

Jacksonville State University
2023 Annual Reporting Measures
CAEP Accountability Measures

Measure 1 Completer Effectiveness

R4.1 Completer effectiveness and impact on P-12 learning and development.

Measure 1a: EPP Report Card

Prior to the 2018-2019 academic year, a survey for first-year teachers was developed by The Alabama Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (ALACTE) members, it was administered electronically to first-year teachers who, during the 2018-2019 school year, completed an Alabama State Board of Education (ALSBOE) approved undergraduate (Class B) or alternative master's degree program (Class A program leading to their first or initial Professional Educator Certificate). The purpose of the annually administered survey is to collect data on employers' satisfaction with the effectiveness of first-year teachers. The Alabama State Department of Education (ALSDE) does not provide the EPP with the number of completers being assessed, their programs of study, or the number of employer respondents. Data provided in this report include a summary of survey categories and the percentage of first-year teacher's employers who rated their first-year teachers as *teacher leader, effective teacher, emerging teacher, or ineffective teacher*. From the 2021-2022 data provided, the EPP was able to ascertain that overall JSU initial program completers were rated as "Effective or Emerging" on most items. Very few completers were rated as Ineffective.

Measure 1a: EPP Report Card Data

Employer Satisfaction Survey Educator Preparation Institutional Report Card For Jacksonville State University				
2023 Report: 2021/2022 data on JSU Employer Satisfaction (Alabama Statewide Employer Satisfaction)				
Survey Item	JSU%(AL%)	JSU%(AL%)		
Understanding how learners grow and develop. (The Learner and Learning – Learner Development 1.1)	Teacher Leader	0% (0%)		
	Effective	50% (45%)		
	Emerging	41% (47%)		
	Ineffective	8% (0%)		
Understanding of learners’ commonalities and individual differences. (The Learner and Learning – Learning Differences 2.1)	Teacher Leader	0% (0%)		
	Effective	42% (45%)		
	Emerging	47% (46%)		
	Ineffective	0% (0%)		
Manage the learning environment to engage learners actively. (The Learner and Learning – Learning Environments 3.2)	Teacher Leader	0% (0%)		
	Effective	48% (48%)		
	Emerging	36% (37%)		
	Ineffective	9% (9%)		
The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry	Teacher Leader	0% (0%)		
	Effective	58% (51%)		

and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches. (Content Knowledge-Content Knowledge 4.1)	Emerging	33% (0%)		
	Ineffective	8% (0%)		
Create learning experiences that make the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assure mastery of the content. (Content Knowledge – Content Knowledge 4.2)	Teacher Leader	0% (0%)		
	Effective	52% (48%)		
	Emerging	39% (43%)		
	Ineffective	0% (0%)		
Connect concepts, perspectives from varied disciplines, and interdisciplinary themes to problems and issues. (Content Knowledge – Application of Content 5.1)	Teacher Leader	0% (0%)		
	Effective	44% (45%)		
	Emerging	47% (46%)		
	Ineffective	0% (0%)		
Use, design, or adapt multiple methods of assessment to document, monitor, and support learner progress appropriate for learning goals and objectives. (Instructional Practice – Assessment 6.1)	Teacher Leader	0% (0%)		
	Effective	39% (43%)		
	Emerging	55% (48%)		
	Ineffective	0% (0%)		
The teacher implements assessments in an ethical manner and minimizes bias to enable learners to display the full extent of their learning. (Instructional Practice – Assessment 6.3)	Teacher Leader	0% (0%)		
	Effective	62% (59%)		
	Emerging	28% (33%)		
	Ineffective	0% (0%)		
Plan instruction based on information from formative and summative assessments and other sources and systematically adjust plans to meet each student’s learning needs. (Instructional Practice – Planning for Instruction 7.3)	Teacher Leader	0% (0%)		
	Effective	44% (45%)		
	Emerging	50% (46%)		
	Ineffective	0% (0%)		
Understand and use a variety of instructional strategies and make learning accessible to all learners. (Instructional Practice – Instructional Strategies 8.1)	Teacher Leader	0% (0%)		
	Effective	48% (50%)		
	Emerging	39% (40%)		
	Ineffective	8% (0%)		

Initiative (AMSTI); Alabama Learning Exchange (ALEX); And the Alabama Connecting Classrooms, Educators and Students Statewide (ACCESS); Response to Instruction (RTI) and their relationship to student achievement. (Alabama Specific Expectations – Standard 4(0)).				
Possesses knowledge of Alabama’s state assessment system. (Alabama Specific Expectations – Standard 6(q)).	Teacher Leader	0% (0%)		
	Effective	50% (43%)		
	Emerging	45% (50%)		
	Ineffective	0% (0%)		
Integrates Alabama-wide programs and initiatives into the curriculum and instructional process. (Alabama Specific Expectations – Standard 7(g)).	Teacher Leader	0% (0%)		
	Effective	44% (45%)		
	Emerging	50% (48%)		
	Ineffective	0% (0%)		
Communicates with students, parents, and the public about Alabama’s assessment system and major Alabama educational improvement initiatives. (Alabama Specific Expectations – Standard 7(h)).	Teacher Leader	0% (6%)		
	Effective	37% (38%)		
	Emerging	59% (51%)		
	Ineffective	0% (0%)		
Understands the expectations of the profession including the Alabama Educator Code of Ethics, the NASDTEC model of Code of Ethics for Educators (MCEE), professional standards of practice, and relevant law and policy. (Alabama Specific Expectations – Standard 6(q)).	Teacher Leader	0% (0%)		
	Effective	42% (39%)		
	Emerging	50% (52%)		
	Ineffective	8% (0%)		

Measure 1b: Common Lesson Plan and Observation

The CEPS developed the Common Planning and Observation Rubrics (CLP + COBS) to measure candidate performance in planning and instruction. The CAEP committee agreed that the EPP-created instruments should be common, meaning that the content measured should apply to all teaching fields, grades, age bands, and settings. The instruments were developed with this guiding question in mind: what were the essential elements of pedagogical content knowledge that all teacher candidates need to know and be able to do for effective planning and instruction? Lawshe's Method was followed to determine content validity. The instruments are used throughout the candidate's program, the following data was collected during internship.

SCD-Class B <i>N=Number of students</i>	COMMON OBSERVATION RUBRIC (COBS)										
	N= 32	Exceptional (4)		Proficient (3)		Developing (2)		Unacceptable (1)		Not Applicable	
		CT	US	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US
Learning Environment <i>INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.4, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.2, INTASC-2010.5, CAEP.1.3, INTASC-2010.4, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.2, INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1</i>		28 (87.5%)	31 (96.9%)	2 (6.3%)	1 (3.1%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prior Knowledge <i>AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.5.3, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.4.2, INTASC-2010.5, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.1, INTASC-2010.4, INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.2.1, INTASC-2010.7</i>		23 (71.9%)	31 (96.9%)	7 (21.9%)	1 (3.1%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Differentiation, including exceptionalities, cultural, and linguistic differences <i>CAEP.1.4, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.3, CAEP.1.3, CAEP.2.3, INTASC-2010.3, INTASC-2010.2, CAEP.1.2, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1</i>		24 (75 %)	32 (100%)	6 (18.8%)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Academic Language <i>CAEP.1.3, INTASC-2010.4, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.2, INTASC-2010.1, INTASC-2010.8, CAEP.1.1, INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.4</i>		22 (68.8%)	29 (90.6%)	8 (25%)	3 (9.4%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Assessment <i>INTASC-2010.6, CAEP.1.3, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.2, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4</i>		25 (78.1%)	31 (96.9%)	5 (15.6%)	1 (3.1%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Technology <i>INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.5</i>		26 (81.3%)	31 (96.9%)	4 (12.5%)	1 (3.1%)	0	0	0	0	0	0

SCD-Alt-A	COMMON OBSERVATION RUBRIC (COBS)										
	N= Number of students	Exceptional (4)		Proficient (3)		Developing (2)		Unacceptable (1)		Not Applicable	
		CT	US	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US
Learning Environment INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.4, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.2, INTASC-2010.5, CAEP.1.3, INTASC-2010.4, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.2, INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1	13	10 (76.9%)	11 (84.6%)	1 (7.7%)	1 (7.7%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prior Knowledge AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.5.3, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.4.2, INTASC-2010.5, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.1, INTASC-2010.4, INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.2.1, INTASC-2010.7		7 (53.8%)	7 (53.8%)	4 (30.8%)	4 (30.8%)	0	1 (7.7%)	0	0	0	0
Differentiation, including exceptionalities, cultural, and linguistic differences CAEP.1.4, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.3, CAEP.1.3, CAEP.2.3, INTASC-2010.3, INTASC-2010.2, CAEP.1.2, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1		11 (84.6%)	11 (84.6%)	0	1 (7.7%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Academic Language CAEP.1.3, INTASC-2010.4, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.2, INTASC-2010.1, INTASC-2010.8, CAEP.1.1, INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.4		8 (61.5%)	8 (61.5%)	3 (23.1%)	4 (30.8%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Assessment INTASC-2010.6, CAEP.1.3, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.2, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4		10 (76.9%)	11 (84.6%)	1 (7.7%)	1 (7.7%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Technology INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.5		8 (61.5%)	10 (76.9%)	2 (15.3%)	2 (15.3%)	0	0	0	0	0	0

