

Candidates will be effective collaborators in a professional community

Data will be collected from internal (T-TESS) and external (principal surveys) data sources to assess each candidate’s ability as effective collaborators in the professional community (i.e., elementary and middle schools). During observations in clinical teaching or year-long residency, field supervisors conduct four formal observations using the T-TESS. This assessment focuses on providing continuous, timely and formative feedback to candidates during clinical teaching. This is the same form that future principals will use to evaluate their teaching performance when they are hired by a district. Internal: Field Supervision using Texas Teacher Evaluation and Support System (T-TESS). External: Principal Surveys on First Year Teachers
90% of candidates will be proficient (3) on T-TESS data during clinical teaching/year-long residency.
100% average of all graduates will meet or exceed 2.5 (sufficiently prepared/well prepared) on principal survey data.

MEASURES	RESULTS	ACTIONS															
Formal Observation Residency: PEDG 4320	Summary T-TESS Formal Observation Data (Observation 4) — Professional Practices & Responsibilities Clinical teacher candidates enrolled in PEDG 4320/4620 were formally observed by field supervisors using the Texas Teacher Evaluation and Support System (T-TESS) instrument during their semester-long or year-long residency. The fourth and final formal observation serves as the summative assessment of candidate performance. For this reporting cycle, the program target focuses on the Professional Practices and Responsibilities domain: 75% of candidates will receive a rating of Proficient or higher in this domain on Observation 4. Professional Practices and Responsibilities encompasses candidates' demonstration of ethical conduct, communication with stakeholders, participation in professional learning communities, and fulfillment of duties beyond the classroom. <table><tr><th>Cohort</th><th>Candidates Assessed</th><th>Proficient or Higher (Professional Practices & Responsibilities)</th><th>Target</th><th>Target Met?</th></tr><tr><td>Fall 2025</td><td>36</td><td>25 (69.44%)</td><td>75%</td><td>No</td></tr><tr><td>Spring 2026</td><td>43 (incomplete)</td><td>33 (76.74%)*</td><td>75%</td><td>Yes*</td></tr></table> For Fall 2025, 25 of 36 candidates (69.44%) achieved a rating of Proficient or higher in the Professional Practices and Responsibilities domain on Observation 4, falling short of the 75% target by approximately 5.56 percentage points. For Spring 2026, 33 of 43 candidates assessed to date (76.74%) met the proficiency threshold, narrowly exceeding the 75% target; however, this cohort's data remains incomplete as the semester is ongoing. The Fall 2025 cohort did not meet the benchmark, while Spring 2026 has provisionally met it pending final data. Analysis Based on data collected from the T-TESS Observation 4 residency scores for the Professional	Cohort	Candidates Assessed	Proficient or Higher (Professional Practices & Responsibilities)	Target	Target Met?	Fall 2025	36	25 (69.44%)	75%	No	Spring 2026	43 (incomplete)	33 (76.74%)*	75%	Yes*	Revise Curriculum Not Started Program faculty and field supervisors will review Observation 4 data for the Professional Practices and Responsibilities domain to identify the specific indicators most commonly rated below Proficient. Residency seminars in PEDG 4320/4620 will incorporate dedicated sessions on professional conduct, educator ethics, family and community communication, and participation in professional learning communities. Supervisors will explicitly address Professional Practices and Responsibilities indicators in mid-residency coaching conversations to ensure candidates receive timely, formative feedback before their final observation. Because Professional Practices and Responsibilities encompasses dispositions and habits of mind that develop over time, the program will conduct a curriculum review to assess where professional identity, ethics, and educator responsibilities are introduced in pre-residency coursework. Opportunities to strengthen candidates' professional preparation — including case study analysis, professional portfolio development, and reflection activities — will be identified and embedded across the program sequence, not only during the clinical semester.
Cohort	Candidates Assessed	Proficient or Higher (Professional Practices & Responsibilities)	Target	Target Met?													
Fall 2025	36	25 (69.44%)	75%	No													
Spring 2026	43 (incomplete)	33 (76.74%)*	75%	Yes*													

