

2017 LOUISIANA TEACHER PREPARATION DATA DASHBOARD
University of New Orleans
Prepared by Louisiana Board of Regents & University of Louisiana System
Public Undergraduate Teacher Preparation Program

BASIC PROGRAM INFORMATION

Program Web Site	http://www.uno.edu/coehd/index.aspx		
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 (2014-15)		100%					
	Median GPA of Candidates Entering the Program (2014-15)		3.20					
	Median GPA of Candidates Completing the Program (2014-15)		3.37					
	Number of Candidates who Started but Did not Complete the Program Within 6 Years (by 2014-15)		Data Not Yet Available					
Teaching Promise	Data not yet available.							
Candidates/Completer Diversity	Candidates (2014-15)	Enrolled 123	Completers 48	Total 171				
	Enrolled Gender	Males 23		Females 100				
		Enrolled Race	Hispanic 8	Indian 2	Asian 7	Black 11	Islander 0	White 88

KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS FOR TEACHING OF COMPLETERS

Knowledge	Content	Completer Passage Rate on Praxis Content Assessments (2014-15)		100%	
	Pedagogical	Completer Passage Rate on Praxis Professional Knowledge Assessments (2014-15)		100%	
	Overall	Completer Passage Rate on all Assessments (2014-15)		100%	
Clinical Experiences	Student Teaching	Clock Hours of Clinical Experiences Prior to Student Teaching			180
		Clock Hours of Clinical Experiences During Student Teaching	Number of Weeks	Number of Clock Hours per Week	Total Number of Clock Hours
			15	35	
Licensure Requirements	Number and Percentage of 2014-15 Completers That Meet State Licensing Requirements			100%	
Completer Rating	Data Not Yet Available				

PROGRAM PRODUCTIVITY AND ALIGNMENT TO STATE NEEDS OF COMPLETERS

Entry and Persistence in Teaching in Public Schools in Louisiana	Percentage & Number of 2014-15 Completers That Began Teaching in 2015-16		81% (n=39)		
	Percentage & Number of 2014-15 Completers That Obtained a License to Teach		Data Not Yet Available		
	2010-11 Completers Teaching in Public Schools in Louisiana in 2011-12, 2012-13, 2013-14, 2014-15, & 2015-16				
	Number of 2010-11 Completers	Number & Percentage Teaching in 2011-12	Number & Percentage Teaching in 2012-13	Number & Percentage Teaching in 2013-14	Number & Percentage Teaching in 2014-15
100% (n=49)	67% (n=33)	67% (n=33)	63% (n=31)	57% (n=28)	59% (n=29)
Placement/Persistence in High-Need Subjects/Schools	Data Not Yet available				

(Please examine the 2017 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these scores.)

2017 LOUISIANA TEACHER PREPARATION DATA DASHBOARD (CONT'D)

University of New Orleans

Prepared by Louisiana Board of Regents & University of Louisiana System

Public Undergraduate Teacher Preparation Program

PERFORMANCE AS CLASSROOM TEACHERS (NEW TEACHERS WITH LESS THAN TWO YEARS OF TEACHING)

