

Institutional Effectiveness Report 2020-21

Program: Secondary Education

College and Department: College of Education, Curriculum & Instruction

Contact: Jeremy Wendt, Chairperson

Mission: The mission of the Department of Curriculum & Instruction is to enhance education and policy for the well-being of society through the creation, communication and application of new knowledge; preparation of scholars, researchers, educators and other professionals to meet the needs of our increasingly diverse, global, technological society; and outreach initiatives engaged with matters related to the local community, state, nation, and world.

Mission Brief: Learn from the past. Impact the present. Focus on the future.

Vision: Evidence-based, student-focused, future-oriented education for life-long learners.

Program Goals

PG 1: This program will prepare effective teacher candidates to apply their content and pedagogical knowledge and skills to contribute to the academic and developmental growth of diverse P-12 students.

Student Learning Outcomes

SLO 1: Program candidates will demonstrate content and pedagogical knowledge and skills by meeting or exceeding passing scores on the respective state licensure exam as set by the State Board of Education.

SLO 2: Program candidates will demonstrate content and pedagogical knowledge and skills by meeting or exceeding a passing score on the respective performance-based subject-specific assessment as set by the State Board of Education.

SLO 3: Program candidates will demonstrate content and pedagogical knowledge and skills in their clinical practice by scoring at or above expectations on the TEAM rubric.

A departmentally developed curriculum map can be found in Appendix 1 that shows the connections between courses and student learning outcomes.

Assessment Methods

SLO 1: Program candidates will demonstrate content and pedagogical knowledge and skills by meeting or exceeding passing scores on the respective state licensure exam as set by the State Board of Education.

- State licensure exams. Candidates take between one and six licensure exams in order to be recommended for licensure. The Praxis subject assessments measure candidates' content

knowledge of the subjects they teach. The subject assessments measure subject-specific teaching skills and content knowledge. Validity for the assessments is evidenced through multiple means, including job analysis; item writing and reviewing; standard-setting studies; test reviews; and ongoing reviews. Reliability is addressed via the standard error of measurement, reliability of classification, and reliability of scoring. Praxis is a proprietary assessment developed, regulated, and scored by ETS, and the Tennessee State Board of Education sets candidate cut scores.

SLO 2: Program candidates will demonstrate content and pedagogical knowledge and skills by meeting or exceeding a passing score on the respective performance-based subject-specific assessment as set by the State Board of Education.

- Performance-based subject-specific assessment. The edTPA is a performance-based assessment that assesses teaching behaviors that focus on student learning. edTPA is a proprietary, nation-wide assessment, developed by SCALE/Stanford and administered by Pearson. It is available in 27 individual content areas as a multiple-measures system that includes two primary components: 1) teaching-related performance tasks embedded in clinical practice that focus on planning, instruction, assessment, academic language, and analysis of teaching; 2) a three to five day documented learning segment. edTPA was nationally validated in 2013 to establish validity and reliability. The edTPA is professionally scored by Pearson, and the Tennessee State Board of Education sets candidate cut scores.

SLO 3: Program candidates will demonstrate content and pedagogical knowledge and skills in their clinical practice by scoring at or above expectations on the TEAM rubric.

- Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM). In 2011 the State Department of Education implemented the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) evaluation rubric—a comprehensive student outcomes-based statewide educator evaluation system. The majority of Tennessee educators across all content areas are observed multiple times throughout the year using this observation instrument developed by the State. This program uses the TEAM rubric as the primary assessment tool for evaluating teacher candidate performance and application of content knowledge and pedagogical skills during clinical practice. The TEAM rubric evaluates educators across three primary domains: instruction, planning, environment. Educators are rated across all domains on a scale of 1 (significantly below expectations) to 5 (significantly above expectations). The program chose to use TEAM to evaluate its teacher candidates in an effort to familiarize them with and best prepare them for this rigorous evaluation of teachers across Tennessee.