SCD-Alt-A	COMMON LESSON PLAN (CLP)										
	N=	Exceptional (4)		Proficient (3)		Developing (2)		Unacceptable (1)		Not Applicable	
<i>N= Number of students</i>		CT	US	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US
Standards Based Instruction <i>INTASC-2010.1, INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.7</i>	13	9 (69.2%)	7 (53.8%)	2 (15.4%)	4 (30.8%)	0	1 (7.7%)	0	0	0	0
Prior Knowledge <i>AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.2, INTASC-2010.3, CAEP.1.3, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.1, INTASC-2010.2, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.2, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.3</i>		7 (53.8%)	3 (23.1%)	4 (30.8%)	9 (69.2%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Differentiation, including exceptionalities, cultural and linguistic differences <i>INTASC-2010.2, CAEP.1.2, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4, INTASC-2010.3, CAEP.1.3</i>		10 (76.9%)	12 (92.3%)	1 (7.7%)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Academic Language <i>CAEP.1.2, CAEP.2.3, INTASC-2010.1, INTASC-2010.8, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4, INTASC-2010.7, INTASC-2010.4, CAEP.1.3</i>		7 (53.8%)	8 (61.5%)	4 (9.8%)	4 (9.8%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Assessment <i>CAEP.1.2, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4, INTASC-2010.6, CAEP.1.3</i>		9 (69.2%)	9 (69.2%)	2 (15.4%)	3 (23.1%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Technology <i>CAEP.1.2, CAEP.2.3, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1, INTASC-2010.8, CAEP.1.4, INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.3</i>		7 (53.8%)	11 (84.6%)	3 (23.1%)	1 (7.7%)	0	0	0	0	0	0

ECP-Class B	COMMON OBSERVATION RUBRIC (COBS)											
	N= Number of students	N=	Exceptional (4)		Proficient (3)		Developing (2)		Unacceptable (1)		Not Applicable	
			CT	US	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US
Learning Environment <i>INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.4, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.2, INTASC-2010.5, CAEP.1.3, INTASC-2010.4, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.2, INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1</i>	204	162 (79.4)	155 (76%)	36 (17.6%)	43 (21.1%)	6 (2.9%)	6 (2.9%)	0	0	0	0	
Prior Knowledge <i>AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.5.3, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.4.2, INTASC-2010.5, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.1, INTASC-2010.4, INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.2.1, INTASC-2010.7</i>		135 (66.2%)	122 (59.8%)	62 (30.4%)	77 (37.7%)	7 (3.4%)	6 (2.9%)	0	0	0	0	
Differentiation, including exceptionalities, cultural, and linguistic differences <i>CAEP.1.4, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.3, CAEP.1.3, CAEP.2.3, INTASC-2010.3, INTASC-2010.2, CAEP.1.2, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1</i>		130 (63.7%)	82 (40.2%)	67 (32.8%)	109 (53.4%)	7 (3.4%)	14 (6.9%)	0	0	0	0	
Academic Language <i>CAEP.1.3, INTASC-2010.4, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.2, INTASC-2010.1, INTASC-2010.8, CAEP.1.1, INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.4</i>		151 (74%)	152 (74.5%)	49 (24%)	47 (23%)	4 (2%)	6 (2.9%)	0	0	0	0	
Assessment <i>INTASC-2010.6, CAEP.1.3, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.2, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4</i>		143 (70%)	142 (69.6%)	51 (25%)	56 (27.5%)	8 (3.9%)	6 (2.9%)	0	0	2	0	
Technology <i>INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.5</i>		132 (64.7%)	50 (24.5%)	48 (23.5%)	70 (34.3%)	6 (2.9%)	31 (15.2%)	0	1 (0.5%)	18 (8.8%)	46 (22.5%)	

ELA-Class B	COMMON OBSERVATION RUBRIC (COBS)										
<i>N= Number of students</i>	N=	Exceptional (4)		Proficient (3)		Developing (2)		Unacceptable (1)		Not Applicable	
	15	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US
Learning Environment <i>INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.4, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.2, INTASC-2010.5, CAEP.1.3, INTASC-2010.4, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.2, INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1</i>		9 (60%)	6 (40%)	5 (33.3%)	7 (46.7%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prior Knowledge <i>AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.5.3, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.4.2, INTASC-2010.5, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.1, INTASC-2010.4, INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.2.1, INTASC-2010.7</i>		10 (66.7%)	5 (33.3%)	4 (26.7%)	8 (53.3%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Differentiation, including exceptionalities, cultural, and linguistic differences <i>CAEP.1.4, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.3, CAEP.1.3, CAEP.2.3, INTASC-2010.3, INTASC-2010.2, CAEP.1.2, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1</i>		8 (53.3%)	4 (26.7%)	6 (40%)	9 (60%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Academic Language <i>CAEP.1.3, INTASC-2010.4, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.2, INTASC-2010.1, INTASC-2010.8, CAEP.1.1, INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.4</i>		11 (73.3%)	4 (26.7%)	3 (20%)	9 (60%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Assessment <i>INTASC-2010.6, CAEP.1.3, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.2, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4</i>		9 (60%)	5 (33.3%)	5 (33.3%)	8 (53.3%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Technology <i>INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.5</i>		10 (66.7%)	7 (46.7%)	3 (20%)	6 (53.3%)	1 (6.7%)	0	0	0	0	0

ELA-Class B	COMMON LESSON PLAN (CLP)										
N= Number of students	N=	Exceptional (4)		Proficient (3)		Developing (2)		Unacceptable (1)		Not Applicable	
		CT	US	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US
Standards Based Instruction <i>INTASC-2010.1, INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.7</i>	15	11 (73.3%)	6 (53.3%)	3 (20%)	7 (46.7%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prior Knowledge <i>AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.2, INTASC-2010.3, CAEP.1.3, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.1, INTASC-2010.2, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.2, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.3</i>		10 (66.7%)	4 (26.7%)	4 (26.7%)	9 (60%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Differentiation, including exceptionalities, cultural and linguistic differences <i>INTASC-2010.2, CAEP.1.2, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4, INTASC-2010.3, CAEP.1.3</i>		8 (53.3%)	4 (26.7%)	6 (53.3%)	9 (60%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Academic Language <i>CAEP.1.2, CAEP.2.3, INTASC-2010.1, INTASC-2010.8, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4, INTASC-2010.7, INTASC-2010.4, CAEP.1.3</i>		10 (66.7%)	5 (33.3%)	4 (26.7%)	8 (53.3%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Assessment <i>CAEP.1.2, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4, INTASC-2010.6, CAEP.1.3</i>		9 (60%)	5 (33.3%)	5 (33.3%)	8 (53.3%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Technology <i>CAEP.1.2, CAEP.2.3, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1, INTASC-2010.8, CAEP.1.4, INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.3</i>		10 (66.7%)	7 (46.7%)	3 (20%)	6 (53.3%)	1 (6.7%)	0	0	0	0	0

ELA-Ait-A	COMMON OBSERVATION RUBRIC (COBS)										
	N=	Exceptional (4)		Proficient (3)		Developing (2)		Unacceptable (1)		Not Applicable	
		CT	US	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US
<i>N= Number of students</i>	6										
Learning Environment <i>INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.4, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.2, INTASC-2010.5, CAEP.1.3, INTASC-2010.4, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.2, INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1</i>		6 (100%)	5 (83.3%)	0	1 (16.7%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prior Knowledge <i>AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.5.3, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.4.2, INTASC-2010.5, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.1, INTASC-2010.4, INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.2.1, INTASC-2010.7</i>		3 (50%)	4 (66.7)	3 (50%)	2 (33.3%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Differentiation, including exceptionalities, cultural, and linguistic differences <i>CAEP.1.4, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.3, CAEP.1.3, CAEP.2.3, INTASC-2010.3, INTASC-2010.2, CAEP.1.2, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1</i>		1 (16.7%)	5 (83.3%)	5 (83.3%)	1 (16.7%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Academic Language <i>CAEP.1.3, INTASC-2010.4, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.2, INTASC-2010.1, INTASC-2010.8, CAEP.1.1, INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.4</i>		3 (50%)	4 (66.7%)	3 (50%)	2 (33.3%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Assessment <i>INTASC-2010.6, CAEP.1.3, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.2, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4</i>		4 (66.7%)	4 (66.7%)	2 (33.3%)	2 (33.3%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Technology <i>INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.5</i>		5 (83.3%)	3 (50%)	1 (16.7%)	3 (50%)	0	0	0	0	0	0

ELA-AIt-A	COMMON LESSON PLAN (CLP)										
	N=	Exceptional (4)		Proficient (3)		Developing (2)		Unacceptable (1)		Not Applicable	
		CT	US	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US
Standards Based Instruction <i>INTASC-2010.1, INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.7</i>	6	5 (83.3%)	4 (66.7%)	1 (16.7%)	2 (33.3%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prior Knowledge <i>AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.2, INTASC-2010.3, CAEP.1.3, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.1, INTASC-2010.2, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.2, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.3</i>		3 (50%)	5 (83.3%)	3 (50%)	1 (16.7%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Differentiation, including exceptionalities, cultural and linguistic differences <i>INTASC-2010.2, CAEP.1.2, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4, INTASC-2010.3, CAEP.1.3</i>		2 (33.3%)	4 (66.7%)	4 (66.7%)	2 (33.3%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Academic Language <i>CAEP.1.2, CAEP.2.3, INTASC-2010.1, INTASC-2010.8, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4, INTASC-2010.7, INTASC-2010.4, CAEP.1.3</i>		3 (50%)	5 (83.3%)	3 (50%)	1 (16.7%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Assessment <i>CAEP.1.2, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4, INTASC-2010.6, CAEP.1.3</i>		3 (50%)	4 (66.7%)	3 (50%)	2 (33.3%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Technology <i>CAEP.1.2, CAEP.2.3, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1, INTASC-2010.8, CAEP.1.4, INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.3</i>		5 (83.3%)	5 (83.3%)	1 (16.7%)	1 (16.7%)	0	0	0	0	0	0