Impact on K-12 Students <i>(Please examine the 2017 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these scores.)</i>	Mean <i>Compass Student Outcome Score</i> (2013-14, 2014-15, & 2015-16) and Number of Scores for All New Teachers with Less than Two Years of Teaching	Compass Student Outcome Mean & Number of Scores											
		3.0 (n=218)											
	Percentage and Number of 2013-14, 2014-15, & 2015-16 <i>Compass Student Outcome Scores</i> for the New Teachers by LDOE Teacher Effectiveness Levels	Compass Teacher Effectiveness Levels for Student Outcome Scores											
		<table border="1"> <tr> <th>Ineffective</th> <th>Effective Emerging</th> <th>Effective Proficient</th> <th>Highly Effective</th> </tr> <tr> <td>5% (n=10)</td> <td>17% (n=37)</td> <td>40% (n=88)</td> <td>38% (n=83)</td> </tr> </table>	Ineffective	Effective Emerging	Effective Proficient	Highly Effective	5% (n=10)	17% (n=37)	40% (n=88)	38% (n=83)			
Ineffective	Effective Emerging	Effective Proficient	Highly Effective										
5% (n=10)	17% (n=37)	40% (n=88)	38% (n=83)										
Demonstrated Teaching Skill <i>(Please examine the 2017 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these scores.)</i>	Mean <i>Compass Professional Practice Score</i> (2013-14, 2014-15, & 2015-16) and Number of Scores for All New Teachers with Less than Two Years of Teaching	Compass Professional Practice Mean & Number of Scores											
		3.0 (n=218)											
	Percentage and Number of 2013-14, 2014-15, & 2015-16 <i>Compass Professional Practice Scores</i> for the New Teachers by LDOE Teacher Effectiveness Levels	Compass Teacher Effectiveness Levels for Professional Practice Scores											
		<table border="1"> <tr> <th>Ineffective</th> <th>Effective Emerging</th> <th>Effective Proficient</th> <th>Highly Effective</th> </tr> <tr> <td>1% (n=≤10)</td> <td>12% (n=27)</td> <td>70% (n=152)</td> <td>17% (n=37)</td> </tr> </table>	Ineffective	Effective Emerging	Effective Proficient	Highly Effective	1% (n=≤10)	12% (n=27)	70% (n=152)	17% (n=37)			
Ineffective	Effective Emerging	Effective Proficient	Highly Effective										
1% (n=≤10)	12% (n=27)	70% (n=152)	17% (n=37)										
Overall Impact and Demonstrated Teaching Skill <i>(Please examine the 2017 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these scores.)</i>	Mean <i>Compass Final Evaluation Score</i> (2013-14, 2014-15, & 2015-16) and Number of Scores for New Teachers with Less than Two Years of Teaching	Compass Final Evaluation Mean & Number of Scores											
		3.0 (n=218)											
	Percentage and Number of 2013-14, 2014-15, & 2015-16 <i>Compass Final Evaluation Scores</i> for the New Teachers by LDOE Teacher Effectiveness Levels	Compass Teacher Effectiveness Levels for Final Evaluation Scores											
		<table border="1"> <tr> <th>Ineffective</th> <th>Effective Emerging</th> <th>Effective Proficient</th> <th>Highly Effective</th> </tr> <tr> <td>3% (n=≤10)</td> <td>12% (n=26)</td> <td>70% (n=153)</td> <td>15% (n=32)</td> </tr> </table>	Ineffective	Effective Emerging	Effective Proficient	Highly Effective	3% (n=≤10)	12% (n=26)	70% (n=153)	15% (n=32)			
Ineffective	Effective Emerging	Effective Proficient	Highly Effective										
3% (n=≤10)	12% (n=26)	70% (n=153)	15% (n=32)										
State Value Added Scores for New Teachers in Grades 4-8 with Less than Two Years of Teaching by Content Areas (Ten or More New Teachers) <i>(Please examine the 2017 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 Ten or More New Teachers with Less Than Two Years of Teaching who Taught During 2013-14/2014-15/2015-16											
	Mathematics <i>(Taught During 2014-15 & 2015-16)</i>	-2.8 (n=12)											
		<table border="1"> <tr> <th>Ineffective</th> <th>Effective Emerging</th> <th>Effective Proficient</th> <th>Highly Effective</th> </tr> <tr> <td>17% (n=≤10)</td> <td>50% (n=≤10)</td> <td>25% (n=≤10)</td> <td>8% (n=≤10)</td> </tr> </table>	Ineffective	Effective Emerging	Effective Proficient	Highly Effective	17% (n=≤10)	50% (n=≤10)	25% (n=≤10)	8% (n=≤10)			
	Ineffective	Effective Emerging	Effective Proficient	Highly Effective									
	17% (n=≤10)	50% (n=≤10)	25% (n=≤10)	8% (n=≤10)									
	Science <i>(Taught During 2013-14, 2014-15 & 2015-16)</i>	0.2 (n=23)											
		<table border="1"> <tr> <th>Ineffective</th> <th>Effective Emerging</th> <th>Effective Proficient</th> <th>Highly Effective</th> </tr> <tr> <td>≤10% (n=≤10)</td> <td>52% (n=12)</td> <td>22% (n=≤10)</td> <td>22% (n=≤10)</td> </tr> </table>	Ineffective	Effective Emerging	Effective Proficient	Highly Effective	≤10% (n=≤10)	52% (n=12)	22% (n=≤10)	22% (n=≤10)			
	Ineffective	Effective Emerging	Effective Proficient	Highly Effective									
	≤10% (n=≤10)	52% (n=12)	22% (n=≤10)	22% (n=≤10)									
	Social Studies <i>(Note: Data not available – new assessments being developed.)</i>	N/A											
	<table border="1"> <tr> <th>Ineffective</th> <th>Effective Emerging</th> <th>Effective Proficient</th> <th>Highly Effective</th> </tr> <tr> <td>N/A</td> <td>N/A</td> <td>N/A</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table>	Ineffective	Effective Emerging	Effective Proficient	Highly Effective	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A				
Ineffective	Effective Emerging	Effective Proficient	Highly Effective										
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A										
English/Language Arts/Reading <i>(Taught During 2014-15 & 2015-16)</i>	0.0 (n=23)												
	<table border="1"> <tr> <th>Ineffective</th> <th>Effective Emerging</th> <th>Effective Proficient</th> <th>Highly Effective</th> </tr> <tr> <td>22% (n=≤10)</td> <td>30% (n=≤10)</td> <td>22% (n=≤10)</td> <td>26% (n=≤10)</td> </tr> </table>	Ineffective	Effective Emerging	Effective Proficient	Highly Effective	22% (n=≤10)	30% (n=≤10)	22% (n=≤10)	26% (n=≤10)				
Ineffective	Effective Emerging	Effective Proficient	Highly Effective										
22% (n=≤10)	30% (n=≤10)	22% (n=≤10)	26% (n=≤10)										
K-12 Student Perceptions	Data Not Yet Available.												