Results

Student Learning Outcome 1: Program candidates will demonstrate content and pedagogical knowledge and skills by meeting or exceeding passing scores on the respective state licensure exam as set by the State Board of Education. PRAXIS content exams: All candidates must pass their respective Praxis content exam prior to entering residency I/student teaching. Praxis summary reports show EPP scores compared to State and National averages, as well as a breakdown of our candidates in each quartile. All summary reports are posted on the EPP's website. Content areas that had five or less candidates scored

for each of the three academic years are Earth and Space Science, and Economics. These content areas were omitted from this report. See Tables 1–6 below for SEED PRAXIS data.

Table 1. Biology: Content Knowledge PRAXIS

Year	TTU			State		
	N	Pass Rate	Mean	N	Pass Rate	Mean
2017-2018	7	85.71	155.14	137	77.37	157.42
2018-2019	11	100	158.55	150	77.33	157.17
2019-2020	8	100	158	135	74.07	158.33

Table 2. Chemistry: Content Knowledge PRAXIS

Year	TTU			State		
	N	Pass Rate	Mean	N	Pass Rate	Mean
2017-2018	4	–	–	65	55.38	149.78
2018-2019	8	87.5	161.25	69	52.17	151.3
2019-2020	19	89.47	164.89	60	53.33	153.42

Table 3. Mathematics PRAXIS

Year	TTU			State		
	N	Pass Rate	Mean	N	Pass Rate	Mean
2017-2018	17	52.94	156.71	228	49.56	155.63
2018-2019	12	33.33	144.25	228	42.11	151.36
2019-2020	6	33.33	149.17	205	37.56	148.24

Table 4. English Language Arts PRAXIS

Year	TTU			State		
	N	Pass Rate	Mean	N	Pass Rate	Mean
2017-2018	16	68.75	173.38	323	85.76	177.11
2018-2019	16	93.75	175.5	382	82.2	176.19
2019-2020	7	85.71	175.86	320	75.94	174.34

Table 5. Government/Political Science PRAXIS

Year	TTU			State		
	N	Pass Rate	Mean	N	Pass Rate	Mean
2017-2018	7	85.71	162.71	78	84.62	164.27
2018-2019	2	–	–	70	81.43	162.54
2019-2020	2	–	–	48	79.17	162.85

Table 6. World and U.S. History: Content Knowledge PRAXIS

Year	TTU			State		
	N	Pass Rate	Mean	N	Pass Rate	Mean
2017-2018	20	60	157	255	85.75	158.58
2018-2019	18	55.56	156.67	310	84.43	159.01
2019-2020	10	60	159.7	247	79.78	157.11

For the 2019-2020 academic year, TTU had 5 or less candidates take the Government/Political Science, Economics, and Earth and Space Science PRAXIS exams. Therefore, no statistical information was reported. A total of 8 TTU candidates completed PRAXIS for Biology: Content Knowledge. The total mean score was 158, with a pass rate of 100 percent. At the State level, a total of 135 candidates completed PRAXIS for the same content area. The total mean score was 158.33, comparatively higher than TTU's mean score, with a pass rate of 74.07 percent. A total of 19 TTU candidates completed PRAXIS for Chemistry: Content Knowledge. The total mean score was 164.89, with a pass rate of 89.47 percent. At the State level, a total of 60 candidates completed PRAXIS for the same content area. The total mean score was 153.42, comparatively lower than TTU's mean score, with a pass rate of 53.33 percent. A total of 6 TTU candidates completed PRAXIS for Mathematics. The total mean score was 149.17, with a pass rate of 33.33 percent. At the State level, a total of 205 candidates completed PRAXIS for the same content area. The total mean score was 148.24, comparatively lower than TTU's mean score, with a pass rate of 37.56 percent. A total of 7 TTU candidates completed PRAXIS for English Language Arts. The total mean score was 175.86, with a pass rate of 85.71 percent. At the State level, a total of 320 candidates completed PRAXIS for the same content area. The total mean score was 174.34, comparatively lower than TTU's mean score, with a pass rate of 75.94 percent. Lastly, a total of 10 TTU candidates completed PRAXIS for World and U.S. History: Content Knowledge. The total mean score was 159.7, with a pass rate of 60 percent. At the State level, a total of 247 candidates completed PRAXIS for the same content area. The total mean score was 157.11, comparatively lower than TTU's mean score, with a pass rate of 79.78 percent.