GS- Class B	COMMON OBSERVATION RUBRIC (COBS)											
	N= Number of students	N=	Exceptional (4)		Proficient (3)		Developing (2)		Unacceptable (1)		Not Applicable	
			CT	US	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US
Learning Environment INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.4, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.2, INTASC-2010.5, CAEP.1.3, INTASC-2010.4, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.2, INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1	21	12 (57.1%)	9 (42.9%)	6 (28.6%)	5 (23.8%)	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Prior Knowledge AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.5.3, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.4.2, INTASC-2010.5, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.1, INTASC-2010.4, INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.2.1, INTASC-2010.7		10 (47.6%)	5 (23.8%)	8 (38.1%)	9 (42.9%)	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Differentiation, including exceptionalities, cultural, and linguistic differences CAEP.1.4, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.3, CAEP.1.3, CAEP.2.3, INTASC-2010.3, INTASC-2010.2, CAEP.1.2, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1		8 (38.1%)	5 (23.8%)	8 (38.1%)	9 (42.9%)	2	0	0	0	0	0	
Academic Language CAEP.1.3, INTASC-2010.4, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.2, INTASC-2010.1, INTASC-2010.8, CAEP.1.1, INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.4		11 (52.4%)	2 (9.5%)	7 (33.3%)	12 (57.1%)	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Assessment INTASC-2010.6, CAEP.1.3, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.2, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4		11 (52.4%)	3 (14.3%)	7 (33.3%)	11 (52.4%)	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Technology INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.5		13 (61.9%)	0	5 (23.8%)	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	

GS- Class B		COMMON LESSON PLAN (CLP)									
N= Number of students	N=	Exceptional (4)		Proficient (3)		Developing (2)		Unacceptable (1)		Not Applicable	
	21	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US
Standards Based Instruction <i>INTASC-2010.1, INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.7</i>		12 (57.1%)	10 (47.6%)	6 (28.6%)	4 (19%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prior Knowledge <i>AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.2, INTASC-2010.3, CAEP.1.3, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.1, INTASC-2010.2, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.2, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.3</i>		10 (47.6%)	7 (33.3%)	8 (38.1%)	7 (33.3%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Differentiation, including exceptionalities, cultural and linguistic differences <i>INTASC-2010.2, CAEP.1.2, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4, INTASC-2010.3, CAEP.1.3</i>		7 (33.3%)	2 (9.5%)	9 (42.9%)	12 (57.1%)	2	0	0	0	0	0
Academic Language <i>CAEP.1.2, CAEP.2.3, INTASC-2010.1, INTASC-2010.8, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4, INTASC-2010.7, INTASC-2010.4, CAEP.1.3</i>		11 (52.4%)	5 (23.8%)	7 (33.3%)	9 (42.9%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Assessment <i>CAEP.1.2, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4, INTASC-2010.6, CAEP.1.3</i>		12 (57.1%)	4 (19%)	6 (28.6%)	10 (47.6%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Technology <i>CAEP.1.2, CAEP.2.3, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1, INTASC-2010.8, CAEP.1.4, INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.3</i>		13 (61.9%)	3 (14.3%)	5 (23.8%)	11 (52.4%)	0	0	0	0	0	0

GS- Alt-A	COMMON OBSERVATION RUBRIC (COBS)												
	N= Number of students	N=	Exceptional (4)		Proficient (3)		Developing (2)		Unacceptable (1)		Not Applicable		
			CT	US	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US	
Learning Environment INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.4, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.2, INTASC-2010.5, CAEP.1.3, INTASC-2010.4, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.2, INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1	1	1 (100%)	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
Prior Knowledge AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.5.3, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.4.2, INTASC-2010.5, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.1, INTASC-2010.4, INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.2.1, INTASC-2010.7		0	1 (100%)	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
Differentiation, including exceptionalities, cultural, and linguistic differences CAEP.1.4, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.3, CAEP.1.3, CAEP.2.3, INTASC-2010.3, INTASC-2010.2, CAEP.1.2, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1		1 (100%)	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
Academic Language CAEP.1.3, INTASC-2010.4, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.2, INTASC-2010.1, INTASC-2010.8, CAEP.1.1, INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.4		1 (100%)	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
Assessment INTASC-2010.6, CAEP.1.3, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.2, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4		1 (100%)	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
Technology INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.5		1 (100%)	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-

GS-Alt-A	COMMON LESSON PLAN (CLP)											
	N= Number of students	N=	Exceptional (4)		Proficient (3)		Developing (2)		Unacceptable (1)		Not Applicable	
			CT	US	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US
Standards Based Instruction <i>INTASC-2010.1, INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.7</i>		1	0	-	1 (100%)	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
Prior Knowledge <i>AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.2, INTASC-2010.3, CAEP.1.3, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.1, INTASC-2010.2, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.2, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.3</i>		1	0	-	1 (100%)	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
Differentiation, including exceptionalities, cultural and linguistic differences <i>INTASC-2010.2, CAEP.1.2, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4, INTASC-2010.3, CAEP.1.3</i>		1	1 (100%)	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
Academic Language <i>CAEP.1.2, CAEP.2.3, INTASC-2010.1, INTASC-2010.8, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4, INTASC-2010.7, INTASC-2010.4, CAEP.1.3</i>		1	1 (100%)	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
Assessment <i>CAEP.1.2, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4, INTASC-2010.6, CAEP.1.3</i>		1	0	-	1 (100%)	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
Technology <i>CAEP.1.2, CAEP.2.3, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1, INTASC-2010.8, CAEP.1.4, INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.3</i>		1	1 (100%)	-	-	-	0	-	0	-	0	-

ECE-AIt-A	COMMON OBSERVATION RUBRIC (COBS)											
	N= Number of students	N=	Exceptional (4)		Proficient (3)		Developing (2)		Unacceptable (1)		Not Applicable	
			CT	US	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US
Learning Environment INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.4, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.2, INTASC-2010.5, CAEP.1.3, INTASC-2010.4, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.2, INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1	7	6 (42.9%)	2 (14.3%)	1 (7.2%)	2 (14.3%)	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Prior Knowledge AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.5.3, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.4.2, INTASC-2010.5, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.1, INTASC-2010.4, INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.2.1, INTASC-2010.7		4 (28.6%)	3 (21.4%)	3 (21.4%)	1 (7.2%)	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Differentiation, including exceptionalities, cultural, and linguistic differences CAEP.1.4, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.3, CAEP.1.3, CAEP.2.3, INTASC-2010.3, INTASC-2010.2, CAEP.1.2, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1		5 (35.7%)	1 (7.2%)	2 (14.3%)	3 (21.4%)	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Academic Language CAEP.1.3, INTASC-2010.4, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.2, INTASC-2010.1, INTASC-2010.8, CAEP.1.1, INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.4		2 (14.3%)	2 (14.3%)	5 (35.7%)	2 (14.3%)	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Assessment INTASC-2010.6, CAEP.1.3, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.2, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4		6 (42.9%)	3 (21.4%)	1 (7.2%)	1 (7.2%)	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Technology INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.5		4 (28.6%)	2 (14.3%)	2 (14.3%)	1 (7.2%)	0	1 (7.2%)	0	0	0	0	

ECE-Alt-A	COMMON LESSON PLAN (CLP)											
	N= Number of students	N=	Exceptional (4)		Proficient (3)		Developing (2)		Unacceptable (1)		Not Applicable	
			CT	US	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US
Standards Based Instruction <i>INTASC-2010.1, INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.7</i>		7	6 (42.9%)	3 (21.4%)	1 (7.2%)	1 (7.2%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prior Knowledge <i>AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.2, INTASC-2010.3, CAEP.1.3, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.1, INTASC-2010.2, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.2, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.3</i>			4 (28.6%)	2 (14.3%)	3 (21.4%)	2 (14.3%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Differentiation, including exceptionalities, cultural and linguistic differences <i>INTASC-2010.2, CAEP.1.2, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4, INTASC-2010.3, CAEP.1.3</i>			3 (21.4%)	1 (7.2%)	4 (28.6%)	3 (21.4%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Academic Language <i>CAEP.1.2, CAEP.2.3, INTASC-2010.1, INTASC-2010.8, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4, INTASC-2010.7, INTASC-2010.4, CAEP.1.3</i>			3 (21.4%)	1 (7.2%)	4 (28.6%)	3 (21.4%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Assessment <i>CAEP.1.2, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4, INTASC-2010.6, CAEP.1.3</i>			6 (42.9%)	1 (7.2%)	1 (7.2%)	3 (21.4%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Technology <i>CAEP.1.2, CAEP.2.3, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1, INTASC-2010.8, CAEP.1.4, INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.3</i>			4 (28.6%)	1 (7.2%)	2 (14.3%)	1 (7.2%)	0	2 (14.3%)	0	0	1 (7.2%)	0

EED-Alt-A	COMMON OBSERVATION RUBRIC (COBS)										
	N=	Exceptional (4)		Proficient (3)		Developing (2)		Unacceptable (1)		Not Applicable	
		CT	US	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US
<i>N= Number of students</i>	14										
Learning Environment <i>INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.4, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.2, INTASC-2010.5, CAEP.1.3, INTASC-2010.4, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.2, INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1</i>		11 (78.6%)	8 (57.1%)	2 (14.3%)	5 (35.7%)	4 (28.6%)	0	0	0	0	0
Prior Knowledge <i>AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.5.3, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.4.2, INTASC-2010.5, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.1, INTASC-2010.4, INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.2.1, INTASC-2010.7</i>		8 (57.1%)	5 (35.7%)	4 (28.6%)	7 (50%)	1 (7.1%)	1 (7.1%)	0	0	0	0
Differentiation, including exceptionalities, cultural, and linguistic differences <i>CAEP.1.4, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.3, CAEP.1.3, CAEP.2.3, INTASC-2010.3, INTASC-2010.2, CAEP.1.2, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1</i>		6 (42.9%)	2 (14.3%)	7 (50%)	11 (78.6%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Academic Language <i>CAEP.1.3, INTASC-2010.4, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.2, INTASC-2010.1, INTASC-2010.8, CAEP.1.1, INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.4</i>		8 (57.1%)	5 (35.7%)	5 (35.7%)	8 (57.1%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Assessment <i>INTASC-2010.6, CAEP.1.3, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.2, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4</i>		9 (64.3%)	6 (42.9%)	4 (28.6%)	7 (50%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Technology <i>INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.5</i>		10 (71.4%)	2 (14.3%)	3 (21.4%)	8 (57.1%)	0	3 (21.4%)	0	0	0	0

