

2016 LOUISIANA TEACHER PREPARATION DATA DASHBOARD
 University of Louisiana at Monroe
 Prepared by Louisiana Board of Regents & University of Louisiana System

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%
-------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------	------

2016 LOUISIANA TEACHER PREPARATION DATA DASHBOARD (CONT'D)
 University of Louisiana at Monroe
 Prepared by Louisiana Board of Regents & University of Louisiana System

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		