Student Learning Outcome 2: Program candidates will demonstrate content and pedagogical knowledge and skills by meeting or exceeding a passing score on the respective performance-based subject-specific assessment as set by the State Board of Education. edTPA: edTPA is a performance-based assessment used to measure pedagogical skills and pedagogical content knowledge. It shows what candidates can do, rather than what they plan to do. It is holistic and reflective as candidates integrate learning from across the curriculum and examine teaching practices. The portfolio includes 15 rubrics across 3 tasks (planning, instruction, and assessment) to demonstrate teacher effectiveness. In 2017, the Tennessee State Board of Education voted to require edTPA of all teacher candidates seeking licensure in the state. This requirement will go into effect January 1, 2019; however, Tennessee Tech progressively implemented edTPA in 2012 for all programs with strong support for both candidates and faculty. Currently, candidates complete the edTPA during the residency II/student teaching clinical experience; each rubric is scored on a 5-point scale. Over the past three years (2017-2018, 2018-2019, and 2019-2020), TTU has consistently produced total mean scores higher than State and National levels. However, TTU's total mean score has dipped from 48.0 in 2018-2019 to 47.0 in 2019-2020, whereas the State and National total mean scores experienced relatively little change (-.1 and -.1, respectively) between the

same years. TTU mean scores exceeded both State and National levels for Secondary ELA and Secondary History/Social Studies (with the exception of 2019-2020 regarding the State level, which TTU did not exceed). However, TTU mean scores did not exceed State and National levels for Secondary Math across all three years. For the year 2018-2019, TTU mean scores failed to exceed State and National levels for Secondary Science, but exceeded both levels in the subsequent 2019-2020 year. There were no outstanding changes in number of completed portfolios for any areas. See Tables 1–5 below for edTPA data.

Table 1. Total mean scores for TTU, State, and National levels

	TTU	State	National
2017-2018	47.9	46.3	44.1
2018-2019	48.0	45.9	43.8
2019-2020	47.0	45.8	43.7

Table 2. edTPA data for Secondary ELA

TTU			State			National		
Year	N	Mean	Year	N	Mean	Year	N	Mean
2017-2018	7	50.3	2017-2018	100	47.8	2017-2018	3,293	46.1
2018-2019	8	50.6	2018-2019	169	47.7	2018-2019	3,552	46.1
2019-2020	7	48.3	2019-2020	186	47.3	2019-2020	3,033	46.3

Table 3. edTPA data for Secondary History/Social Studies

TTU			State			National		
Year	N	Mean	Year	N	Mean	Year	N	Mean
2017-2018	12	46.3	2017-2018	109	45.6	2017-2018	3,161	45.2
2018-2019	10	47.6	2018-2019	145	45.4	2018-2019	3,399	44.7
2019-2020	11	45.5	2019-2020	155	46.0	2019-2020	3,079	44.9

Table 4. edTPA data for Secondary Math

TTU			State			National		
Year	N	Mean	Year	N	Mean	Year	N	Mean
2017-2018	5	39.8	2017-2018	57	41.9	2017-2018	2,549	40.4
2018-2019	6	37.8	2018-2019	88	41.2	2018-2019	2,736	40.0
2019-2020	15	39.1	2019-2020	116	39.9	2019-2020	2,576	39.6

Table 5. edTPA data for Secondary Science

TTU			State			National		
Year	N	Mean	Year	N	Mean	Year	N	Mean
2017-2018	11	46.3	2017-2018	64	43.7	2017-2018	2,649	43.1
2018-2019	5	42.0	2018-2019	16	47.5	2018-2019	2,998	42.1
2019-2020	17	43.4	2019-2020	104	41.9	2019-2020	2,651	41.5