EED-Alt-A	COMMON LESSON PLAN (CLP)										
	N=	Exceptional (4)		Proficient (3)		Developing (2)		Unacceptable (1)		Not Applicable	
		N=	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US	CT
Standards Based Instruction <i>INTASC-2010.1, INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.7</i>	14	11 (78.6%)	6 (42.9%)	2 (14.3%)	7 (50%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prior Knowledge <i>AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.2, INTASC-2010.3, CAEP.1.3, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.1, INTASC-2010.2, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.2, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.3</i>		9 (64.3%)	5 (35.7%)	4 (28.6%)	7 (50%)	0	1 (7.1%)	0	0	0	0
Differentiation, including exceptionalities, cultural and linguistic differences <i>INTASC-2010.2, CAEP.1.2, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4, INTASC-2010.3, CAEP.1.3</i>		8 (57.1%)	2 (14.3%)	5 (35.7%)	11 (78.6%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Academic Language <i>CAEP.1.2, CAEP.2.3, INTASC-2010.1, INTASC-2010.8, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4, INTASC-2010.7, INTASC-2010.4, CAEP.1.3</i>		8 (57.1%)	4 (28.6%)	4 (28.6%)	9 (64.3%)	1 (7.1%)	0	0	0	0	0
Assessment <i>CAEP.1.2, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4, INTASC-2010.6, CAEP.1.3</i>		9 (64.3%)	6 (42.9%)	4 (28.6%)	7 (50%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Technology <i>CAEP.1.2, CAEP.2.3, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1, INTASC-2010.8, CAEP.1.4, INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.3</i>		10 (71.4%)	2 (14.3%)	3 (21.4%)	8 (61.5%)	0	3 (21.4%)	0	0	0	0

PE- Class B	COMMON OBSERVATION RUBRIC (COBS)										
	N= Number of students	Exceptional (4)		Proficient (3)		Developing (2)		Unacceptable (1)		Not Applicable	
		CT	US	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US
Learning Environment INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.4, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.2, INTASC-2010.5, CAEP.1.3, INTASC-2010.4, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.2, INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1	54	28 (51.9%)	27 (50%)	10 (18.5%)	21 (38.9%)	2 (3.7%)	1 (1.8%)	0	0	0	0
Prior Knowledge AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.5.3, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.4.2, INTASC-2010.5, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.1, INTASC-2010.4, INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.2.1, INTASC-2010.7		24 (44.4%)	23 (42.6%)	13 (24%)	25 (46.3%)	3 (5.6%)	1 (1.8%)	0	0	0	0
Differentiation, including exceptionalities, cultural, and linguistic differences CAEP.1.4, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.3, CAEP.1.3, CAEP.2.3, INTASC-2010.3, INTASC-2010.2, CAEP.1.2, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1		22 (40.7%)	13 (24.1%)	17 (31.5%)	32 (59.3%)	1 (1.8%)	4 (7.4%)	0	0	0	0
Academic Language CAEP.1.3, INTASC-2010.4, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.2, INTASC-2010.1, INTASC-2010.8, CAEP.1.1, INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.4		24 (44.4%)	12 (22.2%)	14 (25.9%)	33 (61.1%)	2 (3.7%)	4 (7.4%)	0	0	0	0
Assessment INTASC-2010.6, CAEP.1.3, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.2, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4		24 (44.4%)	5 (9.3%)	14 (25.9%)	35 (64.8%)	2 (3.7%)	8 (14.8%)	0	1 (1.8%)	0	0
Technology INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.5		20	12 (22.2%)	17 (31.5%)	33 (61.1%)	1 (1.8%)	1 (1.8%)	0	1 (1.8%)	2 (3.7%)	0

PE- Class B	COMMON LESSON PLAN (CLP)											
	N= Number of students	N=	Exceptional (4)		Proficient (3)		Developing (2)		Unacceptable (1)		Not Applicable	
			CT	US	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US
Standards Based Instruction <i>INTASC-2010.1, INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.7</i>		54	28 (51.9%)	26 (48.1%)	9 (16.7%)	22 (40.7%)	3 (5.6%)	1 (1.9%)	0	0	0	0
Prior Knowledge <i>AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.2, INTASC-2010.3, CAEP.1.3, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.1, INTASC-2010.2, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.2, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.3</i>			22 (40.7%)	22 (40.7%)	17 (31.5%)	25 (46.3%)	1 (1.9%)	2 (3.7%)	0	0	0	0
Differentiation, including exceptionalities, cultural and linguistic differences <i>INTASC-2010.2, CAEP.1.2, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4, INTASC-2010.3, CAEP.1.3</i>			24 (44.4%)	15 (27.8)	13 (24.1%)	30 (55.6%)	3 (5.6%)	4 (7.4%)	0	0	0	0
Academic Language <i>CAEP.1.2, CAEP.2.3, INTASC-2010.1, INTASC-2010.8, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4, INTASC-2010.7, INTASC-2010.4, CAEP.1.3</i>			25 (46.3%)	11 (20.3%)	13 (24.1%)	36 (66.7%)	2 (3.7%)	2 (3.7%)	0	0	0	0
Assessment <i>CAEP.1.2, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4, INTASC-2010.6, CAEP.1.3</i>			24 (44.4%)	7 (13%)	15 (27.8%)	34 (63%)	1 (1.9%)	7 (13%)	0	1	0	0
Technology <i>CAEP.1.2, CAEP.2.3, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1, INTASC-2010.8, CAEP.1.4, INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.3</i>			24 (44.4%)	11 (20.3%)	14 (26%)	31 (57.4%)	2 (3.7%)	7 (13%)	0	0	0	0

SOS-Class B	COMMON OBSERVATION RUBRIC (COBS)											
	N= Number of students	Exceptional (4)		Proficient (3)		Developing (2)		Unacceptable (1)		Not Applicable		
		16	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US
Learning Environment INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.4, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.2, INTASC-2010.5, CAEP.1.3, INTASC-2010.4, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.2, INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1		11 (68.8%)	9 (56.3%)	2 (12.5%)	6 (37.5%)	1 (6.3%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prior Knowledge AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.5.3, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.4.2, INTASC-2010.5, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.1, INTASC-2010.4, INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.2.1, INTASC-2010.7		9 (56.3%)	7 (43.8%)	5 (31.3%)	8 (50%)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Differentiation, including exceptionalities, cultural, and linguistic differences CAEP.1.4, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.3, CAEP.1.3, CAEP.2.3, INTASC-2010.3, INTASC-2010.2, CAEP.1.2, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1		6 (37.5%)	6 (37.5%)	7 (43.8%)	9 (56.3%)	1 (6.3%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Academic Language CAEP.1.3, INTASC-2010.4, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.2, INTASC-2010.1, INTASC-2010.8, CAEP.1.1, INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.4		6 (37.5%)	6 (37.5%)	7 (43.8%)	9 (56.3%)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Assessment INTASC-2010.6, CAEP.1.3, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.2, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4		8 (50%)	4 (25%)	6 (37.5%)	11 (68.8%)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Technology INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.5		12 (75%)	6 (37.5%)	1 (6.3%)	9 (56.3%)	1 (6.3%)	0	0	0	0	0	0

SOS- Class B	COMMON LESSON PLAN (CLP)											
	N= Number of students	Exceptional (4)		Proficient (3)		Developing (2)		Unacceptable (1)		Not Applicable		
		N=	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US
Standards Based Instruction <i>INTASC-2010.1, INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.7</i>	16	11 (68.8%)	9 (56.3%)	2 (12.5%)	6 (37.5%)	1 (6.3%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prior Knowledge <i>AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.2, INTASC-2010.3, CAEP.1.3, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.1, INTASC-2010.2, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.2, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.3</i>		9 (56.3%)	7 (43.8%)	5 (31.3%)	8 (50%)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Differentiation, including exceptionalities, cultural and linguistic differences <i>INTASC-2010.2, CAEP.1.2, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4, INTASC-2010.3, CAEP.1.3</i>		7 (43.8%)	7 (43.8%)	6 (37.5%)	8 (50%)	1 (6.3%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Academic Language <i>CAEP.1.2, CAEP.2.3, INTASC-2010.1, INTASC-2010.8, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4, INTASC-2010.7, INTASC-2010.4, CAEP.1.3</i>		10 (62.5%)	7 (43.8%)	3 (18.8%)	8 (50%)	1 (6.3%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Assessment <i>CAEP.1.2, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4, INTASC-2010.6, CAEP.1.3</i>		8 (50%)	4 (25%)	6 (37.5%)	11 (68.8%)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Technology <i>CAEP.1.2, CAEP.2.3, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1, INTASC-2010.8, CAEP.1.4, INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.3</i>		12 (75%)	6 (37.5%)	1 (6.3%)	9 (56.3%)	1 (6.3%)	0	0	0	0	0	0

SOS-Alt-A	COMMON OBSERVATION RUBRIC (COBS)										
	N=	Exceptional (4)		Proficient (3)		Developing (2)		Unacceptable (1)		Not Applicable	
		CT	US	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US
<i>N=Number of students</i>	3										
Learning Environment <i>INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.4, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.2, INTASC-2010.5, CAEP.1.3, INTASC-2010.4, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.2, INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1</i>		3 (100%)	1 (33.3%)	0	2 (66.7%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prior Knowledge <i>AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.5.3, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.4.2, INTASC-2010.5, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.1, INTASC-2010.4, INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.2.1, INTASC-2010.7</i>		3 (100%)	0	0	3 (100%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Differentiation, including exceptionalities, cultural, and linguistic differences <i>CAEP.1.4, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.3, CAEP.1.3, CAEP.2.3, INTASC-2010.3, INTASC-2010.2, CAEP.1.2, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1</i>		2	0	1 (33.3%)	3 (100%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Academic Language <i>CAEP.1.3, INTASC-2010.4, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.2, INTASC-2010.1, INTASC-2010.8, CAEP.1.1, INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.4</i>		3 (100%)	0	0	3 (100%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Assessment <i>INTASC-2010.6, CAEP.1.3, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.2, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4</i>		3 (100%)	0	0	3 (100%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Technology <i>INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.5</i>		3 (100%)	0	0	3 (100%)	0	0	0	0	0	0