	Practices and Responsibilities domain, the following findings are documented for this assessment cycle: • The 75% proficiency target for the Professional Practices and Responsibilities domain on T-TESS Observation 4 was not met by the Fall 2025 cohort. Of 36 candidates assessed, 25 (69.44%) achieved Proficient or higher, falling 5.56 percentage points below the benchmark. • Spring 2026 candidates have provisionally met the 75% target, with 33 of 43 assessed candidates (76.74%) achieving proficiency in Professional Practices and Responsibilities. This is an encouraging result; however, the semester remains incomplete and final data should be reviewed before drawing definitive conclusions																							
Principal Survey data Indirect - Survey Target Principals will score candidates as sufficiently or well-prepared by the program during their first year of teaching.	NOT MET Summary Graduates of the BS-INDS program who obtained teaching positions following program completion were evaluated by their campus principals using the T-TESS instrument during their first year as professional educators. The program target for the principal survey is that 100% of graduates will meet or exceed an average score of 2.30 in the Professional Practices and Responsibilities domain. This domain reflects the degree to which graduates demonstrate professionalism, collaborate with colleagues and families, engage in ongoing professional development, and fulfill their broader responsibilities as educators. Results for Lamar University are compared below to statewide averages, followed by a full reference table for all six survey domains. <table><tr><th>Domain</th><th>Lamar Avg (2025)</th><th>State Avg (2025)</th><th>Target</th><th>Met?</th><th>Gap to Target</th></tr><tr><td>Professional Practices & Responsibilities</td><td>2.25</td><td>2.53</td><td>2.30</td><td>No</td><td>-0.05</td></tr></table> Scale: 1.00 = Not At All Prepared 2.00 = Not Sufficiently Prepared 3.00 = Sufficiently Prepared 4.00 = Well Prepared Lamar University graduates fell below the 2.30 target in the Professional Practices and Responsibilities domain for the 2025 reporting year, averaging 2.25 — 0.05 points below the benchmark. While this represents the closest margin to the target of any domain in the principal survey, the target was not met. Lamar's average also fell below the statewide average of 2.53, a gap of 0.28 points. Notably, this domain received the highest average score among Lamar graduates across all six surveyed areas, suggesting it is a relative strength even though it did not meet the program's threshold. All Principal Survey Domains — Reference Data (2025, Lamar University) <table><tr><th>Domain</th><th>Lamar Avg (2025)</th><th>State Avg (2025)</th><th>Measured Target?</th><th>Notes</th></tr><tr><td>Planning</td><td>2.21</td><td>2.40</td><td>No</td><td>For reference only</td></tr></table>	Domain	Lamar Avg (2025)	State Avg (2025)	Target	Met?	Gap to Target	Professional Practices & Responsibilities	2.25	2.53	2.30	No	-0.05	Domain	Lamar Avg (2025)	State Avg (2025)	Measured Target?	Notes	Planning	2.21	2.40	No	For reference only	Community Partnership Not Started Given that the Professional Practices and Responsibilities principal survey target was missed by only 0.05 points, program coordinators will engage school partners with a targeted request for qualitative feedback about what specific professional behaviors graduates demonstrate well and where gaps remain. This information will be used to fine-tune residency seminar content and pre-residency coursework to better align with principal expectations in the first year of independent teaching.
Domain	Lamar Avg (2025)	State Avg (2025)	Target	Met?	Gap to Target																			
Professional Practices & Responsibilities	2.25	2.53	2.30	No	-0.05																			
Domain	Lamar Avg (2025)	State Avg (2025)	Measured Target?	Notes																				
Planning	2.21	2.40	No	For reference only																				

	Instruction	2.18	2.41	No	For reference only	
	Learning Environment	2.13	2.46	No	For reference only	
	Professional Practices & Responsibilities	2.25	2.53	Yes — 2.30	Target not met	
	Students with Disabilities	2.15	2.34	No	For reference only	
	Emergent Bilingual Students	2.19	2.33	No	For reference only	
	Analysis					
	• The 2.30 principal survey target for Professional Practices and Responsibilities was not met for the 2025 reporting year. Lamar University graduates averaged 2.25 in this domain, falling 0.05 points below the program threshold — the narrowest margin of any domain assessed. • Despite not meeting the target, Professional Practices and Responsibilities was the highest-rated domain among Lamar University graduates in the 2025 principal survey (2.25), suggesting that candidates demonstrate relative strength in this area compared to other T-TESS domains such as Learning Environment (2.13) and Instruction (2.18). • Lamar University graduates scored below the statewide average of 2.53 in Professional Practices and Responsibilities by a margin of 0.28 points. This gap, while notable, is consistent with the pattern observed across all six principal survey domains, where Lamar averages fall below state benchmarks. • The near-miss on the principal survey target (2.25 vs. 2.30) and the provisional meeting of the T-TESS residency target in Spring 2026 together suggest that the program is trending in the right direction for this domain, and that focused, sustained efforts may be sufficient to achieve both benchmarks in the next assessment cycle.					