For the 2019-2020 academic year, the total mean score for TTU (47.0) was higher than State (45.8) and National (43.7) total mean scores. TTU had 7 candidates scored in Secondary ELA, whereas the State and National levels had 186 and 3,033 candidates scored, respectively. Regarding total mean scores for Secondary ELA portfolios, TTU (48.3) was comparatively higher than both the State (47.3) and National (46.3) levels. TTU had 11 candidates scored in Secondary Social Studies, whereas the State and National levels had 155 and 3,079 candidates scored, respectively. Regarding total mean scores for Secondary Social Studies portfolios, TTU (45.5) was comparatively lower than the State (46.0) level but was higher than the National (44.9) level. TTU had 15 candidates scored in Secondary Math, whereas the State and National levels had 116 and 2,576 candidates scored, respectively. Regarding total mean scores for Secondary Math portfolios, TTU (39.1) was comparatively lower than both the State (39.9) and National (39.6) levels. TTU had 17 candidates scored in Secondary Science, whereas the State and National levels had 104 and 2,651 candidates scored, respectively. Regarding total mean scores for Secondary Science portfolios, TTU (43.4) was comparatively higher than both the State (41.9) and National (41.5) levels.

Student Learning Outcome 3: Program candidates will demonstrate content and pedagogical knowledge and skills in their clinical practice by scoring at or above expectations on the TEAM rubric. TEAM: In 2011, the State Department of Education implemented the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) evaluation rubric – a comprehensive, student outcomes-based, statewide educator evaluation system. The majority of Tennessee educators across all content areas are observed multiple times throughout the year using this observation instrument developed by the State (TEAM Rubric). The EPP uses the TEAM rubric as the primary assessment tool for evaluating teacher candidate performance during clinical experiences. The TEAM rubric evaluates educators across 3 primary domains: instruction, planning, and environment. Educators are rated across all domains on a scale of 1 (significantly below expectations) to 5 (significantly above expectations). The TEAM rubric aligns with InTASC standards 1-8, demonstrating candidate mastery of Learner and Learning, Content, and Instructional Practice standards. First, the TEAM domain of Instruction (broken into 12 specific components) closely aligns to InTASC standards 1-5. Second, the TEAM domain of Planning (3 components) aligns to InTASC standards 6-8. Lastly, the TEAM domain of Environment (4 components) aligns to InTASC standards 2-3. TEAM rubric scores at and above expectations demonstrate candidate mastery of InTASC standards 1-8. See Tables 1–10 below for TEAM data.

Table 1. TEAM data

TTU				
Year	N	Instruction	Planning	Environment
2017-2018	1,212	3.53	3.48	3.77
2018-2019	821	3.67	3.61	4.08
2019-2020	695	3.78	3.68	4.09

The EPP chose to use TEAM to evaluate its teacher candidates in an effort to familiarize them with and best prepare them for this rigorous evaluation of teachers across Tennessee. Residency candidates are formally evaluated 3 times by a university supervisor and 2 times by a mentor teacher using the TEAM rubric, for a total of 5 TEAM evaluations across the residency year. Candidates, when evaluated 3 times each by university supervisors, earned the following mean scores on the TEAM rubric: 2017-2018 (n = 1,212 evaluations) Instruction = 3.53, Planning = 3.48, Environment = 3.77; 2018-2019 (n = 821 evaluations) Instruction = 3.67, Planning = 3.61, Environment = 4.08; 2019-2020 (n = 695 evaluations) Instruction = 3.78, Planning = 3.68, Environment = 4.09. The 3-year trend of university supervisor evaluations shows a gradual increase in mean scores across all 3 domains. Similarly, student teachers are formally evaluated 2 times by the university supervisor and once by the mentor teacher, for a total of 3 formal TEAM evaluations across student teaching (due to the 1-semester time limit versus 1.5 semesters in residency). See TEAM Evaluation Data for aggregate and disaggregate TEAM data across 3 years for both residency and student teaching.