BME-Alt-A	COMMON OBSERVATION RUBRIC (COBS)										
<i>N= Number of students</i>	N=	Exceptional (4)		Proficient (3)		Developing (2)		Unacceptable (1)		Not Applicable	
	1	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US
Learning Environment <i>INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.4, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.2, INTASC-2010.5, CAEP.1.3, INTASC-2010.4, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.2, INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1</i>		-	1	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0
Prior Knowledge <i>AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.5.3, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.4.2, INTASC-2010.5, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.1, INTASC-2010.4, INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.2.1, INTASC-2010.7</i>		-	1	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0
Differentiation, including exceptionalities, cultural, and linguistic differences <i>CAEP.1.4, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.3, CAEP.1.3, CAEP.2.3, INTASC-2010.3, INTASC-2010.2, CAEP.1.2, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1</i>		-	1	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0
Academic Language <i>CAEP.1.3, INTASC-2010.4, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.2, INTASC-2010.1, INTASC-2010.8, CAEP.1.1, INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.4</i>		-	1	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0
Assessment <i>INTASC-2010.6, CAEP.1.3, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.2, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4</i>		-	1	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0
Technology <i>INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.5</i>		-	1	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0

BME-Alt-A	COMMON LESSON PLAN (CLP)											
	N= Number of students	N=	Exceptional (4)		Proficient (3)		Developing (2)		Unacceptable (1)		Not Applicable	
			1	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US	CT
Standards Based Instruction <i>INTASC-2010.1, INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.7</i>		-		1	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0
Prior Knowledge <i>AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.2, INTASC-2010.3, CAEP.1.3, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.1, INTASC-2010.2, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.2, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.3</i>		-		1	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0
Differentiation, including exceptionalities, cultural and linguistic differences <i>INTASC-2010.2, CAEP.1.2, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4, INTASC-2010.3, CAEP.1.3</i>		-		1	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0
Academic Language <i>CAEP.1.2, CAEP.2.3, INTASC-2010.1, INTASC-2010.8, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4, INTASC-2010.7, INTASC-2010.4, CAEP.1.3</i>		-		1	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0
Assessment <i>CAEP.1.2, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4, INTASC-2010.6, CAEP.1.3</i>		-		1	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0
Technology <i>CAEP.1.2, CAEP.2.3, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1, INTASC-2010.8, CAEP.1.4, INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.3</i>		-		1	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0

FCS-Alt-A	COMMON OBSERVATION RUBRIC (COBS)										
	N= Number of students	Exceptional (4)		Proficient (3)		Developing (2)		Unacceptable (1)		Not Applicable	
		N=	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US	CT
	1										
Learning Environment INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.4, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.2, INTASC-2010.5, CAEP.1.3, INTASC-2010.4, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.2, INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1		0	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prior Knowledge AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.5.3, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.4.2, INTASC-2010.5, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.1, INTASC-2010.4, INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.2.1, INTASC-2010.7		1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Differentiation, including exceptionalities, cultural, and linguistic differences CAEP.1.4, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.3, CAEP.1.3, CAEP.2.3, INTASC-2010.3, INTASC-2010.2, CAEP.1.2, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1		0	0	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Academic Language CAEP.1.3, INTASC-2010.4, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.2, INTASC-2010.1, INTASC-2010.8, CAEP.1.1, INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.4		0	1 (100%)	0	0	1 (100%)	0	0	0	0	0
Assessment INTASC-2010.6, CAEP.1.3, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.2, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4		1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Technology INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.5		0	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

MS-Class B	COMMON OBSERVATION RUBRIC (COBS)										
<i>N= Number of students</i>	N=	Exceptional (4)		Proficient (3)		Developing (2)		Unacceptable (1)		Not Applicable	
	4	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US
Learning Environment <i>INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.4, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.2, INTASC-2010.5, CAEP.1.3, INTASC-2010.4, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.2, INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1</i>		3 (75%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	3 (75%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prior Knowledge <i>AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.5.3, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.4.2, INTASC-2010.5, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.1, INTASC-2010.4, INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.2.1, INTASC-2010.7</i>		4 (100%)	1 (25%)	0	3 (75%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Differentiation, including exceptionalities, cultural, and linguistic differences <i>CAEP.1.4, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.3, CAEP.1.3, CAEP.2.3, INTASC-2010.3, INTASC-2010.2, CAEP.1.2, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1</i>		2 (50%)	1 (25%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	0	1 (25%)	0	0	0	0
Academic Language <i>CAEP.1.3, INTASC-2010.4, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.2, INTASC-2010.1, INTASC-2010.8, CAEP.1.1, INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.4</i>		2 (50%)	1 (25%)	2 (50%)	3 (75%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Assessment <i>INTASC-2010.6, CAEP.1.3, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.2, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4</i>		3 (75%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	3 (75%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Technology <i>INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.5</i>		4 (100%)	1 (25%)	0	3 (75%)	0	0	0	0	0	0

MS-Alt-A	COMMON OBSERVATION RUBRIC (COBS)										
	N= Number of students	Exceptional (4)		Proficient (3)		Developing (2)		Unacceptable (1)		Not Applicable	
		2	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US	CT
Learning Environment INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.4, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.2, INTASC-2010.5, CAEP.1.3, INTASC-2010.4, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.2, INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1		1 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prior Knowledge AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.5.3, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.4.2, INTASC-2010.5, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.1, INTASC-2010.4, INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.2.1, INTASC-2010.7		1 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Differentiation, including exceptionalities, cultural, and linguistic differences CAEP.1.4, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.3, CAEP.1.3, CAEP.2.3, INTASC-2010.3, INTASC-2010.2, CAEP.1.2, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1		2 (100%)	0	0	1 (50%)	0	1	0	0	0	0
Academic Language CAEP.1.3, INTASC-2010.4, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.2, INTASC-2010.1, INTASC-2010.8, CAEP.1.1, INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.4		1 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Assessment INTASC-2010.6, CAEP.1.3, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.2, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4		2 (100%)	1 (50%)	0	1 (50%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Technology INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.5		2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0

MS-Alt-A	COMMON LESSON PLAN (CLP)											
	N= Number of students	N=	Exceptional (4)		Proficient (3)		Developing (2)		Unacceptable (1)		Not Applicable	
			CT	US	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US
Standards Based Instruction <i>INTASC-2010.1, INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.7</i>		2	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prior Knowledge <i>AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.2, INTASC-2010.3, CAEP.1.3, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.1, INTASC-2010.2, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.2, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.3</i>			1 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Differentiation, including exceptionalities, cultural and linguistic differences <i>INTASC-2010.2, CAEP.1.2, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4, INTASC-2010.3, CAEP.1.3</i>			1 (50%)	0	1 (50%)	2 (100%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Academic Language <i>CAEP.1.2, CAEP.2.3, INTASC-2010.1, INTASC-2010.8, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4, INTASC-2010.7, INTASC-2010.4, CAEP.1.3</i>			1 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Assessment <i>CAEP.1.2, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4, INTASC-2010.6, CAEP.1.3</i>			2 (100%)	1 (50%)	0	1 (50%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Technology <i>CAEP.1.2, CAEP.2.3, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1, INTASC-2010.8, CAEP.1.4, INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.3</i>			2 (100%)	0	0	2 (100%)	0	0	0	0	0	0

MUSIC-Class B	COMMON OBSERVATION RUBRIC (COBS)											
	N= Number of students	N=	Exceptional (4)		Proficient (3)		Developing (2)		Unacceptable (1)		Not Applicable	
			CT	US	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US	CT	US
Learning Environment <i>INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.4, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.2, INTASC-2010.5, CAEP.1.3, INTASC-2010.4, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.2, INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1</i>	78	56 (71.7%)	62 (79.4%)	17 (21.8%)	14 (17.9%)	1 (1.3%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prior Knowledge <i>AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.5.3, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.4.2, INTASC-2010.5, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.1, INTASC-2010.4, INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.2.1, INTASC-2010.7</i>		59 (75.6%)	55 (70.5%)	15 (19.2%)	21 (26.9%)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Differentiation, including exceptionalities, cultural, and linguistic differences <i>CAEP.1.4, AL-CIEP-ECE-2015.1.3, CAEP.1.3, CAEP.2.3, INTASC-2010.3, INTASC-2010.2, CAEP.1.2, INTASC-2010.1, CAEP.1.1</i>		49 (62.8%)	27 (34.6%)	25 (32%)	49 (62.8%)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Academic Language <i>CAEP.1.3, INTASC-2010.4, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.2, INTASC-2010.1, INTASC-2010.8, CAEP.1.1, INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.4</i>		64 (82%)	49 (63%)	10 (13%)	27 (35%)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Assessment <i>INTASC-2010.6, CAEP.1.3, CAEP.2.3, CAEP.1.2, CAEP.1.1, CAEP.1.4</i>		54 (69%)	26 (33.3%)	20 (26%)	50 (64%)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Technology <i>INTASC-2010.8, INTASC-2010.7, CAEP.1.5</i>		56 (71.8%)	44 (56.4%)	15 (19.2%)	32 (41%)	1 (1.3%)	0	0	0	2 (2.6%)	0	

Measure 1c: Case Study

The EPP developed and piloted a case study to evaluate completer effectiveness in applying professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions during the 2019-2020 AY. Based on the case study, the EPP revised the case study and schedule a Spring 2020 pilot. Due to the pandemic, the pilot was not implemented. During the next year, the EPP experienced administrative leadership changes. A new dean was hired, and the position of associate dean was not filled. There were also changes in departmental leadership including 3 new department heads (2 interim). The case study was not implemented.

