(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	9% Ineffective 11% Ineffective	N/A  Effective Emerging 53%  -2.7  Effective Emerging 46%  -5.4  Effective Emerging 41%	Effective Proficient 34%  (n=28)  Effective Proficient 36%  (n=27)  Effective Proficient 33%	3%  Highly Effective  7%  Highly Effective			
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	(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	9% Ineffective 11% Ineffective	N/A  Effective Emerging 53%  -2.7  Effective Emerging 46%  -5.4  Effective Emerging 41%	Effective Proficient 34%  (n=28)  Effective Proficient 36%  (n=27)  Effective Proficient	3%  Highly Effective  7%  Highly Effective			
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	(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- year averages due to differences in cut-off	9%  Ineffective 11%  Ineffective 22%	N/A  Effective Emerging 53%  -2.7  Effective Emerging 46%  -5.4  Effective Emerging 41%  N/A	Effective Proficient 34%  (n=28)  Effective Proficient 36%  (n=27)  Effective Proficient 33%  (n=27)	3%  Highly Effective 7%  Highly Effective 4%			
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	(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-	9% Ineffective 11% Ineffective	N/A  Effective Emerging 53%  -2.7  Effective Emerging 46%  -5.4  Effective Emerging 41%	Effective Proficient 34%  (n=28)  Effective Proficient 36%  (n=27)  Effective Proficient 33%	3%  Highly Effective  7%  Highly Effective			

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

**Louisiana Tech University** 

Prepared by Louisiana Board of Regents & University of Louisiana System

Certification-Only Alternate Teacher Preparation Program

2525021441	CERTIFICATION - Only Arternate	A CHERCIANE	LEGG THAN TWO	EARS OF TEASURE	٥١			
	CE AS CLASSROOM TEACHERS (NEW TE				•			
Impact on			Compass Student Growth Mean & Number of Scores					
K-12 Students	Score (2012-13, 2013-14, & 2014-							
(0)	15) and Number of Scores for All	3.3 (n=83)						
(Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation	New Teachers with Less than Two							
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	4%	10%	27%	60%			
	Teachers by LDOE Teacher	470	10/0	2770	0070			
	Effectiveness Levels							
Demonstrated Teaching	Mean Compass Professional	Com	pass Professional Pract	ice Mean & Number of	Scores			
Skill	Practice Score (2012-13, 2013-14,							
	& 2014-15) and Number of Scores		3.3 (	n=83)				
(Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation	for All New Teachers with Less than							
Data Fact Book to accurately	Two Years of Teaching							
interpret the meaning of these	Percentage and Number of 2012-	•	eacher Effectiveness Le					
scores.)	13, 2013-14, & 2014-15 Compass	Ineffective	Effective Emerging	Effective Proficient	Highly Effective			
	Professional Practice Scores for the	0%	6%	53%	41%			
	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	3.3 (n=83)						
	Teachers with Less than Two Years							
(Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation	of Teaching							
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 4%	Effective Emerging 6%	Effective Proficient	Highly Effective			
scores.)	Final Evaluation Scores for the New	4%	0%	48%	42%			
	Teachers by LDOE Teacher							
	Effectiveness Levels		<u> </u>					
State Value Added Scores	Content Areas		er of Scores, & Effective					
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)  N/A (n=27)						
Learning for New	Mathematics							
Teachers in Grades 4-8	(Note: A Mean score could not be							
with Less than Two Years	determined this year to calculate 3- to 5- year averages due to differences in cut-off							
of Teaching by Content	scores for new assessments. Percentages of	Ineffective	Effective Emerging	Effective Proficient	Highly Effective			
Areas (Twenty-five or	individual scores within effectiveness levels	22%	41%	30%	7%			
More New Teachers)	could be determined.)							
(Please examine the 2016	Science	-1.5 (n=27)						
Louisiana Teacher Preparation								
Data Fact Book to accurately			T =00					
interpret the meaning of these scores.)		Ineffective 11%	Effective Emerging	Effective Proficient	Highly Effective			
scores.)		11%	41%	48%	0%			
	Carial Chudian	11/0	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
	Social Studies	11/0	F.C.	(n=27)				
	Social Studies	1170	-5.6	(n=27)				
	Social Studies				Highly Effective			
	Social Studies	Ineffective	Effective Emerging	Effective Proficient	Highly Effective			
					Highly Effective			
	Social Studies  English/Language Arts/Reading (Note: A Mean score could not be	Ineffective	Effective Emerging 37%	Effective Proficient 22%				
	English/Language Arts/Reading (Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5-	Ineffective	Effective Emerging 37%	Effective Proficient				
	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	Effective Emerging 37%	Effective Proficient 22%				
	English/Language Arts/Reading (Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5-	Ineffective 33%	Effective Emerging 37% N/A (	Effective Proficient 22% n=N/A)	7%			