Table 2. TEAM data for Secondary Education Biology

TTU				
Year	N	Instruction	Planning	Environment
2017-2018	35	3.8	3.7	3.9
2018-2019	28	3.4	3.4	3.5
2019-2020	35	3.8	3.7	4.1

Candidates, when evaluated 3 times each by university supervisors, earned the following mean scores on the TEAM rubric: 2017-2018 (n = 35 evaluations) Instruction = 3.8, Planning = 3.7, Environment = 3.9; 2018-2019 (n = 28 evaluations) Instruction = 3.4, Planning = 3.4, Environment = 3.5; and 2019-2020 (n = 35 evaluations) Instruction = 3.8, Planning = 3.7, Environment = 4.1. The 3-year trend of university supervisor evaluations shows a dip in mean scores during the 2018-2019 year, but a return to previous levels in 2019-2020 across all 3 domains.

Table 3. TEAM data for Secondary Education Chemistry

TTU				
Year	N	Instruction	Planning	Environment
2017-2018	4	3.0	2.8	3.3
2018-2019	–	–	–	–
2019-2020	15	3.7	3.8	3.8

Candidates, when evaluated 3 times each by university supervisors, earned the following mean scores on the TEAM rubric: 2017-2018 (n = 4 evaluations) Instruction = 3, Planning = 2.8, Environment = 3.3; 2018-2019 no data were available; and 2019-2020 (n = 15 evaluations) Instruction = 3.7, Planning = 3.8, Environment = 3.8. The 2-year trend of university supervisor evaluations shows a gradual increase in mean scores across all 3 domains.

Table 4. TEAM data for Secondary Education History

TTU				
Year	N	Instruction	Planning	Environment
2017-2018	47	3.8	3.7	4.0
2018-2019	60	3.8	3.9	4.2
2019-2020	47	3.8	3.8	4.1

Candidates, when evaluated 3 times each by university supervisors, earned the following mean scores on the TEAM rubric: 2017-2018 (n = 47 evaluations) Instruction = 3.8, Planning = 3.7, Environment = 4.0; 2018-2019 (n = 60 evaluations) Instruction = 3.8, Planning = 3.9, Environment = 4.2; and 2019-2020 (n = 47 evaluations) Instruction = 3.8, Planning = 3.8, Environment = 4.1. The 3-year trend of university supervisor evaluations shows little change in mean scores across all 3 domains.

Table 5. TEAM data for Secondary Education Math

TTU				
Year	N	Instruction	Planning	Environment
2017-2018	6	3.7	3.7	3.9
2018-2019	14	3.5	3.2	3.5
2019-2020	6	4.4	4.3	4.4

Candidates, when evaluated 3 times each by university supervisors, earned the following mean scores on the TEAM rubric: 2017-2018 (n = 6 evaluations) Instruction = 3.7, Planning = 3.7, Environment = 3.9; 2018-2019 (n = 14 evaluations) Instruction = 3.5, Planning = 3.2, Environment = 3.5; and 2019-2020 (n = 6 evaluations) Instruction = 4.4, Planning = 4.3, Environment = 4.4. The 3-year trend of university supervisor evaluations shows a gradual increase in mean scores across all 3 domains.

Table 6. TEAM data for Secondary Education Political Science

TTU				
Year	N	Instruction	Planning	Environment
2017-2018	8	3.5	3.7	3.3
2018-2019	–	–	–	–
2019-2020	4	2.8	3.1	2.6

Candidates, when evaluated 3 times each by university supervisors, earned the following mean scores on the TEAM rubric: 2017-2018 (n = 8 evaluations) Instruction = 3.5, Planning = 3.7, Environment = 3.3; 2018-2019 no data were available; and 2019-2020 (n = 4 evaluations) Instruction = 2.8, Planning = 3.1,

Environment = 2.6. The 2-year trend of university supervisor evaluations shows a gradual decrease in mean scores across all 3 domains.