During the same time, the ALSDE began the Alabama Teacher Growth Program (ATGP). According to ALSDE:

The Alabama Teacher Growth Program (ATGP) promotes continuous monitoring of the teachers' ability to support the implementation of Alabama Core Teaching Standards (ACTS), improve instructional practices, seek professional supports, and increase student performance. The ATGP logo encompasses these foundational goals. The ATGP components include a Self-Assessment, the ATOT, a Professional Learning Plan (PLP), and a Professional Practice Diagnostic (optional). Together these tools ensure there are numerous opportunities to provide effective feedback to educators.

All districts in Alabama must complete at least one observation a year of the teacher using the Alabama Teacher Observation Tool (ATOT). The ATOT-Teacher provides a tool to formatively observe teachers' actions and practices. It allows the observer to provide clear and focused feedback, to acknowledge teachers' actions that promote learner-centric instruction, and to support the implementation of effective teaching and learning practices. Districts will report data to the Alabama State Department of Education (ALSDE).

The EPP will review the ATGP and the ATOT to determine whether the ATOT can be adopted or adapted to utilize in the case study or whether the EPP will launch the previously developed case study.

R4.2 Employer Satisfaction and Stakeholder Involvement

Measure 2a: (Initial) Employer Satisfaction Survey

The members of the Alabama Association of Colleges for Teacher Education have created an electronic survey for first-year teachers who completed either an approved undergraduate (Class B) or alternative master's degree program (Class A) leading to their initial Professional Educator Certificate during the 2018-2019 school year. The purpose of this annual survey is to gather information on how satisfied employers are with these first-year teachers. The Alabama State Board of Education (ALSDE) does not provide the Education Preparation Program (EPP) with details such as the number of participants being evaluated, their specific programs of study, or the number of employers who responded to the survey. As a result, the EPP continues to utilize various methods to assess the effectiveness of program completers. The data presented in this report includes a summary of survey categories and the percentage of first-year teachers' employers who rated them as teacher leaders, effective teachers, emerging teachers, or ineffective teachers.

Based on the data provided for the 2021-2022 academic year, the Education Preparation Program (EPP) determined that most initial program completers from Jacksonville State University were evaluated as "Effective or Emerging" in most areas. Only a small number of completers received a rating of "Ineffective."

**Employer Satisfaction Survey Educator Preparation Institutional
Report Card
For Jacksonville State University**

2023 Report: 2021/2022 data on JSU Employer Satisfaction (Alabama Statewide Employer Satisfaction)				
Survey Item	JSU%(AL%)	JSU%(AL%)		
Understanding how learners grow and develop. (The Learner and Learning – Learner Development 1.1)	Teacher Leader	0% (0%)		
	Effective	50% (45%)		
	Emerging	41% (47%)		
	Ineffective	8% (0%)		
Understanding of learners’ commonalities and individual differences. (The Learner and Learning – Learning Differences 2.1)	Teacher Leader	0% (0%)		
	Effective	42% (45%)		
	Emerging	47% (46%)		
	Ineffective	0% (0%)		
Manage the learning environment to engage learners actively. (The Learner and Learning – Learning Environments 3.2)	Teacher Leader	0% (0%)		
	Effective	48% (48%)		
	Emerging	36% (37%)		
	Ineffective	9% (9%)		
The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches. (Content Knowledge-Content Knowledge 4.1)	Teacher Leader	0% (0%)		
	Effective	58% (51%)		
	Emerging	33% (40%)		
	Ineffective	8% (0%)		
Create learning experiences that make the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assure mastery of the content. (Content Knowledge – Content	Teacher Leader	0% (0%)		
	Effective	52% (48%)		
	Emerging	39% (43%)		

Knowledge 4.2)	Ineffective	0% (0%)		
Connect concepts, perspectives from varied disciplines, and interdisciplinary themes to problems and issues. (Content Knowledge – Application of Content 5.1)	Teacher Leader	0% (0%)		
	Effective	44% (45%)		
	Emerging	47% (46%)		
	Ineffective	0% (0%)		
Use, design, or adapt multiple methods of assessment to document, monitor, and support learner progress appropriate for learning goals and objectives. (Instructional Practice – Assessment 6.1)	Teacher Leader	0% (0%)		
	Effective	39% (43%)		
	Emerging	55% (48%)		
	Ineffective	0% (0%)		
The teacher implements assessments in an ethical manner and minimizes bias to enable learners to display the full extent of their learning. (Instructional Practice – Assessment 6.3)	Teacher Leader	0% (00%)		
	Effective	62% (59%)		
	Emerging	28% (33%)		
	Ineffective	0% (0%)		
Plan instruction based on information from formative and summative assessments and other sources and systematically adjust plans to meet each student’s learning needs. (Instructional Practice – Planning for Instruction 7.3)	Teacher Leader	0% (0%)		
	Effective	44% (45%)		
	Emerging	50% (46%)		
	Ineffective	0% (0%)		
Understand and use a variety of instructional strategies and make learning accessible to all learners. (Instructional Practice – Instructional Strategies 8.1)	Teacher Leader	0% (0%)		
	Effective	48% (50%)		
	Emerging	39% (40%)		

	Ineffective	8% (0%)		
Encourage learners to develop a deep understanding of content areas, make connections across content, and apply content knowledge in meaningful ways. (Instructional Practice – Instructional Strategies 8.2)	Teacher Leader	0% (0%)		
	Effective	52% (46%)		
	Emerging	41% (46%)		
	Ineffective	0% (0%)		
Use evidence to continually evaluate the effects of my decisions on others and adapt my professional practices to better meet learners’ needs. (Professional Responsibility – Professional Learning and Ethical Practice 9.2)	Teacher Leader	0% (0%)		
	Effective	45% (45%)		
	Emerging	42% (45%)		
	Ineffective	8% (0%)		
Practice the profession in an ethical manner. (Professional Responsibility – Professional Learning and Ethical Practice 9.3)	Teacher Leader	14% (11%)		
	Effective	61% (63%)		
	Emerging	21% (23%)		
	Ineffective	0% (0%)		
The Teacher collaborates with others to build a positive learning climate marked by respect, rigor, and responsibility. (The Learner and Learning Environments 3.1)	Teacher Leader	0% (7%)		
	Effective	55% (56%)		
	Emerging	32% (32%)		
	Ineffective	8% (0%)		
The teacher engages learners in critical thinking, creativity, collaboration, and communication to address authentic local and global issues. (Content Knowledge-Application of Content 5.2)	Teacher Leader	0% (0%)		
	Effective	47% (42%)		
	Emerging	45% (50%)		
	Ineffective	0% (0%)		
Select, create, and sequence learning experiences and performance tasks that support learners in reaching rigorous	Teacher Leader	0% (%)		
	Effective	44% (40%)		
	Emerging	47% (51%)		

curriculum goals based on content standards and cross-disciplinary skills. (Instructional Practice – Planning for Instruction 7.1)	Ineffective	8% (0%)		
Plan instruction by collaborating with colleagues, specialists, community resources, families, and learners to meet individual learning needs. (Professional Responsibility – Leadership and Collaboration 10.1)	Teacher Leader	0% (6%)		
	Effective	47% (50%)		
	Emerging	41% (38%)		
	Ineffective	8% (0%)		
Engage in continuous professional learning to meet the needs of each learner more effectively. (Professional Responsibility – Professional Learning and Ethical Practice 9.1)	Teacher Leader	0% (0%)		
	Effective	58% (55%)		
	Emerging	36% (37%)		
	Ineffective	0% (0%)		
Use Assessment to engage learners in their own growth. (Instructional Practice – Assessment 6.2)	Teacher Leader	0% (0%)		
	Effective	45% (44%)		
	Emerging	45% (46%)		
	Ineffective	0% (0%)		
Collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, other school professionals, and community members to ensure learner growth. Professional Responsibility – Leadership and Collaboration 10.1)	Teacher Leader	0% (6%)		
	Effective	47% (50%)		
	Emerging	45% (39%)		
	Ineffective	0% (0%)		
Seek appropriate leadership roles and opportunities that would allow me to take responsibility for student learning and to advance in the profession. (Professional Responsibility – Leadership and Collaboration 10.2)	Teacher Leader	0% (0%)		
	Effective	38% (43%)		
	Emerging	50% (46%)		
	Ineffective	8% (0%)		
Has deep knowledge of current and emerging state initiatives and programs including, but not limited to the Alabama Reading	Teacher Leader	0% (0%)		
	Effective	36% (34%)		
	Emerging	56% (58%)		

Initiative (ARI); the Alabama Math, Science and Technology Initiative (AMSTI); Alabama Learning Exchange (ALEX);	Ineffective	0% (0%)		
And the Alabama Connecting Classrooms, Educators and Students Statewide (ACCESS); Response to Instruction (RTI) and their relationship to student achievement. (Alabama Specific Expectations – Standard 4(0)).				
Possesses knowledge of Alabama’s state assessment system. (Alabama Specific Expectations – Standard 6(q)).	Teacher Leader	0% (0%)		
	Effective	50% (43%)		
	Emerging	45% (50%)		
	Ineffective	0% (0%)		
Integrates Alabama-wide programs and initiatives into the curriculum and instructional process. (Alabama Specific Expectations – Standard 7(g)).	Teacher Leader	0% (0%)		
	Effective	44% (45%)		
	Emerging	50% (48%)		
	Ineffective	0% (0%)		
Communicates with students, parents, and the public about Alabama’s assessment system and major Alabama educational improvement initiatives. (Alabama Specific Expectations – Standard 7(h)).	Teacher Leader	0% (6%)		
	Effective	37% (38%)		
	Emerging	59% (51%)		
	Ineffective	0% (0%)		
Understands the expectations of the profession including the Alabama Educator Code of Ethics, the NASDTEC model of Code of Ethics for Educators (MCEE), professional standards of practice, and relevant law and policy. (Alabama Specific Expectations – Standard 6(q)).	Teacher Leader	0% (0%)		
	Effective	42% (39%)		
	Emerging	50% (52%)		
	Ineffective	8% (0%)		

Measure 2a: (Initial) Employer Satisfaction Survey Data

RA 4.1 Employer Satisfaction and Stakeholder Involvement

Measure 2b: RA 4.1. (Advanced) Employer Satisfaction

The members of the Alabama Association of Colleges for Teacher Education have created an electronic survey for first-year teachers who completed either an approved undergraduate (Class B) or alternative master's degree program (Class A) leading to their initial Professional Educator Certificate during the 2018-2019 school year. The purpose of this annual survey is to gather information on how satisfied employers are with these first-year teachers. The Alabama State Board of Education (ALSDE) does not provide the Education Preparation Program (EPP) with details such as the number of participants being evaluated, their specific programs of study, or the number of employers who responded to the survey. Since the survey does not identify whether the teacher is a graduate of a Class B or Class A program, we are unable to determine the evaluation scores of the first-year teachers with certainty and will look to other measures to identify employer satisfaction.