Candidates will support academic and behavioral needs of students.

Clinical teachers are observed by field supervisors and assessed formally four times during their semester-long or year-long residency. Field supervisors use the T-TESS. This instrument provides candidates with continuous, timely, and formative feedback about their instructional planning and classroom management. This is the same form that their future principals will use to evaluate their teaching performance. The purpose of the T-TESS is to provide educators with information about their teaching practices, so that they can improve their practice.

Data sets are one year apart. Students who graduate in May, 2023 and obtain a teaching position in the 2023-2024 school year would be the same data set. T-TESS scores from spring 2023 would be compared with principal survey data from 2024, etc.
90% of candidates will receive proficient or higher on the T-TESS
100% average of all graduates will meet or exceed 2.5 on principal survey data in each domain above.

MEASURES	RESULTS	ACTIONS
----------	---------	---------

Formal Observation During PEDG 4320, 4620-candidates are evaluated by field supervisors. After graduation, principals use the same instrument (T-TESS) to evaluate candidates in their first year as professional educators. 100% of students will receive a 2.3 or above on the principal survey. Indirect - Survey <i>Residency: PEDG 4320</i> Target The purpose of the T-TESS is to provide educators with information about their teaching practices, so that they can improve their practice. The T-TESS instrument assesses four areas: 1. Planning, 2. Instruction, 3. Learning Environment, and 4. Professional Practices and Responsibilities. 75% of students will achieve a proficient score in the Instruction and Learning Environment Domains in TTESS T-TESS Rubric.pdf	NOT MET image.png image (1).png Analysis Based on data collected across both assessment measures (the T-TESS Observation 4 residency scores (Instruction and Learning Environment domains) and the principal survey results for the same domains) the following findings are documented for this assessment cycle: • The 75% proficiency target for the Instruction and Learning Environment domains on T-TESS Observation 4 was not met by the Fall 2025 cohort. Of 36 candidates assessed, 25 (69.44%) achieved Proficient or higher in both domains, falling 5.56 percentage points below the benchmark. • Spring 2026 candidates have provisionally met the 75% target, with 33 of 43 assessed candidates (76.74%) achieving proficiency in Instruction and Learning Environment. This result is encouraging but should be interpreted with caution as semester data remains incomplete. • The 2.30 principal survey target was not met in either the Instruction or Learning Environment domain for the 2025 reporting year. Lamar University graduates scored 2.18 in Instruction and 2.13 in Learning Environment, indicating that principals rate graduates as approaching but not yet reaching the Sufficiently Prepared threshold in these areas. • Lamar University graduates performed below the statewide average in both target domains. The gap was 0.23 points in Instruction (Lamar: 2.18 vs. State: 2.41) and 0.33 points in Learning Environment (Lamar: 2.13 vs. State: 2.46), suggesting that preparation in these two areas warrants focused programmatic attention. • A consistent pattern emerges across both measures: candidates and graduates show relative weakness in the Learning Environment domain compared to Instruction. This pattern points to a programmatic gap in preparing candidates to establish and manage effective classroom environments.	Revise Curriculum Not Started Program faculty and field supervisors will review disaggregated Observation 4 data for the Instruction and Learning Environment domains to identify recurring areas of weakness at the indicator level. Seminar activities and coaching conversations within PEDG 4320/4620 will be restructured to provide candidates with targeted, evidence-based feedback specific to these two domains prior to the final formal observation. Supervisors will use inter-observation feedback cycles to scaffold candidate growth progressively across all four observations. Given that Learning Environment is the lowest-performing domain in both the T-TESS observation data and the principal survey, the program will conduct a curriculum review to identify where classroom management theory, restorative practices, and positive behavioral support strategies are embedded in pre-residency coursework. Adjustments will be made to ensure candidates have meaningful practice opportunities in these skills before entering their clinical placement.
--	--	--

Candidates will effectively use technology to enhance student learning

Students will complete an ISTE survey and reflect on their identified areas of development needed during enrollment in educational technology.
 Students will receive a score of 2.5 (average) on principal surveys in the area of technology
 100% of students will complete an ISTE survey during the ed tech course.
 100% of students will complete a reflection identifying areas needing development in ed tech.
 100% average scores on principal survey candidates will be 2.5 or greater.