Table 7. TEAM data for Secondary Education English

Year	N	TTU		
		Instruction	Planning	Environment
2017-2018	33	4.0	3.9	4.2
2018-2019	–	–	–	–
2019-2020	15	4.0	4.0	4.1

Candidates, when evaluated 3 times each by university supervisors, earned the following mean scores on the TEAM rubric: 2017-2018 (n = 33 evaluations) Instruction = 4.0, Planning = 3.9, Environment = 4.2; 2018-2019 no data were available; and 2019-2020 (n = 15 evaluations) Instruction = 4.0, Planning = 4.0, Environment = 4.1. The 2-year trend of university supervisor evaluations shows little change in mean scores across all 3 domains.

Modifications for Improvement

In the 2019-2020 academic year, a new course was designed in collaboration with the Math department to help Math candidates pass the national licensure exam. With interventions and support, SEED Math candidates in the 2020-2021 academic year had a much higher success rate (~80%) on the national licensure exam.

Appendices

1. Curriculum Map

Appendix 1: Curriculum Map

Program: Biology 6-12	CCSSO's Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC)				
	Learner Development	Learning Differences	Learning Environment	Content Knowledge	Application of Content
Course & Assignment:	1	2	3	4	5
National Science Teacher Association http://www.nsta.org/preserve/docs/2012NSTAPreserveScienceStandards.pdf	Std. 2 Content Pedagogy	Std. 2 Content Pedagogy, Std. 3 Learning Environment	Std. 3 Learning Environments	Std 1 Content Knowledge	Std. 2 Content Pedagogy
CUED 6150 Middle School Curriculum+4:21	Task 1 – Review of research on young adolescent development (focus on middle level) and middle level classroom practices; Task 3 – In-depth analysis with a focus on the intersection of the developing adolescent and application of content in the middle level classroom.	Task 1 – Review of research on young adolescent development (focus on middle level) and middle level classroom practices; Task 3 – In-depth analysis with a focus on the intersection of the developing adolescent and application of content in the middle level classroom.	Task 1 – Review of research on young adolescent development (focus on middle level) and middle level classroom practices; Task 3 – In-depth analysis with a focus on the intersection of the developing adolescent and application of content in the middle level classroom.	Task 2 – Analysis of This We Believe and Promoting Harmony; Task 3 – In-depth analysis with a focus on the intersection of the developing adolescent and application of content in the middle level classroom.	Task 3 – In-depth analysis with a focus on the intersection of the developing adolescent and application of content in the middle level classroom.
SEED 6210 Secondary School Prog	Discussion Posts & Responses, Journal Article Critique, Battelle for Kids (BFK), “Best Teacher in You” Summary Report, Literature Review	Discussion Posts & Responses, Journal Article Critique, Battelle for Kids (BFK), “Best Teacher in You” Summary Report, Literature Review	Discussion Posts & Responses, Journal Article Critique, Battelle for Kids (BFK), “Best Teacher in You” Summary Report, Literature Review	Discussion Posts & Responses, Journal Article Critique, Battelle for Kids (BFK), “Best Teacher in You” Summary Report, Literature Review	Discussion Posts & Responses, Journal Article Critique, Battelle for Kids (BFK), “Best Teacher in You” Summary Report, Literature Review