The EPP will develop an employer satisfaction survey in the next year to ensure feedback is able to be disaggregated by program level and area of certification.

R3.3 Candidate Competency at Program Completion

Measure 3a: R3.3 edTPA Data (Class B & Alt. A)

To obtain an Alabama Educator Certificate through the traditional approach established by the Alabama State Board of Education (ALSBOE), candidates are required to successfully complete the “educative” Teacher Performance Assessment (edTPA). This requirement applies to all candidates enrolled in Class B and Class A-Alternative initial programs. The following are the edTPA scores for candidates at Jacksonville State University during the 2021-2022 AY.

Business Marketing - Class B edTPA Scores AY2021-22 (CS=Completer Score/PS=Passing Score)																		
N	Task 1 Planning for Instruction and Assessment					Task 2 Instructing and Engaging Students in Learning					Task 3 Assessing Student Learning					Scores		% of 1st Attempt Pass Rate
	Task 1					Task 2					Task 3					CS	PS	A
2021-2022	RB1	RB2	RB3	RB4	RB5	RB6	RB7	RB8	RB9	RB10	RB11	RB12	RB13	RB14	RB15			
Standards																		
N= 0 attempts N= 0 passed 1st attempt																		
Business Marketing - Alternative Class A edTPA Scores AY2021-22 (CS=Completer Score/PS=Passing Score)																		
N	Task 1 Planning for Instruction and Assessment					Task 2 Instructing and Engaging Students in Learning					Task 3 Assessing Student Learning					Scores		% of 1st Attempt Pass Rate
	Task 1					Task 2					Task 3					CS	PS	A
2021-2022	RB1	RB2	RB3	RB4	RB5	RB6	RB7	RB8	RB9	RB10	RB11	RB12	RB13	RB14	RB15			
Standards																		

N=1 attempts N= 1 passed 1st attempt	3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0 45.0 37 100%																	
Early Childhood Education - Class B edTPA Scores AY2021-22 (CS=Completer Score/PS=Passing Score)																		
N	Task 1 Planning for Instruction and Assessment					Task 2 Instructing and Engaging Children in Learning					Task 3 Assessing Childrens Learning					Scores		% of 1st Attempt Pass Rate
	Task 1					Task 2					Task 3					CS	PS	A
2021-2022	RB1	RB2	RB3	RB4	RB5	RB6	RB7	RB8	RB9	RB10	RB11	RB12	RB13	RB14	RB15			
Standards																		
N= 0 attempts N= 0 passed 1st attempt																		
Early Childhood Education - Alternative Class A edTPA Scores AY2021-22 (CS=Completer Score/PS=Passing Score)																		
N	Task 1 Planning for Instruction and Assessment					Task 2 Instructing and Engaging Children in Learning					Task 3 Assessing Childrens Learning					Scores		% of 1st Attempt Pass Rate
	Task 1					Task 2					Task 3					CS	PS	A
2021-2022	RB1	RB2	RB3	RB4	RB5	RB6	RB7	RB8	RB9	RB10	RB11	RB12	RB13	RB14	RB15			
Standards																		
N=3 attempts N= 2 passed 1st attempt	2.5 3.0 3.0 3.0 2.7 3.0 3.3 3.0 1.8 2.3 2.7 2.5 3.0 2.7 2.7 41.0 44 66%																	

Elementary Education: Lit/Math - Class B edTPA Scores AY2021-22 (CS=Completer Score/PS=Passing Score)																					
N	Task 1 Planning for Literacy Instruction and Assessment					Task 2 Instructing and Engaging Students in Literacy Learning					Task 3 Assessing Student's Literacy Learning					Task 4 Assessing Students Mathematics			Scores		% of 1st Attempt Pass Rate
	RB1	RB2	RB3	RB4	RB5	RB6	RB7	RB8	RB9	RB10	RB11	RB12	RB13	RB14	RB15	RB19	RB20	RB21	CS	PS	A
2021-2022																					
Standards																					
N=119 attempts N= 116 passed 1st attempt																					
	3.0	3.1	3.3	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.1	3.6	3.0	3.0	3.2	2.9	3.2	2.9	55.1	44	98%
Elementary Education: Lit/Math - Alternative Class A edTPA Scores AY2021-22 (CS=Completer Score/PS=Passing Score)																					
N	Task 1 Planning for Literacy And Instruction					Task 2 Instructing and Engaging Students in Literacy					Task 3 Assessing Student's Literacy					Task 4 Assessing Students			Scores		% of 1st Attempt Pass Rate
	RB1	RB2	RB3	RB4	RB5	RB6	RB7	RB8	RB9	RB10	RB11	RB12	RB13	RB14	RB15	RB19	RB20	RB21	CS	PS	A
2021-2022																					
Standards																					
N=13 attempts N= 12 passed 1st attempt																					
	2.9	3.1	3.3	2.8	2.9	3.0	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.8	3.2	3.7	3.0	2.8	3.0	2.8	3.1	2.8	53.7	44	92%

Family and Consumer Science - Class B edTPA Scores AY2021-22 (CS=Completer Score/PS=Passing Score)																		
N	Task 1 Planning for Instruction and Assessment					Task 2 Instructing and Engaging Students in Learning					Task 3 Assessing Student Learning					Scores		% of 1st Attempt Pass Rate
	Task 1					Task 2					Task 3					CS	PS	A
2021-2022	RB1	RB2	RB3	RB4	RB5	RB6	RB7	RB8	RB9	RB10	RB11	RB12	RB13	RB14	RB15			
Standards																		
N= 3 attempts N= 2 passed 1st attempt																		
	3.5	3.0	3.0	3.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.5	3.0	###	37	66%
Family and Consumer Science - Alternative Class A edTPA Scores AY2021-22 (CS=Completer Score/PS=Passing Score)																		
N	Task 1 Planning for Instruction and Assessment					Task 2 Instructing and Engaging Students in Learning					Task 3 Assessing Student Learning					Scores		% of 1st Attempt Pass Rate
	Task 1					Task 2					Task 3					CS	PS	A
2021-2022	RB1	RB2	RB3	RB4	RB5	RB6	RB7	RB8	RB9	RB10	RB11	RB12	RB13	RB14	RB15			
Standards																		
N=0 attempts N= 0 passed 1st attempt																		

Mathematics - Class B edTPA Scores AY2021-22 (CS=Completer Score/PS=Passing Score)																		
N	Task 1 Planning for Instruction and Assessment					Task 2 Instructing and Engaging Students in Learning					Task 3 Assessing Student Learning					Scores		% of 1st Attempt
	Task 1					Task 2					Task 3					CS	PS	A
2021-2022	RB1	RB2	RB3	RB4	RB5	RB6	RB7	RB8	RB9	RB10	RB11	RB12	RB13	RB14	RB15			
Standards																		
N= 6 attempts N= n/a passed 1st attempt																		
	2.8	2.3	3.2	2.7	2.8	3.2	3.0	3.0	3.5	3.0	3.2	3.5	3.0	3.2	3.0	45.3	37	100%
Mathematics - Alternative Class A edTPA Scores AY2021-22 (CS=Completer Score/PS=Passing Score)																		
N	Task 1 Planning for Instruction and Assessment					Task 2 Instructing and Engaging Students in Learning					Task 3 Assessing Student Learning					Scores		% of 1st Attempt
	Task 1					Task 2					Task 3					CS	PS	A
2021-2022	RB1	RB2	RB3	RB4	RB5	RB6	RB7	RB8	RB9	RB10	RB11	RB12	RB13	RB14	RB15			
Standards																		
N = 2 attempts N= 0 passed 1st attempt																		
*Scores N/A																		

Science - Class B edTPA Scores AY2021-22 (CS=Completer Score/PS=Passing Score)																		
N	Task 1 Planning for Instruction and Assessment					Task 2 Instructing and Engaging Students in Learning					Task 3 Assessing Student Learning					Scores		% of 1st Attempt
	Task 1					Task 2					Task 3					CS	PS	A
2021-2022	RB1	RB2	RB3	RB4	RB5	RB6	RB7	RB8	RB9	RB10	RB11	RB12	RB13	RB14	RB15			
Standards																		
N= 20 attempts N= 19 passed 1st attempt																		
	3.2	2.6	3.1	2.8	3.0	3.0	2.9	2.8	2.6	2.4	3.4	3.9	2.6	2.8	2.8	43.4	37	95%
Science - Alternative Class A edTPA Scores AY2021-22 (CS=Completer Score/PS=Passing Score)																		
N	Task 1 Planning for Instruction and Assessment					Task 2 Instructing and Engaging Students in Learning					Task 3 Assessing Student Learning					Scores		% of 1st Attempt
	Task 1					Task 2					Task 3					CS	PS	A
2021-2022	RB1	RB2	RB3	RB4	RB5	RB6	RB7	RB8	RB9	RB10	RB11	RB12	RB13	RB14	RB15			
Standards																		
N = 2 attempts N= 0 passed 1st attempt																		
*Scores N/A																		

Measure 3b: R3.3 Praxis Content Data (Class B & Alt. A)

To obtain an Alabama Educator Certificate through the traditional approach established by the Alabama State Board of Education (ALSBOE), candidates are required to successfully complete the program and content specific Praxis assessments. This requirement applies to all candidates enrolled in Class B and Class A-Alternative initial programs. The following are the Praxis scores for candidates at Jacksonville State University.