MEASURES	RESULTS	ACTIONS																																								
ISTE Survey At least 70% of teacher candidates will rate themselves Confident or Very Confident on 75% or more of the ISTE-aligned Technology Integration Self-Evaluation items, demonstrating readiness to integrate technology effectively to support student learning. At least 65% of candidates will express belief that AI will play a significant role in the future of education, reflecting awareness of and openness to emerging technologies in the modern classroom. Direct - Assignment Technology in Education: PEDG 3332 Target At least 70% of teacher candidates will rate themselves Confident or Very Confident on 75% or more of the ISTE-aligned Technology Integration Self-Evaluation items, demonstrating readiness to integrate technology effectively to support student learning. At least 65% of candidates will express belief that AI will play a significant role in the future of education, reflecting awareness of and openness to emerging technologies in the modern classroom. principal-survey-questions-example.pdf	NOT MET Summary The Technology Integration Self-Evaluation survey was administered to teacher candidates during the current reporting period. The instrument assessed candidate confidence across six ISTE-aligned standards using 29 Likert-scale items rated on a four-point scale (Strongly Disagree/Not Confident at All = 0; Disagree/Slightly Confident = 1; Neutral/Moderately Confident = 2; Agree/Confident = 3; Strongly Agree/Very Confident = 4). The survey also included open-response items related to AI use, AI awareness, and observed and enacted technology integration in field placements. ISTE Standard Confidence Ratings The table below presents average confidence scores and the percentage of responses rated Confident or Very Confident (score ≥ 3) for each of the six ISTE-aligned standard areas among teacher candidates. The program target is that 70% or more of candidate responses will fall at the Confident or Very Confident level in each standard. <table><tr><th>ISTE-Aligned Standard</th><th>Mean Score (0–4)</th><th>% Confident or Very Confident</th><th>Target (≥ 70%)</th><th>Target Met?</th></tr><tr><td>Standard I: Creativity & Innovation</td><td>3.10</td><td>77.6%</td><td>70%</td><td>Yes ✓</td></tr><tr><td>Standard II: Communication & Collaboration</td><td>3.40</td><td>87.1%</td><td>70%</td><td>Yes ✓</td></tr><tr><td>Standard III: Research & Information Fluency</td><td>3.37</td><td>84.5%</td><td>70%</td><td>Yes ✓</td></tr><tr><td>Standard IV: Critical Thinking, Problem Solving & Decision Making</td><td>3.29</td><td>83.8%</td><td>70%</td><td>Yes ✓</td></tr><tr><td>Standard V: Digital Citizenship</td><td>3.48</td><td>89.0%</td><td>70%</td><td>Yes ✓</td></tr><tr><td>Standard VI–VII: Technology Operations & Concepts</td><td>3.12</td><td>77.6%</td><td>70%</td><td>Yes ✓</td></tr><tr><td>Overall (All 29 Items)</td><td>3.29</td><td>83.3%</td><td>70%</td><td>Yes ✓</td></tr></table>	ISTE-Aligned Standard	Mean Score (0–4)	% Confident or Very Confident	Target (≥ 70%)	Target Met?	Standard I: Creativity & Innovation	3.10	77.6%	70%	Yes ✓	Standard II: Communication & Collaboration	3.40	87.1%	70%	Yes ✓	Standard III: Research & Information Fluency	3.37	84.5%	70%	Yes ✓	Standard IV: Critical Thinking, Problem Solving & Decision Making	3.29	83.8%	70%	Yes ✓	Standard V: Digital Citizenship	3.48	89.0%	70%	Yes ✓	Standard VI–VII: Technology Operations & Concepts	3.12	77.6%	70%	Yes ✓	Overall (All 29 Items)	3.29	83.3%	70%	Yes ✓	No actions have been added.
ISTE-Aligned Standard	Mean Score (0–4)	% Confident or Very Confident	Target (≥ 70%)	Target Met?																																						
Standard I: Creativity & Innovation	3.10	77.6%	70%	Yes ✓																																						
Standard II: Communication & Collaboration	3.40	87.1%	70%	Yes ✓																																						
Standard III: Research & Information Fluency	3.37	84.5%	70%	Yes ✓																																						
Standard IV: Critical Thinking, Problem Solving & Decision Making	3.29	83.8%	70%	Yes ✓																																						
Standard V: Digital Citizenship	3.48	89.0%	70%	Yes ✓																																						
Standard VI–VII: Technology Operations & Concepts	3.12	77.6%	70%	Yes ✓																																						
Overall (All 29 Items)	3.29	83.3%	70%	Yes ✓																																						