FOED 6020 Perspectives in American Education OR FOED 7020 Philosophy & Public Policy	Peer Journal Responses: Students respond to peer journals to experience collaboration with other professionals with a view to foster learner growth and development.	Weekly Journaling Activities: Students demonstrate understanding that learners bring assets to learning based on their individual experiences, abilities, talents, prior learning, and peer and social group interactions, as well as language, culture, family, and community values through weekly practices of connecting their own experiences, prior learning, community values, etc. during journaling activities.	Weekly Participation & Peer Engagement: Students are encouraged to become thoughtful and responsive listeners and observers through weekly engagement with peers and are expected to observe and respond in a thoughtful way a minimum of five times each week for a participation grade.	Midterm Paper: Students are encouraged to recognize the potential of bias in his/her representation of the discipline and are expected to appropriately address problems of bias through analysis of their experiences of American education in their education biography midterm papers.	Weekly Readings and Research: Students are constantly exploring how to use disciplinary knowledge as a lens to address local and global issues through their critical engagement weekly with readings regarding the history of American education.
CUED 6430 Production of Instructional Materials	Copyright and Fair Use; ☐ VR and AR in the classroom			Copyright and Fair Use; ☐ VR and AR in the classroom	Copyright and Fair Use; ☐ VR and AR in the classroom
FOED 6920 Educational Research OR	Research & Written Research Proposal	Research & Written Research Proposal	Research & Written Research Proposal	Research & Written Research Proposal	Research & Written Research Proposal
FOED 6980 Qualitative Research in Education	Research & Written Research Proposal	Research & Written Research Proposal	Research & Written Research Proposal	Research & Written Research Proposal	Research & Written Research Proposal
CUED 6900 Problems in Curriculum	Problem Paper	Problem Paper	Problem Paper	Problem Paper	Problem Paper
FOED 6320 Educational Applications for Teachers	Learning Styles/Self Assessment, Learning Styles/Self Assessment Discussion	Learning Styles/Self Assessment, Learning Styles/Self Assessment Discussion		Bloom's Weblesson, Final WebQuest, WebQuest Evaluations	Bloom's Weblesson, Bloom's Weblesson Reviews, WebQuest Evaluations, Final WebQuest
EDPY 7200 Advanced Educational Psychology	Chapter Concept Teaching & Review				
SPED 6010 Surv-Disab Char Proc Meth/SPED	Philosophy of SPED; Field Experience; Article Summaries; Chapter Presentation; Case Study	Philosophy of SPED; Field Experience; Article Summaries; Case Study	Philosophy of SPED; Field Experience; Article Summaries; Case Study	Philosophy of SPED; Field Experience; Article Summaries; Chapter Presentation; Case Study	Philosophy of SPED; Field Experience; Article Summaries; Chapter Presentation; Case Study
READ 6350 Secondary School Reading Program	Cross-curricular project		Cross-curricular project	Cross-curricular project	
SEED 5123 Mtrls/Meth-Tch the Sciences	Assignments: Lesson Plan, Questioning Project	Assignments: Lesson Plan, Questioning Project	Assignments: Journal Presentation, Lesson Plan, Activity Presentation	Assignments: Journal Presentation, Lesson Plan, Activity Presentation, Lab Safety Course/Quiz	Assignments: Lesson Plan, Questioning Project
CUED 6800 Field Experience	Context for Learning, Lesson Plan TEAM	Context for Learning, Lesson Plan TEAM	Context for Learning, Lesson Plan TEAM	Context for Learning, Lesson Plan TEAM	Context for Learning, Lesson Plan TEAM
CUED 6880 Student Teaching	Assignments: Lesson Plan, Instruction, Self-Assessment TEAM edTPA Rubrics	Assignments: Lesson Plan, Instruction, Self-Assessment TEAM edTPA Rubrics	Assignments: Lesson Plan, Instruction, Self-Assessment TEAM edTPA Rubrics	Assignments: Lesson Plan, Instruction, Self-Assessment TEAM edTPA Rubrics	Assignments: Lesson Plan, Instruction, Self-Assessment TEAM edTPA Rubrics