Test: 5025 Early Childhood Education
 3-yr. Performance: Attending Institution Data
 Institution: Jacksonville State University
 Test Taker Attempts: Highest Score
 Include All Delivery Modes: Yes

Variables	Passing Score	Testing Year	# Exams Taken	# Individuals	Mean Score	# Passing	% Passing	Median Score
Total	156	2019-2020	61	56	173.88	55	98.21	175.00
Total	156	2020-2021	105	97	165.35	79	81.44	167.00
Total	156	2021-2022	114	107	164.07	83	77.57	165.00

Test: 5205 Teaching Reading: Elementary
 3-yr. Performance: Attending Institution Data
 Institution: Jacksonville State University
 Test Taker Attempts: Highest Score
 Include All Delivery Modes: Yes

Variables	Passing Score	Testing Year	# Exams Taken	# Individuals	Mean Score	# Passing	% Passing	Median Score
Total	159	2019-2020	47	43	170.14	40	93.02	170.00
Total	159	2020-2021	105	88	165.40	69	78.41	166.50
Total	159	2021-2022	163	131	161.98	87	66.41	163.00

Test: 5903 Elem Ed: 3 Subject Bundle Math
 3-yr. Performance: Attending Institution Data
 Institution: Jacksonville State University Test
 Taker Attempts: Highest Score
 Include All Delivery Modes: Yes

Variables	Passing Score	Testing Year	# Exams Taken	# Individuals	Mean Score	# Passing	% Passing	Median Score
*Total	157	2019-2020	150	110	161.78	74	67.27	163.00
Total	157	2020-2021	172	134	164.18	95	70.90	167.00
Total	157	2021-2022	203	154	156.91	88	57.14	160.00

*Test code 5003, exp 9/20

Test: 5904 Elem Ed: 3 Subject Bundle Social Studies
 3-yr. Performance: Attending Institution Data Institution:
 Jacksonville State University

Test Taker Attempts: Highest

Score Include All Delivery

Modes: Yes

Variables	Passing Score	Testing Year	# Exams Taken	# Individuals	Mean Score	# Passing	% Passing	Median Score
*Total	154	2019-2020	163	113	160.90	87	76.99	159.00
Total	154	2020-2021	159	120	154.13	67	55.83	157.00
Total	154	2021-2022	183	151	150.99	73	48.34	152.00

***Test code 5004 exp 9/20**

Test: 5905 Elem Ed: 3 Subject Bundle Science
 3-yr. Performance: Attending Institution Data
 Institution: Jacksonville State University

Test Taker Attempts: Highest

Score Include All Delivery

Modes: Yes

Variables	Passing Score	Testing Year	# Exams Taken	# Individuals	Mean Score	# Passing	% Passing	Median Score
*Total	158	2019-2020	174	119	162.71	84	70.59	164.00
Total	158	2020-2021	168	130	159.48	85	65.38	163.00
Total	158	2021-2022	182	152	156.78	85	55.92	160.00

***Test code 5005 exp 9/20**

Test: 5354 Special Ed: Core Knowledge and Applications
 3-yr. Performance: Attending Institution Data
 Institution: Jacksonville State University

Test Taker Attempts: Highest Score

Include All Delivery Modes: Yes

Variables	Passing Score	Testing Year	# Exams Taken	# Individuals	Mean Score	# Passing	% Passing	Median Score
Total	153	2019-2020	31	31	174.55	31	100.00	176.00
Total	153	2020-2021	18	18	168.44	16	88.89	172.00
Total	153	2021-2022	25	25	170.24	25	100.00	168.00

Test: 5551 Health Education
 3-yr. Performance: Attending Institution Data
 Institution: Jacksonville State University
 Test Taker Attempts: Highest Score
 Include All Delivery Modes: Yes

Variables	Passing Score	Testing Year	# Exams Taken	# Individuals	Mean Score	# Passing	% Passing	Median Score
Total								
Total	154	2019-2020	15	12	156.00	8	66.67	158.00
Total	154	2020-2021	21	10	156.60	9	90.00	157.00
Total	154	2021-2022	13	12	152.58	6	50.00	154.50
Total	154	2022-2023	13	12	149.67	4	33.33	149.50

Test: 5091 Physical Education: Content Knowledge
 3-yr. Performance: Attending Institution Data
 Institution: Jacksonville State University
 Test Taker Attempts: Highest Score
 Include All Delivery Modes: Yes

Variables	Passing Score	Testing Year	# Exams Taken	# Individuals	Mean Score	# Passing	% Passing	Median Score
Total	149	2019-2020	29	18	151.83	12	66.67	151.50
Total	149	2020-2021	49	31	150.35	23	74.19	152.00
Total	149	2021-2022	65	36	149.94	21	58.33	150.00

Test: 5101 Business Education: Content Knowledge
 3-yr. Performance: Attending Institution Data
 Institution: Jacksonville State University
 Test Taker Attempts: Highest Score
 Include All Delivery Modes: Yes

Variables	Passing Score	Testing Year	# Exams Taken	# Individuals	Mean Score	# Passing	% Passing	Median Score
Total	154	2019-2020	7	3	*	*	*	*
Total	154	2020-2021	2	2	*	*	*	*
Total	154	2021-2022	5	5	170.40	3	60.00	177.00

Notes:

* No data is displayed because the test taker count is fewer than 5.

Test: 5038 English Language Arts: Content Knowledge
 3-yr. Performance: Attending Institution Data
 Institution: Jacksonville State University
 Test Taker Attempts: Highest Score
 Include All Delivery Modes: Yes

Variables	Passing Score	Testing Year	# Exams Taken	# Individuals	Mean Score	# Passing	% Passing	Median Score
Total	167	2019-2020	35	24	170.13	16	66.67	169.50
Total	167	2020-2021	34	25	170.48	22	88.00	171.00
Total	167	2021-2022	19	17	174.47	13	76.47	177.00

Test: 5122 Family and Consumer Sciences
 3-yr. Performance: Attending Institution Data
 Institution: Jacksonville State University
 Test Taker Attempts: Highest Score
 Include All Delivery Modes: Yes

Variables	Passing Score	Testing Year	# Exams Taken	# Individuals	Mean Score	# Passing	% Passing	Median Score
Total	161	2019-2020	9	7	158.86	3	42.86	159.00
Total	153	2020-2021	12	8	158.38	5	62.50	161.00
Total	153	2021-2022	7	7	154.71	5	71.43	153.00

Test: 5435 General Science: Content Knowledge

3-yr. Performance: Attending Institution Data
 Institution: Jacksonville State University
 Test Taker Attempts: Highest Score
 Include All Delivery Modes: Yes

Variables	Passing Score	Testing Year	# Exams Taken	# Individuals	Mean Score	# Passing	% Passing	Median Score
Total	152	2019-2020	30	14	147.86	5	35.71	147.50
Total	152	2020-2021	54	32	151.25	17	53.13	153.00
Total	152	2021-2022	33	18	152.22	11	61.11	153.00

Test: 5081 Social Studies: Content
 3-yr. Performance: Attending Institution Data
 Institution: Jacksonville State University
 Test Taker Attempts: Highest Score
 Include All Delivery Modes: Yes

Variables	Passing Score	Testing Year	# Exams Taken	# Individuals	Mean Score	# Passing	% Passing	Median Score
Total	155	2019-2020	61	35	154.97	18	51.43	155.00
Total	155	2020-2021	67	34	157.68	20	58.82	160.00
Total	155	2021-2022	51	23	152.52	12	52.17	155.00

Test: 5161 Mathematics: Content Knowledge
 3-yr. Performance: Attending Institution Data
 Institution: Jacksonville State University
 Test Taker Attempts: Highest Score
 Include All Delivery Modes: Yes

Variables	Passing Score	Testing Year	# Exams Taken	# Individuals	Mean Score	# Passing	% Passing	Median Score
Total	155	2019-2020	21	14	148.86	7	50.00	153.00
Total	160	2020-2021	23	12	149.17	4	33.33	150.50
Total	160	2021-2022	17	8	154.88	3	37.50	154.00

Test: 5113 Music: Content Knowledge
 3-yr. Performance: Attending Institution Data
 Institution: Jacksonville State University
 Test Taker Attempts: Highest Score
 Include All Delivery Modes: Yes

Variables	Passing Score	Testing Year	# Exams Taken	# Individuals	Mean Score	# Passing	% Passing	Median Score
Total	161	2019-2020	39	29	163.31	19	65.52	163.00
Total	161	2020-2021	33	19	165.05	11	57.89	164.00
Total	161	2021-2022	48	30	160.33	19	63.33	162.00

Measure 4: Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they have been prepared

The state of Alabama does not share data with EPPs regarding the employment of their graduates. Alabama also faces a critical teacher and leadership shortage, especially in central Alabama. Previously, a few areas were considered high need. But currently, the content areas and grade-bands experiencing shortages continue to grow. In 2021-2022 the US Department of Education reported Alabama shortages in Mathematics, Biological Sciences, Physical Science, Language Arts, and Special Education (Early Childhood and Life Skills). The table below displays the percentage of completers during the 2021-2022 AY that were eligible for employment within the state of Alabama, meaning they completed their initial certification program, passed all required Praxis, and the edTPA. The EPP needs to review proposed methods of collecting this information and determine a new measure developed with K-12. partners.

JSU Program Completers Eligible for Certification Graduates of the 2021-2022 AY

Initial Certification Program Level	Total Program Completers	Praxis	edTPA	Degree	Candidates Eligible for Certification/Certifications Received
Undergraduate	223	149	149	149	149/149
Graduate	46	41	41	41	41/41