All six ISTE-aligned standard areas exceeded the 70% Confident-or-above threshold. Standard V: Digital Citizenship achieved the highest confidence rate at 89.0% (mean = 3.48), and Standard II: Communication and Collaboration was also notably strong at 87.1% (mean = 3.40). Standard I: Creativity and Innovation and Standard VI-VII: Technology Operations and Concepts were the lowest-performing areas, each at 77.6% (means of 3.10 and 3.12 respectively), though both cleared the program benchmark. The overall average across all 29 items was 3.29, with 83.3% of all responses rated Confident or Very Confident.

Student-Level Proficiency Thresholds

Each candidate's overall confidence profile was examined by calculating the proportion of all 29 items on which the individual rated themselves Confident or Very Confident. The program target is that at least 70% of candidates will rate themselves Confident or Very Confident on 75% or more of all items.

Proficiency Threshold	# of Students	% of Students	Target	Met?
≥ 50% of items rated Confident or Very Confident	37 / 42	88.1%	—	—
≥ 75% of items rated Confident or Very Confident	34 / 42	81.0%	70%	✓
≥ 90% of items rated Confident or Very Confident	26 / 42	61.9%	—	—
100% of items rated Confident or Very Confident	16 / 42	38.1%	—	—

The program target was met and exceeded: 81.0% of candidates (34 of 42) rated themselves Confident or Very Confident on at least 75% of the 29 survey items, surpassing the 70% program threshold by 11 percentage points. Additionally, 88.1% of candidates (37 of 42) met the 50% proficiency threshold, and 61.9% (26 of 42) rated themselves confidently on 90% or more of all items, reflecting a broadly high-confidence cohort.

AI Awareness and Attitudes

The survey included open-response items asking candidates about their AI usage habits, their understanding of how AI works, and their beliefs about AI's role in the future of education. Responses were categorized thematically. The program target is that at least 65% of candidates will express belief that AI will play a significant role in education.

AI Attitude / Awareness	# of Students	% of Students	Notes
-------------------------	---------------	---------------	-------

Item			
Use AI at least weekly (weekly or daily)	20 / 42	47.6%	ChatGPT and Google AI most common
Use AI occasionally or rarely	7 / 42	16.7%	Situational, grammar or study help
Never use AI or strongly avoid it	9 / 42	21.4%	Some express concern or principled avoidance
Understand basic principles of how AI works (Yes)	31 / 42	73.8%	Partial/unsure: 11.9%; No: 14.3%
Believe AI will play significant role in education (Yes)	28 / 42	66.7%	Mixed/uncertain: 33.3%; Skeptical: 0%
The AI awareness target was met: 66.7% of candidates (28 of 42) expressed a belief that AI will play a significant role in the future of education, exceeding the 65% program threshold. Additionally, 73.8% of candidates (31 of 42) reported understanding the basic principles of how AI works. The most frequently named AI tools were ChatGPT and Google AI (Gemini). A notable 21.4% of candidates reported never using AI or actively avoiding it and approximately one-third of respondents expressed mixed or uncertain views about AI's role in education, often citing concerns about student over-reliance and academic integrity.			
Principals responded to the principal survey for graduates from the BS IS program in 2024. Graduates taught during the 2024-2025 academic year, and principals completed a survey in May of 2025.			
The three items on the principal survey related to technology include: Number 8. design lessons that integrate technology when appropriate to the lesson (to the extent technology is available at the school)? Number 15. make sure all instructional resources, materials, and technology are aligned to instructional purposes? Number 20. use technology when appropriate to the lesson (to the extent technology was available at the school)?			
Forty-one principals completed the survey, and the average scores did not meet the goal of 2.5. For Q8, the average was 2.25, for Q15, the average was 2.24, and for Q20, the average score was 2.219.			
ISTE_Principal_Survey.png			
Analysis			
We are currently revising the educational technology course to ensure students are prepared to use technology effectively in K-12			

	classrooms upon graduation and certification. One note, with the changes and recent advances in technology, candidates may be behind on the latest technology due to the time delay between the ed tech course and their first year as a certified educator.	
--	---	--