Program: Biology 6-12	CCSSO's Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC)				
	Assessment	Planning/ Instruction	Instructional Strategies	Professional Learning & Ethical Practice	Leadership & Collaboration
Course & Assignment:	6	7	8	9	10
National Science Teacher Association http://www.nsta.org/preservice/docs/2012NSTAPreserviceScienceStandards.pdf	Std. 2 Content Pedagogy, Std. 3 Learning Environment Std. 5 Impact on Student Learning	Std. 2 Content Pedagogy	Std. 2 Content Pedagogy	Std. 4 Safety Std. 6 Professional Knowledge & Skills	Std. 6 Professional Knowledge & Skills
CUED 6150 Middle School Curriculum+4:21					
SEED 6210 Secondary School Prog	Discussion Posts & Responses, Journal Article Critique, Battelle for Kids (BFK), "Best Teacher in You" Summary Report, Literature Review	Discussion Posts & Responses, Journal Article Critique, Battelle for Kids (BFK), "Best Teacher in You" Summary Report, Literature Review	Discussion Posts & Responses, Journal Article Critique, Battelle for Kids (BFK), "Best Teacher in You" Summary Report, Literature Review	Discussion Posts & Responses, Journal Article Critique, Battelle for Kids (BFK), "Best Teacher in You" Summary Report, Literature Review	Discussion Posts & Responses, Journal Article Critique, Battelle for Kids (BFK), "Best Teacher in You" Summary Report, Literature Review
FOED 6020 Perspectives in American Education OR FOED 7020 Philosophy & Public Policy	Instructor Pedagogy: Students observe instructor pedagogy that understands and models multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, and to guide the teacher's and learner's decision making.	American Teacher Planning: Through critical engagement with the movie "American Teacher" the student is expected to demonstrate how learning theory, human development, cultural diversity, and individual differences and impact ongoing planning.	Instrutor Pedagogy: Students observe instructor pedagogy that is committed to exploring how the use of new and emerging technologies can support and promote student learning and are encouraged to incorporate these into their own practice.	Weekly Reflections: The students are engaged in ongoing professional learning and uses evidence to continually evaluate his/her practice, particularly the effects of his/her choices and actions on others through weekly reflection activities.	Leadership Readings Students read accounts of community involvement in schooling and explore the historical development of leadership structures in public schools in the United States.
CUED 6430 Production of Instructional Materials		Copyright and Fair Use; ☐ VR and AR in the classroom	Interactive Programs (Classflow)		Google Classroom, Develop and maintain a LMS for your classroom
FOED 6920 Educational Research OR FOED 6980 Qualitative Research in Education	Research & Written Research Proposal	Research & Written Research Proposal	Research & Written Research Proposal	Research & Written Research Proposal	Research & Written Research Proposal
CUED 6900 Problems in Curriculum	Problem Paper		Problem Paper	Problem Paper	Problem Paper
FOED 6320 Educational Applications for Teachers		Sir Ken Robinson Discussion, TED Talk Discussion, Instructional Movie Production	INTERNET Apps Research Discussion, Digital Photography Pedagogy Discussion, iPad Apps Research Discussion		Final WebQuest
EDPY 7200 Advanced Educational Psychology		Chapter Review Present & Myth-buster			
SPED 6010 Surv-Disab Char Proc Meth/SPED	Philosophy of SPED; Field Experience; Article Summaries; Chapter Presentation; Case Study	Philosophy of SPED; Field Experience; Case Study	Field Experience; Case Study	Field Experience Presentation; Case Study Presentation	Field Experience Presentation; Case Study Presentation
READ 6350 Secondary School Reading Program		Cross-curricular project	Cross-curricular project	Cross-curricular project	
SEED 5123 Mtrls/Meth-Tch the Sciences	Assignments: Lesson Plan, Questioning Project	Assignments: Journal Presentation, Lesson Plan, Activity Presentation, Questioning Project	Assignments: Journal Presentation, Lesson Plan, Activity Presentation, Questioning Project	Assignments: Journal Presentation	Assignments: Community Outreach Project
CUED 6800 Field Experience	Context for Learning, Lesson Plan TEAM	Context for Learning, Lesson Plan TEAM	Context for Learning, Lesson Plan TEAM	Lesson Plan TEAM	TEAM
CUED 6880 Student Teaching	Assignments: Lesson Plan, Instruction TEAM edTPA Rubrics	Assignments: Lesson Plan, Instruction, Self-Assessment TEAM edTPA Rubrics	Assignments: Lesson Plan, Instruction, Self-Assessment TEAM edTPA Rubrics	Assignments: Lesson Plan, Instruction, Self-Assessment TEAM edTPA Rubrics	Assignments: Lesson Plan, Instruction, Self-Assessment TEAM edTPA Rubrics